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Chapter 3: St Francis and the Holy Land in the fifteenth century

From around the turn of the sixteenth century onwards, when the Franciscans had been established in the Holy Land for almost two hundred years, they began to develop increasingly articulate ideas about their own role within this country. Not only did they come to view receiving and conducting all Western European pilgrims as their Franciscan prerogative, as was discussed in the previous chapter, but they also began to lay claim to the Holy Land as an essentially Franciscan territory (see chapter four). In order to substantiate this claim to the Holy Land, the Franciscans of the custody of the Holy Land turned to look at the past. By writing their own particular narrative of the history of the Holy Land, they were able to create a cultural memory to inform their identity as divinely appointed keepers and possessors of, or even heirs to, the Holy Land. By studying and reinterpreting the past the friars aimed to give substance to their ideological relationship to the Holy Land.

This chapter examines the first, late fifteenth-century, example of such a text by a Franciscan that analyses the past in order to point out the present significance of the *custodia Terrae Sanctae*: book VII of friar Paul Walther von Guglingen’s *Treatise on the Holy Land*. Book VII is firmly grounded in the established tradition of compiling manuscripts with historical texts on the Holy Land at the Franciscan convent in Jerusalem; nevertheless, Guglingen’s text is also innovative. Firstly, because it synthesises a new, coherent history of Jerusalem and the Holy Land, based on the sources present in the convent library in Jerusalem, something that had not previously been attempted by a friar of the Franciscan custody of the Holy Land. Moreover, the overarching historical framework that this history proposes, creates room for presenting the Franciscans as the answer to the misfortunes that have befallen the Holy Land in the past. The second part of book VII, which contains reflections on the various ethno-religious groups in Jerusalem, also advances a perspective for the future in the shape of Crusade and recapture of the Holy Land informed by history, once again expanding the friars’ literary scope. This second part of book VII of Guglingen’s *Treatise* knew quite an extensive secondary circulation throughout Western Europe, since it was included, with few alterations, in Bernhard von Breydenbach’s famous *Itinerarium in Terram Sanctam* (1486). Nonetheless, despite the extensive scholarship on Breydenbach’s text, book VII of Guglingen’s *Treatise* has not been clearly identified as the source, nor studied in any depth. The present chapter seeks to remedy that situation, with particular attention for the nascent signs of interest for the role

---

1 It concerns the rather lengthy section on the habits and errors of the various communi-
of the Franciscans in the history and future of the Holy Land, first signalled by Guglingen’s *Treatise*. Thus, it provides the groundwork for the following chapters, which deal with expressions of similar ideas in later periods.

The thematic sections below explore and contextualise the tentative late-medieval emergence of themes and ideas found in Guglingen’s text, which later, during the early modern period, took root in a virulently territorial Franciscan literature on the Holy Land, which is the subject of chapter four. The present chapter is divided into five sections: the first provides an in-depth discussion of Guglingen’s history of Jerusalem. The second section examines the eschatological and apocalyptic perspectives on history that influenced Guglingen’s outlook, and fostered both late-medieval and early-modern texts and initiatives that see an important role for the Franciscan order in the (re)claiming of the Holy Land. The third section again returns to book VII of Guglingen’s *Treatise*, discussing its contents, sources and innovative character. While Guglingen is unique among the authors of the late medieval Franciscan custody of the Holy Land in explicitly calling for Crusade in writing, the same custody did show a clear appetite for Crusade by recruiting royal patronage for Holy Land Crusade. Accordingly, the fourth section of this chapter contextualises Guglingen’s call by looking at the coeval efforts of the Franciscan custody of the Holy Land to egg on Duke Philip the Good of Burgundy (1396-1467), as well as the Spanish royal couple, Isabella I of Castile (1451-1504) and Ferdinand of Aragon (1452-1516), to mount a Crusade. Finally, the last section examines the development of a narrative of the legendary foundation of the custody of the Holy Land by St Francis himself, something Guglingen hints at. Few contemporaneous Franciscan authors likewise explore the possibility of reinterpreting the Life of St Francis to say either that he visited Jerusalem, and/or founded the province of the Holy Land, in connection to his recorded mission to Damietta in Egypt in 1219. These rare medieval reinterpretations of traditional hagiography were to provide the basis for grander Franciscan claims to the Holy Land in the seventeenth century.

3.1 Guglingen’s history of Jerusalem

In the seventh book of his treatise, Guglingen adopts a way of understanding the space of the Holy Land that was very important for Franciscan *geographia sacra*: a space occupied by the impious other. The first part of book VII is a history of Jerusalem that pays much attention to the various rulers of the city...
since the ascension of Christ, and whether these rulers were worthy of their office or not. The second part of book VII then builds on this history, to express Guglingen’s present and future concerns for the Holy Land (see section three of this chapter). The present section offers a detailed examination of the sources, as well as the main concerns and goals of the history that makes up the first part of book VII. Guglingen’s effort of composing a history is remarkable, because he is the first Franciscan of the custody of the Holy Land to do so. Working with the sources he could consult at the convent in Jerusalem, he composed a history distinctly set in an eschatological perspective, an arena in which the forces of good and evil compete. In addition, Guglingen wrote his history in such a way that the Franciscans of Mount Sion could be inserted not only into the history of the Holy Land, but which also made them very relevant for the present and the future of the Holy Land. He was thus the first friar of the custodia Terrae Sanctae to tentatively start thinking about the role of the Franciscans in, and their exceptional link to, the Holy Land. In later centuries, several other friars would follow suit.

In a way, Guglingen’s history of Jerusalem is a continuation of books I to VI of his Treatise, in which he already narrated history starting with Creation, terrestrial paradise, the genealogy of Christ, up to the Passion; including descriptions of the Holy Land, Jerusalem, and the Holy Places. Guglingen makes clear that it is the task of book VII to close the gap between the days of Christ and Guglingen’s own day, and that various groups of different beliefs play a big part in this story. He opens book VII with the words:

Here follows the seventh part of this treatise, in which I intend to plainly describe the <...> of the many various faithful and unfaithful nations living in Jerusalem. And for fundamental understanding, I want to start from the Lord Christ’s ascension, and briefly go through history.²

Thus, Guglingen leads us to understand that the lengthy history that follows, serves to explain the current situation in which various nations inhabit Jerusalem. This history starts with New Testament events, such as the ascension of Christ and the descent of the Holy Ghost, and then recounts the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus Vespasian in 70 AD, the legend of the finding of the True Cross by St. Helena, the building of many churches under her direction, ano-

² “Sequitur septima pars huius tractatus In qua describere intendo plane <...> multarum variarum nationum fidelium et infidelium in iherusalem habitancium. Et pro fundamentali intellectu incepere volo a dominica Christi ascensione et breviter hystorice percurrere.” Neuburg MS p. 265.
ther destruction of the city during the Jewish revolt against Heraclius in 614 AD, and the rediscovery of the True Cross by the same emperor. A narrative of destruction and re-sanctification of Jerusalem starts to emerge.

Now Guglingen has arrived at a point in his history of Jerusalem where he finds it necessary to include a number of sections on events that did not exactly take place in Jerusalem, but which, he feels, are nevertheless indispensable for understanding the history of the city; it is titled “On Muhammad and his damnable sect.” A systematic discussion of the life of Muhammad follows, starting with his birth and origins, based on chapter five of the Historia Orientalis by Jacques de Vitry (ca. 1160/70-1240), his life before starting ‘his sect,’ and the beginnings of Islam. Then, under the heading “On the detestable and false doctrine of Muhammad,” Guglingen gives a commentary on the Quran. He was able to read it in the Latin Translation by Mark of Toledo. A further source that Guglingen reports is a dialogue between Muhammad and Abdullah Ibn Salam, an early Jewish convert to Islam, known from the Book of One Thousand Questions, which was first translated from Arabic into Latin by Herman of Carinthia in 1143 as Doctrina Machumet. Guglingen copies a hundred of these questions and responses into his treatise. Finally, he records the death of Muhammad, loosely based on chapter seven of Vitry’s Historia Orientalis.

The library of the Franciscan convent on Mount Sion in Jerusalem

3 Neuburg MS p. 266-280.
4 “De Machometo et eius dampnabili secta.” Neuburg MS p. 281.
8 “Sequuntur quedam Abusive stulte ac falsissime responses Machometi ad centum interrogationes Abdye ybensalon summo [sic] Rabi hebreorum In dyalogo.” Neuburg MS p. 298-302.
provided Guglingen with such reading materials. The presence of the *Historia Orientalis* as well as several works on Muhammad and Islam in the library collection is in all respects significant: these were the spectacles through which the Franciscans of the Holy Land could begin to understand not only their Muslim neighbours, but also their own role in the history of Jerusalem. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, a number of collections of texts on the Holy Land were compiled at the Jerusalem convent, demonstrating a similar focus. These compilation manuscripts, studied by Michele Campopiano, contain not only texts on the history and geography of the Holy Land, but also on its Muslim, Jewish, and Eastern Orthodox Christian inhabitants and their supposed errors. By putting together collages of pre-existing texts, the friars created manuscripts that projected disapproval of most of the groups present in Jerusalem, as well as a nostalgic image of the heyday of the Crusader era.10

The readings on Islam afforded by the library of the Franciscan convent on Mount Sion made quite an impression on Guglingen. He confesses that, after reading these texts, “my heart and soul were made sad within me,” and because of the confusion, errors, and lies he perceived in Islam, he felt inspired to set about reproving them in an ordered way in his treatise.11 Guglingen’s enterprise of writing his own new history of Jerusalem, presents an important innovation with respect to the compilation manuscripts discussed above. Instead of setting different texts on related subjects side by side in a compilation, he takes on the challenge of writing a new text, a continuous history of Jerusalem and its various nations. Thus, instead of copying the reading digest of the convent library, Guglingen uses it as source material. This effort in book VII was again part of Guglingen’s larger project of writing an all-encompassing *Treatise on the Holy Land*. Guglingen’s approach of creating an overarching historical framework based on the sources he could consult at the Franciscan convent of Jerusalem, eventually allowed him to start to tentatively bring Franciscans into the mix of his history of Jerusalem.

11 “Perlectis diligenter singulis tristis facta est anima mea et cor meum intra me, merens tam propter materias in se confuse scriptas, quam propter nephandas detractiones deo meo et veritati factas. Necon propter horrenda in eis mendacia et seducencia populum scripta. Cum vero me insufficientem ad huiusmodi ordinate et intelligibiliter inscribenda et ad sufficienter reprobanda reperi ...” Neuburg MS p. 289.
One way in which he does this, is by placing the rule of the followers of Muhammad over Jerusalem in an eschatological perspective, a strategy that is certainly representative of later histories of the Holy Land by Franciscans as well. In his discourse on Islam, Guglingen repeatedly refers to Muhammad as a pseudo-prophet, and suggests that we should refer to the prophesies in the Apocalypse of St John in order to understand Muhammad’s role in history. This was a common point of view in medieval period - perhaps most famously represented by Joachim de Fiore’s *Expositio in Apocalypsim* - present in medieval Franciscan exegesis, and indeed the text compilations produced at the Franciscan convent in Jerusalem, which Guglingen consulted in Jerusalem. This apocalyptic framework for understanding history, offers Guglingen the opportunity to start hinting at the role of the Franciscan friars in Jerusalem. When Guglingen calls Muhammad the first-born of Satan as well as the *alter Antichristus*, echoing a passage in Vitry’s *Historia Orientalis*, he knows that this phrase is going to resonate with contemporaneous readers, especially Franciscan ones. He is begging a comparison, if implicitly, with St Francis, who was by then commonly seen as the *alter Christus*. This is a comparison that would most likely not be lost on the readers of Guglingen’s history, and it conjures up the image of the followers of *alter Antichristus* abusively ruling


Jerusalem, while the followers of the *alter Christus* are oppressed, living in the Franciscan convent on Mount Sion.

Having completed the section about Muhammad and Islam, Guglingen returns to Jerusalem and the Holy Land, continuing his history by recording what he calls the destruction of Jerusalem by Caliph Umar the Great in 636, a section that he took from Vitry’s *Historia Orientalis*. A collage of chapters taken from *Historia Orientalis* follows, in a rearranged order, sometimes closely following Vitry’s text, and sometimes interjecting other material. From relating, for example, the division between Shia and Sunni Islam, Guglingen quickly moves on to the exploits of Peter the Hermit, the first Crusade, and the siege and capture of Antioch and Jerusalem by the Crusaders. When he tells the story of the establishment of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, Guglingen relies on a text about the Nine Worthies, the heroic Crusaders Lords of Jerusalem; this text is also found in a Franciscan manuscript compilation from Jerusalem, mentioned above. Relying again on Vitry’s *Historia Orientalis* Guglingen then describes the military orders in Jerusalem. Finally, he dwells particularly on the reasons for the loss of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem.

With Vitry, Guglingen attributes the loss of the Latin Kingdom to the corruption and laxity of the regular and secular clergy of that realm, who, amongst other things, did not practice perfect obedience to their superiors, nor did they live in the poverty of Christ. The shortcomings of the Latin clergy are indeed an important theme in Vitry’s work; he sees evangelical renewal of the Roman Church from within as paramount to the success of the Crusades. In the *Historia Occidentalis* and elsewhere, Vitry presents St Francis and his followers as exactly the type of exemplary religious men to counter the forces of the Antichrist, also mentioning St Francis’ expedition to Egypt.

---

17 Following chapter 7 and 3, Guglingen also uses chapters 8, 9, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 20 of Vitry’s text; Neuburg MS p. 302-308 and Jacques de Vitry, *Histoire Orientale*, 79-120.
18 Guglingen includes only the first eight worthies. Neuburg MS p. 308-314; The Hague, Royal Library MS 73 G8, fols. 31v-35v. Campopiano, “Islam, Jews and Eastern Christianity,” 87.
22 Whalen, *Dominion of God*, 152-3.
to preach to the Sultan. These are sources that Guglingen did not have at his disposal, but he senses an opportunity for the Franciscans of the Holy Land: to fill in the gap left by the corrupt Latin Clergy in Vitry’s Historia Orientalis. Guglingen could easily make this connection, since from the very inception of the Franciscan order, both obedience to one’s superiors and imitation of the poverty of Christ and his apostles had been all-important, if enduringly controversial, Franciscan ideals. Later on in book VII of his Treatise, Guglingen harks back to the shortcomings of the clergy of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, by emphasizing that the Franciscans of the Holy Land, the new Latin clergy, excel in both poverty and obedience.

Guglingen’s history projects an image of Jerusalem as a city now in the possession of pious Christians such as the emperor Constantine and his mother, and then again destroyed by pagan powers. In this narrative of constantly changing authorities ruling the city, the Catholic Crusader princes of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem are the ultimate heroes, and Muhammad and his followers the worst villains. The narrative of destruction and re-sanctification of Jerusalem that Guglingen develops, shares a few main characteristics with the commentary on the Apocalypse by Franciscan exegete Nicholas of Lyra (1270-1349), whose work Guglingen was certainly familiar with. Nicholas’ commentary offers a historiographical perspective with a prominent role for Jerusalem and the events of the First Crusade. Like Guglingen, he identifies Muhammad and Islam with the forces of Antichrist, and he paints a picture in which the Holy Land changes hands several times. Christian victories, if laudable, were never lasting, and although Nicholas sympathises with the Crusading ideal, he does not expect the recapture of Jerusalem or the conclusion of history to happen any time soon, nor does he accept any apocalyptic role for the Franciscans. Guglingen also deplores the current state of affairs,


namely Mamluk rule; however, his history of Jerusalem is meant to demonstrate that there is still room for improvement. St Francis or his friars have not been mentioned explicitly yet, but insinuating implicit comparisons between the followers of the *alter Christus* and the corrupt Latin clergy, Guglingen is setting the scene for the conclusion of the seventh book of his *Treatise*, in which the Franciscans of the Holy Land do figure prominently.

In conclusion, Guglingen’s history of Jerusalem since the Ascension pays particular attention to Muslim rule over the Holy Land and Islamic doctrine, the glories of the Latin Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem, as well as the reasons for the loss of this kingdom: corrupt Latin clergy. This text is innovative, not only because it is the first of its kind by a Franciscan of the Custody of the Holy Land, but also because the author places all these elements in an eschatological perspective on history that is geared towards introducing the Franciscans of the Holy Land into the scheme of things. Inspired by the reading digest present at the Franciscan convent in Jerusalem, Guglingen wrote a history that presents the Franciscans of the Holy Land as the likely answer to two major problems that, in his eyes, impeded the unfolding of history towards its right conclusion. The friars can be the antidote to the followers of the Antichrist ruling Jerusalem, by acting as improved Latin clergy. Before moving on to discuss the implications this might have for the future, which Guglingen suggests in the second part of book VII, it is opportune to first consider the wider context of late medieval (Franciscan) visions of the end of history. These ideologies informed both Guglingen’s take on the history and the future of the Holy Land, as well as later Franciscans authors of the *custodia Terrae Sanctae*: eschatological and apocalyptic ideologies formed much of the backbone of the Franciscan claim and link to the Holy Land.

### 3.2 Franciscan expectations for the future of the Holy Land

Guglingen places his history of Jerusalem in a decidedly eschatological, if not expressly apocalyptic, perspective.26 He begins his history at a very sig-

---

26 The word *apocalypse* comes from Greek and means ‘revelation’, but it has come to absorb many additional shades of meaning, that have much to do with associated terms such as eschatology and prophecy. Apocalypticism can be seen as a branch of eschatology: the study of last things and the end of history, but this particular branch is distinguishable by a
significant point in time: just after the ascension of Christ, a moment that marks an important transition in the unfolding of Salvation history in most medieval apocalyptic schemes. Guglingen associates Muhammad with the Antichrist, and he portrays history as an ongoing battle between the forces of good and evil: Islamic rule vs. Crusader rule over Jerusalem. Thus he lays the groundwork for his future hopes for the Holy Land, and the role of the Franciscans in bringing about those prospects. His outlook - considering the past, reflecting on who were deserving and who were undeserving rulers of the country, and expressing hopes and expectations for the future, very much prefigures early modern Franciscan texts on the subject, which are more overtly apocalyptic in character. In order to fully understand the eschatological remarks in book VII of Guglingen’s Treatise, the ideas that must have shaped his perspective on history, as well as apocalyptic expectations that informed later Franciscan claims to the Holy Land, it is imperative to consider the broader milieu of medieval Christian apocalypticism that fostered these texts. In this type of apocalypticism the Antichrist, the religious other, the city of Jerusalem, its recapture by Crusade, and, by the later middle ages, the role of the Franciscan order in the unfolding of history towards the end, are important and recurring themes.

The first and foremost Christian apocalyptic is the last book of the New Testament, the Apocalypse (or Revelation) of John, also referred to in Guglingen’s Treatise. Following this first-century text, early Christian apocalypticists continued to develop important motifs such as the coming of the Antichrist, the number and duration of the ages of the world, and a thousand year earthly kingdom ruled by a Messiah-king predicted in Apocalypse 20: 4-6, an expectation also known as millenarianism. These strands of thought were effectively suppressed in the fifth century, by the enduringly influential church father Augustine of Hippo (354-430) who severely objected to apocalyptic readings of current events, or predictions about the future, developing an anti-apocalyptic eschatology that would remain influential for centuries to come. Nevertheless, the desire to read past events and predict future ones, did continue to exist. This undercurrent was fertilised by a text of Eastern belief that the end may be imminent. Similarly, as prophecy is the stuff of divinely inspired messages, all apocalyptic messages are thus prophetic in the broadest sense of the word, but not all prophecies are concerned with the end. Bernard McGinn, Apocalyptic Spirituality: Treatises and Letters of Lactantius, Adso of Montier-en-Der, Joachim of Fiore, the Franciscan Spirituals, Savonarola (London: SPCK, 1979), 4-5; Bernard McGinn, Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages (New York: Columbia UP, 1979), 2-4.

27  McGinn, Visions of the End, 5-18.
Christian origins: the Syriac Apocalypse or Revelations of Pseudo-Methodius. This text, written at the end of the seventh century, was highly political in nature; it was fuelled by the Islamic threat, which it saw as a divine punishment. In addition, Pseudo-Methodius is the first witness of the legend of the Last World emperor, who would tackle the Islamic threat and finally march into Jerusalem, abdicate laying his crown on Golgotha, and hand over his kingdom to God, in anticipation of the coming of Antichrist. By the beginning of the eighth century the Latin translation of the text began to circulate in Western Europe, to a large extent shaping apocalyptic expectations there.29

Two centuries later, at the end of the tenth century with the apocalyptic year 1000 approaching, a Frankish monk called Adso of Montier-en-Der picked up where Pseudo-Methodius left off, by developing the figure of the Antichrist and the scenario of the last days much further. In his Letter on the Origin and Life of the Antichrist Adso describes how the Antichrist will be born from Jewish parents, and start a reign of terror in Jerusalem to last three and a half years. Then, since the Roman Empire had been destroyed, a Frankish king would relieve the world by marching into Jerusalem, laying his sceptre and crown on Mount Olives: the final consummation of the Christian empire. At this, Antichrist would be revealed and finally killed by Christ or the archangel Michael. Adso’s clever application of the notion of translatio imperii on his version of the Last World emperor myth, turned him from a Byzantine emperor into a Catholic monarch, a notion that was to remain appealing to many generations of apocalypticists to come.30

As we can observe in the very influential apocalyptic scenarios by Pseudo-Methodius and Adso of Montier-en-Der sketched above, Jerusalem already took up a very important position in Western apocalyptic schemes long before the era of the Crusades. Islamic possession of the Holy Places never sat quite comfortably with Christian thinkers.31 After the first Crusade had taken place “Western possession of the Promised Land would remain the sine qua non of Latin apocalyptic schemes” for centuries to come, in the words of Brett Edward Whalen.32 Another crucial element in medieval apocalypticism is the concept of universal Christian community: first the Gospel was to be spread to all corners of world, then the Antichrist would tempt the faithful with false miracles and prophecies, and finally Eastern orthodox

29 McGinn, Visions of the End, 70-6; Reeves, “The Originality,” 274-5; Whalen, Dominion of God, 17-18.
30 McGinn, Visions of the End, 82-7; Whalen, Dominion of God, 13-4.
31 Whalen, Dominion of God, 46-9.
32 Whalen, Dominion of God, 65, 70-1.
Christians, Jews, and others would return to the Catholic fold before the Final Judgement. Thus, apart from the issue of Islamic rule over Jerusalem, the non-Christian other had an important part to play in future visions of the end, an issue that also seems to occur in the remainder of book VII of Guglingen’s Treatise.

During the twelfth century, this apocalyptic focus on outsiders was complemented by augmented attention for internal division and threats from within Catholicism itself. In the wake of the papal reforms of the eleventh and twelfth century a new strain of ‘reformist apocalypticism’ emerged. It not only warned for evil Christians, but also crystallised a new more coherent conception of history as the battleground of good and evil – the same can be observed in Guglingen’s history of Jerusalem - in which the own present day is seen in the light of crisis and new developments, and end times are believed to be very near. In this period, thinkers such as Honorius of Autun, Anselm of Havelberg, and Gerloh of Reichersberg started to take leave of the Augustinian view on history, introducing notions of progress, change, and renewal, thus preparing the way for Joachim of Fiore (ca. 1135-1202), the most famous and influential medieval apocalypticist of all.

Joachim recognised a great variety of complementary patterns and ages in history, but his most important contribution on this score is the idea of three status in history, based on the persons of the Trinity: the status of the Father (Adam to Christ), the status of the Son (Christ to Joachim’s own day, a time of crisis – Guglingen’s history starts here), and the status of the Holy Spirit: a future age of renewed spirituality after the persecution of the Antichrist, in which all believers would be unified in a single church that would last until the last judgement. Joachim worried about the menace of Islam, represented by Saladin in his own day, which led him to believe a historical transition was near, and to initially favour the notion of Crusade. Later on, after the failure of the third Crusade in 1195, he changed his mind and favoured apocalyptic conversion instead, effected by the preaching of two new monastic orders of ‘spiritual men’ who he foretold, and who were to be the driving force of the third status. There was no place for a Last World emperor in Joachim’s schemes, but he did see an important role for a renewed and spiritualised papacy, which in time gave rise to the notion of the ‘angelic

34 McGinn, Visions of the End, 94-107; Whalen, Dominion of God, 72-99;
35 Reeves, “The Originality,” 276-286.
pope’. With the several books he wrote, Joachim transformed the landscape of Latin medieval apocalypticism: by projecting not only crisis and persecution, but also a transition to a brighter future ahead. Certain elements of his highly complex ideas were particularly appealing to his contemporaries; for example, the role of the new *viri spirituali* of the last *status* was claimed by several religious movements, not least the Franciscans.

During the final decades of the thirteenth century a specific Franciscan Joachite apocalyptic began to develop within the Spiritual Franciscan movement (see chapter six of this dissertation). The Franciscan theologian Peter Olivi (1248/9-1298) first created a true amalgam of Franciscan eschatology combined with the Joachite apocalyptic. According to Olivi, St Francis was the herald of the third status, and his mission to the Levant had prefigured the imminent universal apocalyptic conversion that was to be effected by his followers (also see section 3.5 below). Olivi’s teachings were widely influential, not least through the writings of his student Ubertino da Casale (1259 – ca. 1329), and laid the foundation for a new vibrant and diverse field of Franciscan apocalypticism. This type of apocalypticism, shaped by thinkers such as for example friar Jean de Roquetaillade (d. 1366), featured expectations of the earthly recapture of Jerusalem and the notion of a Franciscan angelic pope to be installed there. During the later middle ages this


37 Reeves, *The Influence*, 133-292.


39 Daniel, *The Franciscan Concept of Mission*, 89-90; see chapter six of this dissertation.

40 The notion of the angelic pope had already appeared in the writings of the Franciscan scholar Roger Bacon (ca.1219/20- 1292), who was no Joachite, but the notion was truly developed by Arnau de Vilanova (ca. 1240-1311), a non-Franciscan physician, who had become deeply influenced by Olivi’s teachings while studying at Montpellier. Daniel, *The Franciscan Concept of Mission*, 92-4; Reeves, *The Influence*, 45-8, 401-415; McGinn, *Vision of the End*, 186-5, 222-5; Arnau de Vilanova predicted not one, but a series of Angelic popes, as well as the capture of earthly Jerusalem, ideas that reappeared in the anonymous *Liber de Flore* at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Daniel, *The Franciscan Concept of Mission*, 89-90; see chapter six of this dissertation.
type of Franciscan Joachite prognostications proliferated, and by the fifteenth and sixteenth century Franciscans on the Iberian Peninsula, as elsewhere, could rely on a “medley of apocalyptic lore”. 41 Sometimes the only vaguely Joachite element in this medley was the identification of the Franciscans with the proselytising ‘spiritual men’ of the final age, as well as a strong sense that history was about to be consummated. Franciscan apocalypticism flourished upon discovery of the New World, but remained significantly oriented to the Old World in the sense that the retaking of Jerusalem remained the ultimate goal.

For example, Christopher Columbus (ca. 1450/51-1506) believed that his discovery of in the New World was the first in a chain of apocalyptic events that would eventually lead to the recovery of Jerusalem by the Spanish monarchy. In a collaborative effort with his friend, the Franciscan Gaspar Gorritio, Columbus compiled a Book of Prophecies (1505), describing this persuasion in detail. 42 The dedicatory letter to this volume stressed “the need to recover the holy city and Mount Zion, and the discovery and conversion … of all of the peoples and nations, for Ferdinand and Isabella, our Spanish rulers.” 43 When the mission to the Indians of the New World was first set up in 1524, it consisted of a team of Franciscans that, quite symbolically, numbered twelve. From the beginning, these missionary efforts were infused with apocalyptic expectations, perhaps most famously exemplified by the staging of play, “the conquest of Jerusalem,” by the newly converted Indians of Tlaxcala on June 18, 1539, in which the apocalyptic scenario is furthered by an army of Indians of New Spain, as well as more traditional forces. The theatrics are described

94-5; Lerner, “Refreshment of the Saints,” 134; The very influential prophecies of the French Franciscan Jean de Roquetaillade (d. 1366) had as central figures a Franciscan Angelic pope, a holy emperor, and a king of Sicily, who would recover the Holy Land. Jean also predicted the transferral of the papacy to Jerusalem and the establishment of a millennial kingdom on earth after the Antichrist had been defeated and the multitudes converted. Whalen, Dominion of God, 221-6; Daniel, The Franciscan Concept of Mission, 95-6; McGinn, Visions of the End, 230-233; Lerner, “Refreshment of the Saints,” 132-6; Lerner, The Feast of Saint Abraham, 73-88, esp. 80-1; Inspired by the ideas of Jean de Roquetaillade and worried by the Western Schism, the hermit Telesphorus of Cosenza completed an apocalyptic tract in 1386 that foretold an angelic pope and a French emperor conquering Jerusalem together. Daniel, The Franciscan Concept of Mission, 97.
by Toribio de Benavente Motolinía (1482-1568) who was most likely also the playwright, besides one of the twelve initial Franciscan missionaries, in his History of the Indians of New Spain.\textsuperscript{44}

In sum, from late medieval period onwards a vibrant Franciscan apocalyptic flourished, in which St Francis and his followers themselves were thought to play a prominent role in hastening history to its conclusion, and which often featured elements such as the Catholic recapture of Jerusalem, and the installation of a Franciscan pope there. These traditions provided part of the ideological backbone for Franciscan Holy Land Crusade imperatives; as well as for the territorial claims made by some of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century authors of Franciscan Holy Land writing, as will become clear in chapters four and six. Like Guglingen, these authors looked at the past and wrote history in order to then turn to hopes and predictions for the future. At the basis of apocalypticism stands the Judeo-Christian concept of history as linear, running from a beginning to an end; as well as a desire to understand events that already took place, the individual’s current position on the divine time line, and especially what is still about to happen.\textsuperscript{45} Similarly, the eschatological outlook of Guglingen’s history of Jerusalem, the first part of book VII of his Treatise on the Holy Land, forms the basis for what the author unfolds in the second part of book VII, which discusses both the present and the future: the impious other dominating Jerusalem, the Franciscans who make amends as good Latin clergy, thereby creating a historical opening for future change by means of Crusade, as will be discussed in the following section.


3.3 The friars of the Holy Land as ‘good seed’ and Guglingen’s call for Crusade

In the second part of book VII of his *Treatise*, Guglingen elaborates on his view that the Holy Land is a space unjustly occupied by an impious other, a topic that he had already highlighted in his history of Jerusalem. At the very beginning of book VII, Guglingen had indicated that knowledge of history is needed to understand the present-day situation in this city. Having traced history from the Ascension up to and including the loss of the Crusader Kingdom, he is now fully equipped to move on to discuss the next main theme for book VII: the various nations living in Jerusalem in 1483, the year that Guglingen was there. Thus, history, especially the failure of the Crusades caused by the defects of Roman Catholics themselves, now serves to explain how it can be that the Holy City is ruled by infidels, and its Holy Places inhabited by heretics and schismatics, a situation that is very undesirable in Guglingen’s eyes. At the very end of book VII, he proposes a solution to this situation, the point to which his *Treatise* has been building up to by means of history and ethnography. The present section examines the ethnographical second part of book VII, as well as the concluding Crusade manifesto, providing an in-depth analysis of the sources and composition of this little studied text, which was a very important source for Breydenbach’s famous *Itinerarium* (1486).

Guglingen follows a well-established tradition by offering an ethnographical exposé: lists and discussions of the different religious communities and their errors are a common feature in Jerusalem travelogues. The very widely read *Descriptio Terrae Sanctae* by the Dominican pilgrim Burchard of Mount Sion, who travelled to the Holy Land in the early years of the 1280s, includes sections on the subject; Jacques de Vitry discusses some groups of differing denominations in the *Historia Orientalis*; and his discussion on the subject also made its way into the 1373-74 Mount Sion compilation. In—

---


47 Burchardus Monachus, *Palaestina seu Descriptio Terrae Sanctae Solertissima*, ed. Philippus Bosquierus (Cologne: Ioannis Crithius, 1626), 56-63; for the problems concerning the dating of this popular text or the pilgrimage of Burchard see, Ingrid Baumgärtner, “Burchard of Mount Sion and the Holy Land,” *Peregrinations: Journal of Medieval Art and Architecture* 4, no. 1 (2013): 5-41; Vitry discusses the Syrians, Jacobites, Nestorians, Ma-ronites, Armenians, and Georgians as groups present in Jerusalem apart from the Saracens in chapters 75- 80; furthermore, he discusses several different peoples living elsewhere in
deed, Guglingen assembled his discussion from various sources; he relies on Vitry, on his own observations, and other sources present in convent library on Mount Sion. One of these is a short Latin text that must have been kept in the library of Jerusalem convent, titled *De diversis nationibus habitantibus in terra sancta: et earum moribus et ritu etc.*; this text was also copied into the manuscript with the vernacular pilgrimage account by the German Franciscan friar Gabriel von Rattenberg who travelled to the Holy Land in 1527.  

Nevertheless, although Guglingen relies on this traditional ethnographic form for expressing unease about the various communities present in Jerusalem, he moulds his source material to serve a specific purpose at the end of book VII. He has ranked the religious communities in a moral succession ranging from very bad to very good: starting with the Saracens, who are both pagans and infidels; then the Jews, who are infidels; then the heretical Christian nations: the Greeks, Syrians, Jacobites, Nestorians, Armenians, Georgians, Abyssinians; then the Maronites who are Catholics, and finally the Latins, the Franciscan friars of Mount Sion. This moral succession, not present in Guglingen’s sources, is a rhetorical device, which, at the end of book VII, serves to dramatise its conclusion, as will become clear. In addition, he includes material that is much less frequently part of these listings and discussions of different religious communities. Namely, Guglingen concludes some of his sections with the alphabet of the group in question: an Arabic alphabet (fig. 1), together with a Latin-Arabic vocabulary, as well as the region. Jacques de Vitry, *Histoire Orientale*, 206-229; Campopiano, “Islam, Jews and Eastern Christianity,” 79-81.

48 “On the different nations living in the Holy Land and their customs and rites etcetera.”, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, MS Cgm 1274, fols 2r-8r; the text discusses the Saracens, Greeks, Syrians, Jacobites, Nestorians, Armenians, Georgians, Abyssinians, and Maronites, in that order; apart from this text and the travelogue, this manuscript also contains an Arabic-German vocabulary analogous to the one offered by Guglingen and *Peregrinationes tocius Terrae Sanctae* (fols. 95r-112v), listing the indulgences to be gained in the Holy Land; also see “No. 151 Gabriel von Rattenberg,” in *Europäische Reiseberichte*, ed. Christian Halm.

49 Whalen, *Dominion of God*, 153-5.

50 Neuburg MS p. 322-363; Nikolaus Glassberger, who saw another, now lost, redaction of Guglingen’s text, gives different order in some of his notes: “Primo de Latinis Christianis; 2o de Judaeis; 3o de Graecis et eorum erroribus; 4o de Surianis et eorum erroribus; 5o de Jacobitis et eorum erroribus habitantibus in Jerusalem et in Oriente; 6o de Nestorianis et eorum erroribus; 7o de Armenis et eorum erroribus; 8o de Georgianis et eorum erroribus; 9o de Abyssinianis sive indianis habitantibus in Jerusalem et de eorum erroribus; 10o de Maronitis et eorum erroribus, quos olim tenuerunt; sed nunc conversi sunt et facti catholici.” Nikolaus Glassberger, *Chronica fratris Nicolai Glassberger*, 656-7.
as Hebrew, Greek, Chaldean, Jacobite, Armenian, and Abyssinian alphabets. This is an innovation that subsequently became widespread in late medieval Jerusalem travelogues through the influential itinerary of Guglingen’s fellow traveller Bernhard von Breydenbach (ca.1440-1497), which copies these alphabets along with the sections on the different nations in Jerusalem directly from Guglingen’s text. Finally, Guglingen also innovates with respect to his sources by including two illustrations to demonstrate the faults of the Greek and Armenian Christians.

In the first ethnographical section about the Saracens, Guglingen has a less theological outlook than before, when he discussed the life of Muhammad and Islam as a part of his history of Jerusalem. These observations are not as larded with references to written sources, and may also be based on Guglingen’s own observations during the year he lived in Jerusalem, and what others may have told him. Guglingen mostly describes customs and rules such as polygamy, the giving of alms, washing before prayer, the orientation of prayer, Ramadan, the consumption of Halal meat, the ban on eating pork, which cities are considered holy, certain mosques, and the rewards of paradise. He is interested in these practices and beliefs, because these help him to answer a question he asks at the end of his discussion: if the Saracens accept the Old and the New Testament, from which it becomes clear that


52 Neuburg MS p. 311-9.
Christ is the Messiah, do they then not believe in him as the true son of God? Guglingen responds that they cannot be considered Christians because the evangelical laws proscribe abstinence from earthly and carnal desires, which, the Saracens do not practice at all, considering their habits that he just described.53

After proving that the Saracens are indeed very un-Christian, Guglingen turns to review the errors of the Jews. He blames them for not accepting Christ as their Messiah, and offers a lengthy discussion on why they should have recognised Christ as such, mostly based on various Old Testament types.54 Up to this point, Guglingen has dealt with what he calls the infidels in Jerusalem, and has found them wanting. He now turns his attention to the Christians groups in the city, partly basing himself on Vitry’s Historia Orientalis, partly on De diversis nationibus habitantibus in terra sancta, also found in the manuscript of friar Gabriel von Rattenberg’s Jerusalem travelogue, and possibly on his own observations.55 Again, Guglingen is bent on making it crystal clear that even if these groups are Christians, they err unforgivably in their religious practices, especially with regards to their Eucharistic rites. Guglingen works through a catalogue of nine errors the Greek Church commits against Catholic orthodoxy.56 He calls the ninth error, the Greeks’ use of

53  Neuburg MS p. 336-7.
56  The 1374-5 compilation from the Franciscan convent in Jerusalem also contains various materials on the errors of the Greeks which must have been present in the library on Mount Sion; Guglingen may have consulted these, cf. Un Guide Pélerin de Terre Sainte au XVe Siècle, ed. Regine Pernoud (Paris: Mantes, 1940), 7; Campopiano, “Islam, Jews and Eastern Christianity,” 83-5.
leavened bread for the Eucharist, their worst fault. He holds that their error appears clearly from their practice, which he describes at length and may have witnessed himself in Jerusalem.

To prove his point, Guglingen includes an illustration (fig. 2) along with the explanation that when the Greeks celebrate Mass they take a reasonably large, thick, round, and not very white piece of leavened bread, which is marked on top with a circle the size of a Catholic Host: “the form of which is depicted bigger here.” Below this statement we find a curious illustration in which a chalice seems to be standing on top of the Host, below which we read the words: “here stands the priest.” This intriguing arrangement of elements is meant to visualise how the bread is carried to the altar at the beginning of the Greek Eucharistic ritual: “and they place the chalice with wine and water according to the aforementioned manner; then they take the entire bread to the altar in a linen cloth in between the chalice and the priest, without a paten.” Beside the illustration four blocks of text offer additional information on the Greek procedure. Thus we learn that the Greeks use a large chalice with wine mixed with water, and that they do not use a paten for

---

57 “Nonus error et peyor aliis est Quia a dyabolo edocti.” Neuburg MS p. 351.
61 A paten would be used for this purpose in the Roman rite. “Et ponunt calicem cum vino et aqua secundum modum prenotatum denique ponunt totum panem ad altare in panno lineo infra calicem et sacerdotem absque patena.” Neuburg MS p. 351.
the sacrament, but rather take a silver dish to distribute pieces of the Host.62 On both sides of the Eucharistic bread the notes explain that the bigger outer circle indicates the entire bread, and that the small inner circle constitutes the Eucharist proper.63 Within the inner circle the word *Eukaristia* reiterates this point, and on the outer circle we are again reminded that this is leavened bread: *Panis fermentatus*. With this illustration Guglingen has visualised all the features of the Greek Eucharistic ritual that he perceived as erroneous as compactly as possible.

On the errors of the other Christian communities in Jerusalem Guglingen is more concise, discussing those of the Syrians, Jacobites, Nestorians, Armenians, Georgians, Abyssinians, and Maronites in quick succession. His concern about the Eucharistic ritual of Eastern Christians leads him once more to offer an illustration, depicting the Armenian Host (fig. 3). Announced by the text *hec est forma hostie in sacrificio Armenorum*, the Host is represented by two concentric circles, a cross within the inner circle. The text running between the two circles explains that the thickness of the host is indicated by the distance between the two circles, the breadth of the host is indicated by the outer circle.64 Guglingen’s attitude to this Host is less hostile, as the Armenian rites are closer to the Latin ones.65

Finally, after having reviewed all of the shortcomings of the pagans, infidels, and heretics in Jerusalem, Guglingen is now ready to discuss the last remaining traditional ethnographical category known from Crusade and pilgrimage literature: the Latins.66 These men, called ‘Franks’ by the Saracens, are true Catholics according to Guglingen.67 Following this brief introduction, he immediately starts to lament the fate of this formerly prominent

62 “Nota quod greci utuntur magno calice infundentes multum vinum cum aqua modica et ponunt primo calicem,” “Non utuntur patena pro sacramento sed cum frangunt in partes ponunt in calicum argenteum partes et de illo distribuunt.” Neuburg MS p. 350.
63 “Nota: ille circulus maior demonstrat integrum panem quem recipiunt pro sacrificio ut supra dictum est,” “Circulus minor demonstrat eukaristiam qui tamen illud quod continet parvulus circulus conficitur in sacramentum eukaristie etc.” Neuburg MS p. 350.
64 “Spissitudo hostie Armenorum est sicut spacium inter illos duos circulos, Latitudo vero sicut primus et maior circulus.” Neuburg MS p. 359.
65 “Armeni concordant modicum nobiscum in officio misse, habentes patenas et calices in nostris formis ... In orationibus et officiis eorum devoti Sacramentis latinorum reverenciam exhibentes.” Neuburg MS p. 359.
66 “De latinis et veris catholicis christianiis In iherusalem Civitate sancta habitantibus.” Neuburg MS p. 363.
group: once they were many, now they are few, once they were powerful, now subjected, once they dominated Jerusalem and now: “alas, I grieve to say it, they are completely expelled from their heritage, trampled upon by all, and practically reduced to nothing!” Barely forty of these good Catholics remain in the city and they are surrounded by Christians sects suffused in error and infected by heresy, as, Guglingen points out, he explained before. The historical and ethnographical background he provided before, now serves to point out the stark contrast between the glorious days of the Latin Kingdom and the deplorable current situation.

Yet, there is hope. Alluding to the parable of the Sower and that of the Wheat and the Tars, Guglingen characterises the Franciscans of Mount Sion:

However, just as whenever a few good, fruit-bearing seeds are thrown on soil they excellently bear many fruits, so a few truly Catholic men, friars of the blessed father Francis, although they are few, still - just like good, fruit-bearing seeds sewn onto the Promised Land with the right hand of true obedience - [are] incessantly sprouting forth odoriferous flowers of many virtues, and producing salubrious fruits of many good works for the benefit of the sons of the holy mother church. They are magnanimous in their faith, well-confirmed in their hope, and deeply rooted in the love of God and their neighbour, not suspected of any error, nor blemished by the least rumour of any heresy, through God’s grace.

These Franciscan friars offer new hope for the Holy Land, since, even though

---

69 “Nam vix inveniuntur quadraginte [sic] persone que veri catholici sunt in civitate sancta. Alii omnes christiani ut dictum est erroribus involuti et heresi sunt infecti.” Neuburg MS p. 363.
70 Matthew 13.
they are few, they are very different from the former Latin clergy of the Crusader Kingdom, who caused the loss of that kingdom by their disregard for the practice of obedience, poverty, and chastity, as became clear from the history that Guglingen provided. Now that huge failing has been repaired by the Franciscans, who are like good seed sown in the Holy Land, producing salubrious fruits; a brighter future, may lie ahead. Furthermore, Guglingen emphasises that these friars are thoroughly orthodox Catholics, unlike the heretical Christians that surround them. These other groups are unworthy of worshipping at the Holy Places, since their Eucharistic rites are erroneous, as Guglingen took pains to demonstrate in his prior discussions and illustrations of the Greek and Armenian Eucharist. He now indicates that the Franciscans celebrate the Eucharist in the correct way and also reprove the others about their rite. This makes the heretics very hostile to Franciscans, not to mention the hostility and molestation suffered at the hands of the Saracens. According to Guglingen, the friars are assailed from all sides and in constant danger of being expelled from their place in the Holy Land, which they only retain through the grace of God and the alms of good Christians.72 Given the precarious situation of the friars, Guglingen first begs God at length to liberate Jerusalem, and then turns to another source of rescue:

They [the friars] also call to all Christian princes, and nobles, and other devout Christians, saying with a lamenting voice: “Oh you all who serve under the banner of Christ’s Cross and Christendom, and who rest under the wings of the holy Roman mother church, consider with your mind, receive with your heart, and behold with your corporal eye your land and city, sprinkled and sanctified with the precious blood of Jesus Christ your Saviour, which now for 283 years has been trampled upon and possessed by the perfidious Saracens and the worst heretics; aye, daily it is defiled, spat on, and mocked by infidel dogs, to the contempt of Christ and sacred Christendom. Rush to the defence of the honour of your God, hasten to liberate your heritage, attack confidently to expel those unclean dogs, and the Lord will be with you. Follow in the footsteps of the noble prince

72 “Publice contra hereticos confitentes Eukaristiam in azimis panibus et vino mixto aqua in calice frequenter conficientes errores aliarum nationum odientes, hereses eorum reprobantes et contra hereticos acriter inpingentes. Quapropter non paucas detractiones ab ipsis hereticis sufferentes, ac non modicas adversitates et molestias a sarracenis continue sustinentes, indubie undique angustie, undique tribulationes et circumquaque stant pericula, et nisi gratia dei consolati, et manu adiutrice eleemosynis christifidelium ex imponenti adiuti subsistere et tenere loca in terra sancta minime possent.” Neuburg MS p 363-4.
Godfrey of Bouillon as much as you can and for the love of Christ who suffered for us there. Hasten to rescue the friars in their distress, who live in poverty.73

This call for Crusade is the point which book VII of Guglingen’s *Treatise* has been building up to. He has meticulously constructed a historical framework meant to demonstrate that the history of the Holy Land is incomplete, and its current inhabitants unworthy. However, after the lamentable loss of the glorious Latin Kingdom, a good seed has been sown into its soil, which allows an opening for its recovery for Christianity: the Franciscans of Mount Sion. The friars are doing their part, behaving as irreproachable Catholic clergy; all that is wanting now are brave Christian princes, willing to emulate Godfrey of Bouillon, and the other worthy men of whom we have heard before in Guglingen’s history of Jerusalem. Following this fervent Crusade manifesto, Guglingen shows a more practical mindset saying that if one cannot come in person, one can at least send some clergy instead and give alms. He emphasises that if the friars are expelled they can no longer assist pilgrims, and also that the friars have many costs, which they have to pay for from alms. A long and meticulous description of all the buildings that need to be kept up and the mouths that need to be fed follows.74 Finally, Guglingen exhorts his less wealthy readers, especially regular clergy, to pray, if they have no alms to give.75

Thus, with the seventh book of his *Treatise*, Guglingen has provided a continuous history of the Holy Land, as well as an account of the various

73  “Clamant etiam ad omnes christifideles principes et nobiles ceterosque devotos christianos dicentes voce lamentabili, O vos omnes qui militatis sub vexillo crucis christi et cristiani nominis, et qui quiescitis sub alis sancte matris ecclesie romane, considerate mente, recipite corde, aspicite et oculo corporali terram et civitatem vestram, precioso sanguine ihesu vestri redemptoris aspersam et sanctificatam, iam quam per ducentos octoginta et tres annos a perfidis saracenis et pessimis hereticis possessam et conculcatam, ymmo ab infidelibus canibus quotidie fedatur conspuitur et deridetur, in despectum christi et sancti nominis christiani. Accurrite defendere honorem dei vestri. Festinate liberare hereditatem vestram. Accedite confidere expellere foras canes immundos et dominus erit vobiscum. Incedite pro viribus vestris vestigia nobilissimi principis Godofridi de Boilheym et ob amorem ihesu pro nobis ibidem passi. Succurrite fratribus tribulatis et in paupertate constitutis.” Neubrug MS p. 364.
74  The convent on Mount Sion: twenty four friars, ten flasks of oil, three asses; two friars at the Holy Sepulchre, ten flasks of oil; the church and monastery in Bethlehem, six friars, six flasks of oil; the five tertiary sisters of Mount Sion, one flask of oil; last but not least: tribute to the Saracens. Neuburg MS p. 365.
75  A page length prayer is provided for the purpose: “Exhortacio ad orationem et forma orationis pro terra sancta.” Neuburg MS p. 365.
nations presently in Jerusalem, integrating the Franciscans into both as an improved version of the Latin clergy, as well as the superiors of other Christian groups in Jerusalem, thereby making it possible to propose a scenario for the future by means of renewed Crusade. Moving beyond the historical compilations that heretofore emanated from the Franciscan convent in Jerusalem, he has produced a text that is in all respects innovative. Not only because it is the first cohesive history of Jerusalem and the Holy Land by a friar of that convent, but also because it pays attention to the role of the Franciscans within this history, and explicitly calls for Crusade, by arguing that history is incomplete and the Franciscans are doing their part in pushing for its completion, and are in need only of help from Catholic princes. These features, which appear for the very first time in Guglingen’s treatise, were to become hallmarks of later early modern perspectives on the Holy Land by Franciscans of that province. Guglingen’s *Treatise* suggests a budding sense of self-assertiveness among Franciscans, with regards to the Holy Land, even though its claims are still tentative in comparison to later examples. The following section of this chapter aims to contextualise Guglingen’s remarkable call for Crusade in coeval Crusade campaigning by the custody of the Holy Land, in order to demonstrate that this was on the friars’ agenda if not in their writing, and thus also presenting continuity with later Franciscan Holy Land writing. The final section of this chapter then explores the covert suggestion, inserted by means of Guglingen’s characterisation of the Franciscans of the Holy Land as ‘good seed’, that St Francis himself founded the *custodia Terrae Sanctae*, a defining feature of later Franciscan Holy Land territoriality, which finds its roots in relatively obscure late medieval hagiographic traditions.

### 3.4 The Franciscans of the Holy Land and late medieval Crusade projects and patronage

Guglingen is the first friar of the late medieval *custodia Terrae Sanctae* to call for Crusade in (extant) writing: looking back at the past to see what has been lacking, that is good Latin clergy; and also looking forward to the future: good Franciscan friars are in place now, all that is needed is princely military initiative. His Crusading zeal, for the first time expressed by a Franciscan of the Holy Land *in writing*, was to remain the exception until the early seventeenth century, notably with the publication of Francesco Quaresmio’s *Elucidatio* (1639). Nevertheless, it is important to emphasise that Guglingen’s call for Crusade is representative of a more general atmosphere at the Franciscan convent of Mount Sion in Jerusalem around the turn of the six-
teenth century. His overt call for Crusade and assistance from Catholic rulers is striking considering that explicitly calling for Crusade was certainly not a feature of the historical compilations produced at the Franciscan convent in Jerusalem at the time, even though these texts breathe a certain nostalgia for the classical Crusader era. The same nostalgia was expressed in dedicated masses sung by the friars behind the closed doors of the Holy Sepulchre. The same nostalgia was expressed in dedicated masses sung by the friars behind the closed doors of the Holy Sepulchre.76 Openly calling for Crusade in writing was uncommon among the authors of the Franciscan custody of the Holy Land. In this section, however, I mean to demonstrate that Guglingen was not an eccentric in this respect, but expressed more widely held convictions, by briefly perusing the context of fifteenth-century Crusading movements and previous Franciscan involvement with Crusading projects, as well as by examining two examples of Crusade campaigning coordinated by the custodia Terrae Sanctae. These two fifteenth century missions to the Burgundian and Iberian courts have left few traces in that custody’s own records, but were indeed far from ineffective according to sources connected to the recipients.

The fall of Acre in 1291 to the Mamluks ended the existence of the last of the Crusader states, as well as the classical period of Crusading. The loss of the Holy Land and Muslim rule over the Holy Sepulchre and - Places met with dismay in Western Europe, and in the following two centuries the recovery of Jerusalem was the object of a number of (unsuccessful) military initiatives, as well as a proliferation of carefully planned proposals for Holy Land Crusade.78 Several of these Crusade projects were put forward by Franciscans, such as for example is the Liber Recuperationis Terre Sancte by friar Fidentius of Padua, presented to the first Franciscan Pope Nicolas IV in February 1292.79 Patrick Gautier Dalché has recently proposed a “milieu francis-
caine” from which several Crusade projects, including a geographical component in the shape of a map, emanated. The best-known specimen from this environment is the *Liber Secretorum Fidelium Crucis* by Marino Sanudo the Elder, not a Franciscan himself. The first draft of this project, without maps, was presented to Clement V in 1309, and a second, much expanded, version including maps was presented to John XXII in 1321. This second project was examined by a committee of four, which counted three Franciscans, including the Franciscan historian Paulinus of Venice.

Given this precedent of Franciscan Crusade campaigning, before the establishment of the Franciscan custody of the Holy Land, it may seem surprising that, once established in the Holy Land, the friars did not actively call for Crusade in writing. Guglingen’s is the first explicit call for Crusade by a Franciscan of the Holy Land, more than 200 years after the establishment of the convent in Jerusalem. He uttered his call in a new context of Crusading movements, following the fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks in 1453. This type of late medieval Crusade often cited the recovery of the Holy Land as an ideal, but was in practice mostly focused on defending the


80 Gautier Dalché has also published the map that was part of this work by Fidentius, which had not been discussed in previous scholarship; furthermore, he introduces a heretofore unknown manuscript copy of the text. Patrick Gautier Dalché, “Cartes, Réflexion Stratégique et Projets de Croisade à la Fin du XIIIe et au Début du XIVe Siècle: Une Initiative Franciscaine?” *Francia* 37 (2007): 80-3, Plate I, 87-92.

81 These include a map of the Holy Land, a map of the Eastern Mediterranean, Jerusalem, and a *mappa mundi*; for a reproduction of the *mappa mundi* see Gautier Dalché, “Cartes, Réflexion Stratégique,” 84-7, Planche III; for renderings of all of these maps see Marinus Sanudus, *Liber Secretorum Fidelium Crucis super Terrae Sanctae Recuperatione et Conservatione*, ed. Jac. Bongarsio (Hanover: Wechelianus/Johannis Aubrius, 1611), 285 ff.

82 Gautier Dalché hypothesises that it was Paulinus who advised Sanudo to include maps in the second redaction of the book, in line with the Franciscan forma mentis on this subject. These maps, attributed to Pietro Vesconte, were also to become part of Paulinus’ *Chronologia Magna* later on. See for example Paris, Bibliothèque National de France, MS Lat. 4939, fols. 9r (mappa mundi), 10r (map of the Eastern Mediterranean), 10v-11r (map of the Holy Land). Available online via http://gallica.bnf.fr; Gautier Dalché, “Cartes, Réflexion Stratégique,” 84-6, 89-93; Konrad Kretschmer, “Marino Sanudo der Ältere und die Karten des Petrus Vesconte,” *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin* 26 (1871): 352–370.
receding borders of Europe from the Ottoman advance. However, the ultimate ideological goal of the recovery of Jerusalem was, if distant, never quite empty or meaningless. In this milieu of heightened interest in war against the infidels during the second half of the fifteenth century, the Franciscans of the *custodia Terrae Sanctae* sought to mobilise Western European monarchs for a Crusade to the Holy Land, for example by appealing to their ancestry of glorious Crusaders. Guglingen’s unique call in writing is thus representative of ideas held more widely amongst the friars of this custody.

The Franciscan custody of the Holy Land actively tried to recruit help in Western Europe, by sending out friars to princely houses to ask for financial backing and protection from the Mamluk authorities, also encouraging these rulers to undertake a Crusade. The fact that these envoys of the *custodia Terrae Sanctae* were well received and their requests were taken seriously, testifies that Holy Land Crusade was not universally seen as a lost cause, quite on the contrary. For example, Duke Philip the Good of Burgundy (1396-1467) lent his support to the Franciscans of the Holy Land. Philip entertained a particular devotion for the Holy Land, which he expressed by financing the Holy Land pilgrimages of several illustrious, as well as more humble, persons, and through several large donations to the Franciscan custody there. Apart from substantial annual donations, he gave a stained glass-window with his coat of arms to the Franciscan church on Mount Sion along with a breviary in 1437, around a decade later he provided building materials for the restoration of the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, and in the 1460’s he financed the restoration of the chapel of the Holy Ghost on Mount Sion. In addition, Philip was greatly attracted by the idea of Crusade, he maintained a fleet for this purpose in the Mediterranean Sea in the 1440’s, he maintained a theologian in his service who compiled texts relating to the subject of Crusade and the Levant, and during the decade following the fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks in 1453, he prepared for action in earnest, although this project never materialised.

---

86 Richard Vaughan, *Philip the Good: The Apogee of Burgundy* (London: Longmans,
The efforts by Franciscans of the custody of the Holy Land to obtain such support and patronage, have left only few traces in comparison to their results, but in this case we have few witnesses of how the Franciscans tried to secure Philip’s support, and urge him to take up a Holy Land Crusade. In 1435 Alberto de Sarteano (1385-1450), a prominent observant Franciscan preacher and later Vicar General of the Order, travelled to Jerusalem to install an observant Franciscan guardian there, instead of the conventual friar who had been elected. This mission failed, only in 1439 an observant guardian was installed, but during his stay in Jerusalem on October 6, 1436, Alberto wrote a letter to Philip thanking him profusely for a financial donation, but also expressing the hope the prince would not only come to visit the Holy Places for devotion, but even more so that he would to take up arms in defence of the Christian faith, now that his dominions were at peace. In 1440 Alberto wrote to Philip again, now from Rhodes, encouraging him to imitate his ancestors, among whom Godfrey of Bouillon, and fight for Christendom.

The Franciscan efforts to solicit Philip’s services were not restricted to writing letters alone. In the years 1442-1448 Philip received several visits from friar Jean Marquet, also called de Valombreuse, sent from Jerusalem first to collect a donation, and later, after the pope had issued a Crusade bull in favour of the custody of the Holy Land in 1443, to discuss “certain things concerning the recovery and reunion of the said Holy Land” as the ducal administration reveals. We do not know what kind of approach Jean Marquet adopted to convince Philip of the necessity of a Crusade during his secretive visits, but it seems that Philip took his requests seriously, sending an ambassador to the English court to broach the subject of a Crusade, and even starting to construct a fleet destined for the Levant at Antwerp in 1446-9, but due to circumstances this Crusade too was not to be. After Constantinople had


fallen to the Turks in 1453, the Duke’s Crusading fervour could now be more clearly directed and find wider approval more easily. On February 17, 1454 Phillip presided over the *Feast of the Pheasant* in Lille. This lavish royal banquet was organised to promote a Crusade against the Ottomans; several members of the court swore oaths to that purpose on a live pheasant, opening another decade of Crusading plans and projects.90

One month after the feast, in March 1454, the famous observant Franciscan Crusade preacher Giovanni da Capistrano (1386-1456) wrote to the duke from Bratislava, confessing that he would love to hear “that the very noble and formidable prince the duke of Burgundy from now on deploys his formidable power for the recovery of the Holy Land.”91 It may seem surprising that Capistrano urges Philip to go on a Crusade to the Holy Land, rather than employ his military might in defending the Balkans from the Ottomans, the Crusade in which Capistrano was to distinguish himself most notably as a preacher.92 Perhaps, this goes to show that the anti-Ottoman - and Holy Land Crusades were never entirely separate, but rather inextricably linked phenomena. In his letter to Philip, the preacher wonders what could be more pleasant than “a beautiful army to restore and recover the Holy Sepulchre of our Lord.” De Capistrano then deplores the division and dissension in Philip’s Duchy, referring to the recent Ghent wars. He exhorts Philip at length to restore peace and forgive his subjects, and concludes by repeating the suggestion of taking up arms for the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre instead, fighting enemies of the faith.93 Thus, apart from commissaries present at the court of Philip the Good, the custody of the Holy Land could rely on very prominent observant Franciscan preachers to pour their rhetorical skill into letter-form,

93  In the speech to justify the new taxes that eventually led to the Ghent wars, Philip actually enumerates his expenses for the Holy Land as an important cost: “All this does not include the heavy expenses I have sustained over a long period and still sustain every day in the service of God, in support of the Christian faith and of the chapel of the Holy Sepulchre of our beloved Lord in Jerusalem and of other Holy Places thereabouts against heathens and pagans. To these ends I have expended a good deal of money and I am still doing so willingly, for the atonement and honour of God and for the salvation of myself and my subjects.” Vaughan, *Philip the Good*, 308.
appealing to the Duke’s sense of duty based on history and his ancestry.

With the death of Philip the Good of Burgundy in 1467, the Franciscan custody of the Holy Land had lost a very important patron and protector. Only in the 1480s similarly powerful and generous protectors were found in the royal couple Isabella I of Castile (1451-1504) and Ferdinand II of Aragon (1452-1516). Over the years several Franciscan representatives were sent from Jerusalem and well received; they collected substantial donations, and gained diplomatic support against the Mamluk government.94 Suggesting a Holy Land Crusade must have undoubtedly also formed part of the assignment of these envoys, and such efforts would be well directed, because Isabella and Ferdinand favoured the idea of Crusade, notably in the shape of the Spanish Reconquista.95 The clearest signs of such Franciscan Crusade encouragement are associated with the embassy of fray Mauro Hispano, guardian of Mount Sion in Jerusalem from May 1501 to May 1504. At the end of his term there, fray Mauro returned to Europe entrusted with diplomatic messages from the Mamluk Sultan Qansuh Al-Ghuri (r. 1501-1516), who was displeased with Ferdinand II because of recent forced conversions of Muslims in the principality of Granada, and with King Manuel I of Portugal (r. 1495-1521) for harassment of Mamluk merchants in the Indian Ocean. The Sultan desired intervention by Venice as well as by the pope; in March 1504, fray Mauro arrived in Venice, and he moved on to Rome in August of the same year. Since these meetings remained inconclusive, it was decided that Mauro would first move on to Spain and Portugal, much to the ire of Qansuh Al-Ghuri.96

In September 1504 fray Mauro arrived at the Spanish court, where he remained for eight months and collected exceptionally large donations for the Franciscan custody of the Holy Land. Although no documentary evidence survives to prove it, it seems very likely that fray Mauro tried to convince the Spanish Royal couple of the desirability of a Crusade.97 When Isabella died in November 1504, her will articulated the wish for war against Islam and the conquest of Africa.98 This request was taken especially seriously by

98  Erika Rummel, Jiménez de Cisneros: On the Threshold of Spain’s Golden Age (Tempe:
Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros (1436-1517), the queen’s observant Franciscan confessor, a powerful politician, archbishop of Toledo, and eventually also cardinal of Spain. Cisneros himself must have in turn conferred with his Franciscan confrère Mauro from Jerusalem, since he introduced the explicit goal of conquering the Holy Land to Isabella’s final request.\(^9\) In the years following her death, he collected geographical and strategic information for a military excursion.\(^10\)

In the beginning of 1506, Cisneros found an enthusiastic ally in Manuel I of Portugal for this grand Crusade project. In May 1505, Manuel had likewise received a visit from fray Mauro, and was so taken by the idea of a Crusade that two months later in July, he sent his Franciscan confessor fray Henrique de Coimbra to enlist the English King Henry VII (r. 1485-1509) for the plan too.\(^11\) The attitude of Ferdinand II was favourable too, and several appeals were sent to Pope John II, although with meagre results.\(^12\) The documents containing this particular Crusade project have unfortunately not survived, but from a warmly worded letter by Manual I to Cisneros in February 1506 we know that it envisioned destroying Islam and seeing Cisneros celebrate mass in front of the Holy Sepulchre.\(^13\) In the end, these monarchs were unable to realise the project, and although in 1509 Cisneros did manage to capture the port of Orán in present day Algeria on an expedition largely financed by himself, the Holy Land was never gained.\(^14\)

Within the atmosphere of Franciscan apocalyptic anticipation sketched above in the second section of this chapter, Cardinal Ximenes Cisneros was led to hope he would become the new Franciscan pontiff of Jerusalem, upon completing his Crusade project.\(^15\) During his Crusading years, the Franciscan cardinal sustained his faith in these undertakings by relying on several proph-
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100 Cisneros’ personal library included a memorial with the strategic information necessary for a military expedition in the Mediterranean with the ultimate goal of regaining the Holy Land. For a description see Garcia Oro, “La ‘Casa Santa de Jerusalen’,” 752-761.
103 The text of this reply is given in Latin in Luke Wadding’s *Annales Minorum seu Trium Ordinum a S. Francisco Institutorum*, vol. XV (Rome: Rochi Bernabò, 1736), 358-9; Garcia Oro, “La ‘Casa Santa de Jerusalen’,” 749-50; de Witte, “Un Projet Portugais,” 422.
ecies, such as those by the French philosopher Charles de Bovelles (1479-1566), the controversial mystic “la Beata de Piedrahíta”, or María de Santo Domingo (ca. 1485- ca. 1524), and a certain fray Melchor. These visionaries foretold events, in a number of variations, that supported the Cardinal’s Crusading plans: the end of Islam, the swift re-conquest of the Holy Land (within twelve years), and a new reformed papacy in Jerusalem, with Cisneros as its first pontiff.106

In conclusion, the written call for Holy Land Crusade that Guglingen’s *Treatise on the Holy Land* builds up to, represents widely held hopes and beliefs of the Franciscan custody of the Holy Land. In the second half of the fifteenth century, the envoys of the *custodia Terrae Sanctae* were well received at prominent European courts, and their requests for Holy Land Crusade were taken seriously. Sailing on the current of the anti-Ottoman Crusade, their appeals coincided with current concerns and attracted the approval of the Burgundian, Spanish, and Portuguese courts. Moreover, prominent observant Franciscan preachers such as Alberto Sarteano and Giovanni da Capistrano threw their backs into directing Philip the Good’s attention to the Holy Land, and its Crusade; while on the Iberian peninsula the Franciscan prelate Ximenes Cisneros acted as an important catalyst for the custody’s Crusading ambitions. All of these efforts, as well as the call in Guglingen’s *Treatise*, point to continuity with early modern Franciscan Holy Land writing, which is replete with Crusading rhetoric, as we shall see in the next chapter. Another very significant element at the end Guglingen’s book VII, which resonates with this same literature, is his characterisation of the Franciscans of the Holy Land as ‘good seed’ sown in the Holy Land, which will be analysed and contextualised in the following section.

### 3.5 St Francis in the Holy Land

Book VII of Guglingen’s *Treatise* is designed to point out the relevance of the Franciscans of the Holy Land: the history of Jerusalem it contains first emphasises the problem of the absence of good Latin clergy, and the ethnographical exposé that follows it then presents the friars as the answer to this complication, setting the stage for recovery of by Crusade. Within the con-

---

text of his discussion of the various nations that live in Jerusalem, Guglingen characterises the Franciscans of the Holy Land by means of allusion to the parable of the Sower and of the Wheat and the Tars, as we saw above in section three.107 This particular characterisation is very significant, in terms of the claims and beliefs about the Franciscan custody of the Holy Land it may refer to: the foundation of this custody by St Francis himself. This section first discusses the possible, but certainly indirect reference to the Life of St Francis contained in Guglingen’s allusion to the seed metaphors in Matthew 13; it then turns to discuss early modern examples of the same seed metaphor, which do explicitly claim the foundation of the custodia Terrae Sanctae by Francis himself: an important revision of history and hagiography. In conclusion, I review the rather rare out-of-the-way, late medieval hagiographical traditions that prepared the way for these claims.

In book VII of his Treatise, Guglingen sees a specific role for the Franciscans in the Holy Land, perhaps even a missionary one, reproving Eastern Orthodox Christians and bringing them into the Catholic fold. He does not, however, explicitly connect this role in history to the Life of St Francis. For instance, Guglingen does not refer to Francis’ mission preaching to the Sultan of Egypt, a well-known hagiographical episode based on an encounter with Sultan Malik al-Kâmil in 1219 close to the city of Damietta in the Egyptian Nile delta, which might seem surprising.108 Nevertheless, Guglingen wrote a history of Jerusalem, and according to received hagiographic tradition at the time Francis did not go to Jerusalem. Nor does it seem to be the case that during the late medieval period other Franciscans of the Holy Land paid especial heed to this episode in the life of their founding saint. It is primarily later, early modern, Franciscan commentators who do reflect on the episode on St Francis and Sultan, and even bring Francis to the Holy Land.

The only possible, but if so, very covert, reference to the Life of St Francis in Guglingen’s Treatise is his characterisation of the friars in the Holy Land as good seed sown into holy ground producing many fruits, we saw above in section three.109 Francis’s first biographer, Thomas of Celano, refers

107 Matthew 13.
108 This meeting is reported in hagiographical sources and Crusader chronicles. Tolan, Saint Francis and the Sultan, 4-5.
109 “However, just as whenever a few good, fruit-bearing seeds are thrown on soil they excellently bear many fruits, so a few truly Catholic men, friars of the blessed father Francis, although they are few, still — just like good, fruit-bearing seeds sewn onto the Promised Land with the right hand of true obedience — [are] incessantly sprouting forth odoriferous flowers of many virtues, and producing salubrious fruits of many good works for the benefit of the sons of the holy mother church. They are magnanimous in their faith, well-confirmed in their
to the parable of the sower in the *vita prima* in a chapter about the saint’s desire for martyrdom, and his missions to Morocco and Syria: “Francis the servant of God quitted the sea and walked on the land, and cleaving it with the ploughshare of the word, sowed the seed of life and brought forth blessed fruit”. This sentence actually occurs following a failed attempt to reach Syria, when Francis had already disembarked at Ancona in Italy. Bonaventure retains the reference to this parable in his influential *Legenda Maior*: “When, leaving the sea behind, Francis began to travel through the land, sowing therein the seed of salvation, he gained rich sheaves.”

We cannot be entirely sure about whether Guglingen had this bit of the Life of Francis in mind, when he characterised the friars of the Holy Land as good seed, nor whether he perhaps believed that Francis went to Jerusalem to sow these seeds himself, even though the early biographies report no such expedition. It is tempting to assume he might have done, since later Franciscan authors also connect the image of St Francis as the biblical sower to the supposed foundation of the custody of the Holy Land by Francis himself. For example, Francesco Quaresmio identifies the Franciscans of the Holy Land as holy seed, sown into the Holy Land, on several occasions, and dedicates a chapter to the fruits reaped by St Francis on his travels through the Holy Land. In this chapter, Quaresmio writes that although Francis did not con-
vert many infidels, his stay was nevertheless productive:

I do not doubt that the preaching and example of Saint Francis was like good and chosen seed, that fell in good and holy ground, moistened by the celestial dew of the Holy Spirit, warmed by the rays of the sun of justice, so that it produced multiple fruit in its time, threefold, sixfold, and hundredfold. Once planted, they took root and produced leaves, flowers, and fruit in that Promised Land: the three orders of Saint Francis, the Friars Minor, the Poor Ladies or Clarissans, and the Third Order of Penitence which contains both sexes.  

According to Quaresmio, the Franciscans in the Holy Land were thus the fruit and flowers of seeds sown there by St Francis himself. The same message is communicated by the title and title page of Electus Zwinner’s *Blumenbuch des H. Lands Palestinae so in Dreij Biecher Getheilet* (München: Wilhelm Schell, 1661). The copperplate engraving shows a Franciscan friar kneeling next to a thorny branch with three big flowers two times his own size, supported from the top by a flying angel (fig. 4). The *Blumenbuch* is manifestly not a florilegium, as this title might suggest, but a history of the Holy Land focused on the rather prominent role of the Franciscan order in that history. Juan de Calahorra likewise characterises the friars as the fruit of good seed sown by St Francis, following Francesco Quaresmio. Guglingen does not

---


114 Electus Zwinner, *Blumenbuch des H. Lands Palestinae so in Dreij Biecher Getheilet* (München: Wilhelm Schell, 1661); Juan de Calahorra, *Chronica de la Provincia de Syria y
explicitly make the same connection as these later sources; his is, at any rate, the first potential reference to St Francis having been in the Holy Land by a Franciscan of the custody of the Holy Land.

Before this date, there had been very few brief comments by Franciscans, which placed Francis in the Holy Land. The first Franciscan ever to suggest Francis was in Jerusalem is Angelo Clarenro (1247-1337). In his *Chronica seu Historia Septem Tribulationem Ordinis Minorum* (1326), he relates his version of Francis’ expedition to the Sultan of Babylon in 1219 within the context of larger history of the Franciscan order written from a Spiritual Franciscan perspective.\(^{115}\) Angelo indicates that Francis and his followers were granted permission by the Sultan to visit the Holy Sepulchre without having to pay tribute, and he concludes the episode with the words “and after a visit to the Sepulchre of the Lord in Jerusalem, Francis returned immediately to the Christian lands.”\(^{116}\) This succinct remark was written down more than a hundred years after the supposed event in 1219, and before the Franciscans were granted a presence at the Holy Places in 1333.

According to John Tolan, Angelo’s assertions may be connected with the, then ongoing, attempts by both Franciscans as well as Dominicans to gain a presence in the Holy Land.\(^{117}\) It is rather difficult to fathom Angelo’s exact reasons for these embellishments to the Life of Francis. However, it does seem that Angelo’s readers did not know what to do with the suggestion that Francis went to Jerusalem, and it was not picked up by anyone until Bartolomeo de Rinonichi da Pisa (1338-1401) included two, again very brief, remarks in his *Liber de Conformitate Vitae Beati Francisci ad Vitam Domini Nostri Jesu Christi* (1385-1390). This book sets out to prove the conformity of St Francis to Christ, but it also contains descriptions of Franciscan houses at the time, one of the reasons for its popularity. Bartolomeo concludes his very concise summing up of the Franciscan *loci* in the Holy Land by remarking there were many exemplary friars in this province, thirty-one of whom were martyred there preaching the faith, but he only mentions one by name:

---


\(^{116}\) “Finally, the sultan ordered that Francis and his brothers should be able to visit the sepulchre of Christ in Jerusalem without paying any tribute.” Translation by David Burr and Randolph E. Daniel, cited in Tolan, *Saint Francis and the Sultan*, 147-8.

“the first friar minor who preached in the Holy Land was the blessed father Francis, when he went to the Sultan with eleven companions.”

Elsewhere, when summing up the pilgrimages Francis undertook, Bartolomeo includes the “Sepulchre of the Lord” in the list. By the time Bartolomeo was writing his Liber, the Franciscan custody of the Holy Land had been established for around half a century, and associating Francis with that custody must have seemed attractive to him, although there were few sources to back up this association.

When Bartolomeo narrates Francis’ expedition to preach to the Sultan, however, he mentions neither the Holy Land (Terra Sancta), Jerusalem, nor any visit to the Holy Sepulchre. He does reflect in this context that “while Francis was overseas, that is to say in the city of Antioch,” an entire monastery of Benedictine monks on the Black Mountain near Antioch converted en groupe to become Franciscans, resigning their property and retaining only their convent buildings. This, according to Bartolomeo demonstrates that Francis was able to preach to and convert both infidels, such as the Sultan, and good Christians alike. Antioch is more than 650 km across the Mediterranean Sea from the whereabouts of Francis in Egypt, and Bartolomeo is not very clear on topography or the chronology of this excursion. He bases it on an older tradition about the conversion of Antiochian Benedictines to Franciscanism, but introduces Francis’ personal agency to the story, albeit somewhat vaguely and tentatively: “it came to pass … that they were all made friars minor.”


120 “Dum in partibus esset ultramarinis b. Franciscus, scilicet in citivate antioche, que tunc a Christianis tenebatur, evenit illud de quo dictum est supra conformitate precedenti quod Monachi de Montana Nigra, que ab Antiochia per octo miliaria distat, una cum abbatie vitam considerando et mores b. Francisci et Sociorum, possessiones omnes monasterii Patriarche resignantes, et locum monasterii solum retinentes, facti sunt omnes fratres Minores; et in dicto loco plura miracula Deus ostendit, ut dictum est. Sic ergo prefatis apparat, quod b.
Later on, this tale of the conversion of the Antioch Benedictines was to be interpreted by some as the first convent of the Franciscan custody of the Holy Land, founded by Francis. That does not seem to be the fish that Bartolomeo is frying here; he is more interested in illustrating Francis’ power of converting just about anyone, not mentioning the *custodia Terrae Sanctae* in this case. Around a century later Mariano da Firenze, prolific chronicler of the Franciscan observance, writing his *Libro delle Vite de Sancti Frati Minorri* around 1480, does make that connection. Mariano bases his account of Francis’ expedition to the Sultan on Bartolomeo’s *Liber*, among other sources. He also includes the conversion of the Benedictines of the Black Mountain near Antioch, but tries to make the timing and itinerary of Francis’ overseas expedition fit a little bit better. Mariano has Francis setting out from Italy first to Crete, then to Acre, and to Antioch, return to Acre, and only from there to sail to Damietta in Egypt to meet the Sultan. Whilst preaching in Antioch, Francis was invited by the Benedictine monks to their Black Mountain, and “finally they all took the habit from his holy hands, and the life of friars minor.”

Mariano goes on to relate that Francis, before sailing to Egypt, also converted a convent in Antioch itself, and in other regions and cities of Syria, and “in this way a new province was made.” Although Mariano does not have Francis travel to Jerusalem, he does still implicitly turn him into the founder of the

---


by then observant Franciscan custody of the Holy Land. Francesco Suriano also briefly refers to again another version of this tradition in the first, 1485, redaction of his *Treatise on the Holy Land*, in conclusion to a description of the city of Antioch:

Near this city is the Black Mountain inhabited by crowds of hermits, full of hermitages and Greek monasteries and those of other nations. It was on this mountain that St. Francis when he left the Sultan to go to Antioch converted all the monks of one monastery and made them Friars and took them with him to Italy.\(^{123}\)

In the later redaction of the text, prepared for press by Francesco Bindoni in 1524, Suriano adds the slightly contradictory afterthought: “and he established the province of Antioch, which produced many holy friars.”\(^{124}\)

In sum, during the late medieval period only Angelo Clarenno and Bartolomeo da Pisa, Franciscans who do not have any close ties with the custody of the Holy Land, very briefly assert that Francis was in the Holy Land, visiting Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulchre. Bartolomeo also introduces Francis as an agent into the tradition about the conversion of the Benedictines of Black Mountain, an innovation which turned out to be very attractive for observant Franciscans such as Mariano da Firenze and Francesco Suriano one century later: this could bring Francis closer to the Holy Land and at the very least suggest the foundation of a province by him there. All in all, these very brief, and by all accounts rare, assertions about St Francis’ supposed presence in the Holy Land or its vicinity, testify that during the late medieval period these posthumously invented hagiographical episodes did not yet play any important role, either in the Franciscan order at large, or for bolstering Franciscan confidence in the Holy Land. Nevertheless, a modest foundation had been laid: a particular outlook on history, for St Francis’ early modern *possessio* of the Holy Land that is subject of chapter four.

### 3.6 Conclusion

With Book VII of his *Treatise on the Holy Land*, Guglingen has composed an innovative text; he was the first friar of the *custodia Terrae Sanctae* to write a history of Jerusalem, place the Franciscan friars firmly on the timeline, and explicitly express hopes for a future Catholic recapture. All of these features

---

can be contextualised by looking at contemporaneous Franciscan concerns. For instance, Guglingen’s characterisation of the Franciscans of the Holy Land as good seed sown into holy ground, may likely be a covert suggestion of St Francis’ role as the founder of the custody there, while Angelo Clareno and Bartolomeo da Pisa had previously placed the saint in Jerusalem, and Mariano da Firenze and Francesco Suriano suggest Francis established a convent in Antioch. His call for Crusade can be connected to the efforts of the custody of the Holy Land to enlist support for the same; Franciscan envoys sent from Jerusalem to further Holy Land Crusade projects were well received at prominent European courts, and their proposals could benefit from an atmosphere of apocalyptic spirituality, that featured the forthcoming recapture of Jerusalem and allotted the Franciscans a quite prominent role in the unfolding of history.

Even though the issues that Guglingen raises, and the solutions he proposes, can certainly be connected to the context in which the Treatise was produced, it is exceptional to find them all united in one text. They are, however, typically part of the thematic programme of later Franciscan Holy Land writing. Rather than claiming that the Treatise is a direct source for these later texts, I intend my analysis and contextualisation of these elements of book VII in this chapter, to serve as a foundation for understanding the claims of early modern Franciscan tracts on the Holy Land, the subject of the following chapter. Early modern Franciscans of the Holy Land could and did draw on this large and diversified reservoir with suggestions of St Francis’ presence in the Holy Land, Crusading fervour, and Franciscan apocalyptic expectations, in order to attempt to explain Islamic rule over Jerusalem and the presence of various religious communities there, to be able expect and argue for Catholic recapture of Jerusalem, and above all claim the Holy Land for the Franciscan order.