

**VIATOR**  
*Medieval and Renaissance Studies*  
VOLUME 49, No. 3





# VIATOR

MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE STUDIES

Volume 49, No. 3 (2018)

PUBLISHED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF

THE CENTER FOR MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES



# **VIATOR**

## **MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE STUDIES**

Founded by Lynn White, jr. (1907–1987)

### **EDITOR**

Henry Ansgar Kelly (University of California, Los Angeles)

### **MANAGING EDITOR**

Heather Sottong (University of California, Los Angeles)

### **EDITORIAL BOARD**

John Dagenais (Spanish & Portuguese, UCLA)  
Sharon Gerstel (Art History, UCLA)  
Jessica Goldberg (History, UCLA)  
Matthew Fisher (English, UCLA)  
Efrain Kristal (Spanish & Portuguese and Comp Lit, UCLA)  
Peter Stacey (History, UCLA)

### **EDITORIAL CONSULTANTS**

Brigitte Buettner (Smith College)  
Courtney M. Booker (University of British Columbia)  
Jean-Claude Carron (University of California, Los Angeles)  
Jamie Fumo (Florida State University)  
Patrick J. Geary (Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton,  
and University of California, Los Angeles)  
Sarah James (University of Kent)  
Chris Jones (University of Canterbury, Christchurch)  
Constant Mews (Monash University)  
Andrea Moudarres (University of California, Los Angeles)  
Cary J. Nederman (Texas A&M University)  
Thomas O'Donnell (Fordham University)  
Kristen Lee Over (Northeastern Illinois University)  
Eric Palazzo (Université de Poitiers)  
Edward Schoolman (University of Nevada, Reno)  
Elisa Tosi Brandi (Università di Bologna)

Manuscripts should be sent as e-mail attachments to Heather Sottong, [hsottong@humnet.ucla.edu](mailto:hsottong@humnet.ucla.edu). Intercultural and interdisciplinary articles are of particular interest.

© 2018, Brepols Publishers n.v., Turnhout, Belgium

ISSN: 0083-5897

ISBN: 978-2-503-57873-6

D/2018/0095/309

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Library of Congress Card Number 71-111417

## CONTENTS

Imperial Narratives, Complex Geographies: The Saxon Marches between Textuality and Materiality, 929–983 CHRIS HALSTED	1
News in the Middle Ages: News, Communications, and the Launch of the Third Crusade in 1187–1188 HELEN BIRKETT	23
<i>Audita Tremendi</i> and the Call for the Third Crusade Reconsidered, 1187–1188 THOMAS W. SMITH	63
Reading Geoffrey of Monmouth in Wales: The Intellectual Roots of <i>Brut y Brenhinedd</i> in Latin Commentaries, Glosses, and Variant Texts GEORGIA HENLEY	103
Female Suicide in Thirteenth-Century Iceland: The Case of Brynhildr in <i>Völsunga Saga</i> KIRSI KANERVA	129
The Day the Emperor Became Podestà: Negotiating Legitimacy in a Fourteenth- Century Commune LUCA R. FOTI	155
“Ainssi comme ung beaux mirouer”: A Medieval French Translation of Margaret of Oingt’s <i>Speculum</i> HUW GRANGE	181
“To See beyond the Moment is Delightful”: Devout Chronologies of the Late Medieval Low Countries MATTHEW S. CHAMPION	199
The Maces of the Jagiellonian University: A Contribution to the Research on Insignia of Power in the Late Middle Ages and at the Beginning of the Early Modern Period MAREK WALCZAK	223
Crossing Boundaries: A Problem of Territoriality in Renaissance Italy LUCIANO PIFFANELLI	245
“By Means of Secret Help and Gifts”: Venetians, Mamluks, and Pilgrimage to the Holy Land at the Turn of the Sixteenth Century JESSE HYSELL	277
The Diffusion of the <i>De spiritu et anima</i> and Cistercian Reflection on the Soul CONSTANT J. MEWS	297

## AUDITA TREMENDI AND THE CALL FOR THE THIRD CRUSADE RECONSIDERED, 1187–1188

Thomas W. Smith\*

**Abstract:** This article presents the first forensic source criticism of the papal encyclical that launched the Third Crusade, *Audita tremendi* (1187/1188); it makes four main arguments. First, its core empirical contribution is to demonstrate textual variation across the four issues of the letter. Second, it engages with the debate on whether the crusading movement existed in an institutional form in the twelfth century by challenging the interpretation that the reissue of *Audita tremendi* and similar papal documents was the result of uninspired “plagiarism.” Third, it offers a new reconstruction of the immediate context of the issue of the document and argues that, rather than being the product of a long period of careful composition, it was issued as a hurried response to the arrival of the news from Hattin. Fourth, it reconsiders the role of the encyclical in the call for the Third Crusade and contends that the papacy was focused not on the promotion of the military expedition but on the launch of an immediate liturgical campaign of communal repentance. Additionally, the article prints comparative transcriptions of the four issues as an appendix, three of which are published here for the first time.

**Keywords:** *Audita tremendi*, Third Crusade, papal encyclicals, crusading movement, Pope Gregory VIII, Pope Clement III, Battle of Hattin, Jerusalem, theology, manuscripts, textual reception and transmission.

Reeling from the news that the Ayyubid sultan of Egypt and Syria, Saladin, had annihilated the forces of the Latin East at the Battle of Hattin on 4 July 1187, Pope Gregory VIII gathered members of his court at Ferrara in October to craft the text of a new encyclical.<sup>1</sup> This letter, known by its opening words *Audita tremendi*, ushered in not only the beginning of the preparation for the Third Crusade (1189–1192), but also a new era of the crusading movement:

When we heard of the severity of the awesome judgement that the hand of God visited on the land of Jerusalem, we and our brothers were disturbed by so great a horror, afflicted by such great sorrows, that we scarcely knew how we ought to act or what we ought to do, save that the psalmist laments and says, “O God, the gentiles have come into your inheritance...” [Psalm 78:1]<sup>2</sup>

\* History Department, Rugby School, Lawrence Sheriff Street, Rugby, Warwickshire, CV22 5EH, United Kingdom, TWS@rugbyschool.net. I am very grateful to the Leverhulme Trust for the award of an Early Career Fellowship at the University of Leeds (2017–2020) during which this article was researched and written. I am indebted to Helen Birkett, Andrew Buck, Peter Crooks, Simon John, Graham Loud, Georg Strack, and the anonymous reviewers for their comments on this article. My thanks also to the audiences of the “Grey Popes” sessions at Leeds International Medieval Congress and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft-funded research network in Munich, *Stilus curiae: Spielregeln der Konflikt- und Verhandlungsführung am Papsthof des Mittelalters*, where I read early versions of this work in 2018, for their helpful suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> On the battle, see J. France, *Hattin* (Oxford 2015) and S. Tibble, *The Crusader Armies, 1099–1187* (New Haven 2018) 325–344.

<sup>2</sup> “*Audita tremendi severitate iudicii, quod super terram Jerusalem divina manus exercuit, tanto sumus nos et fratres nostri horrore confusi, tantisque afflicti doloribus, ut non facile nobis occurreret, quid agere aut quid facere deberemus, nisi quod Psalmista deplorat, et dicit: Deus, venerunt gentes in haereditatem tuam ...*”: *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ed. J. P. Migne, 221 vols. (Paris 1844–1864) CCL.1539–1542, at 1539 [hereafter *PL*]; translation lightly adapted from *Crusade and Christendom: Annotated Documents in Translation from Innocent III to the Fall of Acre, 1187–1291*, eds. J. Bird, E. Peters and J. M. Powell (Philadelphia 2013) 4 [hereafter *Crusade and Christendom*]. For a list of editions and translations, and most of the manuscripts, see: *Regesta Imperii, IV: Lothar III. und ältere Staufer 1125–1197, 4. Abteilung: Papstregesten 1124–1198, Teil 4, Lieferung 3: 1185–1187*, ed. J. F. Böhrer, rev. U. Schmidt and K. Baaken (Cologne 2012) 661–662, no. 1307, 663–664, no. 1311, 677–678, no. 1330; *Regesta Imperii, IV: Lothar III. und ältere Staufer 1125–1197, 4. Abteilung: Papstregesten 1124–1198, Teil 4,*

*Viator* 49 No. 3 (2018) 63–101. 10.1484/J.VIATOR.5.119574

*Audita tremendi* has long been considered the pinnacle of twelfth-century papal crusade letters, its visceral language providing an insight into the thought-world of the papal curia as its constituents reacted to the losses at Hattin.<sup>3</sup> The emotional sentences of the *narratio*—reworked from the first battlefield reports—relate how the True Cross was lost, the bishops butchered, the king of Jerusalem captured, and the knights of the military orders decapitated before Saladin; they have lost little of their shock value in the intervening eight centuries.<sup>4</sup> The audience in Ferrara felt the political landscape shifting under their feet; drawing upon Matthew 27: 51–52 to make sense of the disaster, Henry, cardinal-bishop of Albano, wrote that “the earth trembled” (“terra tremuit”) with the loss of Christ’s patrimony.<sup>5</sup> After nearly a century of a crusading movement during which the papacy had regularly sought recruits to help defend the Latin polities in the East, in *Audita tremendi*, Pope Gregory VIII now called upon the faithful to join the last-ditch fight for Outremer’s very survival.<sup>6</sup> This fight was not just to involve warrior-pilgrims in the Holy Land, but the entirety of the Christian community in the West. In seeking out the cause of God’s wrath, the papacy turned inwards, blaming the sins of the people of Christendom and ordering widespread repentance. *Audita tremendi* marked a sea-change in the nature of the crusading movement, which shifted from a focus on military reinforcement and the liturgical celebration of 1099 to recovery expeditions and supplication before God to bring about their success.<sup>7</sup> Of course, Christian sin as a cause of military defeat in the East

*Lieferung 4: 1187–1191*, ed. J. F. Böhmer, rev. U. Schmidt (Cologne 2014) 14–15, no. 25 (also available at <<http://www.regesta-imperii.de/regesten>> [last accessed 18 December 2018]). On the news from Hattin, see H. Birkett, “News in the Middle Ages: News, Communications, and the Launch of the Third Crusade in 1187–1188,” *Viator* 49.3 (2018) and B. Bolton, “‘Serpent in the Dust: Sparrow on the Housetop’: Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Circle of Pope Innocent III,” in *The Holy Land, Holy Lands, and Christian History*, ed. R. N. Swanson, Studies in Church History, 36 (Woodbridge 2000) 154–180, at 162–164.

<sup>3</sup> V. Cramer, “Kreuzpredigt und Kreuzzugsgedanke von Bernhard von Clairvaux bis Humbert von Romans,” in *Das Heilige Land in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart: Gesammelte Beiträge und Berichte zur Palästinaforschung*, eds. V. Cramer and G. Meinertz, vol. I (Cologne 1939) 43–204, at 68–69.

<sup>4</sup> PL (n. 2 above) CCII.1540. Cf. the letters of the Genoese, Terricus, and Peter of Blois, interpolated in Roger of Howden, *Gesta regis Henrici secundi Benedicti abbatis*, ed. W. Stubbs, vol. II, Rolls Series XLIX (London 1867) 11–15. See U. Schwerin, *Die Aufrufe der Päpste zur Befreiung des Heiligen Landes von den Anfängen bis zum Ausgang Innozenz IV.: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der kurialen Kreuzzugspropaganda und der päpstlichen Epistolographie* (Berlin 1937) 83; Cramer, “Kreuzpredigt” (n. 3 above) 69.

<sup>5</sup> PL (n. 2 above) CCIV.249; S. Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City: Crusader Jerusalem and the Catholic West (1099–1187)* (Aldershot 2005) 163. On the reaction in the West, see *ibid.* 159–187.

<sup>6</sup> C. Tyerman, *How to Plan a Crusade: Reason and Religious War in the High Middle Ages* (London 2015) 52. On the papacy’s calls for aid on behalf of the Holy Land before 1187, see J. Riley-Smith, “The Crusades, 1095–1198,” in *The New Cambridge Medieval History, IV: c.1024–c.1198*, eds. D. Luscombe and J. Riley-Smith (Cambridge 2004) 534–563, at 556–557 and J. Phillips, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations between the Latin East and the West, 1119–1187* (Oxford 1996).

<sup>7</sup> On the liturgical support for the crusades, see: J. L. Bird, “Rogations, Litanies, and Crusade Preaching: The Liturgical Front in the Late Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries,” in *Papacy, Crusade, and Christian-Muslim Relations*, ed. J. L. Bird (Amsterdam 2018) 155–193; I. Shagrir and C. Gaposchkin, “Liturgy and Devotion in the Crusader States: An Introduction,” *Journal of Medieval History*, 43.4 [Special Issue: “Liturgy and Devotion in the Crusader States”] (2017) 359–366; M. C. Gaposchkin, *Invisible Weapons: Liturgy and the Making of Crusade Ideology* (Ithaca 2017); R. D. G. Allington, “Prayer Warriors: Crusading Piety in Rome and the Papal States (1187–1291)” (unpublished PhD dissertation, Saint Louis University, 2017); A. Linder, *Raising Arms: Liturgy in the Struggle to Liberate Jerusalem in the Late Middle Ages* (Turnhout 2003); K. A. Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture* (Woodbridge 2011); C. T. Maier, “Crisis, Liturgy and the Crusade in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 48 (1997) 628–657; S. John, “The ‘Feast of the Liberation of Jerusalem’: Remembering and Reconstructing the First Crusade in the Holy City, 1099–1187,” *Journal of Medieval*

had been an important theme in the discourse on the crusades from the beginning—and especially after Pope Eugenius III's encyclical *Quantum praedecessores* in 1145/1146—but with *Audita tremendi* the papacy structured the entire crusading movement around the spiritual purity of every member of the Christian community.<sup>8</sup> The theological explanation for the disaster in the Holy Land percolated down through the organs of the universal Church to become an intrinsic part of a new liturgical campaign to recover the holy places, infusing the papacy's organisation of the crusades and the wider ecclesiastical discourse.<sup>9</sup> As Christopher Tyerman puts it, the “response to the loss of Jerusalem and most of Outremer reinvented crusading.”<sup>10</sup> *Audita tremendi* marked the beginning of this reinvention, setting the crusading movement on a new footing and helping to shape the development of the crusades as an institution, in the West and the East, for the rest of the twelfth century and into the thirteenth.<sup>11</sup> It is a document central to the history of the crusade movement; and yet there is so much we do not know about it.

*Audita tremendi*'s fame, the familiar and comfortable way in which we cite it in our scholarship, and its ubiquity in translation on undergraduate crusade courses, all belie the stark reality that the document has been subjected to little dedicated research, and essential aspects of its production and circulation remain obscure.<sup>12</sup> Although we often speak of *Audita tremendi* as if it were a single document, if we want to be precise, it was, in fact, four. *Audita tremendi* was issued and reissued at least four times by two different popes: by Gregory VIII on 29 October, 30 October, and 3 November 1187, and by Clement III on 2 January 1188 (see the appendix, below, for the texts of all four versions).<sup>13</sup> Although Rudolf Hiestand pointed out in the mid-1980s that the reissues contain variant texts, no-one has systematically examined and compared them.<sup>14</sup> As a result, we do not know exactly which text each issue circulated, how they relate to one another, what changes were made and why.<sup>15</sup> The most commonly used and cited version of the text, that interpolated in the *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris* (“The History of the Expedition of the Emperor Frederick”—a major

*History*, 41 (2015) 409–431; and T. W. Smith, “Scribal Crusading: Three New Manuscripts to the Regional Reception and Transmission of First Crusade Letters,” *Traditio*, 72 (2017) 133–169.

<sup>8</sup> See Maier, “Crisis, Liturgy and the Crusade” (n. 7 above); Gaposchkin, *Invisible Weapons* (n. 7 above) 194.

<sup>9</sup> Schein, *Gateway* (n. 5 above) 163–164; A. Jotischky, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, 2nd edn. (Abingdon 2017) 168; Gaposchkin, *Invisible Weapons* (n. 7 above) 194–225.

<sup>10</sup> C. Tyerman, *God's War: A New History of the Crusades* (London 2006) 375.

<sup>11</sup> See also *Crusade and Christendom* (n. 2 above) 4; C. Tyerman, *The Invention of the Crusades* (Basingstoke 1998) 30–98.

<sup>12</sup> Aspects of the document are considered in Schwerin, *Aufrufe* (n. 4 above) 81–85, 137–139 and M. R. Tessera, “The Use of the Bible in Twelfth-Century Papal Letters to Outremer,” in *The Uses of the Bible in Crusader Sources*, eds. E. Lapina and N. Morton (Leiden, 2017) 179–205, at 201–205. The indulgence clause is assessed throughout A. L. Bysted, *The Crusade Indulgence: Spiritual Rewards and the Theology of the Crusades, c.1095–1216* (Leiden 2015). Key elements of the rhetoric, and their impact, are explored in Schein, *Gateway* (n. 5 above) 161–180.

<sup>13</sup> *Regesta Imperii*, IV: 4.4.3, ed. Böhmer (n. 2 above) 661–662, no. 1307, 663–664, no. 1311, 677–678, no. 1330; IV: 4.4.4, 14–15, no. 25; Another reissue on 3 December 1187 is posited in Tessera, “Use of the Bible” (n. 12 above) 202. Although it is extremely plausible that there were further reissues, this is not supported by the manuscripts known at present. On Gregory VIII, see T. di Carpegna Falconieri, “Gregorio VIII,” in *Enciclopedia dei papi*, 3 vols. (Rome 2000) II.314–316 and A. Dalzell, “The *Forma dictandi* attributed to Albert of Morra and Related Texts,” *Mediaeval Studies*, 39 (1977) 440–465. On Clement III, see J. Petersohn, “Clemente III,” in *Enciclopedia dei papi*, III.316–319.

<sup>14</sup> *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande*, ed. R. Hiestand (Göttingen 1988) 395–397, no. 201.

<sup>15</sup> Schwerin, who only knew of six copies of the document in the 1930s, offered only the observation that they were all closely related: Schwerin, *Aufrufe* (n. 4 above) 137–139.

narrative account of the crusade of the German emperor, Frederick Barbarossa) and edited by Anton Chroust in 1928, has never been dated satisfactorily, and no-one has established whether it is an accurate witness to the text.<sup>16</sup> Another aspect that demands further attention is how and when *Audita tremendi* was composed. The standard interpretation is that the encyclical must have been the product of a long period of reflection, discussion and drafting. Tyerman writes that:

[t]he effort to mobilize Christendom involved every available medium of communication in a carefully organized campaign. Although published in late October and early November 1187, only days after his accession, Gregory VIII's *Audita tremendi* had taken weeks of drafting since September when definite news of Hattin reached the papal Curia, then in Verona.<sup>17</sup>

Similarly, Jonathan Riley-Smith believed that:

[*Audita tremendi*] must have been drafted by Urban before his death, because such an important letter could hardly have been composed, approved, corrected and copied in the eight days that elapsed between Gregory's election on 21 October and the date of the earliest versions of it.<sup>18</sup>

There are two points to draw out here. First, that the crusade call was apparently part of a carefully organized response to the news of Hattin. Second, that Pope Urban III began drafting the document weeks before its issue and that it was subjected to the standard chancery procedures of approval and correction.<sup>19</sup> Close textual analysis of the different types of the document, however, suggests an alternative interpretation: that the first three versions of *Audita tremendi* are in fact the result of emergency drafting which bypassed normal chancery checks. Consequently, the letter text necessitated continuing revision and repeated reissue. Locating *Audita tremendi* in the wider historiographical context, the act of the reissue of the document also takes on a new significance. There has been a tendency in the scholarship to treat the reissue of papal letters as derivative and unimportant—the calling card of intellectually moribund popes incapable of crafting their own, original letters.<sup>20</sup> The present article seeks to subvert this narrative. Although the different issues of *Audita tremendi* all circulated the same core text, each preserves modifications which support a more complex analysis of the process and impulses behind the reissues. In other words, the various versions of the letter are more distinct than currently recognized, and we should be wary of dismissing them as unimaginative. In sum, *Audita tremendi*, like so many of the documentary sources for the crusades, has not been subjected to modern,

<sup>16</sup> "Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris," in *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I.*, ed. A. Chroust, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum, new ser. 5 (Berlin 1929) 6–10; trans. in *The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa: The History of the Expedition of the Emperor Frederick and Related Texts*, ed. G. A. Loud (Farnham 2013).

<sup>17</sup> Tyerman, *God's War* (n. 10 above) 376.

<sup>18</sup> J. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: A History*, 3rd edn. (London 2014) 163.

<sup>19</sup> Tessera, "Use of the Bible" (n. 12 above) 202.

<sup>20</sup> R. C. Smail, "Latin Syria and the West, 1149–1187," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 19 (1969) 1–20, at 11–12; C. Tyerman, "Were there any Crusades in the Twelfth Century?," *English Historical Review*, 110 (1995) 553–577, at 560; cf. I. Fonnesberg-Schmidt, "Alexander III and the Crusades," in *Pope Alexander III (1159–81): The Art of Survival*, eds. P. D. Clarke and A. J. Duggan (Farnham 2012) 341–363; see below.

rigorous examination according to the standards of *Quellenkritik*.<sup>21</sup> This article makes four main arguments. First, its core empirical contribution is to demonstrate textual variation across the four issues, as well as the further ramification of these distinct “types” as they were themselves copied and modified in the West. Second, it engages with the debate on whether the crusading movement existed in an institutional form in the twelfth century, challenging the interpretation that the reissue of *Audita tremendi* and similar papal documents was the result of uninspired “plagiarism.”<sup>22</sup> Third, it offers a new reconstruction of the immediate context of the issue of the document, which changes our understanding of *Audita tremendi* by arguing that, rather than being the product of a long period of careful composition and reflection, it was issued as a hurried response to the arrival of the news from Hattin. Fourth, it reconsiders the role of the encyclical in the call for the Third Crusade and contends that, at the time of its issue, the papacy was focused not on the promotion of the military expedition but on the launch of an immediate liturgical campaign of communal repentance. Additionally, the article prints comparative transcriptions of the four issues as an appendix, three of which are published here for the first time.

#### ISSUE AND REISSUE

*Audita tremendi* was addressed “to all the faithful of Christ whom this letter may reach” (“universis Christi fidelibus ad quos litterae istae pervenerint”) and ordered the entire community to repent their sins and those of able body to take the cross and march to the rescue of the Holy Land.<sup>23</sup> In circulating crusade encyclicals, the papacy usually despatched copies to the head of each diocese, that is the local archbishop or bishop, who was charged with transmitting the text to the faithful through local ecclesiastical administrative structures.<sup>24</sup> From these official communication channels, “[p]ropaganda spread effectively,” Tyerman writes, “along the interlaced networks of the lay and ecclesiastical elites,” and we will see evidence of such manuscript transmission in extra-papal contexts below.<sup>25</sup> It was common for papal encyclicals to form the basis of local crusade preaching.<sup>26</sup> Surviving evidence of the transmission of the encyclicals in Latin or the vernacular by preachers is extremely rare, but Christoph Maier has drawn attention to a valuable survival: a copy of Pope Clement IV’s letter *Expansis in cruce* from 1265 promoting a crusade against the Mamluks, now preserved in Freiburg. This manuscript, which was made in a Dominican priory, bears an accurate copy of Clement’s Latin text on one side of the parchment, and on the recto a “word-by-word translation” of the encyclical into Middle High German.<sup>27</sup> Also on the reverse of the letter is a copy of the crusade ordinance *Ad liberandam* approved at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, which laid out the rights and privileges of

<sup>21</sup> On the scholarly tradition of *Quellenkritik*, the forensic close source analysis pioneered by the German academy in the nineteenth century, see the various series of editions produced by the Monumenta Germaniae Historica (MGH) and H. von Sybel, *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzugs*, 1st edn. (Dusseldorf 1841), 2nd edn. (Leipzig 1881).

<sup>22</sup> Tyerman, “Crusades in the Twelfth Century” (n. 20 above).

<sup>23</sup> *PL* (n. 2 above) CCII.1539.

<sup>24</sup> C. T. Maier, *Preaching the Crusades: Mendicant Friars and the Cross in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge 1994) 3. For an overview of the function of papal letters in recruitment campaigns, see now: C. T. Maier, “Ritual, what else? Papal Letters, Sermons and the Making of Crusaders,” *Journal of Medieval History*, 44 (2018) 333–346, at 334–337.

<sup>25</sup> Tyerman, *How to Plan a Crusade* (n. 6 above) 115.

<sup>26</sup> R. Rist, “The Medieval Papacy and Holy War: General Crusading Letters and Papal Authority, 1145–1213,” in *Faith, War, and Violence*, ed. G. R. Ricci (New Brunswick 2014) 105–121, at 111.

<sup>27</sup> Maier, “Ritual” (n. 24 above) 336.

crusaders and legislated to restrict trade in war materiel with Muslims and to enforce peace within Christendom, among other things.<sup>28</sup> Such papal documents supplied clerics with the theological and administrative toolkit necessary to construct their own sermons and recruit for new crusades; indeed, some popes even ordered that their encyclicals be read out verbatim so as to avoid the contamination of their carefully crafted message.<sup>29</sup> While *Ad liberandam* assumed the status of a core text in crusade recruitment from 1215, no such standard ordinance existed in 1187, and it is generally accepted that *Audita tremendi* formed the basis of the preaching campaigns for the Third Crusade.<sup>30</sup> Tyerman argues that Archbishop Baldwin of Canterbury's recruitment tour of Wales in 1188 probably publicized the encyclical and states that it "is almost certain that Baldwin's team of preachers...would have taken *Audita tremendi* as the basis for their speeches."<sup>31</sup> In order to shine light on the preaching of the Third Crusade, then, it is necessary to understand exactly which texts were circulating and how they were produced.

An investigation into *Audita tremendi* must begin by untangling the four known versions of the text. As noted above, the first was given at Ferrara by Gregory VIII on 29 October 1187. He then modified its content and despatched a new version one day later, on 30 October. Still at Ferrara, Gregory reissued the letter with further alterations again on 3 November. Finally, his successor, Clement III, also adapted the text and reissued *Audita tremendi* on 2 January 1188 while his curia was based in Pisa.<sup>32</sup> This identification of four discrete issues is straightforward enough (although scholarly awareness of the four versions and the differences between them remains patchy).<sup>33</sup> The root of the problem in sorting these different issues of the document was that it was hitherto extremely difficult to categorize the various witnesses according to issue date: key witnesses of the letter lack their *datum* clause, and the reissues of 30 October 1187 (first noticed by Hiestand), 3 November 1187, and 2 January 1188 (discovered by Benjamin Kedar) remain unpublished.<sup>34</sup> This would have been easy to adjust for, if we had a full set of authoritative manuscript witnesses produced in the papal chancery against which to compare. But, like most medieval papal letters, *Audita tremendi* is not preserved as the original parchment sheet issued and sealed by the papal chancery. Nor do we possess the twelfth-century papal registers, in which the curia entered copies of

<sup>28</sup> Ibid. On *Ad liberandam* see T. W. Smith, "Conciliar Influence on *Ad liberandam*," in *The Fourth Lateran Council and the Crusade Movement: The Impact of the Council of 1215 on Latin Christendom and the East*, ed. J. L. Bird and D. J. Smith (Turnhout 2018) 219–239.

<sup>29</sup> Maier, *Preaching* (n. 24 above) 35, 102–103, 117; P. B. Pixton, "Die Anwerbung des Heeres Christi: Prediger des Fünften Kreuzzuges in Deutschland," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 34 (1978) 166–191, at 176; *Crusade and Christendom* (n. 2 above) 277; M. Lower, *The Barons' Crusade: A Call to Arms and its Consequences* (Philadelphia 2005) 3.

<sup>30</sup> Cramer, "Kreuzpredigt" (n. 3 above) 69.

<sup>31</sup> C. Tyerman, *England and the Crusades, 1095–1588* (Chicago 1988) 153–154, quotation at 158. See also Tyerman, *How to Plan a Crusade* (n. 6 above) 114–115.

<sup>32</sup> *Regesta Imperii*, IV: 4.4.3, ed. Böhmer (n. 2 above) 661–2, no. 1307, 663–664, no. 1311, 677–678, no. 1330; IV: 4.4.4, 14–15, no. 25.

<sup>33</sup> Gaposchkin, *Invisible Weapons* (n. 7 above) 193 n. 5, following Schein, *Gateway* (n. 7 above) 164 n. 19, states that there are only three versions.

<sup>34</sup> B. Z. Kedar, "Ein Hilferuf aus Jerusalem vom September 1187," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 38 (1982) 112–122, at 112–114. Georg Strack intends to produce a full critical edition and study of *Audita tremendi*, which is greatly needed, as Hiestand pointed out: *Papsturkunden*, ed. Hiestand, 396.

outgoing correspondence.<sup>35</sup> What we are left with, instead, are copies of the letter made exclusively in extra-papal contexts, appended to miscellaneous manuscript codices produced in the provinces and interpolated in longer histories. Like many interpolated documents, some witnesses to *Audita tremendi* have been shorn of their dating clauses by medieval scribes at some point in the manuscript transmission; others present texts modified by scribes who juggled the order of grammatical constructions, abbreviated and excised biblical quotations, and inserted new material. This cocktail of “unauthorized” alterations means that we are confronted by an extremely complex and confusing manuscript transmission made up of a veritable jumble of texts which survive in diverse manuscript contexts, some dated and others not, with a wide range of textual variants and hybridization between the different issues. Attempting to bring order to this documentary disarray is a major challenge. Because every single surviving copy of *Audita tremendi* was produced outside the papal chancery, and because it enjoyed such a wide circulation, we must establish, through close textual comparison, which variants between the four issues represent development of the text at the papal curia, and which are the result of reworking in the localities. Devotion of close attention to seemingly minor changes in wording—hitherto disregarded as insignificant—underpins the central arguments of the present article. It demonstrates textual variation across the four issues, revealing development and theological refinement of the content between the reissues. This identification of dynamism across the different issues of *Audita tremendi* invites us, in turn, to reconsider the idea that the process of reissuing papal encyclicals sprang from a lack of interest and originality. It also lays the foundation for the new interpretation of the immediate context in which *Audita tremendi* was issued: it was not a product of lengthy, careful composition as scholars had claimed, but drafted in a hurry to a standard that was not entirely satisfactory.

We have securely dated copies and a very stable text for the first issue of the document, dated 29 October 1187. The first issue is published in a number of editions, some made from copies interpolated in narrative texts, and others apparently from letter collections and miscellaneous codices and perhaps even the original papal documents (sadly, the source of most of the texts is not provided by their editors). The most influential and accurate of these editions is that made by Giovanni Domenico Mansi in 1778, which was reprinted in 1855 with minor corrections by Jacques Paul Migne in his ubiquitous *Patrologia Latina* series.<sup>36</sup> Aside from some minor evidence of reworking in the provinces, comparison of all the editions reveals an unproblematic text for the first version of *Audita tremendi*.

It was only relatively recently that the very existence of Gregory VIII's second issue of *Audita tremendi*, sent out on 30 October, came to the attention of scholars after Hiestand first noticed that the dating clause was “III kal. novembris” (30 October), not “IIII kal. novembris” (29 October), as previously thought.<sup>37</sup> There is only a single known manuscript of this issue, a twelfth-century codex in Rouen containing the letters of St Gregory the Great which belonged to the church of St Ouen

<sup>35</sup> U.-R. Blumenthal, “Papal Registers in the Twelfth Century,” in *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Medieval Canon Law*, Cambridge, 23–27 July 1984, ed. P. Linehan (Vatican City 1988) 133–151.

<sup>36</sup> *Sacrorum conciliorum nova, et amplissima collectio*, ed. J. D. Mansi, vol. XXII (Venice 1768); *PL* (n. 2 above) CCII.1539–1542; The corrections are: “quod illis contra Deum” (Mansi, 529) is corrected to “quod illi contra Deum” (*PL*, CCII.1541) and “donec du ipsorum” (Mansi, 530) is corrected to “donec de ipsorum” (*PL*, CCII.1542).

<sup>37</sup> *Papsturkunden*, ed. Hiestand (n. 14 above) 396.

in Rouen.<sup>38</sup> The text transmitted in the Rouen manuscript appears to have been altered in the localities. It includes an apparently unique interpolation of rhetoric, which urges the audience to take strength from the example of St Paul and the promise of divine aid, that cannot be traced in the transmission of the other types.<sup>39</sup> In other words, this snippet of rhetoric appears in this manuscript for the first time, but then disappears again, leaving no trace in the later issues. If this insertion were an authentic papal alteration then we would expect to find some traces of the new textual formulations in the next issue, since the later iterations tend to preserve previous changes. Despite the evidence of non-papal modifications to the text of the second issue, the likelihood is that this witness represents a distinct issue of the letter and that the *datum* is not the result of a missing minim through scribal error, since the development of the text slots into the correct order established through comparison against the other manuscript witnesses. The second issue has readings in common with the third version which must originate in the former, thus marking its text out as distinct from the original issue. If we entertain the possibility that the *datum* is a scribal mistake, then, and that the second version is a phantom, the sloppy copyist in question would have to have transposed *Kalendas* with *Nonas*, which is less likely than merely missing a minim (compare the *datum* clauses in the appendix).

The third time that Gregory is recorded to have issued his encyclical was on 3 November. We are blessed with a relatively large number of manuscripts of this iteration. One is preserved as an appendix to the chronicle of Sigebert of Gembloux in a twelfth-century manuscript in London.<sup>40</sup> We might assume that the early date of this witness, which would make it almost contemporaneous with its original issue, would mean that it is not far removed from the official papal text and is therefore a trustworthy witness. In fact, comparison with the printed editions and unpublished manuscript material shows that it is not. Aside from a large number of scribal errors (such as “spalmista” for *psalmista*) the text displays significant divergence from the original text.<sup>41</sup> Fortunately, we possess three good witnesses to the text of the third issue. The oldest is in a late twelfth-century manuscript uncovered in Munich by Helen Birkett. This codex, which contains Hilary of Poitiers on the Trinity, was produced in southern Germany and belonged to the Benedictine foundation Kloster Weihenstephan.<sup>42</sup> There is a range of peculiar scribal mistakes in this copy, which

<sup>38</sup> Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, Ms. 518 (O 17), fo. 202v; <[https://ccfr.bnf.fr/portailccfr/jsp/index\\_view\\_direct\\_anonymous.jsp?record=eadcgm:EADC:D08A11127](https://ccfr.bnf.fr/portailccfr/jsp/index_view_direct_anonymous.jsp?record=eadcgm:EADC:D08A11127)> [last accessed 18 December 2018].

<sup>39</sup> Ms. 518 (O 17) (n. 38 above) fo. 202v: “sed ad voluntatem Dei, qui pro fratribus animam posuit, confortentur et ex vobis addiscant, qualiter in obsequium creatoris sui, et personas et substantias suas impendant, sicut exemplo dominico beatus Paulus apostolus pro animabus auditorum suorum se ipsum impendere satagebat. Nec velitis aliqua exceptione lentescere sed sicut Deus prudentia vos extulit, et divitiis et multitudine ac probitate virorum, ita necessariis rebus per agendis insistite, et celeritatem ac diligentiam, quam in his que carnis sunt hactenus habuistis, et divinis rebus, et salutis vestre negotio habetote. Scientes non esse novum, quod terra illa iudicio divino percutitur [italics denote interpolated material].”

<sup>40</sup> London, British Library, Additional MS 24145, fos. 76v–77r, <[http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=add\\_ms\\_24145](http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=add_ms_24145)> [last accessed 18 December 2018].

<sup>41</sup> Additional MS 24145 (n. 40 above) fo. 76v.

<sup>42</sup> Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 21528, fos. 120v–121v; E. Klemm, *Die romanischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek: Teil 2. Die Bistümer Freising und Augsburg, verschiedene Provenienzen*, Katalog der illuminierten handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek in München, vol. III.3 (Wiesbaden 1988) 68. I am very grateful to Helen Birkett for notifying me about this manuscript and generously sharing materials.

suggests that it was copied in haste, and two good, fourteenth-century witnesses preserved in Paris and Madrid can be used to make up for deficiencies.<sup>43</sup>

The very existence of Clement III's reissue of *Audita tremendi*, the fourth version of the letter, was unknown to scholars for a long time. During research in the manuscript collection of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich, however, Kedar discovered the first manuscript witness of this reissue, dated 2 January 1188, and made the scholarly community aware of this important find in 1982.<sup>44</sup> Soon thereafter, in 1985, Hiestand included a calendar entry of the encyclical in his landmark collection of papal letters regarding the Church and the Holy Land, in which he first observed that each separate issue of the encyclical displays textual differences.<sup>45</sup> Hiestand argued that a new critical edition of all the different versions of *Audita tremendi* was urgently needed, but the thorny manuscript transmission prohibited him from publishing it alongside the other documents in his *Papsturkunden*. There the matter remained until Georg Strack and I came across another witness of Clement III's reissue in an Erlangen manuscript, closely related to Kedar's Munich codex.<sup>46</sup> Subsequently I noticed a third witness to the text in a manuscript held in Innsbruck, which also preserves a new copy of the appeal for military aid sent by Patriarch Eraclius from Jerusalem in 1187.<sup>47</sup> Like the early thirteenth-century Munich and Erlangen manuscripts, the fourteenth-century Innsbruck codex contains letters and tracts by Bernard of Clairvaux, which had become associated with the letter of Eraclius and *Audita tremendi* and were transmitted together in Cistercian circles. The provenance of the manuscript is most probably the Cistercian foundation Stift Stams in Austria.<sup>48</sup> Thus it shares a similar provenance with the other two manuscripts: they all originate from Cistercian foundations in southern Germany and Austria and contain central texts of interest to Cistercian audiences—further evidence of the order's embrace of the liturgical preparations for the Third Crusade and its preaching. The Munich and Erlangen manuscripts were both composed around the same time in the early thirteenth century, and textual comparison of *Audita tremendi* and other documents shows that they are extremely closely related in the manuscript transmission.<sup>49</sup> They both present the best text of the fourth issue; reference is made to the Erlangen copy.

<sup>43</sup> Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 4221, fos. 161r–162v, <<https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8552411g>> [last accessed 18 December 2018]; Madrid, Archivo Histórico Nacional, Códices y Cartularios, L. 649, pp. 12–14 (note that this manuscript is paginated rather than foliated), <<http://pares.mcu.es/ParesBusquedas20/catalogo/show/2357591>> [last accessed 18 December 2018].

<sup>44</sup> Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 28195, fos. 49ra–50rb; Kedar, “Hilferuf” (n. 34 above) 114.

<sup>45</sup> *Papsturkunden*, ed. Hiestand (n. 14 above) 396.

<sup>46</sup> Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen-Nürnberg MS 224, fos. 18va–21va. I have described the Munich and Erlangen manuscripts respectively in T. W. Smith, “The First Crusade Letter Written at Laodicea in 1099: Two Previously Unpublished Versions from Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 23390 and 28195,” *Crusades*, 15 (2016) 1–25, at 12–13 and Smith, “Scribal Crusading” (n. 7 above) 137–140.

<sup>47</sup> Innsbruck, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Tirol Cod. 118, fos. 94rb–95va; *Katalog der Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Innsbruck, Teil 2: Cod. 101–200*, ed. W. Neuhauser (Vienna 1991) 64–66; <[http://manuscripta.at/m1/hs\\_detail.php?ID=7699](http://manuscripta.at/m1/hs_detail.php?ID=7699)> [last accessed 18 December 2018]. The letter of Eraclius is preserved on fo. 94r; another unpublished version can be found in MS 224 (n. 46 above) fos. 17rb–18va; see Smith, “Scribal Crusading” (n. 7 above) 137. On the letter, see Kedar, “Hilferuf” (n. 34 above). I am very grateful to the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, especially to Peter Zerlauth, for generous assistance in reproducing this manuscript.

<sup>48</sup> *Katalog der Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Innsbruck*, ed. Neuhauser (n. 47 above) 64.

<sup>49</sup> Smith, “Scribal Crusading” (n. 7 above) 149.

We can chart the changing attitudes and priorities of the curia in the very opening lines of the document (see the appendix, below, for a comparison of the texts with significant modifications between the issues marked in bold). In the first issue of *Audita tremendi* on 29 October, the authors wrote of the “great sorrow” with which they had been “afflicted” or “crushed” (“*tantisque afflicti doloribus*”).<sup>50</sup> In the second issue of 30 October, however, they replaced this formulation with “*tantis affecti doloribus*,” a reading retained in the third and fourth iterations of 3 November 1187 and 2 January 1188 respectively.<sup>51</sup> The change of verb from *afflicti* to *affecti* is surprising in that it tones down the effect of the terrible news from the East on the curia. There are a number of possible translations for each verb, each with subtle gradations of meaning, but *affligere* generally carries stronger, more violent meanings (“to afflict,” “to throw down,” “to ruin,” “to crush”) than *afficere* (“to affect,” “to move,” “to weaken,” “to cause hurt or death”). It is unlikely that the passage of a few days dulled the pain of the pope and his curialists, but it is possible that they made this alteration to improve the style of the oral delivery of the text. In any case, it serves as an example of just how rapidly central elements of the text of *Audita tremendi* were revised.

Across the four issues, the papacy refined its portrayal of the feeling of hopelessness that permeated the curia. In the first issue of 29 October, Gregory described the curia’s listlessness by “not knowing how we ought to act or what we ought to do” (“*ut non facile nobis occurreret, quid agere aut quid facere deberemus*”).<sup>52</sup> The very next day he changed this to not knowing “how we ought to act or what we ought to say” (“*...quid agere aut quid dicere deberemus*”), a reading retained in the third issue of 3 November.<sup>53</sup> On 2 January, Clement III developed this once more, combining the previous issues to invent a new formulation which stated that they knew not “what we ought to say or do” (“*... quid dicere aut quid facere deberemus*”).<sup>54</sup> We should be careful how much we read into this. Although the similar meanings of *agere* (“to act”) and *facere* (“to do”) in this context appear to render the sentence a tautology to modern eyes, this was quite normal according to the rule of the *stilus curiae*, which commonly strung together synonyms in order to ratchet up the emotional impact of textual formulations.<sup>55</sup> We can interpret this, then, as evidence of the effort poured into polishing the text across the different versions, but without altering the basic message.

We can also trace a subtle shift in the political priorities at the curia by studying the adjustment to the formulation describing the aftermath of Hattin: “*trucidati episcopi, captus est rex*” (“the bishops were slaughtered, and the king [of Jerusalem, Guy de Lusignan] was captured”).<sup>56</sup> This text appears unchanged in all three issues until Clement switched the word order in his reissue of 2 January to read: “*captus est rex, trucidati episcopi*.”<sup>57</sup> Unless this represents subsequent reworking of the reissue of

<sup>50</sup> *PL* (n. 2 above) CCII.1539.

<sup>51</sup> 30 Oct. 1187: Ms. 518 (O 17) (n. 38 above) fo. 202v; 3 Nov. 1187: Clm 21528 (n. 42 above) fo. 120v; 2 Jan. 1188: MS 224 (n. 46 above) fo. 18vb.

<sup>52</sup> *PL* (n. 2 above) CCII.1539.

<sup>53</sup> 30 Oct. 1187: Ms. 518 (O 17) (n. 38 above) fo. 202v; 3 Nov. 1187: Clm 21528 (n. 42 above) fo. 120v.

<sup>54</sup> MS 224 (n. 46 above) fo. 18vb; trans. in *Crusade of Frederick*, ed. Loud (n. 16 above) 37.

<sup>55</sup> T. Frenz, “Kuriästil,” in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, ed. G. Ueding, vol. IV (Tübingen 1998) 1536–1541, at 1538.

<sup>56</sup> 29 Oct. 1187: *PL* (n. 2 above) CCII.1540; 30 Oct. 1187: Ms. 518 (O 17) (n. 38 above) fo. 202v; 3 Nov. 1187: Clm 21528 (n. 42 above) fo. 120v.

<sup>57</sup> MS 224, fo. 19ra.

1188 in the localities in all three manuscript witnesses, then this alteration suggests that, after the initial shock of the news had passed, Clement re-evaluated the priorities of the threats facing the Latin East. While appalling, the death of the bishops did not pose an existential threat to the Latin polities of Outremer—new, replacement prelates could be drawn from the hierarchy of the Church. The capture of the king of Jerusalem, however, meant that the remnants of the kingdom were without military leadership; an anointed king without issue could not be replaced so easily as a bishop. Clement and his curia therefore appear to have bumped the capture of Guy up the list to take the place of the dead bishops in the reformulation of the text in January 1188, so as to frontload it as the more pressing threat.

As the pope and his staff continued to modify the text of their encyclical, they also reflected upon the function of the document. In the first issue, Gregory VIII referred to the role of his letter as “setting forth” or “unfolding” the events (“nostris litteris explicandum”), but by the very next day, 30 October, he had modified the function of the letter to “pronouncing” upon them, replacing *explicandum* with *exprimendum*, a reading retained in the third and fourth issues (“nostris litteris exprimendum”).<sup>58</sup> The most probable explanation is that the curialists drafted the letter in a hurry and chose the verb *explicare* in their haste to explain the news and pass it on. The decision to revise this to *exprimere* perhaps denotes the reappraisal of the function of the document, since *exprimere* better fitted the purpose of an encyclical, which was not merely to relay news, but to order communal repentance through papal authority.

All these alterations, the improvement of style, the switch in political priorities, and the reconsidered function of the letter, reveal that, as the initial shock of the news from Hattin passed, the pope and his staff reflected critically upon the message they were transmitting to their audience and continually revised the document in the effort to present the most powerful and accurate rendering of its content. We can trace the shifting curial attitudes and thinking on the crisis in the East through the revisions, all of which suggest that the document was first composed in a state of panic immediately upon receiving word from Hattin—a new reading of the encyclical that has ramifications for how we understand both the process of its production and its changing message. The implications of this are explored more fully below.

As the curia embarked upon its programme of revision, it concentrated its effort on refining the theological import of the encyclical so as to maximize the effectiveness of the prescribed penitence. The explanation of the catastrophe in the East as the result of the West’s sins and the launch of the liturgical campaign of communal repentance formed the keynote of *Audita tremendi*, and the fine-tuning of this central message attracted much curial energy. In the first version of 29 October, Gregory VIII invoked Hosea 4:2 in stating that “lying, murder and adultery abound” within Christendom (“mendacium, homicidium et adulterium inundaverunt”).<sup>59</sup> But comparison of this passage with the biblical verse demonstrates that one sin is absent: theft (*furtum*). By the second issue, however, the text included the missing sin: “furtum et mendacium, homicidium, et adulterium, inundaverunt.”<sup>60</sup> That *furtum* was absent from the first version of *Audita tremendi*, but quickly corrected a day later, suggests that its

<sup>58</sup> 29 Oct. 1187: *PL* (n. 2 above) CCII.1540; 30 Oct. 1187: Ms. 518 (O 17) (n. 38 above), fo. 202v; 3 Nov. 1187: *Códices y Cartularios* L. 649 (n. 43 above) p. 12 (CIm 21528 (n. 42 above) fo. 120v preserves a scribal error here, reading: “nostris exprimendum”); 2 Jan. 1188: MS 224 (n. 46 above) fo. 19ra.

<sup>59</sup> *PL* (n. 2 above) CCII.1541; trans. in *Crusade and Christendom* (n. 2 above) 7.

<sup>60</sup> 30 Oct. 1187: Ms. 518 (O 17) (n. 38 above) fo. 202v; 3 Nov. 1187: CIm 21528 (n. 42 above) fo. 121r; 2 Jan. 1188: MS 224 (n. 46 above) fo. 20rb.

omission was an oversight made in haste. Another central element of the theological explanation that God was punishing these sins was that the reasoning behind His decisions was beyond the bounds of human understanding. The first and second issues state that “sense is not able to understand” (“*nec sensus cogitare potest*”) the terrible divine judgement, while the two subsequent issues, beginning with that of 3 November, clarify that it is the sense of *humankind* that is not able to comprehend (“*nec sensus hominis cogitare potest*”).<sup>61</sup> This drew a distinction between divine and mortal understanding—a difference on which rested the theological argument that the punishment was deserved and just.

The authors also took the opportunity to develop their argumentation regarding the debt that all Christians owed to God.<sup>62</sup> The first issue called upon its audience to: “Give what you have, then give your very selves, because you, who cannot make even a gnat upon the land, are nothing of yourselves, nor do you have anything of yourselves” (“*et date vestra, date post vos ipsos, quia non estis ex vobis, nec quidquam a vobis habetis, qui nec culicem unum potestis facere super terram*”).<sup>63</sup> The aim of this passage was to remind listeners that they owed everything in life to the Lord and how they were powerless without Him. The reissues of 30 October and 3 November built upon this argument, interpolating an extra clause that reads: “and give yourselves over not to destruction but to the service of Him, from whom you have received your life and all that you have...” (“*et date vestra, date ergo vos ipsos non in exterminium, sed in conversationem ei a quo et vos et vestra omnia recipistis, quia non estis ex vobis*”).<sup>64</sup> This reworked passage develops the theme of sin from the rest of the letter, arguing that it would lead only to destruction. But the new clause also made the motif of divine debt more explicit: the faithful owed the greatest debt to the Lord, and the papacy was attempting to leverage guilt about its repayment to provoke the audience into action.

The papacy increasingly sought to harness the religiosity of the target audience more fully as it revised the text. The first issue’s pronouncement that the cause of divine punishment at Hattin was that God had been “angered by the people” (“*Deum ita populo iratum*”) was tweaked in the second and subsequent iterations to specify that God had been “angered by *His* people” (“*Deum ita populo suo iratum*”).<sup>65</sup> These revisions to the central theological idea coursing through *Audita tremendi* sought to draw the faithful closer to God as *His* people, to specify that it was *their* sins which had caused the crisis, and to emphasize once more the debt that they owed Him. The authors made a similar amendment to the significance of the True Cross, lost to Saladin at Hattin, which they explained as the pivotal artefact of the Crucifixion.<sup>66</sup>

<sup>61</sup> 29 Oct. 1187: *PL* (n. 2 above) CCII.1540; 30 Oct. 1187: Ms. 518 (O 17) (n. 38 above), fo. 202v; 3 Nov. 1187: Clm 21528 (n. 42 above) fo. 120v; 2 Jan. 1188: MS 224 (n. 46 above) fo. 19va.

<sup>62</sup> Bysted, *Indulgence* (n. 12 above) 222–223.

<sup>63</sup> *PL* (n. 2 above) CCII.1541; translation adapted from *Crusade and Christendom* (n. 2 above) 7.

<sup>64</sup> 30 Oct. 1187: Ms. 518 (O 17) (n. 38 above) fo. 202v; 3 Nov. 1187: Clm 21528 (n. 42 above) fo. 121r (although this copy has “quoque” in place of “ergo,” and replaces the word “conversationem” with “conservationem,” which may be a scribal slip); trans. in *Crusade of Frederick*, ed. Loud (n. 16 above) 39; Clement III’s reissue gives a very slightly modified version of this, replacing the word *non* with *nec* – MS 224 (n. 46 above) fo. 20va.

<sup>65</sup> 29 Oct. 1187: *PL* (n. 2 above) CCII.1540; 30 Oct. 1187: Ms. 518 (O 17) (n. 38 above), fo. 202v; 3 Nov. 1187: Clm 21528 (n. 42 above) fo. 120v; 2 Jan. 1188: MS 224 (n. 46 above) fo. 19rb.

<sup>66</sup> On the True Cross see: A. V. Murray, “‘Mighty Against the Enemies of Christ’: The Relic of the True Cross in the Armies of the Kingdom of Jerusalem,” in *The Crusades and their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton*, ed. J. France and W. G. Zajac (Aldershot 1998) 217–238; M. Cassidy-Welch, “Before

While discussing the Cross, the first issue states generally that Christ's sacrifice "redeemed humankind" ("genus humanum redemit").<sup>67</sup> But by the second version of 30 October, the pope made the minor, but significant, addition that Christ had redeemed humankind *in ea*, that is, "on it [the Cross]" ("genus humanum redemit *in ea*").<sup>68</sup> This demonstrates two things. First, that the initial wording of the document was checked carefully, considered too vague, and quickly revised within the space of twenty-four hours, but after the first issue had already entered circulation. Second, that the papacy wanted to make the link between the redemption of humanity and the physical artefact of the Cross precise and unbreakable. Essentially it was joining the dots for the faithful to ensure that they came to the exact same understanding: the faithful owed it to God to recover the physical artefact of the Cross in gratitude for the sacrifice of His son on behalf of humanity. In short, the recovery of the Cross from Saladin provided another powerful motivating factor for the target audience and the curia hammered this home from the second issue onwards.

We can also trace rapid development of the text regarding the state of the Holy Land and the threat posed by Saladin. In the first issue of 29 October, Gregory VIII wrote of the threat to Christianity in the Holy Land, stating that the Muslims were struggling to "erase the *name* of God from that land" ("*titulum Dei valeant auferre de terra*").<sup>69</sup> Gregory soon replaced the reference to the *titulum Dei*, however, with the *cultum Dei*. Already in the second issue the pope announced that Saladin threatened the very "worship of God" in the Holy Land: "*cultum Dei valeant auferre de terra.*"<sup>70</sup> The improved text was a refinement of papal anxiety about the state of Christianity in the Holy Land. Rather than just bringing low the name of God, as the first issue announced, the curialists were worried that Saladin threatened to snuff out Christian worship in the *Terra Sancta*. As a result, they ramped up the rhetoric to explain to their audience the existential nature of the threat to Christianity in the East. Moreover, this change was probably designed to transmit a clearer message, since the *cultum Dei* was a much more concrete, less abstract, concept for the target audience to comprehend than the *titulum Dei*. More broadly, all of these theological improvements demonstrate that the curia's understanding of the ramifications of the Battle of Hattin was still in flux at the time of the first issue on 29 October and that, given only a few more precious hours to think, it developed briskly over the following days, becoming more fully formed and theologically coherent with each reissue.

The pope and his staff went to great lengths to tune their appeal and make it more attractive to the faithful. One of the prime targets for revision was the introspective wording of the first and second issues. In a section calling upon the audience to work for the recovery of the Holy Land and to take up the cross, Gregory VIII had originally used first-person pronouns to address the faithful, calling upon them to: "Labor for the recovery of that land in which for *our* salvation Truth arose from the land and did not disdain to bear the cross *for us*" ("*laborantes ad recuperationem terrae illius, in qua pro salute nostra veritas de terra orta est, et sustinere pro nobis crucis patibulum non*

Trauma: The Crusades, Medieval Memory and Violence," *Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, 31 (2017) 619–627.

<sup>67</sup> *PL*, CCII.1540.

<sup>68</sup> 30 Oct. 1187: Ms. 518 (O 17) (n. 38 above) fo. 202v; 3 Nov. 1187: Clm 21528 (n. 42 above) fo. 120v; 2 Jan. 1188: MS 224 (n. 46 above) fo. 19ra.

<sup>69</sup> *PL* (n. 2 above) CCII.1540; trans. in *Crusade and Christendom* (n. 2 above) 6.

<sup>70</sup> 30 Oct. 1187: Ms. 518 (O 17) (n. 38 above) fo. 202v; 3 Nov. 1187: Clm 21528 (n. 42 above) fo. 120v; 2 Jan. 1188: MS 224 (n. 46 above) fo. 19rb.



despexit”).<sup>71</sup> By referring to “our” (“nostra”) salvation, and Christ’s sacrifice “for us” (“pro nobis”), this textual construction shared responsibility for the new struggle among the papacy and the faithful. But, given a little more time to reflect, Gregory and his staff clearly reconsidered the effect that this wording would have on the effectiveness of the liturgical campaign and recruitment for the military expedition. For his reissue of 3 November, Gregory and his staff removed one of the first-person pronouns and replaced it with a second-person equivalent to refer to Christ’s sacrifice “for you” (“pro vobis”): “laborantes ad recuperationem terre illius, in qua pro salute nostra veritas de terra orta est, et sustinere pro vobis crucis patibulum non despexit.”<sup>72</sup> Clement tailored this section further by changing the formulation “pro salute nostra” to “pro salute vestra,” but strangely chose to remove the reference to Christ’s sacrifice *pro vobis* from the third issue, which may simply be a deficiency of the manuscripts, which are all very closely related and may err on this point of detail: “Laborantes ad reparacionem terre illius, in qua pro salute vestra veritas de terra orta est, et sustinere crucis patibulum non despexit.”<sup>73</sup> These tweaks distanced the papacy from the sinners of Christendom and turned the spotlight onto the latter: it was their responsibility to recover the Holy Land; the struggle would not be undertaken on their behalf by others (such as the papacy). The revised formulation left no room for Christians to be complacent and shirk their duty—the very thing that had brought about divine punishment in the first place. The use of second-person forms also made the text more direct and hard-hitting for oral delivery, which was clearly a concern for the papacy; we can point to similar reworking between the draft and engrossment of Innocent III’s *Quia maior* in 1213.<sup>74</sup> The final point to note about the reissue of 2 January is that Clement also swapped out the word *recuperatio* for *reparacio*, which changed the meaning from “recovering” the Holy Land to “restoring” or “renewing” it. At first glance this appears to be a peculiar editorial decision, since it weakens the meaning of the sentence. This could be another stylistic improvement, but a more attractive explanation is that this change was designed to signal the deeper meaning of renewal in the sense of religious reform.<sup>75</sup> This reading not only advances the spiritual reform of the whole of Christendom initiated by *Audita tremendi*, a meaning that *recuperatio* does not possess, but also loops back to the idea of the faithful struggling to re-establish the *cultum Dei* in the Holy Land after Saladin’s campaign.

While the first three issues of *Audita tremendi* followed in rapid succession, the weeks between early November 1187 and early January 1188 allowed more time and thinking space for the curia to reconsider its content. We can point to evidence that Clement’s modifications to the encyclical were coloured by the dawning realization that the recovery of the Holy Land would be a long, gruelling process. In the first three issues, Gregory proclaimed that the Christian community should not doubt that God “will not quickly pardon when he is pleased by their penance and, after tears and groans, will lead them to exaltation” (“...non cito per misericordiam penitentia

<sup>71</sup> 29 Oct. 1187: *PL* (n. 2 above) CCII.1541; 30 Oct. 1187: Ms. 518 (O 17) (n. 38 above) fo. 202v; translation adapted from *Crusade and Christendom* (n. 2 above) 7–8.

<sup>72</sup> Clm 21528 (n. 42 above) fo. 121r.

<sup>73</sup> MS 224 (n. 46 above) fo. 20va.

<sup>74</sup> T. W. Smith, “How to Craft a Crusade Call: Pope Innocent III and *Quia maior* (1213),” *Historical Research*, 92 (2019) 2–22.

<sup>75</sup> On reform and the crusade, see, for example: J. L. Bird, “Heresy, Crusade and Reform in the Circle of Peter the Chanter, c. 1187–c. 1240” (unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford 2001); J. L. Bird, “Reform or Crusade? Anti-Usury and Crusade Preaching during the Pontificate of Innocent III,” in *Pope Innocent III and his World*, ed. J. C. Moore (Aldershot 1999) 165–185.

placatus alleviet, et post lacrymationem et fletum exultationem inducat”).<sup>76</sup> The point here is the belief that God could be moved quickly to mercy if proper penance were performed immediately and that liturgical efforts at assuaging His wrath would bring about rejoicing. By 2 January, however, Clement had adopted a more pessimistic outlook. He excised the adverb *cito* (“quickly”) and the reference to *penitentia* (“penance”), and predicted that success might only bring about *consolacionem* (“consolation”) rather than rejoicing: “... non per misericordiam placatus allevet [*sic*], et post lacrimacionem et fletum *consolacionem* inducat.”<sup>77</sup> As time passed it had apparently become clear that the rapid liturgical campaign of penitence in the West alone had not been enough to placate God, hence the removal of the words *cito* and *penitentia*. Rather, this alteration reveals a more cautious reassessment that it would take the much larger display of penitence of a full-scale crusade, and that this might only bring about consolation rather than ecstatic celebration. This is a theological development in Clement’s reissue that has not been noticed before.

In addition to the call to liturgical arms was the call to take up physical weaponry, appended to the encyclical. These practical arrangements for the Third Crusade underwent the same improvement as the theological provisions. While clever rhetoric and biblical allusions might easily inspire, converting that enthusiasm into concrete action posed a more difficult task that necessitated practical measures of support as well. The first issue of the document aimed to protect crusaders by preventing forced payment of interest on debts: “Also, they shall not be forced to pay interest if they have a loan” (“Ad dandas quoque usuras, si tenentur alicui, non cogantur”).<sup>78</sup> For the second issue of the encyclical, however, Gregory returned to this section to strengthen the papal protection. He inserted a new clause to make clear that the crusaders should not be harassed at all regarding such loans and that they should be absolved from the interest altogether: “They shall not be forced to pay usurious interest, even if they should be obligated to someone; rather they shall remain absolved from it and unmolested” (“Ad dandas quoque usuras si tenentur alicui non cogantur sed absoluti maneant et quieti”).<sup>79</sup> Crusading was an expensive business, and such provisions have been claimed as being of the most practical use to potential recruits.<sup>80</sup> The accurate and water-tight formulation of their wording was necessary, since, as Maier explains, documents such as *Audita tremendi* would have been examined by potential crusaders among the audience in order to check such provisions after the text had been read aloud.<sup>81</sup> Gregory must have feared that any lack of clarity would have a negative effect on recruitment and therefore attempted to circumvent such problems at the source.

The above investigation demonstrates that the texts of the different issues are not the same. Not only did the papacy develop the document over at least four official issues, but once it entered circulation its text forked off into a myriad of regional textual traditions which modified the content of the letter further.<sup>82</sup> That the first issue of

<sup>76</sup> 29 Oct. 1187: PL (n. 2 above) CCII.1540; 30 Oct. 1187: Ms. 518 (O 17) (n. 38 above) fo. 202v; 3 Nov. 1187: Clm 21528 (n. 42 above) fo. 120v; trans. in *Crusade and Christendom* (n. 2 above) 6.

<sup>77</sup> MS 224 (n. 46 above) fo. 19rb.

<sup>78</sup> PL (n. 2 above) CCII.1542; translation lightly adapted from *Crusade and Christendom* (n. 2 above) 8–9.

<sup>79</sup> 30 Oct. 1187: Ms. 518 (O 17) (n. 38 above) fo. 202v; 3 Nov. 1187: Clm 21528 (n. 42 above) fo. 121v; 2 Jan. 1188: MS 224 (n. 46 above) fo. 21rb; trans. in *Crusade of Frederick*, ed. Loud (n. 16 above) 41.

<sup>80</sup> M. Purcell, *Papal Crusading Policy, 1244–1291: The Chief Instruments of Papal Crusading Policy and Crusade to the Holy Land from the Final Loss of Jerusalem to the Fall of Acre* (Leiden 1975) 138.

<sup>81</sup> Maier, “Ritual” (n. 24 above) 336–337.

<sup>82</sup> See directly below.

*Audita tremendi* was rapidly reworked and improved at the curia within the space of single day suggests that the pope and his staff considered it almost immediately to require further work. This observation prompts us to reconsider the standard interpretation by modern historians that the encyclical was the product of long weeks of careful drafting: such swift correction and revision would have been unnecessary if that were really the case and standard chancery checks on its content had been carried out.<sup>83</sup>

#### RECEPTION AND TRANSMISSION

Having untangled and sorted the different versions of *Audita tremendi*, we can now evaluate the key undated textual witness: that interpolated in the *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*, the history of the crusade of Frederick Barbarossa, which lacks a *datum*.<sup>84</sup> Much is at stake in dating this copy because it is the most widely cited version of the document and forms the basis of the widely-used English translations published by Louise and Jonathan Riley-Smith and Graham Loud.<sup>85</sup> Confusion over the date of this interpolated text appears to stem from Chroust's edition of the *Historia*. Apparently he was unaware that his text did not belong to the original issue of the document, since he added a footnote to the letter that it was "from 29 October 1187" and cited Philipp Jaffé's calendar entry for the first issue.<sup>86</sup> The Riley-Smiths, however, expressed caution in dating this version, suggesting that it "was sent to Germany at about the same time" as the issues of 29 October and 3 November (at the time that they were writing, the scholarly community did not know then about the reissues of 30 October 1187 or 2 January 1188).<sup>87</sup> One of the most recent translations of *Audita tremendi* adds to the uncertainty over its status, since the editors date their translated text to the first issue of 29 October 1187, but give as their source both Migne's edition of the first issue and Chroust's edition of the undated interpolation.<sup>88</sup> The problem is that the version of *Audita tremendi* published by Migne is not the same as that edited by Chroust. Close textual analysis demonstrates that the version of *Audita tremendi* in the *Historia de expeditione Friderici* traces its origins not to the first issue, as assumed; in fact, it is closest to the second and third types and represents a hybrid that displays textual variants which only appear from the third issue onwards, such as the formulation *nec sensus hominis cogitare potest*, but also the first-person pronouns that do not appear in the official text after the first issue (see above).<sup>89</sup> We can rule out the existence of another "official" intermediate issue (that is, between the second and third) with some certainty; instead, this hybridization must be the result of the fertile manuscript traditions of the document in the West. In the attempt to isolate the "official" papal version of *Audita tremendi*, we must revise the significance of the *Historia* copy downwards again, because it is not even an accurate witness to the second and third types of the document. Aside from its hybridity, the interpolated encyclical text displays evidence of having been freely reworked outside

<sup>83</sup> See below.

<sup>84</sup> "Historia de expeditione," ed. Chroust (n. 16 above) 6–10.

<sup>85</sup> *The Crusades: Idea and Reality, 1095–1274*, eds. L. Riley-Smith and J. Riley-Smith (London 1981) 63–67; *Crusade of Frederick*, ed. Loud (n. 16 above) 37–41.

<sup>86</sup> "Historia de expeditione," ed. Chroust (n. 16 above) 6: "Vom 29. Oktober 1187; I.-L. no. 16019"; *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, ed. P. Jaffé, 2 vols., 2nd edn. (Leipzig 1885–1888), II.529, no. 16019.

<sup>87</sup> *Crusades: Idea and Reality*, eds. Riley-Smith and Riley-Smith (n. 85 above) 64.

<sup>88</sup> *Crusade and Christendom* (n. 2 above) 5: "Source: PL 202, 1539–1542; trans. from Anton Chroust ...6–10." Comparison of the texts reveals that their translation is from Migne's edition.

<sup>89</sup> "Historia de expeditione," ed. Chroust (n. 16 above) 8, 9.

of the papal chancery. So the Chroust edition, used by many scholars since the late 1920s as the premier text of *Audita tremendi*, is actually an unofficial, modified hybrid version of the second and third issues.

The other well-known, but undated, published version of *Audita tremendi* is that interpolated in the *Gesta regis Henrici secundi*, formerly ascribed to Benedict of Peterborough, but now attributed to the Third Crusader, Roger of Howden.<sup>90</sup> This version appears to be closest to the first type, since it presents the textual constructions *tantisque afflicti doloribus*; *quid agere vel quid facere*; refers to the *titulum Dei*; and omits the word “hominis” in *nec sensus cogitare potest*.<sup>91</sup> But, like the text in the *Historia de expeditione Friderici*, it is a hybrid, and includes some of the updated formulations from the second issue, such as *genus humanum redemit in ea* and *Deum ita populo suo iratum*.<sup>92</sup> It is also now possible to reveal that one of the manuscripts is also wrongly attributed according to the *Regesta Imperii*. The *Regesta Imperii* list a Munich manuscript, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 17137, as a witness to the 29 October issue, but the text—which contains wordings such as the third type’s *nec sensus hominis cogitare potest* and the first-person pronouns from the first type—is actually closest to the second and third issues, and a reworked and chopped-down version at that.<sup>93</sup> Similarly, the undated Copenhagen copy, which was made around 1200, appears to stem from the second and third types, displaying modified readings such as *qui in ea pependit, et humanum genus redemit* and referring to the *cultum Dei*, but with some inconsistencies left over from the first issue, such as *tantis afflicti doloribus*.<sup>94</sup> This copy, first uncovered by Karen Skovgaard-Petersen in 2004, has attracted scholarly attention for displaying apparently unique readings, such as *concussi* in place of *confusi* in the opening lines, in which “the pope appears much less paralyzed” by the shock from Hattin than in other versions of the letter.<sup>95</sup> There are some interesting parallels for this reassessment of the shock, explored above, in some of the other versions of the text, but the fact that the reading *concussi* is only known from the Copenhagen manuscript at present strongly suggests that this was an amendment made in the localities after the text entered circulation, rather than at the curia and therefore is unlikely to reflect feeling at the curia.

These modified types of the document are no less fascinating or significant than those which preserve content that lies closer to the original text, however; we simply need to ask different questions of them. The manuscript witnesses to provincial campaigns of revision supply evidence of the subsequent transmission of the encyclical through European monastic houses and communication chains which allows us to question earlier analyses about its medieval manuscript transmission.

<sup>90</sup> Roger of Howden, *Gesta regis Henrici secundi*, 15–19; D. M. Stenton, “Roger of Howden and Benedict,” *English Historical Review*, 68 (1953) 574–582.

<sup>91</sup> Roger of Howden, *Gesta regis Henrici secundi* (n. 90 above) 15–16.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid. 16.

<sup>93</sup> *Regesta Imperii*, IV: 4.4.3, ed. Böhmer (n. 2 above) 661–662, no. 1307. According to ibid. 661, there is also an undated manuscript witness in Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Cod. 21, fo. 37, a fourteenth-century codex containing the letters of Richard of Bury, but it was not possible to locate the letter in the National Library of Wales using this reference, which appears to be incorrect. I am very grateful to Emyr Evans for his help in this search.

<sup>94</sup> Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibliotek, GKS 1571, fos 207r–208v, at fo. 207r; *Catalogus codicum Latinorum mediæ ævi Bibliothecae Regiae Hafniensis*, ed. E. Jørgensen (Copenhagen 1926) 288–290, at 289.

<sup>95</sup> J. Møller Jensen, “Martyrs for the Faith: Denmark, the Third Crusade and the Fall of Acre in 1191,” in *Acre and its Falls: Studies in the History of a Crusader City*, ed. J. France (Leiden 2018) 49–68, at 57; K. Skovgaard-Petersen, “Fra Jerusalem til Holsten – en pavelig korstogsopfordring i et holstensk håndskrift fra omkring 1200,” *Magasin fra det Kongelige Bibliotek*, 17 (2004) 49–55, at 54.

Ursula Schwerin argued that, with the exception of the copy interpolated in the *Historia expeditione Friderici*, the document was transmitted purely through English manuscripts.<sup>96</sup> Similarly, Tyerman stated that “[f]or all its importance, *Audita Tremendi* survives in only two English and one German chronicle.”<sup>97</sup> The identification of new witnesses and the reassessment of its transmission demand that we reconsider these statements. For a start, *Audita tremendi* is now known to survive in a larger number of manuscripts from a wider geographical spread of provenances; but, even with the new manuscripts weighed, we are only looking at a fragment of its original transmission. It is clear that the letter spread like wildfire throughout the West, no doubt a result of the urgency of the events and the papal order that the entire Christian community perform immediate penance. When one compares the texts of “unofficial” variants with the other witnesses, it becomes obvious that the document passed through the hands of many scribes, a good number of whom made their mark on the text by varying the order of words and making other modifications, such as the composition of the new rhetorical section featuring St Paul in the Rouen manuscript, mentioned above. There was even an abridged *Audita tremendi* in circulation, which is preserved in the chronicle of William of Newburgh.<sup>98</sup> The campaign of provincial copying and modification seems to have happened remarkably quickly. That a large number of textual variants can be detected in the London manuscript of the third issue (that containing the text of Sigebert of Gembloux’s chronicle—see above), apparently copied at the end of the twelfth century, suggests that the modified versions of the text were multiplying at an incredible pace. Of course our scribe who penned this codex might have been the originator of the alterations, but the large number of manuscripts with other variants and the wide transmission make it more likely that the version of the text that reached him had already seen the improving hand of other scribes. The finding that many of the manuscripts are witnesses to the hybridization of the text of *Audita tremendi*, especially of the second and third iterations, demonstrates an incredibly complex process of textual cross-pollination that can only have occurred if a number of scribes compared multiple copies of the text and updated older types as new versions of the letter arrived. The plethora of textual variants therefore reveal that *Audita tremendi* spread widely in different branches of transmission, and the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century copies establish that the copying of, and engagement with, the encyclical was not a flash in the pan at the end of the twelfth century, but a much lengthier process of concerted monastic engagement with the crusading movement.

We must also exercise caution that the search for the “original” text does not blind us to the fact that most contemporaries—that is to say, those who were not die-hard collectors of the document and did not compare multiple versions, which it is probably safe to say represented the majority of the audience—would probably only have had access to one copy. Most of the monastic audience who copied, read, heard, prayed, and meditated upon its words would have had no way of knowing that their version was not the “official” one or even that other types existed. For them, the amended and hybridized texts were just as important, and would have inspired the same liturgical and contemplatory actions as those closer to the original, albeit modified to a lesser or greater extent by the content of the alterations—look at the appearance of St Paul in

<sup>96</sup> Schwerin, *Aufrufe* (n. 4 above) 137.

<sup>97</sup> Tyerman, *How to Plan a Crusade* (n. 6 above) 115.

<sup>98</sup> William of Newburgh, *Historia rerum Anglicarum*, ed. R. Howlett, vol. I, Rolls Series, LXXXII (London 1884) 267–270.

the Rouen manuscript, above, for example, which would have prompted readers and listeners to make different theological connections and target their prayers differently. As I have argued elsewhere, we need to shift the way we analyse crusade sources to concentrate on the transmission and reception of manuscripts and their texts as a form of scribal crusading—an approach that accounts for and ascertains the value of such engagement in the localities during the circulation of crusade texts.<sup>99</sup>

#### RE-INTERPRETING REISSUES

One result of the lack of dedicated research into the documentary sources of the crusades is that the act of reissuing papal encyclicals and the status of the resulting documents have arguably been undervalued. In 1969, R.C. Smail wrote critically about the decision of Pope Alexander III in 1165 to reissue *Quantum praedecessores*, the call for the Second Crusade, which by then was two decades old.<sup>100</sup> Smail judged Alexander's decision to reissue the old encyclical, rather than to craft his own, "an odd, almost half-hearted" effort, and found it "scarcely surprising that so uninspired a document failed to arouse a new crusade."<sup>101</sup> In other words, the reissue of an earlier papal encyclical signified a lack of originality and effort, and such documents produced a correspondingly lacklustre response from their audiences. In 1995, Tyerman took a similar line to Smail, arguing that "papal responses" to calls for assistance from the East in the second half of the twelfth century "lacked originality" and that their dependence upon *Quantum praedecessores* traced "a pattern of unadventurous plagiarism."<sup>102</sup> These observations fed into the main thrust of his famous article, in which he posed the startling question: were there any crusades in the twelfth century?<sup>103</sup> Tyerman argued that one can only identify the elements of crusading as an established institution in the long thirteenth century, that is, from 1187 to the dissolution of the Templars between 1307–1314.<sup>104</sup> That the late twelfth-century papacy did not develop original crusade encyclicals, but only regurgitated old letters, was an indicator of a lack of papal interest in crusading to the Holy Land, according to this interpretation. This formed one of the pillars supporting the edifice of the argument that the crusades did not exist in an institutionalized form before 1187.<sup>105</sup> Although scholars have engaged with Tyerman's central thesis,<sup>106</sup> the negative assessment of the reissue of encyclicals has gone unchallenged until very recently. In 2012, Iben Fonnesberg-Schmidt re-engaged with Alexander III's reuse of earlier papal letters.<sup>107</sup> She reconsidered the curial recycling of motifs and documents and argues that we should see the practice instead as part of the standard operating procedure of an institution which stressed the importance of tradition. The evidence presented in Fonnesberg-Schmidt's chapter and the present article reveals that the reissue of encyclical letters could be complex and dynamic. The close textual analysis above demonstrates that the process of reissue should be reconsidered as a course of reflection, criticism and improvement far removed from the alleged "unadventurous

<sup>99</sup> Smith, "Scribal Crusading" (n. 7 above).

<sup>100</sup> On *Quantum praedecessores*, see J. Phillips, *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom* (New Haven 2007) 37–60.

<sup>101</sup> Smail, "Latin Syria and the West" (n. 20 above) 11–12.

<sup>102</sup> Tyerman, "Crusades in the Twelfth Century" (n. 20 above) 560.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid. republished with minor changes in Tyerman, *Invention of the Crusades* (n. 11 above) 8–29.

<sup>104</sup> Tyerman, *Invention of the Crusades* (n. 11 above) 31.

<sup>105</sup> Tyerman, "Crusades in the Twelfth Century" (n. 20 above) 566, 575–576.

<sup>106</sup> N. Housley, *Contesting the Crusades* (Oxford 2006) 48–50.

<sup>107</sup> Fonnesberg-Schmidt, "Alexander III and the Crusades" (n. 20 above).

plagiarism.” This has ramifications for the debate about the lack of evidence for crusading as an institution, and papal interest in it, in the twelfth century, which rests partially on a negative assessment of papal reissues.

Over the course of Alexander III’s pontificate, however, Fonnesberg-Schmidt perceives a transition away from reliance on the documents of predecessors towards a more independent and original approach to drafting his crusade letters as he gained in confidence: “As his pontificate progressed, Alexander became less dependent on the letters of his predecessors and his later crusade appeals... had far more original content than the letters of his early pontificate.”<sup>108</sup> This element of the argument actually subscribes to the theses of Smail and Tyerman because, although contesting that the reissue of papal encyclicals during the late twelfth century indicated a lack of interest in the crusading movement, it reinforces the idea that reissues are to be prized less highly than original letters and that they stemmed from a deficit of confidence and originality. In re-evaluating the status of reissues, we should reflect upon our own motivations in searching for originality in papal letters in the first place. The identification of innovation in papal diplomatic and theological thinking is, of course, essential to our endeavours to understand better the intellectual culture of the papacy and its chancery as a medieval institution, and the development of its documents and diplomatic. But as we embrace more holistic readings of the papacy which champion the contributions of a wider range of pontiffs outside the canon of interventionist agitators, we need to reconsider: is it anachronistic to attach such value to originality and to celebrate it? In other words, did the papacy value originality in the same way that modern scholars do? Or are we retrospectively and anachronistically projecting our own values onto the medieval source material? Key to this is the history of the papacy as an institution, and the power of its traditions, as Fonnesberg-Schmidt has emphasized. Far from exposing papal weakness, the act of reissuing a document was a source of strength and authority, since it drew on the rich heritage of the institution, which could be traced in an (almost) unbroken line to St Peter himself. The papal privilege, for example, represents one of the most obvious artefacts of pontifical authority in the medieval world, a type of document whose power was not diminished, but augmented, by its reissue with near identical wording, resting on a solid foundation of acceptance and recognition of the authority of papal documents which stretched back centuries.<sup>109</sup> Rebecca Rist has examined the papacy’s issue of crusade letters through the prism of its attempts to assert authority both over the crusading movement and more generally, and she draws little distinction between the original issues and subsequent reissues in their effect.<sup>110</sup> She argues that although “many general crusading letters were reissues or part reissues of previous letters that took *Quantum praedecessores* as their model... subsequent popes could have changed that model had they wished.”<sup>111</sup> In other words, Rist’s point is that later popes reviewed the content of the previous letters and *chose* not to alter it—the reissue of an earlier document was thus the result of an active choice rather than laziness. If we look outside the papal curia to the secular powers, we can point to the reissue of the Magna

<sup>108</sup> Ibid. 348, and 362.

<sup>109</sup> J. E. Sayers, *Papal Government and England during the Pontificate of Honorius III (1216–1227)* (Cambridge 1984) 101–122. On the acceptance of traditional papal political ideas, see S. John, “The Papacy and the Establishment of the Kingdoms of Jerusalem, Sicily and Portugal: Twelfth-Century Papal Political Thought on Incipient Kingship,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 68 (2017) 223–259, at 228–230, 258.

<sup>110</sup> Rist, “Papacy and Holy War” (n. 26 above) 107.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid. 109.



Carta and the Forest Charter throughout the thirteenth century by the kings of England as an appeal to the “good old laws.”<sup>112</sup> Like *Audita tremendi*, these multiple reissues introduced a number of modifications, and the texts circulated in multiple different versions simultaneously.<sup>113</sup> The point is that there existed a general hostility to innovation in the Middle Ages which meant that even genuine innovation tended to be cast in the mold of ancient practice. As William Purkis emphasizes, when Pope Eugenius III first composed *Quantum praedecessores*, a document which by any measure could be considered groundbreaking, “he did not wish to be thought of as an innovator” and presented himself as a follower of his predecessors, especially Urban II.<sup>114</sup> Penny Cole goes further, arguing that Eugenius “viewed his document as conservative, believing that it was merely a written formulation and application of all that Urban had intended” in 1095.<sup>115</sup> Of course, papal motivations in recycling old documents were also tempered by less lofty practical concerns, such as urgency, the sheer volume of business, and the wording of the petitions presented by supplicants, but the crusade was usually its top priority.<sup>116</sup> We must, therefore, attempt to understand reissued encyclicals according to medieval sensibilities and documentary cultures which championed tradition over innovation.

One way to begin thinking about the problem is to explore the way in which popes and their curialists drafted and used documents as a community. As scholars of the papacy are quick to caution, the drafting of papal letters was not primarily the occupation of the pope alone, though he retained the ultimate say over the content. Rather, this was communal, collaborative composition.<sup>117</sup> Cardinals, chancery staff, and other curialists all played a role in the drafting process. That is not to say that we cannot trace distinctions and developments in the content of papal letters attributable to the accession of new popes or the arrival of new figures at the curia.<sup>118</sup> The figure of Henry, cardinal-bishop of Albano, for instance, looms large over *Audita tremendi* and similarities can be traced between the encyclical, which he had a hand in drafting, and his tracts promoting the new crusade during his subsequent preaching tour of France and Germany.<sup>119</sup> But the standing members of the papal court, that is, the cardinals of Gregory VIII and Clement III, barely changed over the four short months in which *Audita tremendi* was reissued, since Gregory did not create any new cardinals.<sup>120</sup> This

<sup>112</sup> N. Vincent, *Magna Carta: The Foundation of Freedom, 1215–2015*, 2nd edn. (London 2015) 31.

<sup>113</sup> N. Vincent, *Magna Carta: Origins and Legacy* (Oxford 2015) 75–82; D. Carpenter, *Magna Carta* (London 2015) 404–429.

<sup>114</sup> W. J. Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality in the Holy Land and Iberia, c.1095–c.1187* (Woodbridge 2008) 86.

<sup>115</sup> P. J. Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270* (Cambridge, MA 1991) 41.

<sup>116</sup> On the influence of the texts of petitions on the wording of resultant papal documents, see, for instance, E. Pitz, *Papstreskript und Kaiserreskript im Mittelalter* (Tübingen 1971); C. Morris, *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050 to 1250* (Oxford 1989) 212.

<sup>117</sup> P. Zutshi, “The Personal Role of the Pope in the Production of Papal Letters in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries,” in *Vom Nutzen des Schreibens: Soziales Gedächtnis, Herrschaft und Besitz im Mittelalter*, eds. W. Pohl and P. Herold (Vienna 2002) 225–236.

<sup>118</sup> See, for example: T. W. Smith, *Curia and Crusade: Pope Honorius III and the Recovery of the Holy Land, 1216–1227* (Turnhout, 2017) 213–260; T. W. Smith, “Preambles to Crusading: The Arengae of Crusade Letters Issued by Innocent III and Honorius III,” in *Papacy, Crusade, and Christian-Muslim Relations*, ed. Bird (n. 7 above) 63–78.

<sup>119</sup> Tyerman, *How to Plan a Crusade* (n. 6 above) 114–118; Bysted, *Indulgence* (n. 12 above) 229.

<sup>120</sup> W. Maleczek, *Papst und Kardinalskolleg von 1191 bis 1216: Die Kardinäle unter Coelestin III. und Innocenz III.* (Vienna 1984) 68–96; E. Kartusch, *Das Kardinalkollegium in der Zeit von 1181–1227: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kardinalates im Mittelalter* (Vienna 1948) 30–32. In contrast to Gregory VIII,

means that the majority of individuals involved in drafting the text in October 1187 also oversaw the three reissues of the document up to the beginning of January 1188. The continued tweaking of *Audita tremendi* demonstrated above makes it likely that the curialists considered the text, like all papal letters during this period, to be communal property. For the papacy considered its documentary history as a common store from which to draw freely, reuse, and adapt at will. Look at the incipits and *arengae* of common letters or the reuse and adaptation of Honorius III's marriage dispensation *arenga* from 1223 which had afterlives measured in centuries, for example.<sup>121</sup> The common theology of the crusade propounded in *Audita tremendi*, crafted at the papal court in a collegial fashion from Ferrara to Pisa during late 1187 and early 1188, functioned as the anchor-point for the diverse documents of the liturgical and recruitment campaigns that it launched.<sup>122</sup> In essence, then, for medieval popes and curialists, it was probably a moot point whether they shared the drafting and content of their letters with contemporary colleagues or those long dead. Birkett suggests that it might be better to speak of *Audita tremendi*'s continuing issue, rather than its reissue, pointing out the limitations of the terminology.<sup>123</sup> It is clear that we need to shift our perspective in order to view the curial procedures of composition and revision, and the chancery campaign of copying documents, as a continuum without a finite end point, driven by a slowly changing community with shared traditions, rather than the fixed, cyclical process implied by the word "reissue."

In reassessing the process of the continuing issue of papal letters, we are confronted by the most puzzling aspect of *Audita tremendi*'s rapid reissue, hinted at throughout the present article: why was it even necessary for a day-old document? Why did the papacy continue to modify the text between each issue? And, perhaps most elusive of all, why did it release the early versions for circulation if they were quickly identified as sub-standard? It seems counter-intuitive to suggest that chancery scribes copied an encyclical for the entire list of recipients on 29 October, and then repeated this enormous labour for a slightly developed document on the following day, and then again on 3 November. The textual comparison above demonstrates that the papacy was not re-issuing an identical text but in fact continuing to develop it after each *datum*. There are examples of popes despatching crusade encyclicals over a number of days in a continuing issue, and one of them with variant texts: Innocent III's *Quia maior*, issued between 19 and 29 April 1213; and Pope Honorius III's *Iustus Dominus*, which he issued between 11 and 27 April 1223, made up of multiple different texts tailored to royal recipients and the people of Christendom.<sup>124</sup> The point here is that, with the exception of Hiestand and Kedar, most scholars seem to have assumed that, like the issue of *Quia maior* in 1213, in 1187/1188 the chancery was simply continuing to issue the same text; in other words, that the different *datum* clauses of *Audita tremendi* are proof of the simple division of labor for such an enormous encyclical letter, which was too much for the chancery staff to cope with in a single day. But, as we have seen, this was not the case: the text was still being developed even as previous drafts entered production in the chancery. This offers us a fresh insight and deepens our

Clement III did change the character of the college of cardinals later in 1188 when he made a swathe of new appointments.

<sup>121</sup> Smith, *Curia and Crusade* (n. 118 above) 251–257.

<sup>122</sup> Schein, *Gateway* (n. 7 above) 161–180; Bysted, *Indulgence* (n. 12 above) 229–230, 258–260

<sup>123</sup> Birkett, "News" (n. 2 above).

<sup>124</sup> Smith, "How to Craft a Crusade Call" (n. 74 above); T. W. Smith, "The Dynamism of a Crusade Call: Pope Honorius III and *Iustus Dominus* (1223)," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 74 (2018) 111–142.

understanding of the crafting and distribution of encyclical documents in the High Middle Ages.

The standard practice of the curia and chancery, as established by scholars of papal diplomatic, is that the pope and his staff completed drafting the text and then delivered this “minute” to the chancery to be written up in its final, neat form (“engrossment”).<sup>125</sup> Often the text would then be read aloud to the pope for its final check before being returned to the chancery to have the *bull*a attached for despatch.<sup>126</sup> The evidence from *Audita tremendi*, however, demonstrates how these procedures were compromised in times of emergency. As noted at the beginning of this article, leading scholars of the crusades have asserted that *Audita tremendi* was the product of a lengthy period of careful composition and reflection and that it conformed to the standard chancery procedure.<sup>127</sup> Although many crusade encyclicals, such as Innocent III’s *Post miserabile* of 1198 and *Quia maior*, were crafted with the luxury of time, others, such as *Iustus Dominus* (which Honorius III put together hurriedly after a papal-imperial colloquium), were not—the inherent importance of such documents was not always reflected in the length of time devoted to their composition.<sup>128</sup> Indeed, the content and continuous issue of *Audita tremendi* only make sense if we reject the notion that it is the product of weeks of drafting and reinterpret it as the product of a hurried conception and gestation. Aside from the rapid development of the text demonstrated above, there are a number of clues in the internal content of the letter which support such a reassessment.

The admission of the authors in the *narratio* that “[w]e do not think that we ought to describe the events in letters until somebody comes to us from those parts who can explain more fully what really happened” suggests that the curia was responding to the news as it broke, rather than having had weeks to process it and confirm it from different sources.<sup>129</sup> Tyerman observes that the drafting of some of the provisions of *Audita tremendi* was sloppy and had to be fleshed out by the secular powers in their own crusade ordinances in order to make them workable.<sup>130</sup> It is clear that the authors of *Audita tremendi* were not thinking in the long term. If we re-examine the encyclical and look to identify the “[c]entral elements” of crusading “introduced or confirmed” in the period after 1187, namely “tightly organized preaching; crusade taxation...; transport by sea; and a widening strategic understanding of what was required to ensure the recovery of Jerusalem,” we find them all absent.<sup>131</sup> Cole also observes that the document has much less organisational detail and precision of thought in its

<sup>125</sup> T. Frenz, *Papsturkunden des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, 2nd edn. (Stuttgart 2000) 87, 94–97, 106–107; P. Herde, *Beiträge zum päpstlichen Kanzlei- und Urkundenwesen im dreizehnten Jahrhundert*, 2nd edn. (Kallmünz 1967) 154.

<sup>126</sup> Herde, *Beiträge zum päpstlichen Kanzlei- und Urkundenwesen* (n. 125 above) 154: “Es braucht nicht besonders betont zu werden, daß diese Kurialsachen [i.e. curial letters, as opposed to letters in response to petitions] nur formal geprüft, eventuell in der Reinschrift nochmals dem Papste vorgelegt und dann sofort bulliert wurden.” It is worth reiterating here that to refer to encyclical documents as “bulls,” as is almost ubiquitous in the scholarship, is anachronistic and incorrect from the standpoint of papal diplomatic, see Smith, *Curia and Crusade* (n. 118 above) 50–51.

<sup>127</sup> Tyerman, *God’s War* (n. 10 above) 376; Riley-Smith, *Crusades: A History* (n. 18 above) 163.

<sup>128</sup> Smith, “How to Craft a Crusade Call” (n. 74 above); Smith, “Preambles to Crusading” (n. 118 above); Smith, “The Dynamism of a Crusade Encyclical” (n. 124 above). See also Cole, *Preaching* (n. 115 above) 81.

<sup>129</sup> *Crusades: Idea and Reality*, eds. Riley-Smith and Riley-Smith (n. 85 above) 64; on the news from Hattin, see Birkett, “News” (n. 2 above).

<sup>130</sup> Tyerman, *Invention of the Crusades* (n. 11 above) 57.

<sup>131</sup> Tyerman, *God’s War* (n. 10 above) 375.

provisions for the new crusade than other encyclicals, and Rist has questioned why no mention is made of the papal legate for the Third Crusade, Ubaldo Lanfranchi, archbishop of Pisa, as Innocent III did for his own legate in his *Post miserabile*.<sup>132</sup> In *Audita tremendi*, it is only the final, short section of the document that offers the indulgence and papal protection to prospective pilgrims, exempts them from legal suits and interest on loans, and orders them to adopt modest dress as befitting pilgrims.<sup>133</sup> The finding to draw from this is that the priority of the papacy was not the launch of the Third Crusade but the liturgical campaign of repentance that might assuage God's wrath. This could be carried out immediately, as soon as *Audita tremendi* was received, and its effect would be correspondingly immediate. To respond to the letter in this way, no-one had to take the cross, to consider leaving their family and possessions behind, or to put affairs in order and raise money; it could be accomplished by every member of the Christian community literally instantaneously upon receipt of *Audita tremendi*. Indeed, this is exactly what is said to have occurred when the initial news from the Holy Land arrived. Apparently King Henry II of England contemplated the disaster in silence for four days. King William II of Sicily is supposed to have donned sackcloth and withdrawn from the world, again for four days (the duration must be a topos). The churches of Assisi "remained open night and day" and the people of the city reportedly donned sackcloth and performed public penance, including displays of weeping.<sup>134</sup> This explains why *Audita tremendi* was issued hurriedly throughout the West in variant versions before the text was finished to a satisfactory standard. Although *Audita tremendi* would indeed change the face of the crusading movement, this was partly by accident rather than design, since, at the time of its creation, the papacy was clearly only thinking in the short term. Its authors conceived of the letter as a rapid response to Hattin, focused almost entirely on theological explanation and liturgical repentance. Furthermore, although *Audita tremendi* marked the beginning of the preparation of the expedition that we now know as the Third Crusade, the steps taken in this letter in order to plan and launch that campaign were short. The long-term developments that came to typify crusading in the thirteenth century grew organically out of the renewed crusading movement sparked by *Audita tremendi*, but they were not included in its text. Its authors lacked the time and thinking space necessary to lay down provisions for the logistics of the expedition—integral components of encyclicals such as *Quia maior* which scholars have since come to expect in all crusade encyclicals.

#### CONCLUSION

This article has attempted to cast *Audita tremendi* in a new light. Having untangled the labyrinth of texts, editions, and manuscripts, we have developed a more advanced understanding of the encyclical and its reissues and can now draw a number of conclusions. By following the medieval editorial decisions made at the curias of Gregory VIII and Clement III, we have traced the hurried evolution of the crusade call in the late autumn and winter of 1187/1188 and the impulses behind the textual changes for the first time. *Audita tremendi* was not a homogenous text, but at least four official types with theological development between each issue. Far from being the carefully crafted product of weeks of drafting, we must confront the reality that *Audita tremendi* was an urgent production crafted briskly in response to the arrival of

<sup>132</sup> Cole, *Preaching* (n. 115 above) 82–83; Rist, "Papacy and Holy War" (n. 26 above) 116.

<sup>133</sup> *PL* (n. 2 above) CCII.1542.

<sup>134</sup> Schein, *Gateway* (n. 5 above) 162.

the shocking news of the Battle of Hattin; it is probably the most immediate and rushed crusade encyclical of them all. This explains why *Audita tremendi* is so emotionally charged when compared with other crusade calls and why it employs “rather different language from the norm.” This renders its rhetoric and the coherence of its core theological message even more impressive.<sup>135</sup> *Audita tremendi* is always cited as the grand call for the Third Crusade, but, as this article argues, while the letter marked the beginning of preparations for a military expedition, that was only the supplementary focus of the document, not much more than an addendum. Rather, the overriding aim of the document in each of its four versions was to meet the immediate need for liturgical repentance to assuage God’s anger, and limited practical provisions for a new crusade to accompany it were tacked on to the end. The confusing question of why the document was reissued with different texts days apart can only be answered if we reconsider the nature of its composition, engrossment, and despatch. In a panicked state of emergency, the pope and his curialists appear to have cut corners by sending a version of the first draft for immediate engrossment and despatch without going through the process of multiple checks on its content, so as to save precious time. They continued to work on refining and improving the document, however, even as scribes were preparing the original text for despatch and engrossed copies were thrust into the hands of waiting messengers. In the coming days, these variant texts were also delivered to the chancery for engrossment and all of them were disseminated throughout the West simultaneously in pursuit of the fastest possible distribution of the crusade call (so as to stand a chance of defending the city of Jerusalem and the rest of the Frankish possessions, which the curialists did not know had already fallen). These multiple, variant texts of *Audita tremendi* then enjoyed a long afterlife in manuscript once they began to circulate in the West. They were once again tailored, improved, and reworked outside the papal court, by scribes eager to copy and engage with crusade texts composed at the curia. The text, or, better, texts, of *Audita tremendi* were not ossified but dynamic. This vitality in the transmission of the manuscripts explains why we have such a confusing multitude of divergent and hybridized texts. *Audita tremendi* also invites us to reconsider the way that we think about the issue and reissue of papal documents more broadly. From a modern perspective, we can now appreciate the reissue of medieval papal encyclicals as a dynamic process. As this article argues, we should shift our approach in evaluating the significance of reissues and their status in medieval documentary cultures. If we effect such an interpretive pivot, it allows us to reconsider the role of the papacy in the debate about whether the crusades existed in an institutional form in the twelfth century.



<sup>135</sup> Rist, “Papacy and Holy War” (n. 26 above) 111.

APPENDIX: THE FOUR ISSUES OF *AUDITA TREMENDI*

Editorial Note: The texts printed below are the best known witness to each issue (see main text above for full discussion). The significant textual modifications originating at the papal curia referred to in the main text above are printed in bold; smaller amendments and rewriting by third parties in the localities are not marked. The original spelling from each manuscript is retained, but punctuation is modern and standardized according to the edition of the first issue by Migne.

1st Issue	2nd Issue	3rd Issue	4th Issue
Issued by: Gregory VIII	Issued by: Gregory VIII	Issued by: Gregory VIII	Issued by: Clement III
Date: 29 Oct. 1187	Date: 30 Oct. 1187	Date: 3 Nov. 1187	Date: 2 Jan. 1188
Location: Ferrara	Location: Ferrara	Location: Ferrara	Location: Pisa
Text: <i>Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina</i> , ed. J. P. Migne, 221 vols. (Paris, 1844–1864) CCII.1539–1542	Text: Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, Ms. 518 (O 17), fo. 202v	Text: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 21528, fos. 120v–121v	Text: Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen-Nürnberg MS 224, fos. 18va–21va
Gregorius episcopus, servus servorum Dei, universis Christi fidelibus ad quos litterae istae pervenerint, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.	[G]regorius, servus servorum Dei, universis Christi fidelibus, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.	Gregorius episcopus, servus servorum Dei, universis Christi fidelibus ad quos litterae istae pervenerint, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.	Clemens episcopus, servus servorum Dei, universis Christi fidelibus ad quos litterae istae pervenerint, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.
Audita tremendi severitate iudicii, quod super terram Jerusalem divina manus exercuit, tanto sumus nos et fratres nostri horrore confusi, tantisque <b>afflicti</b> doloribus, ut non facile nobis occurreret, <b>quid agere aut quid facere deberemus</b> , nisi quod Psalmista deplorat, et dicit:	Audita tremendi severitate iudicii, quam super terram Ierosolimitanam divina manus exercuit, tanto sumus nos et fratres nostri horrore confusi, tantis <b>afflicti</b> doloribus, ut non facile nobis occurreret, <b>quid agere aut quid dicere deberemus</b> , nisi quod Psalmista declarat, et dicit:	Audita severitate tremendi iudicii, quam super terram Ierosolimitanam divina manus exercuit, tanto sumus nos et fratres nostri horrore confusi, tantis <b>afflicti</b> doloribus, ut non facile nobis occurreret, <b>quid agere aut quid dicere deberemus</b> , nisi quod Psalmista deplorat, et dicit:	Audita tremendi severitate iudicii, quam super terram Ierosolimitanam divina manus exercuit, tanto sumus nos et fratres nostri horrore confusi, tantis <b>afflicti</b> doloribus, quod facile non nobis occurreret, <b>quid dicere aut quid facere deberemus</b> , nisi quod psalmista

<p>“Deus, venerunt gentes in haerediatem tuam, coinquinaverunt templum sanctum tuum, posuerunt Jerusalem in pomorum custodiam, carnes sanctorum tuorum bestiis terrae, et escas volatilibus coeli, etc” [Psalm 78:1–2].</p>	<p>“Deus, venerunt gentes in hereditatem tuam, coinquinaverunt templum sanctum tuum, posuerunt Ierosolem velud pomorum custodiam, carnes sanctorum tuorum bestiis terre, et escas volatilibus celi” [Psalm 78:1–2].</p>	<p>“Deus, venerunt gentes in hereditatem tuam, conquinaverunt templum sanctum tuum, posuerunt Ierosolem velud pomorum custodiam, carnes sanctorum tuorum bestiis terre, et escas volatilibus celi, et cetera” [Psalm 78:1–2].</p>	<p>deplorat, et dicit: “Deus, venerunt gentes in hereditatem tuam, choinquinaverunt templum sanctum tuum, posuerunt Iherusalem velud pomorum custodiam, carnes sanctorum tuorum bestiis terre, et escas volatilibus celi” [Psalm 78:1–2].</p>
<p>Ex occasione quippe dissensionis quae malitia hominum ex suggestione diaboli facta est nuper in terra, accessit Saladinus cum multitudine armatorum ad partes illas, et occurrentibus eis rege, et episcopis, et Templariis, et Hospitalariis, baronibus ac militibus cum populo terrae, et cruce Dominica, per quam ex memoria et fide passionis Christi, qui pependit, et genus humanum <b>redemit</b>, certum solebat esse tutamen, et contra paganorum incursus desiderata defensio, facta congressione inter eos, et superata parte nostrorum, capta est crux Dominica,</p>	<p>Ex occasione quippe dissensionis quae malicia hominum ex suggestione diaboli facta est nuper in terra, accessit Salahadinus cum multitudine armatorum ad partes illas, et occurrentibus eis rege, et episcopis, Templariis, Hospitalariis, et baronibus ac militibus cum populo terre, et cruce Dominica, per quam ex memoria de fide passionis Christi, qui pependit, et genus humanum <b>redemit in ea</b>, certum solebat esse tutamen, et contra paganorum concursus desiderata defensio, facta est congressio inter eos, et superata parte</p>	<p>Ex occasione quippe defensionis [<i>sic</i>] quae malicia hominum ex suggestione diaboli facta est nuper in terra, accessit Saladinus cum multitudine armatorum ad partes illas, et occurrentibus eis rege, episcopis, Templariis, Hospitalariis, et baronibus ac militibus cum populo terre, et cruce Dominica, per quam ex memoria et fide passionis Christi, qui pependit, et genus humanum <b>redemit in ea</b>, certum solebat esse tutamen, et contra paganorum incursus desiderata defensio, facta est congressio inter eos, et superata parte nostrorum, capta est</p>	<p>Ex occasione quippe dissensionis quae malicia hominum ex suggestione diaboli facta est nuper in terra, Saladynus accessit ad partes illas, cum multitudine armatorum et occurrentibus eis rege, et episcopis, Templariis, et Hospitalariis, et baronibus ac militibus cum populo terre, et cruce Dominica, per quam ex memoria et fide passionis Christi, qui pependit, et genus humanum <b>redemit in ea</b>, certum solebat esse tutamen, et contra paganorum incursus desiderata defensio, facta est congressio inter eos, et superata parte nostrorum, capta est</p>

<p><b>trucidati episcopi, captus est rex</b>, et universi fere aut occisi gladio, aut hostilibus manibus deprehensi, ita ut paucissimi per fugam dicantur elapsi.</p>	<p>nostrorum, capta est crux Dominica, <b>trucidati episcopi, captus est rex</b>, universi fere aut occisi gladio, aut hostilibus manibus deprehensi, ita ut paucissimi per fugam dicantur elapsi.</p>	<p>crux Dominica, <b>trucidati episcopi, captus est rex</b>, et universi fere aut occisi gladio, aut hostilibus manibus deprehensi, ita ut paucissimi per fugam dicantur elapsi.</p>	<p>crux Dominica, <b>captus est rex, trucidati episcopi</b>, et universi fere, aut occisi gladio, aut hostilibus manibus deprehensi, ita ut paucissimi per fugam dicantur elapsi.</p>
<p>Ipsi quoque Templarii et Hospitalarii in ejus oculis decollati.</p>	<p>Ipsi quoque Templarii et Hospitalarii in eius oculis [<i>sic</i>] decollati sunt.</p>	<p>Ipsi quoque Templarii et Hospitalarii in eius oculis decollati.</p>	<p>Ipsi quoque Templarii et Hospitalarii in eius oculis decollati.</p>
<p>Superato autem exercitu, qualiter subsequenter invaserint et rapuerint universa, ita ut non nisi pauca loca remansisse dicantur, quae in eorum non devenerint potestatem, non credimus nostris litteris <b>explicandum</b>.</p>	<p>Superato autem exercitu, qualiter subsequenter invaserint et rapuerint universa, ita ut non nisi pauca loca remansisse dicantur, qui non in eorum devenerint potestate non credimus nostris litteris <b>exprimendum</b>, donec ad nos aliquis de partibus illis accedat, qui plenius ordinem et veritatem exponat.</p>	<p>Superato autem exercitu, qualiter subsequenter invaserint et rapuerint universa, ita ut non nisi pauca loca remansisse dicantur, que non in eorum devenerint potestatem, non credimus [<i>om.</i> litteris] nostris <b>exprimendum</b>.</p>	<p>Superato autem exercitu, qualiter subsequenter invaserint et rapuerint universa, ita vero non nisi pauca loca remansisse dicantur, que non in eorum devenerint potestatem, non credimus nostris litteris <b>exprimendum</b>.</p>
<p>Nos autem, licet cum propheta dicere habeamus: “Quis det capiti meo aquam, et oculis meis fontem lacrimarum, et plorabo nocte ac die interfectos populi mei?” [Jeremiah 9:1] non tamen adeo deicere nos</p>	<p>Nos autem, licet cum propheta dicere habeamus: “Quis det capiti meo aquam, et oculis [<i>sic</i>] meis fontem lacrimarum, et plorabo nocte et die interfectos populi mei?” [Jeremiah 9:1] non tamen adeo deicere</p>	<p>Nos autem, licet cum propheta dicere habeamus: “Quis det aquam capiti meo, et oculis meis fontem lacrimarum, et plorabo nocte ac die interfectos populi mei?” [Jeremiah 9:1] non tamen adeo nos deicere</p>	<p>Nos autem, licet cum propheta dicere habeamus: “Quis det capiti meo aquam, et oculis meis fontem lacrimarum, et plorabo nocte ac die interfectos populi mei?” [Jeremiah 9:1] non tamen adeo deicere nos</p>

<p>debemus, ut in diffidentiam decidamus, et credamus <b>Deum ita populo iratum</b>, ut quod communium faciente multitudine peccatorum fieri permisit iratus, <b>non cito per misericordiam poenitentia placatus alleviet, et post lacrymationem et fletum exultationem inducat.</b></p> <p>Quisquis sane in tante lugendi materia, si non corpore, saltem corde non luget, non tantum fidei Christianae, quae cum omnibus dolentibus docet esse dolendum, sed ipsius est humanitatis nostrae oblitus, cum ex ipsa periculi magnitudine ac feritate barbarica Christianorum sanguinem sitiente, ac totam suam in hac apponente virtutem, ut profanare sancta, et <b>titulum Dei</b> valeant auferre de terra, quod nos tacemus, discretus quisque valeat aestimare.</p> <p>Sane cum prophetae</p>	<p>nos debemus, ut in diffidentiam decidamus, et credamus <b>Deum ita populo suo iratum</b>, ut quod communium faciente multitudine peccatorum fieri permisit iratus, [<i>om.</i> <b>non</b>] cito per misericordiam penitentia placatus alleviet, et post lacrymationem et fletum exultationem inducat.</p> <p>Quisquis sane in tanta lugendi materia, si non corpore, saltem corde luget, non tamen fidei Christiane, quae cum omnibus dolentibus docet esse dolendum, sed ipsius etiam humanitatis videtur oblitus, cum ex ipsa periculi magnitudine ac feritate barbarica Christianorum sanguinem faciente, ac totam suam in hec apponentes [<i>sic</i>] virtutem, ut profanare sancta, et <b>cultum Dei</b> valeant auferre de terra, quod nos tacemus, discretus quisque valeat estimare.</p> <p>Sane cum prophete</p>	<p>debemus, ut in diffidentiam decidamus, et credamus <b>Deum ita populo suo iratum</b>, ut quod communium faciente multitudine peccatorum fieri permisit iratus, <b>non cito per misericordiam penitentia placatus alleviet, et post lacrymationem et fletum exultationem inducat.</b></p> <p>Quisquis sane in tanta lugendi materia, si non corpore, saltem mente non luget, non tamen fidei Christiane, quae cum omnibus dolentibus [<i>sic</i>] docet esse dolendum, sed ipsius humanitatis videtur oblitus, cum ex ipsa periculi magnitudine ac feritate barbarica Christianorum sanguine sitiente, ac totam in hoc suam apponente virtutem, ut profanare sancta, et <b>cultum Dei</b> valeant auferre de terra, quod nos tacemus, discretus quisque valeat estimare.</p> <p>Sane cum prophete</p>	<p>debemus, ut in diffidentiam decidamus, et credamus <b>Deum ita populo suo iratum</b>, ut quod communium faciente multitudine peccatorum, fieri permisit iratus, <b>non per misericordiam placatus allevet [<i>sic</i>], et post lacrymationem et fletum consolacionem inducat.</b></p> <p>Quisquis sane in tanta lugendi materia, si non corpore, saltem corde non luget, non tamen fidei Christiane, quae cum omnibus dolentibus docet esse dolendum, sed ipsius etiam humanitatis videtur oblitus, cum ex ipsa periculi magnitudine ac feritate barbarica Christianorum sanguinem siciente, ac totam suam in hoc apponente virtutem, ut profanare sancta, et <b>cultum Dei</b> auferre de terra valeant, etiam nobis tacentibus discretus quisque valeat estimare.</p> <p>Sane cum prophete</p>
---	--	---	--

<p>toto prius studio laboraverunt, postmodum apostoli, et sequaces eorum, ut divinus cultus esset in terra illa, et ad omnia climata mundi ex ea deflueret, imo, quod maximum et ineffabile est, Deus, qui voluit incarnari, per quem facta sunt universa, per ineffabilem sapientiam et incomprehensibilem misericordiam suam, per infirmitatem carnis esuriem, sitim, crucem, et mortem et resurrectionem, salutem nostram ibi voluit operari, iuxta quod dicitur: “Qui operatus est salutem in medio terrae” [Psalm 74:12] per seipsum ad hoc dignatus est laborare, nec lingua dicere, <b>nec sensus cogitare potest</b>, quantum nobis et universo dolendum sit populo Christiano, quod id nunc perpressa est terra illa, quod sub veteri populo legitur pertulisse.</p> <p>Nos autem credere non debemus quod ex injustitia Iudicis ferientis, sed ex</p>	<p>toto prius studio laboraverint, postmodum apostoli, et sequaces eorum, ut divinus cultus esset in terra illa, et ad omnia climata ex ea difflieret, immo, quod maximum et ineffabile est, Deus, qui voluit tantum, et facta sunt universa, per ineffabilem sapientiam, per misericordiam suam, per infirmitatem carnis esuriem, sitim, crucem, et mortem et resurrectionem, salutem nostram in voluit operari, iuxta quod dicitur: “Qui operatus est <i>om.</i> salutem] in medio terre” [Psalm 74:12] per se ad hoc dignatus est laborare, non lingua dicere, <b>nec sensus cogitare potest</b>, quanto nobis et universo dolendum sit populo Christiano, quod id nunc perpressa est terra illa, quod sub veteri populo legitur pertulisse.</p> <p>Nos autem credere non debemus quod ex iniusticia Iudicis ferientis, sed ex</p>	<p>prius toto prius [<i>sic</i>] laboraverint studio, laboraverint postmodum apostoli, et sequaces eorum, ut divinus cultus esset in terra illa, et ad omnia clymata mundi ex ea deflueret, immo, quod maximum est et ineffabile, Deus, qui tantum tantum [<i>sic</i>] voluit, et facta sunt universa, per ineffabilem sapientiam et incomprehensibilem misericordiam suam, per infirmitatem carnis esuriem, sitim, crucem, mortem et resurrectionem, salutem nostram ibi voluerit operari, iuxta quod dicitur: “Qui operatus est salutem in medio terre” [Psalm 74:12] per seipsum ad hoc dignatus sit laborare, nec lingua dicere, <b>nec sensus hominis cogitare potest</b>, quantum nobis et universo populo sit dolendum, quod id nunc perpressa est terra illa, quod sub veteri populo legitur pertulisse.</p> <p>Nos autem credere non debemus, quod ex iniusticia Iudicis ferientis, sed ex</p>	<p>toto prius studio laboraverint, laboraverunt postmodum apostoli, et sequaces eorum, ut divinus cultus esset in terra illa, et ad omnia climata mundi ex ea defluerent, immo, quod maximum et inefabile est, Deus, qui voluit tantum, et facta sunt universa, per ineffabilem sapientiam et incomprehensibil-em misericordiam suam, per infirmitatem carnis esuriem, sitim, crucem, mortem et resurrectionem, salutem nostram ibi voluit operari, iuxta quod dicitur: “Qui operatus est salutem in medio terre” [Psalm 74:12] per seipsum dignatus sit laborare, nec lingua dicere, <b>nec sensus hominis cogitare potest</b>, quantum nobis dolendii sit, et universo populo Christiano, quod id nunc perpressa est terra illa, quod subverti populo legitur pertulisse.</p> <p>Nos autem credere non debemus quod ex iniusticia Iudicis ferientis, sed ex</p>
---	---	---	---

iniquitate potius populi delinquentis, ista provenerunt, cum legamus quod, quando populus convertebatur ad Dominum, persequabatur unus mille, et duo fugabant decem millia, imo, ipso populo quiescente, exercitum Sennacherib angelica manu consumptum.	iniquitate potius populi delinquentis, provenerint, cum legamus quod, quando populus convertebatur ad Dominum, persequabatur unus mille, et duo fugabant .x. milia, immo, ipso quiescente, exercitum Sennacherib angelica manu consumptum.	iniquitate potius populi delinquentis, ista provenerint, cum legamus quod, quando populus convertabatur ad Dominum, persequabatur unus mille, et duo fugabant decem milia, immo, et ipso populo quiescente, exercitum Sennacherib angelica manu consumptum.	iniquitate pocius populi delinquentis, ista provenerint, cum legamus quod, quando populus convertebatur ad Dominum, persequabatur unus mille, et duo fugabant decem millia, immo, et ipso populo quiescente, exercitum Sennacherib angelica manu consumptum.
Sed et terra illa devoravit habitatores suos, et nec diu habere quietum statum, nec transgressores legis divinae potuit retinere, doctrinam et exemplum tribuens illis qui ad coelestem Jerusalem intenderent, quod non possunt ad eam nisi per exercitium boni operis et per tentationes plurimas pervenire.	Sed terra illa devoravit habitatores suos, et ut diu haberet quietum statum, nec transgressores legis potuit retinere, doctrinam et exemplum tribuens illis qui ad Ierosolem supernam intenderent, quod non possint ad eam nisi per exercitium boni operis et temptationes plurimas pervenire.	Sed terra illa devoravit habitatores suos, et nec diu habere quietum statum, nec transgressores divine legis potuit retinere, doctrinam et exemplum tribuens illis qui ad Hierusalem supernam intenderent, quod non possint ad eam nisi per exercitium boni operis et temptationes plurimas pervenire.	Sed terra illa devoravit habitatores suos, et nec diu habere quietum statum, nec transgressionem divine legis potuit sustinere, doctrinam et exemplum tribuens illis qui ad Iherusalem supernam intenderent, quod non possent ad eam nisi per exercitium boni operis et temptaciones plurimas pervenire.
Potuerunt autem ista timeri iam pridem, quando Arroasia, et alia terra in potestatem transiit paganorum, et fuisset bene provisum, si populus qui remansit, ad poenitentiam rediisset; et Deum,	Potuerunt iam pridem ista timeri, quando Arthasia, et alia terra in potestatem transiit paganorum, et fuisset bene provisum, si populus qui remansit [sic], ad penitentiam redisset; et Deum,	Potuerunt autem iam pridem ista timeri, quando Aroasia, et alia terra in potestatem transiit paganorum, et fuisset bene provisum, si populus qui remansit, ad penitentiam redisset; et Deum,	Potuerunt autem iam pridem ista timeri, quando Aroasya, et alia terra in potestatem transiit paganorum, et fuisset bene provisum, si populus qui remansit, ad penitenciam redisset; et Deum,

quem praevaricatione offenderat, conversione placasset.	quem prevaricatione offenderat, conversione placasset.	quem prevaricatione offenderat, p [sic] conversione placasset.	quem prevaricacione offenderat, conversione placasset.
Nec enim subito venit ira ejus, sed et ultionem differt, et tempus tribuit poenitenti.	Nec autem venit subito ira eius, sed ultionem differt, et tempus tribuit penitendi.	Nec enim subito venit ira eius, sed ultionem differt, et tempus tribuit penitendi.	Nec enim venit subito ira eius, sed ultionem differt, et tempus tribuit penitendi.
Tandem vero, qui in misericordia iudicium non amittit, vindictam suam ad poenam transgredientium et cautelam salvandorum exercet.	Tandem vero, misericordia iudicium non admittit, vindictam suam ad penam transgredientium et cautelam salvandorum exercet.	Tandem vero, quia in misericordia iudicium non amittit, vindictam suam et ad penam transgredientium et cautelam salvandorum exercet.	Tandem vero, quia in misericordia iudicium non amittit, vindictam suam et ad penam transgredientium et cautelam salvandorum exercet.
Porro nos, qui in tanta terrae illius contritione non solum peccatum habitatorum illius, sed et nostrum et totius populi Christiani debemus attendere ac vereri, ne quod reliquum est illius terrae depereat, et in alias etiam potestas eorum desaeviat regiones, cum ex omnibus partibus inter reges et principes, civitates et civitates dissensiones audiamus et scandala, ut lugere cum propheta et dicere valeamus: “Non est veritas, non est scientia Dei <b>in terra,</b>	Porro nos, in tanta illius terre contricione non solum peccatum habitatorum eius, sed et nostrum et totius populi Christiani debemus attendere ac vereri, ne quod reliquum est illius terre depereat, et in alias etiam potestas eorum deseuiat regiones, cum ex omnibus partibus inter reges et principes, civitatum dissensiones audiamus et scandala, et lugere cum propheta et dicere valeamus: “Non est veritas, non est scientia Dei <b>in terra, furtum et mendacium,</b>	Porro nos, in tanta illius terre contritione sed solum peccatum habitatorum eius, sed et nostrum et totius populi Christiani debemus attendere ac vereri, ne quod reliquum est illius terre depereat, et in alias etiam potestas illorum deseuiat regiones, cum ex omnibus partibus inter reges et principes, civitates et civitates dissensiones audiamus et scandala, et lugere cum propheta et dicere valeamus: “Non est veritas, non est scientia Dei <b>in terra, furtum et</b>	Porro nos, in tanta illius terre contricione non solum peccatum habitatorum eius, sed etiam nostrum et totius populi Christiani debemus attendere et vereri, ne quod reliquum est illius terre depereat, et in alias etiam potentias eorum deseuiat et regiones, cum omnibus partibus eorum inter reges eorum et principes, civitates et civitates dissensiones audiamus et scandala, et lugere cum propheta et dicere valeamus: “Non est veritas, non est scientia Dei <b>in terra, furtum et</b>

<p><b>mendacium</b>, homicidium et adulterium inundaverunt, et sanguis sanguinem contigit” [Hosea 4:1–2].</p> <p>Unde hoc universis est cogitandum, imo et agendum, ut peccata nostra castigatione voluntaria emendantes, per poenitentiam et opera pietatis convertamur ad Dominum Deum nostrum, et in nobis primo quod male gessimus emendemus; deinde feritatem et malitiam hostium attendamus; et quod illi contra Deum tentare non timent, nos pro Deo, agere nullatenus haesitemus.</p> <p>Cogitate itaque, filii, qualiter in hunc mundum venistis, et qualiter exituri estis, et qualiter transeant universa, et pariter transeatis et vos; et poenitendi ac bene agendi tempus, quantum spectat ad vos, cum gratiarum actione recipite, <b>et date vestra, date post vos ipsos,</b></p>	<p>homicidium et adulterium inundaverunt, et sanguinis sanguinem tetigit” [Hosea 4:1–2].</p> <p>Unde hoc universis et cogitandum, imminet et agendum, ut peccata nostra castigatione voluntaria emendantes, per penitentiam et opera pietatis convertamur ad Dominum Deum nostrum, et in nobis primo quod male gessimus emendemus; deinde feritatem et maliciam hostium attendamus; et quod illi contra Deum non timment [<i>sic</i>] temptare, nos pro Deo, agere nullatenus hesitemus.</p> <p>Cogitate itaque, filii, qualiter in hunc mundum venistis, et qualiter exituri sitis, et qualiter traxeant universa, et pariter traxeatis et vos; penitendi ac bene agendi, quantum prestat [<i>sic</i>] tempus ad vos, cum gratiarum actione recipite, <b>et date vestra, date ergo</b></p>	<p><b>mendatium</b>, homicidium et adulterium inundaverunt, et sanguis sanguinem tetigit” [Hosea 4:1–2].</p> <p>Unde hoc universis et cogitandum, imminet et agendum, ut peccata nostra et castigatione voluntaria emendantes, per penitentiam et opera pietatis convertamur ad Dominum Deum nostrum, et in nobis quod male gessimus emendemus; deinde feritatem et malitiam hostium attendamus; et quod illi contra Deum attentare non timent, nos pro Deo, agere nullatenus hesitemus.</p> <p>Cogitate itaque, filii, qualiter in hunc mundum venistis, et qualiter exituri sitis, et qualiter transeant universa, et pariter transeatis et vos; et penitendi ac bene agendi, tempus quantum spectat ad vos, cum gratiarum actione recipite, <b>et date vestra, date quoque vos ipsos,</b></p>	<p><b>mendacium</b>, homicidium et adulterium inundaverunt in terra, et sanguis sanguinem tetigit” [Hosea 4:1–2].</p> <p>Unde hoc universis et cogitandum, imminet et agendum, ut peccata nostra castigacione voluntaria emendantes, per penitentiam, et opera pietatis convertamur ad Dominum Deum nostrum, et in nobis primo quod male gessimus emendemus; deinde feritatem et maliciam hostium attendamus; et quod illi contra Deum temptare non timent, nos pro Deo, nullatenus agere hesitemus.</p> <p>Cogitate itaque, filii, qualiter in hunc mundum venistis, et qualiter exituri sitis, et qualiter transeant universa, et qualiter transeatis et vos; et pentendi [<i>sic</i>] ac bene agendi, tempus quantum spectat ad vos, cum gratiarum actione recipite, <b>et date vestra date quo</b></p>
--	---	--	--

<p><b>quia non estis ex vobis</b>, nec quidquam a vobis habetis, qui nec culicem unum potestis facere super terram.</p>	<p><b>vos ipsos, non in exterminium, sed in conservatione</b> [<i>sic</i>] <b>ei a quo et vos et vestra omnia recipistis, quia non estis ex vobis</b>, nec quicquam a vobis habetis, qui nec culicem unum potestis facere super terram.</p>	<p><b>non in exterminium, sed in conservationem</b> <b>ei a quo et vos et vestra omnia recepistis, quia non estis ex vobis</b>, nec quipquam [<i>sic</i>] a vobis habetis, quia nec culicem unum potestis facere super terram.</p>	<p><b>vos ipsos, non in exterminium, sed in conversationem</b> [<i>sic</i>] <b>ei a quo et vos et omnia vestra recepistis, quia nec estis ex vobis</b>, nec quicquam a vobis habetis, quia nec culicem unum potestis facere super terram.</p>
<p>Nec dicimus: dimittite, sed, praemittite in coeleste horreum quae habetis, et deponite apud eum, apud quem aerugo ea non demolitur, aut tineae, nec fures effodiunt, et furantur; laborantes <b>ad recuperationem</b> terrae illius, in qua <b>pro salute nostra</b> veritas de terra orta est, et sustinere <b>pro nobis</b> crucis patibulum non despexit; et nolite ad lucrum vel gloriam temporalem attendere, sed voluntatem Dei, qui pro fratribus animas in seipso docuit esse ponendas, et ei vestras commendate divitias, quas, sive volentes, sive nolentes, nescitis tandem quibus haeredibus sitis relicturi.</p>	<p>Nec dicimus; dimittite, set, praemittite in celeste horreum quae habetis, et deponite apud quem ea [<i>om. non</i>] demolitur erugo, nec tineae, nec fures effodiunt, aut furantur; laborantes <b>ad recuperationem</b> terre illius, in qua <b>pro salute nostra</b> veritas de terra orta est, et sustinere <b>pro nobis</b> crucis patibulum non despexit; et nolite ad hoc ad lucrum et gloriam temporalem attendere, sed ad voluntatem Dei, qui pro fratribus animam posuit, confortentur et ex vobis addiscant, qualiter in obsequium creatoris sui, et personas et substantias suas impendant, sicut exemplo dominico beatus Paulus apostolus pro</p>	<p>Nec dicimus; dimittite, sed, praemittite in celeste horreum quae habetis, et deponite apud q [<i>sic</i>] eum, apud quem erugo ea non demolitur, aut tineae, nec fures effodiunt, nec furantur; laborantes <b>ad recuperationem</b> terre illius, in qua <b>pro salute nostra</b> veritas de terra orta est, et sustinere <b>pro vobis</b> crucis patibulum non despexit; et nolite ad hoc ad lucrum vel gloriam attendere, sed ad voluntatem Dei, qui pro fratribus animas in seipso docuit esse ponendas, et ei commendate divitias, quas, sive volentes, sive nolentes, nescitis tandem qualibet sitis heredibus relicturi.</p>	<p>Nec dicimus; dimittite, sed, praemittite in celeste horreum quae habetis, et deponite apud eum, apud quem erugo ea non demolitur, aut tineae, nec fures effodiunt, nec furantur; laborantes <b>ad reparacionem</b> terre illius, in qua <b>pro salute vestra</b> veritas de terra orta est, et sustinere crucis patibulum non despexit, et nolite adhuc ad lucrum et gloriam temporalem attendere, sed voluntatem Dei, qui pro fratribus anima [<i>sic</i>] in seipso docuit esse ponendas, et ei vestras commendate divicias, quas, sive volentes, sive nolentes, nescitis tandem qualibus sitis heredibus relicturi.</p>

	animabus auditorum suorum se ipsum impendere satagebat. Nec velitis aliqua exceptione lentescere sed sicut Deus prudentia vos extulit, et divitiis et multitudine ac probitate virorum, ita necessariis rebus per agendis insistite, et celeritatem ac diligentiam, quam in his que carnis sunt hactenus habuistis, et divinis rebus, et salutis vestre negotio habetote. Scientes		
Non est equidem novum, quod terra illa iudicio divino percutitur, sed nec insolitum, ut flagellata et castigata misericordiam consequatur.	non esse novum, quod terra illa iudicio divino percutitur, sed nec est insolitum, ut castigata et flagellata misericordiam consequatur.	Non est equidem novum, quod terra illa iudicio divino percutitur, sed nec insolitum, ut flagellata et castigata misericordiam consequatur.	Non est quidem novum, quod terra illa iudicio divino percutitur, sed nec est insolitum, ut flagellata et castigata misericordiam consequatur.
Poterit Dominus quidem sola eam voluntate servare, sed non habemus ei dicere cur ita fecerit.	Poterat quidem Dominus sola eam voluntate servare, sed non habemus dicere cur ita fecerit.	Poterat quidem Dominus sola eam voluntate servare, sed non habemus dicere ei cur e [sic] ita fecerit.	Poterat quidem Dominus sola eam voluntate servare, sed non habemus ei dicere cur ita fecerit.
Voluit enim forsitan experiri, et in notitiam ducere aliorum, si quis sit intelligens aut requirens Deum, qui oblatum sibi poenitentiae tempus hilariter amplectatur, et	Voluit enim forsitan experiri, et in notitiam ducere aliorum, si aliquis intelligens aut requirens Deum, qui oblatum sibi penitentiae tempus hilariter amplectatur, et	Voluit enim forsitan experiri, et in noticiam ducere aliorum, si aliquis sit intelligens aut requirens Deum, qui oblatum sibi penitentiae tempus hilariter amplectatur, et	Voluit enim forsitan experire, et innocentiam ducere aliorum si aliquis sit intelligens, aut requirens Deum, et qui oblatum sibi penitencie tempus hilariter amplectatur, et

animam ponendo pro fratribus consummetur in breui, et compleat tempora multa.	animam ponendo pro fratribus consumetur in breui, et compleat tempora multa.	animam ponendo pro fratribus consummetur in breui, et compleat tempora multa.	animam ponendo pro fratribus, consumetur in breui, et compleat tempora multa.
Attendite qualiter Machabaei zelo divinae legis accensi, pro fratribus liberandis extrema quaeque pericula sunt experti, et non solum substantias, sed et personas pro fratrum docuerint salute ponendas, exhortantes seipsos atque dicentes: “Accingimini, et estote filii potentes, quoniam melius est nobis mori in bello quam videre mala gentis nostrae et sanctorum” [1 Machabees 3:58– 59].	Attendite qualiter Machabaei zelo divine legis accensi, pro fratribus liberandis extrema queque pericula sint experti, et non solum substantias, sed et personas pro fratrum docuerint salute ponendas, et hortantes seipsos atque dicentes: “Accingimini, et estote filii potentes, quoniam melius est nobis mori in bello quam videre mala gentis nostrae et sanctorum” [1 Machabees 3:58– 59].	Attendite qualiter Machabaei zelo divine legis accensi, pro fratribus liberandis extrema quoque s [sic] pericula sint experti, et non solum substantias, et [sic] sed et personas pro fratrum docuerint salute ponendas, et hortantes se ipsos at [sic] dicentes: “Accingimini, et estote filii potentes, et quoniam melius est nobis mori in bello quam videre mala gentis nostrae et sanctorum” [1 Machabees 3:58– 59].	Attendite qualiter Machabaei zelo divine legis accensi, pro fratribus liberandis extrema quo pericula sunt experti, et non solum substantias, sed et personas pro fratrum docuerint salute ponendas, exhortans se ipsos atque dicentes: “Accingimini, et estote filii potentes, quoniam melius est nobis mori in bello quam videre mala gentis nostrae et sanctorum” [1 Machabees 3:58– 59].
Et quidem illi sub una constituti lege fuerunt, vos per incarnationem Domini nostri Jesu Christi ad lucem veritatis adducti, et multis exemplis instructi sanctorum, sine trepidatione aliqua faciatis, et non timeatis dare terrena et pauca, et breviter duratura, quibus illa bona promissa sunt, et reposita, quae nec oculus vidit, nec	Et quod illi sub una lege constituti fecerunt, vos per incarnationem Domini Dei nostri ad lucem veritatis adducti, et multorum exemplis instructi sanctorum, sine trepidatione aliqua faciatis, et non timeatis dare terrena et pauca, et brevi tempore duratura, quibus illa bona promissa sunt, [om. et reposita] que nec oculis	Et quod illi sub una lege constituti fecerunt, vos per incarnationem Dei vestri ad lucem veritatis adducti, et multorum exemplis sanctorum instructi, sine trepidatione aliqua faciatis, et non timeatis dare terrena et pauca, et brevi tempore duratura, quibus illa bona promissa sunt, et reposita, que nec oculus vidit, nec in	Et quod illi sub una lege constituti fecerunt, vos per incarnationem Domini Dei nostri ad lucem veritatis adducti, et multorum exemplis instructi sanctorum, sine trepidatione aliqua faciatis, et non timeatis dare terrena et pauca, et brevi tempore duratura, quibus illa bona promissa sunt, et reposita, que oculus non vidit,

auris audivit, nec in cor hominis ascenderunt, de quibus dicit Apostolus: “Quod non sunt condignae passiones huius temporis ad futuram gloriam quae revelabitur in nobis” [Romans 8:18].	[sic] vidit, nec aut aut [sic], nec in cor hominis ascenderunt, et de quibus dicit Apostolus: “Quod non sunt condigne passiones huius temporis ad futuram gloriam quae revelabitur in nobis” [Romans 8:18].	cor hominis ascenderit, et de quibus dicit Apostolus: “Quod non sunt condigne passiones huius temporis ad futuram gloriam quae, revelabitur in nobis” [Romans 8:18].	nec auris audit, nec in cor hominis ascendit, et de quibus dicit apostolus: “Quod non sunt condigne passiones huius temporis, ad futuram gloriam quae revelabitur in nobis” [Romans 8:18].
Eis autem qui corde contrito et humiliato spiritu, itineris huius laborem assumpserint, et in poenitentia peccatorum et fide recta decesserint, plenam suorum criminum indulgentiam, et vitam pollicemur aeternam.	Eos autem qui corde contrito et humiliato spiritu, laborem huius itineris assumpserint, et in penitentia peccatorum et fide recta decesserint, plenam suorum criminum indulgentiam, et vitam pollicemur aeternam.	Eis autem qui corde contrito et humiliato spiritu, laborem huius itineris assumpserint, et in penitentia peccatorum et fide recta decesserint, plenam suorum criminum indulgentiam, et vitam pollicemur eternam.	Eis autem qui corde contrito, et humiliato spiritu, laborem huius itineris assumpserint, [om. et] in penitentia peccatorum et fide recta decesserunt, plenam suorum criminum indulgentiam, et vitam pollicemur eternam.
Sive autem supervixerint, sive mortui fuerint, de omnibus peccatis suis, de quibus rectam confessionem fecerint, impositae satisfactionis relaxationem de omnipotentis Dei misericordia, et apostolorum Petri et Pauli auctoritate et nostra, se noverint habituros.	Sive autem supervixerint, sive mortui fuerint, de omnibus peccatis suis, de quibus recte confessionem fecerint, inposite satisfactionis relaxationem de omnipotentis Dei misericordia, et auctoritate Petri et Pauli apostolorum et nostra, se noverint habituros.	Sive autem supervixerint, sive mortui fuerint, de omnibus peccatis suis, de quibus rectam confessionem fecerint, imposite satisfactionis relaxationem de omnipotentis Dei misericordia, et apostolorum Petri et Pauli et nostra, se noverint habituros.	Sive autem supervixerint, sive mortui fuerint, de omnibus peccatis suis, de quibus confessionem recte fecerint, imposite satisfactionis relaxationem de omnipotentis Dei misericordia, et apostolorum Petri et Pauli auctoritate et nostra, se noverint habituros.
Bona quoque ipsorum, ex quo crucem acceperint,	Bona quoque ipsorum, [om. ex quo crucem	Bona quoque ipsorum, ex quo crucem acceperint,	Bona quoque ipsorum, ex quo crucem acceperint,

<p>cum suis familiis, sub sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae, nec non et archiepiscoporum, et episcoporum, et aliorum praelatorum Ecclesiae Dei protectione consistent; et nullam de his quae in susceptione crucis quiete possederunt, donec de ipsorum reditu vel obitu certissime cognoscatur, sustineant quaestionem, sed bona eorum integra interim maneant et quieta.</p> <p><b>Ad dandas quoque usuras, si tenentur alicui, non cogantur.</b></p> <p>Nec eant in vestibis pretiosis, et cum canibus, sive avibus, aut aliis quae ostentationi potius et lasciviae, quam necessariis videantur usibus deservire; sed in modesto apparatu, et habitu, in quo poenitentiam potius agere quam inanem affectare gloriam videantur.</p> <p>Datum Ferrariae quarto Kalendas</p>	<p>acceperint] cum suis familiis, sub sancte Marie, nec non archiepiscoporum, et episcoporum, ac aliorum prelatorum et [<i>sic</i>] Dei protectione consistant [<i>sic</i>]; et nullam de his quae in susceptione crucis quiete possederunt, donec de ipsorum reditu vel obitu certissime cognoscatur, sustineant quaestionem, sed bona eorum integra interim maneant et quieta.</p> <p><b>Ad dandas quoque usuras, si tenentur alicui, non cogantur, sed absoluti maneant ac quieti.</b></p> <p>Nec eant in vestibis preciosis, et cum canibus, et avibus, aut aliis quae ostentationem potius agere quam inanem affectare gloriam videantur.</p> <p>Datum Ferrariae .III.</p>	<p>cum suis familiis, sub sancte Romane ecclesie, nec non et archiepiscoporum, episcoporum, et aliorum prelatorum Ecclesie Dei protectione consistent; et nullam de his quae in susceptione crucis quiete possederint, donec de ipsorum reditu vel obitu certissime cognatur, sustineant quaestionem, sed bona eorum integra interim maneant et quieta.</p> <p><b>Ad dandas quoque usuras, si tenentur alicui, non cogantur, sed absoluti maneant et quieti.</b></p> <p>Nec eant in vestibis preciosis, et cum canibus, sive avibus, et aliis quae ostentationibus potius et lascivie, quam necessariis videantur usibus deservire; sed in modesto apparatu, et habitu, in quo poenitentiam potius agere quam inanem affectare gloriam videantur.</p> <p>Datum Ferrariae III. Nonas Novembris</p>	<p>cum suis familiis, sub sancte Romane ecclesie, nec non et archiepiscoporum, [<i>om.</i> et episcoporum] atque aliorum prelatorum Ecclesie Dei protectione consistent; et nullam de his quae in susceptione crucis quiete possederint, donec de ipsorum reditu vel obitu certissime cognoscatur, sustineant quaestionem, sed bona eorum integra interim maneant et quieta.</p> <p><b>Ad dandas quoque usuras, si tenentur alicui non cogantur, sed absoluti maneant et quieti.</b></p> <p>Nec eant in vestibis preciosis, et cum canibus, sive avibus, aut aliis quae ostentacioni potius et lascivie, quam necessariis videantur usibus deservire; sed in modesto apparatu, et habitu, in quo poenitentia potius agere quam inanem affectare gloriam videantur.</p> <p>Datum Pisis .iiii. Nonas Ianuarii</p>
--	---	---	---

Novembris, indictione sexta.	Kalendas Novembris.	indictione sexta.	indictione sexta.
---------------------------------	------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

