



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *The Dynamism of a Crusade Encyclical: Pope Honorius III and Iustus Dominus (1223)*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/131169/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Smith, TW orcid.org/0000-0001-9329-6880 (2019) The Dynamism of a Crusade Encyclical: Pope Honorius III and Iustus Dominus (1223). *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 74. pp. 111-142. ISSN: 0012-1223

This paper is protected by copyright. This is an author produced version of a paper published in *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

The Dynamism of a Crusade Encyclical: Pope Honorius III and *Iustus Dominus* (1223)¹

Thomas W. Smith

Pope Honorius III, so the older historiography led scholars to believe, was an unoriginal plodder. Regularly labelled a ‘caretaker’ pope, he was thought incapable of the energy and innovation that Innocent III and Gregory IX brought to the office. As a result, for a long time, the originality and importance of his pontificate and the documents that he created were underestimated.² A series of recent studies on Honorius paint a different picture of the pope, however, who now emerges as a creative and confident pontiff worthy of the same reverence as his celebrated contemporaries.³ Yet one of the best examples of Honorius’s dynamism as pope, his crafting of the pan-European crusade encyclical, *Iustus Dominus*, issued between 11 and 27 April 1223, remains under-appreciated (see Appendix for the text).⁴ Buried among the

¹ I am very grateful to the Leverhulme Trust for the award of an Early Career Fellowship at the University of Leeds (2017–20), during which this article was researched and written. My thanks also to Karl Borchardt for his helpful comments on this article and Georg Strack for his advice on the topic.

² Horace K. MANN, *The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, 18 vols. (1902–32) 13 p. 20; Adalbert KEUTNER, *Papsttum und Krieg unter dem Pontifikat des Papstes Honorius III. (1216–1227)* (1935) p. 12; Ernst KANTOROWICZ, *Frederick the Second, 1194–1250*, trans. E. O. LORIMER (1931) p. 96; Joseph P. DONOVAN, *Pelagius and the Fifth Crusade* (1950) p. 105; Steven RUNCIMAN, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols. (1951–54), 3 p. 164; Thomas C. VAN CLEVE, *The Emperor Frederick II of Hohenstaufen. Immutator mundi* (1972) pp. 108–109; Peter PARTNER, *The Lands of St Peter. The Papal State in the Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance* (1972) p. 244; Hans Eberhard MAYER, *The Crusades*, trans. John GILLINGHAM, 2nd edn (1988) p. 220 and in the latest German edition, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, 10th edn (2005) p. 259; Colin MORRIS, *The Papal Monarchy. The Western Church from 1050 to 1250* (1989) p. 442; J. N. D. KELLY, *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, rev. Michael J. WALSH, 2nd edn (2010) p. 190.

³ Pierre-Vincent CLAVERIE, *Honorius III et l’Orient (1216–1227). Étude et publication de sources inédites des Archives vaticanes (ASV)* (2013); Viola SKIBA, *Honorius III. (1216–1227). Seelsorger und Pragmatiker* (2016); Thomas W. SMITH, *Curia and Crusade. Pope Honorius III and the Recovery of the Holy Land, 1216–1227* (2017); *Nuovi studi su Onorio III*, ed. Christian GRASSO (2017).

⁴ Vatican City, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Registra Vaticana 12, fols 52r–54r; calendared in *Regesta Honorii Papae III*, ed. Petrus PRESSUTTI, 2 vols. (1888–95) 2 no. 4262 pp. 118–119, and edited in the Appendix to the present article. Previously, the letter was printed in *Epistolae saeculi XIII e regestis pontificum Romanorum selectae*, ed. Carl RODENBERG, 3 vols. (1883–94) 1 no. 225 pp. 152–155. In order to avoid unnecessary

mass of diplomatic documentation on the crusade that emanated from Honorius's chancery, which has only recently been explored thoroughly, the modern profile of *Iustus Dominus* is a shadowy reflection of its medieval status when it was recognised as a model letter and included in the *Briefsammlung* of Thomas of Capua.⁵ Although Ursula Schwerin appraised its significance in 1937 and noted its most notable features in her pioneering study of crusade appeals, and Laurie Shepard briefly examined some of the rhetoric from the first half of the letter in 1999, hitherto no-one has taken up the mantle to explore the document in the requisite level of detail.⁶ As a result, it is not well known. It is usually missing from the relevant sections of the standard general histories of the crusades, histories that tend to treat more liberally the most famous encyclicals *Quantum praedecessores* (1145/46), *Audita tremendi* (1187/88), *Post miserabile* (1198) and *Quia maior* (1213), and even more specialised works usually mention it only in passing, if at all.⁷ Yet *Iustus Dominus* was the

duplication of the text of the letter in the footnotes, only very short and specific quotations are given therein; readers are directed to the Appendix, where the internal diplomatic sections of the letter are marked in bold, italic type in order to facilitate ease of comparison with the main body of the article.

⁵ Die Briefsammlung des Thomas von Capua. Aus den nachgelassenen Unterlagen von Emmy Heller und Hans Martin Schaller, ed. Matthias THUMSER and Jakob FROHMANN (2011) no. III 5, pp. 98–100. On the purpose of the *Briefsammlung*, p. 4: 'die Schreiben [wurden] als Briefformulare und stilistische Vorbilder verstanden'.

⁶ Ursula SCHWERIN, Die Aufrufe der Päpste zur Befreiung des Heiligen Landes von den Anfängen bis zum Ausgang Innozenz IV. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der kurialen Kreuzzugspropaganda und der päpstlichen Epistolographie (1937) pp. 31–32, 108–109; Laurie SHEPHARD, Courting Power. Persuasion and Politics in the Early Thirteenth Century (1999) pp. 96–99. See also now SMITH, Curia and Crusade (see n. xy) pp. 181–184, 187, 241–242.

⁷ SKIBA, Honorius III. (see n. xy) p. 329; Christopher TYERMAN, How to Plan a Crusade. Reason and Religious War in the High Middle Ages (2015); Jonathan RILEY-SMITH, The Crusades. A History, 3rd edn (2014) p. 206; Crusade and Christendom. Annotated Documents in Translation from Innocent III to the Fall of Acre, 1187–1291, ed. Jessalynn BIRD, Edward PETERS and James M. POWELL (2013); CLAVERIE, Honorius III et l'Orient (see n. xy) p. 108; Marcello PACIFICO, Federico II e Gerusalemme al tempo delle crociate. Relazioni tra cristianità e islam nello spazio euro-mediterraneo medievale, 1215–1250 (2012) p. 137; Olaf B. RADER, Friedrich II., der Sizilianer auf dem Kaiserthron. Eine Biographie (2010) p. 381; Thomas ASBRIDGE, The Crusades. The War for the Holy Land (2010) pp. 564–565; Jonathan PHILLIPS, Holy Warriors. A Modern History of the Crusades (2009) pp. 228–229; Norman HOUSLEY, Fighting for the Cross. Crusading to the Holy Land (2008) pp. 16–17; Christopher TYERMAN, God's War. A New History of the Crusades (2006) pp. 736, 741, 743; Bodo HECHELHAMMER, Kreuzzug und Herrschaft unter Friedrich II. Handlungsspielräume von Kreuzzugspolitik (1215–1230) (2004) p. 143; Jonathan RILEY-SMITH, What were the Crusades?, 3rd edn (2002) pp. 29–31; Wolfgang STÜRNER, Friedrich II., 1194–1250, 2 vols. (1992–2000, repr. in one vol., 2009) 2 p. 93;

next great encyclical in this series of calls to recover the Holy Land and the most important and widely distributed such appeal since *Quia maior*.⁸ Not only does its status as a key document in the history of papal calls to crusade in the East demand detailed analysis, but *Iustus Dominus* also reveals the innovative approach that Honorius employed in constructing his encyclical, hitherto unappreciated. Rather than preparing a uniform text for distribution, the surviving diplomatic evidence demonstrates that Honorius approached the composition of his encyclical in a much more dynamic way, creating two main branches of the text, one addressed to the kings of Europe and the other to the faithful, which deployed quite different rhetoric.⁹ He then modified individual copies of the letter, tailoring them to the most promising recruits, King Andrew II of Hungary and King Henry III of England, with personal information in the hope of increasing the persuasive power of the document.¹⁰ Honorius's efforts cast the Crusade of Frederick II (1228–29) in a new light: it was not intended to be a personal, imperial expedition, as some scholars, reading backwards from later evidence, have claimed (and its modern name and place in the numbering of the expeditions to the East suggest).¹¹ The broader importance of *Iustus Dominus* is twofold. First, it brings into question the interpretation of the crusading movement that:

Jean RICHARD, *The Crusades, c.1071–c.1291*, trans. Jean BIRRELL (1999) pp. 307–308, 313; Christopher TYERMAN, *The Invention of the Crusades* (1998); Penny J. COLE, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270* (1991) pp. 146–147; D. A. CARPENTER, *The Minority of Henry III* (1990) pp. 301–306; MAYER, *The Crusades* (see n. xy) p. 232 and in the latest German edition, *Die Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (see n. xy) p. 272; David ABULAFIA, *Frederick II. A Medieval Emperor* (1988) p. 149; VAN CLEVE, *Emperor Frederick II*; Thomas C. VAN CLEVE, *The Crusade of Frederick II*, in: *A History of the Crusades*, ed. Kenneth SETTON, 6 vols., 2nd edn (1969–89) 2 pp. 429–462, here p. 438; René GROUSSET, *Histoire des croisades et du royaume franc de Jérusalem*, 3 vols. (1934–36; new edn 2006) 3 pp. 293–295.

⁸ SCHWERIN, *Die Aufrufe* (see n. xy) p. 31.

⁹ SCHWERIN, *Die Aufrufe* (see n. xy) p. 32.

¹⁰ SCHWERIN, *Die Aufrufe* (see n. xy) p. 31.

¹¹ Tyerman writes, for instance, that 'Recruitment hardly seemed designed to produce a mass response': TYERMAN, *God's War* (see n. xy) p. 745. The crusade is presented primarily as a personal, imperial expedition in RILEY-SMITH, *The Crusades* (see n. xy) pp. 205–207; ASBRIDGE, *The Crusades* (see n. xy) p. 566; STÜRNER, *Friedrich II.* (see n. xy) 2, p. 131; RICHARD, *The Crusades* (see n. xy) p. 313; MAYER, *The Crusades* (see n. xy) p. 233 and in the latest German edition, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (see n. xy) p. 273; ABULAFIA, *Frederick II* (see n. xy) p. 151; VAN CLEVE, *The Crusade of Frederick II* (see n. xy) pp. 430, 439, 461, 462.

‘By the early thirteenth century the idea of a mass crusade, swept forward on a surge of popular enthusiasm, was giving ground to a different, more sober view: a carefully planned expedition, with chosen targets, appointed leaders and close liaison between papal curia and crusading army was what was needed ... Frederick II’s crusade, backed by the material resources of southern Italy, was to be this sort of war; and, rather than random recruits, organized companies were needed, as well as funds, drawn from Frederick’s dominions’.¹²

To the contrary, the evidence presented in this article demonstrates that the new crusade was clearly envisaged and promoted as a traditional *passagium generale* and that recruits were sought—and secured—on a pan-European basis. Second, it demonstrates that there were multiple different authentic versions of the text circulating simultaneously in different regions of the West. This shifts our perspective on crusade calls and the unity of message being preached by the clergy, forcing us to reconsider the common assumption that each issue of a crusade encyclical was static and homogenised in the form of a single text. *Iustus Dominus*, therefore, is of great import to our understanding of the crusading movement in the early thirteenth century.

Some crusade calls were crafted with the luxury of time for reflection, such as Innocent III’s *Quia maior* of 1213, which was the product of a long period of drafting and redrafting. Comparison of the text of *Quia maior* with its unreleased draft version *Quoniam maior* demonstrates just how carefully the pope and his advisors reworked the document as they sought to maximise the appeal of their message and deploy rhetoric, biblical imagery, and metaphors that would trigger a positive crusading response in its audience.¹³ Other encyclicals, however, such as *Iustus Dominus*, had a more hurried gestation. In contrast to Innocent, Honorius had to draft and issue his encyclical as part of a rapid response to contemporary political developments. In 1221, the war that Innocent’s *Quia maior* had unleashed, the Fifth Crusade (1217–21), came to an ignominious end in the muddy flood waters of the Nile.¹⁴ In response to this defeat, Honorius and the *crucesignatus* Emperor

¹² ABULAFIA, Frederick II (see n. xy) p. 151.

¹³ On *Quia maior*, see now Thomas W. SMITH, How to Craft a Crusade Call. Pope Innocent III and *Quia maior* (1213), in: Historical Research (forthcoming).

¹⁴ On the Fifth Crusade, see: James M. POWELL, *Anatomy of a Crusade, 1213–1221* (1986); *The Fifth Crusade in Context. The Crusading Movement in the Early Thirteenth Century*, ed. E. J. MYLOD, Guy PERRY, Thomas

Frederick II ramped up their efforts to recover the Holy Land and avenge the failed expedition. The pope hoped finally to persuade Frederick to fulfil his crusade vow after a long-running, and, at times, frustrating diplomatic correspondence that had carried on since the turn of 1218/19.¹⁵ The first colloquium that they organised after the failure of the Fifth Crusade, held at Veroli in April 1222, was preliminary in nature and no major decisions were reached, but it appears that this meeting laid the foundations for a more significant second conference.¹⁶ This second assembly, convened at Ferentino in March 1223, made notable progress. The emperor agreed to marry Isabella, the daughter of the king of Jerusalem, John of Brienne, and bound himself to the fixed deadline of the Feast of John the Baptist (24 June 1225) for his delayed crusade.¹⁷ It is apparent that Frederick desired support from other Western rulers for his expedition and that the papal recruitment documents issued after Ferentino reflected the emperor's wishes.¹⁸ As Rudolf Hiestand observes, Frederick attempted to involve the kings of England, Hungary and Denmark in the new expedition.¹⁹ For his part, Honorius promoted the crusade as a traditional *passagium generale* in his letters.²⁰ It is clear, then, that in 1223 the new crusade was conceived as a pan-European

W. SMITH and Jan VANDEBURIE (2017); Guy PERRY, John of Brienne. King of Jerusalem, Emperor of Constantinople, c. 1175–1237 (2013) pp. 89–121. For the papal administration of the expedition, see SMITH, Curia and Crusade (see n. xy) pp. 103–171.

¹⁵ See SMITH, Curia and Crusade (see n. xy) pp. 127–129.

¹⁶ SMITH, Curia and Crusade (see n. xy) p. 176.

¹⁷ SMITH, Curia and Crusade (see n. xy) p. 178; Thomas W. SMITH, Between Two Kings. Pope Honorius III and the Seizure of the Kingdom of Jerusalem by Frederick II in 1225, in: Journal of Medieval History 41 (2015) pp. 41–59, here pp. 43–46.

¹⁸ SMITH, Curia and Crusade (see n. xy) pp. 180–186.

¹⁹ Rudolf HIESTAND, Friedrich II. und der Kreuzzug, in: Friedrich II. Tagung des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom in Gedenkjahr 1994, ed. Arnold ESCH and Norbert KAMP (1996) pp. 128–149, here p. 135. See also HECHELHAMMER, Kreuzzug und Herrschaft (see n. xy) pp. 146–147.

²⁰ See, for example, Honorius's letter to the clergy of the West issued on 11 January 1227. Reg. Vat. 13, fol. 159r: 'Sperantes quod Deus exurgens iudicare disposuit causam suam et Ierusalem sicut diebus pristinis instaurare, mandatum quod de predicanda cruce dudum a sede apostolica recepisti, duximus innovandum fraternitatem tuam sollicitantes et hortantes attente ac per apostolica tibi scripta mandantes quatinus iniuncte tibi predicationis officium exerceas studiose, magnos et parvos secundum datam tibi a Deo prudentiam sedulis exortationibus inducendo, ut in instanti Augusto quo *generale passagium* [my italics] est indictum impendant suum dicte Terre Sancte subsidium modis omnibus quibus possunt.'; Regesta, ed. PRESSUTTI (see n. xy) 2 nos 6155, 6157.

expedition in which Frederick would play the leading part, and not an imperial one-man army.²¹ The launch of such a mass movement demanded an encyclical letter sent throughout the West, and Honorius and his curia hastily composed *Iustus Dominus* and began to issue the document to its first recipients on 11 April (the last known copies were issued on 27 April). The promotion of a campaign led by Frederick, however, was a tall order. The emperor had repeatedly reneged on his previous promises to fulfil his crusade vow, and many of Christendom's most enthusiastic warrior-pilgrims had either been bankrupted by, or killed on, the recent Egyptian expedition. As Björn Weiler argues, there can be no doubt that this dampened enthusiasm for a new attempt to recover the Holy Land and it seems reasonable to suggest that crusading fervour in the West in 1223 was at a low ebb.²² Honorius and his curia therefore had their work cut out if they were to reignite it, the first stage in which was the creation of a crusade appeal with real persuasive power.²³

Crusade calls such as *Iustus Dominus* are long, complex documents with many layers of meaning encoded into their texts. They were designed to elicit a positive and active response, that is, the act of taking the cross, from their audiences and they needed to appeal to different social groups and work on different rhetorical levels (inspiring, shaming, motivating) simultaneously. Crusade encyclicals therefore adopt a more flexible approach to the standard chancery diplomatic rules and do not conform exactly to the strict division of internal sections that governed most other papal letters, in which the main body of the text was usually structured around a tripartite division consisting of the *arenga* (theological preamble), *narratio* (narration of events leading to the issue of the letter), and *dispositio*

²¹ The evidence from *Iustus Dominus* nuances the classic argument that 'Partly of his own choice, and partly as a result of pressure from the curia, Frederick had to push forward by himself his preparations for a crusade.': VAN CLEVE, *The Crusade of Frederick II* (see n. xy) p. 439. See also the works cited above in n. xy.

²² Björn WEILER, *Henry III's Plans for a German Marriage (1225) and their Context*, in: *Thirteenth Century England VII. Proceedings of the Durham Conference, 1997*, ed. Michael PRESTWICH, Richard BRITNELL and Robin FRAME (1999) pp. 173–188, here p. 184.

²³ The pope would have played a key role in the composition process, but this was collegial drafting in his name, and he drew upon the advice of cardinals, chancery staff and other advisers. See Patrick ZUTSHI, *The Personal Role of the Pope in the Production of Papal Letters in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*, in: *Vom Nutzen des Schreibens. Soziales Gedächtnis, Herrschaft und Besitz im Mittelalter*, ed. Walter POHL and Paul HEROLD (2002) pp. 225–236.

(papal decision or orders).²⁴ These internal divisions in crusade calls are instead much more fluid, since the documents were designed foremost with oral delivery and aural reception in mind. Therefore it was necessary for curialists to bend chancery norms in order to present the audience with a clear and arresting message that would be understood and appreciated by as many listeners as possible, most of whom would not have been drilled in the technicalities of papal diplomatic.²⁵

Like other crusade encyclicals, *Iustus Dominus* opens with an *arenga* rich in biblical imagery.²⁶ The *arenga* was the opening preamble to the letter that functioned essentially as a miniature sermon, placing contemporary events—in this case, the failure of the Fifth Crusade—in an explanatory theological framework.²⁷ But while the *arengae* of most quotidian papal letters contained purely theological content, that of *Iustus Dominus*, like other crusade appeals, mixes in narrative information about contemporary events which strictly should first appear in the following section of the letter, the *narratio*.²⁸ The *arenga* of our document begins that the Lord is just in all His ways (Ps. 144.17) and that He renders worthy recompense to His people according to their merits.²⁹ He keeps hope of the recovery of the Holy Land alive with good fortune at some times as a reward, and cripples it with misfortune at others as a punishment. Good fortune smiled on the Fifth Crusaders after their

²⁴ Thomas FRENZ, *Papsturkunden des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, 2nd edn (2000) p. 12.

²⁵ Paul B. PIXTON, *Die Anwerbung des Heeres Christi. Prediger des Fünften Kreuzzuges in Deutschland*, in: *DA* 34 (1978) pp. 166–191, here p. 176; Christoph T. MAIER, *Preaching the Crusades. Mendicant Friars and the Cross in the Thirteenth Century* (1994) pp. 35, 117; SMITH, *Curia and Crusade* (see n. xy) pp. 217–218, 242.

²⁶ See also SMITH, *Curia and Crusade* (see n. xy) pp. 241–242 and 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. Jessalynn BIRD (2018) pp. 63–78.

²⁷ On *arengae*, see SMITH, *Curia and Crusade* (see n. xy) pp. 213–260; Thomas W. SMITH, *The Use of the Bible in the Arengae of Pope Gregory IX's Crusade Calls*, in: *The Uses of the Bible in Crusader Sources*, ed. Elizabeth LAPINA and Nicholas MORTON (2017) pp. 206–235; SMITH, *Preambles to Crusading* (see n. xy).

²⁸ SMITH, *Curia and Crusade* (see n. xy) p. 242.

²⁹ Most of the *arenga* is translated in SMITH, *Curia and Crusade* (see n. xy) p. 241. This translation, which I draw on here, was made with the invaluable assistance of Susan Edgington, Martin Hall, Simon Parsons, and the other members of Dr Edgington's famous 'Latin Therapy' sessions in London. The fluid approach to the rules of papal diplomatic and the mixing of theological and narrative in crusade encyclicals make it more difficult to separate the clauses, and, following further research, I now demarcate the end of the *arenga* of *Iustus Dominus* with the word *elatos*, not with *sperabatur* — see Appendix.

miraculous success in capturing Damietta, which God granted to the weak in order to bewilder the strong (1. Cor. 1.27). All of Christendom had reason to hope that this would lead to further successes on the crusade, but, after their triumph, the crusaders forgot the name of the Lord (Gen. 40.23) and committed sins where their great remission had been hoped for. Thus provoked, the Lord changed grace into anger, and joy into sorrow, and the Christians lost Damietta, their long labours reduced to nothing in a few short days because they showed contempt for Christ. Here Honorius tied the success of the crusade directly to the moral state of Christendom, a basic theological idea—that God would justly punish the sins of crusaders and Christians on the home front with defeat in their military endeavours in the East—that had been present in ecclesiastical thought about the crusading movement since the very beginning, but which the papacy expressed even more forcefully after the loss of Jerusalem in 1187.³⁰ But the situation was not irreversible: Honorius used theological argumentation to strike a note of hope. Although this offence to God had distanced the Lord from His people, it had not cut them off entirely; it was still possible to find salvation. The mixing of narrative information in the *arenga* was a necessity in a crusade call. The audience listening to the document being read aloud—essentially being preached—had to know from the beginning that the letter concerned the failure of the Fifth Crusade.³¹ It would have been counterproductive to present listeners with dense theological information without the factual information—the reasons that God did not allow the Fifth Crusade to succeed— necessary in which to anchor the biblical imagery and theological concepts. Essentially, it provided the essential context. Honorius’s explanation of the theological foundations for the new expedition was crucial to its successful recruitment. He had to explain to the faithful why the moral state of the crusaders and the rest of the West had not been propitious at that time and to give them hope that the situation had now changed and that this was perfect moment for them to make amends with God and prove their devotion through a new attempt to recover the Holy Land. As Honorius emphasised, the Fifth Crusade came within a hair’s breadth of

³⁰ Christoph T. MAIER, Crisis, Liturgy and the Crusade in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, in: *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 48 (1997) pp. 628–657, here pp. 630–632; 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: *Studies in Church History* 36 (2000) pp. 154–180, here p. 156.

³¹ On the use of papal encyclicals as the basis for preaching campaigns and the reading aloud verbatim of the documents as part of those campaigns, see: PIXTON, *Die Anwerbung des Heeres Christi* (see n. xy) p. 176; MAIER, *Preaching the Crusades* (see n. xy) pp. 35, 117; *Crusade and Christendom*, ed. BIRD et al. (see n. xy) p. 277; Michael LOWER, *The Barons’ Crusade. A Call to Arms and its Consequences* (2005) p. 3.

ultimate victory; it was only defeated because of the sins of its pilgrims — a factor determined entirely on earth by the participants, but punished by God.

After chastising the devotion of the crusaders, the document continues on with the *narratio* section, which usually recounted the events leading to the issue of the letter. Here, however, this narrative information is spliced with extensive rhetorical sections, once again subverting the norms of chancery diplomatic practices in order to meet the needs of aural reception, and making it more difficult to distinguish between the *arenga* and *narratio* sections. The first part of the *narratio* carries on with the logical extension of the core message of the *arenga*, stating, essentially, that the impending crusade of Frederick II offered a renewed chance to find salvation. It relates in detail the events of the papal-imperial colloquium held at Ferentino in March, at which were present the patriarch of Jerusalem, John of Brienne, king of Jerusalem, the bishop of Bethlehem, the masters of the Hospitallers, Templars and Teutonic Knights, and others from all parts of the world invited to plan the expedition. At this assembly, Frederick agreed to depart on crusade at the Feast of John the Baptist in two years' time, that is, 24 June 1225. Apparently at the instigation of the patriarch of Jerusalem and the other delegates from the East, it was agreed that Frederick would marry John of Brienne's daughter, Isabella. The provision of this information to the princes and people of Christendom was central to the recruitment effort, given that Frederick's long history of crusade delays threatened to undermine support for this renewed effort. Honorius proffered the agreement reached at Ferentino to reassure potential crusaders that Frederick's marriage pact made the fulfilment of his crusade vow much more likely.

It is at this point, mid-way through the *narratio*, that the letter branches off into its two distinct versions, one for the kings and the other for the people of Christendom. These two branches also splinter here into their own variant texts personalised to particular recipients. First we will examine the branch of the letter addressed to the kings of the West. The main text of the encyclical preserved in the register was addressed to the elderly king of France, and former Third Crusader, Philip II Augustus. Underneath Philip's version of the letter, in the space used to record identical or similar *in eundem modum* copies of papal documents, the register preserves the variant texts sent to the kings of Hungary and England (and also the other branch of the text, addressed to the faithful, which we will explore below). Honorius wrote to the kings that it was not too late for them to take action and he sought to inspire them with rhetorical overtures. Oh, how greatly would the recovery of the Holy Land be aided, Honorius cried, if the addressees, moved by the same devotion that had inspired

their fathers, might rush to its aid at this crucial moment! Oh, how magnificent it would be, if pious Gaul would prepare itself to help! God forbid that the kings of the West might become accustomed to ignore the plight of the Holy Land! God forbid that the *gens Christiana* withdraw itself from its service to Christ! God forbid that, those who thus far have endured many burdens for the Lord, might untie their sword belts from military service on behalf of the son of God and engage in private warfare, leaving their arms to rust and denying their souls victory, when crusaders will enjoy grace and merit in the present, and glory and reward in the future. This rhetoric was crafted to engage, and shame, Philip and the other kings who received this version of the appeal. In content, this appeal was very traditional. It played upon the recipients' sense of duty and awareness of the *gesta* of their ancestors, and invited them to reflect upon their own achievements and legacy. Recruitment for the crusading movement had long relied upon the unfavourable comparison of the deeds of the 'sons' with those of their 'fathers'. It had been the central theme in the call for the Second Crusade, *Quantum praedecessores* (which, as we will see below, provided inspiration for many of the rhetorical motifs of *Iustus Dominus*), and was an idea that had permeated the papacy's organisation of the crusading movement.³² After the First Crusade 'there existed among certain noble families', Nicholas Paul writes, 'a strong sense of obligation to revere and imitate the deeds of crusading ancestors'.³³ Naturally enough, the papacy attempted to tap into this desire as a source of crusading fervour in the promotion of new campaigns. The critique of private warfare, of warriors turning their aggression inwards towards fellow Christians when they should have been directing it outwards against the *hostes fidei*, also struck a deeply traditional tone. The castigation of private warfare, along with the appeal to the deeds of ancestors, had long been entwined with the crusading movement. The ideas both appear in Robert the Monk's wildly popular account of the events at the Council of Clermont, written soon after

³² Rolf GROSSE, Überlegungen zum Kreuzzugsaufruf Eugens III. von 1145/46. Mit einer Neuedition von JL 8876, in: Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte 18 (1991) pp. 85–92; Jonathan PHILLIPS, The Second Crusade. Extending the Frontiers of Christianity (2007) pp. 52, 54, 55. Paul writes that 'Papal letters issued from the time of the Second Crusade (1147–49) until the pontificate of Pope Innocent III (1198–1216) enjoined the nobility to recall the efforts of their forefathers': Nicholas L. PAUL, To Follow in their Footsteps. The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages (2012) p. 2, see also p. 48. It is now possible to extend this statement at least to the pontificate of Honorius III; indeed it is probable that an examination of later crusade calls would yield further examples.

³³ PAUL, To Follow in their Footsteps (see n. xy) p. 2.

the First Crusade, for instance.³⁴ In this latter section of the *narratio* of *Iustus Dominus*, then, Honorius was making a clear attempt to provoke a period of self-reflection among the royal courts of the West. What would be their deeds? How would their descendants—and the writers and tellers of history—remember them as kings? In his pioneering study of family memory and the crusades, Paul argues:

‘That the enthusiasm demonstrated by many nobles for crusading could to some degree be explained by medieval conceptions of noble lineage is, for crusade historians, a safe conclusion based on decades of prosopographical identification of crusade participants and important discoveries in the language of ancestral obligations emanating from the papal chancery.’³⁵

For royal dynasties obsessed with their ancestors and their deeds, then, there can be no doubt that this was a potent, if traditional, trigger.³⁶

Thus primed, the *dispositio* clause of the document—which contained the pope’s entreaty, decision, or order—moved from the suggestive rhetorical imagery of the *narratio* to a concrete request. The pope called upon the recipients, the most serene kings and the most Christian princes, beseeching them through the father, the son and the holy ghost, through the blood of Jesus Christ, that they might rise up in aid of Christ—He who delivered Himself over to a mortal death—and take the cross, so that He might rescue them from the jaws of everlasting death. As Honorius and his staff were fond to do, the pontiff made use of anaphora (that is the repetition of a word multiple times for rhetorical effect), in this case the

³⁴ The *Historia Iherosolimitana* of Robert the Monk, ed. D. KEMPF and M. G. BULL (2013) p. 6: ‘Moveant vos et incitent animos vestros ad virili tatem gesta predecessorum vestrorum, probitas et magnitudo Karoli Magni regis et Ludovici filii eius aliorumque regum vestrorum, qui regna paganorum destruxerunt, et in eis fines sancte ecclesie dilataverunt ... Inde est quod vos in invicem mordetis et contenditis, bella movetis et plerumque mutuis vulneribus occiditis. Cessent igitur inter vos odia, conticescant iurgia, bella quiescant et totius controversie dissensiones sopiantur.’

³⁵ PAUL, *To Follow in their Footsteps* (see n. xy) pp. 6–7.

³⁶ As Phillips writes, the deeds of crusading ancestors were ‘a source of real pride and lay at the heart of the consciousness of western European nobility’: PHILLIPS, *Second Crusade* (see n. xy) p. 52.

word ‘rise’ (*exurgat*), in order to build the rhetoric of his crusade call towards a crescendo.³⁷ He called upon the kings of Christendom to rise up and free that land in which the Saviour personally laboured for the salvation of the human race; to rise up in contrition for the crooked and evil people who blame and insult the Christian name with many taunts. Honorius also attempted to preempt and counteract any indifference to this religious rhetoric by switching to a feudal metaphor aimed at the kings and their nobles. Just as they punished offences inflicted on them by their enemies in the West, would they not avenge the injuries and atrocities done to their God in the East? They would never allow the hand of the invaders to stretch out to their temporal inheritance, so why do they suffer the detainers of the inheritance of the Lord for so long?³⁸ The pope implored the monarchs, therefore, not to ignore the insults done to the Lord, insults which rightly they would never tolerate in men. Here Honorius was playing with the idea of God as a temporal lord in his efforts to shift the perspectives of his audience — a motif present in another of his letters to Philip from 18 April 1223 and which he was extremely adept in using.³⁹ The kings and their nobles would never ignore insults and attacks on their temporal lords, so why do they permit them on their spiritual Lord? The pope wrote that these indignities pricked the heart of their Creator, and hoped that the zeal of Christian faith might inflame them, so that, with strong hand and extended arm, they might come to the rescue of the Holy Land. If they did so, then the papacy and the faithful of Christendom would be able to glory in praising the kings, who would gather to themselves the accumulation of merit not only from their own deeds, but also even from those inspired to follow their example. Here Philip’s version of the text ended. The rhetorical pull of the *dispositio* section explains why Honorius composed a separate text for the kings of Europe. The pope recognised, as many popes before him had, that the enlistment of kings would have a transformative effect on crusade recruitment. Kings were lynchpins who had the potential to act as motivators and leaders who could inspire others to take the cross. Through the power of their political and familial connections, they could also draw in large bands of kin and followers beholden to the monarch who might otherwise not have joined the crusade — a political reality expressed cleverly in the rhetoric of the letter about temporal lords and their vassals. This explains why Honorius pursued an innovative two-

³⁷ SHEPARD, *Courting Power* (see n. xy) p. 97.

³⁸ SCHWERIN, *Die Aufrufe* (see n. xy) p. 32.

³⁹ SCHWERIN, *Die Aufrufe* (see n. xy) p. 64; SMITH, *Preambles to Crusading* (see n. xy) pp. 75–76; SMITH, *Curia and Crusade* (see n. xy) pp. 234, 237.

pronged approach to the composition of his crusade call. Where his predecessors had relied on a traditional ‘one size fits all’ approach that lumped different audiences in together, Honorius crafted two different letters with different rhetorical cores so as to better target the different social strata and their triggers and thus maximise the persuasive power of his appeal.

Honorius went even further in targeting the persuasive power of *Iustus Dominus* at the kings of Europe by customising the content of the *dispositio* clause of the documents for particular rulers. The first variant text that the register records (preserved below the copy addressed to Philip II) is that modified to appeal to the veteran of the Fifth Crusade, Andrew II of Hungary. The register records that Andrew’s version of the letter was identical up to the end of the *narratio* clause. Honorius and his advisers made a number of revisions to the *dispositio*, swapping the reference to Gaul for one relevant to Hungary rushing to the aid of the Holy Land, and also adding a snippet of new text about the threat posed by the ‘terrible enemies of the Cross’.⁴⁰ The pope also removed a section of rhetoric that took aim at Philip and other kings for turning their backs to the Holy Land.⁴¹ Given his recent service on the Fifth Crusade, this did not apply to Andrew. The pope replaced this criticism with a simpler, more general construction that fitted better Andrew’s status as a crusade veteran and simply warned against Christians descending into private warfare among themselves.⁴² I have argued elsewhere that Andrew’s crusade should be re-evaluated in a more favourable light, and this softening of the text in his copy of *Iustus Dominus* supports the interpretation that the papacy was not as disappointed with the king’s expedition as later chroniclers and scholars were.⁴³ If Honorius had viewed Andrew’s withdrawal from the Fifth Crusade in such a negative light, one would have expected personal and much fiercer criticism in his tailoring of these passages. Finally, Honorius also addressed Andrew differently, removing the flattering references to Philip as ‘the most serene of kings’ (‘serenissime Regum’) and ‘the most Christian of princes’ (‘Christianissime principum’), which perhaps reflects a difference in status between the two kings, although these diplomatic niceties also appear in the copy sent

⁴⁰ Reg. Vat. 12, fol. 53v: ‘O quantum *usque* ad succursum Ungaria inimicis crucis terribilis se pararet, *usque* misso.’

⁴¹ Reg. Vat. 12, fol. 53r: ‘Absit ut post terga remaneat que precedere consuevit. Absit ut tam salutari Christi servitio gens tam Christiana se subtrahat. Absit ut que pro Domino hactenus onera multa sustinuit, in peculiari bello Dei filii solvat’.

⁴² Reg. Vat. 12, fol. 53v: ‘Absit ut in peculiari bello Dei filii gens tibi subiecta solvat.’

⁴³ SMITH, *Curia and Crusade* (see n. xy) pp. 103–125.

to the boy king, Erik XI of Sweden (which survives only in an edition made by Johannes Vastovius in 1623, before a fire in 1697 gutted the Swedish royal archive — see below), so it is possible that the omission was an oversight rather than a deliberate slight.⁴⁴

The chancery scribe who made the register copies of these texts also recorded the altered version despatched to King Henry III of England. In appealing to Henry, Honorius and his staff had a special pressure point on which they could lean: Henry's impressive familial ties to the crusading movement. Among his ancestors, Henry could count a king of Jerusalem, Fulk of Anjou, as his great-great-grandfather. By virtue of Fulk and his descendants, who held the throne of Jerusalem from 1131 until 1186, Henry possessed a strong personal connection to the kingdom of Jerusalem.⁴⁵ Henry was also related to Robert Curthose, who was widely celebrated in the Anglo-Norman world as one of the foremost heroes of the First Crusade.⁴⁶ The most direct tie to the crusading movement, however, was embodied in Henry's uncle and predecessor as king of England, the famous crusader, Richard the Lionheart. Richard presented a more recent example for Henry to imitate and his legend was very much alive in the early 1220s: the compiler of the so-called 'IP2' version of the narrative of Richard's crusade, the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, for example, produced his text around the time of the Fifth Crusade, and even in the 1250s Richard's martial deeds were still being feted through Henry's patronage of artistic works (see below).⁴⁷ 'Such ties', Nicholas Vincent writes, 'were not unimportant, and would quite naturally be stressed by correspondents ... anxious to recruit Henry's support.'⁴⁸

Henry's copy of *Iustus Dominus* matched that of Philip's text from its opening words until the end of the *narratio* section.⁴⁹ From this point on, however, Henry's copy of the letter diverged into unique rhetoric that was extremely personal and specific. Honorius tackled

⁴⁴ Reg. Vat. 12, fol. 53r. The copy sent to Erik IX is printed in Vitis Aquilonia, ed. Johannes VASTOVIUS (1623) pp. 173–174. For the flattering wording addressed to Erik XI, see p.173.

⁴⁵ Nicholas VINCENT, *The Holy Blood. King Henry III and the Westminster Blood Relic* (2001) p. 22.

⁴⁶ Simon LLOYD, *King Henry III, the Crusade and the Mediterranean*, in: *England and her Neighbours, 1066–1453*, ed. Michael JONES and Malcolm VALE (1989) pp. 97–119, here pp. 101–102; PAUL, *To Follow in their Footsteps* (see n. xy) pp. 9, 233 n. 90.

⁴⁷ *Chronicle of the Third Crusade. A Translation of the Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, trans. Helen J. NICHOLSON (1997) pp. 10–11.

⁴⁸ VINCENT, *The Holy Blood* (see n. xy) p. 22.

⁴⁹ Reg. Vat. 12, fol. 53v: '*Iustus Dominus et cetera usque desiderat Terra Sancta*'.

Henry's ancestry head-on, writing that Richard's name still struck terror in the hearts of the enemies of the faith: even the mere cry of his name in the heat of battle was enough to cause havoc in the enemy lines. Honorius suggested that the enemies of God might still be afraid if the 'right hand of the uncle might rise again in the nephew'.⁵⁰ He then attempted to land the knock-out blow, continuing that Henry had succeeded to the throne as a crusader and it was fitting that he might fulfil his vow, because if, as legitimate heir of King John—who had taken his own crusade vow but never departed—Henry might leave on crusade, it would be enough to satisfy the creditor (that is, God) and pay the debts of his father, who died with his vow unfulfilled.⁵¹ At this point, Henry's copy of the letter transitioned smoothly back into the main text. Just as in his appeals to the other kings, Honorius's aim was to inspire Henry, but also, according to the tradition of papal crusade encyclicals, to tread the fine line between inspiring him and shaming him enough, without alienating him, to provoke an active response.⁵² The memory of Richard was the perfect tool at the papacy's disposal to provide the inspiration. Although Honorius did not compare Henry's deeds with those of Richard's explicitly in this copy of *Iustus Dominus*, the modified text inevitably invited its recipients to draw such comparisons themselves. Was Henry the equal of the great crusader king? Honorius suggested that he could become a new Lionheart if he went on crusade. Or would he end up like his father, John, who died with the shame of an unfulfilled crusade vow? This was a repetition of the fathers and sons motif from the *narratio*. Henry, therefore, received a double dose of unfavourable comparison with his ancestors, both the general use of the theme in the second half of the *narratio*, and the precision-targeted needling of his personal shame in the *dispositio*. The effect of this rhetoric must have been compounded by the unsettled question of his father's unfulfilled vow — a duty, and embarrassment, that Henry inherited along with the crown.

It is extremely difficult to judge the persuasive power of crusade encyclicals, but in this case of Henry, there are valuable clues which suggest that Honorius struck the desired chord with the king of England. Although single sheet papal letters have suffered extremely

⁵⁰ Reg. Vat. 12, fol. 53v: 'Et forte non deest quid hostes adhuc in proximo sanguinis metuant dummodo resurgat patrum dextera in nepote.'

⁵¹ See SCHWERIN, Die Aufrufe (see n. xy) p. 32.

⁵² See, for example, the papacy treading a fine line between inspiring and shaming the people of Christendom in *Quia maior*: SMITH, How to Craft a Crusade Call (see n. xy).

high attrition rates—the overwhelming majority have long been lost, reused or destroyed—Henry’s government carefully preserved and archived the original, impressively large single-sheet parchment copy of *Iustus Dominus* sent to England, which is still extant today in the The National Archives at Kew.⁵³ Another crusade letter that Honorius sent throughout Europe concurrently with *Iustus Dominus*, requesting that secular rulers waive *pedagia*, or tax on travellers, for *crucesignati*, is also extant in The National Archives.⁵⁴ The survival rate for such single-sheet diplomatic documents is extremely low—Jane E. Sayers estimates as low as 5%—because they were not jealously guarded like their counterparts which granted privileges or protected rights and were seen as useless and ‘positively undesirable to retain’ after the dissolution of the monasteries in England between 1535 and 1540.⁵⁵ The dorse of both documents, however, bear the marks of the English royal government in archiving the letters. These endorsements describe the contents of both documents and record that *Iustus Dominus* was ‘registered in book nine’ (or ‘in the new book’ if one prefers the reading of Sayers) and that the letter about *pedagia* was ‘written in the book’.⁵⁶ That Henry III’s government carefully preserved the original copy of *Iustus Dominus* and the letter regarding *pedagia* for future reference, then, supplies a marker of the king’s interest in the crusade, and also of the pope’s success in tailoring the text of his encyclical to the most viable crusader king in Europe. Moreover, there is strong evidence that Henry was extremely receptive to the idea of replicating Richard I which Honorius expressed in *Iustus Dominus*. In the 1250s, the king ordered that the Antioch Chamber at Clarendon palace be decorated with wall paintings depicting the fictitious mounted duel between Richard and Saladin supposed to have taken place during the Third Crusade.⁵⁷ Indeed, this subject, John Cherry writes, ‘was a favourite theme of Henry III.’⁵⁸ Not only was it depicted in royal wall paintings, but also contemporary

⁵³ Kew, The National Archives, SC 7/18/14; Jane E. SAYERS, *Original Papal Documents in England and Wales from the Accession of Pope Innocent III to the Death of Pope Benedict XI (1198–1304)* (1999) no. 90 p. 46.

⁵⁴ Kew, The National Archives, SC 7/18/10; SAYERS, *Original Papal Documents* (see n. xy) no. 91 p. 47.

⁵⁵ SAYERS, *Original Papal Documents* (see n. xy) p. xxx.

⁵⁶ SC 7/18/14: ‘Registrata in nono libro’; cf. SAYERS, *Original Papal Documents* (see n. xy) no. 90 p. 46, who gives this endorsement as ‘Registrata in novo libro’; SC 7/18/10: ‘Scribitur in libro’; SAYERS, *Original Papal Documents* (see n. xy) no. 91 p. 47.

⁵⁷ LLOYD, *King Henry III, the Crusade and the Mediterranean* (see n. xy) p. 102; *Calendar of the Liberate Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office. Henry III*, 6 vols. (1916–64) 6 p. 362.

⁵⁸ John CHERRY, *Chertsey Tiles: Richard I and Saladin*, in: *Age of Chivalry. Art in Plantagenet England, 1200–1400*, ed. Jonathan ALEXANDER and Paul BINSKI (1987) no.16 p. 204.

tiles. The famous Chertsey tiles depicting the duel, found at the abbey of the same name in Surrey in the 1850s, were actually probably ‘designed for a royal palace, perhaps Westminster’ in the 1250s.⁵⁹ Indeed, excavations at Clarendon palace in 1936 discovered a set of tiles ‘almost certainly depicting the duel *in situ*’.⁶⁰ Of course, this later evidence does not prove that Henry was as besotted with the memory of Richard’s crusading deeds at the time of *Iustus Dominus* as he was a quarter of a century later. There is good reason to think that the royal commissions for these artistic creations were made in response to Henry taking his second crusade vow in 1250, and Christopher Tyerman claims that the ‘taste for crusading iconography was short-lived’.⁶¹ Taken with the careful archival preservation of the documents, however, it is extremely probable that Honorius’s selection of the Lionheart for his targeted rhetorical appeal hit the mark in 1223. Combined with the devotional pull of the theological and biblical imagery and Henry’s famous religiosity, it is hard to imagine a more powerful motivational document than Honorius’s effort to turn Henry’s attention to the East.

The decision of the pope to appeal to the kings of Hungary and England personally, and then to preserve the wording of these variants for future reference, must stem from the pope’s discussions with Frederick at Ferentino. The two kingdoms were probably identified during the colloquium as the most viable recruiting grounds outside of the Germany for the new crusade. This is confirmed by a letter that Frederick addressed to Honorius in March 1224 requesting that the pope send extra crusade preachers to Germany, Hungary, France, England and other parts of the world.⁶² As the Fifth Crusade had demonstrated, Hungary was a hotbed of crusading fervour and its monarch, Andrew II, was a veteran of that expedition who perhaps could be persuaded to return to the East for another tour of duty, having withdrawn from the last campaign after its opening forays. Honorius and Frederick

⁵⁹ CHERRY, Chertsey Tiles (see n. xy) p. 204; LLOYD, King Henry III, the Crusade and the Mediterranean (see n. xy) p. 102.

⁶⁰ LLOYD, King Henry III, the Crusade and the Mediterranean (see n. xy) p. 102.

⁶¹ Christopher TYERMAN, England and the Crusades, 1095–1588 (1988) p. 117.

⁶² Acta Imperii inedita seculi XIII. Urkunden und Briefe zur Geschichte des Kaiserreichs und des Königreichs Sicilien in den Jahren 1198 bis 1273, ed. Eduard WINKELMANN, 2 vols (1880–85) 1 no. 261 p. 239 ‘Erit itaque sanctitatis vestre per Alemanniam, Ungariam et regna finitima, necnon in Franciam, Angliam et ceteras partes orbis tam sufficientes et idoneas delegare personas et illa prestande remissionis et indulgentie auctoritate munitas, que ad crucis negotium promovendum audiri debeant et timeri.’; HECHELHAMMER, Kreuzzug und Herrschaft (see n. xy) p. 147.

apparently hoped to tap any remaining enthusiasm left in the Hungarian king. The extent of the personalisation of Andrew's copy of *Iustus Dominus*, however, is more limited than that addressed to Henry, who cut the figure of an even more viable crusader. Not only had he inherited the crusade vow of his father, King John, but he was also signed with the cross in 1216 in order to gain papal protection at a time of civil war when he was only nine years old and extremely vulnerable. Henry had enjoyed the special protection of the papacy and now the time had come to make good on his part of the bargain. Through his legates Guala and Pandulph, Honorius had played an instrumental role in shoring up the king's grip on the throne and bringing peace to England after the civil war.⁶³ Furthermore, while Philip II's copy of *Iustus Dominus* was dated 11 April, Honorius's personalised appeal to Henry was not issued until 27 April — a mere fortnight after Henry was declared to be 'of legal age' on 13 April.⁶⁴ Is it possible that the curia waited until Henry had entered into his majority before addressing the young king? Or is this just a coincidence? Viola Skiba argues that Honorius did not realistically believe that Henry III would personally depart on crusade because of his age.⁶⁵ But the tailoring of the letter argues against this, since it would have been a waste of time if that were the case, and it must be remembered that Frederick's crusade was planned for 1225, that is, two years after the issue of *Iustus Dominus* and only a few months before Henry's eighteenth birthday. For a multiplicity of reasons, therefore, conditions were ripe for an English royal crusade and Honorius probably thought that Henry represented the more viable of the two monarchs, which would explain why he and his staff put extra effort into the personalisation of Henry's copy of the letter.

But the kings of France, Hungary and England were not the only monarchs to receive *Iustus Dominus*. Nestled between the variant wordings addressed to Andrew and Henry, the papal register also preserves a note that states, somewhat opaquely, that *Iustus Dominus* was sent with similar alterations to 'other kings'.⁶⁶ This chancery note must refer to multiple other monarchs of Europe, ones not recorded by name, since the chancery scribe recorded that copies were sent 'aliis Regibus' in the plural form. Why, then, did the pope or his staff elect to record only the variant texts sent to three royal recipients, and who were the other kings? The placement of the *in eundem modum* note (unless it is the product of laziness or a mistake

⁶³ SMITH, *Curia and Crusade* (see n. xy) pp. 277–284.

⁶⁴ Simon LLOYD, *English Society and the Crusade, 1216–1307* (1988) p. 209.

⁶⁵ SKIBA, *Honorius III.* (see n. xy) p. 330.

⁶⁶ Reg. Vat. 12, fol. 53v: 'In eundem modum aliis Regibus quibusdam verbis mutandis competenter mutatis'.

on behalf of the scribe) could be significant. It appears *after* the full copy of the text sent to Philip Augustus and the lightly modified formulation of that letter sent to Andrew, but *before* the highly personalised text sent to Henry III of England. This suggests that, just like Andrew II, the ‘other kings’ perhaps also received lightly modified versions of the encyclical first addressed to the king of France, that is, essentially the same text as Philip’s, featuring similar minor alterations made perhaps to the same sections that the chancery refashioned in Andrew’s copy. We are fortunate that a copy of the letter addressed to the boy-king of Sweden, Erik XI, survives in an edition apparently made from the original single-sheet parchment letter issued in 1223, now lost. Judging from the evidence of Erik XI’s version, the only difference between his letter and that sent to the king of France was the exchange of ‘pious Gaul’ for ‘pious Sweden’ (*devota Suecia*) in the middle of the of the *narratio* section.⁶⁷ The extent of the modifications made to the other copies sent *aliis regibus* was probably of a similar extent, ranging somewhere between the one-word alteration in Erik’s copy and the more personalised modifications displayed by Andrew’s version. The extent of the tailoring was probably determined by the likelihood of each king departing on crusade. Although it is possible that the pope made more extensive revisions in the lost letters without preserving them in the register, the correlation between the personalised texts in the register and Frederick’s letter of March 1224 requesting extra crusade preachers in Germany, Hungary, France and England (see above), makes such an interpretation unlikely.

Yet kings alone did not a crusade make. In order to provide the backbone of crusader armies, the papacy had to reach out and appeal to a wider audience, the people of Christendom as a whole, which required a quite different rhetorical strategy. This is where the second branch of the text of *Iustus Dominus* comes in. We only have the texts of two copies of the encyclical sent to non-royal recipients, and one of these is preserved in the *in eundem modum* space following the variant wordings explored above. The register records the personalised copy that Honorius despatched to the faithful of Tarentaise, and a copy sent to the faithful of Flanders and Brabant—which is not noted in the register—survives in an edition made by Charles Louis Hugo in 1725.⁶⁸ The congruence between these two letter texts reveals that the non-royal recipients, that is, the people of the West, appear to have received a different letter from that despatched to the kings. Their texts of *Iustus Dominus*

⁶⁷ Vitis Aquilonia, ed. VASTOVIUS (see n. xy) p. 173.

⁶⁸ *Sacrae antiquitatis monumenta historica, dogmatica, diplomatica*, ed. Charles Louis HUGO, 2 vols. (1725–31) 1 no. 136 pp. 122–123.

follow the royal copies up to the middle of the *narratio*, with only very minor alterations to reflect that the pope was now addressing the people of Christendom rather than their rulers. Thence they fork off into completely different texts for the remainder of the letter. In the letters to the faithful, Honorius changed strategy and deployed the *tempus acceptabile* theme: a rhetorical device used by Bernard of Clairvaux and in subsequent papal appeals to persuade potential recruits that now was the ‘acceptable time’ to perform penance by joining the crusade, thus looping back to the main theme of the *arenga* that God was just and that a new expedition could succeed where the Fifth Crusade had failed.⁶⁹ This traditional theme ‘reaffirmed the relation between crusade and penance’, and as Ane Bysted points out, Honorius had already attributed the motif a prominent place in an important crusade letter from 1217.⁷⁰ Delivering the theme using the rhetorical technique of anaphora again, Honorius wrote in this second branch of the *Iustus Dominus* text that truly the time had come for confusion to be removed and for justice to be done in the Holy Land, where the sons of handmaidens are insulted and the land of the Lord is miserably occupied. The time had come for those who sell themselves to the devil through the fee of their sins to regain their liberty, and through the remedy of life-giving redemption, they might redeem their souls taken captive by devilish trickery. Honorius urged those who hitherto had slept to arise now and by works be stirred away from death, so that Christ might illuminate them. They might now rise up and hurry in the lustre of the brightness of arms to the Lord, equipped for the fight, assured of the crown of life. Thus the letter to the faithful shared some of the same general theological ideas and rhetorical motifs. Like the kings of Christendom, Honorius urged the faithful that now was the right time to rise up and rush to arms, and devoted attention to the insults done to Christ and the holy places. That Honorius deployed rhetoric from the Second Crusade in both versions of the letter supplies a thematic link between the two documents, but otherwise they are quite different. Here the pope focussed his appeal even more on Christ, the personal sins of the audience, and the redemption on offer to *crucesignati*.⁷¹ Although there is, of course, overlap between the two rhetorical triggers and the different audiences—one would expect kings to be moved by the injuries done to Christ and the redemption of sins, just as humble pilgrims also had crusading ancestors they wished to emulate—we can

⁶⁹ SCHWERIN, *Die Aufrufe* (see n. xy) p. 112. On the *tempus acceptabile* motif, see Ane L. BYSTED, *The Crusade Indulgence. Spiritual Rewards and the Theology of the Crusades, c.1095–1216* (2015) pp. 236–243.

⁷⁰ BYSTED, *Crusade Indulgence* (see n. xy) pp. 236, 241.

⁷¹ W. J. PURKIS, *Crusading Spirituality in the Holy Land and Iberia, c.1095–c.1187* (2008) pp. 30–47.

discern a clear change in emphasis between the audiences: the kings received letters geared to appeal to their martial urges, their political ties and responsibilities, and their awareness of the deeds of their ancestors; the people received letters focussed more on their sins and the possibility of redemption through Christ. Honorius and his staff obviously perceived the existence of these differences in their audiences and attempted to appeal to them by crafting two branches of the text through which they could better target potential *crucesignati* and achieve recruitment from as broad a section of society as possible.

Honorius then moved on to outline the practical aspects of his crusade call, namely the benefits that would accrue to those who took the cross. The pope simply copied the bulk of the provisions directly from the crusade canon ratified at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, *Ad liberandam*.⁷² These provisions set out that the persons and goods of crusaders would be placed under special papal protection, that all those who confessed their sins with a contrite heart would be awarded a full indulgence of remission of sins, that those who financed another to go on the journey in their place and that those who accepted this responsibility would also receive the same full indulgence. This essential practical information only appears in the letters to the faithful; strikingly it is absent in the version sent to the monarchs. This is a crucial point that has not been recognised before. It demonstrates that the ‘main’ text of *Iustus Dominus* which appears in the register addressed to the king of France is not the text that was sent throughout Christendom as an encyclical. The letters sent to the kings were not meant to be circulated and preached throughout the West — the lack of information about crusader privileges reveals that they were personal letters intended to be consumed at the royal courts and not designed for distribution. By presenting the letter to Philip Augustus as the base text of *Iustus Dominus*, and recording the other versions below it as *in eundem modum* copies, the register is misleading here. It is only through close textual analysis and the fortunate survival of the copy sent to Flanders and Brabant that we are able finally to identify the latter text as the genuine encyclical.

⁷² Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta, editio critica: II/1. The General Councils of Latin Christendom from Constantinople IV to Pavia-Siena (869–1424), ed. Antonio GARCÍA Y GARCÍA et al. (Corpus Christianorum. Conciliorum oecumenicorum generalium decreta II.1, 2013) p. 204. On *Ad liberandam*, see Thomas W. SMITH, Conciliar Influence on *Ad liberandam*, in: The Fourth Lateran Council and the Crusade Movement: The Impact of the Council of 1215 on Latin Christendom and the East, ed. Jessalynn L. BIRD and Damian J. SMITH (forthcoming 2018).

The letter to Tarentaise recorded in the register preserves the same text as that sent to Flanders and Brabant—thus confirming that this text is the original encyclical—but with an extra closing section concerning peacemaking in Christendom and the preaching of the crusade. Honorius wrote that the princes and the people of Christendom ought to rejoice in the unity of peace and that the prelates of the Church were attempting to lead quarrelling parties back to the observation of peace or a firm truce. The pope then announced the despatch of two unnamed representatives who were to preach the crusade and make peace in the region and ordered that they be well received, citing the biblical example of Mattathias who, seeing the Lord prophaned, sprang to His defence. Although this text is only recorded in the register as being sent to Tarentaise, it is probable that this addition would have been despatched to all regions of Christendom that were suffering from internecine Christian warfare.

Once again, we can draw a link between *Iustus Dominus* and *Quantum praedecessores* and the Second Crusade, this time through the Old Testament figure of Mattathias. A member of the Jewish Maccabees tribe, Matthathias successfully resisted the Romans, despite being outnumbered.⁷³ Maccabees' imagery was extremely popular in the promotion of the crusading movement, and Honorius had used it a number of times in his other letters.⁷⁴ But as William Purkis argues, in *Quantum praedecessores* the figure of Mattathias was invoked 'not as an example of a warrior who had fought with divine approval', but as someone who struggled to uphold the laws of the fathers.⁷⁵ Honorius used it in a similar way, but in a different textual formulation and he also inserted a reference to Mattathias upholding the law of God, in addition to the observances of the fathers.⁷⁶ It was, therefore, another extension of the fathers and sons motif of *Quantum praedecessores*. Of course the popularity of the ideas propagated by Pope Eugenius III and Bernard of Clairvaux in the mid 1140s percolated through and infused ecclesiastical thought in the following

⁷³ PHILLIPS, Second Crusade (see n. xy) p. 56.

⁷⁴ SMITH, Curia and Crusade (see n. xy) pp. 225–228, 230–231, 235.

⁷⁵ PURKIS, Crusading Spirituality (see n. xy) p. 91; GROSSE, Überlegungen zum Kreuzzugsaufruf Eugens III. (see n. xy) p. 91: 'Sit uobis etiam in exemplum bonus ille Mathathias, qui pro paternis legibus conseruandis se ipsum cum filiis et parentibus suis morti exponere et, quicquid in mundo possidebat, relinquere nullatenus dubitauit atque tandem diuino cooperante auxilio per multos tamen labores de inimicis tam ipse quam sua progenies uiriliter triumphauit.'

⁷⁶ Reg. Vat. 12, fol. 54r: 'quod vobis non desit magnanimitas Mathathie qui videns sancta Domini prophanari, prosiliit ut Dei legem et paternas observantias tueretur.'

decades, but Honorius's repeated use of specific motifs from *Quantum praedecessores* and Bernard of Clairvaux are too much to write off as mere coincidence. Mattathias clinches it then: in composing *Iustus Dominus*, Honorius and his curia appear to have drawn direct inspiration from, and probably consulted, Pope Eugenius III's call for the Second Crusade, *Quantum praedecessores*.

But why did Honorius choose a crusade call that was some eighty years old? The most obvious explanation is the sheer quality of *Quantum praedecessores* and the universality of its themes, which were obviously thought to have lost none of their persuasive power in the intervening years — as Purkis states, the letter 'proved to be invaluable to the composition of subsequent crusade encyclicals'.⁷⁷ Probably, more practical reasons were also at play here, too. Honorius was pressed for time in crafting his crusade call and *Quantum praedecessores* represented a useful template from which he could borrow ideas. This was unusual for a pope who appears to have made a point of going his own way in the production of his letters, but we should not underestimate the originality of *Iustus Dominus*.⁷⁸ Some popes simply reissued the crusade letters of their predecessors almost verbatim. Others only went as far as adapting them, such as Alexander III, who modified *Quantum praedecessores* in 1165 but left untouched outdated information about the loss of Edessa which had sparked the Second Crusade twenty years earlier.⁷⁹ Honorius, on the other hand, displayed his typical flair for documentary innovation by creating an entirely new letter text inspired and underpinned by ideas from the call for the Second Crusade.⁸⁰ The selection of the deeds of ancestors as the core theme for *Iustus Dominus* is not an indicator that Honorius's curia was intellectually moribund. Rather, as Purkis argues, the papacy's repeated deployment of themes from *Quantum praedecessores* in the years following its first issue was an attempt to key into the family crusading traditions that had developed 'amongst the arm-bearers of the West'.⁸¹ Honorius was part of this tradition; like Alexander III before him, he was trying to connect with his audience, and the appeal to tradition and crusading ancestors was one of the

⁷⁷ PURKIS, *Crusading Spirituality* (see n. xy) p. 118. On the centrality of the *strenuitas patrum* motif to the crusading movement, see pp. 115–116.

⁷⁸ SMITH, *Curia and Crusade* (see n. xy) pp. 259–260.

⁷⁹ Iben FONNESBERG-SCHMIDT, Alexander III and the Crusades, in: Pope Alexander III (1159–81). *The Art of Survival*, ed. Peter D. CLARKE and Anne J. DUGGAN (2012) pp. 341–363, here pp. 343–345.

⁸⁰ Cf. the textual formulations of the two documents in their sections regarding Matthathias, given in n. xy, above, for example.

⁸¹ PURKIS, *Crusading Spirituality* (see n. xy) p. 118.

most powerful motivational tools at his disposal, which explains why the papacy recycled it in the decades after the Second Crusade. The use of such traditional recruitment rhetoric in 1223 also provides further evidence that Honorius was thinking in terms of a traditional *passagium generale* in launching the new expedition. He designed *Iustus Dominus* to have as broad an appeal as possible in the effort to recruit a large crusader host, just as Eugenius III had managed for the Second Crusade.

Having examined the content of *Iustus Dominus* in detail here for the first time, what conclusions can we draw about Honorius III's approach to the crafting of the crusade encyclical? That Honorius created and sent (at least) two completely different versions of his crusade encyclical *Iustus Dominus*, and that he modified and personalised some of the copies of the letter quite extensively, offers us a significant new insight into the composition of crusade encyclicals in the medieval papal chancery. Previously, the texts of crusade encyclicals have been considered static and scholars have talked about the documents as single, uniform authorised texts. According to this traditional interpretation, the pope and his advisers poured effort into composing the perfect letter text and then delivered it to papal scribes who drew up the final, engrossed copies which were despatched throughout the West, transmitting one standard text that everyone in Christendom received. But the close textual analysis of *Iustus Dominus* here demonstrates that Honorius's approach to crafting his encyclical text was much more innovative than previously realised. By creating multiple texts of his encyclical, Honorius was pursuing a new, dynamic approach to calling the crusade to the East in which he and his advisers carefully targeted the pressure points of different recipients in the attempt to increase the persuasive power of his documents. This article also reveals for the first time that the main register text of the letter addressed to the king of France was not the encyclical text circulated throughout the West. The royal appeals, which lacked the practical provisions regarding privileges for potential crusaders, were private crusade calls designed to stir up crusading enthusiasm among the rulers of Europe and their courtiers; they were not intended for general consumption. The rhetoric that Honorius deployed in these letters was carefully tailored to speak to royal audiences and lacked the essential recruitment information to be effective as a universal recruitment call. The encyclical text of *Iustus Dominus* was actually that preserved in the copies sent to Flanders and Brabant and (with an addition regarding peacemaking in the West) Tarentaise. Misleadingly, this was not inscribed as the main text in the register, but relegated to the space after Philip's version, a space in the register reserved for the *in eundem modum* copies of

papal documents. The rhetoric of this encyclical to the faithful of the West focussed much less on the deeds and ancestors of the audience and much more on the redemption of sin through Christ, illustrating how Honorius and his curia targeted the different social strata with tailored rhetoric.

Despite the pope's efforts to customise his appeal for his different audiences, however, successful crusade recruitment relied upon more than just the papal document that launched it. The rhetoric and theology of crusading had to filter down through European society in the form of effective preaching, and the crusading movement remained reliant upon influential family and political connections to draw in large groups of pilgrims to the cause. But *Iustus Dominus* appears to have had an impact on the recruitment for the Crusade of Frederick II. Although Frederick, ever true to form, missed the deadline announced throughout the West in Honorius's encyclical, when the new crusade finally did assemble in 1227, it was the largest crusading host since the Third Crusade, perhaps between 10,000 and 14,000 strong.⁸² As Hiestand writes, and Bodo Hechelhammer and Olaf B. Rader confirm, the end result of recruitment efforts 'was a significant host *de diversis mundi partibus*, not only made up of Germans and Italians, but also [crusaders] from England, Flanders, southern France and Hungary.'⁸³ At the remove of eight hundred years, it is extremely difficult to measure the effect that papal crusade encyclicals had, but the fact that the kingdoms that are recorded to have received the personalised copies of the text, Hungary and England, also made up important sections of Frederick's army, suggests that *Iustus Dominus* succeeded in sparking significant, localised recruitment for the crusade at the royal courts and beyond. In any case, the effort that Honorius devoted to his attempts to attract the kings of Hungary and England to join the crusade, and the fact that *Iustus Dominus* was despatched to all the faithful of the West, demonstrates that the so-called 'Crusade of Frederick II' was envisioned as a true *passagium generale* rather than a personal, purely imperial expedition as

⁸² HIESTAND, Friedrich II. und der Kreuzzug (see n. xy) p. 138. Compare the detailed study of Hechelhammer, who comes to a similar, but more precise figure of between 11,400 and 11,900: HECHELHAMMER, Kreuzzug und Herrschaft (see n. xy) p. 265. This count tallies well with Hiestand's estimate. Hiestand's more generous estimate is perhaps to be preferred since it leaves more scope for the deficiencies of our sources.

⁸³ HIESTAND, Friedrich II. und der Kreuzzug (see n. xy) p. 138: 'Das Ergebnis war ein bedeutendes Heer *de diversis mundi partibus*, keineswegs nur Deutsche und Italiener, sondern auch Engländer, Flandrer, Südfranzosen und Ungarn.'; see also RADER, Friedrich II. (see n. xy) p. 386. The most detailed study of the composition of the crusade host of 1227 is HECHELHAMMER, Kreuzzug und Herrschaft (see n. xy) pp. 258–265.

traditionally claimed.⁸⁴ Drawing all of these threads together, these findings demonstrate just how little serious research according to the principles of *Quellenkritik* has been carried out into crusade encyclicals to date. We cannot afford to take these documents at face value, and, if we hope to understand better the role of the papacy as the champion of the crusading movement in the medieval West, we must return to the documents with a much more critical eye than has hitherto been the case.

⁸⁴ See above (n. xy).

Appendix: The register text of *Iustus Dominus*

Pope Honorius III writes throughout Christendom entreating recipients of the letter to join the crusade of Emperor Frederick II. The register preserves the variant wording of some copies of the encyclical, which Honorius personalised to prominent recipients. The main text given in the register, the copy sent to King Philip Augustus of France, is not the text of the encyclical sent throughout the West — that is preserved in the copies sent to Tarentaise and Flanders and Brabant (the latter text is not recorded in the register). The standard edition of Carl Rodenberg is corrected here and textual variants from that edition are given in the footnotes under the siglum ‘E’. The main diplomatic divisions of the text into the arenga, narratio, and dispositio are given in square brackets and bold type for ease of comparison with the main text.

11–27 April 1223.

Manuscript: Vatican City, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Registra Vaticana 12, fols 52r–54r.

Calendar: Regesta Honorii Papae III, ed. Petrus PRESSUTTI, 2 vols. (1888–95) 2 no. 4262 pp. 118–119.

Edition: Epistolae saeculi XIII e regestis pontificum Romanorum selectae, ed. Carl RODENBERG, 3 vols. (1883–94) 1 no. 225 pp. 152–155 (siglum: E).

Illustri Regi Francorum⁸⁵

[**Arenga**] *Iustus Dominus in omnibus viis suis*⁸⁶, qui unicuique pro meritis condigna retributione respondet, circa negotium Terre Sancte, spem populi Christiani fovit aliquando prosperis, et interdum debilitavit adversis. O quantum Christicolis videbatur arridere prosperitas, O quantum illuxisse credebatur fidelibus felicitis⁸⁷ aurora successuum, quando cruce signatorum exercitus Egyptum aggrediens, post turrim captam, post transitum fluminis, post hostes exterritos, in adversariorum stationibus castra fixit, et Damiatam, que robur

⁸⁵ E Regi Francorum illustri.

⁸⁶ Ps. 144.17.

⁸⁷ E felicitum.

censebatur Egypti, duris obsidionis angustiis coartavit⁸⁸. Res quidem agebatur miraculi, cum Dominus, qui *elegit infirma mundi, ut confunderet fortia*⁸⁹, civitatem expugnationi difficilem eo tempore tradidit gerentibus bellum eius, quo invaluerat multum partis adverse potentia, et abbreviatus erat non modicum nostrorum numerus bellatorum. Habebat autem in hiis⁹⁰ universitas Christiana unde protenderet quasi certe spei fiduciam in futurum, verum *succendentibus prosperis victores obliti*⁹¹ nomen Domini post triumphum, dato virtutibus *libello repudi*⁹², sic contraxere cum vitiis, quod detrahebatur fidei, ubi convertendi fuerant infideles, et maior erat peccatorum commissio, ubi maior remissio sperabatur. Quapropter provocatus Dominus dexteram in sinistram et gratiam mutavit in iram, *citharam nobis vertit in luctum*⁹³, et gaudium transtulit in merorem cum nostris in manu hostili conclusis et perdita Damia brevi dierum numero sic exinaniti sunt temporis longi labores quod non solum blasphemorum iniuriis nomen est expositum Christianum verum etiam quoad aliquos qui aliquando communicaverant fidei contemptui datus est ipse Christus, unde facta est durior post prosperitatem adversitas et eo minus habuit consolationis afflictio quominus argumenta prosperitatis preterite subsecute iacture pati poterant coniecturam. Sed licet iniquitates nostre quandoque diviserint inter nos et Deum⁹⁴ nostrum *non est tamen aggravata Eius auris, ut non exaudiat*⁹⁵, nec abbreviata⁹⁶ manus Eius ut salvare non possit. Misericordiam quippe non continebit in ira quin saltem propter nomen suum ne ulterius blasphemetur in gentibus potenter exurgens iudicet causam suam et exaltans humilem in salutem, iniquos abigat et consternat elatos. **[Narratio]** Ecce ipsius inspiratione ut firmiter credimus karissimus⁹⁷ in Christo filius noster Fridericus illustris Romanorum Imperator semper augustus et Rex Sicilie omissis multis arduisque negotiis quorum onus honorem imperialis celsitudinis sequebatur, venit ad nos in Campaniam nobiscum de predictae Terre subsidio tractaturus. Ibique

⁸⁸ E coarctavit.

⁸⁹ 1 Cor. 1.27.

⁹⁰ E iis.

⁹¹ Gen. 40.23.

⁹² Ier. 3.8.

⁹³ Iob 30.31.

⁹⁴ E dominum.

⁹⁵ Isai. 59.1.

⁹⁶ E abbreviata.

⁹⁷ E carissimus.

presentibus venerabili fratre nostro . .⁹⁸ Patriarcha, et Carissimo in Christo filio nostro Iohanne illustri Rege Ierusalimitan' . .⁹⁹ Beethlemitan'¹⁰⁰ episcopo . .¹⁰¹ Magistro Hospitalis . .¹⁰² Preceptore Templi et . .¹⁰³ Magistro Domus Theutonicorum ac aliis quos ad tractatus huiusmodi diversis¹⁰⁴ mundi partibus vidimus¹⁰⁵ adhibendos, singulis que natura negotii requirebat, diligenti meditatione pensatis, idem Imperator ad nostrum beneplacitum et consilium predictorum transfretandi terminum in festo beati Iohannis baptiste post biennium proximo secuturo, prompta voluntate suscepit, corporale super hoc exhibens spontaneus iuramentum. Denique ut ad id plenius suum manifestaret affectum, et plus fidei daretur negotio ad omnino suspensionis contrarie scrupulus tolleretur, ad instantiam Patriarche predicti et aliorum orientalium in nostra et fratrum nostrorum presentia et multitudinis hominum qui ad colloquium venerant se ducturum in uxorem legitimam filiam Regis eiusdem iurisiurandi religione firmavit. Sane probabili presumptione tenemus, quod a Domino factum est istud ut votis fidelium obtate¹⁰⁶ rei successus exolvat, quod preconcepte spei preludia promiserunt, ad sui restaurationem negotii tuum et aliorum Regum ac principum animos ipse filius summi Regis accendat, qui de secreto patris in publicum egressus, ad servos ad ima descendit, ut subditis ad summa pararet ascensum, sub testa nostre mortalitatis, figulus in terris visus et cum hominibus conversatus, tuum proculdubio expetit et expectat auxilium, causa Christi et probatam domus tue potentiam desiderat Terra Sancta. Numquid non¹⁰⁷ habuerit¹⁰⁸ de iuventutis tue primitiis et de maioris etatis reliquiis quasi de vite decima¹⁰⁹ non habebit? O quantum accresceret eiusdem Terre subsidio si de propagata devotione patris in filios per unum ex ipsis subvenires in tante necessitatis articulo crucifixo. O quam magnifice ad

⁹⁸ E *gemmipunctus deest*.

⁹⁹ E *gemmipunctus deest*.

¹⁰⁰ E Bethleemitano.

¹⁰¹ E *gemmipunctus deest*.

¹⁰² E *gemmipunctus deest*.

¹⁰³ E *gemmipunctus deest*.

¹⁰⁴ E e diversis.

¹⁰⁵ E credidimus.

¹⁰⁶ E optate.

¹⁰⁷ E qui.

¹⁰⁸ E habuit.

¹⁰⁹ E decimam.

succursum devota Gallia se pararet, ut mittendi¹¹⁰ placeret et misso. Absit ut post terga remaneat que precedere consuevit. Absit ut tam salutari Christi servitio gens tam Christiana se subtrahat. Absit ut que pro Domino hactenus onera multa sustinuit, in peculiari bello Dei filii solvat militie cingulum, arma relinquat rubigini, animum neget victorie, cum corona non desit victoribus per gratiam et meritum in presenti, per gloriam et premium in futuro.

[*Dispositio*] Hinc est quod excellentiam tuam affectuose rogamus, serenissime Regum et a te instanter exposcimus¹¹¹, Christianissime principum, obsecrantes per patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum per sanguinem Ihesu¹¹² Christi ut exurgas in adiutorium Christi tui qui quodam modo in se prodigus et parvus in servis, temporali morti se tradidit ut te a faucibus mortis eriperet sempiternae. Exurgas et liberares terram illam in qua salutem humani generis operatus est personaliter ipse salvator. Exurgas ab contritionem nationis prave atque perverse que ubi sit Deus Christianorum impropere, et multis insultat opprobriis¹¹³ nomini Christiano. Et quidem illatas subditis tuis offensas ulcisceris, et Dei tui non vindicabis iniurias tam atroces? Ad hereditates tuorum manus invasorum extendi non pateris, et patieris hereditatis Dominice tanto tempore detentores? Ne igitur in Deo periculose dissimules quod iuste non tolerares in homine pungat cor tuum tui contumelia Creatoris, accendat te zelus fidei Christiane, ut sic in forti manu et extento brachio terre memorate subvenias quod insinuat nobis subventionis tue proposito ante faciem aliorum te fructuose ponamus exemplar, in tuis laudibus gloriantes, tibi que accrescat cumulus meritorum non solum ex hiis¹¹⁴ que feceris per te ipsum, sed ex aliis etiam que facti tui similitudine subsequantur. Datum Lateran'.

*Scriptum est*¹¹⁵ *in eundem modum* . .¹¹⁶ Regi Ungarie. Iustus Dominus *et cetera usque* desiderat Terra Sancta. O quantum *usque* ad succursum Ungaria inimicis crucis terribilis se pararet, *usque* misso. Absit ut in peculiari bello Dei filii gens tibi subiecta solvat *usque*

¹¹⁰ E mittenti.

¹¹¹ E poscimus.

¹¹² E Iesu.

¹¹³ E obprobriis.

¹¹⁴ E iis.

¹¹⁵ E deest.

¹¹⁶ E *gemmipunctus deest*.

futuro. Hinc est quod excellentiam tuam affectuose rogamus et a te instanter exposcimus obsecrantes *et cetera usque in finem*.

In eundem modum aliis Regibus quibusdam verbis mutandis competenter mutatis.

. . Illustri Regi Anglorum. Iustus Dominus *et cetera usque* desiderat Terra Sancta. Sensit enim quis qualis et quantus ei fuerit illustris memorie Rex Riccardus cuius nomen sic in terrorem hostium fidei creverat quod exclamatio eius in prelio nonnumquam sufficiebat ad stragem. Et forte non deest quid¹¹⁷ hostes adhuc in proximo sanguinis metuant dummodo resurgat patruī dextera in nepote. Illud etiam non duximus omittendum, quod cum in thronum Regni cruce signato successeris, decet ut et in crucis obsequium te votivum exhibeas successorem, quia si patris debita legitimus heres exolves, expedit non minus celesti quam terreno satisfieri creditori, presertim cum favor crucis persone tue per Dei gratiam satis fuerit fructuosus. Certe ad id gens tibi subiecta plenis desideriis et totis viribus debet assurgere, quia non sine nota in peculiari bello Dei filii *et cetera usque* in futuro. Hinc est quod excellentiam tuam affectuose rogamus obsecrantes *et cetera usque in finem*.

Scriptum est universis Christi fidelibus per Tarantasien' provinciam constitutis. Iustus Dominus *et cetera usque* ad sui restaurationem negotii Regum, Principum, ac aliorum corda ipse summi Regis filius *et cetera usque* conversatus. Sane quia tempus est ut tollatur illa confusio, qua filii ancille insultant in filios libere, terram nostri Principis detinendo miserabiliter occupatam. Tempus est ut hii qui ere peccatorum se diabolo vendiderunt, ammissam recuperent libertatem, et per salutifere redemptionis remedium, animas redimant fraude diabolica captivatas, exurgat nunc qui dormit, et ab operibus mortis excitetur, ut illuminet eum Christus. Exurgat et currat in splendore fulgoris armorum Domini, accinctus ad illius prelium preliandum, qui legitime certantibus coronam vite promittit. Nos autem iuxta generalis statuta concilii, personas et bona eorum qui crucis sunt caractere insigniti recipientes sub protectione sedis apostolice speciali, omnibus qui laborem istum in propriis personis subierint et expensis, plenam suorum peccaminum de quibus veraciter fuerint corde contriti et ore confessi veniam indulgemus, et in retributione iustorum salutis eterne pollicemur augmentum. Eis autem qui non in propriis personis illuc accesserint, set in suis dum taxat expensis iuxta facultatem et qualitatem suam viros idoneos destinarint et illis similiter qui licet in alienis expensis, in propriis personis tamen accesserint plenam suorum¹¹⁸

¹¹⁷ E quod.

¹¹⁸ E *add.* veniam.

concedimus peccatorum. Huius quoque remissionis volumus et concedimus esse participes iuxta quantitatem subsidii et devotionis affectum omnes qui ad subventionem ipsius terre de bonis suis congrue ministrabunt, aut circa predicta consilium et auxilium impenderint oportunitate. Et quoniam per necessarium est prosecutioni negotii memorati, ut Principes et Populus Christiani pacis gaudeant unitate, per ecclesiarum Prelatos discordantes reducantur ad plenam pacem vel firmam treugam inviolabiliter interim observandam. Hinc est quod tam pro exhortatione verbi crucis quam pacis seu treugarum federe suadendo, mittimus ad vos . . . et . . .¹¹⁹ universitatem vestram monentes, et obsecrantes in Domino, quatinus ipsum recipientes ylariter et benigne tractantes, sic super premissis eius salubribus monitis intendatis, ut opere clareat quod vobis non desit magnanimitas Mathathie qui videns sancta Domini prophanari, prosiliit ut Dei legem et paternas observantias tueretur.

¹¹⁹ E et *and gemmipunctus desunt*.