



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *How to craft a crusade call: Pope Innocent III and Quia maior (1213)*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/124634/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Smith, TW orcid.org/0000-0001-9329-6880 (2019) How to craft a crusade call: Pope Innocent III and Quia maior (1213). *Historical Research*, 92 (255). pp. 2-23. ISSN 0950-3471

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2281.12258>

© 2018 Institute of Historical Research. This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Smith, T. W. (2019), How to craft a crusade call: Pope Innocent III and Quia maior (1213). *Hist Res*, 92: 2-23, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2281.12258>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving. 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/>

How to craft a crusade call: Pope Innocent III and *Quia maior* (1213)¹

Thomas W. Smith

Abstract

The fame of *Quia maior* – commonly considered one of the most important medieval papal crusade encyclicals – belies the fact that we actually know little about its composition at the curia of Pope Innocent III in 1213. This article compares a lesser-known draft of the letter, *Quoniam maior*, preserved in the chronicle of Burchard of Ursberg, with *Quia maior* in order to reconstruct the debates and concerns of its authors during the composition process. It seeks to advance our understanding of Innocent’s conception of the crusade and offers new insights into how the papacy crafted crusade calls in the Middle Ages.

Quia maior, Pope Innocent III’s encyclical of April 1213, is widely considered one of the most important calls to crusade ever issued by the medieval papacy.² Christopher Tyerman refers to it as Innocent’s ‘great crusade encyclical’, and Jonathan Riley-Smith judged it to be

¹ The wording of my title takes inspiration from C. Tyerman, *How to Plan a Crusade: Reason and Religious War in the High Middle Ages* (2015). I am indebted to Peter Crooks, Bernard Hamilton, Damian Smith and the two anonymous peer reviewers for generously giving up their time to comment on this article and for their helpful suggestions. 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 I completed the drafting of this article.

² Città del Vaticano, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Reg[istra] Vat[icana] 8, fos. 140v–141v; edited in *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ed. J.P. Migne (221 vols., Paris, 1844–64), ccxvi. cols. 817–22. Scholars commonly consider the Fifth Crusade to be one of the best planned expeditions to recover the Holy Land, in which *Quia maior* played a key role. See: R. Röhrich, *Studien zur Geschichte des fünften Kreuzzuges* (Innsbruck, 1891), pp. 3–7; H. Roscher, *Papst Innocenz III. und die Kreuzzüge* (Göttingen, 1969), pp. 140–2, 147; J. M. Powell, *Anatomy of a Crusade, 1213–1221* (Philadelphia, Pa., 1986), pp. 17–22; H. E. Mayer, *The Crusades*, trans. J. Gillingham (2nd edn., Oxford, 1988), pp. 217–20; J. Richard, *Histoire des croisades* (Paris, 1996), pp. 269–70; J. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: A History* (2nd edn., 2005), pp. 173–5.

‘possibly the greatest of them all’.³ It was through this letter that the pope announced the Fifth Crusade to rescue the Holy Land – most of which had slipped out of Christendom’s grasp in 1187 – and circulated his design for the organisation of the expedition.⁴ Proffering information on the liturgical and practical preparations, as well as the available spiritual rewards and protections, the document represents a keystone in our understanding of how the papacy organised and engaged with the crusading movement in the thirteenth century. It has been translated and reprinted on numerous occasions, and summarised and discussed on countless others.⁵ Generations of students of the crusades have pored over the letter,

³ C. Tyerman, *God’s War: A New History of the Crusades* (2006), p. 477; Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, p. 173. Similarly, J. A. Watt referred to *Quia maior* as ‘the classical papal document of crusading exhortation.’: J. A. Watt, ‘The papacy’, in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. P. Fouracre et al. (Cambridge, 1995–2005), v, pp. 107–63, at p. 120. Although *Quia maior* and other high medieval papal encyclicals are often referred to as ‘bulls’, this is anachronistic and has no grounding in the medieval terminology. See: T. Frenz, *Papsturkunden des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* (2nd edn., Stuttgart, 2000), p. 28, also p. 14; T. W. Smith, *Curia and Crusade: Pope Honorius III and the Recovery of the Holy Land, 1216–1227* (Turnhout, 2017), pp. 50–1.

⁴ On the Fifth Crusade, see *The Fifth Crusade in Context: The Crusading Movement in the Early Thirteenth Century*, ed. E. J. Mylod, G. Perry, T. W. Smith and J. Vandeburie (Abingdon, 2017) and Powell, *Anatomy of a Crusade*.

⁵ The letter is translated in *Crusade and Christendom: Annotated Documents in Translation from Innocent III to the Fall of Acre, 1187–1291*, ed. J. Bird, E. Peters and J. M. Powell (Philadelphia, Pa., 2013), pp. 107–12 and L. and J. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: Idea and Reality, 1095–1274* (1981), pp. 118–24. For discussion of various aspects of *Quia maior*, see, for example: Röhrich, pp. 3–5; G. Tangl, *Studien zum Register Innocenz’ III.* (Weimar, 1929), pp. 4–5; P. Alphandéry, *La chrétienté et l’idée de croisade*, ed. A. Dupront (Paris, 1959), pp. 150–3; Roscher, pp. 140–7; M. Maccarrone, *Studi su Innocenzo III* (Padua, 1972), pp. 100–3; Powell, *Anatomy of a Crusade*, pp. 17–22, 45–7; Mayer, pp. 217–18; C. T. Maier, ‘Crisis, liturgy and the crusade in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, xlviii (1997), 628–57, at p. 634; C. Tyerman, *The Invention of the Crusades* (Basingstoke, 1998), pp. 35–6; Watt, pp. 120–1; J. C. Moore, *Pope Innocent III (1160/61–1216): To Root Up and to Plant* (Leiden, 2003), pp. 209–11; Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, pp. 173–5;

acquiring an intimate knowledge of its contents. But, taken alone, *Quia maior* cannot reveal *how* its message was crafted and with what purpose. There is another text, however, that can shed new light on the matter. Far less renowned, especially outside of the realms of German scholarship, is *Quoniam maior*, the draft version of the encyclical which escaped the confines of the papal chancery to find preservation in the chronicle of Burchard of Ursberg.⁶ In the early twentieth century, Georgine Tangl compared the two documents in an attempt to uncover the origins of *Quoniam maior*. Was it a curial draft? Was it a corrupt text invented by Burchard or one of his sources? Or did the papacy send out multiple, variant versions of the encyclical in 1213?⁷ As Tangl demonstrated through careful *Quellenkritik*, Burchard's copy of *Quoniam maior* was indeed a genuine (draft) product of the papal chancery. But while Tangl only discussed some of the textual differences between *Quoniam maior* and

N. Housley, *Fighting for the Cross: Crusading to the Holy Land* (New Haven, Conn., 2008), pp. 75, 108, 200; A. L. Bysted, *The Crusade Indulgence: Spiritual Rewards and the Theology of the Crusades, c. 1095–1216* (Leiden, 2014), pp. 175–6, 231, 233, 240–1, 244–5, 248–9.

⁶ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, ed. O. Holder-Egger and B. von Simson (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum rerum Germanicarum, xvi, 2nd edn., Hannover and Leipzig, 1916), pp. 101–5. It has long been known in the German scholarship that the version of *Quia maior* which Burchard of Ursberg copied into his chronicle was a variant draft: T. Lindner, 'Zum Chronicon Urspergense', *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, xvi (1891), 117–34, at p. 118; Tangl, pp. 17–46; Helmut Roscher also picked up the point in Roscher, p. 142, but there appears to be very little awareness in the Anglophone scholarship of the status of Burchard's copy.

⁷ Tangl, p. 18: 'Die Frage, die der Forschung gestellt wird, ist, zu erklären, wie es bei zwei so bekannten Bullen [*Quia maior* and *Vineam domini Sabaoth*] möglich war, sie in einer vom offiziellen Text so abweichenden Form zu bieten. Handelt es sich um eigenmächtige Änderungen Burchards, bzw. [beziehungsweise] seiner Vorlage, wurden die Bullen in mehrfacher Fassung verschickt, von denen nur eine im heutigen Register erhalten ist, oder geht Bu [Burchard's text] sonst irgendwie, direkt oder indirekt, auf die päpstliche Kanzlei zurück?' For the results, see Tangl, pp. 17–46.

Quia maior, there are still many questions about exactly how Innocent III and his curialists composed the crusade call of 1213 that remain unanswered. The more thorough comparison of the texts presented in this article permits us to trace the gestation of the document at the papal curia in sharper definition, gaining new insights into the concerns and debates of its authors in the process. Not only does this add a new dimension to our understanding of the much studied crusade conception of Innocent III and his curia, but it also has a wider significance that reaches beyond his pontificate.⁸ It offers us a rare glimpse, in fine detail, into exactly how the medieval papacy crafted its calls to crusade so as best to persuade the faithful to sacrifice their normal lives and seek salvation as *crucesignati* – something central to the crusading movement but hitherto surprisingly little researched.⁹

⁸ On the crusade conception of Innocent III, see: Powell, *Anatomy of a Crusade*, pp. 1–106; Alphan  ry, pp. 149–53, 160–3; Maccarrone, pp. 86–113; B. Bolton, ‘“Serpent in the dust: sparrow on the housetop”: attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the circle of Pope Innocent III’, *Studies in Church History*, xxxvi (2001), 154–80; Roscher; J. Bird, ‘Reform or crusade? Anti-usury and crusade preaching during the pontificate of Innocent III’, in *Pope Innocent III and his World*, ed. J. C. Moore (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 165–85; C. T. Maier, ‘Mass, the eucharist and the cross: Innocent III and the relocation of the crusade’, in *Pope Innocent III and his World*, ed. J. C. Moore, pp. 351–60; J. Bird, ‘Innocent III, Peter the Chanter’s circle, and the crusade indulgence: theory, implementation, and aftermath’, in *Innocenzo III, Urbs et Orbis: Atti del Congresso Internazionale Roma, 9–15 settembre 1998*, ed. A. Sommerlechner (2 vols., Rome, 2003), i. 503–24; Powell, *Anatomy of a Crusade*, pp. 15–30, 41–7.

⁹ There have been very few studies dedicated to the composition of crusade calls, although Tyerman has examined the ‘publicity’ and ‘persuasion’ of crusade organisation more broadly in *How to Plan a Crusade* pp. 63–123 and woven throughout *God’s War*. There is a short overview of papal letters and the crusading movement in general in C. T. Maier, ‘Papal letters’, in *The Crusades: An Encyclopedia*, ed. A. V. Murray (4 vols., Oxford, 2006), iii. 931–2. U. Schwerin, *Die Aufrufe der P  pste zur Befreiung des Heiligen Landes von den Anf  ngen bis zum Ausgang Innozenz IV.: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der kurialen Kreuzzugspropaganda und der p  pstlichen Epistolographie* (Berlin, 1937) is the only dedicated study of papal crusade calls, but while

This article argues that the differences between *Quoniam maior* and *Quia maior* reveal an institution concerned less with the exposition of its authority over Christendom than with striving to achieve consensus within its own ranks, and then attempting to create, through the appeal of the crusade encyclical, a broader consensus with all the Christian faithful, so as to create the conditions necessary to rescue the Holy Land. This article attempts to move beyond the immediate question of the illocutionary act of a call to crusade to the more difficult-of-access question of the perlocutionary force of the encyclical, that is, the intended effect to be engendered by the document, both on the part of those who were to preach it, and those who heard that preaching.

The process of composition of encyclicals was essential to the successful recruitment for new crusades. The pope had to make a case that was persuasive in both theological and practical terms. As a result, the papacy formulated the content of *Quia maior* with exacting care, not least because, as Christoph Maier and Paul Pixton make clear, medieval popes designed their encyclical texts to form the basis of crusade preaching in the localities. Crusade preachers would have based their sermons on papal encyclicals because, as Maier states, they ‘provided a set of arguments and reasons for each crusade ... they probably were the primary points of reference for most crusade propagandists’ arguments’.¹⁰ Similarly,

it supplies a useful short overview, it is now outdated in its approach and interpretation. Although less concerned with crusade encyclicals than other sources, M. Purcell, *Papal Crusading Policy, 1244–1291: The Chief Instruments of Papal Crusading Policy and Crusade to the Holy Land from the Final Loss of Jerusalem to the Fall of Acre* (Leiden, 1975) contains a number of relevant sections, but the interpretation of the interaction of the papacy with the crusading movement is much too mechanistic. On Spain, see J. G. Gaztambide, *Historia de la Bula de la Cruzada en España* (Vitoria, 1958).

¹⁰ C. T. Maier, *Preaching the Crusades: Mendicant Friars and the Cross in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 117, see also p. 35; *Crusade and Christendom*, p. 277; M. Lower, *The Barons’ Crusade: A Call to Arms and its Consequences* (Philadelphia, Pa., 2005), p. 3.

Pixton argues that the sermons that made up the preaching campaign for the Fifth Crusade were probably ‘for the most part free renditions of papal letters, from which [the preachers] also took their arguments.’¹¹ In the case of *Quia maior*, Louise and Jonathan Riley-Smith and Maier long ago pointed out that Innocent III intended the document to form the basis of crusade preaching, and the Riley-Smiths and Tyerman have identified key themes from the encyclical in Fifth Crusade sermons by Jacques de Vitry and Oliver of Cologne, respectively.¹² This was in line with the pope’s insistence ‘that the details of ... *Quia maior* be transmitted “carefully and effectively.”’¹³ Moreover, popes sometimes went further to guarantee that their carefully constructed theological arguments circulated without being modified by crusade preachers. Maier draws attention to the fact that some pontiffs attempted to ensure that their letters were simply read out verbatim in the regions to which they had been despatched.¹⁴ Thus it is clear that, at least for the expeditions such as the Fifth Crusade where the papacy had ample time to perfect its propaganda, the texts of encyclicals such as *Quia maior* were finely tuned in the extreme.¹⁵

¹¹ P. B. Pixton, ‘Die Anwerbung des Heeres Christi: Prediger des Fünften Kreuzzuges in Deutschland’, *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, xxxiv (1978), 166–91, at p. 176: ‘Die meisten Predigten waren daher wahrscheinlich zum größten Teil freie Wiedergaben der päpstlichen Bullen, denen sie auch ihre Argumente entnahmen.’

¹² Riley-Smith and Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: Idea and Reality*, pp. 119, 133–5; Maier, *Preaching the Crusades*, p. 117; Tyerman, *God’s War*, p. 618; Tyerman, *How to Plan a Crusade*, p. 69. See also Bysted, pp. 248, 272–3.

¹³ Tyerman, *How to Plan a Crusade*, p. 79.

¹⁴ Maier, *Preaching the Crusades*, p. 117.

¹⁵ There are of course examples of crusade calls being issued in haste without the luxury of time for such careful preparation. See, for example, T. 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. E. Lapina and N. Morton (Leiden, 2017), pp. 206–35, at pp. 218–19.

Like many other crusade encyclicals, *Quia maior* displays a masterful command of rhetoric, theology and canon law on behalf of its authors. Although the document is too long and too well known to justify inclusion in full, it is essential to sketch a precis of its content here in which the reader can locate the subsequent close textual analysis. The opening section of the document, the *arenga*, cried out to the faithful on behalf of Christ to imitate Him by taking up the cross and following Him (Matthew 16:24).¹⁶ The pope explained that the endeavour was a divine test of faith. God could easily take back Jerusalem, ‘since nothing can resist His will’ (Romans 9:19), but instead He presented the crusade as an opportunity to test the faith of the Christians ‘like gold in a furnace’ (1 Peter 1:7).¹⁷ The journey would offer the chance of salvation, indeed, an opportunity for pilgrims to prove to the Lord that they were deserving of salvation. Innocent compared God to a temporal king under attack: what would loyal vassals do if his land were conquered by enemies? Ungrateful Christians who did not rush to His aid would rue their selfishness at the Last Judgement.¹⁸ In the *narratio* section of the encyclical, which outlined events leading up to the issue of the letter, the pope justified the crusade by informing his audience that the Holy Land had belonged to the Christian faith before Islam swept across the region.¹⁹ Yet there was reason for hope. Innocent interpreted the crusaders’ crushing defeat of the Muslims at the Battle of Las Navas de Tolosa in July 1212 as a ‘good sign that the end of the beast was approaching’: the 666 years allotted to Islam in John’s Apocalypse (Apocalypse 13:18), and calculated from Mohammed’s

¹⁶ On the diplomatic structure of papal letters, see Frenz, p. 12 and Smith, *Curia and Crusade*, pp. 58–62.

¹⁷ *Crusade and Christendom*, p. 111. *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 817. See Bysted, pp. 240, 273.

¹⁸ *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 817; Tyerman, *How to Plan a Crusade*, p. 219.

¹⁹ Tyerman, *How to Plan a Crusade*, p. 36.

migration (Hijrah) to Medina in 622, were almost up.²⁰ As Damian Smith argues, the pope's response to the news of the Christian victory at Las Navas de Tolosa 'was apocalyptic in tone' and the result of the battle clearly 'revitalized' his pontificate and formed 'an essential part of the background' to the preparation of the Fifth Crusade.²¹ Now, then, with crusading in Spain and against heresy in the south of France yielding successful results, was the time for a crusade to recover the holy places.²² Moving away from theological explanation, Innocent also discussed the strategical necessity for a crusade. The Muslim forces had erected a fortress on Mount Tabor from which they could threaten Acre and potentially wipe out the last remaining vestiges of the Frankish polities in Outremer.²³ After this short *narratio*, Innocent cut straight to the point and the *dispositio* section of the letter (which carried the papal orders). He offered forgiveness of sins to those who took part in person or financed the crusade of another. He took the crusaders and their property under ecclesiastical protection and forbade the charging of interest on loans owed by *crucesignati*. He called upon ecclesiastical and secular figures to band together to fund contingents of pilgrims if they could not participate themselves.²⁴ Nominally to speed up the recruitment process, Innocent permitted all members of the Christian community (except religious) to take the cross and provided for the commutation, redemption and deferral of vows by unsuitable recruits.²⁵ The pope also cancelled indulgences for those travelling to crusade in Spain and the south of France, and banned piracy and trade in materiel with Muslims, under threat of

²⁰ D. J. Smith, *Innocent III and the Crown of Aragon: The Limits of Papal Authority* (Aldershot, 2004), p. 114; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 818. See Alphandéry, p. 150.

²¹ Smith, *Innocent III and the Crown of Aragon*, p. 114.

²² Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 612.

²³ *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 818.

²⁴ *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. cols 818–19.

²⁵ *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. cols 819–20.

excommunication.²⁶ Then the pope turned from practical measures to spiritual ones, ordering monthly liturgical processions, fasting, alms-giving and prayer to intercede with God for the return of the Holy Land. Every day after mass all men and women were commanded to prostrate themselves on the ground while the clergy sang Psalm 78 ‘in a high voice’, followed by Psalm 68 and a prayer for the Holy Land.²⁷ Continuing his theme of universal participation in the crusading movement, Innocent ordered that collection chests be installed in ‘those churches where the general procession is held’.²⁸ Finally, Innocent left the departure deadline and ports in abeyance until after the recruitment of a crusader host, but appointed a number of representatives to continue the crusade preparations and enjoined upon the recipients the responsibility of facilitating their work.²⁹

It goes without saying that Innocent did not develop this mature crusade plan in a vacuum. It is well known that he was refining, codifying and building upon a long tradition of papal promotion of the crusading movement, most notably the renewed crusading effort in response to the fall of Jerusalem to Saladin in 1187.³⁰ ‘Innocent III’, Tyerman states, ‘established an institutional framework within which his crusading theology found concrete expression, even if much of his construction rested on earlier foundations ... He was a codifier as much as an innovator.’³¹ Furthermore, Tangl demonstrated that parts of *Quia*

²⁶ *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 820.

²⁷ *Crusade and Christendom*, p. 111; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. cols 820–1. On this, see Maier, ‘Crisis, liturgy and the crusade’, p. 634.

²⁸ *Crusade and Christendom*, p. 112; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 821.

²⁹ *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 821.

³⁰ *Crusade and Christendom*, p. 107; Tangl, pp. 14–17.

³¹ Tyerman, *God’s War*, p. 481.

maior bear similarities to Innocent's previous crusade letters.³² These longer traditions found new expression in *Quia maior*.³³ But was Innocent alone responsible for the composition of this detailed document? Unlike common letters on quotidian ecclesiastical affairs, curial letters (regarding political matters) such as this were collegial products composed by a combination of the pope, the head of the chancery, the cardinals and other curialists and advisers.³⁴ Attempting to distinguish the hand of the pope himself in the drafting process is fraught with difficulty; usually, it is simply not possible.³⁵ Yet, given that 'in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries', Patrick Zutshi writes, 'the pope's personal part in the production of documents continued to be vital', it would be hard to suggest that Innocent did not play a central role in shaping the content of *Quia maior*.³⁶ Even if he was not the originator of all the content – indeed, it is hard to imagine that such a long and complex document was the product of a single mind – it must reflect his thinking, else he would not have issued the

³² Tangl, p. 14: 'Betrachtet man die Gesamtmasse der Entlehnungen, so sind am stärksten die Kreuzzugsaufrufe vom 15. August 1198 und von der Wende 1199/1200 benutzt, bei Verbesserungen Kreuzzugs- und Albigenserdokumente aus den Jahren 1208–12.' Although the similarities exhibited by the examples given on pp. 6–14 are not as striking as the author suggests.

³³ Tyerman, *God's War*, p. 481.

³⁴ J. E. Sayers, *Papal Government and England during the Pontificate of Honorius III (1216–1227)* (Cambridge, 1984), p. 29; *Selected Letters of Pope Innocent III concerning England*, ed. C. R. Cheney and W. H. Semple (1953), pp. xxii–xxiii.

³⁵ See P. Zutshi, 'The personal role of the pope in the production of papal letters in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries', in *Vom Nutzen des Schreibens: Soziales Gedächtnis, Herrschaft und Besitz im Mittelalter*, ed. W. Pohl and P. Herold (Vienna, 2002), pp. 225–36.

³⁶ Zutshi, p. 236.

document under his seal.³⁷ In order to avoid prolixity and repetition, in this article authorship is therefore attributed to Innocent in the understanding that this was collegial authorship conducted in his name. Indeed, it is this collegiality of composition that explains the changes and refinements to the text that we will examine below.

The text of the engrossed (that is, the final, neat copy) version of *Quia maior*, issued between 19 and 29 April 1213, is preserved as an entry in Innocent's register, in addition to a number of other manuscript copies.³⁸ This was the official version of the text, and the one that Innocent intended for promulgation through the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the West. But, of course, given the importance of the call to crusade, the pope and his curialists composed at least one draft version of the letter before the papal chancery issued it for circulation.³⁹ These unfinished texts were not supposed to leave the papal court, but at least one copy of a draft – which must have been in the possession of a number of high-ranking curialists – managed to slip through the cracks. The Premonstratensian chronicler Burchard of Ursberg (c. 1177–1231) managed to lay his hands on just such a chancery draft of *Quia maior* and interpolated

³⁷ W. Imkamp, *Das Kirchenbild Innocenz' III. (1198–1216)* (Stuttgart, 1983), p. 86: 'die Vorstellungen über die Kirche, die sich im Register und dort besonders in den einzelnen Arengen finden, entsprechen den Vorstellungen des Papstes, haben sie nun direkt oder indirekt dort Eingang gefunden'; Sayers, p. 29.

³⁸ Reg. Vat. 8, fos. 140v–141v; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. cols. 817–22. Migne edited the letter in the middle of the nineteenth century, and, although the accuracy of the texts of his editions varies greatly, that of *Quia maior* – the text of which is taken from the papal register – is for the most part correct, although the present study compares both the edition and register manuscript and proffers corrections where necessary. On the accuracy of Migne's edition of *Quia maior*, see the comments in *Die Papsturkunden Westfalens bis zum Jahre 1378: Erster Theil. Die Papsturkunden Westfalens bis zum Jahre 1304*, ed. H. Finke, (Westfälisches Urkunden-Buch, v.i, Münster, 1888), no. 235, p. 112. See R. Foreville, *Lateran I–IV*, trans. [into German] N. Monzel (Mainz, 1970), pp. 290–1 and Roscher, pp. 142–7.

³⁹ For an introduction to the processes of the papal chancery, see Smith, *Curia and Crusade*, 49–100.

it into his universal chronicle, which he compiled in 1229/30.⁴⁰ It is certain that Burchard obtained this using the close connections made with papal staff during his earlier time at the curia in 1198 and 1210/11. Either he acquired the letter text in person during a later visit to Rome, as Theodor Lindner suggested, or he received it at a distance from curial correspondents.⁴¹ Like Tangl, Carol Neel states that the variant copies of *Quia maior* and *Vineam domini Sabaoth* (which convoked the Fourth Lateran Council) ‘derive in their U[rsberg] C[hronicle] forms from copies acquired by Burchard from the papal chancery itself, since they include details for the particularization of address to European spiritual and temporal leadership’ – information that simply would not be transmitted in non-papal manuscripts.⁴² This rules out transmission of the text in an extra-papal context. In any case, it is clear from Burchard’s introductory comments to the encyclicals of April 1213 that he believed himself to be in possession of the authentic text of *Quia maior* that circulated throughout Christendom, and not a variant draft.⁴³

⁴⁰ Holder-Egger and Von Simson published an excellent edition of Burchard’s chronicle for the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* in 1916: *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*. The draft of *Quia maior* is found on pp. 101–5, and the editors’ arguments for the date of composition of the chronicle on p. x. On Burchard of Ursberg, see M. Herweg, ‘Burchard of Ursberg’, in *The Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, ed. G. Dunphy (2 vols., Leiden, 2010), i. 226, at p. 226 and the series of six important articles by C. L. Neel, ‘The historical work of Burchard of Ursberg’, *Analecta Praemonstratensia*, lviii–lxi (1982–85).

⁴¹ Lindner, pp. 117–18.

⁴² Neel, ‘The historical work of Burchard of Ursberg, III: the historian and his sources’, *Analecta Praemonstratensia*, lix (1983), 19–42, at p. 36.

⁴³ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 101: ‘... Secundo transmisit [Innocent III] litteras per omnem christianitatem pro succursu terre Iherosolimitane, quarum exemplar hic subiciemus. Tercio pro coadunando generali concilio litteras per orbem transmisit. Sed istarum exemplar ponemus. Delate fuerunt iste littere anno Dominici MCCXIII tempore paschali, quarum exemplaria sunt hec.’

It is difficult to state with absolute certainty exactly what stage of the drafting process Burchard's version represents (it may have gone through several more edits before or after its text was committed to parchment), but it appears to be quite advanced. If it is not the penultimate draft then it is certainly not far removed from it. It is uncertain, and probably unlikely, that Burchard's draft and the subsequent April engrossment represent a complete record of the composition process. As a result, we cannot reconstruct the crafting process in its totality – that is now lost to the sands of time, and, unless new sources come to light, it will not be possible. A more prosaic methodological problem also presents itself: the possibility of scribal error by Burchard in copying the text. The textual variations presented here, however, can be treated with a high degree of confidence on two counts. First, using the parts of the two texts that do match, one can state with confidence that Burchard executed an impressively careful and accurate copy of the document. Second, the variants presented here align clearly with the papal agenda of clarifying the message and orienting the text towards its audience so as to maximise recruitment. It is important to recognise these limitations here, but there can be no doubt about the inherent value of *Quoniam maior*, which offers a unique window into the composition of medieval crusade encyclicals.

Even on the most cursory of glances, the most obvious difference of the draft positively leaps off the page: the incipit. Expecting to read the famous words *Quia maior*, instead we find the less familiar *Quoniam maior*.⁴⁴ The Latin words 'quoniam' ('because', 'since') and 'quia' ('because') are essentially synonyms. This seemingly insignificant change is instructive, since it draws our attention to the importance that the pope and his curialists attributed to the written style of their chancery products. Peppered throughout the document are similarly small stylistic improvements. There are a number of instances where those

⁴⁴ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 101; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 817.

composing the text played with the word order and selection. Thus, in a section calling for the transformation of dissensions into peace, the wording ‘pro illo et personas et res exponere’ in the draft was tidied up and edited to become ‘pro illo res exponere ac personas’ in the engrossment.⁴⁵ In the section concerning the custody of keys to collection chests, the draft’s reference to the devout layman, ‘laicum devotum’, was switched to ‘devotum laicum’.⁴⁶ Another example can be found in the passage on the Apocalypse of John, where Innocent changed a formulation in the draft from ‘... convaluerit confidimus ...’ to ‘... invaluerit confidimus ...’⁴⁷ The words are near synonyms, but this modification can perhaps be explained by the apparent desire to avoid having ‘convaluerit’ precede ‘confidimus’ as it does in the draft. Why, then, did the pope and his curialists deem it necessary to make such minor modifications to the text? The ink spilled over these infelicities could not have been on behalf of the vernacular audiences, since we know that papal crusade encyclicals were translated into the vernacular to be read aloud by preachers.⁴⁸ Therefore we must be dealing with the accommodation of an audience drilled in Latin, that, depending upon their ability in the language, would have been expecting a document that followed the rules of the *cursus*, or the style, of the papal court. Aside from the papacy’s application of the rigours of the *cursus* to help identify forgeries, the performative aspect of papal documents meant that the authors

⁴⁵ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 103; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 818.

⁴⁶ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 104; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 821.

⁴⁷ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 102; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 818.

⁴⁸ Maier, *Preaching the Crusades*, pp. 102–3.

were clearly concerned to perfect the aural reception of the text by such audiences by creating a document that was word perfect.⁴⁹

Crusade calls lived and died on their ability to persuade people to take up the cross, something of which the pope and his advisers were all too aware. With this in mind, they made a number of alterations to the opening sentence of the *arenga* concerning their cries of help for the Holy Land.⁵⁰ While the draft has ‘pro illo clamamus, qui voce clamavit in cruce spiritum emittendo’, the engrossment reads ‘pro illo clamamus qui *moriendo* voce *magna* clamavit in cruce’.⁵¹ Here, Innocent and his advisers were comparing the cries of the papacy with those of Christ during the crucifixion as related in Matthew 27:50 (‘Jesus autem iterum clamans voce magna, emisit spiritum’).⁵² A lot of careful thought went into this biblical allusion and it is clear that the reference was intentional.⁵³ Although the authors deleted the direct quotation ‘spiritum emittendo’ (‘yielding up the ghost’) to make room for ‘moriendo’,

⁴⁹ On the *cursus*, see Frenz, pp. 46–47. On the performative aspects of papal documents, see Smith, *Curia and Crusade*, pp. 218, 242, 251, and, more broadly, P. Chaplais, *English Diplomatic Practice in the Middle Ages* (2003), pp. 250–1; M. T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066–1307* (3rd edn., Oxford, 2013), p. 287.

⁵⁰ On the *arengae* of papal documents, see: Smith, *Curia and Crusade*, 213–60; Smith ‘The use of the Bible’; T. W. Smith, ‘Preambles to crusading: the *arengae* of crusade letters issued by Innocent III and Honorius III’, in *Papacy, Crusade, and Christian-Muslim Relations*, ed. J. Bird (Amsterdam, forthcoming 2018).

⁵¹ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 101; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 817.

⁵² All biblical references are to the Douay-Rheims edition.

⁵³ On the use of the Bible in the *arengae* of papal crusade letters, see Smith, *Curia and Crusade*, 213–60; Smith ‘The use of the Bible’; Smith, ‘Preambles to crusading’. See also A. V. Murray, ‘Biblical quotations and formulaic language in the chronicle of William of Tyre’, in *Deeds Done Beyond the Sea: Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the Military Orders presented to Peter Edbury*, ed. S. B. Edgington and H. J. Nicholson (Farnham, 2014), pp. 25–34, at p. 34.

modifying the pope's voice to one that was 'dying' or 'failing', they saw fit to insert 'clamans' soon thereafter ('*clamans* ut nos ab aeternae mortis eriperet cruciatu') in order to reinforce the link that they were forging with the crucifixion.⁵⁴ Taken with the famous quotation from Matthew 16:24 that appears immediately after the allusion to Matthew 27:50, it is obvious that Innocent went to great lengths to anchor the crusade call in the long tradition of *imitatio Christi*, which remained one of the most potent motivational forces in medieval Christian religiosity.⁵⁵

In the effort to increase the rhetorical impact of the crusade call, Innocent also ratcheted up the threat posed to the survival of the Latin settlements in Outremer. While the draft exclaimed that the Holy Land was in the grip of the *hand* of the enemy ('... de manu hostium'), the engrossment related that it was in their *hands* ('... de manibus hostium'), a change perhaps intended to imply a greater number of opponents and to increase the perceived level of danger (although one must sound a note of caution here: since each enemy has a pair of hands, this may just be a stylistic improvement).⁵⁶ In the same vein, when discussing the enslavement of Christians in the Near East, the authors added the superlative adjective *gravissima* ('*gravissime* servitutis').⁵⁷ When explaining the threat that the Muslim fortification of Mount Tabor posed to Acre because the latter was devoid of resources and

⁵⁴ *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 817.

⁵⁵ W. J. Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality in the Holy Land and Iberia, c.1095–c.1187* (Woodbridge, 2008), pp. 30–47; Bysted, p. 231; Alphonse, p. 151; Bird, 'Innocent III, Peter the Chanter's circle, and the indulgence', p. 512. Bolton emphasises that 'Innocent's own attitude to the support and liberation of the Holy Land ... was based upon the *vita apostolica* with its firm commitment to Christ': Bolton, p. 180.

⁵⁶ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 101; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 817.

⁵⁷ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 101; Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 140v; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 818 adds an æ ligature in 'gravissime'.

defenders, Innocent hoped to hammer home the precariousness of the city through the insertion of the formulation ‘pene penitus’ (‘almost entirely’): ‘cum sit viribus et opibus *pene penitus* destituta.’⁵⁸ The pope and his curialists also modified the opening of the next sentence, ‘Eapropter igitur’, to ‘Eya [eia] igitur’, which was not only a more direct form for oral delivery, but, significantly, encapsulated the required sense of urgency that Innocent’s text was attempting to convey to its audience.⁵⁹

The process of drafting these rhetorical flourishes was not just one of minor additions and stylistic tweaks, however. One large segment of significant rhetoric from *Quoniam maior* did not make the final cut.⁶⁰ This section was supposed to follow the exposition of the metaphor of God as a temporal lord and the faithful as his vassals, where Innocent warned his audience that Christ ‘will condemn you for the vice of ingratitude and the crime of infidelity if you should fail to aid him with the result that he lost his kingdom’.⁶¹ The excised section from the earlier text took this theme further, calling on the audience to take pause and think upon the injuries done to Christ and the cruel losses that His inheritance had suffered and

⁵⁸ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 101; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 817.

⁵⁹ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 103; Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 140v; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. 216: col. 818 changes the spelling ‘Eya’, as it appears in the register manuscript, to ‘Eia’.

⁶⁰ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 102: ‘Nam si quis sibi vel modicum quid hereditatis paterne sentiret dure ablatum, mox secundum morem mundanum totis viribus laboraret et suam vindicaret iniuriam et violentiam propulsaret nec rebus parceret nec personis, donex ex toto recuperaret amissum. Quomodo ergo poterit excusari, qui nec mediocriter laborare studuerit pro punienda sui redemptoris offensa et eius iniuria ulciscenda, dum parcendo rebus et personis impedit, ne locus recuperetur passionis et resurrectionis dominice, in quo Deus rex noster ante secula salutem in medio terre dignatus est operari?’

⁶¹ *Crusade and Christendom*, p. 108; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 817: ‘[Jesus] de ingratitude vitio et infidelitatis crimine vos damnabit [Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 140v reads ‘dampnabit’], si ei quasi ejecto de regno, quod pretio sui sanguinis comparavit, neglexeretis subvenire.’

then to take action by abandoning worldly concerns and possessions and avenging the Lord, only stopping once the Holy Land had been recovered. The draft then continued in a hectoring tone, posing the rhetorical question ‘in what way, therefore, might one be excused’ if the listener did not strive for the liberation of the place of Christ’s passion and resurrection, the land which Christ sanctified by his presence? This was a rational extension of the means by which Innocent shamed his audience in the engrossed version of the letter, where he stated that those who deigned not to take up the cross were ungrateful and unfaithful. The question remains: why did the authors decide to remove this section of the text? Stylistically, the expunged sentences are impressive and perfectly in keeping with the content and tone of the rest of the letter. In particular, the references to Christ’s passion and resurrection loop back neatly to the theme of *imitatio Christi* with which the letter opens, functioning as a useful reiteration of one of the key points of the encyclical – an aspect of great importance to the aural reception of the document and the effective transmission of the take-home message to the audience. The most plausible explanation for the excision of this part of the letter, then, must be that the papacy considered it either repetitive, and thus superfluous, or too hectoring and critical of the target audience, and thus counterproductive, or perhaps both.

In attempting to rouse the warriors of the West into action, Innocent and his advisers were treading a fine line between inspiration and alienation. They cut out another passage from the draft that, in referring to the ‘cold hearts of the faithful’, was similarly critical of the devotion of potential *crucesignati*: ‘... qui caritatis igne corda fidelium hactenus frigescencia reaccendet.’⁶² These cuts reveal that the authors were performing a delicate balancing act. An early part of the engrossed text does in fact state that the charity of many had grown cold (‘refrigescente caritate multorum’).⁶³ So why did the pope approve the latter statement but

⁶² *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 102.

⁶³ Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 140v; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 817 reads ‘charitate’.

not the former? The repetition of this theme could have been considered too negative, but the more revealing answer lies in the phrasing of the two formulations. While the former disparaged all the faithful without distinction, thus running the risk of offending the most pious members of the Christian community, who would also be those most receptive to the crusade call, the latter was much less specific. The pope and his advisers wanted to shame their audience a little, to prompt them to think upon their sins and the true depth of their devotion so as to move them to take up arms.⁶⁴ But here they showed great concern not to overstep the line and estrange their audience. As we have seen, the final version of *Quia maior* is not uncritical of the people of Christendom, but it strikes the right balance between censure and encouragement, and it is clear that its authors thought extremely carefully about the overall tone of the letter and its impact.

There is extensive evidence that, during the drafting process, the pope and his curialists showed great concern to engage their intended audience. Some of the resultant changes were quite subtle. By modifying the declaration in the draft that Christ had brought body and soul ‘to us’ (‘qui corpus *nobis* et animam contulit’), to Christ bringing these things ‘to you’ in the engrossment (‘qui corpus et animam et cetera *vobis* contulit bona’), Innocent was turning the spotlight on the audience and making the text less introspective.⁶⁵ The pope did the exact same thing later in the letter when he discussed the sacrifice that Christ had made, laying down His life and shedding His blood for humanity. While the draft pronounced

⁶⁴ Maier identifies this as one of the two most effective means used by crusade preachers during recruitment drives, the other being the arousal of anger in the audience against the enemy: Maier, *Preaching the Crusades*, p. 116. See also Bysted, p. 234. On the subject of papal rhetoric and the manipulation of an audience’s emotions, see a forthcoming paper by I. Fonnesberg-Schmidt, provisionally entitled ‘Rhetoric and emotions in twelfth-century papal letters on the crusades’.

⁶⁵ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 102; Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 140v; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 817 reads ‘et caetera’.

that this sacrifice was made ‘for us’ (‘qui pro *nobis* animam suam posuit et sanguinem suum fudit’), when we turn to the engrossment, we witness the exact same change of emphasis that Christ had done this ‘for you’ (‘qui pro *vobis* animam suam posuit et sanguinem suum fudit’).⁶⁶ In the same way, the authors modified the simile of testing the devotion of the faithful like gold in a furnace. The draft referred to the crusade as a struggle ‘in quo fidem *illorum* velut aurum in fornace probaret’.⁶⁷ By the time that *Quia maior* was engrossed, however, the word *ille* had given way to *ei*: ‘in quo fidem *eorum* velut aurum in fornace probaret’.⁶⁸ This alteration may have been simply stylistic, but perhaps Innocent and his curialists considered the subtle sense of remoteness that *ille* conjures up as a demonstrative pronoun undesirable, since it distanced the ‘those’ willing Christians from the audience of the encyclical, which was the polar opposite of the encyclical’s intended effect. *Ei*, as a more neutral pronoun, does not have this problem. In the same vein, after presenting crusade-minded clergy with the option of clubbing together to fund a contingent instead of participating personally, Innocent immediately turned to make the same offer to the laity. In the draft, he had connected these two groups with the formulation *similiter*, but in the engrossment, the pope changed this to ‘Postulantes hoc ipsum ...’⁶⁹ This change is significant

⁶⁶ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 103; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 818. *Crusade and Christendom*, p. 109 renders ‘vobis’ into English incorrectly as ‘for us’.

⁶⁷ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 101.

⁶⁸ *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 817.

⁶⁹ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, pp. 103–4: ‘... et si ad hoc unum quia persone non deerung, si expense non desint. Similiter a regibus et principibus et comitibus et baronibus aliisque magnatibus, qui forsitan per se ipsos personaliter non accesserint ad obsequium crucifixi.’; Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 141r: ‘Et si ad hoc unum quodlibet non suffecerit, plura coniungantur in unum, quia pro certo speramus quod persone non deerunt, si expanse non desint. Postulantes hoc ipsum a regibus et principibus, comitibus et baronibus, aliisque magnatibus, qui forsitan per seipsos personaliter non accesserint ad obsequium crucifixi.’; *Patrologiae cursus*

because, while *similiter* ('similarly') was a relatively weak way to extend this offer to the lay powers, *postulantes* was much more direct and engaging (it is perhaps best rendered into English as we 'ask' or we 'pray', but it can also have the much stronger meaning of demanding of requiring something), posing a question of the secular rulers that demanded a response.⁷⁰ Through these subtle but important alterations, Innocent was attempting to make the letter more personal, to reach out and connect with his audience, to draw them into a dialogue, and make them more active participants in the reception of the crusade call, so that, thus primed, they might be more likely to take the cross.

Comparison of the draft with the engrossment also reveals a whole raft of clarifications and corrections made to the text. One set of corrections rectified two inaccurate scriptural quotations. Apparently, the pope needed to correct one of the most famous parts of the text: that referring to number of the beast and announcing that the allotted 666 years of Islam were almost up. The Apocalypse of John 13:18 states that the number of the beast is 666 ('numerus ejus sexcenti sexaginta sex'), but Burchard's copy of the draft claimed on the authority of John's Apocalypse that this number was 660: 'quod numerus huius bestie, que secundum Apocalypsim Iohannis infra sexcenta LX clauditur'.⁷¹ Tangl suggested that this might simply be a mistake made by a copyist: either Burchard, the scribe who penned the version that Burchard used, or the papal notary who took down the original minute of the letter.⁷² It is hard to believe that the pope and his advisers would make such a rudimentary mistake with such a memorable number, and the explanation of scribal error here is to be

completa, series Latina, ccxvi. col. 819 again has an accurate reading, only inserting æ ligatures in 'persone' and 'expense'.

⁷⁰ *Crusade and Christendom*, p. 110 translates this as '[w]e ask', which best fits the tone of the letter.

⁷¹ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 102.

⁷² Tangl, p. 39.

preferred. In any case, the authors took the opportunity to rework and clarify this whole section (below), and the final text reads: ‘cuius numerus secundum Apocalypsim Iohannis intra sexcenta sexaginta *sex* clauditur’.⁷³ The authors also removed the phrase ‘sicut scriptum est’ (‘as it is written’) that had followed an allusion to Matthew 19:19 in the draft: ‘... diligit proximum suum sicut se ipsum, sicut scriptum est’.⁷⁴ The problem was that this construction was not a direct quotation of scripture. The relevant segment of Matthew 19:19 reads ‘diliges proximum tuum sicut teipsum’. The pope and his advisers had therefore changed the person of the verb and the second person possessive and pronoun to third person. The inclusion of ‘sicut scriptum est’ in this context was thus entirely inappropriate. Not only did the formulation ‘sicut scriptum est’ follow this allusion in this case when it was normal practice in papal letters for the phrase to introduce a scriptural quotation, but also, much more importantly, it was not a direct quotation from the Bible: it was not written as the papacy was claiming. Therefore, Innocent removed this phrase from the draft. The significance of this correction is that it sheds light on a crucial aspect of the drafting process of papal letters: it suggests that the pope and his curialists were first recalling scripture from memory and only checking the accuracy of the letter draft against the Bible afterwards. This is an important finding that has a broad relevance for the study of the medieval papacy and its documents. It confirms the interpretation that pope and his advisers, having received most of their knowledge of the Bible through the liturgy of the Divine Office eight times a day since

⁷³ Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 140v; the reading in *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 818 contains a number of small errors of transcription here.

⁷⁴ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 102. Cf. *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 818.

childhood, were recalling from memory when quoting and alluding to the Bible in papal letters, rather than holding a copy of the Vulgate in their hands.⁷⁵

In addition to correcting the number of the beast, the authors also sought to clarify the relation of the planned crusade to John's Apocalypse. When discussing the 'son of perdition', the 'pseudoprophet' Mohammed, the authors changed the formulation 'filius perditionis pseudopropheta' to 'perditionis filius *Machometus* pseudopropheta'.⁷⁶ The addition of the name of Mohammed made the allusion unquestionably specific and reveals the curialists thinking carefully about the reception of the encyclical by a lay audience, at least part of which may not have been able to make the link between 'pseudoprophet' and Mohammad unaided. The authors also took the opportunity to streamline and clarify the statement that the 666 years of Islam were almost over. Aside from the mistaken reference to 660 years, the draft lacked clarity about how the end of this time would come to pass. The original formulation wrote that the end would some come about through the work of the Holy Spirit:

Cuius perfidia etsi usque ad hec tempora signum, quod numerus huius bestie, que secundum Apocalypsim Iohannis infra sexcenta LX clauditur, *in proximo finietur per operationem spiritus septiformis*, qui caritatis igne corda fidelium hactenus frigescentia reaccendet.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ S. Boynton, 'The Bible and the liturgy', in *The Practice of the Bible in the Middle Ages: Production, Reception and Performance in Western Christianity*, ed. Boynton and D. J. Reilly (New York, 2011), pp. 10–33, at p. 11; M. Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (2nd edn., Cambridge, 2008), pp. 102–3. See also Murray, 'Biblical quotations and formulaic language in the chronicle of William of Tyre' and Smith, *Curia and Crusade*, pp. 224–5.

⁷⁶ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 102; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 818.

⁷⁷ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 102.

Innocent and his advisers appear to have considered this problematic from the perspective of preachers and potential crusaders. The latter were sure to wonder whether the years of the beast were indeed almost over, or whether the end of Islam was contingent upon the work of the Holy Spirit. The authors therefore reworked this section of the text to deliver a message that was much simpler to understand:

Cuius perfidia etsi usque ad hec tempora invaluerit, confidimus tamen in Domino, qui iam fecit nobiscum signum in bonum, quod finis huius bestie *appropinquat* cuius numerus secundum Apocalipsim Iohannis, intra sexcenta sexaginta sex clauditur *ex quibus iam pene sexcenti sunt anni completi*.⁷⁸

In contrast to the previous version, this construction did not leave any room for doubt. Rather than requiring divine intervention and support, Innocent now pronounced that the number of the beast was about to come to an end through the simple passage of time – almost 600 had already elapsed. Left uncorrected, such uncertainty would have affected recruitment. It had the potential to instil doubt in the minds of would-be *crucesignati* about whether the moral state of Christendom was deserving of divine support and whether this was the right time at which to embark on a crusade.

Next came clarifications regarding the spiritual privileges enjoyed by recruits and a refinement of the power of the papacy in granting such rewards. One such modification that the authors made was to insert the word *martirium* into the formulation regarding those who had converted to penitence to rescue the Holy Land and saved their souls as if martyrs in so doing, rather than dying entangled in iniquities: ‘et quasi per agonem *martirii* coronam glorie

⁷⁸ Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 140v; as noted above, the reading in *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col.

818 contains a small number of errors of transcription and also adds æ ligatures.

sunt adepti, qui forte in suis iniquitatibus periissent'.⁷⁹ This amendment reassured recipients that those who had died and would die as crusaders would also die as if martyrs; it served to emphasise the spiritual rewards on offer to *crucesignati* and reassure potential recruits that all those who set out and died on the way to Jerusalem, even if through sickness or shipwreck rather than armed conflict, would still be deemed worthy of a martyr's crown.⁸⁰

When it came to outlining the indulgence of remission of sins, Innocent also made a number of adjustments.⁸¹ For one thing, the pope altered the way in which he expressed the famous power of loosing and binding that Christ had entrusted to His disciples, and which, in turn, the disciples had passed down to Innocent through St Peter (Matthew 18:18: 'whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven.'). This power was crucial to the award of the indulgence since it guaranteed that the spiritual privileges that Innocent offered on earth would be honoured by God in heaven. As James Brundage has pointed out, one of the things necessary for an indulgence to be valid was 'that the indulgence be proclaimed by a person empowered to grant it'.⁸² The draft phrased the award of this power thus: 'ex illa, quam nobis Deus, licet indignis, ligandi atque solvendi *potestatem tradidit*'.⁸³ By the time that the chancery engrossed the document, however, this had changed to: 'ex illa quam nobis

⁷⁹ Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 140v; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. 216: col. 817 has a different spelling of *martirii* ('martyrii') and adds an æ ligature to 'glorie'. Cf. *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 101. See Bysted, p. 241.

⁸⁰ See Bysted, pp. 244–5.

⁸¹ On the crusade indulgence, see James A. Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law and the Crusader* (Madison, Wis., 1969), pp. 145–55 and Bysted.

⁸² Brundage, p. 151.

⁸³ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 103.

Deus, licet indignis, ligandi atque solvendi *contulit potestate*'.⁸⁴ The thinking behind this change, however, is difficult to ascertain. The meaning of *tradere* in this context, that God 'bestowed' or 'bequeathed' the power to the pope, is clear. But the different emphasis that *conferre* brought to the formulation is hard to explain, since the meanings that best fit this context, of God having 'conveyed', 'conferred' or 'bestowed' this power, are synonymous. Although the reasoning behind this modification is obscure, it shows the pope and his advisers thinking very carefully about the theological implications of the wording for the award of the indulgence, and, more broadly, for papal power.

Innocent also made adjustments to the confession of sins that formed the prerequisite for the award of the indulgence. The draft offered 'omnibus, qui laborem istum in propriis personis subierint et expensis, plenam suorum *peccatorum*, si cordis et oris egerint *penitentiam*'.⁸⁵ That is, the pope offered the indulgence to all those who undertook the labour of the crusade, having first repented of their sins with heart and mouth. The curialists refined the latter half of this formulation in the engrossment, however, to the indulgence 'plenam suorum *peccaminum*, de quibus veraciter fuerint corde contriti et ore confessi'.⁸⁶ The switch of *peccati* for *peccaminis* was almost certainly stylistic. Innocent used both interchangeably in crusade letters throughout his pontificate and he referred to 'peccatorum' in the very next sentence of *Quia maior*, so this is probably an example of elegant variation.⁸⁷ The significant alteration is the change in the manner by which sins were to be confessed. Now the pope required that *crucesignati* confess their sins truthfully and contritely with heart and mouth, emphasising the importance of the character of the confession and the moral state of the

⁸⁴ *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 818.

⁸⁵ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 103.

⁸⁶ *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 818.

⁸⁷ Bysted, pp. 293–6.

crusader. The cleansing of sin from the West in preparation for the launch of a successful crusade had long been a keystone in the papal engagement with the crusading movement – especially since 1187 – and it was a concern that also coursed through the final sections of *Quia maior*, as we will see below.⁸⁸ This change brought the papal indulgence closer into line with the theological views of Innocent’s former master at Paris, Peter the Chanter (d. 1197), who argued that without genuine contrition on behalf of the penitent any indulgence granted would be invalid.⁸⁹ This final form of the encyclical is reflected in the crusade preaching of another Paris alumnus, Jacques de Vitry, who emphasised the ‘*crucesignati qui vere contriti et confessi ad Dei servitium accinguntur*’ in one of his sermons – wording that certainly has its roots in the circles of Parisian theologians and which could have been influenced by the text of *Quia maior*.⁹⁰ The amendment to how pilgrims were supposed to make their confessions must therefore be understood in this context. The seemingly small change in wording was in fact crucial to the effective moral preparation of the Fifth Crusade.

The pope and his advisers went further in refining how *crucesignati* were to engage in the crusading movement in order to receive the spiritual rewards. A subtle change in verb regarding the award of the indulgence to those pilgrims who were crusading on behalf of another, from ‘*impenderint*’ to ‘*accesserint*’, raised these proxy crusaders up to the same level of participation in the expedition as those who were funding them, to whom the pope referred

⁸⁸ M. C. Gaposchkin, *Invisible Weapons: Liturgy and the Making of Crusade Ideology* (Ithaca, N.Y., 2017), pp. 192–225.

⁸⁹ Bysted, pp. 113, 115–16. See also Brundage, pp. 151–2.

⁹⁰ C. T. Maier, *Crusade Propaganda and Ideology: Model Sermons for the Preaching of the Cross* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 112.

as ‘taking part’ (‘accesserint’) in both the draft and the engrossment.⁹¹ This change stressed that these proxy crusaders were actively taking part in the crusade to earn their own indulgence, rather than merely contributing to the penance of their benefactor, as the phrasing of the draft (‘impenderint’) appeared to suggest. The authors made similar revisions to the text regarding those who stood to earn the indulgence through the contribution of wealth towards the expedition. Innocent clarified the wording of the offer of remission of sins to this group between the draft and engrossment. The draft declared that the papacy ‘wanted’ such funders to enjoy the same spiritual rewards as crusaders in accordance with the ‘character’ or ‘nature’ of their contribution in aid of ‘the land’ (*ipse* being used to suggest eminence):

Huius quoque remissionis *volumus* esse participes iuxta *qualitatem* subsidii et devotionis affectum omnes, qui ad subventionem ipsius terre de bonis suis congrue ministrabunt.⁹²

It is apparent that the pope and his advisers debated the clarity of formulation of this part of the encyclical and how it might be received, because the engrossment exhibits a number of amendments:

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.⁹³

⁹¹ Cf. *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 103 and *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 818. On the extension of the indulgence to substitute crusades, see Bysted, p. 161 and Brundage, pp. 153–5.

⁹² *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 103.

⁹³ Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 140v; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. cols. 818–19 has a variant reading of ‘terrae sanctae’ instead of ‘ipsius terrae’.

These redactions are revealing. The authors obviously considered the extension of the offer of the indulgence to benefactors in the draft to be too vague and were worried that they risked losing donations out of such uncertainty. Thus, rather than the papacy merely ‘wanting’ (‘volumus’) funders to enjoy the spiritual benefits, Innocent removed any ambiguity by explicitly ‘conceding’ (‘concedimus’) them, thus establishing three clear categories of penitent crusade funders who would receive full remission of sins: ‘those who paid for themselves; those who paid for others; and those who were paid to go.’⁹⁴ But the pope was also careful to close the loophole presented by the word *qualitas* in the draft. The meaning of *qualitas* (‘character’, ‘nature’ or ‘quality’) was much too vague and difficult to quantify in monetary terms, and, as such, was ill suited to its purpose in the letter. There was a danger that collection and recruitment efforts would be stymied by exploitation of *Quia maior*’s generous phrasing, resulting in smaller donations and fewer people taking the cross if a cheap alternative were on offer. The replacement term, *quantitas* (‘magnitude’, ‘quantity’ or ‘size’), on the other hand – while itself far from perfect – gave the clergy involved in recruitment a much better guide to judge a benefactor’s eligibility for the indulgence. The implication is that, in order to qualify for the remission of sins, a donor would have to give a substantial amount of cash equal both to their means and to the sacrifice of going on crusade to the Near East.

Closing the donation loophole was the first of many revisions that the authors made to *Quia maior* concerning the more practical aspects of crusading. Innocent also refined the role of the clergy in the movement. In the segment taking *crucesignati* under the protection of the papacy and the Church, the engrossment adds the bishops of Christendom by name: ‘sub beati Petri et nostra protec[t]ione suscipimus, nec non et *sub* archiepiscoporum et

⁹⁴ Tyerman, *How to Plan a Crusade*, p. 127.

episcoporum et omnium prelatorum ecclesie Dei defensione consistant'.⁹⁵ Furthermore, the pope also amended the implementation of ecclesiastical censure against those who infringed the rights of absent crusaders. It might have seemed obvious to the papacy that the responsibility for this would fall to prelates. The wording of the draft seems to support this interpretation, since it declares that: '*Quod si quisquam contra presumpserit, per censuram ecclesiasticam appellatione remota compescatur*'.⁹⁶ Some of those working on the revisions of the text must have sought greater clarity on this point, however, since the engrossment is much more specific: '*Quod si quisquam contra presumpserit, per ecclesiarum prelatos appellatione postposita censura ecclesiastica compescatur*'.⁹⁷ As Brundage has pointed out, and the changes to the draft reinforce, the task of enforcing the privilege of papal protection usually fell to local prelates.⁹⁸ Yet this was an onerous task that pitted prelates against the lay powers, and this change probably was an attempt to prevent any of these churchmen wriggling out of their responsibilities. Innocent also refined his statement regarding the privilege available to crusader clergy of pledging (that is, mortgaging) their ecclesiastical benefices for three years so as to raise funds for the campaign.⁹⁹ The wording of the draft was obviously thought to be unclear, since the authors chose to insert the word *pignus* ('pledge') into the final construction which offered clergy the ability '*beneficiorum suorum proventus propter hoc valeant usque ad triennium pignori obligare*'.¹⁰⁰ Although one of the meanings of

⁹⁵ Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 140v; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 819 adds æ ligatures. On papal protection for crusaders, see Brundage, pp. 160–9.

⁹⁶ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 103.

⁹⁷ Reg. Vat. 8, fos. 140v–141r; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. 216: col. 819 adds æ ligatures.

⁹⁸ Brundage, pp. 167, 169.

⁹⁹ See Brundage, pp. 177–8.

¹⁰⁰ *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 819.

obligare is ‘to pledge’, the revised phrasing made this crystal clear. Furthermore, Innocent also supplemented the role of the clergy in the preparation of the crusade with one extra duty. In one of the final sections of the engrossed encyclical, which dealt with the collection of alms from the faithful in aid of the Holy Land, the pope inserted the phrase *clerici* into the list of those called upon to make free-will donations (this was before the enactment of the tax of a twentieth on ecclesiastical income at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215).¹⁰¹ The interpolation into the discussion of the collection chests ‘in quo *clerici et laici* viri et mulieres *helemosinas suas* ponant’, was made in order to specify that the offering of ‘their’ alms was expected from the entire Christian community, not merely from members of the lay community.¹⁰² Just like the redaction of the text on cash for indulgences, all of these changes were attempts to nail down exactly the rights and responsibilities of those involved in the crusade so that there was neither ambiguity in the benefits on offer nor opportunities for wily clergy to neglect their duties. This instinct would be proven correct. ‘The suggestion in *Quia maior* for a voluntary levy’ from the clergy, Tyerman writes, was simply ‘ignored’.¹⁰³

The most controversial, indeed, infamous, section of *Quia maior* concerns the role of the clergy in recruiting unsuitable crusaders regardless of whether they were actually able to fulfil their vows (with the expectation that those who could not crusade in person would redeem their vows through a cash payment).¹⁰⁴ The engrossment declares that:

Quia vero subsidium terre sancte multum impediri vel retardari contingeret si ante
susceptionem crucis examinari quemlibet oporteret an esset idoneus et sufficiens *ad*

¹⁰¹ On the twentieth tax, see Smith, *Curia and Crusade*, pp. 297–341.

¹⁰² Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 141r; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 821 contains a number of minor misreadings and adds æ ligatures.

¹⁰³ Tyerman, *How to Plan a Crusade*, p. 220.

¹⁰⁴ Tyerman, *God’s War*, p. 614.

*huiusmodi votum personaliter prosequendum, concedimus ut regularibus personis exceptis, suscipiant quicumque voluerint signum crucis.*¹⁰⁵

After *Quia maior* circulated throughout Christendom, contemporaries appear to have interpreted this controversial clause as little more than a cynical papal cash grab.¹⁰⁶ Indeed, opposition to this development at the Fourth Lateran Council led to this brazenly-worded statement being removed from the Holy Land decree, *Ad liberandam* (although the validity of such vow redemptions was enshrined in the document).¹⁰⁷ But comparison of the engrossment with *Quoniam maior* demonstrates that, in fact, Innocent had already toned down this section from the draft, which had originally stated that:

Quia vero subsidium Terre Sancte multum impediri vel retardari contingeret, si ante susceptionem crucis examinari quemlibet oporteret, an esset idoneus et sufficiens *ad hoc* votum personaliter prosequendum, quicumque voluerint, *indifferenter accipiant signum crucis.*¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 141r; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 819 adds æ ligatures.

¹⁰⁶ Powell, *Anatomy of a Crusade*, pp. 21, 46; Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 615, 616, 621; E. Siberry, *Criticism of Crusading, 1095–1274* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 150–5; E. Dehoux, A. Le Roux and M. Rajohnson, “‘Rome, vos estes refroidie d’aidier la terre de Surie’: originality and reception of Huon of Saint-Quentin’s critical discourse”, in Mylod et al., pp. 175–84, at pp. 176–7.

¹⁰⁷ Powell, *Anatomy of a Crusade*, p. 46; Tyerman, *How to Plan a Crusade*, pp. 215–16. For the text of *Ad liberandam*, see *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta, editio critica: II/1. The General Councils of Latin Christendom from Constantinople IV to Pavia-Siena (869–1424)*, ed. A. García y García et al. (Corpus Christianorum: Conciliorum oecumenicorum generalium decreta ii.i, Turnhout, 2013), pp. 200–4. On the document, see now T. W. Smith, ‘Conciliar influence on *Ad liberandam*’, in *Crusade and Council: The Impact of Fourth Lateran (1215) on Latin Christendom and the East*, ed. J. Bird and D. J. Smith (Turnhout, forthcoming 2018).

¹⁰⁸ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 104.

The draft had thus been much more cavalier about signing everyone with the cross indifferently (*indifferenter*). Despite the fact that the very existence of such a system ‘became vulnerable to charges of “crosses for cash”’, the engrossed version of *Quia maior* was actually the end product of a more circumspect reformulation of the text than scholars had assumed.¹⁰⁹ By excluding religious from the crusade and removing the problematic *indifferenter*, the engrossment shifted even more of the responsibility for taking the vow in the first place onto the pilgrim. It thus seems that Innocent and his curia were alive to the criticisms that they might arouse and attempted to limit them, if not entirely circumvent them. These redactions are testament to debate during the composition process and they prove that there was certainly concern among those involved. Indeed, the rewording of the engrossment may even be the end result of active resistance to the initial proposal.

In addition to a new insertion in the engrossed version of the text that reached out to the maritime cities for assistance (‘A civitatibus vero maritimis navale subsidium postulamus’), the largest insertion of new text concerned the wider political sphere of the crusading movement.¹¹⁰ Between the composition of the draft of *Quoniam maior* and the

¹⁰⁹ Tyerman, *God’s War*, p. 481.

¹¹⁰ Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 141r: ‘Et propter eandem causam, remissiones et indulgentias hactenus a nobis concessas, precedentibus in Yspaniam contra Mauros vel contra hereticos in provinciam revocamus, maxime cum illis concessae fuerint ad tempus que iam ex toto preteriiit, et istis ob causam que iam ex maiori parte cessavit utroque negotio per Dei gratiam adeo profecto ut vehementem instantiam non requirat. Et si forte requireret, nos ingruenti necessitati, respicere curaremus. Concedimus tamen ut huiusmodi remissiones et indulgentie apud provinciales remaneant et Yspanos. Ceterum quia cursarii, et pirate nimis impediunt subsidium Terre Sancte, capiendos spoliando transeuntes ad illam, et revertentes ab illa, nos eos et principales adiutores et fautores eorum, excommunicationis vinculo innodamus sub intimatione anathematis, inhibentes ne quis cum eis scienter communicet in aliquo venditionis vel emptionis contractu. Et iniungentes rectoribus civitatum et locorum suorum, ut eos ab hac iniquitate revocent et compescant. Alioquin, quia nolle perturbare perversos nichil est

engrossment of *Quia maior*, Innocent decided to revoke indulgences for those travelling to crusade in Spain and the south of France (but retained them for those who hailed from the regions), to enact measures against pirates and corsairs, and to ban trade in war materials with the Muslims. While the attempted controls on piracy and trade with Muslims were taken from canon 24 issued by Third Lateran Council in 1179 (as, indeed, the encyclical states), the restrictions on the grant of indulgences in theatres other than the Holy Land, which are always cited as one of the key developments in summaries of *Quia maior*, are more significant. The classic and highly influential interpretation of Paul Alphandéry was that this restriction resulted from Innocent's conception of the whole crusading movement: the struggle to recover the Holy Land was his overriding priority, against which campaigns in other theatres paled in comparison.¹¹¹ Recent research on Innocent's pontificate has softened Alphandéry's interpretation greatly, especially that of Rebecca Rist, who has shown that those with a vested interest in the continuation of the Albigensian Crusade had an influence

aliud quam fovere, nec caret scrupulo societatis occulte, qui manifesto facinori desinit obviare, nec in personas et terras eorum, severitatem ecclesiasticam curabimus exercere, cum tales non minus quam Sarraceni adversentur nomini Christiano. Innovamus preterea excommunicationis sententiam in Lateranensi concilio promulgatam adversus eos qui Sarracenis, arma, ferrum et lignamina deferunt galearum, quique in piraticis Sarracenorum navibus curam gubernationis exercent, eosque rerum suarum privatione multari et capientium servos si capti fuerint, fore censemus. Precipientes ut per omnes urbes maritimas diebus Dominicis et festivis huiusmodi sententia publice innovetur.'; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 819 adds æ ligatures and also contains a large number of misreadings.

¹¹¹ Alphandéry, pp. 152–3: 'Et pour que rien ne vienne gêner déclenchement en masse des foules chrétiennes, les rémissions et les indulgences accordées pour la lutte contre les Maures en Espagne ou contre les hérétiques en Narbonnaise sont rapportées. Tout doit être centré sur l'oeuvre unique – à charge pour la papauté de pourvoir à d'autres dispositions, si les nécessités contraignent. Le *negotium crucis* demeure, dans la pensée du pontife, l'accomplissement par excellence, plus anciennement, plus totalement, plus sûrement peut-être, que le *negotium fidei*.'

on Innocent's decisions, and Damian Smith, who has also drawn attention to their rival lobbyists from Aragon, all competing to alter the course of papal politics.¹¹² But generally, scholars have interpreted the subjugation of the Albigensian Crusade and the Reconquista to the Fifth Crusade at this time as an important indicator of Innocent's own evolving agenda and changing priorities for the crusading movement.¹¹³ Yet comparison of the final text of *Quia maior* against the draft proves that the revocation of indulgences in other theatres was, in fact, not part of Innocent's initial plan, but something that arose from debate (and probably disagreement) among curialists during the drafting process.

Uncertainty about the status of the reconquest in Spain and the Albigensian Crusade had reigned at the papal curia since late 1212, when envoys of Peter II of Aragon (who, politically, was deeply involved in the south of France and at odds with the leader of the Albigensian Crusade, Simon de Montfort) had convinced Innocent that, while heresy in the Midi had been extirpated, the Muslims in Iberia were mustering a great counter-offensive, and therefore the *negotium fidei* in the south of France should be closed down.¹¹⁴ In turn,

¹¹² R. Rist, *The Papacy and Crusading in Europe, 1198–1245* (2009), pp. 51–2; Smith, *Innocent III and the Crown of Aragon*, pp. 131–2.

¹¹³ For the wording of canon 24 of Lateran III, see *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta, editio critica: II/1*, p. 144. On the restriction of indulgences as an indicator of Innocent's agenda for the crusading movement, see, for example: Powell, *Anatomy of a Crusade*, pp. 21–2; Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, p. 171; J. Phillips, *Holy Warriors: A Modern History of the Crusades* (2010), p. 214; J. F. O'Callaghan, *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain* (Philadelphia, Pa., 2003), p. 78; M. G. Pegg, *A Most Holy War: The Albigensian Crusade and the Battle for Christendom* (Oxford, 2008), p. 127; R. Rist, 'Salvation and the Albigensian Crusade: Pope Innocent III and the plenary indulgence', *Reading Medieval Studies*, xxxvi (2010), 95–112, at p. 105; *The Cathars and the Albigensian Crusade: A Sourcebook*, ed. C. Léglu, R. Rist and C. Taylor (Abingdon, 2014), p. 11.

¹¹⁴ Smith, *Innocent III and the Crown of Aragon*, pp. 117–21.

however, in January and February 1213, southern French prelates managed to persuade the pope that the Aragonese envoys had deceived him, and that the threat from heresy in the Languedoc had still not been eradicated.¹¹⁵ Thus, in the run up to the composition of *Quia maior*, Innocent could not be sure whom to trust. His problem was not a dearth of information at the curia, but rather too much, and most of it deeply partisan. Between the drafting of *Quoniam maior* and *Quia maior*, however, he obviously decided (or allowed himself to be persuaded) on the neat solution of keeping both causes alive, but with limitations that would prevent them from causing too much of a distraction for the Fifth Crusade. These restrictions simultaneously complicate and nuance our understanding of Innocent's priorities. Just as with the blanket recruitment for the crusade, these redactions may point to discord within the curia itself. Assuming that the pope played a leading role in the drafting process, however, he appears to have revoked indulgences for crusaders travelling to southern France and Spain more hesitantly than historians had thought. In making these revisions to *Quia maior*, Innocent appears to have made the decision primarily in response to the competing accounts supplied by rival supplicants from outside Rome, rather than a deliberately measured, personal vision of crusading across the Christian world.¹¹⁶

The final set of alterations with which this article will deal is that concerning liturgical engagement with the crusading movement. These late sections of the encyclical made provision for monthly processions to be held in order to intercede with the Lord for divine assistance for the crusade.¹¹⁷ Like the rest of the letter, Innocent also made a number of modifications to these sections. There is evidence that at least some of the authors raised questions about the mixing of both men and women in the liturgical processions. The draft

¹¹⁵ Smith, *Innocent III and the Crown of Aragon*, pp. 123–4, 131–2.

¹¹⁶ On such responsive papal government and the crusades, see Smith, *Curia and Crusade*.

¹¹⁷ Bysted, p. 249.

appeared to make it clear that, if possible, men and women were to participate *seorsum*, that is, separately: ‘Ideoque statuimus et mandamus, ut singulis mensibus fiat generalis processio, seorsum virorum ac mulierum’.¹¹⁸ Yet the engrossment gives a different reading: ‘Ideoque statuimus et mandamus ut singulis mensibus semel fiat generalis processio seorsum virorum, ac seorsum, ubi fieri poterit, mulierum’.¹¹⁹ The revised text is clunky but revealing. For a start, it is testament to anxiety at the papal court about the supplicatory power of processions in which men and women were mixed. This fitted into the ongoing reform of the moral state of Christendom as a prerequisite for a successful crusade, which the authors clearly believed required, as far as was possible (and practical), the separation of the sexes in order to maximise its supplicatory effect.¹²⁰ In 1212, Innocent had ordered a similar procession in the city of Rome in support of the Christian offensive against the Muslims in Spain, which preceded a stunning victory for the crusaders at the Battle of Las Navas de Tolosa.¹²¹ The pope’s fascinatingly detailed plan for this procession reveals that the liturgical event was divided into three distinct groups: women, clergy and lay men. Each group was to start from a different church and snake their way – separately – through the streets of Rome towards the Lateran basilica.¹²² Thus the separation of the sexes (and of the laity from the clergy) was

¹¹⁸ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 104.

¹¹⁹ *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 820. See also C. M. Rousseau, ‘Home front and battlefield: the gendering of the papal crusading policy (1095–1221), in *Gendering the Crusades*, ed. S. B. Edgington and S. Lambert (Cardiff, 2001), pp. 30–44, at p. 36.

¹²⁰ Alphandéry, pp. 151–2. On the wider home-front and liturgy of crusading as supplication, see Gaposchkin, pp. 192–225 and A. E. Lester, ‘A shared imitation: Cistercian convents and crusader families in thirteenth-century Champagne’, *Journal of Medieval History*, xxxv (2009), 353–70, at p. 366.

¹²¹ *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. cols. 698–99; Smith, *Innocent III and the Crown of Aragon*, pp. 105–6; Rousseau, p. 36; Maier, ‘Mass, the eucharist and the cross’, pp. 352–4.

¹²² *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 698: ‘Summo itaque mane convenient mulieres apud Sanctam Mariam Majorem; clerici vero apud basilicam Duodecim Apostolorum, et laici apud Sanctam

already established in the liturgy of the crusading movement. The engrossed text of *Quia maior*, with its double emphasis on the processions being undertaken *seorsum*, made the desirability of such a separation of the sexes unequivocal, even for the most mediocre Latinists among the clergy who were to organise the event. One way of reading this change is that some curialists were unsatisfied with the clarity of the original formulation and worried that, if not understood properly, it might lead to more mixed processions than they deemed ideal. Another reading of the redaction is that the authors interpolated the extra *seorsum* in order to emphasise the extra clause ‘where possible’ (‘ubi fieri poterit’). The modification can thus be read, in fact, as a relaxation of the rigid wording of the original provision. The practical realisation that it might not be possible to hold separate processions across Christendom, and that it was preferable to hold mixed intercessory processions than none at all, thus tempered the draft. The authors also moved to clarify further the nature of crusade preaching that was to accompany the processions. While the draft reads simply ‘ubi semper cum diligenti exhortatione verbum crucis populo proponatur’, the engrossment bears a number of interpolations: ‘ut semper in ipsa processione verbum salutifere crucis cum diligenti exhortatione populo proponatur.’¹²³ Again, as we have witnessed throughout *Quia maior*, these changes were attempts to deliver a more specific message, such as the interpolation of the ‘life-giving’ cross here, which is self-explanatory. Yet the insertion of the requirement that preaching take place ‘in ipsa processione’ was superfluous. The change probably reflects a concern to make certain that the preaching took place at the same ‘event’ as the procession in order to maximise recruitment, but its addition represents a needless

Anastasiam; et post collectas, pulsatis simul istarum ecclesiarum campanis, procedant omnes in campum Lateranensem hoc ordine.’ See: Maier, ‘Mass, the eucharist and the cross’, pp. 353–4; Smith, *Innocent III and the Crown of Aragon*, p. 106.

¹²³ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 104; Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 141r; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 820 inserts an æ ligatures in ‘salutifere’

complication to a text that was already obvious. This, then, is one of the few attempts at clarification that backfired.

Two small alterations rounded off Innocent's efforts to improve the exposition of the liturgical preparations. A small verb change to the segment concerning the consumption of the host after daily mass changed the offer of the host so that it was no longer subjunctive. Where the draft has 'cum iam pro peccatis mundi offerenda *sit* hostia salutaris', the engrossment reads 'cum iam pro peccatis mundi offerenda *vel sumenda est* hostia salutaris'.¹²⁴ The final liturgical change was the insertion of the adverb *devote* to ensure that the clergy sang Psalm 77 with the requisite level of devotion: 'quo cum hoc versu *devote* finito: "Exurgat Deus"'.¹²⁵ The spirit in which the liturgy was performed was, as with so many other aspects of *Quia maior*, of crucial importance in the effort to supplicate and intercede with God in the act of begging for Him to allow the recovery of the Holy Land.¹²⁶

Having compared the draft *Quoniam maior* with the engrossment *Quia maior*, what conclusions can we draw on how papal crusade calls were crafted by medieval popes and their advisers? Most obviously, the differences that the two texts exhibit demonstrate the sheer amount of effort that went into the drafting process, and also the care that the authors took with the implications of the wording. These implications went beyond mere embarrassment over stylistic infelicities. It was crucial that the theological content of such letters – in their appeals to biblical authority and the power of the successors of St Peter to offer an indulgence – aligned correctly with the papacy's conception of its authority and power. In crafting the theological content, the authors of *Quia maior* have also revealed to us

¹²⁴ *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, p. 104; Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 141r; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 821.

¹²⁵ Reg. Vat. 8, fo. 141r; *Patrologiae cursus completa, series Latina*, ccxvi. col. 821 has the reading 'Exsurgat'.

¹²⁶ On the liturgy and the crusading movement, see now Gaposchkin.

a crucial aspect of their method hitherto obscure: the initial mistakes they made in their handling of biblical references in the draft demonstrate that they were citing the Bible from memory, rather than the written text. There were also textual loopholes to close, such as the slack wording regarding the enforcement of crusader privileges and the offer of the indulgence in relation to the *qualitas* of one's contribution. These changes were the end product of debate and, probably, argument among curialists. Such internal discord is reflected in Innocent's shifting crusade conception regarding the campaigns in Spain and southern France, on which this article has shed new light. But the most important finding to take from this examination is the sheer level of concern that the authors of *Quia maior* showed to orient the text towards its audience. The modifications reveal, for instance, the concerted effort to anchor the expedition even more firmly in the popular devotional tradition of *imitatio Christi*. The pope and his advisers made the text of the encyclical less introspective and more inclusive, attempting through subtle changes to emphasise the personal debt that the faithful owed to Christ so as to draw listeners into a personal connection with the expedition. The authors clearly thought that by inspiring a feeling of personal investment and involvement at public readings of the encyclical, they were more likely to persuade people to take the extra step and to sign themselves with the cross. In doing this, the curialists were well aware that, in criticising the faith of the people of Christendom so as to provoke an active response, they were treading a thin line between inspiring them to action and alienating them altogether. Finally, the amendments testify to a strong concern to transmit a clear and unambiguous message first time. They must be the result of questions posed during the drafting process regarding its clarity to the uninitiated. Here, we see the pope thinking carefully about the reception of the text both in Latin in its written form (primarily) by the clergy, and also aurally in the vernacular (primarily) by the laity. Misunderstandings among those thinking of taking the cross, as well as those preaching it, about the privileges on offer, the eschatological

timing of the crusade, and the liturgical support on the home-front, had the potential to hamstring recruitment efforts, and were to be avoided as far as possible. The broader importance of *Quoniam maior* to scholarship on the papacy and the crusades is that it establishes the acute sensitivity that medieval popes and their advisers displayed in their attempts to ensure the perlocutionary force of their encyclicals by engaging with, and pre-empting, the expected reactions of the audience (not always successfully, as the controversy over vow redemptions reveals). Encyclicals such as *Quia maior*, then, were not simply top-down expressions of papal authority, but documents designed to create consensus – a consensus hammered out by the upper echelons of the papal curia and offered to the faithful of Christendom in the common effort, pursued in Outremer and on the home-front in the West, to recover the holy places once and for all.