CHAPTER 5

The Loss of Jerusalem: Jeopardizing the Kingdom of Heaven

> From the last hill that looks on thy once holy dome,
> I beheld thee, oh Sion! when rendered to Rome:
> 'Twas thy last sun went down, and the flames of thy fall
> Flashed back on the last glance I gave to thy wall.
>
> LORD BYRON, *On the Day of the Destruction of Jerusalem by Titus*

Jerusalem, the holy city, *civitas Dei*, center of the world was seminal for Christendom's origins, identity, and politics. Its relevance for the Latin West increased significantly due to the conquest of 1099 and the now open pilgrim routes. For the first time in history, it was in Western hands, the fulfillment of a prophecy.[1] Nikolas Jaspert asserts for the 12th century a remarkable 'Jerusalemsehnsucht' in the West, a collective yearning for the holy city.[2] However, its relevance for the Third Crusade was of course very much due to its conquest in October 1187—an event that was not supposed to happen. Sylvia Schein asserted, "The fall of Jerusalem presented a theological problem […]."[3] As with the Cross relic, this chapter examines how preachers explained and classified the event in exegetical and providential terms. Two aspects deserve particular attention: the four senses of Scripture, explained with the example of Jerusalem

1 See Jean Flori, *L'islam et la fin des temps: l'interprétation prophétique des invasions musulmanes dans la chrétienté médiévale* (Paris 2007), 269–272, 316; Jay Rubenstein, "Lambert of Saint-Omer and the Apocalyptic First Crusade," in: *Remembering the Crusades*, ed. Nicholas L. Paul and Suzanne M. Yeager (Baltimore 2012), 70–71, 85–87; Philippe Buc, *Holy War, Martyrdom, and Terror: Christianity, Violence, and the West, ca. 70 C.E. to the Iraq War* (Philadelphia 2015), 74–77, 280–286.

2 Nikolas Jaspert, "'Wo seine Füße standen' (Ubi steterunt pedes eius). Jerusalemsehnsucht und andere Motivationen mittelalterlicher Kreuzfahrer," in: *Die Kreuzzüge: Kein Krieg ist heilig*, ed. Hans-Jürgen Kotzur (Mainz 2004), 177.

3 Sylvia Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City: Crusader Jerusalem and the Catholic West (1099–1187)* (Aldershot 2005), 170.

since early Christianity, and the Corpus Christi, an entity that authors entwined with the city and other spaces in the East.

Nonetheless, one must keep in mind that the city only played a role from a certain point, after the West had received news of its loss (early 1188, exact date unknown).[4] The period before included the cross takings of Henry II and Philip II in Gisors (late Jan. 1188), where Baldwin of Canterbury also took the cross, together with Philip of Dreux and numerous other bishops and princes, as recorded in a list in Rigord's chronicle.[5] A first preaching period thus focused on the Cross: specific texts where it is dominant, and Jerusalem remarkably absent, may be dated to this period—as already argued for Peter's *Passio Raginaldi* (see the chapter on immediate context). The same seems to apply to his *Dialogus*, which mentions Jerusalem no more than three times (none of the cases speaks of a conquest); the text depicts a fictitious abbot enticing Henry II to depart on crusade. Since Henry had promised to do so for decades, it is plausible that Peter penned this while still at the Curia.[6] Certainly, further preachers started penning sermons with October 1187, for example, Henry of Albano's crusade treatise offers several passages where the cross is dominant and Jerusalem absent.[7] In other passages, Jerusalem is central and the cross remarkably absent, in particular at the treatise's outset; these passages date, therefore, after early 1188.[8] It is noteworthy that Henry was already traveling at the time; these passages provide intriguing evidence for a text taking shape while preaching a crusade. Some of the numerous sermons on the cross may also date to the early period, for example, Alan's *De cruce domini*, which reveals the same pattern: cross dominant and Jerusalem absent.[9] Yet, this is not a compelling argument, since, as demonstrated in the previous chapter, preaching on the cross doubtlessly remained important after early 1188.

Anyway, from a certain point onwards, Jerusalem played a role; considering the delayed departures, this was still a substantial period: more than a year for the German crusade (May 1189) and more than two years for the English and

4 See Helen Birkett, "News in the Middle Ages: News, Communications, and the Launch of the Third Crusade in 1187–1188," *Viator* 49/3 (2018), 39, 49–58. As argued, an encyclical from Feb. 1188 suggests that the loss was still unknown (cited in Gerald of Wales, *De principis instructione*, 236–239).

5 Rigord, *Gesta*, ed. Delaborde, 83.

6 Peter of Blois, *Dialogus*. Henry's cross taking substantiates this; it made the *Dialogus* superfluous. For Henry's crusade plans in previous decades, see Christopher J. Tyerman, *England and the Crusades, 1095–1588* (Chicago 1988), 39–54.

7 See esp. Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (XIII), 353–354.

8 Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (XIII), 351–352. See the chapter on immediate context.

9 Alan of Lille, *De cruce domini*, ed. d'Alverny, 279–283.

French contingents (March and July 1190). The news of its loss must have been an immense shock. However, the fact that we cannot grasp this moment—in contrast to news of the loss of the relic—is most puzzling, and I cannot explain it either. One may perhaps suppose a state of shock paralysing the production of historical records for the moment. For example, it is told that Henry II did not speak a word for four days.[10] As the sermon texts or several poems demonstrate, it must have had a powerful impact, since the city was such a vital subject of Latin culture.[11] Whereas one could read the conquest of 1099 as providential progress, the loss of 1187 must have appeared as a regression, whose providential classification thus posed a challenge to exegetes and preachers.

The city was omnipresent in the West despite its geographical distance. This generated a mass of notions and meanings tied to this single object, and in spite of a certain rejection of the physical places in early Christianity, Jerusalem remained a pertinent subject throughout the centuries.[12] By the central Middle Ages, due to the First Crusade, but already with the numerous Holy Land pilgrimages of the 11th century, the earthly city regained a steadily growing significance. This expressed itself, for example, in relics brought from the East or architectural embodiments of the city.[13] However, these developments were not tantamount to an increase in knowledge. Its actual circumstances remained distant and were overall of no interest, since the West had rich resources from the liturgy and Bible for endowing it with meaning—and these were the meanings it bore in the West. This encompassed liturgy and preaching, where its presence shaped lay spirituality, being imprinted in minds since

10 Gervase of Canterbury, *Opera*, 1:389.

11 Such a poem is also found in: Peter of Blois, *Carmina*, 257–262. On poems, see Linda Paterson, *Singing the Crusades: French and Occitan Lyric Responses to the Crusading Movements, 1137–1336* (Cambridge, UK 2018), 47–75; Ingrid Hartl, *Das Feindbild der Kreuzzugslyrik: Das Aufeinandertreffen von Christen und Muslimen* (Bern 2009), 107–160; Alan Murray, "The Poet Friedrich von Hausen in the Third Crusade and the Performance of Middle High German Crusading Songs," in: *Crusading and Warfare in the Middle Ages*, ed. Simon John and Nicholas Morton (Farnham 2014), 119–128.

12 See Nikolas Jaspert, "Das Heilige Grab, das Wahre Kreuz, Jerusalem und das Heilige Land. Wirkung, Wandel und Vermittler hochmittelalterlicher Attraktoren," in: *Konflikt und Bewältigung*, ed. Thomas Pratsch (Berlin 2011), 72; Sylvia Schein, "Die Kreuzzüge als volkstümlich-messianische Bewegungen," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 47 (1991), 123.

13 See Schein, *Gateway*, 109–112, 139, 190; Nikolas Jaspert, "Vergegenwärtigungen Jerusalems in Architektur und Reliquienkult," in: *Jerusalem im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter*, ed. Dieter Bauer (Frankfurt am Main 2001), 219–297. For pilgrimages before the crusades, see Jean Flori, *Prêcher la croisade: XI^e–XIII^e siècle; communication et propagande* (Paris 2012), 19–27.

early childhood—a life without Jerusalem (in whatever guise) must have been inconceivable.[14] Several liturgical feasts put it at center stage, therefore it is difficult or even unreasonable to limit oneself to small samples, especially because sermons' contents like to diverge from their nominal feasts—perhaps due to a current occasion such as the crusade.[15] Crucial feasts belong to the Lenten and Easter season:

The fourth Sunday of Lent (*Laetare Jerusalem*) expressed joy at approaching Jerusalem, at least in a spiritual or monastic sense, stemming from Is. 66:10—but it may likewise have expressed the joy of approaching the earthly city. This shows the *Curia Jesu Christi*, held on that very day (27 March 1188), where Henry of Albano and others preached the crusade, enticing Barbarossa and numerous others to take the cross. As Henry noted in a letter, the date was a conscious choice. The French king held a crusade council on the same day in Paris; and the feast was also meaningful because medieval people dated Christ's resurrection to 27 March.[16] Intertwining this feast with crusade preaching represents a reaction to the news of the city's loss.[17] Just as the Sunday's original meaning pointed to the fulfilling purpose of Christ's Passion, the Sunday in 1188 pointed to the crusade's fulfilling eschatological purpose (see also the chapter on the Apocalypse).

---

14 See Jaspert, "Attraktoren," 72; Cecilia Gaposchkin, *Invisible Weapons: Liturgy and the Making of Crusade Ideology* (Ithaca, NY 2017), 31–35; Jürgen Bärsch, "Jerusalem im Spiegel der abendländischen Liturgie des Mittelalters. Anamnetisches Zitat—szenische Darstellung—visuell-haptische Inkorporation," in: *Die Kreuzzugsbewegung im römisch-deutschen Reich* (*11.–13. Jahrhundert*), ed. Nikolas Jaspert and Stefan Tebruck (Ostfildern 2015), 347–360. On the formative role of the liturgy, see David d'Avray, "Popular and Elite Religion: Feastdays and Preaching," in: *Elite and Popular Religion*, ed. Kate Mason Cooper (Woodbridge 2006), 162–179.

15 On this phenomenon in 13th-century sermon texts, see David d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford 1985), 245–246.

16 Henry of Albano, *Ep.32*, PL 204:250; see also Gerald of Wales, *Expugnatio Hibernica*, 366; Rigord, *Gesta*, ed. Delaborde, 84. The same date had motivated the large eschatological pilgrimage of 1064–1065 (see Schein, *Gateway*, 147). On the feast's pertinence to the crusades, see Schein, *Gateway*, 115–116; Constantinos Georgiou, *Preaching the Crusades to the Eastern Mediterranean: Propaganda, Liturgy, and Diplomacy, 1305–1352* (New York 2018), 135–139. Is. 66:10 was also part of the liturgy which celebrated the conquest of 1099 (see Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 150–152, 265, 272, 282).

17 See Jessalynn L. Bird, *Heresy, Crusade and Reform in the Circle of Peter the Chanter, c.1187–c.1240* (PhD thesis, University of Oxford 2001), 146; contrary to: Birkett, "News," 56–57, who surmises that the news was still unknown at the time (however, I do not see how this is substantiated). The feast is also discussed in: Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (XVIII), 396–402. Fulk of Neuilly preached the Fourth Crusade on the same day (see Renier of Liège, *Annales*, 655).

Palm Sunday (*In ramis palmarum*), the sixth Sunday of Lent, celebrated Christ's arrival in Jerusalem, where the inhabitants received him with palm branches. This feast was concerned with traveling to and entering the city: a most expressive example for crusaders. It thus offered an excellent occasion for preaching the crusade, as Jessalynn Bird demonstrated for early 13th-century material.[18] A popular opening verse in sermon texts sketches the moment when Christ approaches the walls (Mt. 21:1 or Lk. 19:41).[19] Considering emotional reactions upon arriving in Jerusalem, as presented in chronicles and pilgrim reports, this example seems to have been effective, just as authors understood Christ's arrival as a prefiguration of 1099's conquest.[20] The succeeding verse Mt. 21:2 also appears in many Palm Sunday sermons, and the feast contains another reference to crusading, since the palm branch was a pilgrim's trophy for having completed the journey to Jerusalem.[21] The relevant corpus holds numerous Palm Sunday sermons with high crusade potential such as those by Hélinand of Froidmont (discussed in the previous chapter).

Maundy Thursday (*In coena domini*) celebrated the Last Supper, which had taken place on Mount Zion. Key therein was the Eucharist and the Corpus

18 Jessalynn L. Bird, "Preaching the Crusades and the Liturgical Year: The Palm Sunday Sermons," *Essays in Medieval Studies* 30 (2014), 11–36, esp. 19–20. See also Ms. BL Royal 10 A XVI, fols. 87^{v}, 88^{v}–89^{r} and Ms. BNF lat. 10633, fols. 102^{r}, 103^{v}–104^{r}; Oliver of Paderborn, *Ep.5*, ed. Hoogeweg, 302–305; Ms. Lambeth 144, fol. 118^{r}. On the liturgy in Latin Jerusalem, see Barbara Baert, *A Heritage of Holy Wood: The Legend of the True Cross in Text and Image* (Leiden 2004), 175–176; Iris Shagrir, "Adventus in Jerusalem: The Palm Sunday Celebration in Latin Jerusalem," *Journal of Medieval History* 41/1 (2015), 1–20. The corresponding procession was concurrent with that for *In exaltatione sancte crucis*, because both, Heraclius and Christ, had entered Jerusalem via the Eastern gate, the *porta aurea*.

19 See, e.g., Ralph Ardens, *Pars (1), Section (1), Sermo 46*, 1830; Martin of León, *Liber sermonum, Sermo 20*, 832; Ms. Clermont-Ferrand 33, fol. 144^{r}; Ms. Oxford, Magd. Coll. 168, fols. 70^{v}–72^{r}; Ms. Arsenal 543, fol. 204^{v}. See also Jean Longère, *Les sermons latins de Maurice de Sully, évêque de Paris: contribution à l'histoire de la tradition manuscrite* (Steenbrugis 1988), 337, 354–355.

20 See Baert, *Heritage*, 167; Schein, *Gateway*, 103; Andrea Sommerlechner, "Kaiser Herakleios und die Rückkehr des Heiligen Kreuzes nach Jerusalem. Überlegungen zu Stoff- und Motivgeschichte," *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 45 (2003), 351–352. Preachers in the 13th century likewise stressed the exemplary nature, including John of Abbeville; see Jussi Hanska, "Videns Iesus civitatem flevit super illam: The 'lachrymae Christi' Topos in Thirteenth-Century Sermon Literature," in: *Constructing the Medieval Sermon*, ed. Roger Andersson (Turnhout 2007), 249.

21 See, e.g., Jonathan Riley-Smith, "An Army on Pilgrimage," in: *Jerusalem the Golden*, ed. Susan B. Edgington (Turnhout 2014), 112. Alan of Lille penned two sermons on Mt. 21:2 (Ms. BL Add 19767, fols. 82^{r}–83^{v}; Ms. BNF lat. 14589, fols. 57^{v}–59^{r}). On the reference, see Bird, "Palm Sunday," 24–26.

Christi: drinking the wine procured a union with the blood of Christ. The biblical stories of the Last Supper and Passion thus created a threefold nexus held together by Christ's blood, consisting of the Christian community, Christ himself, and the Holy Land. This nexus is exemplified in the relevant corpus: it offers three texts for Maundy Thursday that all focus on the cross and have high crusade potential.[22] Henry of Albano promulgated in his letter to the entire clergy (early 1188) that one should preach and liturgically support the crusade on the feast day—we may take his mandate as a template for reading the sermons.[23] Eventually, Easter shows a significant spatial anchoring: Christ had been crucified on Golgotha and buried at the place where the Church of the Holy Sepulcher would be built, while architectural elements made these venues present within Western churches. With such present, the Easter liturgy related directly to the Holy Land and hence the crusade.[24] The feast's vital role granted, therefore, the crusade heightened meaning if one chose it as a preaching occasion, as Bird argued for 13th-century texts.[25] The relevant corpus offers in particular the Easter sermons of Garnerius of Clairvaux that all focus on the cross. Henry of Albano names Good Friday as a feast for preaching the crusade—he delivers once more a template for reading the sermons.[26] Bernard of Clairvaux's crusade sermon in Vézelay took place on Easter (1146); and the

22 Martin of León, *Liber sermonum*, *Sermo 22*; *Sermo 23*; Peter of Blois, *Sermo 19*. On Peter's sermon, see the chapter on the Cross relic.

23 Henry of Albano, *Ep.31*, 248.

24 See Schein, *Gateway*, 179; Jessalynn L. Bird, "The Victorines, Peter the Chanter's Circle, and the Crusade: Two Unpublished Crusading Appeals in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. Latin 14470," *Medieval Sermon Studies* 48 (2004), 5–6; Andrea Worm, "Visuelle Vergegenwärtigungen Jerusalems und der Heiligen Stätten im Reichsgebiet. Überlegungen zu Kontexten und Übermittlungswegen," in: *Die Kreuzzugsbewegung im römisch-deutschen Reich* (*11.–13. Jahrhundert*), ed. Nikolas Jaspert and Stefan Tebruck (Ostfildern 2015), 316.

25 Jessalynn L. Bird, "'Far Be It from Me to Glory Save in the Cross of Our Lord Jesus Christ (Gal. 6:14)': Crusade Preaching and Sermons for Good Friday and Holy Week," in: *Crusading in Art, Thought, and Will*, ed. Matthew Parker and Ben Halliburton (Leiden 2018), 129–165; see also Christoph T. Maier, *Preaching the Crusades: Mendicant Friars and the Cross in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge, UK 1994), 108, 113. Henry VI took the cross on Good Friday in 1195 and called publicly for the crusade on Easter Sunday (*Annales Marbacenses*, MGH Rer. Germ. 9:65–66; see Graham A. Loud, "The German Crusade of 1197–1198," *Crusades* 13 (2014), 148).

26 Henry of Albano, *Ep.31*, 248; and esp. Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 17*, 686, distinguishing Easter according to the four senses. Innocent III's Fourth Lateran sermon also aligns Easter with crusade preaching: Innocent III, *De diversis*, *Sermo 6*, 675. See also Alan of Lille, *De sancta cruce* (*1*), 223–226, and its attribution to Easter in: Ms. BNF lat. 3818, fol. 53^{r} and Ms. Paris, St.Geneviève 2787, fol. 147^{r}; see the chapter on the Cross relic.

same goes for Baldwin preaching in Wales in 1188.[27] In conclusion, a number of feasts blended with the earthly Jerusalem, often including the meaningful conjunction of city and cross; this derives already from the biblical stories, but generated new meaning thanks to the events of 1187.

Another pertinent genre are sermons *In dedicatione ecclesiae* (On dedicating a church); these sometimes deliver crusade-related texts, as the relevant corpus demonstrates.[28] This is not surprising because the church typologically embodied Jerusalem or the Temple. This conjunction, established at a church's dedication, delivered the foundation for creating a nexus to Jerusalem (in whatever guise) in subsequent liturgy and preaching taking place in the same church.[29] It is also possible that a crusade-related sermon was only ascribed to *In dedicatione* when a collection was set up: this seems likely if the church space, the actual subject, is not dealt with in a text. Lastly, the liturgical commemoration of the conquest of 1099 prompted the establishment of its own feast in Latin Jerusalem that would play an important role for the city's (perpetually renewed) identity. It incorporated elements from *In dedicatione* on account of its references to Jerusalem and Temple, and it expressed an eschatological understanding of the earthly city that will be a major subject of investigation in the following pages.[30] In the West, the development of a dedicated liturgy does not seem to have been that sharp or uniform, yet one finds many "echoes of victory," as Cecilia Gaposchkin put it (such as marking the 15 July, the day of conquest, in liturgical calendars).[31] The relevant corpus does not contain any corresponding sermons, and the evidence is generally slim: only one text has been identified for the West and one for Latin Jerusalem (ascribed to Fulcher of Chartres). Others may await discovery, but not from after 1187, since celebrating the victory would have been absurd in this situation.[32] It is also possible that generic sermons on Jerusalem were used for the feast day.

---

27 See Tyerman, *England*, 159; Penny J. Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270* (Cambridge, Mass. 1991), 42.

28 Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 37*, 806–813; Martin of León, *De diversis*, *Sermo 1*, 61–66; Peter of Blois, *Sermo 52*, 713–715. See also Jessalynn L. Bird, "Damietta the Whore, the Purification of the Virgin Mary, and the Crusade Movement," *Medieval Sermon Studies* 65 (2021), 6–7. Since a bishop dedicated a church, these show that the authors wrote sermons for their superiors.

29 On the corresponding liturgy, see Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 26, 33, 175.

30 See Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 130–164, esp. 148–156. See also the chapter on the Apocalypse.

31 Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 165–191; Gaposchkin, "The Echoes of Victory: Liturgical and Paraliturgical Commemorations of the Capture of Jerusalem in the West," *Journal of Medieval History* 40/3 (2014), 237–259.

32 See Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 150–151, 162–164, 181–183. On Jerusalem in the late medieval liturgy, see Amnon Linder, *Raising Arms: Liturgy in the Struggle to Liberate Jerusalem in the Late Middle Ages* (Turnhout 2003).

Importantly, the four senses of Scripture had been explained with the example of Jerusalem since early Christianity (especially by John Cassian, c.400). This scheme was well received in the 12th century, prominently in the *Glossa ordinaria*, in the prologue to the book of Genesis.[33] It identified (a) the earthly Jerusalem with the literal sense, (b) the heavenly Jerusalem with the anagogical or eschatological sense, (c) the typological Jerusalem with the Church, and (d) the tropological or moral Jerusalem with a Christian's soul.[34] The last two were often combined, shaping together the spiritual Jerusalem, indebted to the intrinsic conjunction of individual and community in the Corpus Christi. Peter the Chanter's *Distinctiones* list the four senses in the same classification, betraying that this scheme was an essential instrument for his circle.[35] And John Beleth delivered an update of Cassian's scheme (1160s), describing the historical Jerusalem as the city where the soldiers and pilgrims go (*historia, quemadmodum de ea civitate ad quam pergunt hospites et peregrini*). Gaposchkin thus underlines that the Jerusalem of the liturgy encompasses the earthly city.[36] A scholar's challenge now consists in the curious finding that many sermon texts do not explicitly state which Jerusalem they are talking about: several cases exist where more than one sense seems applicable. This may reflect an author's intention, since sermon collections have often been set up in a way to be adaptable for different occasions and audiences.[37] If one succeeds in identifying the earthly guise, one can safely speak of a sermon with high crusade potential; this represents a discussion of a physical manifestation, one approach for identifying the crusade (see the section on methodology). In cases where it cannot be established beyond doubt, but it is plausible that a text was used for this purpose, one can speak of a sermon with possible crusade poten-

33 John Cassian, *Collationes* (14.8), 964; *Glossa ordinaria*, ed. Gibson, 1:6; discussed by Riccardo Quinto, "Peter the Chanter and the 'Miscellanea del Codice del Tesoro' (Etymology as a Way for Constructing a Sermon)," in: *Constructing the Medieval Sermon*, ed. Roger Andersson (Turnhout 2007), 50–52, who asserts an influence of the *Glossa* on Peter the Chanter and Stephen Langton. See also Yves Congar, "Eglise et Cité de Dieu chez quelques auteurs cisterciens à l'époque des Croisades: en particulier dans le De Peregrinante Civitate Dei d'Henri d'Albano," in: *Mélanges offerts à Etienne Gilson de l'Académie française*, ed. Callistus Edie (Toronto 1959), 180.

34 See Roberts, *Sermons*, 104–105; Henri de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale: les quatre sens de l'écriture* (Paris 1959), 1:643–648; Hans-Werner Goetz, "Die Rezeption der augustinischen civitas-Lehre in der Geschichtstheologie des 12. Jahrhunderts," in: *Vorstellungsgeschichte* (Bochum 2007), 98.

35 Ms. BL Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 48^{r} and Ms. BNF lat. 10633, fol. 53^{r} as well as Petrus Cantor, *Distinctiones*, 302–303.

36 John Beleth, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, 212–213; discussed by Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 32–33.

37 See Cole, *Preaching*, 113–114; d'Avray, *Friars*, 7, 104–131.

tial. This chapter will keep an eye on this essential methodological issue, which confronts us with the crucial question of how we select sources and determine their relevance.

Beyond this basic disposition, there is the question of whether we should even distinguish the senses in such a clear-cut way, as we tend to with our rational approach trained to think in sharp categories.[38] The blurry lines between the senses in many sermon texts may be symptomatic of the medieval understanding. There was ultimately only one Jerusalem, the celestial, while all others existed due to the Fall of Mankind and would no longer exist after the Apocalypse. The senses were categorically interactive and inclusive—and not antithetical. One may suppose for the 12th century that the earthly city was always comprised; the concurrence of terminology—all are called 'Jerusalem'—corroborates this argument. Jean Flori asserted: "Certainly, it is not the city itself that lures them, but the unique resonance, both spiritual and emotional, of the word Jerusalem in the contemporary mind."[39] Nevertheless, this chapter will keep a lookout for clues that permit identifying the earthly guise and hence the crusade, paying close attention to those passages that explicitly entwine the different senses. A phrase that appears frequently in sermons is *id est*, for example, *Jerusalem id est ecclesia*.[40] It serves the purpose of connecting different elements, but it raises the question of their hermeneutical relationship. It may designate an allegorical nexus: it says Jerusalem, but it means the Church and not Jerusalem.[41] It may be a symbolic nexus: Jerusalem points to the Church—the city is not devalued but elevated in its meaning, since it also stands for something else.[42] The last possibility is that it designates a de facto equation: with the cultural premises of Corpus Christi and four senses, this seems possible. Jerusalem is able to appear in different places and

38 See, e.g., Flori's discussion of Gerhoch of Reichersberg (Flori, *L'islam*, 299–300).

39 Jean Flori, "Jérusalem terrestre, céleste et spirituelle. Trois facteurs de sacralisation de la première croisade," in: *Jerusalem the Golden*, ed. Susan B. Edgington (Turnhout 2014), 26: "*Certes, ce n'est pas la ville en elle-même qui les attire, mais uniquement la résonance, spirituelle et émotionnelle, du mot Jérusalem dans les mentalités contemporaines*." My translation.

40 See, e.g., Martin of León, *Liber sermonum*, *Sermo 26*, 960; Baldwin of Canterbury, *Sermo 8*, 134.

41 See Guibert of Nogent, *Sermo fieri debeat*, 25: "allegoria, in qua ex alio aliud intelligitur."

42 See, e.g., Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 28*, 753, where he explains, related to the Cross relic, that the actual Mount Zion signifies the Church (*mons enim Sion Ecclesiam Dei significat*); see the chapter on the Holy Land. See also Benedictinus anonymus, *De penitentia*, ed. Huygens, 101–102, where the Benedictine explains, in the shadow of 1187, the spiritual meaning of several holy sites.

guises (such as the Church).[43] As a result, elements are related in a network of knowledge and meaning, while all point to the one true guise, the heavenly city.

The city appears as *Jerusalem* or *Hierosolymum*, partly feminine as *Hierosolyma*. Orthography is flexible: *J* and *I* are interchangeable, just as *H* can drop out or be added. Moreover, a number of terms are more or less synonymous such as Zion, *civitas*, kingdom of the heavens (*regnum coelorum*), or *visio pacis*—although they may express nuances. These terms may refer to specific senses; however, one will find enough examples where the same term refers to another sense or constructs causalities between the senses. *Regnum coelorum* and *visio pacis* tend to refer to the heavenly Jerusalem, yet it was common in the 12th century to render the earthly city as such, for example, Hugh of Folieto in his depiction of the four senses (mid-12th century).[44] Guibert of Nogent (early 12th century) said that the earthly city had been re-established as the *visio pacis* thanks to the conquest of 1099, whereas Celestine III deemed it "the former vision of peace" (*quondam visio pacis*)—referring to the disrupted order since 1187.[45] There was also the opposite phenomenon: one portrayed the heavenly guise via biblical verses that actually described the earthly counterpart.[46] The motif of Zion seems to have lent itself primarily to the earthly embodiment, but spiritual and monastic counterparts do likewise exist. An important reference here is Ps. 131:13 (*quoniam elegit Dominus Sion, desideravit eam in habitationem sibi*).[47] One of Peter of Blois' sermons speaks of *terrena Sion*, apparently to underline that the earthly Jerusalem is at stake—even though this is obvious, since he broaches both the conquest of 1187 and the First Crusade (see the discussion below).[48] The situation becomes even more complex with *civitas*

43 Telling is when Innocent identifies the Jerusalem from Ez. 9 as the Church, while being simultaneously concerned with the crusade (Innocent III, *De diversis*, *Sermo 6*, 677).

44 Hugh of Folieto, *De claustro*, 1131; discussed by Goetz, "Rezeption," 98.

45 Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta*, ed. Huygens, 305; Celestine III, *Ep.224*, 1108; see Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 34–35.

46 See Schein, *Gateway*, 136, 191.

47 See Yves Congar, "Henri de Marcy, abbé de Clairvaux, cardinal, éveque d'Albano et légat pontifical," *Analecta monastica* 5 (1958), 60; Samuel Krauss, "Zion and Jerusalem: A Linguistic and Historical Study," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 77 (1945), 15–33. See also Wolf Zöller, *Regularkanoniker im Heiligen Land: Studien zur Kirchen-, Ordens- und Frömmigkeitsgeschichte der Kreuzfahrerstaaten* (Münster 2018), 162–185.

48 Peter of Blois, *Sermo 39*, 677; see also *Passio Raginaldi*, 43. For Zion referring to the earthly city, see, e.g., Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 4*, 599; *Sermo 28*, 753; Peter of Blois, *Ep.98*, 307; *Conquestio*, 79–80; Ralph Ardens, *Pars (II), De tempore, Sermo 19*, 1373; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Ep.289*, 452; Berter of Orleans, *Iuxta threnos*, ed. Raby, 297; Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, 2:330; William of Tyre, *Chronique* (8.2), 383. See also for the First Crusade: Raymond of

and *ecclesia*, terms that authors distinguish into different aspects. This derives from Augustine's theology: the *ecclesia peregrinans* (the community of believers in exile), the *ecclesia militans* (a synonym, but with a militant note), and the *ecclesia triumphans*, the heavenly Jerusalem (equivalent are *civitas peregrinans*, *civitas militans*, and *civitas triumphans*).[49] The motif of *civitas* potentially held a strong connection with the earthly Jerusalem, since the latter was a *civitas*. The *civitas Dei* designates the heavenly entity, but may also refer to its terrestrial embodiment: for example, Richard Lionheart, in his letter to Garnerius of Clairvaux (autumn 1191), describes the city they are currently preparing to recapture as the *civitas Dei*.[50] In conclusion, there is much flexibility in the use of all these terms, a fact that impedes a scholar's approach to these texts and the identification of the crusade in them.

The last point of introduction concerns Jerusalem's topography; there were a number of important places within its walls: the Temple Mount district, where Western observers read the two existing buildings (Dome of the Rock and al-Aqsa Mosque) as two different Temples;[51] the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, the venue of Christ's tomb; and Golgotha, place of Christ's crucifixion, whose location is unknown today. The medieval West equated the latter with the Sepulcher, believing that the Cross had been found by Helena and then recovered by the crusaders in 1099 in the very same spot.[52] According to Pseudo-Methodius, Golgotha would be the place where the Last World Emperor lays down his crown.[53] Furthermore, the Mount of Olives hosted three essential events: Christ's arrival in Jerusalem (Palm Sunday), his incarceration before the crucifixion, and the Ascension after his resurrection. His Second

---

Aguilers, *Liber*, ed. Hill, 138–139; Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia* (1.26), ed. Hagenmeyer, 282; and (1.27), 297.

49 See Thomas Renna, *Jerusalem in Medieval Thought: 400–1300* (Lewiston 2002), 193; Robert Austin Markus, *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of Saint Augustine* (Cambridge, UK 1970), 154–186.

50 Cited in Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, 3:130.

51 See Baert, *Heritage*, 168, 172–175; Jaspert, "Attraktoren," 92; Heribert Busse, "Vom Felsendom zum Templum Domini," in: *Das Heilige Land im Mittelalter*, ed. Wolfdietrich Fischer and Jürgen Schneider (Neustadt a. d. Aisch 1982), 19–32. Hélinand identifies the Temple Mount as Zion when speaking of the conquest of 1099 (Hélinand of Froidmont, *Chronicon*, 995).

52 See Anastasia Keshman Wasserman, "The Cross and the Tomb: The Crusader Contribution to Crucifixion Iconography," in: *Between Jerusalem and Europe*, ed. Renana Bartal and Bianca Kühnel (Leiden 2015), 18–28.

53 See Schein, *Gateway*, 147. Adso of Montier-en-Der, however, located the event on the Mount of Olives (Adso of Montier-en-Der, *De ortu*, 26; see Rubenstein, "Saint-Omer," 79).

Coming was likewise supposed to happen here.[54] David's Tower, part of Jerusalem's fortifications, was another element endowed with exegetical meaning in the West.[55] Lastly, the different gates into the city were an essential element in Western texts, since it was a believer's goal to enter Jerusalem (both the earthly and other guises). As we will see, readings referred to its actual seven gates. One also encountered significant places beyond its walls: to the south lies Mount Zion, location of the Last Supper; to the east the Valley of Josaphat, venue of the Last Judgment, for which reason many Christians chose it as a burial place.[56] Jericho lies c.30 km east, a stopover for a pilgrim route to the holy city, and a motif that played a role in Western discourses;[57] and the River Jordan c.40 km east, place of Christ's baptism and often understood as the Holy Land's eastern border (see the chapter on the Holy Land).

Eventually, it was an essential notion that Jerusalem represented the center of the world, notably on medieval world maps.[58] Already Jerome had developed this idea by combining Ps. 74:12 and Ez. 5:5; the first reference speaks of God performing salvation in the center of the world (*operatus est salutes in medio terrae*).[59] It seems like it was made for preaching the crusades, since it entwines receiving salvation with the localization in Jerusalem, thus suggesting the crusade's remission of sin and martyrdom. It is cited in numerous sources, among

54 See Ms. BL Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 87^{v} and Ms. BNF lat. 10633, fol. 102^{r}. On the Second Coming, see Zach. 14:3–4; and Schein, *Gateway*, 145. A chronicle grants the Mount of Olives a prominent role in the conquest of 1187 (*Libellus*, ed. Brewer and Kane, 196). The Ascension was occasionally located at the Dome of the Rock (see Baert, *Heritage*, 173). See also Zöller, *Regularkanoniker*, 199–205.

55 See, e.g., Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 4*, 597; Ms. Lambeth 144, fols. 117^{r}, 118^{v}.

56 See Joel 4:2–12; Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 31*, 770; Martin of León, *Liber sermonum*, *Sermo 2*, 55; Benedictinus anonymus, *De penitentia*, ed. Huygens, 102; Bernard of Clairvaux, *De laude*, 296; Otto of Freising, *Chronik*, ed. Lammers, 622; John of Würzburg, *Descriptio*, 109–110; William of Tyre, *Chronique* (8.2), 384; Theodericus, *Libellus*, 145. See also Riley-Smith, "Army on Pilgrimage," 105; Ora Limor, "Placing an Idea: The Valley of Jehoshaphat in Religious Imagination," in: *Between Jerusalem and Europe*, ed. Renana Bartal and Bianca Kühnel (Leiden 2015), 280–300.

57 See esp. Ms. BL Add 19767, fols. 72^{r}–76^{r}. See the chapter on exemplary descriptions for the entire text. On Jericho in crusade-related sermons of the 13th century, see Miikka Tamminen, *Crusade Preaching and the Ideal Crusader* (Turnhout 2018), 50–59.

58 See, e.g., Bianca Kühnel, "Geography and Geometry of Jerusalem," in: *City of the Great King: Jerusalem from David to the Present*, ed. Nitza Rosovsky (Cambridge, Mass. 1996), 311–316; Ingrid Baumgärtner, "Die Wahrnehmung Jerusalems auf mittelalterlichen Weltkarten," in: *Jerusalem im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter*, ed. Dieter Bauer (Frankfurt am Main 2001), 271–334.

59 See Mette Birkedal Bruun, *Parables: Bernard of Clairvaux's Mapping of Spiritual Topography* (Leiden 2007), 27.

them *Audita tremendi* or Innocent III's Fourth Lateran sermon. The first concludes that it had been God's conscious decision to make this region into the spatial center of salvation history (*salutem nostram ibi voluit operari*).[60] Jerusalem was a center in two senses: on the one hand, the city itself appeared as the pivot of salvation history. Everything of providential significance happened or will happen there; it was both a topographical and a temporal center. Barbara Baert classified it accordingly: "The centre of the world is the place where heaven, hell and earth coincide in one timeless point."[61] On the other, the center within the city received particular attention, as we have seen with Ez. 9 in the previous chapter: this refers to the Temple and suggests a spatially determined grading of sanctity that signifies the approach to heaven. Jerusalem was thus not only the center of the terrestrial world but of the entire cosmos, a fact that indicates the entanglement of earthly and heavenly city.

The chapter will proceed: (1) with those passages that more or less offer descriptions of the conquest of 1187; (2) followed by an examination of how the holy city is entangled with its other guises, for example, via the motif of the gates, in order to shed light on the maze of the four senses; (3) typological readings of the conquest are then addressed, especially as concerns the fulfillment of prophecies; (4) this leads to a reflection on the four senses concerning the localization of the earthly city within this scheme; (5) and finally, some passages from Henry of Albano's work that fuse monastery, theology, and crusade deserve attention.

1 The Heathen Have Come into the Sanctuary (Ps. 79): Describing the Conquest

Some passages are descriptive overall, but even these use biblical elements for suggesting a reading. One such element is Ps. 79:1: "the heathen have come into the Lord's inheritance, they have defiled the Temple, and laid Jerusalem

60 Gregory VIII, *Audita tremendi*, ed. Chroust, 8; Innocent III, *De diversis*, *Sermo 6*, 676. This is also present in Urban II's sermon in: William of Tyre, *Chronique* (1.15), 131. For further sources, see Ralph Ardens, *Pars (1), Section (1), Sermo 68*, 1920; Baldwin of Canterbury, *Sermo 14*, 212; Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 15*, 671; *Historia peregrinorum*, ed. Chroust, 124; Ms. Arsenal 543, fol. 244^{r}; Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (XIII), 357; Ms. BL Add 24145, fol. 77^{v}; Peter of Blois, *Sermo 19*, 616; *Sermo 23*, 627; *Passio Raginaldi*, 33; Ms. Lambeth 144, fol. 117^{v}; Alan of Lille, *Distinctiones*, 751; Martin of León, *Liber sermonum*, *Sermo 2*, 52; Aelred of Rievaulx, *Sermo 119*, 199–201; Petrus Venerabilis, *Sermo de laude*, ed. Constable, 238–239; *Continuatio Zwetlensis*, 543.

61 Baert, *Heritage*, 172. On this aspect, see the chapter on the Apocalypse.

in ruins" (*venerunt gentes in hereditatem tuam, polluerunt templum sanctum tuum, posuerunt Ierusalem in ruinas*). It is virtually a perfect verse for describing the events of 1187, already put to use at the outset of *Audita tremendi*:[62]

> After we have heard about the severity of the dreadful judgment that the divine hand has brought over the land of Jerusalem, we and our brothers are struck by such horror and affected by such pain, wherefore it is not obvious to us what we shall do or say, a fact that even the Psalmist deplores: God, the heathen have come into thy inheritance, they have defiled your holy Temple. They placed Jerusalem in the custody of apple trees; they left the flesh of your saints to the beasts of the earth and for food to the birds of the sky [Ps. 79:1–2].[63]

It is important to note that the encyclical does not yet describe the conquest, albeit the use of Ps. 79:1 may suggest this; rather, its use evokes a threat for the city—this seems to have been an important strategy in the early period. Today's Vulgate says that Jerusalem was laid in ruins (*posuerunt Ierusalem in ruinas*), but Gregory deviates from it, stating that it has been placed "in the custody of apple trees" (*posuerunt Jerusalem in pomorum custodiam*). Even though this represents the verse's common form at the time,[64] the expression develops

62 In the Greek Bible, this is Ps. 78, but I follow the numbering of the Nova Vulgata. On Ps. 79 and the crusades, see Gerd Althoff, *"Selig sind, die Verfolgung ausüben": Päpste und Gewalt im Hochmittelalter* (Darmstadt 2013), 130–132, 140–144; Penny J. Cole, "'O God, the Heathen Have Come into Your Inheritance' (Ps. 78.1). The Theme of Religious Pollution in Crusade Documents, 1095–1188," in: *Crusaders and Muslims in Twelfth-Century Syria*, ed. Maya Shatzmiller (Leiden 1993), 84–111. Linder asserts that it contains an apocalyptic component (Linder, *Arms*, 91–92). Ps. 79:2 was also used to illustrate the unburied dead of Barbarossa's crusade (see Nicholas L. Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY 2012), 138).

63 Gregory VIII, *Audita tremendi*, ed. Chroust, 6; see also Ms. BL Add 24145, fol. 76^{v} and Thomas W. Smith, "*Audita tremendi* and the Call for the Third Crusade Reconsidered, 1187–1188," *Viator* 49/3 (2018), 88–89. "Audita tremendi severitate iudicii, quod [Add 24145: >< quam] super terram Jerusalem [BL Add 24145: >< Iherosolimitanos] divina manus exercuit, tanto sumus nos et fratres nostri horrore confusi tantisque affecti doloribus, ut non facile nobis occurreret, quid agere aut quid dicere debeamus [PL: >< facere deberemus; Add 24145: >< dicere deberemus], quod etiam Psalmista deplorat et dicit: Deus, venerunt gentes in haereditatem tuam, coinquinaverunt templum sanctum tuum: posuerunt Jerusalem in pomorum custodiam: carnes sanctorum tuorum bestiis terrae, et escas volatilibus coeli [Ps. 79:1–2]."

64 See, e.g., *Glossa ordinaria* (Ps. 79), ed. Feuardent, 3:1041–1042. See also Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (XIII), 354: "haec omnia nobis tecum sunt o bona crux [...] quae cum fieri soleant in pomorum custodiam." See also Ms. BNF lat. 14426, fol. 62^{v}, where Peter the Chanter aligns "the custody of apple trees" with the conquest of 1187.

an uncomfortable reference to the current events: Jerusalem is exposed—only guarded by apple trees—since the bulk of its army has been crushed at Hattin. Telling for the moment at which the text was penned is the rendering as "the land of Jerusalem" (*terra Jerusalem*); this indicates the Holy Land and alludes to the large territorial losses in the events surrounding Hattin. *Haereditas*, which is present in Ps. 79:1, expresses the same idea.[65] The pope delivers a significant example for how biblical language informed the event's perception and commemoration, whereas actual information remained slim.

However, it is remarkable that Ps. 79:1 is hardly present in the relevant corpus of sources. The reference appears more often in chronicles, serving descriptive purposes, but even there it is not as frequent as usually assumed, and the scholarly opinion that it represents a key verse for reading the events of 1187 needs to be revised.[66] It remains absent in important works such as Henry's *De peregrinante civitate Dei* or Peter of Blois' crusade treatises.[67] Peter uses it, however, in his crusade call from 1185:

> Jerusalem, our mother [Gal. 4:26], thus cries for you: she exposes her difficulties to us and, for healing her pain, she demands the love of her children. Since you are indeed her children, receive the sorrows of your mother and, as Isaiah puts it, all those who love her must mourn and suffer with Jerusalem [cf. Is. 66:10]. Because the heathen come into the Lord's inheritance for defiling his Temple [Ps. 79:1]. Those who hate the Lord have raised their heads; those who hate Zion have prided themselves.[68]

65 On both motifs, see the chapter on the Holy Land. See also Matthieu Rajohnson, *L'Occident au regret de Jérusalem (1187-fin du XIV^e siècle)* (Paris 2021), 514–515.

66 For this opinion, see Schein, *Gateway*, 163–164; Cole, "Heathen," 106–107; Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 196–197. For chronicles see Ansbert, *Historia*, ed. Chroust, 14; *Gestorum Treverorum continuatio*, 388; Roger of Howden, *Gesta*, 2:20; Arnold of Lübeck, *Chronica*, 170.

67 Henry once uses 1 Macc. 2:12, which betrays some similarity (Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (XIII), 352). Ps. 79 only became important later: the Cistercians introduced it to the liturgy in 1194 (*Statuta capitulorum*, ed. Canivez (1194), 172), and Innocent III made it into a daily component of mass (Innocent III, *Quia maior*, 821; discussed by Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 311–312; see also Humbert of Romans, *De predicatione*, 10, 18, 109, 167; and Amnon Linder, "'Deus Venerunt Gentes': Psalm 78 (79) in the Liturgical Commemoration of the Destruction of Latin Jerusalem," in: *Medieval Studies in Honour of Avrom Saltmann*, ed. Bat-Sheva Albert and Yvonne Friedman (Ramat-Gan 1995), 145–171, esp. 151–152; Jessalynn L. Bird, "Rogations, Litanies, and Crusade Preaching: The Liturgical Front in the Late Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries," in: *Papacy, Crusade, and Christian-Muslim Relations*, ed. Bird (Amsterdam 2018), 182–185).

68 Peter of Blois, *Ep.98*, 307. "Clamat itaque ad vos Jerusalem mater nostra [Gal. 4:26]: suas nobis exponit angustias, et in remedium sui doloris postulat filiales affectus. Quia ergo

As in *Audita tremendi*, the reference suggests a threat to Jerusalem. Significantly, Peter deviates from the Vulgate, formulating in the present tense (*veniunt*)—the heathen pressured the city, but had not yet conquered it. Jerusalem is portrayed as "our mother" (*mater nostra*); the Christians, specifically Peter's audience, as its children (*filii estis*), motifs that create a sense of responsibility despite geographical distance.[69] The quotation from Isaiah that he turns on its head deserves attention: the Vulgate says *laetamini cum Ierusalem et exsultate in ea* (rejoice with Jerusalem and be glad in it). Peter, however, states that one must mourn and suffer with it (*tristamini cum Jerusalem, et dolete cum ea*), indicating a disrupted order which is not supposed to exist. This suggests to his audience that they must contribute to fulfilling the actual meaning of Isaiah's prophecy (see the discussion below). The fact that it was instead lost in 1187 must have posed a providential enigma. The inversion of Is. 66:10 seems to have been Peter's creation; database searches do not yield any further hits. Yet, John of Abbeville later expresses a similar idea: broaching the city's loss, he argues about Palm Sunday (the sermon's feast) that the liturgy has turned into an act of grief and mockery (*dies festi versi sunt in luctum et sabbatum in obprobrium*).[70]

Celestine III uses Ps. 79:1 in his letter to Hubert Walter (1195), former participant in the Third Crusade and then archbishop of Canterbury, calling him to a new crusade:

> For in these days, the malice of present-day people has certainly grown so much that we are rebuked by neither the warnings of Sacred Scripture nor the whips of our weakness. God willed to lay heavily his hand upon us that much, and, what we cannot explicate without bitterness of the heart, to give the land of his birth into the hands of the pagans [Job 9:24]. Consequently, as we mourn deservedly with the prophet: God, the heathen have come into the inheritance etc. [Ps. 79:1].[71]

---

filii estis, dolores maternos excipite, et, sicut dicit Isaias, tristamini cum Jerusalem, et dolete cum ea omnes qui diligitis eam [cf. Is. 66:10]. Veniunt enim gentes in haereditatem Domini, ut polluant templum ejus [Ps. 79:1]. Qui oderunt Dominum, extulerunt caput, et gloriati sunt omnes, qui oderunt Sion."

69 See David Morris, "The Servile Mother: Jerusalem as Woman in the Era of the Crusades," in: *Remembering the Crusades*, ed. Nicholas L. Paul and Suzanne M. Yeager (Baltimore 2012), 184–185; Steven Biddlecombe, "Baldric of Bourgueil and the *Familia Christi*," in: *Writing the Early Crusades*, ed. Damien Kempf and Marcus Bull (Woodbridge 2014), 12, 16–19.

70 Ms. Oxford, Magd. Coll. 168, fol. 70^{v}. Similar in: Martin of León, *Liber sermonum, Sermo 23*, 895; *Sermo 29*, 1050–1051; the first sermon refers to the state after the conquest of A.D. 70.

71 Celestine III, *Ep.224*, 1107, cited in Ralph of Diceto, *Ymagines*, 132. "Verum cum diebus nostris in tantum excreverit malitia modernorum, ut nec sacrae Scripturae monitis nec

The reference has here the purpose of describing a state: the land has been given into the hands of the pagans (*in manibus tradere paganorum*)—God gave it to them, to punish the Christians.[72] A few lines before the passage cited, Celestine also uses *peccatis nostris exigentibus*. However, as he expounds, they are rebuked neither by the Bible (which would offer a tool and predictions for the future) nor by the "whips of their weakness" (obviously failure in the Holy Land). It transpires that the allegedly popular Ps. 79:1 appears only sporadically in the contemporary evidence; the sermon texts make no use of it at all. When appearing, it serves two purposes: on the one hand, it sketches a threat for Jerusalem (1185's crusade call; *Audita tremendi*); on the other, it stresses the persistent state of conquest (Celestine's letter; chronicles).

How do other sources describe the events? Peter outlines a threat to the city when reporting on Hattin to Henry II (Oct. 1187): "We have heard how Jerusalem has been destroyed and how the Cross with which Christ redeemed us has been captured. The king of Jerusalem has been abducted to Babylon. All cities and fortresses save for Ascalon and Tripoli have fallen, and one is uncertain whether Jerusalem will still resist the filthy dogs."[73] He doubts whether Jerusalem can still resist "the filthy dogs," a pejorative designation for the Muslims. Remarkably, he says he has heard "how the city has been destroyed"; one could believe that he is already talking about the conquest. This may be a marker pars pro toto for the Holy Land (like in *Audita tremendi* using *terra Jerusalem*). This curious example betrays how enigmatically authors can express themselves when anchored in biblical language, and how little they are concerned with delivering accurate descriptions. This is even more significant in this case, since we might suppose that the purpose of this letter was to transmit actual news.

Henry offers two significant descriptions, in his crusade call to the German nobility, likely drafted in March 1188 and already referring to Jerusalem's fall, and in his letter to Barbarossa, probably written a few weeks before:

---

infirmitatis nostrae corripiamur flagellis, manum suam super nos in tantum voluit aggravare, ac terram nativitatis suae, quod sine cordis amaritudine non possumus explicare, in manibus tradere paganorum [Job 9:24], ut cum propheta merito deplorantes, Deus, venerunt gentes in haereditatem etc. [Ps. 79:1] [...]."

72 See Alexander Marx, "Constructing and Denying the Enemy: Cistercian Approaches to Preaching the Third Crusade (1187–1192)," *Cîteaux* 70 (2019), 62–63. See the chapter on the failure of crusades.

73 Peter of Blois, *Ep.219*, 508, cited in Roger of Howden, *Gesta*, 2:15. "Audivimus quomodo Jerusalem destructa est, et quomodo crux, in qua Christus nos redemit, capta est. Rex Jerusalem in Babylonem ductus est. Omnes civitates et munitiones, praeter Ascalonem et Tripolim, captae sunt, et adhuc utrum Jerusalem poterit canibus immundis resistere dubitatur."

> Who would not mourn that this Holy Land, which the Lord's own feet have dedicated to our redemption [cf. Ps. 131:7], is exposed to the filthiness of the pagans? Who would not lament that the salvific Cross has been captured and trampled upon by the pagans, just as the Lord's sanctuary has been defiled? Heu, heu! We believe similar things were heard when the same Cross endured the hammering of the nails: the earth trembled, the sun faded, rocks were split, and the tombs opened up [Mt. 27:51–52].[74]
>
> Oh, how lamentable, this sad loss and unexpected event, when the Lord's sanctuary has been given into the hands of the gentiles [Job 9:24], and the Holy Land, in which the Lord's feet stood [Ps. 131:7], lies now open to the filthiness of the wicked and to the pillages of the pagans, still upsets not only the mind of our Father and Lord, but also truly the hearts of our brethren and incites them to grief.[75]

In agreement with Ps. 79, both letters outline a pollution of the holy places (with *spurcitia*), contrasting it with Ps. 131:7: the feet of the Lord have sanctified the Holy Land (*terram illam sanctam*).[76] The term *spurcitia*, designating filthiness, also holds the layers of pagan superstition and illegitimate birth (compare the adjective *spurius*). This indicates the Abrahamic genealogy, which deems the Muslims to be the sons of Hagar.[77] In the second letter, two further elements serve descriptive purposes: the rendering as unexpected (*inopinatus eventus*)

---

74 Henry of Albano, *Ep.32*, PL 204:249 and ed. Chroust, 11; see also Ms. BL Add 24145, fol. 78r. "Quis terram illam sanctam quam redemptionis nostrae ipsi dedicaverunt pedes Domini [cf. Ps. 131:7], spurcitiis paganorum exponi non doleat? Quis Crucem salvificam captam non deploret, et conculcatam ab ethnicis et sanctuarium Domini profanatum? Heu, heu! ad auditum quemdam similem, cum fixuras clavorum crux ipsa susciperet, terra tremuit, sol expavit, petrae scissae sunt, et aperta credimus monumenta [Mt. 27:51–52]."

75 Ms. BL Add 24145, fol. 77r. "Flebiliter heu casus ille tristis et inopinatus eventus, quo sanctuarium domini datum est in manus gentium [Job 9:24], et terra illa sancta in qua steterunt pedes domini [Ps. 131:7] nefandorum spurcitiis patet et direptionibus paganorum, non solum patris et domini nostri mentem, verum etiam fratrum nostrorum corda movet eatenus et excitat ad dolorem."

76 On this reference, see the chapter on the Holy Land.

77 See also William of Newburgh, *Historia*, 249, where he speaks of *spurcissimus Saladinus*. See also Lucius III, *Ep.182*, 1312; *Urkundenbuch*, ed. Janicke, 1:484. On the sons of Hagar, see Buc, *Holy War*, 281; Richard W. Southern, *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, Mass. 1962), 16–17. See also Ralph Ardens, *Pars (1), Section (1), Sermo 41*, 1811–1815, where he discusses the different sons of Abraham and why Hagar's sons have been rejected. Already Urban II (allegedly) used the terms *spurius* and *spurcitia* in a similar way (see Baldric of Dol, *Historia*, ed. Biddlecombe, 7).

and Job 9:24 (here: *sanctuarium domini datum est in manus gentium*), a parallel with Celestine's letter.[78] The first text also includes a powerful eschatological coloring, comparing the events with the crucifixion (i.e., *ad auditum quemdam similem*), and using the apocalyptic passages from Mt. 27:51–52: the earth trembled (a parallel with *Audita tremendi*), the sun faded, and the tombs of the dead opened up (*aperta monumenta*). According to Matthew, the dead would march to Jerusalem, to participate in the Last Judgment.[79] For Henry, the conquest initiates the Apocalypse; it represents a fulfillment of prophecy, a pivotal watershed tantamount even to the crucifixion.

Concluding this section, two examples from chronicles shall suffice; first, the *Itinerarium peregrinorum* delineates:

> Jerusalem, the glorious City of God [Ps. 87:3], where the Lord suffered, where he has been entombed, and where he revealed the glory of his resurrection, is exposed to the pollution by the bastard enemy. There is no pain like this [cf. Lam. 1:12], since those who persecute the entombed hold his Sepulcher; those who despise the crucified hold his Cross. […] After the city had surrendered, he [i.e., Saladin] climbed the eminent rock of Golgotha with the curse of the Mahometian law, where he proclaimed the spurious law, on the same spot where Christ, hanging on the Cross, has crushed the law of death.[80]

The author stresses the city's providential meaning, designating it as the *civitas Dei* and evoking several stations of Christ's work. The "bastard enemy" (*hostis spurius*) has promulgated "a false law" (*lex spuria*)—note the parallel with Henry.[81] The Muslims, the sons of Hagar, have unjustly occupied the inheritance of the true sons of Abraham. Even worse, they have reestablished "the law of death," the law of the Old Covenant, which Christ's Passion had already

78 See also Marx, "Enemy," 58; Marx, "Jerusalem as the Travelling City of God. Henry of Albano and the Preaching of the Third Crusade," *Crusades* 20 (2021), 92.

79 See also Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (XIII), 354, where he delineates the same vision; see the chapter on the Cross relic. See also *Continuatio Zwetlensis*, 543.

80 *Itinerarium peregrinorum*, ed. Mayer, 265. "Gloriosa civitas dei Ierusalem [Ps. 87:3], ubi dominus passus, ubi sepultus, ubi gloriam resurrectionis ostendit, hosti spurio subicitur polluenda. Nec est dolor sicut dolor iste [cf. Lam. 1:12], cum hii sepulchrum possideant, qui sepultum persequntur, crucem teneant, qui crucifixum contempnunt. […] Urbe redita preco legis Mahumetice eminentem Calvarie rupem conscendit et ibi lex spuria declamata personuit, ubi legem mortis Christus in cruce consumpsit."

81 See also Schein, *Gateway*, 164–165. On the fulfillment of Ps. 87 in Henry's work, see Marx, "City of God," 99–101, 105.

shattered—this entwines the Muslims with the Jews. Second, the extensive eyewitness report of the *Libellus de expugnatione terre sancte* is an especially rich source:

> Who could ever imagine that such an impious act is committed by Christians? That the Sepulcher of Christ's resurrection, the eminent Temple, the most holy Mount Zion, and other places of the holy city are voluntarily surrendered to the hands of the pagans [Job 9:24]? What a pain! There is no pain that would be similar [cf. Lam. 1:12]. We do not read anywhere that the Jews abandoned their inner sanctuary without the shedding of blood and a tenacious battle, and yet, they did not surrender it voluntarily.[82]

Alluding to Job 9:24, the author names several of Jerusalem's components (Sepulcher, Temple, Zion) that have been given into the hands of the pagans (*in manibus gentium tradere*).[83] He criticizes the city's surrender, contrasting it with the Old Testament Jews, who never surrendered it without resistance: the Christians are thus worse than the Jews—this suggests once more that the Covenant with God may belong to the past (see the previous chapter). In conclusion, two important elements have surfaced in the sources: locating the event's cause in Christian sinfulness (*peccatis nostris exigentibus*) and a rendering through Job 9:24 (*terra data est in manus impii*). Due to their quantitative dominance, these two may even be characterized as the most important elements for reading the events of 1187. The two will concern us in the chapter on the failure of crusades, since they represent fundamental strategies for dealing with the paradox of misfortune in the Holy Land.

---

82 *Libellus*, ed. Brewer and Kane, 210. "Quis unquam poterat cogitare tale nefas a Christianis perpetrari, sepulcrum resurrectionis Christi et nobile templum et sanctissimum montem Syon et cetera loca sancte civitatis, sponte in manibus gentium tradere? [Job 9:24] Proh dolor! Non est dolor similis dolori isti [cf. Lam. 1:12]. Nusquam legimus iudaeos sancta sanctorum absque effusione sanguinis et duro certamine deseruisse, nec tamen sponte tradidisse." My translation above, but the edition offers a similar one.

83 On spatial conceptions in the *Libellus*, see also James H. Kane, "'Blood and Water flowed to the Ground': Sacred Topography, Biblical Landscapes and Conceptions of Space in the *Libellus de expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum*," *Journal of Medieval History* 47/3 (2021), 366–380.

2 Garnerius of Clairvaux, *In adventu domini IV*: Pagans and the Captive Daughter Zion

Sermon texts occasionally offer descriptive passages on the events of 1187, yet such descriptions were not their purpose, just as it was not necessary to explicitly deal with the events as soon as the news had spread. Consequently, the events may be present in a more oblique manner, being assumed as a horizon of knowledge—we have already seen examples of this in the previous chapter with Hélinand of Froidmont and Ralph Ardens.[84] Garnerius offers another significant case with a sermon on Advent that certainly holds high crusade potential; he likely answered therein Henry of Albano's call for the crusade to be preached on Advent.[85] The sermon's argument oscillates between sloth and activity: the first is understood as the typical trait of pagans (that is, Muslims), Jews, and false Christians, whereas the latter operates as the text's omnipresent exhortation, including its two opening verses: Is. 52:2 and Rom. 13:11.[86] As this section will demonstrate, this prospective activity is identical with the crusade. After an introduction, Garnerius discusses three groups that lapsed into permanent sloth:

> The pagan has frozen into numbness in the first sleep, the Jew in the second, and the false Christian in the third. Because the pagan neither sees when reading nor does he understand nor does he remember the virtue of God's word. However, the Jew sees when reading, yet he does neither understand nor remember. And the false Christian sees and understands, but he forgets and neglects.[87]

84 See Hélinand of Froidmont, *Sermo 8*, 546–547; *Sermo 10*, 566; Ralph Ardens, *Pars (I), Section (1), Sermo 32*, 1780–1781; *Pars (II), De tempore, Sermo 19*, 1373.

85 Henry of Albano, *Ep.31*, 248. The sermon survived in: Ms. Troyes 970, fol. 8^{v} and Troyes 1301, fol. 11^{v}.

86 Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 4*, 591: "Elevare, consurge, sede, Jerusalem; solve vincula colli tui, captiva filia Sion [Is. 52:2]. Hora enim est jam nos de somno surgere [Rom. 13:11]." These motifs were often used in conjunction with the crusade (see, e.g., Peter of Blois, *Passio Raginaldi*, 31; *Conquestio*, 79–80; Alan of Lille, *Distinctiones*, 812, 949; *Ars praedicandi*, 195; Ms. BNF lat. 14859, fols. 233^{r}–234^{r}; Ralph Ardens, *Pars (I), Section (1), Sermo 1*, 1667; *Pars (II), De sanctis, Sermo 26*, 1592).

87 Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 4*, 592. "Primo ergo somno torpet paganus, secundo Judaeus, tertio falsus Christianus. Paganus enim nec legendo videt, nec intelligit, nec reminiscitur verbi Dei virtutem [Troyes 970; Troyes 1301: >< veritatem]; Judaeus vero legendo videt, sed non intelligit, nec reminiscitur; falsus vero Christianus, videt, intelligit; sed obliviscitur et negligit."

He distinguishes three groups in terms of their approach to the Bible: false Christians, Jews, and pagans (*pagani*).[88] The pagan is furthest from Christian belief, since he does not even "understand when reading" (*nec legendo videt*), a skill which the Jews possess; this alludes to their use of the Old Testament.[89] The pagans are thus least contaminated; they simply do not know any better. The false Christians, however, are closest to the true believers, since they see and understand (*videt, intelligit*), yet they forget and neglect (*obliviscitur et negligit*). They thus pose the greatest threat to the Corpus Christi. The passage raises the question of when other groups were considered a threat; this depended primarily on how one defined the Christian community. If it was a religious and social entity, then all those who contaminated the Church via their sins, that is, false Christians and bad clerics, posed a threat. If one understood it in spatial terms, then the Jews came into focus, who lived among Christians (even if in their own quarters). If one entwined the Christian community with the Holy Land via the Corpus Christi—as we have already seen in several cases—then every alien element there posed a serious threat; this brought the Muslims into focus, even more so after 1187. As a result, priorities seem significantly dependent upon historical circumstances, and the priorities a sermon demonstrates may, therefore, point us to specific historical phenomena.

Garnerius elaborates on a requisite act of adjustment, the cleansing of a defective state, in order to preserve the Corpus Christi's integrity:

> The first sleep is that of ignorance, the second that of betrayal, and the third that of numbness and sloth. If you thus want to dwell in the vision of peace, given that Jerusalem is understood as the vision of peace [Ez. 13:16], and if you want to see good days [Ps. 34:13; 1 Pet. 3:10], then rise from the sleep of ignorance, you pagan, rise from the sleep of betrayal, you Jew, and rise from the sleep of numbness and sloth, you false Christian. Because whoever sleeps or is even knocked out is incapable of considering the matters in the distance, but he only considers those that are close. Therefore, those cried for their God and prayed towards the rising sun with their backs turned to the Temple [Ez. 8:16] who committed abomin-

88 False Christians was an umbrella term encompassing heretics, scholastics, and generally sinful Christians, especially bad clerics (see Buc, *Holy War*, 91, 246–247; Buc, "Crusade and Eschatology: Holy War Fostered and Inhibited," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 125 (2017), 317, 336–337).

89 His sermon *Contra Iudeos* formulates something similar: it describes the Jews as "blind dogs" (Ms. Troyes 1301, fol. 158^{v}).

> able acts in the midst of Jerusalem [Ez. 9:4], when they erected the idol of jealousy at the tabernacle's entrance, in order to provoke strife [Ez. 8:3], when they worshipped their pagan idols.[90]

The abbot formulates a call addressed to the different groups, to renounce their mistakes, aligning each with the element of sleep (*somnum*), a synonym for sloth. The background establishes the eschatological vision of peace in Jerusalem, a popular motif.[91] He thus entangles earthly and heavenly city, specifically by asking his audience whether they want to dwell in the vision of peace (*si in visione pacis habitare vis*). This indicates both the earthly city's recapture and gaining salvation, that is, entering the heavenly guise: the first appears as the latter's preparation or precondition. The vision of peace remains, therefore, a vision for the future to whose fulfillment Garnerius calls his audience. Yet, only those who are vigilant will be capable of considering the matters in the distance (*potest intueri ea quae de longe sunt*). Since he speaks thereafter of Jerusalem and the Temple, both currently defiled by pagan practices and idols, it is clear that he is concerned with the situation of 1187.[92] The textual elements at play stem from Ezekiel; they sketch out the pollution of sacred space that requires cleansing. The portrayal of the invaders indicates the Muslims who pray towards the rising sun (*ad ortum solis*), that is, towards

90 Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 4*, 592. "Primus igitur somnus ignorantiae est, secundus perfidiae, tertius torporis et ignaviae. Si ergo in visione pacis habitare vis, quoniam Jerusalem visio pacis interpretatur [Ez. 13:16], et dies videre bonos [Ps. 34:13; 1Pet. 3:10], elevare 'a somno' [missing Troyes 970] ignorantiae, tu pagane, elevare a somno perfidiae, tu Judaee; consurge a somno torporis et ignaviae, tu false Christiane. Qui enim iacet, et in imo prostratus est, non potest intueri ea quae de longe sunt, sed ea [Troyes 970: >< omnia] tantummodo quae de prope sunt intuetur. Unde et illi qui in medio Jerusalem faciebant abominationes [Ez. 9:4], quando statuebant ad ostium tabernaculi idolum zeli [Troyes 970: >< doli] ad provocandum aemulationem [Ez. 8:3], quando adorabant picturas, plangebant Adonidem, et dorsum contra templum habentes adorabant ad ortum solis [Ez. 8:16]."

91 See Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 34–35; Christoph Auffarth, *Irdische Wege und himmlischer Lohn: Kreuzzug, Jerusalem und Fegefeuer in religionswissenschaftlicher Perspektive* (Göttingen 2002), 110. See, e.g., Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 37*, 807; Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (VI), 299; Peter of Blois, *Sermo 41*, 686–687; Ms. BL Add 19767, fol. 80^{r}; Ms. BNF lat. 14859, fol. 233^{r}; Ms. Arsenal 543, fol. 205^{r}; Ms. BL Add 18335, fol. 10^{r}.

92 On the Muslims as idolaters, see Martin Völkl, *Muslime—Märtyrer—Militia Christi: Identität, Feindbild und Fremderfahrung während der ersten Kreuzzüge* (Stuttgart 2011), 194–196; John Victor Tolan, *Saracens: Islam in the Medieval European Imagination* (New York 2002), 105–134; Katherine Allen Smith, *The Bible and Crusade Narrative in the Twelfth Century* (Woodbridge 2020), 128–136. For similar renderings, see Peter of Blois, *Ep.23*, 85; Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (XIII), 359; Celestine III, *Ep.224*, 1108.

Mecca, with their backs turned to the Temple. This evokes its rejection in religious terms—again a reference to the Muslims (contrary to the Jews). The idea of a statue erected in the Temple indicates the same; many contemporary texts believed that the Muslims had placed a statue of Mohammad there.[93] Garnerius' sermon is thus concerned with the occupation of the holy sites in 1187.

The sermon's second part delineates the counter-model of activity, an exhortation that reverberates throughout. Garnerius presents several Old Testament *exempla* for a "departure" (*egredi*) and formulates the goal of releasing the captive daughter Zion, the reference is to Is. 52:2: Jerusalem has been captured. He presents the Exodus as a grand example for departing to the Holy Land, which is facilitated by the cross (an allusion to the meaning of the cross on their clothes).[94] Some lines later, he emphasizes that Christ has fortified Zion and the Holy Land—obviously to assure his listeners that they could count on divine support.[95] Towards the conclusion of the text, he refers to Christ's exemplary arrival in Jerusalem, as celebrated on Palm Sunday (quoting Mt. 21:1), while identifying the donkey on which he rides as the pagan (repeated twice). The donkey usually refers to the sinner; the specific identification as the pagan once again demonstrates the context of the crusade.[96] The text ends by referring once more to the captive daughter Zion, who must be released, blending it with the desirable *visio Dei* located in Zion (*donec videamus deum deorum in Sion*), the goal of their labors. As the sermon betrays throughout, Zion is referring to the actual hill before the gates of Jerusalem.[97] In conclusion, this sermon obviously deals with the situation of 1187, outlining Jerusalem's pollution by pagans, while vehemently calling on the audience to be active and depart for the Holy Land. It holds high crusade potential and stands in causal and chronological relationship with the Third Crusade.

93 See Tolan, *Saracens*, 131–133. The expressions derive from Ez. 8:16; this, however, does not contradict an application to current affairs (compare, for example, the use of Ps. 79); see also the section on methodology.

94 Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 4*, 594. On the Exodus, see the chapter on the Holy Land.

95 Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 4*, 595: "Sed venit Dominus, et se murum posuit in domo Israel, et tunc facta est urbs fortitudinis nostrae Sion, quia Salvator noster positus est in ea murus [Is. 26:1]." Very similar in: Peter of Blois, *Passio Raginaldi*, 46–47.

96 Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 4*, 598. On reading the donkey as sinner in sermon texts, see Bird, "Palm Sunday," 21–24.

97 Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 4*, 599. The reference is to Ps. 84:8.

3 The Conquest: A Signifier for the Spiritual Jerusalem

The remainder of the chapter is primarily devoted to the earthly city's entanglement with its other guises, in order to disentangle the maze of the senses of Scripture. This aims at elucidating the issue of which sermon texts may be classified as crusade-related. Two directions are possible: either the earthly Jerusalem connects with its spiritual counterpart, creating a causal link with the Christian community, often expressed in an explicit blending of Corpus Christi and Holy Land. Or it connects with the heavenly guise, appearing as the latter's effigy or even as a literal gateway to it. Jay Rubenstein characterizes the holy city after 1099 accordingly: "[…] a new kingdom, established at the intersection between heaven and earth […]."[98] Sylvia Schein agrees: "Warfare for Jerusalem as the gateway to the Heavenly Kingdom, described in terms of Heavenly Jerusalem, became the central theme in the preaching of the Third Crusade."[99] The monastic path presents itself as complementary, a direct connection between spiritual and heavenly city. This conception is conveyed, for example, by Bernard of Clairvaux when he reproached a monk who intended to join a crusade, but finally wound up in Clairvaux. Agreeing with the abbot's authority, the General Chapter of 1157 prohibited monks from crusading.[100] They did not need the earthly city as an intermediary; all others were dependent on it to reach the celestial world.[101]

The beginning of Henry of Albano's crusade treatise delivers a meaningful passage: after having identified the *civitas Dei* with both the biblical Jerusalem and the contemporary city, he reaches the following conclusion about the latter:

> First, one shall grieve over the ruin of the terrestrial Jerusalem, although the ruin of the spiritual Jerusalem preceded it. No earthly adversity would have harmed the terrestrial city, if iniquity had not already ruled the spir-

98 Rubenstein, "Saint-Omer," 87; see also Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 154–155.

99 Schein, *Gateway*, 123. On another page, she asserts that the gate is only open if Jerusalem is in Christian hands (139).

100 Bernard of Clairvaux, *Ep.64*, 554–556; *Statuta capitulorum*, ed. Canivez (1157), 66. See also Bernard of Clairvaux, *Ep.399*, 784; *Ep.544*, 1038; discussed by Giles Constable, "The Place of the Crusader in Medieval Society," *Viator* 29 (1998), 382–383. On the Cistercian vision of Jerusalem, see Congar, "Eglise," 175–178; Renna, *Jerusalem*, 192–198.

101 See Bruun, *Parables*, 106: "[The monk] has skipped the tabernaculum and moved directly to the atrium. Just as he has skipped the terrestrial, literal version of Jerusalem for the celestial." See also Schein, *Gateway*, 126–128, 190–191; William J. Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality in the Holy Land and Iberia, c.1095–c.1187* (Woodbridge 2008), 100.

> itual Jerusalem [...] Therefore, speaking as the Church, we shall mourn the temporal fall of the visible Jerusalem, since we used to be worthy limbs of the Church. And we shall share in suffering and grieving with every afflicted limb of the Church. We must even feel the very strength of the pain no less than the one limb who suffers, if we are true limbs.[102]

The conquest of 1187 signifies a conquest of the spiritual Jerusalem—no enemy would have harmed the earthly guise if iniquity had not already ruled the spiritual counterpart. The event reveals the sinful state of the Christian community; it serves communicative purposes between God and Christians.[103] We saw similar notions with the Cross relic: both objects represent providential markers, a semiotic nexus between terrestrial and celestial sphere. Henry fuses thus the literal and the typological-tropological senses in his use of the Corpus Christi: all *membra* shall share in suffering with the afflicted limbs (*compati et condolere*); this would make them into true limbs (*vera sumus membra*)—an idea that holds every Christian accountable.[104] Extending the chronological frame, one finds John of Abbeville constructing the same causality:

> It would be necessary that we do not only remember, but that we are conscious in the act of commemoration, in order to commemorate not only history but also allegory, just as it is said: Who hears, shall hear [Ez. 3:27]. Who hears the literal sense, shall also hear the mystical. Just as when the people had forgotten the law of nature, the Lord reminded them via penning it on tablets, so has the Lord permitted today the conquest of earthly

---

102 Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (XIII), 351–352 and Ms. Troyes 509, fol. 150^{v}. "Primo igitur terrenae Jerusalem ruinam deploret, licet eam spiritualis Jerusalem ruina praecesserit; nec terrenae ulla nocuisset adversitas, nisi prius dominata fuisset iniquitas Jerusalem spirituali. [...] Temporalem igitur visibilis Jerusalem casum in persona Ecclesiae deploremus qui membra Ecclesiae digni habiti sumus; et patienti uni Ecclesiae membro compati et condolere, imo ipsam vim doloris non minus quam ipsum quod patitur membrum, sentire, si vera sumus membra, debemus."

103 He offers a very similar discussion in: *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (I), 259. See also Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 22*, 712; discussed by Nikolaus M. Häring, "The Liberal Arts in the Sermons of Garnier of Rochefort," *Mediaeval Studies* 30 (1968), 53. Garnerius argues that a good theologian must not only recognize the contents of words but also of things (*significatio rerum*). Behind the external *forma* (such as that of the earthly Jerusalem) lies an internal *natura*.

104 See Marx, "City of God," 93–94. See also Ms. Oxford, Bodley 409, fol. 149^{r}; Martin of León, *Liber sermonum, Sermo 23*, 921–922.

> Jerusalem, in order to refer us to the conquest of the spiritual Jerusalem, which is of course the Church.[105]

Possibly influenced by Henry, John broaches the senses more elaborately, highlighting that both the literal and the allegorical senses must be considered. The hint about the hidden meaning behind the literal sense is a classic exegetical motif.[106] He speaks throughout of commemoration (*memoria*); a generation later, it seemed essential to characterize the events as current (via *hodie*), since the issue had still not been resolved. One thus sees how preachers relate the actual city to its spiritual counterpart, that is, the Christian community and the Corpus Christi. Jerusalem's fall is a divine sign that reveals something about their collective spiritual state: this is an essential strategy for rationalizing the conquest.

The idea of building (*aedificare*) or rebuilding (*reaedificare*) likewise expresses an entanglement with the spiritual city; it can tell us much about the causalities between the senses. A passage from Arnold of Lübeck's chronicle, reporting on the events of 1187, is a promising starting point: "The priests that the Lord had once cast out of the Temple have destroyed the walls of Jerusalem, because the city would not have been made into a mockery for the pagans if such priests had not polluted it already with their evil habits."[107] The pagans have turned Jerusalem into a mockery, but the actual cause is located in the evil habits of clerics. He equates these with the priesthood that Christ cast out of the Temple, concluding that they have destroyed Jerusalem's walls (*destruxerunt muros Iherusalem*): they are responsible for the city's actual destruction.[108] The consequence is its rebuilding—in whatever guise. It is a commonplace

105 John of Abbeville, *Ad crucesignatos*, ed. Cole, 224. "[…] deceret ut nos non solum memores sed memoria memores essemus, memorantes non solum hystoriam sed allegoriam, sicut dicitur: Qui audit audiat [Ez. 3:27]. Qui audit sensum litteralem audiat et misticum. Sicut enim cum populus oblitus esset legis nature Dominus ut eam revocaret ad memoriam legem scripsit in tabulis, sic hodie Dominus captiri permisit terrenam Ierusalem ut nobis insinuaret captivitatem Ierusalem spiritualis, scilicet, ecclesie […]."

106 See Buc, *Holy War*, 103; here discussed regarding Urban II. For the motif, see Ez. 3:27; Rev. 2:17; 2:29; 13:9. See also Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 34*, 790; discussed by Häring, "Liberal Arts," 52.

107 Arnold of Lübeck, *Chronica*, 164. "[…] sacerdotes, quos olim de templo dominus eiecerat, destruxerunt muros Iherusalem, quia nisi tales perversis eam moribus maculassent, nequaquam gentibus ludibrio habita fuisset."

108 On spatial conceptions in Arnold of Lübeck's work, see also Beth C. Spacey, "'A Land of Horror and Vast Wilderness': Landscapes of Crusade and Jerusalem Pilgrimage in Arnold of Lübeck's *Chronica Slavorum*," *Journal of Medieval History* 47/3 (2021), 350–365.

that Jerusalem is built out of living stones (*vivi lapides*).[109] This refers to its spiritual entity, in agreement with the Corpus Christi, but it may also indicate the heavenly guise, which would consist of the living stones (the believers) in future, and whose construction must be initiated in the present. The hymn *visio pacis*, common since the 10th century and used inter alia for the dedication of churches, declares: "Urbs Jerusalem beata, dicta pacis visio, Quae construitur in coelis, vivis ex lapidibus" (the blessed city of Jerusalem, which is called the vision of peace, and which is built in heaven, out of living stones).[110]

These spiritual concepts, however, may blend with the crusade; the *Passio Raginaldi* drafts a meaningful connection between spiritual building and physical Holy Land: "Certainly, they had been obliged to go, not lukewarm but fervent and with the entire joy of the heart, to the place where Mount Zion is erected out of living stones for the joy of the entire land."[111] Literal and allegorical exegesis merge: Peter asserts that the actual Mount Zion consists of "living stones." Sacred topography and Christian community present themselves as indistinguishable; the Holy Land is a literal part of the Corpus Christi—just as the Eucharist literally offers Christ's flesh and blood. Thereafter, he warns his audience of sloth (a parallel with Garnerius): "How shall the Lord spare the itinerant cities, he who did not spare his own city [Jerusalem]? The Lord began at his sanctuary [Ez. 9:6] and, if his rage is not diverted, he will give the chalice of his wrath [cf. Is. 51:17] to those who are far away [from Jerusalem]."[112] How could Christ spare the Christians, if he does not spare his own city, that is, Jerusalem? The master uses the image of the "itinerant cities" (*peregrinae civitates*), a parallel with Henry of Albano and likely influenced by his monumental opus. The crusaders are such *civitates* on pilgrimage, foreigners in exile (according to the second meaning of *peregrinus*), who are supposed to reunite with the Holy Land, the nucleus of the Corpus Christi. The title of

109 See, e.g., *Glossa ordinaria* (Ps. 122), ed. Feuardent, 3:1429–1430; Martin of León, *Liber sermonum, De diversis, Sermo 1*, 65; Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (1), 258; Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 16*, 679; *Sermo 38*, 814; Ms. BNF lat. 14859, fol. 233^{v}; Ms. BL Add 18335, fol. 5^{v}.

110 See Auffarth, *Irdische Wege*, 110; Hartmut Kugler, *Die Vorstellung der Stadt in der Literatur des deutschen Mittelalters* (Munich 1986), 90–96.

111 Peter of Blois, *Passio Raginaldi*, 66. "Sane non tepide sed ferventer et cum omni cordis exultatione illuc ire debuerant, ubi de lapidibus vivis fundatur mons Syon in exultatione universe terre." See also the very similar passage at the beginning of the text (31–32), a noteworthy rhetorical strategy that he begins and ends the text with this significant conjunction.

112 Peter of Blois, *Passio Raginaldi*, 66. "Quomodo parcet [dominus] peregrinis civitatibus qui proprie non pepercit? A sanctuario suo incepit Dominus [Ez. 9:6], et nisi aversus fuerit furor ejus, calicem ire sue [cf. Is. 51:17] propinabit hiis qui longe sunt [...]."

Henry's opus epitomizes this: *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (About the itinerant City of God). Yet, Peter asserts in the passage cited that God's rage will strike them if they remain faraway (*qui longe sunt*)—we have already encountered this argument of distance in Garnerius' Advent sermon. Peter demands deeds, in order to avert God's anger away from the Christians, his own sanctuary (Ez. 9:6). In another passage, however, he constructs a nexus in the other direction: the crusaders must rebuild the walls of earthly Jerusalem, in order to build the heavenly guise.[113] In another sermon, he rebukes with regard to 1187 that even the celestial city lies in ruins; one must now rebuild it out of living stones (*civitas reaedificaretur ex vivis lapidibus*).[114]

It would be possible to conceive of the celestial world as a spaceless eternity, yet 12th-century Christianity imagined it as spatially organized. Both the spiritual and the celestial Jerusalem were informed by imagery of edificial structures; this provided an intensified bond with the actual edificial unit of the holy city.[115] As Christoph Auffarth has discussed, one must recall that medieval people lived in an environment that was little cultivated. Built structures such as churches or monasteries, especially firm stone buildings, were an exception: something extraordinary, orderly, and celestial. This was in keeping with imagining the heavenly city as an *urbs quadrata*: the antithesis of the terrestrial world.[116] Significantly, both earthly and heavenly Jerusalem were depicted accordingly in the 12th century—such a depiction is found in a copy of Garnerius' sermon collection.[117] Such built structures must have made an impression on Latin Christians, notably in the Holy Land, where they were found in far higher numbers than in the West. It thus becomes understandable that they believed this region closer to heaven than the rest of the (known) world. This is corroborated by the fact that Jerusalem still had the ancient

113 Peter of Blois, *Passio Raginaldi*, 48; see the next section. On Ez. 9:6 in crusade texts, see Buc, *Holy War*, 171–172. See also Ansbert, *Historia*, ed. Chroust, 6.

114 Peter of Blois, *Sermo 39*, 677; see the section below on 'Typology and Prophecy.' See also Peter of Blois, *Sermo 40*, 684; *Sermo 41*, 688.

115 See Goetz, "Rezeption," 109, 112. A copy of one of Bernard's crusade letters offers an intriguing variant: Christ "built" the Holy Land via his own blood (*aedificavit sanguine proprio*) (Bernard of Clairvaux, *Ep.363*, 650).

116 Auffarth, *Irdische Wege*, 103–104; see also Bruun, *Parables*, 52–80; Bianca Kühnel, *From the Earthly to the Heavenly Jerusalem: Representations of the Holy City in Christian Art of the First Millennium* (Rome 1987), 141–165.

117 Ms. Troyes 1301, fol. 56^{v}. Such were not only ornaments but also exegetical instruments; see Andrea Worm, "'Ista est Jerusalem'. Intertextuality and Visual Exegesis in Peter of Poitiers' *Compendium historiae in genealogia Christi* and Werner Rolevinck's *Fasciculus temporum*," in: *Imagining Jerusalem in the Medieval West*, ed. Lucy Donkin and Hanna Vorholt (Oxford 2012), 129–133.

Roman layout of two crossing main streets forming a square: an *urbs quadrata*, effigy of the heavenly guise. These historical conditions seem essential for understanding the omnipresent notion of building in the sermon texts.

The reference to Ps. 122:2–3 epitomizes these notions: "Our feet are already standing within your gates, Jerusalem. Jerusalem, which has been built as a city that is solid in itself."[118] Numerous contemporaries put it to use and thus evoke earthly Jerusalem's edificial nature, but also the community of which it consists, as this is inherent in the term *civitas*. Guibert of Nogent betrays this understanding in his exposition of the four senses: the historical Jerusalem is the *civitas*, as opposed to the other senses (*Hierusalem, secundum historiam, civitas est quaedam*). Peter of Blois uses Ps. 122 in a sermon *In dedicatione ecclesiae*, which creates via the church building an explicit connection with earthly Jerusalem's edificial nature.[119] The verse is also present in the pertinent collections of *distinctiones*.[120] Furthermore, Alan of Lille implements it in a sermon on *Laetare Jerusalem* (part of the *Liber sermonum*), which calls repeatedly for unity, the foundation for building Jerusalem, that is, the precondition for the Corpus Christi's well-being and the progress of salvation history. Whoever disrupts it, impedes the fulfillment of Is. 66:10, the theme of the sermon.[121] Overall, this text is designed as a generic model, yet considering the significance of *Laetare Jerusalem* for the Third Crusade (assemblies in Mainz and Paris) as well as the necessary peace-making between the princes, its multiple references to unity make it a perfect piece for these occasions.

Another pertinent reference is Is. 62:6: "Super muros tuos, Ierusalem, constitui custodes" (I have set watchmen on your walls, Jerusalem). According to medieval understanding, the *custodes* may refer to every spiritual guard-

118 "Stantes iam sunt pedes nostri in portis tuis, Ierusalem. Ierusalem, quae aedificata est ut civitas, sibi compacta in idipsum." Its contemporary form often deviated from today's Vulgate with *in atriis* (instead of *in portis*) as well as *cuius participatio in idipsum* (instead of *sibi compacta in idipsum*). See, e.g., *Glossa ordinaria* (Ps. 122), ed. Feuardent, 3:1429–1432.

119 Guibert of Nogent, *Sermo fieri debeat*, 26; and Peter of Blois, *Sermo 52*, 713; see below on this sermon. See also Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 37*, 808; Geoffrey of Auxerre, *Sermo 5*, ed. Gastaldelli, 94; Ralph Ardens, *In dedicatione ecclesiae (1)*, ed. Stansbury, 335; Baldwin of Canterbury, *Sermo 10*, 164; Ms. BNF lat. 3818, fol. 4^{v}; Ms. Oxford, Magd. Coll. 168, fol. 71^{r}; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Ep.64*, 554.

120 Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Distinctiones*, 897, 966 (on *civitas* and *ecclesia*); Alan of Lille, *Distinctiones*, 742, 823 (on *civitas* and *Jerusalem*); Ms. BL Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 48^{r} and Ms. BNF lat. 10633, fol. 53^{r} (on *Jerusalem*). Peter the Chanter, however, aligns Ps. 122 with the celestial city.

121 Ms. BL Add 19767, fol. 80^{r}. This is a parallel with Peter who inverted Is. 66:10's wording, to underline its outstanding fulfillment with reference to the Holy Land (Peter of Blois, *Ep.98*, 307).

ian of the Church; this is corroborated by the *distinctiones*: Garnerius' entry on Jerusalem speaks of an allegorical interpretation (*allegoria*), identifying the *custodes* as *praelatos*. Alan understands the *custodes* as angels and saints; and the *Glossa* as angels and preachers.[122] One of Alan's sermons relates the verse to the *ecclesia* needing to be defended against heretics.[123] Garnerius' liturgical collection offers a sermon *In dedicatione ecclesiae* that starts with Is. 62:6; it also focuses on the institution of the Church, blended with the walls of the church building. However, it straddles several senses of Scripture, tying the matter to both Solomon's Temple and (the heavenly) Jerusalem as the *visio pacis*. It asserts inter alia: "Because just as the Church is referred to via the Tabernacle and the Temple, so it is via the house [of God] and Jerusalem, yet from different angles."[124] The *diversi respectus* can be understood as the various senses; the abbot names different manifestations, among them the Temple and Jerusalem, all pointing to the Church.[125] Thereafter, he identifies the *tabernaculum* as the soldiers' resting place (*requies est militantium et pugnatorum*): this concerns actual warfare, since he distinguishes them from those devoted to contemplative matters (*contemplativi*). Some lines below, he presents Moses as an *exemplum*, underlining that especially 'the East' needs protection: Moses and Aaron shall guard the sanctuary from the East (*ergo custodiant Moyses et Aaron sanctuarium ab oriente*)—note the present tense subjunctive; he is not spinning exegesis in a vacuum.[126] The argument presents itself embedded in a rich salvific topography that highlights Jerusalem and the East, while the sermon betrays throughout that this includes all possible readings or senses: a

122 Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Distinctiones*, 966; Alan of Lille, *Distinctiones*, 758, 868; *Glossa ordinaria* (Is. 62), ed. Feuardent, 4:497–498. See also Peter of Blois, *Sermo 61*, 740; Ms. BL Add 19767, fol. 82^{r}; Ms. BL Sloane 1580, fol. 108^{r}. Ralph alludes to the verse in a crusade-related sermon: "[…] predicatores circumeunt vigilando Ecclesiam, ipsos vero predicatores et ipsam simul Ecclesiam circumeunt angeli et custodiunt." (Ralph Ardens, *Pars (II), De tempore, Sermo 41*, 1475).

123 Alan of Lille, *Sermo 5*, PL 210:212, where he also cites Joel 2:1. See also Ms. BNF lat. 14859, fol. 233^{v}; in this anti-heretical sermon held in southern France (as the title tells us), Alan writes: "[…] invitat nos propheta dicens: Canite tuba in Sion [Joel 2:1] vocare cecum congregate populum. Surgamus ergo ad vocandum cecum ad congregandum populum." Alan calls for preaching which makes the blind see, that is, it reveals sin, in reaction to the trumpets (or events) in Zion. On Joel 2:1 see the chapter on the Cross relic.

124 Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 37*, 807. "Nam sicut per tabernaculum et templum, sic et per domum et Jerusalem, Ecclesia figuratur, diversis tamen respectibus." The text survived in: Ms. Troyes 970, fols. 34^{v}–36^{r} and Ms. Troyes 1301, fols. 116^{r}–119^{v}.

125 Some lines later, he delineates that the different senses are mutually dependent (see Marie-Dominique Chenu, "La décadence de l'allégorisation. Un témoin, Garnier de Rochefort," in: *L'homme devant Dieu* (Paris 1964), 130).

126 Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 37*, 809–811, cited 811.

holistic program. The audience's attention is thus drawn towards the East—even though the use of Is. 62:6 is generally concerned with the Church, while phenomena such as the events of 1187 or heretics demonstrate that its walls are attacked.

Other sources align the reference even more explicitly with the crusading purpose, for example, the Latin liturgy that celebrated the conquest of 1099.[127] Significant evidence is provided by the crusade encyclical issued by Clement III in February 1188:

> Thus, since the watchmen guard the city in vain—unless the Lord himself was its watchman—the human attentiveness rather withers than develops. Having been deprived of divine aid, you shall call upon God's grace through prayers, persistently and before all other things, and you shall preach henceforth in all the churches the invocation of his grace so that he does not pay heed to the iniquities of the people, but protects his sanctuary and the holy city of Jerusalem from above with pity alone, lest he permits that the city is defiled by the ungodly hands of the unbelievers.[128]

Christ, Jerusalem's supreme watchman, complains that the other *custodes* do not guard it—as Is. 62:6 demands: the city is only protected by God's (still extant) pity, who does not permit its pollution by "the impious" (*impii*).[129] The encyclical, addressed to Baldwin of Canterbury and his suffragans, exhorts them to fulfill Isaiah's prophecy by furnishing its walls with defenders, in both literal and spiritual terms.[130] It calls for spiritual support (*precibus invocate*) and continuing crusade preaching in all churches (*per ecclesias praedicate*

---

127 See Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 270. It is also found in a crusade-specific sermon of the early 14th century (see Georgiou, *Preaching*, 209).

128 Cited in Gerald of Wales, *De principis instructione*, 238. "Unde, quia, nisi Dominus custos fuerit civitatis, frustra vigilant custodes illius, nec proficit, immo deficit, humana solertia, si divino fuerit suffragio destituta, misericordiam Dei sedulo ante omnia precibus invocate et per ecclesias praedicate jugiter invocandam, ut non attendat iniquitates populi, sed sola miseratione sanctuarium suum et ex alto sanctam civitatem Jerusalem tueatur, nec eam nefandis manibus impiorum contaminari permittat."

129 As argued, this delivers a new *terminus post quem* for the news' arrival (see Birkett, "News," 53).

130 The *Passio* admonishes that Baldwin must fulfill his duty as a *custos* of the vineyard, referring to the impending crusade (Peter of Blois, *Passio Raginaldi*, 70). For the use of a similar verse (Ez. 13:5) in crusade texts, likewise blending spiritual and literal dimensions, see Nicholas Morton, "Walls of Defence for the House of Israel: Ezekiel 13:5 and the Crusading Movement," in: *The Uses of the Bible in Crusader Sources*, ed. Elizabeth Lapina and Nicholas Morton (Leiden 2017), 403–420.

jugiter). The fact that news of its loss arrived instead, probably only a few days later, must have had a devastating impact.[131] We have seen in numerous examples that the conjunction with the spiritual Jerusalem often uses prophecies, especially that of Isaiah, to assert that their fulfillment is outstanding. By directly addressing the audience (that is, the spiritual Jerusalem) in the form of a sermon, preachers call their listeners to fulfill them, whereby the goals and modes of action that the prophecies provide strongly indicate the Holy Land and the purpose of crusading.

4 The Conquest: A Signifier for the Heavenly Jerusalem

The omnipresent notion of building, spanning all guises of Jerusalem, underlines the idea that the actual city is holy; this includes its walls, towers, and gates, elements that are specifically broached in Western texts. As a result, it must have posed a moral issue to Christians to attack its walls in a way that would damage them. The First Crusade chronicles may suggest this: the Christian siege advanced primarily with the help of siege towers, and these were eventually successful.[132] The cultural conception may have influenced the military strategy here.[133] Even more devastating must have been the news that Saladin had broken through the walls with the help of catapults—not for nothing did preachers speak of (heavenly) Jerusalem lying in ruins.[134] The

131 This is visible in Clement's encyclicals from May and June 1188, both addressing the archbishop of Toledo and his suffragans (see *Papsturkunden* (no.253), ed. Berger, 466; and (no.256), ed. Berger, 474–475).

132 See John France, *Victory in the East: A Military History of the First Crusade* (Cambridge, UK 1994), 346–354. Yet, corresponding texts refer to Jos. 6, that is, the crumbling of Jericho's walls (see Christian Hofreiter, *Making Sense of Old Testament Genocide: Christian Interpretations of Herem Passages* (Oxford 2018), 174–176, 181). This is also present in 13th-century sermon texts (see Bird, "Good Friday," 149; Bird, "Preaching and Narrating the Fifth Crusade: Bible, Sermons and the History of a Campaign," in: *The Uses of the Bible in Crusader Sources*, ed. Elizabeth Lapina and Nicholas Morton (Leiden 2017), 328–333). Interestingly, the *Glossa* interprets Jericho's walls as idolatry and paganism (*Glossa ordinaria* (Jos. 6), ed. Feuardent, 2:45–46; discussed by Hofreiter, *Genocide*, 102).

133 For such cases on the Fifth Crusade, see James Matthew Powell, *Anatomy of a Crusade 1213–1221* (Philadelphia 1986), 18, 178–179. See also Kristin Skottki, "'Until the Full Number of Gentiles Has Come in': Exegesis and Prophecy in St Bernard's Crusade-Related Writings," in: *The Uses of the Bible in Crusader Sources*, ed. Elizabeth Lapina and Nicholas Morton (Leiden 2017), 257–258.

134 See Alexander Marx, "Divergent Voices in the Preaching of the Third Crusade: Martin of León's Reading of the Fall of Jerusalem," *Crusades* 23/1 (2024), 25–43. A chronicle tellingly declares on the conquest: "Arcus, baliste, petrarie inutiliter tractantur; sicque tam arma

beginning of Peter's *Conquestio* emphasizes that its gates (*portae*) and fortifications (*munitiones*) have been destroyed. In a later part, it uses edificial imagery to explain the conquest, asserting that "the siege engines of desires" have shattered the foundations of the divine plan.[135] The nexus with the heavenly city also finds a powerful expression at the outset of the *Passio Raginaldi*:

> The Lord had offered us the kingdom of heaven in return for releasing the kingdom of Jerusalem [i.e., the First Crusade], but now, since he finds us less worthy by reason of this one's sacrifice [i.e., Reynaud de Châtillon's martyrdom], having willed it with grace or rather with his rage, the Lord himself, rejecting human help, will annihilate the power of the pagans.[136]

God gave them the heavenly kingdom for liberating the earthly city, a reference to the First Crusade and its eschatological dimension. Peter's words engender concurrence between earthly and celestial spheres: both are *regna*.[137] Reynaud's extraordinary deed—the subject of the text—left the other Christians in a bad light (*minus dignos invenit*); God now intends to wipe out the pagans all by himself. This suggests a devaluation of the spiritual reward established with the First Crusade; and this rhetorical apex is meant to entice the audience to imitate Reynaud even more enthusiastically. The master understands the crusade as an opportunity to enter the celestial city. This adheres not only to martyrdom but also to a collective eschatological dimension, as the vision of annihilating the pagans demonstrates (*fortitudinem gentium dissipabit*).[138] The idea that God may henceforth reject the Christians as providential agents shows that hitherto they had indeed been such agents; and it indicates that salvation history hangs in the balance.

Peter elaborates on earthly Jerusalem as a heavenly gateway in the middle part of the *Passio*:

---

quam machine iram domini manifeste nunciant et urbis excidium preloquntur." (*Itinerarium peregrinorum*, ed. Mayer, 264; see also *Libellus*, ed. Brewer and Kane, 202).

135 Peter of Blois, *Conquestio*, 75, 85: "[…] si in lapide adiutorii fundamentum voti sui firmassent, stabilitatem sancti propositi nulle cupiditatum machine concussissent" (cited 85). See the chapter on the Cross relic.

136 Peter of Blois, *Passio Raginaldi*, 33. "Pro liberatione regni Ierusalem nobis obtulerat dominus regnum celi, nunc autem, quia nos eius oblatione minus dignos invenit, ipse, humanum dedignatus auxilium, ex quo voluerit dignatione aut potius indignatione sua fortitudinem gentium dissipabit."

137 The use of *regnum* indicates the early period when the city's conquest was still unknown.

138 On these questions, see the chapter on the Apocalypse.

> It is thus proven in a most obvious way that there is another Promised Land, in which the heavenly Jerusalem is located, whose image is the earthly Jerusalem. Therefore, when David reigned in it, he said that it seems as if he travels to another Jerusalem: I am a stranger and a pilgrim as all my fathers were [Ps. 39:13]. O vey, because my exile has been prolonged; waiting for the Lord's beatitude, I believe, he said, to see his good works in the land of the living [Ps. 27:13]. It certainly gives the Lord pleasure, who created every human heart, to transfer his beloved from the earthly Jerusalem to the heavenly counterpart. Thus, in the earthly city, through which we received the foundations of our faith, an unimpeded path leading to heaven is prepared and provided to us. As a result, the earthly Jerusalem suffers destruction in ongoing hostilities, a fact permitting that, with the words of the prophet [Isaiah], the sons of the pilgrims may rebuild it [Is. 60:10], to build thus the city in heaven which is not made with hands [2 Cor. 5:1].[139]

The earthly city is a prefiguration (*figura*) of the heavenly counterpart.[140] Remarkably, he also speaks of a celestial Holy Land (*aliam terram promissionis*), thus granting the overarching spatial category an anagogical guise. Such an idea, however, is rare.[141] God likes to transfer "his beloved" from the earthly to the heavenly city (*de terrestri Ierusalem dilectos suos transferre in celestem*).[142] It appears as a gateway to another dimension, an outstanding bridge between earth and heaven, for which reason, as Peter concludes, it had to suffer destruc-

---

139 Peter of Blois, *Passio Raginaldi*, 48. "Ex his apertissime liquet aliam esse terram promissionis, in qua est celestis Ierusalem, cuius hec figura est. Unde et cum David regnaret in ea, dicebat quasi ad altera peregrinans: advena ego sum et peregrinus sicut omnes patres mei [Ps. 39:13], et Heu mihi, quia incolatus meus prolongatus est, et beatitudinem illius expectans, credo, inquit, videre bona domini in terra viventium [Ps. 27:13]. Placet nimirum ei, qui finxit singillatim corda hominum, de terrestri Ierusalem dilectos suos transferre in celestem, unde et in ea, per quam recepimus nostre fidei fundamentum, paratur nobis et offertur via libera et progressus in celum. Eapropter terrena Ierusalem frequenti hostilitate destruitur, ut iuxta verbum prophete filii peregrinorum reedificent eam [Is. 60:10] et ita non manufactam in celis sibi edificent civitatem [2 Cor. 5:1]."

140 See also Ansbert, *Historia*, ed. Chroust, 59; Benedictinus anonymus, *De penitentia*, ed. Huygens, 106; Honorius Augustodinensis, *Speculum ecclesiae*, 1094; and Susanne Lehmann-Brauns, *Jerusalem sehen: Reiseberichte des 12. bis 15. Jahrhunderts als empirische Anleitung zur geistigen Pilgerfahrt* (Freiburg 2010), 73–74.

141 An exception: Rupert of Deutz, *Commentary on Hos.*, 185. See also the chapter on the Holy Land.

142 On such renderings inspired by the Song of Songs, see Peter of Blois, *Sermo 39*, 678; Ralph Ardens, *Pars (II), De tempore, Sermo 19*, 1374; Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 28*, 753.

tion frequently. This provided "the sons of the pilgrims" with the opportunity to rebuild it (*filii peregrinorum reedificent eam*); and this encompasses both the literal and spiritual city—to erect ultimately the celestial version. The *Glossa* agrees with this inclusive reading (*haec ad literam et spiritualiter*), naming Constantine, since he built churches throughout the world.[143] The expression of *filii peregrinorum* is biblical (Is. 60:10), but Peter endows it with specific meaning: Jerusalem's fall provided an opportunity for salvation; God created a situation similar to the eve of the First Crusade. The classification as sons of pilgrims makes them into descendants of the first crusaders, at least spiritually, sometimes even in a literal sense.[144] The reference is meaningful because Is. 60:4 and 60:9 declare that Jerusalem's children would come from afar (*de longe*)—as if he had predicted it.[145] Note the significant parallel with Garnerius' *Sermo 4*, which exhorted its audience to consider the matters in the distance, delineating the pagan pollution of the holy city.[146]

Henry of Albano's crusade treatise understands the holy sites in general as such a heavenly nexus:

> The divine will's impenetrable sublimity intended to give some visible holy places to the Christians, with which those who strive for visible things, who have not been able to progress to the invisible Holies of Holies, seeing them openly, would build for themselves a ladder to the invisible ones. [...] One comprehends these holies, if one comprehends the Lord's Cross and the Sepulcher for one's own sake. These were not only

143 *Glossa ordinaria* (Is. 60), ed. Feuardent, 4:487–488. Peter's expression resembles Hebr. 13:14: "non enim habemus hic manentem civitatem, sed futuram inquirimus." See also Benedictinus anonymus, *De penitentia*, ed. Huygens, 101; Humbert of Romans, *Sermo 1*, ed. Maier, 214.

144 On family traditions of crusading, see Paul, *Footsteps*; Stephen Bennett, *Elite Participation in the Third Crusade* (Woodbridge 2021), 90–120. Bernard of Clairvaux and Alexander III underlined the first crusaders' exemplarity (see Purkis, *Spirituality*, 90–91, 115–116). However, I disagree with Purkis who thinks that these *exempla* replaced the *imitatio Christi*—his limited samples (esp. papal letters) do not permit such conclusions. See also the critique in: Tamminen, *Crusader*, 109–110.

145 See Buc, "Crusade and Eschatology," 318; André Vauchez, "Les composantes eschatologiques de l'idée de la croisade," in: *Le concile de Clermont de 1095 et l'appel à la croisade de 1095* (Rome 1997), 236. See also Nicole Bériou, *Religion et communication: un autre regard sur la prédication au Moyen Age* (Paris 2018), 168, 196, examining a sermon by Philip the Chancellor; it uses Is. 60:10 to call for an imitation of *Christus peregrinus*. See also Bird, "Good Friday," 155, who discusses an Easter sermon by Odo of Cheriton using the same motif. See also Peter of Blois, *Contra Iudeos*, 865, relating the verse to the Church, in distinction from the Jews.

146 Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 4*, 592.

> presented to the Christians in this last age, but have been foreseen and prophesized many times and in many ways in previous ages by the patriarchs and the prophets. Among these, Isaiah says: His Sepulcher will be glorious [Is. 11:10]. And elsewhere: I will glorify the place of my feet [Is. 60:13].[147]

God instituted the holy places as signposts or springboards towards the celestial sphere. This addresses a particular group: those who strive for visible things (*visibilium sectatores*), those who could only build a ladder to the invisible things through the contemplation of physical objects (*intuentes, scalam sibi ad invisibilia facerent*). Henry highlights the act of watching, inspired by the monastic concept of *contemplatio*—we will return to this below. The argument obviously addresses lay people; in contrast to monks, they require the help of 'ladders'; and such are found in the Holy Land (here Sepulcher and Cross). The passage instructs the monks, the work's addressees, on the differences between them and their lay audiences. This interlocks with two quotations from Isaiah; one is reminiscent of Ps. 131:7: Christ's presence sanctified Palestine.[148] Preachers thus entwine the earthly city with its heavenly counterpart; the first is the ladder that one must climb; it offers a collective opportunity to step over to heaven, that is, salvation. Such ideas endow the crusade with a bold eschatological component.

The idea that one can proceed from the earthly to the heavenly city was already prevalent at the time of the First Crusade, as is apparent in the expedition's eschatological outlook: for example, Urban II preached that the earthly city is an effigy (*instar*) of its celestial counterpart (according to Baldric of Dol).[149] Albert of Aachen renders it a gateway to heaven, and a letter sent by

147 Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (XIII), 353 and Ms. Troyes 509, fol. 151r–v. "Sed voluit divini consilii inscrutabilis altitudo, quaedam visibilia sancta Christianis conferre, quae visibilium sectatores, qui ad invisibilia Sancta sanctorum non conscenderunt, visibiliter intuentes, scalam sibi ad invisibilia facerent. […] Sancta haec intelligit, quisquis se intelligit crucem Domini et sepulcrum. Haec non solum ultima hac aetate sunt Christianis exhibita, sed praecedentibus aetatibus multifarie multisque modis a patriarchis [Troyes 509: + et prophetis] praevisa sunt et prophetata. E quibus unus Isaias sic ait: Erit sepulcrum ejus gloriosum [Is. 11:10]. Et alibi: Locum, ait, pedum meorum glorificabo [Is. 60:13]."

148 See Marx, "City of God," 94–95; Flori, *Prêcher*, 159. On Is. 11:10 see below. On Ps. 131:7, see the chapter on the Holy Land. See also *Glossa ordinaria* (Is. 11), ed. Feuardent, 4:145–146; Alan of Lille, *Contra haereticos* (1.70), 372; *Ars praedicandi*, 111; and on Bernard: Skottki, "Number," 248–251.

149 Baldric of Dol, *Historia*, ed. Biddlecombe, 8; discussed by Buc, *Holy War*, 102–104. As Buc notes, the motif recurs in the sermon which the chronicle cites immediately before the storming of Jerusalem. It renders Jerusalem as a *forma* that *praefigurare* and *praetendere* the celestial city. See also Bernard of Clairvaux, *De laude*, 288–290.

the expedition's leaders (1098) demands that the pope opens the gates of "both Jerusalems"—implying the earthly and the heavenly guise.[150] The gates (mostly *portae*) were a common element in Western texts, a vehicle for discussing ways of approaching God and heaven, for example, baptism is characterized as such. Garnerius of Clairvaux offers a list of gates; he absorbed the seven gates of the actual city into the discourse of Western exegesis, emphasizing the ideal of *visio Dei*, while classifying Jerusalem as the *visio pacis*. The aspect of contemplation plays an important role, a parallel with Henry. The different gates stand for different ways into the heavenly city, including the crusade: this is evident when Garnerius deems the Valley of Josaphat, located before Jerusalem's walls, as one of the seven gates.[151] Prevostin of Cremona offers a similar list, which identifies the seven gates as the seven rows of saints (*hee VII porte sunt VII ordines sanctorum*). He notes that one gate has literally been located in (earthly) Jerusalem (*ad literam in Ierusalem fuit quidem porta*)—the perfect tense likely refers to the disrupted state since 1187. Other sermons in the manuscript corroborate this date.[152]

The book of Ezekiel speaks on several occasions of a *porta orientalis*, an Eastern gate (Ez. 10:19; 11:1; 40:23) that would open at the End of Days (Ez. 44:1–3), whereas Rev. 21:25 asserts that the gates stand open—Ezekiel's prophecy has been fulfilled.[153] Chronicles of the First Crusade speaking of the gates standing open thus deliver an unmistakably apocalyptic reference. If such ideas are still found in texts penned years after the event (as visible in the examples above), then these authors propose that the Apocalypse is still ongoing: the allegedly

150 Albert of Aachen, *Historia*, ed. Edgington, 438; discussed by Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 35; and *Kreuzzugsbriefe* (XVI), ed. Hagenmeyer, 161–165; discussed by Flori, "Jérusalem terrestre," 26; Tamminen, *Crusader*, 75. See also Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia* (1.24), ed. Hagenmeyer, 264.

151 Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 31*, 766; see also *Sermo 4*, 592; *Sermo 37*, 807.

152 Ms. BL Add 18335, fol. 5^{v}. On another sermon from the codex concerned with Jerusalem's fall, see the section below on the four senses of Scripture. See also Ms. BL Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 82$^{r–v}$ and Ms. BNF lat. 10633, fols. 95^{v}–96^{r} as well as Petrus Cantor, *Distinctiones*, 529–534, delivering almost the same list at the entry *porte nonne sunt in utraque Ierusalem*. The list of gates stems from Neh. 2:13–14; 3:1–15; 12:37–39; discussed by Worm, "Intertextuality," 131–138.

153 On Ez. 44 and the Third Crusade, see Marx, "City of God," 98–99. See also the chapter on institutional context on one of Prevostin of Cremona's sermons (Ms. Paris, Arsenal 543, fols. 243^{r}–244^{v}). Richard of Saint-Victor's *In visionem Ezechielis* is devoted to Ez. 44, almost exclusively interpreting it via the literal sense (see Lehmann-Brauns, *Jerusalem*, 89–93; Catherine Delano Smith, "Maps and Plans in Medieval Exegesis: Richard of St Victor's *In visionem Ezechielis*," in: *From Knowledge to Beatitude*, ed. E. Ann Matter and Lesley Janette Smith (Notre Dame, Ind. 2013), 1–45).

earthly city represents a kind of apocalyptic state—a concept developed by Jay Rubenstein. The liturgy of Latin Jerusalem substantiates this; it grants the gates and Rev. 21:25 a prominent role.[154] This raises the question of whether this idea persisted up to the time of the Third Crusade. The evidence already examined, constructing close ties between earthly and heavenly sphere, suggests so; and Martin of León corroborates this in a sermon *In dedicatione ecclesiae*:

> The holy Church has only three gates through which one enters happily into the heavenly Jerusalem, a city that is built daily in its limbs out of the living stones [cf. Ps. 122:3]. The first gate refers of course to the East, the second to the North, and the third to the South. The gate in the East is obviously the faith, for the true light [i.e., Christ] is born into the human mind with the help of this gate. […] Thus, my most beloved brethren, you shall strive now for entering through these three gates, and for earning citizenship in this sublime city, you shall exert yourselves with the utmost effort. Whoever among you has not fallen into the abyss of vices thanks to faith and the sacrament of baptism should thank God and enter the kingdom of the heavens through the Eastern gate.[155]

There are three gates into the heavenly kingdom, and he highlights the one located in the East, because—so the conclusion—it (also) permits entry, an anagogical exegesis. The Eastern gate, taken literally, is the earthly Jerusalem.[156] Despite the existence of two other entries, Martin portrays it as an extraordin-

154 See Rubenstein, "Saint-Omer," 73–75, 85–88; Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven: The First Crusade and the Quest for Apocalypse* (New York 2011), 310–311, 319. On the liturgy, see Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 154–155, 267, 280–281. See in detail the chapter on the Apocalypse.

155 Martin of León, *De diversis, Sermo 1*, 66 and Ms. León, San Isidoro 11/2, fol. 185^{v}. "Tres solummodo portas habet sancta Ecclesia per quas coelestem Jerusalem, quae ut civitas ex lapidibus vivis aedificatur quotidie in suis membris [cf. Ps. 122:3], feliciter ingreditur. Prima videlicet ad orientem, secunda ad aquilonem, tertia vero ad meridiem. Porta quippe in oriente est fides, quia per ipsam lux vera nascitur in mente hominis. […] Nunc ergo, fratres charissimi, per has tres portas intrare contendite, et ut in illa superna civitate cives esse mereamini, summopere elaborate. Quicunque vestrum post fidem et baptismi sacramentum non ceciderunt in profundum vitiorum, Deo gratias referant, et per orientalem portam ingrediantur regnum coelorum."

156 On the Eastern gate, see also Alan of Lille, *Sermo 2*, PL 210:200; Hélinand of Froidmont, *Chronicon*, 1037; the latter is concerned with the Second Crusade's preparations. Joachim of Fiore also considered the earthly city as a celestial gateway (Joachim of Fiore, *Expositio*, fol. 175^{r}; discussed by Jay Rubenstein, *Nebuchadnezzar's Dream: The Crusades, Apocalyptic Prophecy, and the End of History* (Oxford 2019), 189–190). Such ideas also fused into art historical sources (see Worm, "Vergegenwärtigungen," 305–314).

ary opportunity that surpasses the sacraments; he evokes the remission of sin granted via crusading.[157] Yet, the entire sermon does not deliver specific hints about the crusade; the Eastern gate may perhaps be monastic or spiritual. This makes an application in the service of the crusade possible but not unequivocal—though Martin certainly draws attention towards the Holy Land by broaching Christ's incarnation (via *lux vera nascitur*). It transpires that using the motif of the Eastern gate implies both literal and anagogical exegesis, precisely because it connects earthly and heavenly city. A Palm Sunday sermon by Odo of Cheriton (early 13th century) delivers another expressive example: it tells of a crusader who prayed on the Mount of Olives to be taken up to heaven, whereupon his wish was granted.[158]

Henry of Albano's monumental opus includes elaborate discussions of the gates, in particular in treatise five; it bears the title *De portis civitatis Dei* (On the gates of the City of God) and expounds inter alia:

> The gate from the East is thus the sacrament of baptism, through which one enters the city, whose citizen—whoever enters righteously—is received. It is rightly called the Eastern gate, since the East first visited this world through this gate from above [Lk. 1:78], at the time when the heavens were opened, after the Lord whose name is East [Zach. 6:12] had been baptized in the River Jordan [...].[159]

The legate fuses several senses: he identifies the Eastern gate as the sacrament of baptism via which one enters 'Jerusalem' (typological and tropological senses).[160] At the same time, he aligns his examination with the Holy Land as the place where Christ came down to earth through the very same gate (*per hanc visitavit mundum Oriens ex alto*)—note the parallel with Martin. His baptism in the Jordan "opened the heavens" (*aperti sunt coeli*): a breach revealed itself in the wall separating heaven and earth, that is, the initiation of

157 See also Martin of León, *Liber sermonum*, *Sermo* 22, 862; this sermon concerned with Jerusalem's loss in 1187 speaks of *plena indulgentia* achievable through penance—just as promised in the crusade encyclical (Gregory VIII, *Audita tremendi*, ed. Chroust, 10 and Smith, "*Audita tremendi*," 99).

158 See Bird, "Palm Sunday," 23.

159 Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (V), 296 and Ms. Troyes 509, fol. 117^{v}. "Porta igitur ab oriente sacramentum est baptismatis, per quod in civitatem intratur, et ipsius civis, quisquis recte intrat, ascribitur. Bene autem porta haec dicitur orientalis, vel quia primo per hanc visitavit mundum Oriens ex alto [Lk. 1:78], cum baptizato in Jordane Domino, cui nomen est Oriens [Zach. 6:12] aperti sunt coeli [...]."

160 See Thomas Renna, "The Idea of the City in Otto of Freising and Henry of Albano," *Cîteaux* 35 (1984), 66–67.

an apocalyptic state, here already with Christ's incarnation—we will return to this. Henry thus merges baptism with both the literal sense (Holy Land) and the anagogical sense (celestial realm), fusing therein two 'Eastern gates': the city itself may represent such, but also its own Eastern entry had a particular meaning, the Lions' Gate or Saint Stephen's Gate. Located next to the Mount of Olives, Christ used it to enter the city, as celebrated annually on Palm Sunday, and it connects the city with the Valley of Josaphat, the venue of the Last Judgment—a bold anagogical component.[161] Henry also alludes to the fact that the Jordan lies east and thus represents a path to the city (*porta igitur ab oriente sacramentum est baptismatis, per quod in civitatem intratur*). The two 'Eastern gates' tend to intermingle in the Western perception; this intertwines baptism, the Mount of Olives, and Palm Sunday with the idea that the city represents a gateway to heaven.

The very first lines of the crusade treatise fuse these ideas most tellingly with the situation of 1187:

> Although we observe those glorious things already the clearer the more we come near to them, including the 12 gates touching the [heavenly] thresholds, we still strive to enter via the city of the Lord. As we have learned, these glorious things have been gloriously foreseen by David and many kings as well as predicted by the prophets about his city. […] what one sees is incomparably more powerful than the rumor that one hears. Does it not suffice anymore to say with the Prophet: Just as we have heard, so we shall see [Ps. 48:9], but what we already see is much greater than what we have heard about the Lord's city. […] We learn now that the gates of glory are not so much closed as barricaded. This gate of light, whose glory we saw so delightfully until recently, this Eastern gate, I say, through which the East had used to illuminate his city from above [i.e., Christ's incarnation; cf. Lk. 1:78], has eventually hidden the rays of its light.[162]

161 See Baert, *Heritage*, 175–176; Sylvia Schein, "Between Mount Moriah and the Holy Sepulchre: The Changing Traditions of the Temple Mount in the Central Middle Ages," *Traditio* 40 (1984), 189. See also Alan of Lille, *Distinctiones*, 906–907, identifying the gate as the Last Judgment's venue (*dicitur judicium, quia judices solebant sedere in portis*), aligning it with preaching activity and proclaiming the Church's collective goal of "advancing to the gate" (*sancta enim Ecclesia ad civitatis portam procedit*). The Benedictine gives the valley a daunting impression: "Iosaphat ultra mare qui semel viderit sufficit, timoren vero iudicii futuri semper pre oculis habere […]" (Benedictinus anonymus, *De penitentia*, ed. Huygens, 102).

162 Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (XIII), 350–351 and Ms. Troyes 509, fol. 150$^{r–v}$. "Cum gloriosa quae gloriose de civitate Domini a David praevisa et a multis regibus et

Henry identifies the earthly Jerusalem specifically as the Eastern gate, before he moves on to explaining its loss (not cited here).[163] The gates stand open—since the First Crusade according to the general understanding. He underlines that Old Testament prophecies have been fulfilled, whose predictions about the glorious city have already been "the more visible the closer" they came (*tanto jam clarius, quanto vicinius*). This approach can be understood as both temporal (salvation history) and spatial (voyage to the East)—thus the state "until recently" (*paulo ante*), a reference to the conquest and the disrupted providential order. The version in the surviving manuscript adds that it has "already" (*iam iamque*) been possible to enter the celestial kingdom. This expression is already known from First Crusade accounts: it betrays an impending Apocalypse, and it is an eschatological detail which the version presented in the PL preferred to erase.[164] Using Ez. 44, the legate asserts that the gates are now not so much closed as barricaded: the Muslims prevent the Christians from entering the heavenly kingdom.[165] He stresses the act of watching, which is much more powerful than just hearing about a matter; he thus fuels the audience's desire, not only to hear about Jerusalem in liturgy and preaching, but also to depart on the actual journey, in order to experience it with their own eyes. The city, on the brink of heaven and earth, would offer a glimpse of heaven itself—note the significant unison in formulation with the passage from treatise five (via Lk. 1:78). The Cistercian transmits the monastic idea of *contemplatio* to the

---

prophetis praedicta et praefigurata noscuntur, tanto jam clarius, quanto vicinius speculamur; et duodecimae portae limina attingentes per eam [Troyes 509: + iam iamque] intrare contendimus […] incomparabiliter majus est quod videtur quam rumor qui auditur, nec jam cum Propheta dicere sufficit: Sicut audivimus, sic vidimus [Ps. 48:9]; sed longe ampliora quam audivimus de civitate Domini jam videmus. […] Portae gloriae non tam clausae, quam obstructae reperiuntur. Ipsa denique porta lucis, cujus gloriam paulo ante tam delectabiliter speculabamur; illa, inquam, orientalis porta, per quam civitatem suam illustrare consueverat oriens ex alto [cf. Lk. 1:78], radios suae lucis abscondit."

163 This passage has been examined above as to the entanglement of the earthly and spiritual city.

164 See Marx, "City of God," 96–102, 104–105; Buc, "Crusade and Eschatology," 310–311, 334. On such cleansings as well as on the causality of temporal and spatial, see the chapter on the Apocalypse.

165 Some lines below, he says that the loss is only temporal or temporary (*temporalem casum*). As discussed, Peter deviates in claiming that the gates have been destroyed (*omnes porte eius destructe*), referring to Lam. 1:4 (Peter of Blois, *Conquestio*, 75). Yet, the consequence remains the same: access to the celestial kingdom is possible if the crusaders are virtuous. The *Glossa* juxtaposes Lam. 1:4 with all four senses, evoking the gates' purpose as a nexus between the different Jerusalems (*Glossa ordinaria* (Lam. 1), ed. Feuardent, 4:929–930; see also Martin of León, *Liber sermonum*, *Sermo 29*, 1062–1064).

Holy Land, creating an arena where lay people can devote themselves to the same pious practice.[166] He sketches an apocalyptic state that had existed in Jerusalem since 1099, but this state is now disrupted. For Henry, a powerful guardian of interpretive authority, the earthly city embodies a gateway to heaven standing open.

5 Typology and Prophecy

The providential meaning of Jerusalem's fall also unfolded itself via references to its earlier conquests such as that by Nebuchadnezzar (597 B.C.), which initiated the Babylonian exile, or that by Titus and Vespasian (A.D. 70), often considered as a divine vengeance on the Jews for the crucifixion of Christ. Furthermore, there was the Persian conquest of 614, when the Cross relic was lost (subsequently recovered by Emperor Heraclius), and the Arab conquest of 634, when it was lost again (until 1099). Precedents thus existed for the holy city's (pagan) occupation, which are cited in many contemporaneous sources, and which served as a resource of meaning for explaining the current conquest.[167] The common idea that Titus and Vespasian exacted vengeance is found, for example, in Martin of León's or Ralph Ardens' sermons.[168] Ralph emphasizes a liturgical or typological concurrence, claiming that the sack took place at Easter, thus mirroring the crucifixion, whereas in fact it happened in the sum-

166 See Lehmann-Brauns, *Jerusalem*, esp. 71–74. The transfer of monastic concepts to the arena of crusading happened at least since the three Benedictines penned their chronicles around ten years after the First Crusade (see Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 34–35; Purkis, *Spirituality*, 12–58, 118). Purkis discusses the transfer of *imitatio Christi* and *vita apostolica*.

167 See Schein, *Gateway*, 192; Buc, *Holy War*, 21–22, 76–77, 264; Buc, "La vengeance de Dieu: De l'exégèse patristique à la Réforme ecclésiastique et la Première Croisade," in: *La vengeance, 400–1200*, ed. Dominique Barthélemy, François Bougard, and Régine Le Jan (Rome 2006), 459–460; Hubert Glaser, "Das Scheitern des zweiten Kreuzzuges als heilsgeschichtliches Ereignis," in: *Festschrift für Max Spindler*, ed. Dieter Albrecht and Andreas Kraus (Munich 1969), 140–142; and Karen M. Kletter, "Politics, Prophecy and Jews: The Destruction of Jerusalem in Anglo-Norman Historiography," in: *Jews in Medieval Christendom: Slay Them Not*, ed. Kristine T. Utterback and Merrall Llewelyn Price (Leiden 2013), 91–116, who examines William of Newburgh as to the Third Crusade.

168 Martin of León, *Liber sermonum*, *Sermo 18*, 822; *Sermo 22*, 858; *Sermo 23*, 877, 890; Ralph Ardens, *Pars (1), Section (2), Sermo 23*, 2024; *Pars (11), De tempore, Sermo 4*, 1316; see also Peter of Blois, *Passio Raginaldi*, 49; Benedictinus anonymus, *De penitentia*, ed. Huygens, 99.

mer.[169] An anonymous and contemporaneous description of the Holy Land's sites, belonging to the Canterbury circle, declares:

> The church [of the Holy Sepulcher] is located on the slope of Mount Zion just like the city, but only after the Roman emperors Titus and Vespasian had fully demolished the entire city for the sake of avenging the Lord, thus fulfilling the prophecy that the Lord had uttered when approaching Jerusalem, seeing the city and weeping over it [Lk. 19:41].[170]

Jerusalem's destruction fulfilled a prophecy, specifically the one uttered by Christ himself in Lk. 19:41–44, on his arrival in the city, as celebrated on Palm Sunday.[171] Walter Map, also around the Third Crusade, makes an intriguing remark: God used Titus to exact vengeance, but the emperor was not aware of his purpose.[172] The Carolingian exegete Haymo of Auxerre, well received in the 12th century, asserted that Christ would be avenged twice, via the Roman emperors and in the End of Days.[173] Sermons' frequent references to the first vengeance thus suggest to their audiences that they should devote themselves to the second and final vengeance. However, another reading is possible when texts construct parallels between 70 and 1187: just as God used the emperors to deprive the Jews of their elect status, he may now use the Muslims for the same end with the Christians. Martin elaborates on this idea in a sermon on Maundy Thursday that reacts to Jerusalem's loss: broaching the Roman conquest several times and repeatedly calling his (definitely Christian) audience "Jews" (*iudaei*),

169 Ralph Ardens, *Pars (1), Section (2), Sermo 23*, 2024; discussed by Jussi Hanska, "Preachers as Historians. The Case of the Destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD," *Anuario de estudios medievales* 42/1 (2012), 36. On anti-Jewish violence on the eve of the Second Crusade, triggered by Easter, see Buc, "Crusade and Eschatology," 329–330.

170 Ms. Lambeth 144, fol. 117r. "Ista ecclesia [sancti Sepulchri] sita est in declivo montis Syon, sicut civitas, set postquam romani principes Titus et Vespasianus in ultione domini totam civitatem Ierusalem funditus destruxissent, ut prophetatio dominica impleretur, quam dum appropinquaret dominus Ierusalem, videns civitatem flens super illam, dixit [Lk. 19:41]." Thereafter, the text contains the belief that Emperor Hadrian rebuilt Jerusalem and the Temple.

171 See Hanska, "Videns Iesus," 237–251, examining Lk. 19:41–44 in 13th-century sermon texts.

172 Walter Map, *De nugis curialum*, ed. James, 22: "ultor iniuriarum Domini, licet inscius." Contrariwise, Pope Sergius IV (1009–1012) had declared that Titus and Vespasian consciously took vengeance, and now the Christians must take vengeance for the Sepulcher's destruction (see Flori, *L'islam*, 232). The *Chanson d'Antioche* agrees, even stating that the two emperors were Christians (*Chanson d'Antioche*, ed. Duparc-Quioc, 28–29; see Tolan, *Saracens*, 317).

173 Haymo of Auxerre, *In Isaiam*, 1054; discussed by Buc, "Crusade and Eschatology," 317. Buc sees here a logic that unfolded in the events of the First Crusade.

he suggests to his listeners that what had happened to the Jews in A.D. 70 has now happened to them.[174] This adds to the motifs discussed in the chapter on the Cross relic (a new crucifixion, adultery, and comparison with the Ark of the Covenant), but Martin is rhetorically sharper, calling his audience Jews—as if they had lost their elect status already.

Beyond historical precedents, the Bible offers further material, for example, Lk. 21:24 speaks of Jerusalem's occupation by *gentes* that would last until the Apocalypse, or Rev. 11:2 narrates it being captured by the *gentes* for 42 months. Joachim of Fiore believed that this would be the duration of Saladin's reign over Jerusalem, such was his prognosis to Richard Lionheart.[175] A number of prophecies color the city's pagan conquest in apocalyptic terms, making it part of the eschatological scenario or an important element to initiating it: such a conquest thus always represented an event of preeminent providential standing.[176] These ideas were also disseminated via popular prophecies such as Pseudo-Methodius, as their rich manuscript evidence demonstrates.[177] The preachers drew on the eschatological dimension as an established premise; Sylvia Schein asserted, "The Third Crusade, Europe's response to the fall of Jerusalem on 2 October 1187, unfolded in an atmosphere of exceptional eschatological tension. The calamity just as its cure, the retaking of Jerusalem, were integrated into already available popular prophecies such as that about the Last Emperor."[178]

A highly pertinent sermon by Peter of Blois creates significant causalities right at the outset:

---

174 Martin of León, *Liber sermonum*, *Sermo 22*, 856–862 and Ms. León, San Isidoro 11/2, fols. 118r–120r; discussed elaborately by Marx, "Divergent Voices," 38–41.

175 See Roger of Howden, *Gesta*, 2:154. Elsewhere, he converts the 42 months into 1260 days, which are then understood as years: the Apocalypse comes in the year 1260, yet already initiated with first events around 1200 (Joachim of Fiore, *Expositio*, fols. 5r–6r, 131v; Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon*, 68; discussed by Flori, *L'islam*, 323).

176 This pertains to the general struggle against paganism; Orosius' *Historia adversum paganos*, the most widely disseminated historical work of the Middle Ages, made this struggle into the main objective of world history (see Rubenstein, *Dream*, 26).

177 See Rubenstein, *Dream*; Rubenstein, "Crusade and Apocalypse: History and the Last Days," *Quaestiones medii aevi novae* 21 (2016), 172–175; Jessalynn L. Bird, "Prophecy, Eschatology, Global Networks, and the Crusades, from Hattin to Frederick II," *Traditio* 77 (2022), 31–106. The same happened after Jerusalem's loss in 1244, informing several illustrated codices of John's Revelation (see Renna, *Jerusalem*, 230).

178 Schein, "Bewegungen," 130–131: "*Der Dritte Kreuzzug, Europas Antwort auf den Fall Jerusalems am 2. Oktober 1187, spielte sich in einer Atmosphäre außerordentlicher eschatologischer Spannung ab. Das Unglück ebenso wie sein Gegenmittel, die Rückeroberung Jerusalems, wurden in die bereits umlaufenden populären Prophezeiungen, z.B. diejenige des Endkaisers, eingearbeitet.*" My translation.

> Act kindly towards Zion, oh Lord, with your good will so that Jerusalem's walls may be rebuilt [Ps. 51:20]. If we consider the times of Nebuchadnezzar, Sennacherib, as well as of Titus and Vespasian, we do not doubt that the earthly Zion has been conquered, demolished, and rebuilt multiple times. And it may not be necessary to return to these old stories, since the destruction of this city has been in the public's eye at the time of Urban II, when a Philip was king of the Franks. But now, engendered by our faults, this most recent capture and destruction occurred under Urban III and another Philip, king of the Franks. However, there is another, a sublime Jerusalem, this celestial city which is our mother [Gal. 4:26], whose walls have entirely collapsed into ruins and decay with the help of Lucifer and his accomplices. It was the plan of its highness to rebuild the city out of humans as if out of suitable and living stones.[179]

He begins with references to Jerusalem's past conquests and rebuildings; the list is reminiscent of the idea found in the *Passio Raginaldi* that God permitted such events, in order to offer opportunities for salvation.[180] The First Crusade blends therein with 1187: Peter seems to see a form of eschatological fulfillment in the fact that at both times an Urban was pope and a Philip king of France. This idea is found in several contemporary texts: Peter's sermon was likely the earliest; it may have been the model for the others.[181] Hinting at the

179 Peter of Blois, *Sermo 39*, 677. "Benigne fac, Domine, in bona voluntate tua Sion, ut aedificentur muri Jerusalem [Ps. 51:20]. Si referamus [BL Arundel 322; BL Royal 8 F XVII: >< recolamus] tempora Nabuchodonosor, tempora Sennacherib, Titi quoque et Vespasiani, non dubitamus quia terrena Sion multoties capta et destructa et reaedificata est. Et ne ad veteres historias nos ire oporteat, in promptu est destructio illius civitatis facta tempore papae Urbani secundi, regnante rege Francorum Philippo. Sed nunc, culpis nostris exigentibus, haec novissima captio et destructio facta est sub Urbano papa tertio, et sub alio Philippo rege Francorum. Sed est alia Jerusalem superna, et coelestis illa, quae est mater nostra [Gal. 4:26], cujus muri in ruina, et lapsu Luciferi atque complicum ejus, ex parte non modica corruerunt. Erat consilium Altissimi, ut haec civitas reaedificaretur [BL Arundel 322; St.Geneviève 2787: >< restitueretur] ex hominibus tanquam ex rationabilibus et vivis lapidibus."

180 Peter of Blois, *Passio Raginaldi*, 48; see also Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (1), 259. For Alan, the past conquests indicate that Christ already came and that the Jews are thus wrong; he explains the conquest of A.D. 70 with *peccatis exigentibus* (Alan of Lille, *Contra haereticos* (3.12), 412).

181 See William of Newburgh, *Historia*, 254: "[Jerusalem] a Christianis recepta est sub papatu Urbani Secundi, et recidit in manus Agarenorum sub pontificatu Urbani Tertii." See also *L'Estoire d'Eracles*, 116; Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, 2:323; Robert of Auxerre, *Chronicon*, 252. Such typologies also played a role as to the name Heraclius, the Byzantine emperor and the contemporary patriarch of Jerusalem, and was used for blaming the latter for the

spiritual guise, the loss of 1187 was "prompted by our faults" (*culpis nostris exigentibus*), a synonym for *peccatis nostris exigentibus*.[182] Yet, he also entwines the event with the heavenly city (*est alia Jerusalem superna et coelestis illa*), whose walls now likewise lie in ruins (*cujus muri in ruina*), caused by Lucifer and "his accomplices"—a reference to the Muslims.[183] We have seen so far that the earthly Jerusalem signifies the state of its spiritual counterpart, and it offers an opportunity to enter the heavenly city. Here, however, the earthly city reveals the state of the heavenly guise, which must thus be rebuilt out of living stones.

Immediately after the passage cited, the master continues:

> And even though his plan had been hidden from the world [cf. Col. 1:26], yet it has been revealed to the prophets in spirit. Daniel and Amos spoke thus: The Lord will not do anything without having revealed it beforehand to his servants, the prophets [Amos 3:7]. Therefore, David asks through dedicated and pious prayer for the benevolence of the highest judge. David is a conscious and understanding prophet of this secret, which granted the duty of rebuilding Jerusalem to the contemplative men, whom Zion designates.[184]

The conquest fulfills a prophecy; using Amos 3:7, Peter even declares that nothing happens without having been revealed beforehand to the prophets. This is a momentous invitation to understand historical events as the fulfillment of prophetic texts.[185] He extends the coincidental concurrence between history

---

Cross relic's loss (see *La Continuation*, ed. Morgan, 49–50; *Chronique d'Ernoul*, ed. Mas Latrie, 82–84; *L'Estoire d'Eracles*, 46, 57–58; Sicard of Cremona, *Chronica*, 518; discussed by M.R. Morgan, *The Chronicle of Ernoul and the Continuations of William of Tyre* (Oxford 1973), 115, 119, 192–193; Peter W. Edbury and John Gordon Rowe, "William of Tyre and the Patriarchal Election of 1180," *The English Historical Review* 93 (1978), 4–7).

182 For such alternative formulations, see the chapter on the failure of crusades.

183 See Marx, "Divergent Voices," 29.

184 Peter of Blois, *Sermo 39*, 677–678. "Et licet consilium illud absconditum fuisset a saeculis [cf. Col. 1:26], erat tamen prophetis in spiritu revelatum. Unde Daniel [missing BL Arundel 322; St.Geneviève 2787] et Amos dicebant: Non faciet Dominus quidquam, nisi prius revelaverit illud servis suis prophetis [Amos 3:7]. David ergo propheta secreti hujus conscius et intelligens, quod de viris contemplativis qui significantur per Sion reaedificanda esset Jerusalem, supplici et devota oratione benignitatem summi judicis interpellat."

185 Searching databases demonstrates that Amos 3:7 is a very rare reference; only one further hit turned up in the relevant corpus (Peter of Blois, *Sermo 38*, 674). The sermon's eschatological nature is substantiated by its attribution to *In festo sancti Michaelis* (29 Sept.). On 13th-century sermons, see Bériou, *Communication*, 417–433, discussing that Michael was the guardian of the Covenant with God, embodying the rejection of the Old Coven-

and prophecy to a call to consciously relate the two (as he himself does with the city's past conquests). This blends with a call for action: "the contemplative men" must rebuilt Jerusalem. Stemming from *peccatis nostris exigentibus*, present at the sermon's outset, this is a call to spiritually support the crusade. The beginning of Peter's *Conquestio* agrees in prophetically reading the conquest: "I am convinced that the reliable and expressive prophecy of Ezekiel has anticipated this most wretched day: Son of Man, write down the date of this day, this very day when the king of Babylon was encouraged against Jerusalem [Ez. 24:2]. Just as we have heard it, so it has happened in the city of the Lord of virtues."[186] One could hardly be more explicit: it is certain and obvious (*certum et expressum*) that the prophecy has now materialized (*sic accidit*). The reference is different from the previous sermon, but both texts agree on the fulfillment of Old Testament predictions. Significantly, Peter adapts Ez. 24:2 to underline this: the Vulgate says that the Babylonian king attacked Jerusalem (*aggressus est rex Babylonis*); here, he is already confirmed or encouraged (*confirmatus est*). This passage is embedded in an elaborate discussion that emphasizes multiple times the fulfillment of prophecies with regard to the events of 1187 (for example, via Jer. 9:1 or Lam. 1:4).[187]

The anonymous Benedictine blends these ideas with a noteworthy vision of violence:

> You are mistaken: indeed, the Jerusalem on which you focus your attention had never or rarely peace; it has always been engaged in wars and it is still, as one can see nowadays. Thus, you cannot find peace there, for neither the body nor the heart. The name's interpretation that you mention—Jerusalem is the vision of peace [Ez. 13:16]—cannot refer to the earthly city, but it refers to the heavenly Jerusalem, whose effigy is the earthly Jerusalem, and within whose borders the Lord granted peace. Which is thus the Jerusalem that is warlike and that carries peace only in its name? It belongs to God's people; this means, it signifies God's people; these are away from the Lord as long as they dwell here in the

ant. Humbert also underlines his role as the leader of the apocalyptic (crusade) armies, referring to Rev. 12:7–8 (Humbert of Romans, *De predicatione*, 7).

186 Peter of Blois, *Conquestio*, 75. "De hac damnatissima die credo certum et expressum Ezechielis oraculum praecessisse: Fili hominis, scribe tibi nomen diei huius, in qua confirmatus est rex Babilonis adversus Ierusalem hodie [Ez. 24:2]. Sicut audivimus, sic accidit in civitate Domini virtutum […]."

187 Peter says inter alia: "Quicquid adversus Ierusalem et regnum eius multis seculorum curriculis prophete comminando predixerant, dies una lugubris et infelix, dies caliginosa et tenebrosior omni nocte complevit" (*Conquestio*, 75).

> flesh [2 Cor. 5:6]; they have to endure the wars against the temptations induced by the enemies, the devil, the neighbor, and one's own flesh.[188]

Broaching the liturgical hymn *visio pacis*, the author describes Jerusalem as a refuge of peace: this, however, refers only to the heavenly city, which would offer such at the End of Days (*cuius fines dominus pacem posuit*). Until then, war rages, as is visible in his own day (*semper in bellis fuit et adhuc est, sicut hodie videre est*).[189] The earthly city, an effigy of its celestial counterpart (*cuius ista significativa est*), represents the arena for this warfare, just as Bernard of Clairvaux had asserted that the heavenly city creates the obligation of defending the earthly guise with violence.[190] The Benedictine also states that it belongs to God's people, a fact that makes an inimical occupation an unlawful disruption, though divinely ordained to advance salvation history. Warfare thus becomes the premise for making the way to the heavenly city.

Henry of Albano agrees that the conquest fulfilled a prophecy, yet he puts these words into the devil's mouth, whose speech he quotes.[191] The devil first outlines the history of the Cross relic (including Helena and Heraclius), before proceeding to the multiple conquests of Jerusalem:

> Thanks to our cooperation, our pagan people have once occupied this entire land, which we always hated. But then came Charlemagne from the West and liberated it from its enemies with a strong hand and a stretched-out arm. However, after the Christians had been cast out again, our people were once more defeated and expelled by some Westerners, even though they were much smaller in numbers and much weaker than our people

188 Benedictinus anonymus, *De penitentia*, ed. Huygens, 106. "Erras, ymmo Jerusalem, de qua tu intendis, nunquam vel raro pacem habuit, semper in bellis fuit et adhuc est, sicut hodie videre est. Non ergo pacem ibi habere poteris, non pacem corporis nec cordis: non ergo interpretatio nominis, quam tu dicis quia Ierusalem 'visio pacis' est [Ez. 13:16], huic Ierusalem terrene convenire poterit, sed illi celesti Ierusalem, cuius ista significativa est, cuius fines dominus pacem posuit. Que est ergo ista Ierusalem, que et bellicosa est et pacem tantum habet in nomine? Ipsa est populi dei, hoc est significat populum dei, qui quam diu hic in carne peregrinatur a domino [2 Cor. 5:6], bella temptationum ab hostibus, a dyabolo, a proximo, a propria carne tollerare habet."

189 The term *fines* may be either temporal or spatial, yet the two are related; see the chapter on the Apocalypse.

190 See Thomas Renna, "Bernard of Clairvaux and the Temple of Solomon," in: *Law, Custom, and the Social Fabric in Medieval Europe*, ed. Bernard Bachrach and David Nicholas (Kalamazoo 1990), 75.

191 See the chapter on immediate context. On further fulfillments in Henry's work, especially as to Ps. 48:9, Ps. 87:3, and Ez. 44:1–3, see Marx, "City of God," 98–101, 106.

> [i.e., the First Crusade]. What shall we now hope for? What shall we do? One must certainly expect similar things now—save for the fact that we apparently had our time already. Now, I say, the time has come that the crucified had predicted: there will be such an untold act of punishment as has never occurred since the pagans came into being [cf. Dan. 12:1]—whereby even Daniel's prophecy suggests: When you will see the abomination of desolation in the holy place. Whoever reads this, shall understand it [Mt. 24:15]. We understand it thus: we shall maintain the desolation, which we perpetrated in the holy place, a while longer. And as soon as the Christians assemble courageously to come to their people's aid in the desolation, we shall prepare a resistance, we shall erect fortifications, and we shall set snares for them.[192]

The devil broaches the city's tumultuous history that ended in the Christians being expelled once more, described as prophetic fulfillment via Mt. 24:15 (ascribed to Daniel), a verse perfectly suitable for imagining the devastated city.[193] While exhorting his servants to assemble, to offer resistance to the Christians who will soon arrive (the Third Crusaders), he becomes aware that this time is different: the seesaw of the past is thwarted in favor of a unique providential watershed—we have already encountered such a notion with Alan of Lille and the Cross relic.[194] The devil and his servants had their time (*jam advenisse hora nostra*), but now the time predicted by Christ has come (*de qua crucifixus praedixit*), which would know an untold act of punishment of the pagans (*tantam futuram esse tribulationem, quanta non fuit*). Jerusalem's fall represents the fulfillment of an apocalyptic prophecy; the End of Days

192 Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (XIII), 359 and Ms. Troyes 509, fols. 154^{v}–155^{r}. "[Diabolus dicit:] Gentilis noster populus totam terram illam nobis semper exosam aliquando nobis cooperantibus occupavit; sed Carolus ab Occidente veniens in manu forti et brachio extento eam ab hostibus liberavit; sed expulsis iterum Christianis, denuo per quosdam Occidentales, multo nostris pauciores multoque inferiores, nostri victi sunt et expulsi. Quid igitur nunc nobis sperandum est, quid agendum? Similia plane exspectanda nunc essent, nisi quod jam advenisse hora nostra videtur. Hora, inquam, illa, de qua crucifixus praedixit, tantam futuram esse tribulationem, quanta non fuit, ex quo gentes esse coeperunt [cf. Dan. 12:1]. Ubi etiam prophetiam Danielis inducens: Cum videritis, inquit, abominationem desolationis [Troyes 509: >< desolationem] stantem in loco sancto, qui legit intelligat [Mt. 24:15]. Nos igitur hoc intelligentes, desolationem istam, quam in loco sancto esse fecimus, stare ibidem diutius faciamus; et si forte convenerint Christiani, ut suorum subveniant desolationi, paremus eis offendicula, struamus impedimenta, laqueos eis tendamus."

193 See also Peter of Blois, *Ep.23*, 85; Celestine III, *Ep.224*, 1108.

194 Alan of Lille, *De cruce Domini*, ed. d'Alverny, 280–281; see the chapter on the Cross relic.

has arrived—Henry formulates in the perfect tense. The passage has parallels with both Joachim of Fiore and the *Chanson d'Antioche* (later 12th century). Joachim predicted to Richard Lionheart, when the latter passed through Sicily on the way to the East, that there would be a massacre among the Muslims such as the world had never seen before (*erit illorum strages maxima, qualis non fuit ab initio mundi*). The latter depicted Christ prophesizing on the cross the punishment of 'the pagans' in the course of the First Crusade.[195]

Importantly, the idea that Jerusalem's conquest fulfilled a prophecy extended beyond the sermon texts; it is also present in the Third Crusade's chronicles, in particular those of English origin.[196] It can also be found in a poem by Count Henry of Champagne, likely penned prior to the venture: Henry was a participant; his poem may shed light on his motivation.[197] The idea of a prophecy being fulfilled was thus broadly received; it represents an essential element for explaining the event. Yet, it is astonishing that the chronicles do not revise this reading despite having been written after the expedition's failure. The concurrence between prophecy and event was apparently powerful enough that this reading persisted, whereas other (imminent) eschatological expectations were likely disappointed. Noteworthy are the two versions of the exchange between Joachim of Fiore and Richard Lionheart on the eve of the Third Crusade, recorded by Roger of Howden, in his *Gesta* and chronicle respectively. In the *Gesta*, Joachim predicts that Saladin is the sixth head of seven of the beast from Revelation, whom Richard would defeat and then reconquer Jerusalem. The subtext is Rev. 11:2, which speaks of pagans ruling the holy city for three and a half

195 Roger of Howden, *Gesta*, 2:152; *Chanson d'Antioche*, ed. Duparc-Quioc, 1:25–28.

196 See *Itinerarium peregrinorum*, ed. Mayer, 247; Walter Map, *De nugis curialum*, ed. James, 22; Roger of Howden, *Gesta*, 2:20; William of Newburgh, *Historia*, 249; Alberic of Trois-Fontaines, *Chronica*, 748; Arnold of Lübeck, *Chronica*, 170; see also Schein, *Gateway*, 167–170; Rajohnson, *L'Occident*, 213–217. Already Hugh of Folieto (mid-12th cen.) declared at his exposition of the four senses that the earthly Jerusalem would be destroyed some day (*aliquando destruetur*) (Hugh of Folieto, *De claustro*, 1131).

197 *Analecta hymnica* 21, no. 234. On his participation, see Bennett, *Participation*, 242–243. One may ascribe such poems a sermon-like character considering how they were delivered at the time (see Murray, "Poet," 119, 127–128). Caesarius speaks of a prophecy from Heisterbach that predicted Jerusalem's fall (Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus* (2.30), 476). In 1204, the idea existed that Constantinople's conquest fulfilled a prophecy, so the first Latin emperor claimed to Innocent III (Baldwin of Constantinople, *Epistola*, 451; see also Gunther of Pairis, *Hystoria*, ed. Orth, 135–138). This blended with the idea of the Last World Emperor; see Flori, *L'islam*, 306–307, 330; see also Beth C. Spacey, *The Miraculous and the Writing of Crusade Narrative* (Woodbridge 2020), 146–151.

years.[198] The later chronicle (completed c.1201) revises the prediction, since the Third Crusade had failed, now announcing the recapture for the year 1194.[199] The prophecy thus remained pertinent, while its events were postponed to a near future, to enable its fulfillment. Hélinand of Froidmont's chronicle elucidates another meaningful dimension: he begins this work with the Emperor Heraclius, the Cross relic, and the first Muslim occupation of the city (actually 637, but dated to 638).[200] This ensemble suggests an expressive providential cycle: the conquest of 637 typologically repeated itself with 1187. This is demonstrated by two facts: first, despite beginning his chronicle with Heraclius and the Cross relic, Hélinand does not mention the Persian conquest of 624. This event would have thwarted his providential sketch, which is eager to relate the two Islamic conquests. Second, the chronicle ends abruptly with 1186: continuing it was no longer his priority. This is even more remarkable considering that he lived until c.1235. With the year 1187, he deemed it mandatory to act according to the prophecy's appeal and engaged in the preaching of the crusade.[201]

6 The Holy Sepulcher

This short section deals with Christ's tomb located at the same site as the crucifixion, that is, Golgotha, where the Church of the Holy Sepulcher had been

198 Martin reveals the same reading when commenting on the verse, relating this to the crusade and the Last Emperor (Martin of León, *Commentary on Rev*. (11.2), 358). See the chapter on the Apocalypse.

199 Roger of Howden, *Gesta*, 2:153; *Chronica*, 3:77–78; see Rubenstein, *Dream*, 200–202; Flori, *L'islam*, 309–312, 316. These parts of the chronicle were hence penned before 1194. Interestingly, Roger did not revise the chronicle again, even though it narrated up to 1201. The *Gesta* is likely close to what Joachim told Richard, given that Roger was part of the English army and close to Richard (see John D. Hosler, "Embedded Reporters? Ambroise, Richard de Templo, and Roger of Howden on the Third Crusade," in: *Military Cultures and Martial Enterprises in the Middle Ages*, ed. Hosler and Steven Isaac (Martlesham 2020), 177–191; John B. Gillingham, "Roger of Howden on Crusade," in: *Medieval Historical Writing in the Christian and Islamic Worlds*, ed. David Morgan (London 1982), 60–75).

200 Hélinand of Froidmont, *Chronicon*, 771–773.

201 Hélinand of Froidmont, *Chronicon*, 1081. See the chapter on immediate context. The same may have been true for William of Newburgh whose chronicle ends in 1197—a few months before Innocent III called for the Fourth Crusade (see Andrew Brock Kraebel, "Introduction," in: *The Sermons of William of Newburgh* (Toronto 2010), 6–7). Kraebel suggests that William died at the time, but since we do not know much about him, the break-off immediately before the start of crusade preparations is worth noting.

erected. It is short because the Sepulcher plays a remarkably minor role in the Third Crusade's preaching, despite being an essential site. This was even the case in periods when Western authors tended to reject the earthly Jerusalem, and even more so since the Sepulcher's destruction in the early 11th century, while the number of Western pilgrims also expanded drastically due to the apocalyptic year 1000.[202] As Nikolas Jaspert discussed, the period up to the First Crusade was characterized by a particular emphasis on it; one speaks, for example, of 'the city of the Sepulcher' or 'the rescue of the Sepulcher.'[203] This continued into the early 12th century, but, as Jaspert demonstrated, a shift occurred over the course of the century, transferring the focus from the Sepulcher to the Temple. The first meaningful evidence is provided by Bernard's *De laude novae militiae*, a treatise that extols the Templars, thus elevating their headquarters, the *templum Salomonis* (al-Aqsa-Mosque), to unprecedented fame.[204] The work's second part describes an imagined journey to several holy sites, granting the Sepulcher a respectable paragraph and classifying it as the most eminent of the holy sites (*sepulcrum tenet principatum*).[205] However, the work clearly sets other priorities: the Temple, defended by Christendom's new elite, had become the new inner sanctum. Further significant evidence is provided by the *Ludus de Antichristo* (c.1160), which aligns the idea of the Last World Emperor (allegedly) with Barbarossa. It narrates that the Last Emperor will not lay down his crown on Golgotha or the Mount of Olives (as previously common), but in the Temple, while the common nexus of Temple and Antichrist disappears. The *Ludus* provides us with a taste of the ideas that informed

202 See Rubenstein, *Armies*, 4–7; Colin Morris, *The Sepulchre of Christ and the Medieval West: From the Beginning to 1600* (Oxford 2005), 134–139, 269–270. Morris already noted that the Sepulcher is hardly put to use after 1187.

203 Nikolas Jaspert, "The True Cross of Jerusalem in the Latin West: Mediterranean Connections and Institutional Agency," in: *Visual Constructs of Jerusalem*, ed. Bianca Kühnel and Galit Noga-Banai (Turnhout 2014), 208; Jaspert, "Eleventh-Century Pilgrimage from Catalonia to Jerusalem: New Sources on the Foundations of the First Crusade," *Crusades* 14 (2015), 14–15.

204 See Jaspert, "Attraktoren," 84–85, 91–92; Schein, *Gateway*, 90, 96–98, 106, 144–145; see also Morris, *Sepulchre*, 209–218, 254–260. At the time, Peter the Venerable still elevated the Sepulcher to being the world's center (Petrus Venerabilis, *Sermo de laude*, ed. Constable, 238–239). He likely delivered this sermon in Paris in 1146, in preparation for the Second Crusade; it locates a 'Temple' of their own within the Sepulcher, referring to Christ casting out the merchants (see Cole, *Preaching*, 49–52; Jennifer Harris, "The Body as Temple in the High Middle Ages," in: *Sacrifice in Religious Experience*, ed. Albert Baumgarten (Leiden 2002), 252).

205 Bernard of Clairvaux, *De laude*, 300. See also Purkis, *Spirituality*, 96–97.

the Third Crusade, given that this text originated close to Barbarossa's court (in the monastery of Tegernsee).[206]

Numerous sources around the Third Crusade do not refer even once to the Sepulcher, for example, Henry of Albano's letters or Peter of Blois' crusade treatises (with one exception in the *Dialogus*). It is also entirely absent from Gregory VIII's and Clement III's encyclicals.[207] These model-like texts do not grant any attention to it, but move the spotlight to Cross, Jerusalem, and Temple. The few references that exist in the Third Crusade's corpus evolve around Is. 11:10: "erit sepulcrum eius gloriosum" (his Sepulcher will be glorious). According to Sylvia Schein, this verse possesses an eschatological coloring already present in the First Crusade's chronicles, just as it was cited in Latin Jerusalem's eschatological liturgy that celebrated 1099's conquest.[208] As Matthew Gabriele discussed, Robert of Reims adapted its verb tense (from the future into the perfect), to express that the Sepulcher *is* now glorious thanks to the conquest of 1099—the prophecy has been fulfilled.[209] This adaptation was not unique but represented an established reading throughout the 12th century (until 1187). The fact that authors repeated it for decades suggests that Jerusalem constituted an eschatological state, an idea still present in Konrad of Eberbach's work (1180s).[210] It is also noteworthy that several copies of Robert's

206 *Ludus de Antichristo*, ed. Engelsing, 20; discussed by Schein, *Gateway*, 154. See also the chapter on the Apocalypse; and Hans-Dietrich Kahl, "Der sog. Ludus de Antichristo (De finibus saeculorum) als Zeugnis frühstauferlicher Gegenwartskritik. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Humanität im abendländischen Mittelalter," *Mediaevistik* 4 (1991), 53–148. The nexus with the Antichrist is still present in: Hélinand of Froidmont, *Sermo 8*, 546–547; see also *Glossa ordinaria* (2 Thes. 2), ed. Feuardent, 6:671–672; and Kevin L. Hughes, *Constructing Antichrist: Paul, Biblical Commentary, and the Development of Doctrine in the Early Middle Ages* (Washington, D.C. 2005), 217–218.

207 Peter of Blois, *Dialogus*, 408. It only appears with Celestine III, in a crusade encyclical of 1193 (Celestine III, *Ep.102*, 971, cited in Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, 3:200; see Schein, *Gateway*, 186).

208 Schein, *Gateway*, 11–13, 147–148. On the liturgy, see Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 142–143, 153. Sergius IV had used it when broaching the Sepulcher's destruction, an event that contradicted Isaiah's prophecy (see Flori, *L'islam*, 231). See also Petrus Venerabilis, *Sermo de laude*, ed. Constable, 244.

209 Robert of Reims, *Historia*, ed. Bull, 100; see Matthew Gabriele, "From Prophecy to Apocalypse: The Verb Tenses of Jerusalem in Robert the Monk's *Historia* of the First Crusade," *Journal of Medieval History* 42 (2016), 308; see also Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta*, ed. Huygens, 112.

210 Konrad of Eberbach, *Exordium* (3.28), ed. Griesser, 225; see also, e.g., Rupert of Deutz, *Commentary on Zach.*, 761; Hervé de Bourge-Dieu, *In Isaiam*, 144–145; Richard of Saint-Victor, *Christus ponitur*, 523. See also the chapter on the Apocalypse. Bernard voiced a counterargument in a letter to Petrus Venerabilis, after the Second Crusade's failure; he adapted the

chronicle from the late 12th century still rendered this adaptation faithfully, among them codices from Clairvaux and Cîteaux.[211] Henry of Albano uses Is. 11:10 in his crusade treatise when examining the purpose of the holy places as a nexus to heaven (in the original future tense). Some lines below, he returns once more to it, to describe Jerusalem's loss: pagans have defiled the glorious Sepulcher (*ab ethnicis blasphematur gloriosum sepulcrum ejus*).[212] Moreover, it appears in two sermon texts with high crusade potential, by Alan of Lille and Prevostin of Cremona respectively, both using Is. 11:10 to make sense of the events of 1187.[213] Prevostin even implements it as the opening verse and repeats it several times, a fact that makes this sermon unique within the Third Crusade's corpus. Towards its conclusion, after having cited the verse according to the Vulgate, he cites it again, but adapts it: having explained the events of 1187 with *peccatis nostris exigentibus*, he asserts that the Sepulcher had been glorious for such a long time (*quandiu fuit sepulchrum eius gloriosum*), alluding to the former kingdom of Jerusalem, but now "our sins" have deformed it (*sed peccata nostra fecerunt id deforme*). Prevostin extends the fulfillment that Robert of Reims envisioned around ten years after 1099 up to 1187—but then, the glorious state was shattered.[214] The conquest of 1187 seems to have generated confusion, since Is. 11:10 had been fulfilled in 1099. Did God revoke the fulfillment?—the chapter on the Apocalypse will return to this issue. This puzzling situation was likely essential for why authors avoided the Sepulcher as a motif after 1187.

The Temple, on the other hand, appears in numerous Third Crusade texts; it constituted an important element in Western discourses (preaching, liturgy, exegesis), which was distinguished according to the senses of Scripture (for example, the Church or Mary appear as the Temple). Its prominent position predestined it to supersede the Sepulcher.[215] Temple and Sepulcher had ori-

---

verse into the present tense but negated it: the Sepulcher is now not glorious (Bernard of Clairvaux, *Ep.521*, 984).

211 See Ms. Troyes 470 ter, fol. 84^{v}; Ms. Dijon 85, fol. 114$^{r–v}$.

212 Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (XIII), 353, cited 355.

213 Ms. BNF lat. 14859, fol. 215$^{r–v}$; Ms. BL Add 19767, fol. 73^{v}. For both texts, see the chapter on exemplary descriptions. See also Ms. Oxford, Rawlinson C 427, fol. 15^{r}; Bernard of Clairvaux, *De laude*, 316; Innocent III, *De diversis, Sermo 6*, 675; Jacques de Vitry, *Sermo 1*, ed. Maier, 86; Gilbert of Tournai, *Sermo 1*, ed. Maier, 180.

214 Ms. BNF lat. 14859, fol. 215^{v}; see the chapter on the failure of crusades. See also Martin of León, *Liber sermonum, Sermo 23*, 894, another example where the verse appears in crusade-specific preaching material. See also Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 26*, 746, blending Sepulcher and Corpus Christi; this also seems to refer to the crusading arena.

215 On the exegesis of the Temple, see Harris, "Body," 233–256. The Sepulcher was only occasionally present in the form of architecture or relics (see Morris, *Sepulchre*; Jaspert, "Vergegenwärtigungen," 219–297).

ginally designated a parallel structure: the first was the emblem of the Old Covenant, holding its banner, the Ark; the latter was the emblem of the New Covenant, holding its respective banner, the Cross relic: where it had been found by Helena and then recovered in 1099.[216] However, when the literal sense acquired new prominence in the 12th century, comprising the understanding of being Judaism's literal heirs, the Temple also rose to new fame in the Latin West's identity. Jaspert characterized this as a shift from the places of Christ's death (Sepulcher) to the places of his work (Temple).[217] The year 1187 represented another meaningful step in these developments: as already discussed, numerous texts compared the loss of the Cross with that of the Ark, an idea that encouraged the literal exegesis of possessing the Holy Land, just as it facilitated a valorization of the Temple. As a result, the original parallel structure (Temple with Ark and Sepulcher with Cross) was thwarted in favor of a new connection: Temple and Cross.[218] This displayed the bond between God and his people. The break made obvious in 1187 by separating the two suggested its disruption or even its end.

The Temple also became important in Latin liturgy in Jerusalem itself, for example, on Palm Sunday, whose procession now led from the *porta aurea* to the Temple (instead of from the Mount of Olives to the Sepulcher). This stemmed from Mt. 21:1–17, where the Temple's cleansing succeeds Christ's entry into the city.[219] Whereas the Sepulcher indicated Christ's sacrifice, initiating the Age of Grace, the Temple signified the eschatological guise holding judgment. This included the powerful motif of Christ cleansing the Temple: Bernard presented this scene as an example, understanding the Temple as an emblem of victory over the pagans.[220] The coronation ritual is similarly expressive: the

---

216 See Schein, *Gateway*, 141–142; Gia Toussaint, *Kreuz und Knochen: Reliquien zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin 2011), 74–75.

217 Jaspert, "Attraktoren," 84–85. See also Schein, *Gateway*, 109–112, 190; Dieter R. Bauer, "Heiligkeit des Landes: Ein Beispiel für die Prägekraft der Volksreligiosität," in: *Volksreligion im hohen und späten Mittelalter*, ed. Bauer and Peter Dinzelbacher (Paderborn 1990), 45–50.

218 The focus reversed again in the 14th century when the Franciscans became the guardians of the Sepulcher (see Baert, *Heritage*, 183–185; Schein, "Mount Moriah," 192). This agreed with the political circumstances, since the Muslims had occupied the Temple Mount since 1187—this remained the case after Frederick II's regaining of Jerusalem in 1229 (see Busse, "Felsendom," 32).

219 See Busse, "Felsendom," 31. On the Sepulcher's place in Latin Jerusalem, see Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 156–162; Zöller, *Regularkanoniker*.

220 Bernard of Clairvaux, *De laude*, 286; see Katherine Allen Smith, "The Crusader Conquest of Jerusalem and Christ's Cleansing of the Temple," in: *The Uses of the Bible in Crusader Sources*, ed. Elizabeth Lapina and Nicholas Morton (Leiden 2017), 19–41. See Mt. 21:12–17; Mk. 11:15–19; Lk. 19:45–48; John 2:13–16. For sources see, e.g., Ms. BNF lat. 14859, fols. 231r–

future king of Jerusalem was crowned in the Church of the Sepulcher and went thereafter into the Temple (*templum domini*) to symbolically surrender his crown. This was obviously informed by the idea of the Last World Emperor, who would do the same according to some texts (such as the *Ludus de Antichristo*), to initiate the Second Coming and the Apocalypse.[221] The shift from the Sepulcher to the Temple therefore indicates progress in salvation history. As Ezekiel and Revelation betray, the Temple is a deeply eschatological element; the West's increasing emphasis on it hints at eschatological expectations piling up since the First Crusade and waiting for the right moment. This moment seems to have arrived in 1187.[222]

7 The Four Senses of Scripture: Where Does the Earthly Jerusalem Belong?

It has become clear that the earthly city does not exist in isolation, but is intrinsically interwoven with the other guises, including an idiosyncratic connection with the celestial realm. This raises a question that has not yet been asked as far as I can see: To which sense of Scripture does the holy city belong? Peter of Blois offers material on this question, right at the beginning of a sermon *In dedicatione ecclesiae*:

> Jerusalem is built as a city that consists of its partakers [Ps. 122:3]. One receives Jerusalem in a threefold manner: first, the bloodthirsty city that killed the prophets [Mt. 23:37], about which one says: one does not find a prophet that perishes outside of Jerusalem [Lk. 13:33]. The Lord established this city as a signpost and portent for all the other cities, as a manifestation of his wrath and rage, a rock of burden [Zach. 12:3], and a rock of resistance against the pagans [Is. 8:14; Rom. 9:33]. Furthermore, there is Jerusalem as the militant Church, which has its tent under the sun and battles on earth. One says about it: Rise and shine, Jerusalem [Is. 51:17]. Finally, there is Jerusalem as the triumphant Church assembled of angels

232^{v}; Ms. Lambeth 144, fols. 117^{v}–118^{r}; Hélinand of Froidmont, *Sermo 10*, 571; Peter of Blois, *Passio Raginaldi*, 66.

221 See Baert, *Heritage*, 174–176; Schein, *Gateway*, 101. In other versions, he also surrenders his crown but, before the mid-12th century, on Golgotha or the Mount of Olives.

222 See, e.g., Rev. 11:19: "Et apertum est templum Dei in caelo, et visa est arca testamenti eius in templo eius." The Ark, that is, the Cross, reveals itself in the Temple at the End of Days. Significant is that this verse appears in the same chapter as the pagan conquest of Jerusalem (Rev. 11:2).

> and the spirits of the blessed. One says about it: the Jerusalem which is above is free; it is our mother [Gal. 4:26].[223]

The master distinguishes Jerusalem according to three senses, starting with the earthly city which one should "receive" (*accipere*) just like the others—he puts the literal sense on a par.[224] He renders it as the bloodthirsty city that killed the prophets (Mt. 23:37), a common portrayal of the Old Testament city.[225] God instituted it as a signpost and portent (*signum et portentum*), offering a manifest display of his rage (*argumentum irae et indignationis suae*). It is also a rock of resistance against the pagans (*lapidem offensionis in gentibus*): this stems from two significant sources—Zach. 12:3 and Is. 8:14—where Jerusalem's purpose is outlined accordingly, but Peter added *in gentibus* to the original.[226] These are all familiar ideas: God uses the city as a communicative tool and punishes the Christians with its loss. The other two senses are the *ecclesia militans* waging war on earth and the *ecclesia triumphans*, the anagogical guise.

Following these initial words, Peter succeeds to a fourth Jerusalem:

> There is also a fourth Jerusalem, moderate and small, which is like a city despite being no city. Thus, I also recognize it when reading: Jerusalem which is built as a city [Ps. 122:3]. Because it is neither actually a city, despite being like a city, nor the battle-line of the forces, despite being

223 Peter of Blois, *Sermo 52*, 713. "Jerusalem quae aedificatur ut civitas, cujus participatio ejus in idipsum [Ps. 122:3]. Tripliciter accipitur Jerusalem, civitas illa sanguinaria, quae occidit prophetas [Mt. 23:37], de qua dicitur: Non capit perire prophetam extra Jerusalem [Lk. 13:33]; quam posuit Dominus in signum et portentum omnibus civitatibus, in argumentum irae et indignationis suae, 'lapidem oneris [Zach. 12:3], lapidem offensionis in gentibus' [Is. 8:14; Rom. 9:33] [Arundel 322: >< lapidem omnis offensionis in gentibus]. Est et Jerusalem Ecclesia militans, quae habet tabernaculum suum sub sole, et militat in terris. De ista dicitur: Surge, illuminare, Jerusalem [Is. 51:17]. Est et Jerusalem triumphans Ecclesia congregata ex angelis et spiritibus beatorum. De ista dicit: Jerusalem quae sursum est, libera est, quae est mater nostra [Gal. 4:26]."

224 Note that he uses a verb common for the act of taking the cross. See also Renna, *Jerusalem*, 192.

225 See Ms. BL Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 48r and Ms. BNF lat. 10633, fol. 53r as well as Petrus Cantor, *Distinctiones*, 302; Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Distinctiones*, 966; Alan of Lille, *Distinctiones*, 822; *Contra haereticos* (1.71), 373; Hélinand of Froidmont, *Sermo 8*, 547; Ralph Ardens, *Pars (II), De tempore, Sermo 4*, 1314; Martin of León, *De sanctis, Sermo 4*, 26; Arnold of Lübeck, *Chronica*, 164.

226 This seems to have been his creation (no further hits in databases). He uses the same words in the *Passio*, likewise examining Jerusalem's providential purpose and referring to its earlier conquests: *posuit eam dominus lapidem oneris universis gentibus* (Peter of Blois, *Passio Raginaldi*, 48).

> arranged like the battle-line of the forces [Cant. 6:4]. It is rather a house than a city, and it is truly a house, for it is the house of God and the gateway to heaven [Gen. 28:17]. However, if it is the house of God, take care that those who are impure or filthy do not walk in it. The sanctity befits your house, oh Lord: This house, this place, has been sanctified and dedicated to God so that one can offer God appeasing sacrifices in it.[227]

Which Jerusalem is at stake here? We have already encountered the historical, the typological, and the heavenly guise. The text's structure is noteworthy: he does not simply speak of four senses but of three, adding the fourth as a bonus (*est etiam et Jerusalem quarta*): this Jerusalem entangles the others. The depiction reveals that he is dealing with the church building, in agreement with the sermon's feast.[228] It appears as a gateway to heaven (*porta coeli*)—the eschatology is also manifested in spatial terms in the form of a church, a microcosm of Jerusalem. Significantly, he understands it as entangled with all the other guises. Therefore, every appearance of Jerusalem in liturgy and preaching (also) refers to the earthly city.[229]

Remarkably, Peter the Chanter offers an almost identical text in his *Distinctiones*; one copied from the other: Peter of Blois likely used his colleague's collection in agreement with its purpose.[230] However, the Chanter aligns the passage with another sense: the anagogical. He distinguishes the historical, mystical (*ecclesia militans*), moral, and anagogical sense—his categories differ from Peter of Blois'; they follow the classic scheme. He writes on the anagogical:

---

227 Peter of Blois, *Sermo 52*, 713–714. "Est etiam et Jerusalem quarta, modica et exilis, quae, licet non sit civitas, tamen est ut civitas. Ideoque et illam intelligo, quando scriptum est: Jerusalem, quae aedificatur ut civitas [Ps. 122:3]. Nec enim vere est civitas, quae est ut civitas, nec vero castrorum acies, quae est ut castrorum acies ordinata [Cant. 6:4]. Potius est domus quam civitas, et vere domus, quia domus Dei et porta coeli [Gen. 28:17]. Si autem domus Dei est, videte ne per eam transeat incircumcisus et immundus. Domum tuam, Domine, decet sanctitudo. Domus ista, locus iste ad hoc Deo dedicatus et sanctificatus est, ut in ipsa placabiles hostiae [BL Royal 8 F XVII: >< oblationes] offerantur Deo."

228 Peter adds that his audience are to take care that "the impure" and "the filthy" do not enter it.

229 See Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 33, 154–155; Bärsch, "Jerusalem," 347–348. Guibert emphasized this already in his crusade chronicle (Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta*, ed. Huygens, 113). See also the chapter on the Apocalypse regarding how the church building formed an eschatological window.

230 Database searches show that the text belongs to these two authors. On further parallels between the two, see Michael Markowski, *Peter of Blois, Writer and Reformer* (PhD thesis, Syracuse University 1988), 231–235.

> Anagogically: the triumphant Church assembled of angels and the spirits of the virtuous. One says about it: the Jerusalem that is above; it is our mother [Gal. 4:26]. There is also a fourth Jerusalem, moderate and small, which is like a city despite being no city. Thus, I understand what has been written about it: Jerusalem which is built as a city [Ps. 122:3]. Because it is not actually like a city, but it is like a house, and truly is it a house, since it is the house of God and the gateway to heaven [Gen. 28:17]. This house, that is, this place has been sanctified and dedicated to God so that one can offer God appeasing prayers in it.[231]

The two manuscripts cited do not offer a clear separation between the passage aligned with the anagogical sense in Peter of Blois' sermon (until *mater nostra*) and the passage devoted to a fourth Jerusalem—the Chanter presents these lines as one coherent entry.[232] Nevertheless, one of the two copies holds the variant that there is not a fourth but a fifth Jerusalem (*est et Ierusalem quinta*).[233] It inheres in an eschatological coloring, a *civitas* and a *domus* where they worship God; this may also indicate the church building. But, in agreement with the purpose of *distinctiones*, the Chanter leaves this undetermined, offering building blocks that allow a preacher different applications. Peter of Blois cast this template into a specific reading determined by *In dedicatione* and molded via his peculiar categorization of the senses.

The passages under discussion raise the question of where to locate the contemporary city in the scheme of the four senses, since, as Beryl Smalley emphas-

---

231 Ms. BL Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 48^{r}; see also Ms. BNF lat. 10633, fol. 53^{r} as well as Petrus Cantor, *Distinctiones*, 303. "Anagogice, triumphans ecclesia, congregata ex angelis et spiritibus bonorum, de ista dicitur, Ierusalem que sursum est, que est mater nostra [Gal. 4:26], est et Ierusalem quarta [BNF 10633: >< quinta], modica et exilis, que licet non sit civitas, tamen est ut civitas, ideoque de illa intelligo scriptum est, Ierusalem que edificatur ut civitas [Ps. 122:3], 'nec enim vere est ut civitas' [missing BNF 10633], sed potius est domus, et vere domus, quia domus dei et porta celi [Gen. 28:17], domus ista, scilicet locus ad hoc deo dedicatus et sanctificatus est, ut in ipso placabiles orationes offerantur deo."

232 Ainonen noted that copying *Distinctiones* was a challenging task, since one had to copy not only a text but also layout and graphical elements—and perhaps transfer these to another format (Tuija Ainonen, "Making New from Old: Distinction Collections and Textual Communities at the Turn of the Thirteenth Century," in: *From Learning to Love*, ed. Tristan Sharp (Toronto 2017), 48–69, esp. 49).

233 Ms. BNF lat. 10633, fol. 53^{r}. The English copy's depiction, on the other hand, is odd, since the Chanter describes four Jerusalems and adds thereafter: *est et Ierusalem quarta*—a fifth Jerusalem makes thus more sense. Garnerius also goes beyond the four senses, concluding on six dimensions (Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 37*, 807–808; discussed by Chenu, "Décadence," 130–131).

ized, the attribution of senses was a much-discussed issue at the time.[234] Modern observers seem to assume that it belongs to the literal sense. However, considering that the literal is also called the historical (present in Peter the Chanter), strictly speaking, this designates the Jerusalem of the biblical stories. One already needs a step of interpretation to reach the contemporary city. This step may simply have consisted in seeing a continuum between past and present, yet this is not necessarily the case. Another possibility is a typological exegesis, which relates a biblical element to a matter in the present.[235] The common rendering as *ecclesia militans*, present in both Peters, would fit: God willed that this Jerusalem battles its way up to the celestial sphere.[236] The many eschatological notes that surround the city (fulfillment of prophecies, nexus to the heavenly guise) provide yet another possibility. Ekkehard of Aura (early 12th century) explicitly tied the earthly Jerusalem (*historialiter*) into an anagogical exegesis (*per anagogen*).[237] It is another possibility that it stands in between the senses, acting as their pivotal hub (just like the church). Its exegetical localization is such a relevant issue because texts align meaning, biblical references, and ideas with particular senses: to investigate the city's meaning in the West, the scholar must clarify the issue of which material is pertinent. One must navigate through the maze of exegetical categories, which may not concur with our modern ideas, and which reveal flexibility, as visible in the comparison of Peter of Blois and Peter the Chanter. As a result, one must ask each text about where it locates the holy city within the scheme of the senses.

Peter the Chanter's commentary on the Psalms, when interpreting Ps. 79, corroborates the separation of earthly Jerusalem and the literal sense: he distinguishes the verse according to three senses, explaining first its historical meaning, related to the city's earlier conquests (*triplex legitur fuisse captivitas Iudeorum, sub nabugodonosor, sub antioquo epiphanie, sub romanis*). This is

234 Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford 1984), 231–234.

235 See, e.g., Friedrich Ohly, "Typology as a Form of Historical Thought," in: *Sensus spiritualis* (Chicago 2005), 31–67; Sigbjørn Sønnesyn, "Eternity in Time, Unity in Particularity: The Theological Basis of Typological Interpretations in Twelfth-Century Historiography," in: *La typologie biblique comme forme de pensée dans l'historiographie médiévale*, ed. Marek Thue Kretschmer (Turnhout 2015), 77–96.

236 Peter of Blois here cites Is. 51:17 (*surge, illuminare Ierusalem*), a verse that was also part of the liturgy that celebrated the conquest of 1099, and it appears in First Crusade chronicles (see Gaposchkin, *Weapons*, 150, 267, 272). Peter renders the *ecclesia militans* as fighting under the sun (*sub sole*); this is also already present in: Bernard of Clairvaux, *Ep.288*, 446, writing his uncle, a Templar in the Holy Land, and reflecting on the Second Crusade.

237 Ekkehard of Aura, *Chronicon*, MGH SS 6:266; discussed by Rubenstein, "Crusade and Apocalypse," 184–185. See also Buc, *Holy War*, 283.

followed by an indictment of the sinful state of Christian society (including naming heretics), that is, the spiritual guise, and eventually he reaches the conclusion that all this has literally happened "at the time of Saladin" (*hec omnia ad litteram trahi possunt ad tempus salaadini, et multa specialia que operatus est dominus in illa terra*).[238] The clause's second part incorporates Ps. 74:12 in order to locate the possibility of salvation in the Holy Land. Peter thus offers the following three senses: the historical, the tropological, and the contemporary Jerusalem—but which sense corresponds to the latter, which is ontologically separated from the historical sense? One is missing: the anagogical, the heavenly Jerusalem.

Further significant material is provided by an Advent sermon by Prevostin of Cremona.[239] He intertwines this text with Palm Sunday, citing Lk. 19:41 as the opening reference (Christ approaches Jerusalem), while admitting that the verse is usually read on that feast (*hec et in ramis palmarum legatur*)—but he uses it now "for recalling the history" (*sed tunc legitur ad memorandum istoriam*), that is, Christ's arrival at the historical Jerusalem. The master blends a specific episode of the earthly city with Advent's eschatological perspective, that is, the literal and the anagogical senses.[240] Immediately afterwards, he explicates the four senses:

> Jesus approached Jerusalem temporally [cf. Lk. 19:41]. I do not speak about the bloodthirsty Jerusalem that killed the prophets [Mt. 23:37]. I do not speak about the sacramental or the virtuous Jerusalem, that is, the Church or the faithful soul respectively—even though one could easily expound on them, since the Lord acts kindly within its walls. But I speak about the heavenly Jerusalem, because Jesus approached this Jerusalem temporally.[241]

238 Ms. BNF lat. 14426, fol. 62^{v}; discussed by Bird, "Rogations," 185.

239 Ms. BL Add 18335, fols. 11^{r}–12^{v}. Henry promulgated in his letter to the entire clergy (early 1188)—likely including addressees in Paris—that one should preach the crusade on this feast (Henry of Albano, *Ep.31*, 248).

240 See also Jussi Hanska, "Catastrophe Sermons and Apocalyptic Expectations: Eudes de Châteauroux and the Earthquake of 1269 in Viterbo," in: *The Last Judgement in Medieval Preaching*, ed. Thom Mertens (Turnhout 2011), 117–118.

241 Ms. BL Add 18335, fol. 11^{r}. "Temporaliter appropinquavit Ihesus Ierosolimis [cf. Lk. 19:41]. Non dico Ierosalem sanguinariam, que occidisti prophetas [Mt. 23:37]. Non dico de sacramentali, vel de virtuali, id est, ecclesia vel fidelis anima, licet de ea convenienter posset exponi, quia benigne facit dominus in edificio murorum eius. Sed dico de celesti, hec enim temporaliter appropinquavit Ihesus Ierosolimis."

Prevostin twice asserts that Christ approached Jerusalem "temporally" (*temporaliter*), that is, bound to his human body, dependent on time in the terrestrial world. He emphasizes the historical event located at the earthly city. However, he explains that he is concerned with neither (a) Jerusalem that killed the prophets (Mt. 23:37), that is, the Old Testament city, nor (b) Jerusalem as the Church, nor (c) Jerusalem as a Christian's soul. Consequently, he excludes the historical, the typological, and the tropological senses, because he focuses on the heavenly guise (*sed dico de celesti*): Christ approached this guise "temporally." Thus, while aligning the literal sense with a verse that indicates the Old Testament city, Prevostin stresses twice that Christ "actually" (*temporaliter*) approached the heavenly city.[242] He understands his arrival not only as an approach to the earthly but also to the heavenly Jerusalem—since this event was essential for salvation history's progress. The New Testament and contemporary Jerusalem merge with the celestial realm, as if Christ's journey had left traces that now form a bridge. This suggests a permanent eschatology bound to the earthly city, a state established with the New Covenant and existing up to the author's own days.[243] The master underlines therein Christ's exemplary nature: his audience, the potential crusaders, may reach the heavenly city *temporaliter* by approaching the (allegedly) earthly Jerusalem.

The sermon's crusading purpose is substantiated in the remainder of the text: shortly after the passage cited, Prevostin declares that Jerusalem has now been destroyed in large parts (*ex magna parte corruit*)—he most likely refers to 1187—but its foundations are still standing: his audience should be ready to rebuild the walls (*super fundamenta et diruptam paratis parietem restaurare*). As discussed, Peter of Blois developed the same argument for the conquest of 1187. Prevostin also refers to Nebuchadnezzar's dream about the four kingdoms (Chaldean, Persian, Greek, and Roman), a cardinal pointer to the earthly city, as Jay Rubenstein demonstrated.[244] Furthermore, Christ "has turned into the Mount of Olives" via his death (*Christus pro humano genere mortuus est, factus*

242 See Jean Longère, *Œuvres oratoires de maîtres parisiens au 12e siècle: étude historique et doctrinale* (Paris 1975), 2:138, who already asserted this about this sermon, yet without considering the implications for the crusade. On this aspect in Bernard, see Lehmann-Brauns, *Jerusalem*, 69.

243 As discussed, Henry also formulates such an idea: Christ has opened the heavens (*aperti sunt coeli*) through his baptism in the Jordan (Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (V), 296). Peter voices a similar idea at the end of the *Conquestio*: Christ made the Holy Land into *quasi alterum coelum* by his presence; he emphasizes therein the purpose of Christ's blood (*suo sanguine rubricavit*) (Peter of Blois, *Conquestio*, 94).

244 Ms. BL Add 18335, fol. 11v; Peter of Blois, *Sermo 39*, 677; and Rubenstein, *Dream*.

igitur dominus mons oliveti).[245] He fused with the Holy Land, making it into a literal part of the Christian community.[246] The fact that Christ turned into it (and not into another space) stems from its crucial meaning: it was here that he entered the city on Palm Sunday; here that he was incarcerated; and here that the Ascension to heaven happened. The sermon's end presents the example of martyrs, relating them to the palm branches at Christ's arrival: martyrs who received their palm branches in Jerusalem, so ends Prevostin's vision for an eschatological crusade.

8 Henry of Albano: Jerusalem between Monastery, Theology, and Crusade

A chapter from Henry's work embeds the crusade theologically. In the first treatise, having examined the different *adventus Christi* and their entanglement with the liturgy, he writes:

> The advents of Christ will be completed when the matters [of salvation history] progress thanks to all the descending signs: when faith will turn into sight and shadow into truth. In the meantime, while the shadow persists, Christ knows that signs are necessary for preparing in these matters, and he willed to emit such signs, which are also embodiments of the coming signs as well as signs of future things.[247]

245 Ms. BL Add 18335, fol. 12r. He aligns this with citing anew Lk. 19:41. See also Benedictinus anonymus, *De penitentia*, ed. Huygens, 102, where the physical Mount of Olives blends with spiritual concepts such as *misericordia*. See also Ms. Oxford, Magd. Coll. 168, fol. 71r, where John of Abbeville pens: "[…] sed notandum est quia bephage sita est in monte oliveti, qui mons sicut deus ab olivis que ibi crescunt, ex olivis sit oleum, per quod misericordia designatur."

246 The pilgrim Theodericus also considered the Holy Land to be part of the Corpus Christi (Theodericus, *Libellus*, 144, 174; discussed by Lehmann-Brauns, *Jerusalem*, 74). See also Alan of Lille, *Distinctiones*, 751: "Dicitur etiam cor Jerusalem, unde in Evangelio: Sicut fuit Jonas in ventre ceti, sic erit Filius hominis in corde terrae, id est intra Jerusalem sepultus, quae dicitur cor terrae, quia est in medio terrae, scilicet inter occidentem et orientem, non inter plagam septentrionalem et australem." Alan stresses Christ's entombment in Jerusalem: it is located between East and West, but not between North and South. While he evokes the idea of Jerusalem as the center of the world, he explicitly relates this to an East–West axis that indicates the voyage of the crusade.

247 Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (1), 261 and Ms. Troyes 509, fol. 98r. "Complebuntur autem [adventus Christi], cum signis omnibus decedentibus res succedent, fides

With Christ's last advent faith would turn into sight (*fides transibit in speciem*). Matters that had been invisible or spiritual (thus, one had to believe in them) would become visible, being henceforth the subject of conscious contemplation: the ideal of *visio Dei* and Jerusalem as the *visio pacis*.[248] Allegorical turns into literal exegesis: on the brink of the Apocalypse, the walls separating heaven and earth crumble and so do the boundaries between the senses—leaps are much closer to hand. This manifests in the Holy Land, where one finally sees the places that had been present life-long only as an invisible notion. The signs (*signa necessaria*) preparing for the transcendental world (*praeparatoria*) may specifically allude to the Holy Land's purpose, a prefiguration of the celestial *contemplatio*.[249]

When one continues reading, it becomes apparent that the contemplation of the Holy Land is at play:

> Since the pilgrims and soldiers are in particular used to wearing the signs, the same signs are dedicated properly to the itinerant and fighting city. Because, as long as we are in our body, we are away from the Lord [2 Cor. 5:6] and, as long as a human's military service is on earth [Job 7:1], we must climb the ladder of visible signs to the invisible matters, in agreement with the Apostle's words: The invisible things of God are perceived since the creation of this world via the things that have been created in a perceivable form [Rom. 1:20]. The creation of this world, he says, not heaven—because the throne who already holds the ladder does not need it. But the children of Chore, who are signed with the Tau on their foreheads [Ez. 9:4], believe that they are appointed to ruin and baldness. They realize that the matters, which appear first on the forehead, the visible matters, are terrestrial in nature, and they long for the eternal and presaging matters, just as the blessed Augustine says: Such baldheads, pilgrims, foreigners on earth, and citizens of the itinerant city, I say, recognize the signs of their soldiers, and they will chant the song of their city.

---

transibit in speciem, umbra in veritatem. Interim, dum durat umbra, sciens Christus signa esse necessaria, et ad res ipsas praeparatoria, talia agere voluit, quae et res essent praecedentium signorum, et signa rerum futurarum."

248 Henry distinguishes three *adventus*, as he discusses in the preceding lines. Between the usual two, he inserts Christ's daily (*quotidie*) presence in the Age of Grace (*De peregrinante civitate Dei* (I), 259).

249 See also Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (XIII), 353, where he launches a similar argument with regard to Cross and Sepulcher; see above on this passage.

> They receive thus the Psaltery of an active life, in order to strive continuously to transition to a contemplative life.[250]

Two traits characterize Henry's work: it implements Augustine's concept of the *civitas Dei*, and it is essentially concerned with the entanglement of the different Jerusalems, spanning monastery and crusade—the first is the work's audience, the second its ultimate goal.[251] Both spheres are displayed in the passage cited: the pilgrims and soldiers are especially used to wearing "the signs" (*signis peregrinantes et militantes praecipue uti solent*), which signify the itinerant and fighting city, that is, Jerusalem (*peregrinanti et militanti civitati signa dantur*). The terminology designates the two groups of travelers to the Holy Land, pilgrims and crusaders, while evoking the practice of wearing a cross on this journey, here identified with the Tau (Ez. 9), the common portrayal for signing people with the cross, in reaction to the relic's loss. All members of the *civitas* would 'recognize' or 'examine' the signs of their soldiers (*signa suae militiae recognoscunt*), since they are all wearing the same sign, a noteworthy parallel with Hélinand of Froidmont and Peter of Blois. The crusaders are their soldiers—Henry tells his monastic audience.[252] This is a call to participate in the enterprise's preparation, mirroring his *Ep.31* (addressed to the entire clergy). He uses common crusade elements such as Job 7:1 and 2 Cor. 5:6.[253] Both sketch the state of terrestrial existence that makes visible signs necessary for

250 Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (1), 261–262 and Ms. Troyes 509, fol. 98$^{r–v}$. "Et quia signis peregrinantes et militantes praecipue uti solent, recte peregrinanti et militanti civitati signa dantur. Quia quandiu sumus in corpore, peregrinamur a Domino [2 Cor. 5:6], et quandiu militia est hominis super terram [Job 7:1], visibilium signorum scala ad invisibilia necesse habemus uti, secundum quod Apostolus ait: Invisibilia Dei per ea quae facta sunt intellecta conspiciuntur a creatura mundi [Rom. 1:20]. Creatura, ait, mundi, non coeli; illa enim scala non indiget solium jam tenens. Filii autem Chore, qui Thau signatum habent in frontibus suis [Ez. 9:4], qui vocatos se reputant ad cinerem et ad calvitium, qui ea quae prima fronte apparent, visibilia scilicet, temporalia esse cognoscunt, et ad aeterna et anteriora se extendunt, ut ait beatus Augustinus; tales, inquam, calvi et peregrini et advenae super terram et peregrinantis civitatis cives signa suae militiae recognoscunt [Troyes 509: >< recognoscant], et suae civitatis cantaturi canticum; sic activae vitae psalterium assumunt, ut semper ad contemplativam transire contendant."

251 See Marx, "City of God," 83–120.

252 Hélinand of Froidmont, *Sermo 10*, 565–566; Peter of Blois, *Passio Raginaldi*, 34–35. See the chapter on the Cross relic. See also Giles Constable, "The Cross of the Crusaders," in: *Crusaders and Crusading in the Twelfth Century* (Farnham 2008), 62–64. The *calvi* (the bald-headed) designate the monks (see Congar, "Eglise," 197; Renna, "City," 65).

253 See also Peter of Blois, *Passio Raginaldi*, 53; *Sermo 53*, 717; Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Sermo 2*, 570; Ralph Ardens, *Pars (11), De sanctis, Sermo 22*, 1574; Geoffrey of Auxerre, *Sermo 2*, ed. Gastaldelli, 71; *Sermo 10*, ed. Gastaldelli, 139; *Sermo 20*, ed. Gastaldelli, 243; Alan of Lille, *Ars praedicandi*, 186; Hélinand of Froidmont, *Sermo 25*, 685; Humbert of Romans, *Sermo 1*, ed. Maier, 210; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Ep.392*, 748; *Sermo in Cant. 26*, 388.

approaching invisible matters, while Job 7:1 underlines the crusade's militant note.[254] He concludes that they must adopt an active life to achieve a contemplative one. Between these lies the Holy Land, a *contemplatio* not possible in the West, at least not for lay people.

Subsequently, the legate identifies three celestial testimonies that God left on earth:

> There are three things that bear witness on earth: the spirit, the water, and the blood—and those three are one [1John 5:8]. We have learned that indeed three came out of the Lord's body when he was hanging on the wood [of the cross], just as the blessed Augustine says: first, the spirit, as is corroborated by the following: After he had bowed his head, he gave up his spirit [John 19:30]; thereafter, when his side was pierced with a spear, blood and water were following [John 19:34].[255]

All three testimonies, Holy Ghost, water, and blood, stem from Christ's Passion. Since this argument is embedded in the larger discussion about the *civitas Dei* and the crusade, it seems that these designate three senses of Scripture: the water indicates the Church; one becomes its member through baptism. The Holy Ghost designates the spiritual city, since it binds them together as a community. And the earthly city is destined to bathe in blood until the Last Judgment—the same place where Christ's blood soaked Palestine's soil. Some lines after the passage cited, Henry identifies the blood with the Eucharist, the Corpus Christi, and penitence, all important concepts in the crusade arena.[256]

---

254 On Job 7:1 see Bériou, *Communication*, 430; Bird, "Good Friday," 147. Alan of Lille devotes an entire sermon to Job 7:1 (present, e.g., in Ms. BNF lat. 14859, fols. 235^{r}–236^{r}). Ralph Niger's treatise begins with it, likely because it was popular in preaching; he utilizes the common wordplay with *militia* and *malitia* to criticize the crusade (Ralph Niger, *De re militari*, ed. Schmugge, 98; for this wordplay, see Bernard of Clairvaux, *De laude*, 274; *Ep.363*, 656; Henry of Albano, *Ep.32*, PL 204:250; Peter of Blois, *Passio Raginaldi*, 31; Baldric of Dol, *Historia*, ed. Biddlecombe, 8; discussed by Cole, *Preaching*, 68; Purkis, *Spirituality*, 103).

255 Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (1), 262 and Ms. Troyes 509, fol. 98^{v}. "Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terris; spiritus, aqua et sanguis: et hi tres unum sunt [1John 5:8]. Tria siquidem, ut ait beatus Augustinus, novimus de corpore Domini exisse, cum penderet in ligno: primum spiritum, juxta illud: Inclinato capite, emisit spiritum [John 19:30]; deinde, quando latus ejus lancea perforatum est, sanguinem et aquam [John 19:34]."

256 See, e.g., Cole, *Preaching*, 142–176; Anne Lise Bysted, *The Crusade Indulgence: Spiritual Rewards and the Theology of the Crusades, c.1095–1216* (Leiden 2015), 109–128. Innocent III's Fourth Lateran sermon contains a similar threefold distinction (see Georg Strack, "Autorität und 'Imitatio Christi'. Die Konzilspredigten Innozenz' III. (1215), Innozenz' IV. (1245) und Gregors X. (1274)," in: *Autorità e consenso*, ed. Maria Pia Alberzoni and Roberto Lambertini (Milan 2017), 183–184).

We have already encountered some examples where earthly Jerusalem is portrayed as a bloodthirsty city (Mt. 23:37). Numerous authors emphasize that Christ's blood granted this land its eminent standing, for example, Gerald of Wales or Richard Lionheart in his letter to Garnerius of Clairvaux.[257] Other texts underline his sanctifying blood with regard to the Cross relic.[258] Instead of speaking of his presence or work more generally, these texts place particular emphasis on the shedding of blood. An especially disturbing testimony is offered by John of Würzburg, who traveled to the East in the 1170s. Having reached the Holy Sepulcher, he describes it as the place which had been sanctified by Christ's blood—and once again by the bloodshed of "venerable men," that is, the conquest of 1099 (*facta est a viris venerabilibus consecratio*). He also cites an inscription placed in the church that emphasizes the same idea; and he connects this with *Laetare Jerusalem*, which is meant to commemorate the events, hinting at its pertinence for crusade preaching.[259] The violent deeds thus acquire a providential purpose that points back to Christ's Passion and the First Crusade but also forward to the Last Judgment.

Scholars argued in the past that preachers such as Bernard of Clairvaux adapted their message to their audience, thus preaching different concepts of

257 Gerald of Wales, *Expugnatio Hibernica*, 371; Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, 3:132; see also Arnold of Lübeck, *Chronica*, 164; Peter of Blois, *Ep.98*, 307; *Conquestio*, 77–78, 83, 94; Garnerius of Clairvaux, *Distinctiones*, 1045; Guillaume le Breton, *Philippidos*, ed. Delaborde, 66; Lucius III, *Ep.182*, 1312; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Ep.288*, 446; *Ep.363*, 650; *Ep.458*, 896; *Ep.521*, 984; Innocent III, *Quia maior*, 821; Jacques de Vitry, *Sermo 2*, ed. Maier, 102; Roger of Howden, *Gesta*, 2:38. The last reference cites a letter by Henry II to the patriarch of Antioch, penned on the eve of the Third Crusade. Gerhoch used Mt. 23:37 for sketching the sinful state of earthly Jerusalem that caused the Second Crusade's failure (Gerhoch of Reichersberg, *De investigatione*, ed. Sackur, 377; see Rubenstein, *Dream*, 148–149).

258 See, e.g., Peter of Blois, *Conquestio*, 84; *Passio Raginaldi*, 35, 60; Hélinand of Froidmont, *Sermo 10*, 571–572; Gunther of Pairis, *Hystoria*, ed. Orth, 112; Jacques de Vitry, *Sermo 2*, ed. Maier, 108; Gilbert of Tournai, *Sermo 1*, ed. Maier, 182. See also Urbans II's sermon: Christ's body and shadow (*corpus vel umbra Salvatoris*) as well as the blood of martyrs (*martyrum ebibendus sanguis effusus*) sanctified this land (Baldric of Dol, *Historia*, ed. Biddlecombe, 8).

259 John of Würzburg, *Descriptio*, 123–124; discussed by Toussaint, *Knochen*, 63. On John, see Lehmann-Brauns, *Jerusalem*, 121–151. For a focus on the first crusaders' bloodshed, see also Alexander III, *Ep.1505*, 1296–1297; discussed by Purkis, *Spirituality*, 115–116; and Raymond of Aguilers, *Liber*, ed. Hill, 150–151; discussed by Benjamin Z. Kedar, "The Jerusalem Massacre of 1099 in the Historiography of the Crusades," *Crusades* 3 (2004), 18. In his letter to the crusaders (1100) after they had reported on the massacre, Pascal II wrote: "[…] quod coepit adimpleat [deus] et manus vestras, quas hostium suorum sanguine consecravit, immaculatas usque in finem adfluentissima pietate custodiat." (*Kreuzzugsbriefe* (XXII), ed. Hagenmeyer, 178; discussed by Althoff, *Verfolgung*, 139–140).

Jerusalem, in particular to lay compared to monastic audiences.[260] Yet, already Sylvia Schein stressed that Bernard did not chose his arguments for propagandistic reasons, but because he was seriously concerned about the earthly city.[261] This chapter substantiates that Jerusalem—in particular in the moment of its loss—operated as a visible sign for the entire Christian community: after 1187 preachers saw the worlds of monks and laity as related. Monastic responsibility consisted both of instructing crusaders (preaching, liturgy, sacraments) and spiritually supporting them (for example, through prayer). The Corpus Christi's different limbs thus contributed to resolving the issue. Henry's unique work epitomized and exemplified these ideas: its first treatise already establishes significant causalities between the senses; and these observations make it possible to reach some conclusions about the nature of his oeuvre. While monks are its addressees as potential preachers, the crusade—as the crusade treatise explains—represents its purpose and occasion. The opus is located at the intersection of monastery, theology, and crusade. It offers an enormously rich collection of materials on Jerusalem, combining the crusade treatise (no. 13) with more theological examinations (treatises 1–12) and liturgical instructions for the Lenten season (treatises 14–18).[262] The last part concurs perfectly with the season when Henry himself preached the crusade in 1188. A comprehensive analysis shows that the crusade treatise applies many motifs to the situation of 1187, whereas the same are elucidated in the other treatises with regard to their exegetical and providential meaning.[263] For example, the crusade treatise identifies the Cross relic with Moses' *virga*, mentioning some lines later God's vengeful *virga* as well, whereas treatise (12) offers elaborate materials on the motif of *virga*.[264] A recipient of Henry's work, searching for material to preach the crusade, encounters the motif's relevance for the crusade, while being equipped with manifold materials for expanding on it in preaching. The same correlation is found with the motif of the gates: it plays a pivotal role right at the outset of the crusade treatise, while it is elaborately explained in treatise (5).[265] Henry's work seems to have been one of the attempts in the late 12th century to find new formats for supplying others with preaching material (another such attempt

260 See, e.g., Peter Raedts, "St. Bernard of Clairvaux and Jerusalem," in: *Prophecy and Eschatology*, ed. Michael J. Wilks (Oxford 1994), 171–174.

261 See Schein, *Gateway*, 129–130. See also Constable, "Place," 382–383.

262 See the chapter on immediate context; and Marx, "City of God," 88–89, 112–120.

263 See Marx, "City of God," 96, 102, 109–111.

264 Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (XII), 339–342; and (XIII), 353, 355. On the motif of *virga*, see the chapter on the Holy Land.

265 Henry of Albano, *De peregrinante civitate Dei* (V), 291–298; and (XIII), 350–351.

were the *distinctiones*). His effort produced a work that betrays much creativity, sophistication, and preaching experience—even though its complex nature did not permit the establishment of a genre (a fact corroborating the idea that it was tailored to a specific context, the Third Crusade). His work exemplifies that one cannot separate crusading from other phenomena in the West—this has vital consequences for the selection and analysis of sermon material, as the chapters on Jerusalem and the Cross relic have abundantly shown.