

Inhalt:

ERC-Advanced Grant Project 229464
“POR”
“The Perception of Other Religions
in the Christian Occident
during the Early and Central Middle Ages
(5th – 12th centuries)”

FINAL SCIENTIFIC REPORT

Grant Agreement No. ERC-2008-AdG 229464

Project acronym: POR

PI's name: Hans-Werner Goetz

Project title: “The Perception of Other Religions in the Christian Occident during the Early
and Central Middle Ages
(5th – 12th centuries)”

Funding Scheme: AdG

Period covered: April 1st 2009 – March 31st 2012

Tel: 0049/40/42838-4837 or 2582 (secretary)

Fax: 0049/40/42838-3955

E-mail: Hans-Werner.Goetz@uni-hamburg.de

Date of Report: April 2012

1. Team members

The three year ERC-Advanced Grant project began on April 1st 2009 and ended on March 31st 2012. The participants were Hans-Werner Goetz (PI = Principal Investigator), professor of medieval history at the University of Hamburg, and three graduated collaborators (Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiter/innen): Anna Aurast (full-time), Claudia Valenzuela (half-time), Kerstin Zech (half-time, until March 31st 2011) resp. Bele Freudenberg (from April 1st 2011), further Norman Bade, who, after his B.A., worked as a graduated student (until September 30th 2011), and after his M.A. examination, as a graduated collaborator (half-time, from November 1st 2011). Furthermore several students were employed for minor tasks, but also to search databases for evidence and make entries in the POR database (Anne Molls, from October 1st 2010 until September 30th 2011; Yvonne Bresky, from April 1st 2011 until March 31st 2012; Michael Kuhn, from October 1st 2011 until March 31st 2012; Maximilian Zilken, from November 1st 2011 until March 31st 2012). All these members have worked in close cooperation.

2. Project objectives and organization

The aim of the project has been an analysis of the perception of (all) other religions in the perspective of Christian (Catholic) authors from the 5th to the 12th centuries (as described in

detail in the “Description of Work”): heathens, Jews, Muslims, heretics, and Greek-Orthodox Christians.

All collaborators accomplished a double task: on the one hand, they were each recording the evidence of certain (entire) sources on all religions in order to gain insight in the authors’ way of thinking; on the other hand, they were responsible for the perception of a specific religion. In this sense, Anna Aurast, who has also been helping to organize and administrate the whole project, has been dealing with the perception of Jews, Hans-Werner Goetz with the perception of heresies and heathens (as well as directing the whole project and aiming at a comparative analysis), Claudia Valenzuela and Norman Bade were dealing with the perception of Saracens in Spain and the Continent, Kerstin Zech has been dealing with the perception of heathens, while Bele Freudenberg has taken on the perception of the Greek Orthodox religion. The project profited from its organization and structure, forming a research group at one university under the leadership of the Principal Investigator. This structure warranted a close and continuous cooperation.

A fundamental basis for the project was a database constructed particularly responding to its requirements (set up by a computer specialist from the company bubitek). (A description of the database is given in Annex I) The project members entered up all the evidence of chosen, significant sources, to comment on them and to analyze the entries. Regular meetings served to discuss the emerging problems in order to guarantee a uniform and comparable shape of the entries. Because entering up the evidence was time-consuming, we considered it more important, first, to have exact and reliable entries of (certain) important sources, as a starting-point, than to analyze as many sources as possible. In sum, a representative choice of more than 90 sources from the 6th to the 12th centuries, from different centuries, European regions and distinct literary genres have been entered up and examined. (A list of these sources is given in Annex II.) The main emphasis lay on historiography, hagiography, and letters, but also included legal sources, charters, theological treatises, exegetical commentaries, sermons, scientific literature, travel reports, poetry and fiction, manuals and other genres, with a side-glance at book illuminations. While the POR database, therefore, helped us to analyze single authors (and take into regard their specific horizons and perceptions) and to compare their views and try some quantitative analysis, this documentary basis was expanded and complemented extensively by a further search of pertinent reports in existing databases of sources (dMGH, Library of Latin Texts, Patrologia Latina database) and written source collections for all current and pertinent terms used for members of other religions and for the corresponding evidence. This resulted in thousands of further entries from various sources and genres on the single religions. A second undertaking was the establishment of a bibliography and a reviewing of the state of research. A third important part of the project was the discussion of methodological problems, the fourth and, of course, most important part was the analysis of some of the most important, significant and/or representative sources, the comparison of different medieval authors, conclusions according to the leading questions and comparison with previous research.

While it is the aim of the project to investigate the Christian (Catholic) perception, it was important to analyze “normal” sources of all kinds of interest (and not just the outstanding exceptions that have already been analyzed previously). Nevertheless, it was of crucial interest to compare both “types” and to include sources from the border region (Northern Spain) to see if there are differences of perception depending on neighbourhood and contact. Consequently, sources from Spain (for Islam), but also from Scandinavia (for pagans) were specifically integrated into the analysis.

The analysis of the pertinent sources was determined by four guiding principles:

– Each source (and each author) should be analyzed separately in order to recognize the specific perceptions of each author and to integrate them into the author’s world of thinking and ideology.

- Each religion should be dealt with separately first before comparing the perceptions of different religions.
- The project should be based on a large scale of evidence from all respective genres, all centuries and all European regions.
- The perception of other religions should be faced with the perception of their societies and take into regard all kinds of cultural contacts.

The analysis followed nine leading questions:

1. Textual and historical context:

- In which contexts are religions (or their members) mentioned?
- Why are they mentioned?
- What are the main statements?

2. Terminology:

- How are religions and their members called?
- How are they described?
- What is the meaning of each particular remark?

3. Contents:

- What is reported about other religions?
- What are the implications (direct or indirect) of the religious remarks?
- What significance is underlying these ideas?

4. Knowledge and comprehension:

- What do Christians know about other religions?
- What do they consider as being more, what as being less important?
- What is the comprehension of other religions (resp. how far are these religions understood)?
- Are there misunderstandings and what are the reasons for such misinterpretations?

5. Judgment and assessment:

- What judgments are underlying the religious remarks?
- How are other religions assessed?
- Which are the criteria for this assessment?

6. Comparison:

- What are the significant perceptions of, and attitudes towards, each (individual) religion?
- Which are the common perceptions of other religions?
- Are there differences in the perception of heathens and monotheistic religions? Between Jewish and Muslim religions? Between these and Christian heresies?

7. Structures:

- What is the role and function of religion itself?
- What seems typical in writing on religion?
- What relevance do religious perceptions have within the framework of the whole “world view”?

8. Christianity:

- Which are the essential differences between Christian and other religions in the eyes of medieval authors?
- Which are the main aspects of distinctions (between Christian and other religions as well as among non-Christian religions)?
- Which are the circumstances, and which are the reasons for religious confrontations?
- What are the, or possible, consequences?
- What are the conclusions for the self-concept of Christianity?

9. Medieval and modern religiosity:

- Which are the specific medieval ideas on religion and
- Which are the differences to modern religious thinking?

3. (Some) Results of the project

Looking at a wide range of sources (and not only those particularly concerned with the subject) on the one hand, analyzing the individual authors' view on religion(s) (and not only on a particular religion) on the other, and, finally, integrating this religious perception into the general perception of other groups widens and modifies the state of research considerably. In sum, we collected and analyzed a remarkably broad spectrum of evidence from all genres and from different European regions and centuries. Never before has the perception of other religions been analyzed on such a large quantity of sources, and never before has it been analyzed in a comparative view of the perception of (all) different religions. It can be claimed that the perception of heretics and Orthodox Christians has been examined here for the first time; also the (stereotyped) perception of pagans as such has never been analyzed before in such a coherent manner, whereas the perception of Jews and Muslims could be integrated in a much wider perspective than in previous research which concentrated on polemical writings and "religious discourses" (Jews) and particularly in contact zones of Christianity and Islam (Muslims). Even more, by comparing these perceptions according to leading questions, a comparative view could be gained for the first time. It shows, briefly, a much more differentiating perception than is normally assumed, particularly by previous research, but also an extensive range of stereotyped images. Notwithstanding these stereotypes, the authors had a distinct and clear concept of other religions.

The following remarks are classified according to the leading questions (question 1 just organizes the evidence).

Terminology (Question 2): Often enough, terminology and religious allusions are not congruent. It is significant that none of the numerous terms for Muslims (of which *Saraceni* is becoming the most widespread expression) alludes directly to the Muslim religion (Islam). Most terms imply either peoples (like *Moors/Mauri* or *Arab[it]es*) or refer to biblical-mythical persons (which, in fact, is very similar to "peoples" in medieval thinking), for example *Saraceni*, *Ismaelites* or *Agareni* for Muslims, derived from *Sara*, the wife, respectively *Hagar*, the servant-concubine of Abraham, or her son *Ismael*. This is not a new "discovery", of course, but it has strong effects on the perception of other religions, which were not always perceived as such by the Christian authors. Moreover, it is difficult to decide whether these terms are completely synonymous (and there is still some disagreement among the members of the project) or if, for example, *Chaldaei*, a term used for the Saracens particularly in Spain, consciously refers to the Babylonians of the Old Testament, as John Tolan states. In fact, there is no direct evidence for this – possible – hypothesis.

On the contrary, "Jew" (*Iudaeus*), seems to signify the Jewish religion, but refers also to the Jewish people. So here, too, the meaning has to be deduced from the context. It is equally doubtful if there is a strict difference in assessment between *Iudaei* (used in a negative sense) and *Hebraei* or *Israelites* (used in a positive sense), as some scholars claim. There are far too many exceptions to this "rule" to confirm such a suggestion.

Contrary to Muslims, but also to Jews, "pagan" (*pagani*, gentiles, but also *ethnici*, *fanatici*, *profani*), however, always has religious allusions. Nevertheless it is used only in certain contexts whereas in historiographical sources normally, again, expressions for peoples are preferred, and it should be recalled that one of the terms for "pagans", namely gentiles (just as its Latinized Greek equivalent *ethnici*), is closely connected with *gentes*, "peoples", and that *gentes* is also used quite frequently to designate pagans. So it seems that, in the medieval terminology, and consequently also in the medieval perception itself, we find a considerable overlapping of religious and ethnic aspects.

Again, however, both terms, *pagani* and *gentiles*, apart from the different etymology (already expressed in Isidore's "Etymologiae"), are used as synonyms, and, contrary to prevalent opinions (until the latest publications), there is no such difference as the one (*pagani*) meaning "pagans by (their own) fault", whereas the other (*gentiles*) signifies the (un-

baptised) “pagans by destiny”. In fact, we have not found one single piece of evidence to confirm this differentiation.

There is a comparable or even greater problem with “Greeks” (or “Byzantines”) because these terms always seem to refer to either ethnic or (normally) political dimensions (again without any difference between the two terms). Different from “Jews” (which very often adopts a religious meaning) or “Saracens” (which can at least refer to religion), it seems that “Greek” implies no clear allusion to the Greek-Orthodox religion, for which, as with Islam, we lack any term at all. The different faith, here, is neither indicated by the terminology nor by its pertinent context, but mainly by discussions on concrete disputed issues. This difference should have some consequences on the perception of the Greek-Orthodox confession as a different religion.

So, in fact, “heretics” is the only expression which clearly (and exclusively) alludes to religion. Again, however, the term itself does not provide a clear distinction from Catholicism, but comprises a wide range of different religious, although Christian, deviations, which are not necessarily of a dogmatic nature.

Not all of these observations are, of course, new, but they have far-reaching consequences that have been ignored so far: While inquiring into the perception of other religions, it is equally important to inquire more generally into the perception of those groups that may infer religious groups and to ask whether they were seen as being religious at all and in which contexts religious allusions appear (and in which they do not) in order to discern when and why they become important for medieval authors (which confirms the importance of the first leading question). These terminological and methodological problems were the theme of our first publication. It should be emphasized that such an approach leads to a considerable modification of current opinions based exclusively on utterances pertinent to religious contents. In spite of all the stereotypes, the perception of other religions was considerably complex and versatile (and it was not exclusively confined to religious factors).

Contents, knowledge and comprehension (Questions 3 and 4): Here we can observe a great range of different contexts. Contrary to the widespread opinion that the Early Middle Ages, as to their knowledge of Islam, were an “age of ignorance” (R.W. Southern), it could be elaborated that most chroniclers were well aware of the religious difference, although they did not show much interest in this aspect (or, rather, their interest was limited to specific occasions and reasons). Christians and Muslims (but also Christians and pagans or Jews) could as well cooperate, make peace treaties or pacts and maintain diplomatic relations. This goes so far that Christian authors could even imagine Muslim power over Christians (as it was, in fact, realized in the Islamic countries), although, of course, this was not at all wished or hoped for; Johannes of Gorze could even chide the Catholics of Córdoba for their acknowledgment of and agreement with the Islamic rulers. Normally Muslims appeared no more strangers than other (foreign) peoples. However, they became enemies (almost exclusively) when they attacked the Christians, and particularly in this context they were assessed in a negative way and characterized as “enemies of Christ” or of the Church. One hardly notices basic changes of these attitudes in the age of the Crusades, which seem to have been overemphasized in previous research.

For a long time, medieval Latin authors never seem to have asked what Islam was actually like, and they seldom asked what paganism or what heresy was. Nevertheless, when considering the whole spectrum of utterances, by their frequent repetition we can easily recognize the prevalent features of their concept of the other religions. Paganism was, of course, as is well-known, first of all characterized by worshipping idols, but also by special places of worship, namely temples and sacred groves, particular trees, rocks or sources, by sacrifices, lot oracles, fortune-telling, magic spells, prophecies, and superstition in general. Particularly interesting are long enumerations of these and further features which equally characterize pagans as well as the (superstitious) behaviour of Christians and thus indicate

what the Catholic authors considered as being “pagan”. On a more general level, pagans lacked the knowledge of God and of the written law (the Old and New Testament); their “code” was part of the (original) “natural law”. Furthermore, paganism is also characterized by features that were not really religious: thus pagans, for example, were seen as being barbarians who were savage, cruel, furious and immoral. It has equally been rightly observed before that differentiations between individual pagan cults did not matter, notwithstanding the fact that there are also some indications that Christians should know something about the pagans they wanted to convert (as in the famous letter written by Bishop Daniel of Winchester to Saint Boniface). This aspect, however, deserves deeper investigation. When Gregory of Tours reports how Chrodechilde, the wife of the Frankish king Clovis, who was still pagan at that time, admonished him to leave his gods, he lets her mention Roman, not Frankish gods. For the Christian bishop this made no difference, in contrast to the fact that the Christian God created heaven and earth, animals and human beings from nothing. In fact, the argumentation is very similar on both sides. Christians equally believed in miracles, and when the heathens drew lots in order to find out what their gods wanted, the result was often interpreted as being God’s work. If, however, pagans and Christians in principle shared a similar way of thinking, this helps us to understand better and modify the widespread theory of a “Germanization” or “paganization” of Christianity. No doubt there was a religious contrast, but obviously there was no “clash of civilizations” because of a similar way of thinking specific to the epoch. Nevertheless, the Christian authors strictly emphasized the (religious) differences.

Recent research has already observed that Jews and Christians not only had certain knowledge of each other’s religion, but equally influenced each other (in a kind of “cultural transfer”). This observation could be partly confirmed. Behind the polemic attacks of Agobard of Lyon against the Jews of his city (and their favourable treatment by the Emperor, Louis the Pious), for example, a profound knowledge of some rites, customs and religious acts of the Jews becomes visible. Agobard, however, wishes to resist any influence and wants to separate both groups. In fact, it seems characteristic for the Christian perception of Jews that the Christian authors concentrate on those Jewish beliefs which contradict Christianity exclusively in order to refute them. Such an attitude is particularly visible in the “religious conversations” (or “religious debates”), which have already been thoroughly analyzed by Anna Sapir Abulafia and others for the 12th century (particularly with regard to their rational argumentation). Similar (fictional) “conversations”, however, are handed down as early as by the end of the 6th century (in Gregory of Tours), and they already contain more or less the same targets of accusation (and thus a similar knowledge).

Medieval authors equally never asked what heresy was, but Augustine, Isidore, and Hrabanus Maurus presented long lists of heresies with characterizations from which we can deduce their concept of heresy. Equally important for the concept of heresy as such are exegetical interpretations of biblical words as meaning heresies and their explanations. Like many others, Hrabanus, in his exegetical writings, often interprets biblical allusions or terms by identifying them as meaning heretics. An analysis of these allegories (done by the PI for the joint publication) is a valuable approach. Heresy is not explained, but precisely because Hrabanus applies his conceptions to the interpretation of the Bible, they prove a more or less self-evident comprehension that already exists (not necessarily being reflected by the author himself), while the striking conformity of these ideas show that they must have been widespread. The concept of heresy is, of course, dominated by the attribution of wrong belief, false doctrine (wrongness, pravitas, is the most frequent reproach), and a misinterpretation of the Bible (because the heretics interpret it by the secular means of pagan – that is, philosophical – dialectics), but also by a vicious life and a bad character and behaviour (which makes them comparable with bad Christians). However, heretics do not just err, but they do this consciously in order to deceive people. Deception, lies, and hypocrisy, therefore, are further frequent reproaches. Consequently, heretics were regarded as being pugnacious people

who consciously attacked the Church. The relation to the church is an important aspect. Although Christian authors feel that heresies share many things with real Christians (for example the sacraments and belief in the Trinity), but mingle true and false doctrines, they agree in thinking that heretics stand outside the Church and should be expelled. This is why Robert Moore could speak of medieval Christianity as a “persecuting society”, which, in its theoretical foundations, however, begins much earlier than in the 12th century. Furthermore, in the course of the 11th century (the age of the Church reform), the comprehension of heretics was extended to all those who did not agree with the Catholic Church or with the decrees of the popes (including simoniacs and lay investiture). This indicates a considerable shift from doctrinal to institutional criteria (although the older tradition always “survived”). In fact, there are various concepts of heresy. When, in a recent publication on the iconography of heresy, the author (A. Trivellone) claimed that there was no clear concept of heresy before the 13th century, this is not at all true for the written sources. Seeing the evidence as a whole, the authors, although they clearly knew about the great variety of different heresies, had a very clear concept of heresy, albeit with some nuances and differences in detail.

The Greek-Orthodox religion is probably the most difficult case because the “Greeks” are not really perceived as a different religious group. In most cases, “Greek” refers to the people and realm of the Byzantine Empire (and not to religion). Nevertheless, there are similar religious debates and treatises, which, however, and contrary to the other religions, do not so much attack the Greek-Orthodox faith as such, which is much more accepted as being Christian, but concentrate on certain points of dissent (above all the filioque controversy, and thus Trinitarian problems, iconoclasm, or certain liturgical issues, such as the use of unleavened bread for the Holy Communion). In this context, however, the Greek religion is also easily connected with heresy so that sometimes at least the differences between the Orthodox faith and heretical beliefs melt away. In any case, in these reproaches Catholic authors normally have a good knowledge of the religious differences which, however, were taken up only on certain occasions. Insights into an important contact zone in the Early Middle Ages, the papal court in Rome, show how varyingly changeable the perception of the religion of the Greeks was. Moreover, the discrepancies, nuances and inconsistencies in this understanding were often enough dependent on the political and ecclesiastical contexts and situations.

Assessment and judgments (Question 5): It follows from the observations made above that, concerning the assessment, religion again is just one factor. We have already alluded to the fact that very often we find a more or less “neutral” (or even friendly) characterization of Muslims or pagans as long as they do not turn into enemies, although their religion, of course, is condemned when necessary, and so is the faith of all other religions. Religious disparagement is often combined with cultural and ethnic contempt (heathens and Muslims are considered as being barbarians, idolaters, or even man-eaters), notwithstanding the fact that, for example, some (moral) features of pagans (or pagan peoples) can also serve as models for Christians or that Jews and heretics, although they are condemned, nevertheless have their place in God’s history of salvation: as a warning for Christians to stick to their faith, but also as having historically dominated one period of history: the Jews as God’s people in the Old Testament, pagans as the prevailing element in ancient history and, again, in the epoch of martyrs of the early ecclesiastical history, heretics in the period of dogmatic dissent after the Christianization of the Roman empire.

While it thus seems possible that (single) members of other religions were seen in a positive light (for their character, virtue, or for obeying their laws), particularly when the pagan origins of one’s own people are concerned, or that they could even serve as shining examples for Christians, it comes as no surprise that their faith is always assessed in a derogatory manner: pagans, Muslims, Jews and heretics equally follow the wrong religion, characterized by error; they worship the wrong gods and they will never be capable or worthy

of being redeemed. In fact, while baptism is exorcism of the devil, all other religions are perceived as serving the devil. Although originally this feature has been attributed to pagans, it is in fact equally used for monotheistic religions. While there are (some) excuses for pagans, as long as they do not know of God's existence, there is no excuse for Jews and heretics who have all the divine revelations without recognizing them and following the right faith. Hence the Jews' and heretics' blindness and stubbornness are specified by Christian authors as highly dangerous and condemnable vices.

While the polemical nature of religious debates is well-known (such as the so-called religious discussions with Jews and heretics, the treatises *Adversus Iudaeos*, but also the polemical *Lives of Mohammed*), it finds its explanation in such an attitude. It is significant that better knowledge (about Islam in Islamic countries or in Peter the Venerable owing to the translation of the Koran, or about Jews owing to their cohabitation or knowledge of the Talmud) was not so much the result of historical development but rather due to the interest of individual authors and it did not in any way alter the polemical tones and intentions of the writings.

Comparison (Question 6): Comparing the perception of the individual religions, in fact, there are differences as well as congruencies of which only some may be mentioned. It is well known that the missionaries (and the authors of their lives), with only a few exceptions, showed little interest in the specific pagan religion and in the differences between the individual religions. In fact, no religious group was of interest for the sake of its religion, but for the sake of mere contact, enmity, or Christianization. While pagans, but also Jews, were objects of Christianization (and Christians who, on the contrary, became Jews caused an enormous sensation and were particularly despised), and while heretics were always expected to return to the true faith, there were obviously no attempts to convert Muslims before the 13th century.

On the whole, however, Muslims were equally regarded as pagans (and consequently put on a level with pagan peoples such as the Vikings or Hungarians). Although the second tradition of considering them as heretics (already present in John of Damascus), because Muhammad had been influenced by heretic Christians (and Jews), reappears from time to time in Islamic Spain but also, particularly in the High Middle Ages, in the Occident, it remains widely restrained to zones of closer contact. In Latin Europe, however, the categorization as pagans is, and remains, absolutely predominant. Even Peter the Venerable, the abbot of Cluny, who had ordered translations of some important books of the Islam, among them the first Latin translation of the Koran, and who is aware of both traditions and classifies the Saracens several times as heretics, in the final analysis, also regards the Muslims as pagans.

Jews were particularly blamed for being responsible for the death of Christ (which, however, was necessary for the salvation of mankind) and for their literal understanding of the Bible, ignoring the allegorical allusions to Christ (whereas heretics were reproached with their false understanding of the Bible). Religious "disputes" (which exist much earlier than in the 12th century, when they were investigated by the previous research) and polemical treatises clearly reveal these and similar attitudes that have been analyzed previously. Nevertheless, the stereotyped view of the polemics against Jews is also relativized when compared with mentions in all kind of situations to find out the "normal" perception which at times can at least be called "neutral". As far as religion is concerned, however, Jews remain the "blind" and "faithless" enemies of Christ and the Church. Although no medieval Catholic theologian and author has incited the people to physical actions against the Jews, this negative "image" should still be seen as an ideological background and a welcome legitimation of the pogroms of the First and Second Crusade.

Some insight is gained from the interpretation of the medieval exegetical commentaries of the prescriptions on purity in Leviticus where, for example, those animals who do not

ruminating and who do not have cloven hooves were regarded as being impure. Medieval exegetes, among other readings, interpreted these (impure) animals partly as Jews, who obtain the Old Testament and who are consequently ruminating on the words of the law, but they lack cloven hooves because they do not acknowledge the New Testament. Therefore, they are (religiously) impure. In contrast, heretics have cloven hooves, namely the two testaments, believing in God the Father and the Son, but they do not ruminate (on) the doctrine of truth in their mouth. So, in spite of this difference, they are both equally regarded as being impure. This attitude is significant and seems to be representative.

More important, however, is the fact that, although the differences between the individual religions are (partly) recognized, for example the recognition of Islam as being monotheistic and of heresy as being an originally Christian faith, in the final analysis, this question was just not relevant for Christian authors because all other all other religions were seen as standing close together and being united by their wrong faith and thus were excluded from eternal salvation. In the eyes of the Christians, they were all “unbelievers” (infideles) and thus, as already stated above, they were all “members of the devil”. For this reason, the differences between the individual religions become irrelevant in comparison with their not being true Christians.

This, again, has repercussions on the assessment. Although Jews (and sometimes also Muslims) were acknowledged as monotheists who believed in one (and the only) God, this did not result in better judgments. Jews, above all, may have been regarded as being nearer to Christianity than the polytheistic religions, but this by no means pardoned them. On the contrary, they were considered as being worse than pagans who had no knowledge of God, whereas Jews had all the divine revelations about Christ and yet they did not believe them. Consequently, heretics were regarded as the worst kind of unbelievers because they believed in both testaments, but nevertheless explained them in the wrong way.

Greek Christians, too, were at times classified as heretics. Again, however, such a perception is highly dependent on the context and on the period in which corresponding accusations occur, and thus seem to be linked to specific situations when the ties between the West and the East grew weaker or in the process of important theological debates (for example during the iconoclastic phase in the middle of the 8th century and the rise of the Carolingians as seen from the perspective of the popes). At the same time, despite numerous crises up to the 12th century, the possibility to perceive the Greeks as fellow Christians was never abandoned. On the contrary, the wish to see the Eastern and Western Church as one Christian unity remains palpable throughout.

Christian authors, therefore, knew very well how much the pagan cults differentiated, that Muslims worshipped only one God (who, nevertheless, remained “their” God), that Jews venerated the same Christian God (but both did not acknowledge Christ as God’s son) or that heretics had Christian origins (but did not acknowledge Christ’s nature or worship God in the right manner and thus stood outside the Church). Notwithstanding these and further differences in the perception of the single religions, a comparative view reveals that all other religions were considered as being close together, united by their wrong faith and their dissociation from Christian: They all are unbelievers (infideles) who are incited by the devil and they all lack any prospect of eternal salvation.

Christian concept of self (Question 8): In this respect, the perception of other religions is always a reliable indicator of Christian concepts and Christian self-awareness. The differentiation between Christianity and all other religions is a decisive element. Given the Christian claim to be the absolute and only true religion, all the other religions must be equally wrong. They all are not only perceived as not being Christian, but the authors rather emphasize their “otherness” and dissociation from Christianity. Even more significant is their reciprocal relation to the Christian faith: the closer they are to Christianity – Jews are closer than Muslims because they share the Old Testament with Christians, heretics are closer than

Jews because they acknowledge Christ's divinity –, the more they are derogated. Because they might (and should) know the truth, they are all worse than pagans who have no knowledge of God. One reason for this is probably that they were seen as a great(er) danger to Christianity, another reason, however, results from the belief that there can be only one true (the Christian) religion. The perception of other religions, including the (fictional) religious disputes (which addressed Christians rather than non-believers), therefore, have to be interpreted as much as a Christian self-assurance and legitimation than as a refutation of different beliefs. When it has been suggested that Western authors developed a feeling of inferiority towards Byzantium and Islam, this may serve as a modern psychological explanation (which, nevertheless, still has to be tested), of which the medieval authors were unconscious. However, it corresponds by no means to the self-awareness (and Christian self-consciousness) of medieval Catholic authors which rather reflects a firm conviction of their superiority.

Seeing the different aspects altogether, the project has revealed a consistent Christian perception of other religions, but, in spite of all the stereotypes, also diverse and complex perceptions and assessments of the others. Religiously committed polemical dissociation could be confronted with rather unemotional attitudes towards other religions. A deeper interest in the different faith derives exclusively from the intention of its refutation. All in all, the project reveals the specific medieval view of other religions. It confirms the research on individual religions where religion or religious disputes are the concern of the authors, but modifies previous results in many details. It presents a completely different impression, however, where the “normal” view (often uttered in passing), without special occasions and reasons to touch on this subject, is concerned.

4. Presentations

The project has been successfully presented (and discussed) on various occasions, among these in front of the Working group on the Middle Ages at the University of Hamburg and during the “Night of Knowledge” addressing a general audience (November 7th 2009). It has also been presented in the University's research magazine (http://www.verwaltung.uni-hamburg.de/pr/2/publikationen/magazin_02_2010.pdf). Moreover, the PI used the opportunity of presenting and discussing the project on various occasions: in a paper given at the University of Paderborn in 2009 and in a research seminar during his stay at the State University of Paraná in Curitiba, Brazil, (August 27th 2010). He also gave two papers resulting from the project in two series of lectures given at the University of Hamburg on “Religion and society” in Spring 2010 and on “Followers of different faiths” in Spring 2011, and another paper on the concepts of purity in religion at a conference at the University of Bochum in Spring 2010. A paper on religious conversations was given at a conference at the Institut français historique en Allemagne à Frankfurt, and another one on the “Fight of gods in Christian mission” will be given at a conference on “Compétition au Haut Moyen Âge” at the University of Limoges in France in July 2012. All team members presented parts of the project at the Mittelalterkreis at the University of Hamburg in January 2011 and at the IMC in Leeds in July 2011, concentrating on case studies on the knowledge and assessment of other religions. All these (and further) papers are or will be published. Furthermore, there will be some more presentations of this subject at future conferences by the PI (among others at a conference on the perception of other religions and self-identity to be held in Sevilla probably in September or October 2012, in a paper to be given in Fribourg in Switzerland and at a conference on religious identity both to be held in October 2012, or at a conference on Herman of Reichenau to be held in Spring 2013).

In addition, from January 2011 to February 2012 we invited several experts and guest speakers to Hamburg (Klaus Herbers and Christian Saßenscheidt, Erlangen, who lead a large

project on Mozarabs and “Mozarabisms”, Ian Wood and Ann Christys, Leeds, experts on Christian mission among pagans and Islamic Spain respectively, Peter Segl, Bayreuth/Pfaffenhofen, who is currently publishing a book on medieval heresy, Daniel König, Frankfurt, who is working on the Islamic view of Western history in the Middle Ages and is leading a project on the mutual view of Muslims and Christians, and, finally, Kurt Villads Jensen, Odense/Copenhagen, an expert on the Crusades and their impact on the view of each other). All these invited guests gave public papers pertinent to our project (within the framework of courses and series of lectures by the PI) and extensively discussed our problems and results during their stay in Hamburg.

5. Publications

Last but not least, a number of publications have come from the project or will be published within the next months. Apart from several articles (see the list of publications below) a first collective volume presents examples of our work which focus on two aspects: On the one hand, the contributions discuss the relation between terminology and the perception of other religions (including the question whether members of other religions were rather seen as such or as members of certain peoples or cultural groups and in what contexts religious characterizations become visible). On the other hand, by doing this, they aim at discussing methodological problems and approaches of our work: how to obtain results from evidence that was never written to respond directly to our questions and that seldom provides direct characterizations of other religions. Collective articles, based on the papers given in Leeds, will be published together in English in an issue of a historical journal (probably “Early Medieval Europe”) and have been sent in for publication. These articles focus on case studies each from the Early Middle Ages to discuss the question what the Catholic authors knew about the other religions and how they assessed them. A third and final collective volume is in preparation and will be finished by Summer 2012. It will discuss all the leading questions by focusing on certain authors from different centuries, by comparing authors from the Early and from the High Middle Ages and at the same time assessing and integrating them into the whole spectrum of religious perception, thus comparing them with the “standard” view, as it is represented by the database.

Finally, the PI is preparing a voluminous book (in German) on the perception of all the other religions respectively with a long comparative conclusion. The book will be published by the end of 2012. It is planned to summarize the results in English in another monograph publication based on these results but organized from the beginning in a comparative manner. The PI has also published several articles on the subject deriving from the project. In addition, Norman Bade is preparing his Ph.D. thesis on the perception of the Saracens in Occidental historiography from the 8th to the 11th century.

List of publications:

Monographs:

– Hans-Werner Goetz, *Die Wahrnehmung anderer Religionen im christlichen Abendland des frühen und hohen Mittelalters* (in preparation, to go into print in Summer 2012, at the Akademie Verlag Berlin)

Collective volumes:

– *Die Wahrnehmung anderer Religionen im früheren Mittelalter: Terminologische Probleme und methodische Ansätze*, ed. Anna Aurast and Hans-Werner Goetz (Hamburger geisteswissenschaftliche Studien zu Religion und Gesellschaft 1), Münster 2012 (Lit Verlag). This volume contains the following articles:

– Einleitung: Das Forschungsprojekt “The Perception of Other Religions” und die Zielsetzung dieses Bandes

- Hans-Werner Goetz, Was wird im frühen Mittelalter unter „Häresie“ verstanden? Zur Häresiewahrnehmung des Hrabanus Maurus
- Kerstin Zech, Heidenvorstellung und Heidendarstellung. Begrifflichkeit und ihre Deutung im Kontext von Bedas ‚Historia Ecclesiastica‘
 - Norman Bade, Vorstellungen vom Islam und den Sarazenen in der ‚Vita Hludowici imperatoris‘ und den ‚Annales Bertiniani‘. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen einer terminologischen Untersuchung
 - Claudia Valenzuela, „Ritu Mamentiano“. Auf der Suche nach den christlichen Wahrnehmungen vom Islam in der frühmittelalterlichen Historiographie Nordspaniens
 - Anna Aurast, Verwandte Feinde. Christliche Vorstellungen von Juden und ihrer Religion in ausgewählten erzählenden und Rechtszeugnissen des frühen Mittelalters
- Christian perception and knowledge of other religions in the Early Middle Ages (to be published as a series of coherent articles, probably in: ■Early Medieval Europe ■), containing the following articles:
 - Introduction
 - Beate Freudenberg and Hans-Werner Goetz, The Christian perception of heathens in the Early Middle Ages
 - Norman Bade, Muslims in the Christian World Order. Comprehension and Knowledge of the Saracens in two Universal Histories of the Carolingian Empire
 - Claudia Valenzuela, ‘The Faith of the Saracens’. Some Remarks on the Perception of Islam in the Hagiography from the North of the Iberian Peninsula
 - Anna Aurast, What did Christian Authors Know about Jews and Judaism? Some Remarks Based on Early Medieval Evidence
 - Hans-Werner Goetz, What is Heretic in Christian Heresies? The Perspective of Medieval Catholic Authors
 - Beate Freudenberg, ‘Unus grex et unum ovile?’ The Papacy’s Comprehension of the Greek-Orthodox Religion in the Eighth Century
 - Die Wahrnehmung anderer Religionen im Abendland des frühen und hohen Mittelalters: Vergleichende Fallstudien (to go into print in September 2012)

Articles (outside the collective volumes mentioned above):

- Hans-Werner Goetz, Sarazenen als „Fremde“? Anmerkungen zum Islambild in der abendländischen Geschichtsschreibung des frühen Mittelalters, in: Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des islamischen Orients, ed. Lawrence I. Conrad (=Festschrift Gernot Rotter) (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des islamischen Orients. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift „Der Islam“, n.F. 24), Berlin-New York 2009, S. 39 – 66
- Id., Monotheisten als Heiden? Die Wahrnehmung anderer Religionen im christlichen Abendland des frühen und hohen Mittelalters, in: Religion und Gesellschaft, ed. Marc Föcking and Bruno Reudenbach (Hamburger geisteswissenschaftliche Studien zu Religion und Gesellschaft 1, Münster 2012, in print)
- Id., Discourses on Purity in Western Christendom in the Early and High Middle Ages, in: Discourses of Purity in Transcultural Perspective (300 – 1600), ed. Nikolas Jaspert (paper given at a workshop in Bochum, June 2010; in print)
- Id., Häresie – was ist das? Die Wahrnehmung von Häretikern im früheren Mittelalter, in: Ungläubige, Teufelsdiener, Abtrünnige ... Der Umgang mit Andersgläubigen in Geschichte und Gegenwart, hg. v. Marc Föcking und Hans-Werner Goetz (Hamburger geisteswissenschaftliche Studien zu Religion und Gesellschaft 3, Münster 2012, in preparation for print)
- Id., La compétition entre catholiques et ariens en Gaule : les entretiens religieux („Religionsgespräche“) de Grégoire de Tours, in: Agôn: Performance et compétitivité (Ve-XIIe

siècle), ed. François Bougard, Régine Le Jan and Thomas Lienhard (in preparation for print in the series “Haut Moyen Âge”, Brepols, Turnhout)

– Id., Christians and Pagans in the Period of Mission: similar concepts in a religious confrontation, in: Festschrift Sverre Bagge (in print)
(further articles in preparation)

Annex I: Screenshots of the database

The database contains one area for sources (to see all the evidence of individual sources), with additional arrays for edition, genre, time of writing, region/place of writing, bias and horizon of the author, and comment, and a second area for the individual evidence, with arrays which correspond to the leading questions and enable the members to deal with these fields respectively according to our questions as well as combine them with all other fields (in every kind of combination). The latter is important for a quantitative analysis, while at the same time the full text and context is invaluable for any qualitative interpretation. These fields are: period of the report, region/place of the report, text/information, chapter and page in the edition, and historical context. Furthermore, it is possible to categorize the religion, specify the terminology and record key words for the context and contents. A third (combined) area consists of comments on the (individual) evidence along with the leading questions (characterization of the members of a certain religion, assessment, knowledge of the religion, indications of a delimitation from Christianity, comprehension/miscomprehension of the religion). These fields enabled us to already record all kinds of observations that have been made while reading and “exploiting” the sources. Moreover, it is, of course, possible to search the database for any term or religious expression linked with (the perception of) other religions, specified for certain periods of time, regions, genres, authors, religions etc. This is and will be very useful for our final publications.

Fig. 1: General view of a source processed and entered in the database, here a letter of Agobard, Archbishop of Lyon. The yellow field above contains information about the source itself and commentaries on it referring to the leading questions. In the green field below, one can survey a short listing of all records found in the source. Thus, in Agobard’s letter „De Insolentia Iudaeorum“, there are eight entries in total documenting his perception of other religions (here Judaism).

Fig. 1

Fig. 2: Detailed view of an individual piece of evidence. Here all records of an entry can be seen in greater detail. Apart from the particulars concerning period and region/place of the report arrays for the relevant Latin passage, its place (chapter and page) in the edition, and its historical context have been embedded. At the same time it is possible to click on fields to categorize the religion, specify the terminology and record key words for the context and contents.

Fig. 2

Fig. 3 and 4: Beside the tab „Entry“ the tab „Commentary“ has been installed in order to

switch from entry to commentary in one easy step. Here we can analyze the entered texts according to our leading questions and comment on them in more detail. This entails further analysis of characterization of the members of a certain religion, assessment, knowledge of the religion, indications of delimitation from Christianity, and comprehension/miscomprehension of the religion.

Fig. 3

Fig. 4

The database allows a variable use of the search function. The general search function (fig. 5, left column) enables us to search the whole database (all layers of the database involved) for a keyword of our choice at the same time. The advanced search function (fig. 5, brown field) enables us to combine different arrays/fields (such as tags) with the key word that we search for in order to specify our search.

Analogously, the differentiated search function can provide us with fewer, but more qualified search results by using timeframes, frames for regions/types of sources, checkmark fields for a particular religion or for entries with an exclusively religious connotation.

Fig. 5

Annex II: List of the sources that have been analyzed (according to genres, in alphabetical order)

Historiography:

Adam of Bremen, *Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae Pontificum*
Ado of Vienne, *Chronicon*
Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*
Annales Augienses
Annales Bertiniani
Annales regni Francorum
Anonymus, *Adefonsi tertii chronica, Version Ad Sebastianum*
Anonymus, *Adefonsi tertii chronica, Version Rotensis*
Anonymus, *Chronica Byzantia-Arabica*
Anonymus, *Chronica Muzarabica*
Anonymus, *Chronicon Albeldense*
Anonymus, *Cronica Profetica*
Anonymus, *Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*
Astronomus, *Vita Hludowici imperatoris*
Beda Venerabilis, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*
Continuationes Fredegarii
Cosmas of Prag, *Chronica Boemorum*
Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*
Fredegar, *Chronica*
Gesta Treverorum
Gregor of Tours, *Historiarum Libri Decem*

Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta Dei per Francos*
Helmold of Bosau, *Chronica Slavorum*
Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*
John of Bicclair, *Chronicon*
Isidor of Sevilla, *De origine Gothorum Historia Wandalorum Historia Sueborum*
Liudprand of Cremona, *Antapodosis*
Liutprand of Cremona, *Historia Ottonis*
Liutprand of Cremona, *Relatio de legatione constantinopolitana*
Otto of Freising, *Chronica*
Paulus Diaconus, *Historia Langobardorum*
Regino of Prüm, *Chronicon*
Rodulfo Glaber, *Historiarum libri quinque*
Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum*
Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicon*

Hagiography:

Alkuin, *Vita Willibrordi Archiepiscopi Traiectensis*
Altfrid, *Vita Ludgeri*
Anonymus, *Vita Nunilonis et Alodie*
Brun of Querfurt, *Passio Adalberti*
Ebo of Michelsberg, *Vita Ottonis (bishop of Bamberg)*
Eulogius, *Memoriale Sanctorum*
Gregor of Tours, *Liber Vitae Patrum*
Herbord of Michelsberg, *Vita Ottonis Babenbergensis Episcopi*
Hrosvit of Gandersheim, *Passio Sancti Pelagii*
Raguel, *Vita vel Passio Sancti Pelagii Martiris*
Rimbert, *Vita Anskarii*
Rodulfo Glaber, *Vita Domini Willelmi Abbatis*
Vita Aedwardi Regis qui apud Westmonasterium requiescit
Vita S. Birini
Willibald, *Vita Bonifatii*

Letters:

Agobard of Lyon, *Letters concerning the conflict with the Jews in Lyon*
Bonifatius, *Letters (and other documents)*
Isidor of Sevilla, *Epistola*
Petrus of Poitiers, *Epistola*

Poetry:

Carmen in victoriam Pisanorum

Legal sources:

Acts of the Roman synod of 745
Additamenta ad Pippini et Karoli M. capitularia
Additamenta Hludowici Pii et Hlotharii capitularia
Ansegis, Capitularium collectio
Capitula quae de partibus Saxoniae constituta sunt (Charlemagne)
Capitularia Karoli Magni
Capitularia maiorum domus
Capitularia Pippini
Capitularia Salisburgensis

Charles the Bald, Diplom 46
Chlotar II., Capitularia Merowingica
Conciliar canons of Toledo
Concilium Foroiulense a. 796/797 (Paulinus II of Aquileia)
Concilium Germanicum (Karlmann)
Concilium Romanum (Pope Zacharias)
Concilium Suessionense (Pippin III)
De alio synodali conventu, unbekannt
Formulae imperiales
Hludowici Pii capitularia 814-827
Karoli Magni et Pippini filii capitularia italica
Leges Visigothorum: Lib. 12, De Removendis Pressuris et Omnium Hereticorum Sectis
Extinctis

Theological treatises:

Isidor of Sevilla, De fide catholica ex veteri et novo testamento contra Iudaeos
Albarus of Cordoba, Indiculus luminosus
Petrus Alfonsi, Dialogus contra Iudaeos
Petrus of Poitiers, Capitula
Petrus Venerabilis, Contra sectam Saracenorum
Petrus Venerabilis, Epistola de translatione sua
Petrus Venerabilis, Summa totius haeresis Saracenorum
Samson, Apologeticum contra Perfidos

Others:

Dhuoda, Liber manualis
Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum
Interrogationes et responsiones baptismales
Isidor of Sevilla, Etymologiae sive origins
Rather of Verona, Praeloquia