



# Not Sharing the Holy Land: Attitudes towards Sacred Space in Papal Crusade Calls, 1095–1234

Thomas W. Smith

To cite this article: Thomas W. Smith (2022) Not Sharing the Holy Land: Attitudes towards Sacred Space in Papal Crusade Calls, 1095–1234, *Al-Masāq*, 34:2, 140–161, DOI: [10.1080/09503110.2021.2010477](https://doi.org/10.1080/09503110.2021.2010477)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09503110.2021.2010477>



Published online: 29 Dec 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 318



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



# Not Sharing the Holy Land: Attitudes towards Sacred Space in Papal Crusade Calls, 1095–1234<sup>1</sup>

Thomas W. Smith 

History Department, Rugby School, Lawrence Sheriff Street, Rugby, Warwickshire, CV22 5EH, UK

## ABSTRACT

This article traces the attitudes expressed in papal crusade calls from 1095–1234 towards shared sacred space in the Holy Land which had a significant impact on thinking in the West and primed crusaders travelling to the East. The papacy's conception of sacred space was one-dimensional, confrontational, and Eurocentric, promoting the idea of a binary conflict between Christians and Muslims and airbrushed diverse Eastern Christian communities to create a homogenous group. The themes of invasion and occupation of Christian holy sites by Muslims, and Islamic mockery and defilement of them, are staples of the genre, even when the holy places were in Frankish possession. However, through close comparison of the crusade calls, one can also trace subtler shifts in specific elements of the encyclical letters in response to the changing military and political context in the Levant and new devotional trends in the West.

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 9 April 2021

Revised 10 August 2021

Accepted 12 November 2021

## KEYWORDS

Papacy; Crusade; Holy Land; Crusader states; Christian-Muslim relations; Eastern Christianity; Papal letters; Encyclicals; Christian devotion; Preaching

Papal attitudes towards sacred space in the Holy Land, as expressed in the papacy's calls to crusade, had a significant impact on the thought-world of medieval Europe. The texts of the encyclical letters which launched crusades formed the basis for preaching campaigns in the West, being either read aloud verbatim (and translated into the vernacular) or else forming a toolkit from which preachers could draw ideas and arguments. After the Bible, papal encyclical letters probably enjoyed some of the most widespread and effective transmission of any medieval texts, being propagated through the organs of the Church hierarchy down to parish church level and being copied and shared along ecclesiastical-lay communication networks decades after their initial issue.<sup>2</sup> This meant that the ideas

**CONTACT** Thomas W. Smith  TWS@rugbyschool.net

<sup>1</sup>I am grateful for a Visiting Research Fellowship at Oxford Brookes University which allowed me access to online resources necessary for this research and to the anonymous peer-reviewers for their helpful suggestions on this article.

<sup>2</sup>Christoph T. Maier, "Ritual, what else? Papal Letters, Sermons and the Making of Crusaders", *Journal of Medieval History* 44 (2018), 333–46, at pp. 334–7; Michael Lower, *The Barons' Crusade: A Call to Arms and its Consequences* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), p. 3; Christoph T. Maier, *Preaching the Crusades: Mendicant Friars and the Cross in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 3, 35, 102–3, 117; Paul B. Pixton, "Die Anwerbung des Heeres Christi: Prediger des Fünften Kreuzzuges in Deutschland", *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 34 (1978), 166–91, at p. 176; Valmar 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. idem and Gustav Meinertz, volume I (Cologne: J.P. Bachem, 1939), 43–204, at p. 69; Christopher Tyerman, *How to Plan a Crusade: Reason and Religious War in the High Middle Ages* (London: Allen Lane, 2015), p. 115. On crusade preaching in the period under study, see Penny J. Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270* (Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy of America, 1991).

disseminated in papal crusade calls about sacred space in the Holy Land had an enviably high level of reception that far outstripped other contemporary texts such as chronicles, pilgrimage accounts and itineraries, and biblical exegesis.<sup>3</sup> Before crusaders reached the Levant they would have been primed at least in part to encounter shared sacred space according to papal attitudes. The papacy's conception of sacred space in its crusade calls was one-dimensional and confrontational, as indeed the medium demanded. It did not allow for, or aim to reflect, the realities and nuances of shared sacred space in the Levant but promoted instead the idea of a binary conflict between Christians and Muslims in possession of, access to and behaviour in such space, as well as airbrushing out the diversity of the multiplicity of Eastern Christian communities. This goes some way towards explaining the jarring comportment of some Western pilgrims when they arrived in the East and discovered that this was not, in fact, the case.<sup>4</sup> The culture shock is famously illustrated by Usâma Ibn Munqidh (1095–1188) who noted that: "Anyone who is recently arrived from the Frankish lands is rougher in character than those who have become acclimated and have frequented the company of Muslims". Usâma then went on to relate the anecdote of how he was manhandled in a "small mosque that the Franks had converted into a church" in Jerusalem by a Westerner who was aghast that he was praying towards Mecca.<sup>5</sup>

The present article traces papal attitudes to sacred space as expressed in its crusade calls between 1095 and 1234. The chronological limits of this study align with the most intense period of papal calls to crusade in the Holy Land, taking in the genesis and maturation of their rhetoric against the turning tides of Christian and Muslim control of shared holy places. In so doing, it fuses two strands of scholarship. The first is the study of papal crusade encyclicals. Despite the centrality of these documents to the history of the crusading movement, they have rarely been analysed in detail. The present article develops recent research on individual encyclicals by adopting a longer chronological perspective and a comparative approach, which allows one to ask different questions of the source material and gain fresh insights into their composition and significance.<sup>6</sup> The second historiographical strand is on shared sacred space in the Holy Land at the time of the crusades. Work by Alan V. Murray, Nicholas Morton, Christopher MacEvitt, and Steve Tibble, among others, rejects the outdated notion that the

<sup>3</sup>It is beyond the scope of the present article to engage in a comparative analysis of the connections between papal crusade calls and other contemporary sources, which presents a significant avenue for further research.

<sup>4</sup>Jaroslav Folda, "Sharing the Church of the Holy Sepulchre during the Crusader Period", in *Jerusalem, 1000–1400: Every People under Heaven*, ed. Barbara Drake Boehm and Melanie Holcomb (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2016), pp. 131–3, at pp. 131, 132; Nicholas Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), p. 1.

<sup>5</sup>Usâma Ibn Munqidh, *The Book of Contemplation: Islam and the Crusades*, trans. Paul M. Cobb (London: Penguin, 2008), p. 147.

<sup>6</sup>For detailed analyses of specific encyclicals, see: Jonathan Phillips, *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007), pp. 37–60 [on *Quantum praedecessores*]; Thomas W. Smith, "Audita tremendi and the Call for the Third Crusade Reconsidered, 1187–1188", *Viator* 49/3 (2018), 63–101; idem, "How to Craft a Crusade Call: Pope Innocent III and *Quia maior* (1213)", *Historical Research* 92/255 (2019), 2–23; idem, "The Dynamism of a Crusade Encyclical: Pope Honorius III and *Iustus Dominus* (1223)", *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 74/1 (2018), 111–42. For the role of encyclicals in preaching, see: Maier, "Ritual, what else?". For two other long perspectives on the content of papal crusade encyclicals, see Rebecca Rist, "The Medieval Papacy and Holy War: General Crusading Letters and Papal Authority, 1145–1213", in *Faith, War, and Violence*, ed. Gabriel R. Ricci (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2014), pp. 105–21, and Ursula Schwerin, *Die Aufrufe der Päpste zur Befreiung des Heiligen Landes von den Anfängen bis zum Ausgang Innozenz IV.: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der kuralen Kreuzzugspropaganda und der päpstlichen Epistolographie* (Berlin: Dr Emil Ebering, 1937), though the latter is very dated now.

crusades and the Frankish occupation of the Holy Land were simply a binary clash between Christians and Muslims, painting instead a much more detailed picture of inter-faith relationships in Outremer.<sup>7</sup> In particular, Benjamin Z. Kedar, Andrew Jotischky and Brian A. Catlos have demonstrated that Latin Christian authorities allowed Muslim worship at some shrines, such as Bethlehem, Sebastia, and the Templum Domini in Jerusalem – realities which ran counter to the ideals expressed in papal crusade encyclicals composed in Italy.<sup>8</sup> In seeking better to understand the views of the papal curia regarding sacred space in the East and, by extension, some of the ideas that inhabited the minds of European pilgrims when they set foot in the Holy Land, this article traces a robust set of core ideas in calls to crusade as well as subtler shifts in response to the changing status of Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulchre including: the novel dislocation of rhetoric about Jerusalem from the First Crusade and its application to Edessa and its relics at the time of the Second Crusade; the amelioration of angst at the curia that Muslim control of Christian shrines would equal their destruction after 1187; and a trend away from concentrating on the Holy Sepulchre towards a more general emphasis on the Holy Land and a growing devotion to aspects and artefacts of the Passion of Christ.

## The First Crusade (1095)

Although the encyclical letter<sup>9</sup> became the primary vehicle through which the papacy transmitted its calls to crusade from the Second Crusade onwards, no encyclical survives from the launch of the First Crusade; nor is it certain that Urban II's chancery ever composed or despatched one, though scholars have speculated about the possible existence of such a document.<sup>10</sup> We are left, instead, with the task of attempting to reconstruct the pope's crusade call, which he delivered as the closing speech at the Council of Clermont on 27 November 1095, using a number of other contemporary sources, foremost among which are the chronicle accounts of Urban's sermon at Clermont and a handful of

<sup>7</sup>See, for instance: Alan V. Murray, "Sacred Space and Strategic Geography in Twelfth-Century Palestine", in idem, *The Franks in Outremer: Studies in the Latin Principalities of Palestine and Syria, 1099–1187* (Farnham: Ashgate [Variorum], 2015), essay XII: 13–37, esp. pp. 13–17, 23–5; Morton, *Encountering Islam*, pp. 277–80; Christopher MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East: Rough Tolerance* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), pp. 1–2; Steve Tibble, *The Crusader Armies, 1099–1187* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2018), pp. 67–98. On the multiplicity and complexity of religious groups that existed in the Holy Land, see MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East*, esp. pp. 7–12. On the problematic question of how to refer to medieval Muslims, see Morton, *Encountering Islam*, pp. 15–19. The present article follows the same rationale as outlined by Morton.

<sup>8</sup>Benjamin Z. Kedar, "Convergences of Oriental Christian, Muslim and Frankish Worshippers: The Case of Saydnaya and the Knights Templar", in idem, *Crusaders and Franks: Studies in the History of the Crusades and the Frankish Levant* (Abingdon: Routledge [Variorum], 2016), essay XXI: 1–12; Andrew Jotischky, "Pilgrimage, Procession and Ritual Encounters between Christians and Muslims in the Crusader States", in *Cultural Encounters during the Crusades*, ed. Kurt Villads Jensen, Kirsi Salonen and Helle Vogt (Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2013), pp. 245–62. See also: Andrew Jotischky, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 2017), pp. 135–8; Brian A. Catlos, *Muslims of Medieval Latin Christendom, c. 1050–1614* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. 155–6. See, now, also, the other essays in this special issue.

<sup>9</sup>The label "crusade bull", which is frequently used to refer to papal encyclicals in scholarship on the crusades, is technically anachronistic according to the usage of the papal chancery in this period. See: Thomas W. Smith, *Curia and Crusade: Pope Honorius III and the Recovery of the Holy Land, 1216–1227* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2017), p. 51; Thomas Frenz, *Papsturkunden des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, 2nd edn (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2000), p. 28.

<sup>10</sup>Paul Riant, *Inventaire critique des lettres historiques des croisades, I–II. 768–1100* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1880), pp. 114–16; *Epistolae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes quae supersunt aevo aequales ac genuinae / Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088–1100: Eine Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges*, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Innsbruck: Wagner'sche Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1901), pp. 45, 210.

letters.<sup>11</sup> As is well known, hindsight colours the narrative accounts of Clermont, since they were all composed in the afterglow of the First Crusade, and they cannot be taken at face value as a record of what happened in 1095.<sup>12</sup> The traditional approach to the reconstruction of Urban's sermon at Clermont, first pursued by Dana C. Munro, has been to compare common features of the various sources, chief among which are the eyewitness narratives of Baldric of Bourgueil, Fulcher of Chartres and Robert the Monk, in the attempt to recover an outline of the pope's original message.<sup>13</sup> Poring over the narrative sources will elicit – quite understandably – a certain circumspection about the value of covering such well-trodden ground again. There are a number of original points, though, to be drawn out which are necessary to understand the gestation of curial thinking in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.

According to Robert the Monk and Baldric of Bourgueil, Urban was much exercised by the question of Islamic control of three categories of sacred space. Moving from the general to the specific, these were: the churches of the Holy Land; the city of Jerusalem; and the Holy Sepulchre. On the question of the churches of the East, Robert's account states that:

the race of Persians, a foreign people and a people rejected by God, [ ... ] has either overthrown the churches of God or turned them over to the rituals of their own religion. They throw down the altars after soiling them with their own filth, circumcise Christians, and pour the resulting blood either on the altars or into the baptismal vessels.<sup>14</sup>

Developing the theme of defilement, Robert had Urban turn next to the Holy Sepulchre: “most especially let the Holy Sepulchre of Our Lord the Redeemer move you – in the power as it is of foul races – and the holy places now abused and sacrilegiously defiled by their filthy practices.”<sup>15</sup> Urban followed this, Robert relates, with a statement on the city of Jerusalem, sanctified by Christ, which “is now held captive by His enemies, and is in subjection to those who do not know God, to the worship of the heathens.”<sup>16</sup> Two interconnected anxieties about the sharing of sacred space in the Holy Land are

<sup>11</sup>The surviving sources for Urban II's message are listed in H.E.J. Cowdrey, “Pope Urban II's Preaching of the First Crusade”, *History* 55 (1970), 177–88, reprinted in idem, *Popes, Monks and Crusaders* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1984), essay XVI: 181–7. See Christoph T. Maier, “Konflikt und Kommunikation: Neues zum Kreuzzugsaufruf Urbans II.”, in *Jerusalem im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter: Konflikte und Konfliktbewältigung – Vorstellungen und Vergegenwärtigung*, ed. Dieter Bauer, Klaus Herbers and Nikolas Jaspert (Frankfurt: Campus, 2001), pp. 13–30.

<sup>12</sup>Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London: The Athlone Press, 1993), p. 15.

<sup>13</sup>Dana C. Munro, “The Speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont, 1095”, *American Historical Review* 11/2 (1906), 231–42. As Georg Strack points out, Guibert of Nogent, often assumed to be an eyewitness, admitted only to reporting Urban's main arguments (*intentiones*): Georg Strack, “The Sermon of Urban II in Clermont and the Tradition of Papal Oratory”, *Medieval Sermon Studies* 56 (2012), 30–45, p. 31 and n. 3.

<sup>14</sup>*Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade: Historia Iherosolimitana*, trans. Carol Sweetenham (Farnham: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 79–80; “... gens regni Persarum, gens extranea, gens prorsus a Deo aliena, ... ecclesiasque Dei aut funditus everterit, aut suorum ritui sacrorum mancipaverit. Altaria suis feditatibus inquinata subvertunt, Christianos circumcidunt, cruoremque circumcisionis aut super altaria fundunt, aut in vasis baptisterii immergunt”: *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*, ed. D. Kempf and M.G. Bull (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013), p. 5.

<sup>15</sup>*Robert the Monk*, trans. Sweetenham, p. 80; “Presertim moveat vos sanctum Domini Salvatoris nostri Sepulchrum, quod ab inmundis gentibus possidetur, et loca sancta, que nunc inhoneste tractantur et irreverenter eorum inmunditiis sordidantur.”: *Historia Iherosolimitana*, ed. Kempf and Bull, p. 6.

<sup>16</sup>Here the older translation of Dana C. Munro is closer to the wording of the most recent edition of the Latin text: *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Materials*, ed. Edward Peters, 2nd edn (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), p. 28; “[Hec civitas ...] nunc a suis hostibus captiva tenetur, et ab ignorantibus Deum ritui gentilium ancillatur.”: *Historia Iherosolimitana*, ed. Kempf and Bull, pp. 6–7. On Jerusalem in contemporary thought, see Sylvia Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City: Crusader Jerusalem and the Catholic West (1099–1187)* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2005).

discernible in Robert's account. First, Muslim control over the sites, and second, their desecration, both through deliberate acts of defilement and destruction, and through their use in Islamic ritual. As we shall see below, these fears form a common thread which runs through all of the crusade calls issued between 1095 and 1234 (although the anxiety around destruction of the holy sites diminished after 1187). The concentration on the physical destruction of holy sites, however, is something particular to the call for the First Crusade, and probably stems from the reception of news in the West of the partial demolition of the Holy Sepulchre by Caliph al-Hakim in 1009 and the widespread destruction unleashed by the invasion of the Seljuk Turks in Asia Minor over the course of the eleventh century.<sup>17</sup>

Baldric also develops these same themes in his narrative – unsurprising, perhaps, given that Baldric and Robert both lived around Reims and were probably friends, though he goes into greater detail.<sup>18</sup> On the churches and cities of the East, Baldric laments that:

the churches in which formerly divine services were celebrated, alas, now they are set up as stables for their animals. Worthless men have seized the holy cities. Bastard, filthy Turks are ruling over our brothers. St Peter presided over Antioch as the first bishop. There, in his very church, the gentiles have established their own superstitions, and they have wickedly cast the Christian religion, which they should have given the utmost honour, out of the temple dedicated to God [...] God's sanctuary – the impiety of it – has everywhere been profaned.<sup>19</sup>

In common with Robert's narrative, Baldric emphasizes the banishment of Christian divine services and their replacement with Islamic "superstitions", the unclean nature of the Muslim occupants of Christian sacred spaces, and the defilement of the churches of the East, though he departs from Robert's account in emphasising the sanctity of Antioch via St Peter. The desecration of Jerusalem and its holy sites was a particular cause for shame because of their intrinsic connection to the life and Passion of Christ:

Whom does the church of Holy Mary now serve, in which she herself in bodily terms was buried, in the valley of Jehosaphat? But why have we omitted to mention the temple of Solomon, or, more correctly, the temple of the Lord, in which the barbarous nations worship their idols, lately placed there, against which is right and just? Therefore we refrain from recollecting the Holy Sepulchre, since some of you have seen with your own eyes how great is the abomination to which it has been surrendered. The Turks have seized violently from there the offerings you brought many times to that place for alms; there beyond doubt they have heaped many and countless mockeries on our religion.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>17</sup>Colin Morris, *The Sepulchre of Christ and the Medieval West: From the Beginning to 1600* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 134–9. Morton reviews the wide range of evidence for the destructive campaigns of the Turks in *Encountering Islam*, pp. 86–93.

<sup>18</sup>Strack, "Sermon of Urban II", p. 36, *Robert the Monk*, trans. Sweetenham, p. 3; Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades*, pp. 15–16.

<sup>19</sup>Baldric of Bourgueil, "History of the Jerusalemmites": A Translation of the *Historia Ierosolimitana*, trans. Susan B. Edgington, with an Introduction by Steven J. Biddlecombe (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2020), pp. 45–6; "... animalibus eorum stabula preparantur. Nequam homines sanctas occupauere ciuitates. Turci spurii et immundi nostris confratribus dominantur. Antiochie beatus Petrus primus presedit episcopus. Ecce in ipsa ecclesia gentiles suas collacauere superstitiones; et religionem Christianum, quam potissimum coluisse debuerant, ab aula Deo dicata turpiter eliminauerunt... Sanctuarium Dei, proh nefas, ubique profanatum est": *The Historia Ierosolimitana of Baldric of Bourgueil*, ed. Steven Biddlecombe (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2014), p. 7.

<sup>20</sup>Baldric of Bourgueil, "History of the Jerusalemmites", trans. Edgington, p. 46; "Cui seruit nunc ecclesia beate Marie, in qua ipsa pro corpore sepulta fuit in ualle Iosaphat? Sed quid templum Salomonis immo Domini pretermisimus, in quo simulacra sua barbare nationes contra ius et fas modo collocata uenerantur? De sepulcro dominico ideo reminisci superseimus, quoniam quidam uestrum oculis uestris uidistis quante abominationi traditum sit. Inde uiolenter abstrahunt



As in Robert's text, Baldric's portrayal of the fate of the churches of Jerusalem is the antithesis of shared sacred space: Christian alms had been thrown out and replaced with heathen idols, and the sites of devotion had become active sites of mockery. In particular, Baldric picks out the Tomb of the Virgin Mary in the valley of Jehosaphat, which was venerated by both Muslims and Christians.<sup>21</sup> Like Robert, Baldric's account mourns "the tremendous devastation of the Holy Land" by their enemies.<sup>22</sup>

Yet, Baldric is also interesting in that he engages more deeply with the question of shared sacred space and its effects on those who experience it. Regarding the yearly miracle in which the lights around the Holy Sepulchre were re-lit by divine power, Baldric questioned:

Whose flinty heart, brothers, would so great a miracle not soften? Believe me, a man is bestial and pig-headed whose heart such evident divine power does not compel to faith. And yet the gentiles see such things in common with the Christians, and they are not reformed. Indeed, they are terrified, but they are not converted to the faith: no wonder, when blindness rules many of them.<sup>23</sup>

In this passage, Baldric had Urban pondering why it was that Muslims, who attended the service alongside the Christians, could witness such a miracle at the tomb of Christ and not be moved to convert to Christianity.<sup>24</sup> This example, drawn from shared attendance at divine service, was proffered as evidence that the Muslims of the Holy Land did not deserve to have control over Christian holy places, and this argument helped, in part, to justify the crusade. "Every Crusade", Megan Cassidy-Welch writes, "was underpinned by the fundamental claim that a particular place was being unjustly occupied by an invader and that it was the collective duty of Christians to reclaim that territory", and this topos began with the call for the First Crusade.<sup>25</sup> In order to bolster the justification that the crusade was a defensive act against Muslim invaders, and to place the Islamic rule in Outremer in a longer theological context, Baldric deployed the quotation from Psalm 78: "O God, the heathens are come into thy inheritance."<sup>26</sup> As we shall see below, this presaged its use by the popes in their crusade calls after 1187 when the Christians lost most of the Holy Land to the Muslims once again.

---

Turci quas pro helemosina illuc multotiens intulisti oblationes; ibi nimirum multas et innumeras religioni nostre ingerunt irrisiones."': *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. Biddlecombe, p. 7.

<sup>21</sup> Folda, "Sharing the Church of the Holy Sepulchre", p. 132.

<sup>22</sup> Baldric of Bourgueil, "*History of the Jerusalemites*", trans. Edgington, p. 47; "... sanctissime terre plangamus deuastationem."': *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. Biddlecombe, p. 8.

<sup>23</sup> Baldric of Bourgueil, "*History of the Jerusalemites*", trans. Edgington, p. 46; "Cuius pectus silicinium, fratres, tantum miraculum non emolliat? Credite mihi, bestialis homo et insulsi capitis est, cuius cor uirtus diuina tam presens ad fidem non euerberat. Et tamen gentiles cum Christianis ista uident communiter, nec emendantur. Perterrentur equidem, sed non conuertuntur ad fidem: nec mirum, quoniam multis obcecatio illis dominatur."': *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. Biddlecombe, pp. 7–8.

<sup>24</sup> On the attendance of Muslims at the Miracle of the Easter Fire, see Kedar, "Convergences of Oriental Christian, Muslim and Frankish Worshipers", pp. 2–3.

<sup>25</sup> Megan Cassidy-Welch, *War and Memory at the Time of the Fifth Crusade* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2019), pp. 109–10, quotation at p. 109.

<sup>26</sup> Baldric of Bourgueil, "*History of the Jerusalemites*", trans. Edgington, p. 47; *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. Biddlecombe, p. 8. On the question of whether the First Crusade was offensive or defensive, see Morton, *Encountering Islam*, pp. 73–4. On the use of this Psalm in crusade sources, see Penny J. Cole, "'O God, the Heathen have come into your Inheritance' (Ps. 78.1): The Theme of Religious Pollution in Crusade Documents, 1095–1188", in *Crusaders and Muslims in Twelfth-Century Syria*, ed. Maya Shatzmiller (Leiden: Brill, 1993), pp. 84–111. On biblical references generally, see Katherine Allen Smith, *The Bible and Crusade Narrative in the Twelfth Century* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2020).

The ethnocultural pigeon-holing of the enemies of the Christians as barbarians and heathens should be understood as a form of “othering” in contradistinction to the Latin Christians who composed the audience for these texts.<sup>27</sup> Even later, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, otherwise well-informed Christian writers in the West asserted falsely that Muslims were idolaters. As Benjamin Kedar suggests, “awareness of Islam’s monotheism must have been unevenly distributed among the learned of Catholic Europe”, and we see evidence of such patchiness here in Baldric’s writing.<sup>28</sup> Increasing Christian-Muslim contact and familiarity as a result of the crusades did not automatically go hand-in-hand with more accurate portrayal of Muslims in Latin Christian sources, as Bernard Hamilton explored.<sup>29</sup> The term “Muslim” is not deployed in medieval sources; rather, the papal crusade calls examined here give them the epithets “pagans”, “infidels” and “enemies of the cross of Christ”, which they have in common with other contemporary sources.<sup>30</sup> Again, as with the portrayal of the enemy as barbarians, the concern of the papacy was to carve in relief a Christian “self-image and ideology”, and these negative labels tell us more about curial conceptions of the faithful than the Muslims to whom they were applied.<sup>31</sup> The popes were manifestly less interested in exactly what the nature of Islamic liturgy was that was taking place in the shared shrines than in stoking opposition to it and recruiting aspirational, model crusaders who would oppose such vices with arms.<sup>32</sup> At the time of the First Crusade, there was a “pronounced lack of interest”, Nicholas Morton writes, “in the specific theology of the ‘Saracen’ religion” – something evidenced in all the crusade calls analysed in the present study.<sup>33</sup> This indifference led to the reliance in papal crusade encyclicals on generic charges of pollution and defilement in order to project a fuzzy yet shocking image of pagan occupation and idolatry. Yet such vague nomenclature was not simply the result of lack of interest. As Katherine Allen Smith demonstrates, the description of the Muslims as pagans in contemporary sources also sought to align them with the biblical enemies of the Israelites from the Old Testament, in turn reinforcing the claim of the Christians, as the new Israelites, to the Holy Land and its sacred spaces.<sup>34</sup>

The narratives of Robert and Baldric supply useful evidence for how contemporaries responded to and re-imagined Urban’s call for the First Crusade in the decade after the expedition: Baldric and Robert are both thought to have composed their narratives quickly, with Baldric’s text dated to c. 1105 and Robert’s to 1106–1107.<sup>35</sup> But it is doubtful how far their (admittedly very similar) accounts reflect the words of Urban himself. Georg Strack has shed new light on the question by comparing the narratives against contemporary accounts of papal oratory. Strack reveals that it is Fulcher of Chartres’ text that

<sup>27</sup>Margaret Jubb, “The Crusaders’ Perceptions of their Opponents”, in *Palgrave Advances in the Crusades*, ed. Helen Nicholson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), pp. 225–44, at p. 226. For a critique of “othering”, however, see Morton, *Encountering Islam*, p. 273.

<sup>28</sup>Benjamin Z. Kedar, *Crusade and Mission: European Approaches toward the Muslims* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 87–90.

<sup>29</sup>Bernard Hamilton, “Knowing the Enemy: Western Understanding of Islam at the Time of the Crusades”, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, series 3, 7/3 (1997), 373–87.

<sup>30</sup>Jubb, “Crusaders’ Perceptions of their Opponents”, p. 228; Morton, *Encountering Islam*, pp. 81–2.

<sup>31</sup>Jubb, “Crusaders’ Perceptions of their Opponents”, p. 241.

<sup>32</sup>As Morton points out, Western Christian commentators applied the same epithets to Muslims as to sinful co-religionists: *Encountering Islam*, pp. 271–2.

<sup>33</sup>Morton, *Encountering Islam*, p. 275.

<sup>34</sup>Smith, *The Bible and Crusade Narrative*, pp. 128–36, esp. p. 133.

<sup>35</sup>See, respectively: *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. Biddlecombe, p. xxiv; *Robert the Monk*, trans. Sweetenham, p. 7.



reports “a sort of legal oratory, which was, according to protocols, the common and usual style of a papal speech in the eleventh century.”<sup>36</sup> Fulcher’s account, then, which is the most sober of the set, is probably the most reliable of the eyewitnesses to Urban’s sermon at Clermont, especially since there is good reason to believe, as Heinrich Hagenmeyer did, that Fulcher was working from a *schriftliche Vorlage* (“written prototype”) of the council’s proceedings.<sup>37</sup> As Strack points out, Fulcher is the only author to transmit the text of both Urban’s opening and closing speeches from the council.<sup>38</sup> Among the narrative accounts, the treatment of sacred space in Fulcher’s version of the crusade call should therefore be attributed the most weight.

In Fulcher’s *Historia*, the pope is less verbose on the topic than in the accounts of Robert and Baldric. Urban simply declaimed that the Turks “have destroyed churches, have devastated the kingdom of God” and urged those listening “to hasten to exterminate this vile race from our lands and to aid the Christian inhabitants in time.”<sup>39</sup> This supports the main themes of Robert and Baldric’s versions regarding the destruction of churches by the Turks and the concern to expel the “vile race” from the Holy Land, but it does not corroborate the granular detail which characterizes those texts. The reference in Fulcher’s text to the extermination of the Turks from “our lands” (*de regionibus nostrorum*) does, however, reveal that the papal conception of the Holy Land was an exclusively Christian one, with Eastern Orthodox and Western Latin Christians united under the papacy.<sup>40</sup> According to Urban, the Turks were foreign invaders (*invaserunt ... Turci, gens Persica*) in this imagined, homogenously Christian, Holy Land, who needed to be “militarily defeated and repulsed.”<sup>41</sup> This curial conception of the Levant, though, was only partially accurate, for, in addition to brushing over the diversity of the Christian brethren in the East, it ignored the native Muslim inhabitants of Syria and Palestine who also suffered under the invading Turks, and whose plight came as a surprise to European crusaders.<sup>42</sup> Urban portrayed the First Crusade as a reaction to events in the Holy Land, but for his purpose of raising an army of the faithful, fidelity to the exact shape of the situation in Outremer was less important than the perlocutionary force of his call to arms.

Against the chronicles, we can compare the handful of extant letters from Urban’s chancery concerning the crusade. One document contains a statement about sacred space in the East: the epistle addressed to the faithful in Flanders, probably issued very soon after Clermont, in December 1095 (though some date it to February 1096).<sup>43</sup> The

<sup>36</sup>Strack, “The Sermon of Urban II”, p. 45; see also especially pp. 31–4.

<sup>37</sup>Strack, “The Sermon of Urban II”, p. 33.

<sup>38</sup>Fulcheri Carnotensis, *Historia Hierosolymitana (1095–1127): Mit Erläuterungen und einem Anhang*, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1913), pp. 123–4, n. 1; Strack, “The Sermon of Urban II”, p. 32.

<sup>39</sup>Fulcher of Chartres, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095–1127*, trans. Frances Rita Ryan, ed. Harold S. Fink (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1969), p. 66; “... ecclesias subvertendo, regnum Dei vastando.”, “hortor ... ut ad id genus nequam de regionibus nostrorum exterminandum tempestive Christocolis opitulari satagant.”: Fulcheri Carnotensis, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. Hagenmeyer, pp. 134 and 135, respectively.

<sup>40</sup>Fulcheri Carnotensis, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. Hagenmeyer, p. 135, n. 18; *History of the Expedition to Jerusalem*, trans. Ryan and ed. Fink, p. 66, n. 5. The Catholic Church was composed of the patriarchates of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem: Bernard Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: The Secular Church* (London: Variorum Publications, 1980), p. 1. See also idem and Andrew Jotischky, *Latin and Greek Monasticism in the Crusader States* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), pp. 11–21.

<sup>41</sup>Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, p. 58.

<sup>42</sup>Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, p. 58.

<sup>43</sup>The Latin text of the letter is printed in *Kreuzzugsbriefe*, ed. Hagenmeyer, no. II, pp. 136–7, catalogued in *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII*, ed. P. Jaffé, 2 volumes (Leipzig, 1885–

early date of this document is significant since it renders the contents valuable in reconstructing the initial crusade call, though, given the lack of the *datum* clause (a common problem in the transmission of medieval letters), the exact date of issue remains unknown and the content is not specific enough to anchor it to a more defined chronological context. Debate has swirled around the function of this document, which summarizes the launch of the crusade and preparations for departure. Jonathan Riley-Smith used the letter to support his argument that “Urban made quite strenuous efforts to publicize his proclamation of war”.<sup>44</sup> Alfons Becker, on the other hand, interpreted it more as an “organisational document” (*ein Organisationsschreiben*) than a call to crusade.<sup>45</sup> I.S. Robinson saw it as staking a papal claim to leadership over the expedition.<sup>46</sup> And Strack suggests convincingly that the letter was “primarily written in support of Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, the papal legate of the expedition.”<sup>47</sup> In addition to the lack of consensus over the impetus behind its issue, the text of the letter as we have it now may not be its original form: some important sections are surprisingly terse, the *datum* is missing, the *dispositio* clause does not deploy the standard verbs *rogamus* or *exhortamur*, and the *salutatio* is corrupt.<sup>48</sup> We must tread lightly, therefore, in relying upon its evidence and accept that it cannot provide a definitive statement of papal thinking on the matter of sacred space in the Holy Land. That said, as the only source issued by the papal chancery, in a hierarchy of importance, the letter should be placed at the top, followed by Fulcher’s account, and then those by Robert and Baldric.

Urban’s letter to Flanders supports the evidence from the other sources of papal anxiety about, and lamentation over, conflated Turkish-Muslim control and destruction of the churches in the East. In the *narratio* of the letter, which related events leading to its issue, Urban wrote that “a barbaric fury has deplorably afflicted and laid waste the churches of God in the regions of the Orient. More than this, blasphemous to say, it has even grasped in intolerable servitude its churches and the Holy City of Christ, glorified by His passion and resurrection.”<sup>49</sup>

In response, the pope related that he had urged the Franks “to free the churches of the East.”<sup>50</sup> Urban’s letter to Flanders corroborates the broad outline of all three narrative accounts of the sermon at Clermont on three points: the reference to “barbaric fury” correlates with the ethnocultural statements in the chronicles regarding the Turks; the

---

8), I: 683, no. 5608, and translated in *The First Crusade*, ed. Peters, p. 42. A more recent edition of the letter can be found in *Le Registre de Lambert, évêque d'Arras (1093–1115)*, ed. Claire Giordanengo (Paris: CNRS Editions, 2007), pp. 192–3, though unfortunately I have not yet been able to consult this publication. The letter is dated to December 1095 in all these works and accepted by Jonathan Riley-Smith in his *First Crusade*, p. 31 as being ‘dated very soon after the Council of Clermont’. By contrast, the letter is dated to February 1096 in *Inventaire*, ed. Riant, p. 221, Alfons Becker, *Papst Urban II. (1088–1099)*, 3 volumes (Stuttgart and Hannover: Anton Hiersemann, 1964–2012), II: 386, and Lotte Kéry, *Die Errichtung des Bistums Arras, 1093/1094* (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1994), pp. 61–6, 70.

<sup>44</sup>Riley-Smith, *First Crusade*, p. 31.

<sup>45</sup>Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, II: 386–7.

<sup>46</sup>I.S. Robinson, *The Papacy, 1073–1198: Continuity and Innovation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 322, 351–2.

<sup>47</sup>Georg Strack, “Pope Urban II and Jerusalem: A Re-Examination of his Letters on the First Crusade”, *Journal of Religious History, Literature and Culture* 2/1 (2016), 51–70, pp. 56–7.

<sup>48</sup>Thomas W. Smith, *The Letters from the First Crusade* (Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, forthcoming).

<sup>49</sup>*The First Crusade*, ed. Peters, p. 42; “... barbaricam rabiem ecclesias Dei in Orientis partibus miserabili infestatione deastasse, insuper etiam sanctam civitatem Christi, passione et resurrectione inlustratam ...”: *Kreuzzugsbriefe*, ed. Hagenmeyer, p. 136. See also Morton, *Encountering Islam*, pp. 85–6.

<sup>50</sup>*The First Crusade*, ed. Peters, p. 42; “... ad liberationem Orientalium ecclesiarum”: *Kreuzzugsbriefe*, ed. Hagenmeyer, p. 136.

destruction of the churches of the East; Muslim control over those churches and Jerusalem, which were “grasped in intolerable servitude” and which needed to be liberated from the invaders. Through the comparison of the surviving sources, then, with weight attributed according to the hierarchy outlined above, it is possible to reconstruct the main ideas of the papal conception of shared sacred space in the call for the First Crusade. The most reliable evidence can be accessed through a comparison of the letter and Fulcher’s text; the accounts of Robert and Baldric confirm the central themes and arguments, and though they are clearly embellished, the elaborations stick closely to the themes corroborated in the other sources. Urban’s conception of shared sacred space in the Holy Land, then, was one-dimensional, airbrushing out the realities of sharing the Holy Land with both Christians and Muslims, confrontational, centring on Christian-Muslim tensions, and framed in simple terms of invasion, possession and control. As we shall see, this set the tone for the encyclicals which followed.

### The Second Crusade: *Quantum praedecessores* (1145/1146)

From the Second Crusade onwards, we are on much firmer ground in terms of the evidential foundation, because we possess the texts of papal encyclical letters, meaning that we no longer need to attempt to use other sources to reconstruct the pope’s message. Pope Eugenius III launched the Second Crusade with the encyclical *Quantum praedecessores*, of which his chancery issued two versions: one on 1 December 1145, and a second on 1 March 1146.<sup>51</sup> In the analysis of papal attitudes towards shared sacred space, the call for the Second Crusade provides an illuminating comparator against that of the First, since it was produced at a time when Latin control over Jerusalem was firmly established. How could the curia produce a letter with enough motivational force when the premier holy sites of Christ’s life, Passion and Resurrection were already in Christian hands? First, Eugenius and his staff folded the recent history of Outremer in on itself, locating the Second Crusade squarely in the context of sacred space that existed at the time of the First Crusade. This allowed Eugenius and his curial staff to rehearse the main themes of Urban’s call to arms. Second, the pope attempted to transpose the same emotional response occasioned by the liberation of Palestine to the new theatre of conflict: Edessa.<sup>52</sup>

When Eugenius III launched the Second Crusade in 1145–1146, one and a half generations had passed since the First Crusade. Narrative accounts which included Urban’s sermon at Clermont were in wide circulation, foremost among which was the work of Robert the Monk, which was wildly popular; indeed, the advent of the Second

<sup>51</sup>On the two versions, see Erich Caspar, “Die Kreuzzugsbulen Eugens III.,” *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 45 (1924), 285–305. The Latin text of the second issue is edited as an appendix to Caspar’s article and is often cited separately: Peter Rassow, “Der Text der Kreuzzugsbulle Eugens III. vom 1. März 1146, Trastevere (J.-L. 8796),” *ibid.*, 300–5. It is translated in *The Crusades: Idea and Reality, 1095–1274*, ed. and trans. Louise and Jonathan Riley-Smith (London: Edward Arnold, 1981), pp. 57–9. The first issue of *Quantum praedecessores* is printed in *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ed. J.P. Migne, volumes I–CCXXI (Paris: J.P. Migne, 1844–1864), CLXXX: 1064–6. Comparison of the text of both issues on the passages analysed in this article demonstrates that they feature identical wording on these points.

<sup>52</sup>On the circumstances of the call for the Second Crusade and for a detailed analysis of the content of *Quantum praedecessores*, see Phillips, *Second Crusade*, pp. 37–60. On the origins of the crusade see also John G. Rowe, “The Origins of the Second Crusade: Pope Eugenius III, Bernard of Clairvaux and Louis VII of France,” in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, ed. Michael Gervers (New York: St Martin’s Press, 1992), pp. 79–89.

Crusade appears to have led to a burst of energy in its dissemination.<sup>53</sup> Sections of Eugenius' audience, especially among the clergy, would therefore have already been primed, via second-hand knowledge, to receive a new crusade call which deployed similar arguments regarding sacred space in the Holy Land. Indeed, Eugenius and his staff may have sought consciously to tap into existing rhetorical justifications for this reason. For the majority, though, this would have been their first experience of a major call to crusade emanating from the papal curia and we should not underestimate that for a large section of the lay audience, there must have been a certain sense of novelty in hearing the pope's arguments.

Eugenius' chancery set the encyclical firmly in the context of the legacy of the First Crusade, cloaking it in the same language of pollution, tyranny and liberation which had featured so prominently in the original call to crusade.<sup>54</sup> The *narratio* clause of *Quantum praedecessores*, for example, reminds its audiences how the pope's predecessors had worked "for the liberation of the eastern Church" (*pro liberatione orientalis ecclesie*).<sup>55</sup> Eugenius developed this theme further in the *narratio* when he related how the First Crusade had "freed from the filth of the pagans that city in which it was Our Saviour's will to suffer for us and where he left us his glorious Sepulchre as a memorial of his passion."<sup>56</sup> Eugenius also made reference to the Old Testament figure of Mattathias from the First Book of Maccabees.<sup>57</sup> Although the pope and his staff did not hitch Mattathias to the subject of sacred space explicitly, the reference would have called to mind the episode in 1 Maccabees 2: 6–12, where Mattathias "saw the evils that were done in [...] Jerusalem" which was "given into the hands of the enemies [...] The holy places are come into the hands of strangers [...] And behold our sanctuary, and our beauty, and our glory is laid waste, and the Gentiles have defiled them."<sup>58</sup> The reference fits into the focus of the document on the liberation of the Holy Sepulchre and Jerusalem during the First Crusade. The encyclical's *dispositio* section (which carried the papal order) similarly calls upon its audience "to defend [...] the eastern Church, which was freed from their tyranny".<sup>59</sup> It is obvious that *Quantum praedecessores* beats with the same conceptual pulse and courses with the same vocabulary as Urban's call for the First Crusade; indeed, the evidence from Eugenius' encyclical lends credence to the reconstruction of some aspects of Urban's attitudes in his crusade call outlined above. To enflame the crusading ardour of his audience, Eugenius stoked the glowing embers of anxiety about Muslim control of shared holy spaces in Jerusalem, even though the

<sup>53</sup>*The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*, ed. D. Kempf and M.G. Bull (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013), pp. xliii–xlvi.

<sup>54</sup>Phillips, *Second Crusade*, pp. 51–2.

<sup>55</sup>*The Crusades: Idea and Reality*, ed. and trans. the Riley-Smiths, p. 57; "... civitatem illam, in qua salvator noster pro nobis pati voluit et gloriosum ipsius sepulchrum passionis sue nobis memoriale dimisit ... a paganorum spurcicia liberarunt." Rassow, "Text der Kreuzzugsbulle Eugens III.", p. 302.

<sup>56</sup>*The Crusades: Idea and Reality*, ed. and trans. the Riley-Smiths, p. 57; Rassow, "Text der Kreuzzugsbulle Eugens III.", p. 302.

<sup>57</sup>Phillips, *The Second Crusade*, p. 56; William Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality in the Holy Land and Iberia, c. 1095–c. 1187* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2008), p. 91. On the Maccabees, see: Nicholas Morton, "The Defence of the Holy Land and the Memory of the Maccabees", *Journal of Medieval History* 36 (2010), 275–93; Jean Dunbabin, "The Maccabees as Exemplars in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries", in *The Bible in the Medieval World: Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*, ed. Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood, *Studies in Church History Subsidia* 4 (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985), pp. 31–41; Smith, *The Bible and Crusade Narrative*, pp. 62–3.

<sup>58</sup>Translation from the Douay-Rheims Bible: <<http://www.drbo.org/chapter/45002.htm>> [accessed 29 March 2021].

<sup>59</sup>*The Crusades: Idea and Reality*, ed. and trans. the Riley-Smiths, p. 58; "... ecclesiam orientalem ... ab eorum tyrannide liberatam, ita defendere": Rassow, "Text der Kreuzzugsbulle Eugens III.", p. 303.

Holy Sepulchre and other sites in the region were then safely in the hands of the Latin Christians.

The city that had slipped from the fingers of the Latins, however, was Edessa, which Muslim forces under Zengi had captured on Christmas Day 1144 and which supplied the *casus belli* for the Second Crusade. It was to this cause that the curia hoped to transfer the devotional ardour of the audience. *Quantum praedecessores* proclaimed:

The city of Edessa, in our tongue known as Rohais, which also, it is said, alone under Christian rule had respect for the power of God at that time when all the land in the East was held by pagans, has been taken by the enemies of the cross of Christ.<sup>60</sup>

Here, Eugenius emphasized the pedigree of Edessa as a Christian city that, historically, had stood alone against Islamic power, in order to amplify its emotive power. Again, the papacy airbrushed out distinctions between the Western and Eastern Christians in the Holy Land and continued to expound the simple dichotomy of Christians versus pagans found in Urban's crusade call. In describing the desecration of the sacred spaces in Edessa, *Quantum praedecessores* also returned to Urban's themes of defilement, destruction and death, in this case emphasising the threat posed by Muslim invaders to the safety of saints' relics: "And the archbishop of that city and his clerics and many other Christians have been killed there, while the relics of the saints have been trampled under the infidels' feet and dispersed."<sup>61</sup> Eugenius' call to the Second Crusade, then, depicted the threat from Muslim invaders in very similar terms to Urban, collapsing the distinction between Latin and Armenian Christians in the same way, but with a twist of novelty by necessity of the location under threat and by drawing attention to the destruction of saints' relics preserved in Edessan holy sites – a concern which paralleled that of ecclesiastical destruction, but was not mentioned specifically, in the call for the First Crusade.<sup>62</sup> *Quantum praedecessores* is significant because it demonstrates that the core ideas about sacred space in the East established by Urban II retained an emotional force that could be dislocated from the ecclesiastical and political reality in Jerusalem and attached to Edessa and the relics preserved there. This was a novel development considering that Edessa was not a premier destination for medieval pilgrims.

### The Third Crusade: *Audita tremendi* (1187–1188)

The context for the issue of the encyclical letter which marked the launch of the Third Crusade is more complex than that of its predecessor.<sup>63</sup> When news of the defeat of the Frankish field army by Saladin at the Battle of Hattin on 4 July 1187 reached the papal curia, Gregory VIII oversaw the composition of the encyclical letter *Audita*

<sup>60</sup>*The Crusades: Idea and Reality*, ed. and trans. the Riley-Smiths, pp. 57–8; "Edissa civitas, que nostra lingua Roas dicitur, que etiam, ut fertur, cum quondam in oriente tota terra a paganis detineretur, ipsa sola sub Christianorum potestate Domino serviebat, ab inimicis crucis Christi capta est": Rassow, "Text der Kreuzzugsbulle Eugens III.", p. 302.

<sup>61</sup>*The Crusades: Idea and Reality*, ed. and trans. the Riley-Smiths, p. 58; "Ipsius quoque civitatis archiepiscopus cum clericis suis et multi alii Christiani ibidem interfecti sunt et sanctorum reliquie in infidelium conculcationem date sunt et disperse.": Rassow, "Text der Kreuzzugsbulle Eugens III.", p. 303.

<sup>62</sup>Phillips, *Second Crusade*, p. 53.

<sup>63</sup>See Helen Birkett, "News in the Middle Ages: News, Communications, and the Launch of the Third Crusade in 1187–1188", *Viator* 49/3 (2018), 23–61.

*tremendi*, which marked the first step in calling for the Third Crusade.<sup>64</sup> Although scholars often treat *Audita tremendi* as if it were a single document, it was, in fact, four. Gregory issued the epistle in three variant versions (on 29 October, 30 October and 3 November 1187, respectively), and his successor Clement III issued the letter for a fourth time on 2 January 1188 with further amendments.<sup>65</sup> As Helen Birkett has demonstrated conclusively, both Gregory and Clement were unaware of the fall of Jerusalem to Saladin at the time that they oversaw the composition and re-issue of *Audita tremendi*.<sup>66</sup>

This uncertainty placed the papal attitudes towards sacred space in *Audita tremendi* in limbo. The curia knew that the Franks had suffered a terrible defeat that would probably prove a turning-point in the existence of the crusader states, but it did not know which holy sites had been lost to the Muslims or what the status of Jerusalem was. This lack of clarity is reflected in the content of *Audita tremendi*. The *arenga* (theological preamble) of the document cites Psalm 78:1–2 in order to establish a theological context for the events and alludes to the city of Jerusalem: “the psalmist laments and says, ‘O God, the heathens are come into thy inheritance, they have sullied your holy temple, they have made Jerusalem a place for keeping fruit.’”<sup>67</sup> But while Baldric of Bourgueil had deployed this quotation in reference to the city of Jerusalem specifically, here Gregory used it in general terms to explain the terrible judgement “that the hand of God visited on the *land* of Jerusalem [my italics].”<sup>68</sup> The only other passage in the letter that concerns shared sacred space is that concerning the dangers posed to the holy places and the Christians living there:

For from the magnitude of the dangers and their barbarous ferocity thirsting for the blood of Christians, and adding all their power in this cause to profane the holy and erase the name of God [*titulum Dei*] from that land, whoever thinks we should be silent should decide.<sup>69</sup>

Though expressed in much more general terms than the other crusade calls – the news from the East was still breaking at the curia when *Audita tremendi* was drafted – the references to the “barbarous ferocity” of the Muslims and their aim “to profane the holy” were in keeping with the ideas of Urban and Eugenius about the threat that Islamic desecration posed to Christian sacred space. As a result of the ongoing invasion of the Frankish territories of Outremer, though, Gregory and his staff attributed a conscious and deliberate aim to the Muslim forces of seeking to “erase the name of God”, the

<sup>64</sup>I have argued elsewhere that *Audita tremendi* was focussed on securing immediate liturgical support for the Holy Land and was rushed through the papal chancery in a series of emergency issues, rather than being a carefully considered foundation for the logistical organization of the Third Crusade: Smith, “*Audita tremendi*”, pp. 85–7.

<sup>65</sup>See Smith, “*Audita tremendi*”, esp. pp. 65–71. The Latin texts of the four issues are printed side-by-side in *ibid*, pp. 88–101. A more widely available edition of the first issue alone can be consulted in the reliable text printed in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Migne, CCL: 1539–42. The first issue of the letter is translated in *Crusade and Christendom: Annotated Documents in Translation from Innocent III to the Fall of Acre, 1187–1291*, eds. Jessalynn Bird, Edward Peters and James M. Powell (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), pp. 4–9. Though the source for this translation is given as Anton Chroust’s 1929 edition (an interpolation in the *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*, which is a hybrid of the second and third issues and not the best text), textual comparison demonstrates that it is in fact made from Migne’s edition – see Smith, “*Audita tremendi*”, p. 78 and n. 88.

<sup>66</sup>Birkett, “News in the Middle Ages”, pp. 49–58.

<sup>67</sup>Translation amended from *Crusade and Christendom*, eds. Bird, Peters and Powell, p. 5; “Psalmista deplorat, et dicit: ‘Deus, venerunt gentes in hereditatem tuam, coinquinaverunt templum sanctum tuum: posuerunt Jerusalem in pomorum custodiam’”: *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Migne, CCL: 1539–40.

<sup>68</sup>*Crusade and Christendom*, eds. Bird, Peters and Powell, p. 5; “... quod super terram Jerusalem divina manus exercuit”: *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Migne, CCL: 1539.

<sup>69</sup>*Crusade and Christendom*, eds. Bird, Peters and Powell, p. 6; “cum ex ipsa periculi magnitudine ac feritate barbarica Christianorum sanguinem sitiente, ac totam suam in hac apponente virtutem, ut profanare sancta, et titulum Dei valeant auferre de terra, quod nos tacemus, discretus quisque valeat estimare.”: *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Migne, CCL: 1540.



*titulum Dei*, “from that land.” This alleged programme of religious cleansing seemed to pose a heightened, if unspecific, threat to Christianity in the Holy Land compared with the desecration lamented in previous crusade calls, which appeared to be less organized and systematic. From the second issue of the document, the authors of *Audita tremendi* also changed the erasure of the *titulum Dei* in Outremer to that of the *cultum Dei*, or the “worship of God”, a modification retained in the third and fourth issues.<sup>70</sup> This sharpened the threat from wiping out the “name” of God to snuffing out Christian worship in the Holy Land in its entirety. Christian sacred space would, *de facto*, according to *Audita tremendi*, cease to exist, if the worst fears of the curia came to pass.

*Audita tremendi* took on a different meaning during its reception after news of the loss of the city of Jerusalem reached the West, when the ambiguous use of Psalm 78 and its reference to Jerusalem allowed its elision with Saladin’s conquest of the city of Jerusalem itself. It was copied extensively throughout Europe in subsequent decades as a form of ‘scribal crusading’, ensuring that the curial attitudes contained therein achieved a wider audience than the preceding crusade calls of Urban and Eugenius.<sup>71</sup> Among the crusade encyclicals examined in the present article, however, it contributes the least to papal conceptions of sacred space. This should not come as a surprise when the fall of Jerusalem was not known at the curia and when we appreciate that *Audita tremendi* was rushed through the chancery as an emergency document.<sup>72</sup>

### The Fourth Crusade: *Post miserabile* (1198)

The first crusade encyclical to refer specifically to the loss of Christian holy places to Saladin’s forces was Innocent III’s call for the Fourth Crusade, *Post miserabile*, issued between 13 and 15 August 1198.<sup>73</sup> The biblical references that Innocent deployed in the *arenga* of *Post miserabile* hark back to the traditional thematic foci of previous crusade calls.<sup>74</sup> The pope cited Lamentations 5:2 in decrying that “our inheritance has been turned over to strangers, our houses have gone to foreigners”, which built on, rather than recycling verbatim, Gregory VIII’s citation of Psalm 78 in *Audita tremendi* to explain the invasion of the land glorified by Christ’s presence.<sup>75</sup> Innocent’s allusion to Isaiah 11:10 – “The Sepulchre of the Lord, which the prophet foretold would be so glorious, has been profaned by the impious and made inglorious” – was a return to

<sup>70</sup>Smith, “*Audita tremendi*”, p. 91 for the text, and p. 75 for analysis.

<sup>71</sup>On the subsequent reception and transmission of *Audita tremendi*, see Smith, “*Audita tremendi*”, pp. 78–81. On the idea of ‘scribal crusading’ see Thomas W. Smith, “Scribal Crusading: Three New Manuscript Witnesses to the Regional Reception and Transmission of First Crusade Letters”, *Traditio* 72 (2017), 133–69.

<sup>72</sup>Smith, “*Audita tremendi*”, pp. 85–7.

<sup>73</sup>*Die Register Innocenz III.*, ed. Othmar Hageneder et al., 14 volumes to date (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1964–), I: no. 336; translated in *Contemporary Sources for the Fourth Crusade: Revised Edition*, trans. Alfred J. Andrea, with contributions by Brett E. Whalen (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 9–19. On *Post miserabile* and the launch of the Fourth Crusade, see: Edward Peters, “Innocent III and the Beginning of the Fourth Crusade”, in *Papacy, Crusade, and Christian-Muslim Relations*, ed. Jessalynn Bird (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018), pp. 117–30, esp. 123–4; Brenda 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: The Boydell Press, 2000), pp. 154–80, esp. pp. 159–60.

<sup>74</sup>For a full analysis of the *arenga* of *Post miserabile*, see Thomas 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, pp. 63–78, at pp. 71–4.

<sup>75</sup>*Contemporary Sources for the Fourth Crusade*, trans. Andrea, p. 11; “hereditas nostra versa est ad alienos, domus nostre ad extraneos devenerunt”: *Die Register Innocenz III.*, ed. Hageneder et al., II: no. 336.

the more specific rhetoric about the pollution of particular holy sites by the “impious” after the studied imprecision of *Audita tremendi*.<sup>76</sup> Nevertheless, it is surprising that, as the first crusade encyclical issued after the fall of Jerusalem and most of the crusader states, more specific statements about the loss of Christian holy sites are absent from the letter and that the point is not laboured as much as one would expect.

The exception to this, and the most notable contribution of *Post miserabile* to the study of papal attitudes towards shared sacred space, is how Innocent’s document takes the traditional ideas and re-frames them in a striking manner as aggressive Muslim mockery of Christianity and its sanctuaries:

our enemies now insult us, saying: “Where is your God, who can deliver neither Himself nor you from our hands? Behold! We now have profaned your holy places. Behold! We now have extended our hand to the objects of your desire, and in the initial assault we have violently overrun and hold, against your will, those places in which you pretend your superstition began.”<sup>77</sup>

The imagined verbal abuse and challenging of the Christian audience by the Muslims of the Holy Land was an innovative way of delivering and weaponising what by this time had become traditional papal ideas about Islamic control over, and defilement of, the holy places.<sup>78</sup> We can trace here a desire among Innocent and his curia to inject a sense of urgency and novelty in *Post miserabile*, crafted some ten years after the loss of Jerusalem, and to render the conventional ideas about shared sacred space more arresting.

*Post miserabile* also marks a shift in the specific character of the papacy’s fears about Muslim control over Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulchre. As we have seen above, the call to the First Crusade was marked by concern that the Turks and Muslims might destroy the shrines venerated by Christians, chief among them being the Holy Sepulchre. This also coloured the tone of *Quantum praedecessores*, which drew attention to the destruction of saints’ relics in Edessa. Apparently, at the time of the Second Crusade, the papacy was still concerned that Islamic control of Christian shrines might equal their demolition, as al-Hakim had attempted with the Holy Sepulchre in 1009. When Saladin retook the church for the forces of Islam in 1187, however, famously he rejected pressure from some of his co-religionists to raze it to the ground.<sup>79</sup> He did, though, oversee the demolition of other crusader religious buildings on the Temple Mount and the partial dismantling of the upper church of the Sepulchre of the Virgin Mary in Jehosaphat and possibly the church of St Lazarus.<sup>80</sup> It is notable that, in the encyclicals from *Post miserabile* onwards (*Audita tremendi* having been issued before news of the fall of Jerusalem was known in the West), the theme of destruction does not feature, the authors focusing

<sup>76</sup>*Contemporary Sources for the Fourth Crusade*, trans. Andrea, p. 11; “sepulchrum Domini, quod propheta gloriosum fore predixit, prophanatum ab impiis inglorium est effectum.”: *Die Register Innocenz III.*, ed. Hageneder et al., II: no. 336.

<sup>77</sup>*Contemporary Sources for the Fourth Crusade*, trans. Andrea, p. 12; “... insultant nobis inimici nostri dicentes: ‘Ubi est Deus vester, qui nec se potest nec vos de nostris manibus liberare? Ecce iam prohanavimus sancta vestra, ecce iam ad desiderabilia vestra manum extendimus et ea loca impetu primo violenter invasimus et vobis tenemus invitis, in quibus superstitionem vestram principium fingitis suscepisse.’”: *Die Register Innocenz III.*, ed. Hageneder et al., II: no. 336.

<sup>78</sup>See Bolton, “Serpent in the Dust: Sparrow on the Housetop”, esp. pp. 159–60, and Smith, “Preambles to Crusading”, pp. 72–3.

<sup>79</sup>Folda, “Sharing the Church of the Holy Sepulchre”, pp. 132–3; *Arab Historians of the Crusades*, trans. [from Arabic] Francesco Gabrieli, trans. [from Italian] E.J. Costello (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969), pp. 174–5.

<sup>80</sup>Adrian J. Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades: Society, Landscape and Art in the Holy City under Frankish Rule* (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 17–18.

instead on Islamic defilement. This is a result, in part, of the fact that widespread concern about the destruction of churches in the East was predominantly rooted in the context of the Turkish invasions of the eleventh century.<sup>81</sup> But it also appears to signal a certain dissipation of the fear that the fabric of the Holy Sepulchre would be destroyed under Muslim control. Taken together, these two points perhaps explain why the theme of destruction, so prominent in the call for the First Crusade and echoed in that for the Second, did not return after 1187; indeed, it could reflect the reality that the Holy Sepulchre “seems to have remained in relatively good condition throughout the thirteenth century”, as Elizabeth Mylod remarks.<sup>82</sup>

Despite the creative effort poured into its rhetoric, *Post miserabile* did not have the intended effect in raising a crusading army, and, on 31 December 1199, Innocent issued a second encyclical in his effort to promote the Fourth Crusade: *Graves orientalis*.<sup>83</sup> Where *Post miserabile* shone in its the originality of the framing of its taunting rhetoric, *Graves orientalis* stands out for its detailed explanation of the practical organization of the crusade; surprisingly, there is no specific mention of sacred space in the latter. Perhaps Innocent and his curia considered their work in *Post miserabile* outlining the status of the holy sites to be sufficient.

### The Fifth Crusade: *Quia maior* (1213)

With his call for the Fifth Crusade, *Quia maior*, issued between 19 and 29 April 1213, Innocent III once again fused tradition and innovation in the curial conceptualization of sacred space in the Holy Land.<sup>84</sup> As with all the crusade calls examined here, Innocent thought of the struggle against the Muslims in terms of “the liberation of the Holy Land” (*pro liberatione terrae sanctae*).<sup>85</sup> The pope’s proclamation that “brethren in faith and in the Christian name are imprisoned by the faithless Saracens in a cruel prison and endure the harsh yoke of slavery” recollected the theme of “intolerable servitude” present in Urban II’s call for the First Crusade.<sup>86</sup> Innocent continued the binary conceptualization of Christian versus Muslim conflict in the Holy Land by arguing that Christian brethren had prior claim and right to the land, since “the Christian people possessed almost all the Saracen provinces until after the time of Saint Gregory”, again, presenting the diverse Christian communities of Outremer as a homogenous group.<sup>87</sup> The pope dwelled on

<sup>81</sup> Morton, *Encountering Islam*, pp. 86–93.

<sup>82</sup> Elizabeth J. Mylod, “Latin Christian Pilgrimage in the Holy Land, 1187–1291” (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 2013), p. 158.

<sup>83</sup> *Die Register Innocenz III.*, ed. Hageneder et al., II: no. 258; English translation in *Contemporary Sources for the Fourth Crusade*, trans. Andrea, pp. 24–32. See Smith, “Preambles to Crusading”, pp. 73–4.

<sup>84</sup> *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Migne, CCXVI: 817–22; translated in *Crusade and Christendom*, eds. Bird, Peters and Powell, pp. 107–12. On the document, see Smith, “How to Craft a Crusade Call”. Though the quality of Migne’s editions is variable, that of *Quia maior* is generally very good, see *ibid.* p. 8, n. 37 and *Die Papsturkunden Westfalens bis zum Jahre 1378: Erster Theil. Die Papsturkunden Westfalens bis zum Jahre 1304*, ed. Heinrich Finke (Münster: Regensberg’sche Buchhandlung, 1888), no. 235, p. 112. See also, James M. Powell, *Anatomy of a Crusade, 1213–1221* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), pp. 17–22.

<sup>85</sup> *Crusade and Christendom*, eds. Bird, Peters and Powell, p. 108; *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Migne, CCXVI: 817. On *Quia maior* and Latin Christian claims to the Holy Land at the time of the Fifth Crusade, see Cassidy-Welch, *War and Memory at the Time of the Fifth Crusade*, pp. 110–11.

<sup>86</sup> *Crusade and Christendom*, eds. Bird, Peters and Powell, p. 108; “... fratres suos fide ac nomine Christianos apud perfidos Saracenos ergastulo diri carceris detineri ac jugo deprimi gravissimae servitutis”: *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Migne, CCXVI: 818.

<sup>87</sup> *Crusade and Christendom*, eds. Bird, Peters and Powell, p. 108; “omnes pene Saracenorum provincias usque post tempora beati Gregorii Christiani populi possederunt”: *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Migne, CCXVI: 818.

one piece of territory in particular: “recently, to the confusion of the Christian name, they [the Muslims] built a fortress on Mount Tabor, where Christ showed the nature of his future glorification to his disciples.”<sup>88</sup> Though Innocent went on to focus on the strategic threat this posed to Acre, he was careful to draw out the biblical significance of the site and its association with the *vita Christi*, again emphasising the occupation of Christian holy places by the “faithless” Muslims. As Cassidy-Welch has pointed out, this is mirrored in Oliver of Cologne’s *Historia Damiatina*, which he composed during the campaign of the Fifth Crusade.<sup>89</sup> This is good evidence for the reception of Innocent’s ideas as expressed in *Quia maior*. The pope appointed Oliver as a preacher of the crusade and he would have received a copy of both *Quia maior* and its accompanying letter of instructions, *Pium et sanctum*, which ordered preachers to pay careful attention to everything contained within the encyclical.<sup>90</sup> As Jessalynn Bird argues, given that Mount Tabor supplied the *casus belli* for the Fifth Crusade in *Quia maior*, “its strategic importance and religious significance as the site for Christ’s transfiguration loomed large” in the mind of figures such as Oliver, as manifested in his *Historia Damiatina*.<sup>91</sup>

In the *dispositio* clause of *Quia maior*, Innocent called for the invisible weapon of prayer to be wielded on the home front in the form of Psalm 78 (“O God, the heathens are come into thy inheritance”), which was to be sung daily at mass and keyed *Quia maior* into the liturgical campaign of repentance on the home front first launched by Gregory VIII in 1187.<sup>92</sup> Innocent also ordered that “The celebrant sing this prayer at the altar: ‘We humbly pray you, O God, [...] that, seizing the land that your only-begotten son has consecrated with his own blood from the hands of the enemies of the cross you restore it to Christian worship.’”<sup>93</sup> This concern to defend Christian worship in the Holy Land was common to previous crusade calls, but, as we have seen, was particularly pronounced in the reissues of *Audita tremendi* which expressed anxiety that the *cultum Dei* would be wiped out from the Holy Land entirely. Again, this papal conception of the fragility of Christian worship in the East was predicated on securing Latin Christian control of holy sites rather than the mere existence of Eastern Christians living under Muslim rule.<sup>94</sup>

The final point to make about *Quia maior* is that, unlike Innocent’s call for the Fourth Crusade, surprisingly it makes no specific mention of the Holy Sepulchre, but relies on the general association with the Holy Land and Christ’s “inheritance” more broadly. This may reflect the fact that the Muslim authorities did in fact allow Latin Christian pilgrims

<sup>88</sup>*Crusade and Christendom*, eds. Bird, Peters and Powell, p. 109; “nuper in monte Thabor, ubi discipulis suis futurae glorificationis speciem demonstravit, iidem perfidi Saraceni quamdam munitionis arcem in confusionem Christiani nominis erexerunt”: *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Migne, CCXVI: 818.

<sup>89</sup>Cassidy-Welch, *War and Memory at the Time of the Fifth Crusade*, pp. 115–16.

<sup>90</sup>Powell, *Anatomy of a Crusade*, pp. 22, 24. *Pium et sanctum* is printed in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Migne, CCXVI: 822. It is translated in *Crusade and Christendom*, eds. Bird, Peters and Powell, pp. 112–13.

<sup>91</sup>Jessalynn Bird, “Preaching and Narrating the Fifth Crusade: Bible, Sermons and the History of a Campaign”, in *The Uses of the Bible in Crusader Sources*, ed. Elizabeth Lapina and Nicholas Morton (Leiden: Brill, 2017), pp. 316–40, at pp. 322–23.

<sup>92</sup>See: M. Cecilia Gaposchkin, *Invisible Weapons: Liturgy and the Making of Crusade Ideology* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2017), pp. 192–225; Christoph T. Maier, “Crisis, Liturgy and the Crusade in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries”, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 48 (1997), 628–57; Anne E. Lester, “A Shared Imitation: Cistercian Convents and Crusader Families in Thirteenth-Century Champagne”, *Journal of Medieval History* 35 (2009), 353–70, at p. 366.

<sup>93</sup>*Crusade and Christendom*, eds. Bird, Peters and Powell, p. 112; “sacerdos qui celebrat, orationem istam super altare decantet: ‘Deus, [...] te suppliciter exoramus ut terram quam unigenitus Filius tuus proprio sanguine consecravat de manibus inimicorum crucis eripiens, restituas cultui Christiano’: *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Migne, CCXVI: 821.

<sup>94</sup>See MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East*, pp. 31–5; Bernard Hamilton, *The Christian World of the Middle Ages* (Stroud: Sutton, 2003), pp. 105–24; idem, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States*, pp. 1, 18–19, 159.

to visit the Holy Sepulchre in the period after the Third Crusade, albeit in a restrictive manner and subject to fees and close supervision by Muslim guides.<sup>95</sup> But it also fits into broader trends in European discourse on the crusades. Colin Morris has observed that, in the period after the Third Crusade, “the Holy Sepulchre seems to have been given less prominence in the literature of crusading” and it “slipped out of the conventional crusade vocabulary”, to be replaced by Christo-centric expressions of devotion focussed on the True Cross, the blood of Christ and His sufferings, as a well as a trend towards more general expressions of desire to recover Jerusalem and the Holy Land.<sup>96</sup> The drift towards a more general concern for the Holy Land is borne out not only in *Quia maior*, but also in the following two encyclicals examined below. William Purkis has demonstrated convincingly the strong current of Christo-centric devotion present in the sources from the beginning of the crusading movement, some of which can be seen in the examples explored above.<sup>97</sup> The focus on *imitatio Christi* appears to have intensified in papal crusade calls from *Audita tremendi* and in each subsequent crusade encyclical.<sup>98</sup>

The question is whether the papacy drove this cultural swing towards more general conceptions of the Holy Land and sharpened focus on *imitatio Christi* or merely reflected it back to its audience in the hope of appealing more to potential *crucesignati*. Encyclicals, after all, were not composed in a vacuum. As much as they shaped contemporary discourse, they also mirrored and amplified it – we should not think of their influence as being uni-directional; contemporary texts and ideas from outside the curia would have informed the thinking behind the composition of encyclical letters. Unfortunately, it is beyond the scope of the present article to offer a concrete answer to this question (which would probably devolve into an inconclusive “chicken-and-egg” anyway, given the lacunae in medieval source material). We can say with certainty though that, with the exception of *Post miserabile*, which emphasises both Christ’s sufferings and the Holy Sepulchre, Innocent III and Honorius III contributed to the trend through the transmission and reception of their encyclicals.

### The Crusade of Frederick II: *Iustus Dominus* (1223)

Honorius III’s encyclical letter which called the Christians of the West to join the Crusade of Frederick II, *Iustus Dominus*, issued between 11 and 27 April 1223, is the most dynamic of high medieval papal crusade calls, although previously its significance was largely unappreciated.<sup>99</sup> *Iustus Dominus* was not a uniform text but existed in multiple forms with variant passages tailored to the faithful of Europe and to individual rulers, including one despatched to Henry III of England, whose personalized copy features a unique section calling on him to be inspired by the deeds of his crusader uncle,

<sup>95</sup> Mylod, “Latin Christian Pilgrimage in the Holy Land”, p. 156; Morris, *The Sepulchre of Christ*, p. 273.

<sup>96</sup> Morris, *The Sepulchre of Christ*, p. 270; see also *ibid.*, pp. 269–71.

<sup>97</sup> Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, pp. 30–47.

<sup>98</sup> Since the intensifying Christo-centric devotion is not directly relevant to the analysis of sacred space, the examples are not drawn out in the present article. For analysis of these aspects of the crusade encyclicals, however, see, for example: Smith, “*Audita tremendi*”, pp. 74–6; idem, “How to Craft a Crusade Call”, pp. 5 11, 12; idem, “Dynamism of a Crusade Encyclical”, pp. 122–3, 132.

<sup>99</sup> Smith, “Dynamism of a Crusade Encyclical” prints a new edition of the letter texts and contains an extensive English summary of *Iustus Dominus* in the main body of the article.

Richard I.<sup>100</sup> Broadly, there are two different textual branches of *Iustus Dominus*: one to the kings of the West and another for the rest of the faithful. Both contain evidence for Honorius' conception of sacred space in the Holy Land, though, interestingly, the emphases differ according to the audience.

In the version addressed to Philip Augustus and the other kings of Europe, Honorius exhorted them to rise up and liberate that land in which Christ had personally laboured for the salvation of human-kind, to rise up in contrition and take vengeance on those crooked and evil people who insult the Christian name with many taunts.<sup>101</sup> The pope then went on to make a stinging rhetorical comparison of the Lord's inheritance in the Holy Land with the territories of temporal lords: the princes of Europe would never allow the hand of the invaders (i.e. the Muslims of the East) to stretch out to their temporal inheritance, so why do they suffer the detainers of the inheritance of the Lord for so long?<sup>102</sup> Here Honorius and his staff were appealing to the martial urges of the princes and their magnates, casting the Muslims in their traditional rhetorical roles as invaders and blasphemers to be repulsed with arms.

In the branch of the text of *Iustus Dominus* circulated to the people of the West – the true encyclical letter – Honorius addressed the same theme of liberation and Muslim mockery from a different angle, replacing the martial rhetoric with different formulations. Here, Honorius looked back to Eugenius III's *Quantum praedecessores*, and deployed the traditional *tempus acceptabile* motif which had featured in that document.<sup>103</sup> The pope wrote that the time had come for confusion to be removed and for justice to be done in the Holy Land, where the land of the Lord was miserably occupied.<sup>104</sup> In calling for the friendly reception of papal legates to preach the crusade and bring about peace in the West, the popular version of *Iustus Dominus* closed with a reference to Mattathias, who, seeing the Lord profaned, sprang to His defence.<sup>105</sup> As seen above, Mattathias had also featured in *Quantum praedecessores*. Ultimately, despite the more specific connotations of Mattathias and other rhetoric in *Iustus Dominus* having a Christo-centric focus, the attitudes towards sacred space in the Holy Land deployed in *Iustus Dominus* do not venture beyond the general. As in *Quia maior*, the significance of this is that it provides evidence for the wider trend towards a more general focus on the Holy Land. Although Honorius engages with the same themes as the other crusade encyclicals examined here, namely Islamic invasion, occupation and mockery, *Iustus Dominus* does not anchor those ideas in specific Christian holy sites, such as the Holy Sepulchre, even though they were under Muslim control.<sup>106</sup> This represents a distinct shift from the calls for the First and Second Crusades.

<sup>100</sup>Smith, "Dynamism of a Crusade Encyclical", esp. pp. 113–14, 123–8.

<sup>101</sup>"Exurgas et liberes terram illam, in qua salutem humani generis operatus est personaliter ipse salvator. Exurgas ad contritionem nationis prave atque perverse, que ubi sit Deus Christianorum, impropere, et multis insultat opprobriis nomini Christiano.": Smith, "Dynamism of a Crusade Encyclical", p. 140.

<sup>102</sup>"Ad hereditates tuorum manus invasorum extendi non pateris, et patieris hereditatis Dominice tanto tempore detentores?": Smith, "Dynamism of a Crusade Encyclical", p. 141.

<sup>103</sup>Smith, "Dynamism of a Crusade Call", pp. 131–2. See also Ane L. Bysted, *The Crusade Indulgence: Spiritual Rewards and the Theology of the Crusades, c. 1095–1216* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 236–43, esp. 236, 241.

<sup>104</sup>"Sane quia tempus est, ut tollatur illa confusio, [...] terram nostri principis detinendo miserabiliter occupatam.": Smith, "Dynamism of a Crusade Encyclical", p. 142.

<sup>105</sup>"... quod vobis non desit magnamitas Mathathie, qui videns sancta Domini prophanari, prosiliit": Smith, "Dynamism of a Crusade Encyclical", p. 142.

<sup>106</sup>For a full analysis of the rhetoric and content of *Iustus Dominus*, see Smith, "Dynamism of a Crusade Encyclical."



## The Barons' Crusade: *Rachel suum videns* (1234)

The final encyclical that we shall examine is Gregory IX's *Rachel suum videns*, issued on 17 November 1234, which launched the Barons' Crusade.<sup>107</sup> Gregory's crusade call is notable for a swing back to the traditional, more specific papal anxieties about Islamic control over Christian sacred space. *Rachel suum videns* foregrounds papal concern about the holy places, positioning them front and centre in the *arenga*:

For we ought to lament when the abode of the heavenly bread, Mount Sion, from whence the law went forth, the city of the great king, of which so many glorious things were said, that land, which the son of God consecrated with his own blood, shed for our sakes, has lost the best part of its excellence and its territory. We ought to weep, because she who was once free is now enslaved under the yoke of ungodly tyranny. We ought to mourn, because where once the host of the heavenly army celebrated peace through song, now in that very place a shameful throng of the most unclean people has arisen, and also dissensions and schisms. And by renewing the commencement of armed strife the enemy has extended their hand toward her valuables, exiling the order of priests and sacred things, godly laws, and the very laws of nature from the temple of the Lord, and instituting contrary abominations and filthinesses in their stead. And for this very reason, in the midst of her enemies Jerusalem has become soiled, as if polluted by menstrual blood, mocked during her Sabbaths [Lamentations 1:7, 10].<sup>108</sup>

Like the other crusade calls, the themes are traditional. Gregory and his staff touch upon: Jerusalem and specific holy sites, in this case the temple of the Lord, which, unlike the rest of the city, was under the control of Muslims; Jerusalem being “enslaved under the yoke of ungodly tyranny” and in need of liberation; anxiety about Islamic religious services (“contrary abominations”) having supplanted Christian ones in the sacred spaces of the Holy Land; and, connected to the previous point, the pollution of Christian sacred space by an “unclean people” expressed according to ethnocultural principles that focus on their “filthiness”. Gregory's reference to Lamentations to explain the captivity and mockery of Jerusalem looped back to its use in *Post miserabile*, though the reference to Jerusalem being soiled “as if polluted by menstrual blood” was original.<sup>109</sup> Gregory's alignment of Muslim occupation of Jerusalem with pollution by menstrual blood derived from contemporary clerical attitudes towards excluding menstruating women from ecclesiastical spaces, a prejudice still current at the curia despite a previous ruling by Innocent III that menstruating women should not be prohibited from attending church.<sup>110</sup> Again, this demonstrates a certain lack of theological interest in the specific

<sup>107</sup>*Epistolae saeculi XIII e regestis pontificum Romanorum selectae*, ed. Carl Rodenberg, vol. I (Berlin: “apud Weidmannos”, 1883), no. 605, pp. 491–5; translated in *Crusade and Christendom*, eds. Bird, Peters and Powell, pp. 269–76. On the call for the Barons' Crusade, see: Lower, *The Barons' Crusade*, pp. 24–31; Thomas W. Smith, “The Use of the Bible in the *Arengae* of Pope Gregory IX's Crusade Calls”, in *Uses of the Bible in Crusader Sources*, ed. Lapina and Morton, pp. 206–35, at pp. 216–18.

<sup>108</sup>*Crusade and Christendom*, eds. Bird, Peters and Powell, p. 271; “Lamentatur autem, quia domus celestis panis, mons Syon, unde lex exiit, civitas regis magni, de qua dicta sunt multa gloriosa, terra, quam Dei filius fuso pro nobis suo sanguine consecravat, regni robur et pulchritudinem perdidit. Flet, quia quondam libera sub impie tyrannidis iugo servit. Luget, quia ubi pacem multitudo militie celestis cecinit, ibi pressura gentis immundissime scandala, simultates et scismata suscitavit, ac innovans exordia preliorum misit ad desiderabilia manum suam, sacerdotii et sacrorum ordinum pias leges et ipsius nature iura relegans a templo Domini, diversis ibi spurcitiis et abominationibus introductis. Et ideo Ierusalem in suis derisa sabbatis obsorduit quasi polluta menstruis inter hostes.”: *Epistolae*, ed. Rodenberg, p. 492.

<sup>109</sup>For analysis of the imagery of menstruation in *Rachel suum videns*, see Lower, *The Barons' Crusade*, pp. 26–7.

<sup>110</sup>See Monica H. Green, “Flowers, Poisons and Men: Menstruation in Medieval Western Europe”, in *Menstruation: A Cultural History*, ed. Andrew Shail and Gillian Howle (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), pp. 51–64, esp. pp. 59–60.

nature of Islamic defilement of Christian sacred space. Instead, Gregory and his staff conceived of it in terms of pollution generally, drawing an equivalence between pollution by a “most unclean people” and pollution by Christian menstrual blood.

Overall, the statement of papal attitudes to sacred space in the Holy Land in *Rachel suum videns* is significant because it draws together and distills more than a century of thought on the issue, as well as introducing a new comparison of Islamic defilement with perceived menstrual pollution of the holy places. Where in previous crusade encyclicals, statements on sacred space were often diffuse, scattered throughout the various letter clauses, here they are presented in concentrated form and awarded pride of place in the document’s *arenga*. In addition to a return to a greater specificity of thought on sacred space in picking out the Templum Domini (though, again, no mention is made of the Holy Sepulchre), there is a sense of urgency and a notable shift in priorities that sets this apart from the previous documents we have explored.

It is easy to discern the motivation behind this crystallization of papal thought on the matter of sacred space in Jerusalem: the negotiated recovery of the city for the Latin Christians by Frederick II on his crusade of 1228–1229.<sup>111</sup> Gregory addresses this context in the next section of the letter, in which he refers to the recovery of Jerusalem by virtue of a truce and wrote that “The expiration of that truce”, which would end in 1239, “is so very near” (... *quarum terminus adeo est vicinus*) that there was barely time to prepare for a crusade.<sup>112</sup> It also explains the curial focus on the Temple of the Lord in the letter, because this area of Jerusalem had not been included in Frederick’s pact of 1229, and therefore was seen as spiritually polluted at the time of the issue of the encyclical.<sup>113</sup> The status of the Temple loomed large in the condemnatory letter about Frederick’s truce that Patriarch Gerold of Jerusalem sent to Gregory IX in 1229.<sup>114</sup> As Hamilton wrote, “the sound of muezzins summoning the Islamic faithful to prayer was certainly not consonant with the crusading ideal that Jerusalem should be purified as a sacred Christian city”.<sup>115</sup> The *de facto* sharing of Jerusalem through Muslim control of the Temple Mount area was seen by Gregory and his curia as having led to the introduction of “contrary abominations” and filthiness. Again, we witness here a papal insistence in its crusade calls on complete Christian control of holy places in the East and the point-blank refusal to share sacred spaces with Muslims. *Rachel suum videns* thus can be used as a barometer to measure the high level of curial sensitivity to the changing parameters around sacred space in the Holy Land in the 1230s, anxieties that are largely absent from *Quia maior* and *Iustus Dominus*.

## Conclusion

The documents examined above show very little understanding of, or interest in, Islam, the diversity of Christian communities that existed in the Levant, or the realities of shared sacred space during the crusading movement. Indeed, they deliberately flatten out any

<sup>111</sup>Wolfgang Stürner, *Friedrich II., 1194–1250*, volumes I–II (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992–2000), II: 152–5; Marcello Pacifico, *Federico II e Gerusalemme al tempo delle crociate: Relazioni tra cristianità e islam nello spazio euro-mediterraneo medievale 1215–1250* (Caltanissetta–Rome: Salvatore Sciascia Editore, 2012), pp. 243–4.

<sup>112</sup>*Crusade and Christendom*, eds. Bird, Peters and Powell, p. 271; *Epistolae*, ed. Rodenberg, p. 492.

<sup>113</sup>Lower, *The Barons’ Crusade*, pp. 26–7.

<sup>114</sup>*Epistolae*, ed. Rodenberg, no. 384, pp. 299–304, at p. 301.

<sup>115</sup>Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States*, p. 258.

ripples of nuance. In its calls to crusade, the papacy's perception of shared sacred space in the Holy Land was one-dimensional and Eurocentric because that was all that was deemed necessary for the purpose of launching a crusade and inspiring the faithful to join it. The main lines of papal thought changed little over the period 1095–1234. The themes of invasion, occupation, and control over Christian holy sites by Muslims in the Holy Land, and Islamic mockery and desecration of them, are remarkably constant, even when they were in the hands of the Franks. These attitudes were detached from the reality of how sacred space was shared in the crusader states, but, for the papacy's purpose of calling the faithful to crusade, it did not matter. Nuance and understanding would not rile and inspire an audience to take the cross, and the encyclicals were content to conflate Turks and Muslims and to designate them as heathens, infidels and natural enemies of Christians. Although the core themes of the crusade calls remained constant, one can trace shifts in papal priorities in concert with the changing military and political context in the Levant, most notably concerning possession of the city of Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulchre, which changed hands between Muslims and Christians three times in the period under study, and with a fourth occasion expected in Gregory IX's encyclical of 1234 with which this article closed.<sup>116</sup> Subtler changes can also be discerned in the transferral of the rhetoric concerning Jerusalem and the Holy Land to Edessa and its relics to launch the Second Crusade, the apparent amelioration of curial anxieties about destruction of Christian shrines after the loss of Jerusalem in 1187, and the trend away from a focus on the Holy Sepulchre in crusade discourse and towards one that, paradoxically, centred on a more general understanding of the Holy Land and more intense devotion to specific aspects and instruments of Christ's Passion under Innocent III and Honorius III. Usâma Ibn Munqidh may not have recognized the form of shared sacred space painted in the papacy's crusade encyclicals, but he would have been familiar with the papal attitudes reflected in at least some of those newly arrived, rougher Franks, inspired to travel to the Holy Land to liberate it from the "infidel" by the texts examined here. By tracing the shape of papal attitudes to sacred space that underpinned crusade preaching campaigns in the West in the period 1095–1234, it is hoped that the present article has helped to illuminate further the ideas about Christian-Muslim relations that circulated in the West and coloured the attitudes both of those who stayed in the West and those who travelled to the East alike. An important avenue for further research, which is beyond the scope of the present study, would be to trace how these ideas expressed in papal crusade encyclicals percolated down into other contemporary sources, and to what extent this was a unidirectional process.

## ORCID

Thomas W. Smith  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9329-6880>

<sup>116</sup>After Frederick II's truce expired in 1239, the Christians briefly lost control of Jerusalem in that same year, before retaking it in 1241; finally, they lost the city permanently in 1244: Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades*, p. 1.