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Chapter 4: St Francis’ *possessio* of the Holy Land in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries

In the previous chapter, we saw how book VII of friar Paul Walther von Guglingen’s *Treatise*, and its ideological context at the end of the fifteenth century, signalled some characteristics of what later became a more generally expressed self-assertiveness with regards to the Holy Land among Franciscans. In a sense, Guglingen’s work foreshadowed the character of later Franciscan Holy Land writing, although it would take a while before other Franciscans of the Holy Land adopted a similar historical perspective again, allotted a special role the Franciscans in that narrative, and pushed to hasten a more glorious future. These books did indeed start to appear, during a period of much increased pressure on the Franciscan position in Jerusalem and the Holy Land. In reaction to the increasing insecurity of their position the friars formulated a more outspoken Franciscan claim on, a taking possession of, the Holy Land based on well-defined ideologies during the sixteenth and particularly the seventeenth century.

The beginning of sixteenth century saw Jerusalem’s transition from Mamluk to Ottoman rule, which led to a shifting balance of power and mounting tension between various Christian groups and continual strife. In addition, the Franciscans were evicted from their convent on Mount Sion, their headquarters since the foundation of their custody. Furthermore, the Franciscans perceived the arrival of Jesuits and Capuchins, a new type of Catholic missionary, as a threat as well. In the face of these challenges, the Franciscans sought to legitimise their unique right to be present in the Holy Land by looking back on history, asking to whom the Holy Land had belonged in the past, and whose it should be now. They arrived at answers to these questions for example by re-evaluating the history of the Crusades of the high middle ages, and the Life of St Francis, as well as by looking ahead to the future, in the shape of apocalyptic expectations and calls for renewed Crusade.

In response to this novel, more historical outlook, the writings of the Franciscans of the Holy Land began to increasingly take the shape of histories and treatises, alongside the more traditional travelogues and devotional tracts on the Holy Places. Whereas it been suggested in the past that the calls for Crusade that were uttered in these texts were formulaic and devoid of actual intention, I argue that they were indeed genuinely sincere, and should be read as such. Moreover, reinterpretation of the life of the founding saint became an ever more significant aspect of Franciscan efforts to demonstrate the particular rights of the order in the Holy Land. These arguments were primarily di-
rected at Western European audiences, and formed part of a Catholic internal debate, rather than being aimed at the Ottoman authorities or Eastern Orthodox Christians, as has been suggested by John Tolan. Special attention will be paid to Francesco Quaresmio’s *Elucidatio Historica Theologica et Moralis Terrae Sanctae Elucidatio* (1639), a text that in all respects transformed the way Franciscans of the Holy Land thought about their role in that province. In addition, the role of propheticism, apocalypticism and St Francis’ conformity with Christ as strategies for claiming the Holy Land as a Franciscan territory, will be discussed.

The first section of this chapter sketches the evolving position of the Franciscans in Jerusalem, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with particular attention for the rivalry with Jesuit and Capuchin missionaries, as well as the Greek and Armenian patriarchates. It concludes that although Franciscan Holy Land writing was fostered in this atmosphere of conflict, it was primarily directed at Western European, not Ottoman or Greek, audiences. The second section then traces the development of the increasingly assertive and territorial character of Franciscan tracts on the Holy Land during the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century, and argues for the presence of a sincere Crusading zeal in the texts. The third section is devoted to Francesco Quaresmio’s monumental *Elucidatio* and his *Simulacrum* of the Holy Land, and demonstrates that the most defining feature of this often cited but little studied text is Franciscan Holy Land territoriality. The fourth section then focuses on how Quaresmio, quite influentially, reinterpreted the Life of St Francis, staging an apocryphal pilgrimage-*possessio* to the Holy Land, in order to claim it for the Franciscans. The final section of this chapter explores the importance of prophecy and apocalypticism for buttressing the Franciscan claim to the Holy Land, with particular attention for Diego de Cea’s *Thesaurus Terrae Sanctae* (1639).

4.1 The Franciscans and early Ottoman Jerusalem: Jesuits, Capuchins, and Greeks

The first major historical transformation since Guglingen wrote his *tractatus* in the 1480s is the conquest of Jerusalem by the Ottoman Turks in 1517, after around three centuries of Mamluk rule. Initially, during the reign of Selim I (r. 1517-1520) nothing much changed for the Franciscans, since their position as it had been under the Mamluks was confirmed. Then, when Suleiman I (r. 1520-1566) came to power, things started to take a turn for the worse for the

---

1 Charles A. Frazee, *Catholics and Sultans: The Church and the Ottoman Empire 1453-
Franciscans. On March 18, 1523, Suleiman sent an order to Jerusalem that the Franciscans should be evicted from their church on Mount Sion, since the location held David’s Tomb, a holy location that should be converted for Muslim worship.² This move was part of a wider Ottoman attempt to further Islamise the city of Jerusalem, although the Franciscans put much of the blame on their Jewish neighbours.³ Sometime in 1524, the friars had to retreat to their rooms in the Holy Sepulchre Church and other locations in the city. In 1526, they recovered partial use of their convent, but in the years that followed they were gradually edged out of their possessions on Mount Sion, until in 1551 they were finally expelled. In 1560, Suleiman granted the Franciscans full use of a site that had previously belonged to the Georgian Orthodox: the monastery of St. Saviour.⁴

Apart from the eviction from the cenacle, which stemmed from motivations other than a particular hostility to the Franciscans themselves, the Ottoman authorities did not pursue any specific policy to compromise their position. The perceived threats that fuelled a surge in Franciscan Holy Land writing came overwhelmingly from other Christians, both Catholic and Eastern Orthodox. During the second half of the sixteenth century improved French diplomatic relations with Istanbul could offer the Franciscans some protection as Catholic residents of the empire, but they also spelled unwanted intrusion. The French-Ottoman Capitulations of 1569, 1597, and 1604, the latter promising protection for the “religious who live in Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and other places,” were in the interest of the Franciscans, but they also allowed for the sending of missionaries into Ottoman territories, and when Jesuits and Capuchins entered the missionary stage of the Holy Land, they often did so with help of the French.⁵

Getting a foothold in the Holy Land had been a part of Jesuit ideology from the very inception of the order. In 1523, Ignatius of Loyola travelled to

---

Jerusalem, hoping to start a fulfilling religious life there, but he was forced to leave along with his fellow pilgrims. When in 1540 Ignatius founded the Society of Jesus, the desire for mission to the Holy Land formed part of it. In 1553 this Jesuit hope was backed by papal support in the form of a bull issued by Julius III, which allowed for the establishment of Jesuit schools in Jerusalem, Cyprus, and Istanbul. A scout was sent to the East to explore the possibilities for setting up shop, but the circumstances were unfavourable, not least because the Franciscans were rather protective of their rights in the Holy Land, and no further steps were taken. After a number of less successful attempts, the Jesuits were introduced in Istanbul in 1609 under French protection, although their position was characterised by conflict and insecurity.

During the 1620s, the head of the Jesuit mission in Istanbul, François Canillac, revived the ideal of settling in Jerusalem. Together with his confrère Jérome Queyrot he travelled to Jerusalem in 1615, to stay with the Greek patriarch. This exploration alarmed both the Franciscans and the Venetians, who disliked the idea of French rivalry for protection of the Holy Places. By 1621 the Jesuit general Vitelleschi requested papal approval for a Jesuit residence in the Jerusalem, promising not to displace the Franciscans. These efforts went hand in hand with the French desire to found a consulate in Jerusalem: in 1621 Louis Deshayes de Courmenin arrived in the city suggesting French Jesuits take up residence there too. This outraged not only the Franciscans, but also the Venetians who feared to be displaced by the French. When the new consul Jean Lempereur, who arrived in 1624, again pushed for a Jesuit presence, the Venetians acted: they mobilised the other Christian communities in Jerusalem to speak up in favour of the Franciscans, and finally convinced the Ottoman authorities that the Jesuits were in reality Habsburg spies, which put an end to the story. Whether or not the Jesuits would have really posed a threat to the position of the Franciscans in Jerusalem or elsewhere can be doubted: Jesuit visions of an oecumenical community there seem to have been peaceable.

7 Frazee, Catholics and Sultans, 63, 73, 81-3; Adina Ruiu, “Conflicting Visions of the Jesuit Missions to the Ottoman Empire, 1609–1628,” Journal of Jesuit Studies 1 (2014), 260-280.
9 For Jesuit visions of the Christian oecumene in Jerusalem see Clines, Confessional Politics, 258-270.
When Capuchin missionaries first arrived in the Holy Land in 1626 their intentions seem to have been somewhat more aggressive. The Capuchins, a new branch among the Franciscan orders that emerged early in the sixteenth century, directed their missionary attention to the East a little later than the Jesuits. After a failed attempt to found a mission in Istanbul in 1587, the idea of Capuchin mission in the Levant was only truly revived by the prominent Capuchin friar François Leclerc du Tremblay (1577-1638), also called Père Joseph or éminence grise, along with his friend and ally Cardinal Richelieu (1585-1642), the éminence rouge. Père Joseph was very much driven by a desire for Crusade against the Ottomans, and he used his considerable influence at the French court to try to bring this goal about in the early decades of the seventeenth century. When his Crusade projects did not get off the ground soon enough, Père Joseph also turned his attention to a mission in the East. In 1622, a scout, friar Pacifique de Provins (1588-1648), was sent to explore the possibilities, also passing through Jerusalem on his voyage. The following year Pacifique reported back Pope Gregory XV in Rome as well as his superiors in Paris; it was resolved that Capuchin missionaries would be sent to Aleppo, Alexandria, Armenia, and Istanbul.

This immediately alarmed the observant Franciscans in the Holy Land, who appealed to the newly established Congregation De propaganda fide, under whose direct jurisdiction they were since June 22, 1622 as a missionary territory without a resident bishop. Despite repeated reassurances by Pacifique de Provins and Père Joseph that the Capuchins were not after the observant Franciscan holdings in the Holy Land, rumours and suspicions that they were, remained persistent and are corroborated by some letters written by Capuchin missionaries in the years 1627-8. In response to the turmoil that ensued, De propaganda issued a decree on June 30, 1626 which stated

---

11 Frazee, Catholics and Sultans, 87.
that Capuchin missionaries could only go “where there are no friars minor of the observance” and that they had to show proof of their mission to the observant guardian in Jerusalem, and obtain his permission to carry out their work.\textsuperscript{14}

After the first Capuchin missionaries had been sent out in 1626, on January 16, 1627 Père Joseph expressed his displeasure with the arrangement in a letter to the prefect of De propaganda, since now the observants were simply sending one of their own to spend some time in places where there was no previous foundation, simply to impede Capuchin settlement.\textsuperscript{15} This led to De propaganda issuing a supplementary decree on February 22, 1627, which specified that Capuchins could not settle in cities where the observants had an already established convent, but they could where there was only a small hospice.\textsuperscript{16} The following years the friars fought a legal battle via De propaganda, in which the jurisdiction \textit{in situ} of the Guardian of Jerusalem and the right to perform the sacraments in the Holy Land became increasingly important.\textsuperscript{17} On September 19, 1630, a more or less final ruling was made by De propaganda about the rights and obligations of both parties, largely in favour of the observant Franciscans, although the controversy would now and then flare up again in later decades.\textsuperscript{18}

While the Franciscans of the Holy Land were relatively successful at fending off perceived Catholic threats to their position in Jerusalem and elsewhere in the Holy Land, they had more difficulties with other parties, in particular the Greek patriarchate. In 1630 the Greek patriarch of Jerusalem, Theophanes III (p. 1608-1644), presented some documents to the Ottoman authorities that supposedly proved historical precedent for a much more prominent position of the Greeks at the Holy Places. This action triggered the now centuries-old controversy over Christian ownership and access to the Holy Places. This action triggered the now centuries-old controversy over Christian ownership and access to the Holy Places. Previously, there had been numerous complaints, conflicts and mounting tension, but this was in essence the first all-out attack on the privileged position of the Franciscans, who controlled all the prime locations in the Holy Sepulchre Church as well as the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, even though they were an insignificant group in numeric terms.\textsuperscript{19} The Greek

\textsuperscript{14} “ubi non sunt fratres ordinis Minorum de Obs.” \textit{Acta S. Congregationis}, 39-40.
\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Lettres et Documents de Père Joseph de Paris concernant les Missions Étrangères (1619-1638)}, ed. M. de Vaumas (Lyon: Express, 1942), 65-6.
\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Acta S. Congregationis}, 40.
\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Acta S. Congregationis}, 45-53, 55-57; \textit{Lettres et Documents}, 114-8.
\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Acta S. Congregationis}, 60-2.
\textsuperscript{19} Peri, \textit{Christianity under Islam}, 105-7, cf. 33-7.
patriarchate, which enjoyed a strengthened position under the Ottomans, considered this situation unjust, and soon the Armenians joined in to vie for their piece of the pie. Since the Ottoman authorities were relatively neutral arbiters in this struggle, more than a Christian ruler of any denomination would have been, it could draw on undetermined almost indefinitely.\textsuperscript{20} In the following years some of the Holy Places changed hands numerous times.\textsuperscript{21}

When the Greeks opened the battle for the Holy Places in 1630, they did so presenting a number of knowingly forged historical documents to prove their rights at the Holy Places. Supposedly, the oldest one was a charter granted by Caliph Umar (583-644), the first ever Muslim conqueror of Jerusalem. In addition, they produced documents promising Greek preeminence supposedly granted by the much respected Ottoman Sultan Selim I as well as by his son Suleimans I, the Magnificent. The fact of having been issued by great leaders was supposed to lend these documents overruling authority. The Armenians soon produced documents that mirrored the Greek ones, with as the only difference the promise of the desired rights to the Armenians.\textsuperscript{22} These moves of the Greeks and Armenians, combined with the emergence of Franciscan tracts that increasingly laid claim to the Holy Land, has led John Tolan to remark that: “Greeks and Franciscans battled on the field of history.”\textsuperscript{23} On the basis of the books by Quaresmio, Morone da Maleo, and Juan de Calahorra, Tolan observes that since the Franciscans could go back no further than then life of their founding saint, they based their claims to the Holy Places on the rights St Francis supposedly obtained. Some even claimed St Francis obtained his rights from Sultan Malik al-Kâmil.\textsuperscript{24} These statements can be adjusted, however, because even if the Greeks and fought the Franciscans on the field of history, the Franciscans did not fight back there; rather, they relied on French and Venetian protection in this particular struggle.

Much as the threatened position of the Franciscans in the Holy Land in general may have helped to inspire the more territorial tone of Franciscan Holy Land writing in the seventeenth century; it is not directed at the Greek community there, nor at the Ottoman authorities. In that battle the Franciscans chose another strategy, as Oded Peri observes: “not all of the churches took part in this game. Unlike the zimmi churches, the Franciscan monks had no need of tricks such as forging old Muslim or Ottoman deeds.” This was

\textsuperscript{20} Peri, *Christianity under Islam*, 97-105.
\textsuperscript{21} Peri, *Christianity under Islam*, 105-160; Tolan, *Saint Francis and the Sultan*, 267.
\textsuperscript{22} Peri, *Christianity under Islam*, 128-132.
\textsuperscript{23} Tolan, *Saint Francis and the Sultan*, 267.
\textsuperscript{24} Tolan, *Saint Francis and the Sultan*, 267-272.
because their position at the Holy Places was formally regulated in Capitulations granted to the Venetians as well as the French.\textsuperscript{25} Moreover, the Franciscans could have never presented their historical treatises on the Holy Land to the Ottomans or the Greeks, because this would have seriously compromised their position even more, not least because of the repeated calls for Crusade and the hateful views of Islam as well as Greek orthodoxy they contained.

The historical outlook of these treatises is not at all geared towards communication with the Greeks or the Ottomans, but is directed at other Catholic (missionary) orders, Western European Catholic monarchs, and not least the observant Franciscans themselves. If the Franciscans reinvented history, they did so to construct a cultural memory that served the Franciscan identity in the Holy Land, perhaps to boost morale in the struggle with the Greeks, as well as to summon support from home. Thus, while it seems very reasonable to attribute the flowering of this branch of Franciscan Holy Land writing to growing pressure on the Franciscan position in the Holy Land, these texts were never solely directed at the Greeks. They were printed in Western Europe and directed at Western European audiences, sometimes even including Protestants, but certainly not Greeks and Ottomans. Moreover, their scope goes much beyond proving that Sultan Malik al-Kâmil may have granted certain rights at the Holy Places to St Francis, as will become clear in the following sections.

4.2 Territorial Franciscan Holy Land writing in the seventeenth century

Amplified and persistent insecurity prompted observant Franciscans of the custodia Terrae Sanctae to introduce a number of changes to their texts on the Holy Land during the sixteenth and seventeenth century, both in terms of form and subject matter. While the travelogue remained very much the accepted form for writing about Holy Land, practised by several Franciscans throughout the sixteenth century, as was discussed in the chapter two, increased pressure on the Franciscan position in Jerusalem did eventually lead to change. Already at the end of the fifteenth century, the friars Paul Walther von Guglingen and Francesco Suriano experimented with the form of their Holy Land writing, by exploring the possibilities of the treatise instead of the travelogue, as a form for dealing with this topic. Their experimentations do not seem to have caught on at a wider scale; only from the beginning of the seventeenth century, under augmenting pressure on the Franciscan position, Holy Land writing was increasingly cast in to forms other than the

\textsuperscript{25} Peri, \textit{Christianity under Islam}, 132-133.
travelogue: histories and treatises started to gain more and more currency. The range of subjects that these books deal with also broadened, from the experiences of travel and pilgrimage and descriptions of the Holy Places, to including discussions of the rights of the Franciscans in the *custodia Terrae Sanctae* and how these were being encroached upon by other groups. In the new, territorial vein history started to play a more prominent role: to whom did the Holy Land belong in the past, and if so, whose should it be now or in the future? From this territorial historical perspective, new interpretations of the past - St Francis travelled to the Jerusalem, suggestions for the present i.e. calls for Crusade, and apocalyptic expectations for the future could take shape. The present section traces the development of an ever more territorial strain of Franciscan texts about the Holy Land, with particular attention for the Crusade propaganda they contain.

One of the first stirrings of this new type of Franciscan Holy Land writing, after Guglingen, can be recognised in the work of the Portuguese Franciscan friar Pantaleão d’Aveiro, who travelled to Jerusalem in 1563. He reports his experiences in the shape of a travelogue that went through two subsequent print runs three decades later in Lisbon. In as many as ninety-four chapters Pantaleão describes the successive stages of his journey from embarking at Venice, up to and including his return to the Christian territories of Southern Italy. Within this framework of the travelogue, he takes some space to reflect on the, then quite recent, 1551 eviction of the Franciscans from Mount Sion, seeing a Jewish conspiracy at the root of it all. In another chapter, on the Latins (or observant Franciscans) in Jerusalem, Pantaleão laments the “afflictions and travails” of these friars, who preserve the Holy Places for the entire Catholic faith, for which they have received particular privilege. He then explains that in the days of Pope Martin V, some adversaries of the Franciscans tried to claim their places in the Holy Land, and that at a hearing in the Cathedral of Mantua a sentence was pronounced that declared the friars minor the “true possessors of the Holy Places of the entire Holy Land.” This is a reference to proceedings that took place in Mantua

---

28 Pantaleão de Aveiro, *Itinerario da Terra Sancta* (1593), 84r-84v.
29 “verdadeiros possuidores dos sanctos lugares de toda terra sancta.” Pantaleão de Aveiro, *Itinerario da Terra Sancta* (1593), 85r.
in 1421, which resulted in a papal confirmation of Franciscan possessions in the Holy Land with the issue of the brief *His quae pro ecclesiasticarum personarum* by Martin V on February 14, 1421. Thus, Pantaleão points out, apostolic authority had confirmed their rights at the Holy Sepulcre, Mount Sion, Bethlehem and other places, as did privileges granted by the Ottomans, as well as the backing and support of many Christian monarchs.

These two brief passages take up relatively little space in Pantaleão d’Aveiro’s travelogue. However, they already place the same emphasis on Franciscan rights and possessions being endangered, and express the same concern with highlighting rights granted in the past, as later Franciscan texts would do. The legal proceedings at Mantua in 1421, whose original claimants are unknown - perhaps it even was the friars themselves - were to become a topos almost, to be invoked for the backing of Franciscan rights in the Holy Land in general. In early modern accounts, however, the proceedings are often said to have been instigated by unidentified adversaries of the Franciscans, as is the case with Pantaleão; a reinterpretation that is perhaps more telling of the early modern predicament, than the original inquiry.

In a publication printed around twenty years later, the Spanish friar Blas de Buyza also refers to these proceedings and the bull *His quae pro ecclesiasticarum*, but he does so in a chapter entitled “who holds, inhabits, and possesses the Holy Places in the name of the Holy Roman Catholic church.” By this time, Jesuit attempts to set up a mission in Jerusalem had begun, and this is reflected in the *Relacion Nueva, Verdadera, y Copiosa de los Sagrados Lugares* (1622) by a much more assertive stance on Franciscan rights and privileges in the Holy Land. This text is not a travelogue, but a treatise in five chapters, with very particular attention for the position of the Franciscans in Jerusalem. The second chapter is a short history lesson about the rights of the friars, starting with the observation that the religious of St Francis have held and possessed the Holy Places, with apostolic license, for more than three

31 Pantaleão de Aveiro, *Itinerario da Terra Sancta* (1593), 85r-85v.
33 Blas de Buyza, *Relacion Nueva, Verdadera, y Copiosa, de los Sagrados Lugares de Jerusalen, y Tierrasanta. De las Misericordias Diuinas, que en ellos Resplanden. De los Muchos Trabajos, y Afliciones, que por Conservarlos en Piedad Christiana Padecen los Religiosos del Serapfico Padre San Francisco, que los Habitan, que los Grandes Gastos que Tienen con los Turcos* (Madrid: Widow of Alonso Martin, 1622), 35r-v.
hundred years.\textsuperscript{34}

Blas traces this history back to the rights granted by Sultan al-Nâsir Muhammad in 1333 at the request of Robert of Anjou and Sancha of Majorca, and stresses the importance of the bulls \textit{Gratias agimus} issued by Clement VI in 1342, as well as \textit{His quae pro ecclesiasticarum} by Martin V in 1421. In conclusion he observes that all the greater popes have confirmed Franciscan rights of possession, and the privileges of the father Guardian of Mount Sion, and adds that these documents are preserved in the custody archive.\textsuperscript{35} Although Eastern Orthodox presence is mentioned, Blas does not perceive it as an enormous threat, since, as he says, the Franciscans are in control of all the more important Holy Places, more or less summing up the pre 1630 situation.\textsuperscript{36} He does, however, emphasise the importance of the Franciscans for administering the sacraments and other rites they perform in the Levant, as well as the special privileges of the Guardian in Jerusalem, whom he likens to a bishop.\textsuperscript{37} The sufferings of the Franciscans at the hands of the Ottomans are recounted at length, as well as the disrepair of some of the Holy Places, finally Blas appends a “pious consideration” for faithful Christians, who are sternly reminded to build the house of God, rather than houses for themselves, by assisting the Franciscans and giving alms for repairs in the Holy Places.\textsuperscript{38} Both Pantaleão d’Aveiro and Blas de Buyza dwell at length on rights granted by the pope, who supposedly has divine mandate, rather than on rights granted by temporal authorities, such as the Ottomans or Catholic Monarchs, which receive brief mention only.

Temporal authorities did gradually start to receive more attention in Franciscan Holy Land writing, but then primarily in the role of oppressors or liberators of the friars. Until the last decades of the sixteenth century Ottoman power had remained solid in the Mediterranean, and Christian rulers were on the defensive, trying to negotiate terms, rather than actively wage war. However, a decisive victory over the Turks by the Catholic Holy League at the battle of Lepanto in 1571 marked a turning point, in spirit at the least: now it seemed the Turkish threat might be tackled. Especially during the first de-
cades of the seventeenth century Crusade was back on the agenda of Western European rulers. The authors of the Franciscan custody of the Holy Land were highly attuned to this change in atmosphere, and actively tried to turn it to their best advantage in their publications.

A first example of this can be found with Bernardino Amico’s famous Trattato delle Piante & Immagini de Sacri Edifizi di Terra Santa, a collection of plates with plans and elevations of the buildings found at sacred locations in the Holy Land, based on precise measurements taken by Amico himself during his stay in the Holy Land in the years 1593-6. Amico’s book is innovative in the sense that it brought, what we nowadays would regard as, relatively accurate visual information about these buildings from the Holy Land to Europe for the first time, and its images were widely copied in the century to come. In the dedications to Catholic monarchs of the two subsequent printed editions, Amico ties in with resurgent Crusading zeal at the time. The first edition, which appeared in Rome in 1610, is dedicated to Philip III of Spain (r.1598-1621), and in the dedicatory letter Amico expresses the hope that his book “will be very acceptable to you, since that of Jerusalem is deservedly counted among your other realms.” According to Amico, Philip graces the (nominal) title of King of Jerusalem, which he had inherited, and praises him for emulating the Crusader princes Godfrey of Bouillon and Baldwin I of Jerusalem, with the expulsion of the Moriscos from Spain in 1609.

In the dedication to this first edition, then, the notion of Crusade is suggested only in terms of comparison to Philip’s already pious behaviour. Amico voices a more explicit appeal in the dedicatory letter to the second edition of the book, which came out in Florence in 1619, with engravings by the well-known artist

42 The Moriscos were a community of descendants from Spanish Muslims, who had been forcefully converted to Christianity in 1502.
This augmented Crusading spirit can be explained in relation to the patron of this edition, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, Cosimo II de’Medici (r. 1609-1621), who may have taken the initiative for this reprint himself. Amico opens his dedication relating that while he served at the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem in 1596, he took time to read the *Belli Sacri* by William of Tyre, and was struck by the fact that the First Crusade was instigated by the preaching of Peter the Hermit (ca. 1050-1115). He then confesses that since the position of the friars in Jerusalem is ever more fraught with difficulty, and Mount Sion has been taken from them and is no longer accessible to them or Catholic pilgrims, he wants nothing more than to travel around the world preaching Crusade like Peter the Hermit. However, because he has no gift for that, Amico says he has decided to deploy the talents that he does possess: he drew the images of the Holy Places, hoping to “inflame the intellects and the minds of Catholic princes for the recovery of the Holy Land.” He then concludes his dedication by beseeching Cosimo II, “not without tears of desire,” to take up this cause, expressing the hope that his book will pass on from the Grand Duke’s hands to other Christian princes, and in that case “I will be most certain of what I said above.”

Whether Amico really hoped or believed that his book would unleash a Holy Land Crusade if only it could reach the right circles, is a matter open to debate. Zur Shalev tends to place Amico’s Crusading spirit in of realm of literary themes common to dedicatory letters, observing that “although both of Amico’s patrons actively fought against Islam and the Ottomans, it is hard to imagine that he hoped his images would bring them back to battle.”

---

46  “e, d’accendere, & infiammare gl’intelletti, e le menti de’ Principi Cattolici per l’acquisto di Terra Santa.” Bernardino Amico, *Trattato*, “Al Serenissimo Cosimo Secondo Gran Duca di Toscana,” [no pagination].
47  “Di più, e non senza lagrime desidero, con nuova supplica supplicar l’Altezza Vostra Serenissima di ciò, che si come l’acque correnti per le viscere, e meati della terra prendono qualità dalle minier, doue passano, rese per ciò salutifere, così e non altramente questi Ritratte passando per le sue mani di mandarne à Principi Christiani, che se così sarà, sarò sicurissimo di quanto di sopra dissi.” Bernardino Amico, *Trattato*, “Al Serenissimo Cosimo Secondo Gran Duca di Toscana,” [no pagination].
the case of the first dedication, to Philip II, one might plausibly argue that we are dealing with elegant flattery only. In the case of the dedication to Cosimo II, however, this is less likely, because Amico focusses explicitly his own personal zeal for imitating Peter the Hermit and propagating Crusade. In addition, Amico may have truly hoped something would still come from Grand Duke Cosimo’s alliance with a Druze emir who managed to at least seriously threaten Ottoman control of the Levantine coast in the first decades of the seventeenth century.49

Fakhr al-Din II (1572-1635) rose to considerable power due to the weakness of Ottoman control of the region, and in 1608 was able to attract the support of both the papacy and the Tuscan Medici Dukes, who aimed to benefit from the power vacuum in the Mediterranean after Lepanto, by mounting a Crusade against the Ottomans. When the initiative failed, Fakhr al-Din spent the years 1613-1618 in exile at the courts of Tuscany and Naples, before returning home to office and power. Although all parties were from then on more careful to appease the Ottomans, the emir remained in correspondence with the Tuscan as well as other Western European courts, with continued talk of Crusade until his capture and deportation to Istanbul in 1633.50 The French Franciscan Eugene Roger who claimed personal acquaintance with Fakhr al-Din, made him out to be a descendant of Godfrey of Bouillon and quite a champion for Christianity, the Franciscans in particular, in his La Terre Sainte ou Description Topographique first published in 1646, and reprinted in 1664.51

Thus, although chances that Cosimo II himself would mount a Crusade were perhaps slim in 1619, to Amico they may not have seemed entirely imaginary, especially if his book were to be passed on to other prominent figures. Perhaps he did believe that placing the images of the Holy Places, which he had spent so much time measuring up and drafting, put before the eyes of Catholic monarchs, would give them a clearer sense of the priority of Crusade, upon seeing the Holy Places they stood to gain. However, perhaps the most convincing indication that the desire for Crusade expressed by Amico

49 The Druze faith is a monotheistic Abrahamic religion still practiced in modern day Lebanon that is not associated with either Islam, Christianity, or Judaism.


51 Eugene Roger, La Terre Sainte ou Description Topographique Très-Particuliere des Saints Lieux, & de la Terre de Promission (Paris: Antoine Bertier, 1664), 338-367.
might be real, rather than literary, is that contemporaries such as Pope Paul V (p. 1605-1621), Père Joseph du Tremblay (see above), and many others took the matter very seriously indeed. Only a few years later, in 1626, a fellow Franciscan of the Holy Land, Francesco Quaresmio (1583-1650), published an appeal to Philip IV of Spain (r.1621-1665) that leaves very little room for doubt that it is recovery of the Holy Land he is after, and nothing else, making sincerity on the part of Amico again more conceivable.

This seventy-four page tract by Quaresmio, printed in Jerusalem, the *Ierosolymae Afflictae et Humilitae Deprecatio Philippum IV. Hispaniarum et Novi Orbis Potentiissimum, ac Catholicum Regem*, is a passionate petitioning to Philip to reconquer the Holy Land voiced by Jerusalem personified, a destitute woman. Jerusalem personified as a woman, namely the adulterous wife of God, appears in the Bible books of the Old Testament prophets Hosea, (Deutero-) Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, as well as in Lamentations. The form of an appeal by Jerusalem personified directed at potential Crusaders can be connected to Crusade preaching of the first hour: Robert the Monk’s version of the speech of Urban II at the Council of Clermont in 1095 contains the same, and may likely have influenced Quaresmio. His *Deprecatio* opens with the words: “I would like to address you, my most invincible king and prince,” and Philip IV is implored to listen, even if she, Jerusalem, might seem unworthy of his attention, because she is like a widow: abandoned and

53 Francesco Quaresmio, *Ierosolymae Afflictae et Humilitae Deprecatio Philippum IV. Hispaniarum et Novi Orbis Potentiissimum, ac Catholicum Regem* (Jerusalem: Dat. ex Sanctissimo D.N. IESU CHRISTI Sepulchro, anno Dominicae Incarnationis 1626. in sacratissimo die Parasceue); this print is very rare, the only copy known to me is preserved in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan.
55 “Jerusalem is the navel of the world; the land is fruitful above others, like another paradise of delights. This the Redeemer of the human race has made illustrious by His advent, has beautified by residence, has consecrated by suffering, has redeemed by death, has glorified by burial. This royal city, therefore, situated at the centre of the world, is now held captive by His enemies, and is in subjection to those who do not know God, to the worship of the heathens. She seeks therefore and desires to be liberated, and does not cease to implore you to come to her aid. From you especially she asks succor, because, as we have already said, God has conferred upon you above all nations great glory in arms. Accordingly undertake this journey for the remission of your sins, with the assurance of the imperishable glory of the kingdom of heaven.” Robert the Monk, “Urban and the Crusaders,” trans. Dana C. Munro, in *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History*, vol 1:2 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1895), 6-7.
“trampled upon in the street like dung.” The reason why Quaresmio makes her speak, is to urge Philip to liberate her from her helpless state, in which the Holy Places are being profaned, and she is abandoned by all but the Francis- cans. Philip is sternly reminded that his coat of arms bears the sign of the kings of Jerusalem, and asked how it can be that while Mount Calvary is in the hands of the Turks, “you are indifferent, sleep, and do not think of libera-

The task should not be too difficult; Jerusalem personified points out that God did not place her in a remote corner, but in the middle of the earth, easily reachable from the numerous Mediterranean ports of Philip’s realm. In addition, God gave Philip a good army, so that he would understand he was chosen to liberate Jerusalem. Since Philip is the highest master of the

56 “Vellem te, o mi Rex & Princeps invictissime, alloqui; vellem ante excelsam Catholicam Maiestatem tuam meum miserandum referare statum; vellem coram te Iudice causam meam, an melius dicam, Dei, & tuam simul aperire. Sed dum haec agredi contendo, retrahor, & impellor. Retrahor, inquam, meam vilitatem, & nihilatem, & tuam considerans celsitudinem. Et quaenam ego? Afflicta, tristissimis affecta curis, & desolata IERUSALEM, vidua, vils, & ut infamis a viro suo despecta, & derelicta, puluis, & sinis, & sicut stercus in via concul-
cata. ... ita tu in praesentia, o REX pijssime, ac dilectissime, petitionem vnam parvulam non negabis, & me lugentem a conspectu tuo non reijcies. Et si pauper vidua sim, non auertes faciem tuam a me, nec despicias lacrymas meas, cum vices illius teneas, qui non despicit preces pauperis, & viduae, si effundat loquelam gemitus.” Quaresmio, Ierosolymae Afflictae et Humiliatae Deprecatio, 3-5.

57 Quaresmio, Ierosolymae Afflictae et Humiliatae Deprecatio, 6-12.

58 “Rex potentissimus ex illustissima Austria familia oriundus, Rex Catholicus, Rex Ierusalem es, & totius Terrae Sanctae, Hispaniarum, aliarmunque; vastissimarum regionum, Equitumque; sanctissimi Sepulchri D.N. IESU CHRISTI supremus moderator, & magister. ... Ad haec, non tantum quia Rex es, & Rex potentissimus teneris totis viribus ad mei redemp-
tionem, sed amplius quia es meus REX, REX inquam IERUSALEM, & totius Terrae sanctae, successionem, & haereditate, Summorum Pontificum investitura, & pacifica tituli possessione. ... Et talem te ipsum prodis dum in medio tuorum stemmatum quinque rubeas collocas cruces, insignia Regum, & Praesolum sanctae Ciuitatis, quae vt sol mundum totum suis lucidissimis radijs illuminat, ... Ecce, o REX, gladius Domini, vexillum pretiosum, sacratissimus inquam Calvariae mons, gloriosum Christi Sepulchrum, & alia sancta loca, in quibus mundi salus operata est, mors devicta, & expulsion daemon, ecce potentissimae illae claves, quibus inferni portae clausae sunt, ianuae coeli referatae, ecce salutis nostrae instrumenta, & Salvatoris nostri victoriae gloriosa trophea, ecce vexillum, ecce stemmata tua sunt in potestate hostium Dei, sub inimicorum tuorum tyrannide, in manibus inquam Turcarum, & negligis? &dormis? & de redemptione non cogitas? Exurge, exurge o REX, & iudica causam tuam, causam Dei, libera te ab ingrati animi vitio, libera te, libera Deum a probro & injustitia, eripe frameam tuam, vexillum Dei, & tuum ab inimicis domus tuae.” Quaresmio, Ierosolymae Afflictae et Humiliatae Deprecatio, 19-21.

59 “Denique quemadmodum Omnipotens & sapientissimus Dominus me non in angulo, vel in aliqua muni extremitate constituit, sed mei iecit fundamenta in medio terrae, vt ipsamet
Knights of the Holy Sepulchre, he need only give the order and these knights will take up their swords and join him on a Crusade.\textsuperscript{60}

As the plea progresses, Jerusalem’s voice becomes fainter, and Quaresmio’s own voice seems to emerge more and more, and he does not shy away from harsher words to get his message across. For example, he writes that the Turks can be overheard ridiculing not only the Holy Sepulchre, but also Christian kings, Philip clearly implied, who fail to liberate it.\textsuperscript{61} Moreover, he is not afraid to threaten with eternal damnation in quite explicit terms, if Phillip should fail to perform his duty. Quaresmio emphasises that there is so much to be gained from this mission: the spread of Christendom, evangelisation of the Turks, liberation of the faithful who still live in the Holy Land, and finally the treasures of the Holy Land and the Holy Sepulchre themselves.\textsuperscript{62}

It would mean the salvation of multitudes, but most importantly, it would be

---


\textsuperscript{61} “Et ubique audio infideles Turcas obijcentes, & deridentes Christianos Principes nihilificacere sanctum Domini Sepulcrum, & ipsummet Christum, quem vt verum Deum se adorare dicunt, & propter ipsos blasphematur nomen Domini. Dicunt siquidem Mauri, si Terra ista sancta est Christianorum haereditas, accedant, & illam sibi comparent: si hoc est sepulchrum illius, quem Deum praevidant, quare adeo inglorium relinquunt, & non de manibus hostium eripiant, vt sit gloria?” Quaresmio, \textit{Ierosolymae Afflictae et Humiliatae Deprecatio}, 42.

\textsuperscript{62} Quaresmio, \textit{Ierosolymae Afflictae et Humiliatae Deprecatio}, 36-40, 47, 63-5.
the salvation of Philip’s own soul. Quaresmio is not going to let him off the hook easily, confronting him directly: “And what, I ask you, if you neglect this, will be your excuse to the Supreme Judge?” He wonders how Philip can live comfortably, enjoying his enormous wealth and honours, without his conscience troubling him, since only a fraction of his wealth would be needed for an expedition to recover the Holy Land.

The text then adopts a more apocalyptic tone: Philip would not only be fulfilling his own destiny, but also history itself, in conquering the Holy Land. For this Quaresmio refers to Daniel 2 on several occasions. He specifically cites Daniel 2: 31-46, a biblical passage that often figures in apocalyptic

---

63 “Cum igitur sanctae intendens expeditioni non vnius dumtaxat animae saluti, sed multarum liberationi, quae a dura daemonis premuntur tyrannide, incumbas, & iudicium & iustitiam facias, ut verum Principem decet, nedum tua operies peccata coram Altissimo, nedum liberabis animam tuam a morte, sed in caelesti gloria in eminentissimo throno inter sublimes illos Cherubinorum, & Seraphinorum Choros a Domino collocabitur.” Quaresmio, Ierosoly-mae Afflictiae et Humiliiatiae Deprecatio, 45.

64 “Et quaenam quaeso (si illud neglexeris) erit tua ad supremum Iudicem excusatio?” Quaresmio, Ierosoly-mae Afflictiae et Humiliiatiae Deprecatio, 24. cf. 33-4, 50.


schemes, and was already connected to the legend of the Last World Emperor, for example by Adso of Montier-en-Der (see chapter three). It revolves around a dream of Nebuchadnezzar’s about a statue made of four metals: a golden head, silver chest and arms, bronze belly and thighs, legs made of iron, and feet made of clay and iron. In the dream the statue is then destroyed by a rock that becomes a mountain that fills the earth. Daniel interprets the dream by saying that the parts of the statue signify four kingdoms still to come, and after the destruction will come the fifth and final kingdom of God. Quaresmio explains that the four metals are traditionally identified as the Chaldean, Persian, Greek, and Roman Empires, but that he contends that the feet of iron and clay with signify the Ottoman Empire. He then wonders: who will be the rock to smash the entire statue? While accepted interpretation commonly points to Christ, Quaresmio is convinced that Philip IV is the Imperator Electus to carry out this task, as foretold in Daniel 2:44. Referring to the current

68 “Inter alias coelestes visiones, & reuelationes, quae [Dan. 2. a vers. 31 usque ad 46] in sacra scriptura inveniuntur, belle ad id quod tractamus accommodari potest, quod in cap. 2. Danielis legitur. ... Explicuit hanc mirandam visionem Propheta Daniel, & postea eandum interpretati fuere Sancti Patres, & Ecclesiae Doctores. Sed liceat mihi, o Rex, quia & pa-rens Prophetarum sum, & Doctores genui & ut olim, ita in praesentia de Ierusalem verbum Domini egredi potest. In statua illa ad litteram quatuor orbis Imperia significata fuerunt. In illius capite aureo, ipso Daniele interprete, Imperium Chaldaeorum; in pectore branchijsque argenteis, Imperium Medorum, atque Persarum; in ventre & femoribus aereis, Imperium Graecorum; in tibijs denique ferreis Romanorum Imperium fuit expressum. Ita D. Hier- [D. Hier. in Dan. & alij.] ronymus & communiiter interpretes huius visionis. Ego libenter in tibijs ferreis, & pedibus partim ferreis, partim fictilibus Turcicum, seu Mahumeticum Imperium in- telliggendum arbitror; siquidem, vt pedes sunt extremae corporis partes, ita Imperium hoc alijs succedit Imperijs: ferrum comminuit, & domat omnia, sic Mahumeticum Imperium contrivit omnia haec, & in se absumit, vt hisce oculis non sine lacrymis cerno.” Quaresmio, Ierosoly- 
mae Afflictae et Humiliatae Deprecatio, p. 57-8.
69 “Sed quid significat lapis de monte praecesis sine manibus, qui percussis terreis pedibus, miranda illa & terribili statua ad nihilum redacta, ipse evasit mons magnus, qui replevit totem faciem terrae? An Christum Dominum, qui non humano opere, sed Spiritus sancti operan- te virtute ex MARIA virgine, velut mons magnus ob eminentiam virtutum & sublimitatem sanctitatis, conceptus & in lucem editus fuit, cuius Imperium, alijs contritis Regnis, ad omnes mundi partes se extendit & durabit in aeternum? Ita sane, quoniam ea est communis Do-ctorum interpretatio. ... Sed aliter dicam, o REX, Austriacum & Catholicum Imperium, tuum inquam Regnum, eo lapillo praemunimentum fuisse, & apposite quidem, si illius initium & progressum respicias. Initio siquidem non dices fuisse ad instar parui lapidis & religiosa an-imi humilitate, & temporalis dignitate, sed diuina fauente gratia propagatum adeo, vt vniverso orbi terrem incutere videatur. ... Nam non post multum temporis fuit ille Imperator electus,
weakness of the Ottoman Empire, characterised by insurrections and internal fighting - iron mixed with clay - Quaresmio points out that the opportune moment to attack is now, and his plea is therefore urgent.\(^70\)

In sum, *Ierosolymae Afflictæ et Humilitæ Deprecatio*’s main subject and purpose is to convince Philip IV that, from whatever angle the matter is approached, he has no choice but to mount an expedition and conquer the Holy Land. This text, along with the dedicatory letters to Amico’s *Trattato*, can be contextualised in a new wave of Crusading zeal triggered by political developments during the first decades of the seventeenth century, and we should therefore be careful of dismissing their possibly sincere intent. From this moment onwards calls for Crusade were to become a common feature of Franciscan Holy Land writing, more than a hundred years after Guglingen was the first friar of the Holy Land to broach the matter. As we have seen above, texts by Franciscans of the Holy Land changed character on other scores as well during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Apart from Holy Land travelogues, treatises now became more common, and these texts are more territorial in nature: not only Crusade but also rights of possession granted to the Franciscans by popes and others started to become prominent topics. By the time Quaresmio’s *Deprecatio* was published in 1626, the (perceived) incursions of Jesuit and Capuchin missionaries had only just started, and the fight over the Holy Places with the Greeks and Armenians was not to erupt until four years later. Nonetheless, most of the basic ingredients for the flowering of Franciscan Holy Land writing during the remainder of the seventeenth century were already present, also including more than a hint of an apocalyptic perspective. However, it was not until 1639, when, with the publication of Francesco Quaresmio’s *Historica Theologica et Moralis

---

\(^70\) “Praesertim quod Turcarum vires nunc diminutae sunt; Mahumeticum Imperium in se multipliciter diuisum, & oppugnatum; euanuit, & illorum apparens religio cum iustitia, fundamenta regnorum, & omnia fere bona desierunt. Videturque nunc impleri quod iam de ferreis, & fictilibus pedibus supradictae statuae dixit Propheta Daniel, Mahumetanos isto humano quidem semine vnitos, sed animo discrepantes, sicut ferrum miseric non potest testae: subditi suo Principi rebelles, & ad praesens nonne a rebelli gubernatore tyrannice confundor, & apprimor?” Quaresmio, *Ierosolymae Afflictæ et Humilitæ Deprecatio*, 59-61. 

4.3 Francesco Quaresmio’s *Simulacrum of the Holy Land*

Quaresmio’s *Elucidatio* is in all respects a truly transformative text for Franciscan Holy Land writing, in the sense that all subsequent Franciscan texts on the Holy Land are in some way or other indebted to, or influenced by this text. The author’s acumen is reflected by his career within the Franciscan order. Born at Lodi (Italy) in 1583, Quaremio entered the observant Franciscan convent of Mantua at a young age, becoming a student of theology, philosophy, and canon law, and starting his rise in the ranks of the order, holding posts such as guardian, custos, and provincial minister. In 1616 he first travelled to the Levant, becoming guardian at Aleppo (1616-1618), and later superior and apostolic commissary of the East (1618-9). In 1620 he left for Europe, to return to Jerusalem in 1625, publishing his *Deprecatio* to Philip IV there the following year. In the years 1627-29 he served as papal commissary at Aleppo, reporting back to Rome on the state of the Eastern churches in 1629, and travelling extensively through both Europe and the Levant in the years that followed. From 1637 he served as guardian of the convent of Sant’Angelo in Milan; these years saw the publication of a number of books including the *Elucidatio*, and towards the end of his career (1645-48) Quaresmio held the prominent posts of definitor and procurator general of the order, dying in Milan on October 25, 1650.72

Quaresmio worked on his *Elucidatio* for decades, both during and following his stays in the Holy Land. It is a massive text, consisting of two folio volumes that together count no less than 1938 pages of closely printed text, excluding prefatory material and tables of contents. The *Elucidatio* has more than once been characterised as “monumental,” due to its exhaustive treatment of the sacred geography of the Holy Land, from different angles.73 The encyclopaedic nature of Quaresmio’s *Elucidatio*, very much part of early modern biblical antiquarianism and certainly related to the genre of biblical

---


encyclopaedias, is often said to be focused on the Holy Places specifically.\textsuperscript{74} Zur Shalev also notes “Quaresmio’s efforts at systematic documentation,” and gives a very brief description of the contents of the eight books of the \textit{Elucidatio}.\textsuperscript{75} In addition, he calls it “an authoritative statement,” and a “definitive account” of Christian Holy Land pilgrimage and the Holy Places, associating the text with the decline of \textit{geographia sacra}, as an exhausted field of study.\textsuperscript{76} Adam Beaver cites the \textit{Elucidatio} as an example of the active participation of Franciscan scholars to the debates of early modern \textit{geographia sacra} of the Holy Land, which takes up “defending the traditional localisations of the Holy Places in prose.”\textsuperscript{77}

These characterisations of the \textit{Elucidatio} as an encyclopaedic treatment of the Holy Land and its Holy Places, are incontrovertible, but they also leave some of its most defining features unmentioned. Only few scholars, most notably Bernard Heyberger, acknowledge Quaresmio’s fervent Crusading zeal that is expressed at length, throughout large portions of the book.\textsuperscript{78} Moreover, Heyberger is the only one to remark upon what he calls Quaresmio’s “propheticism,” his “apocalyptic vision of history,” and to recognise

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\item[75] “The first book of the of the first volume of the Elucidatio gives a comprehensive description of the Holy Land (name, divisions, history, size, fertility) and offers reflection on the reasons for Muslim rule over it. The second book supplies a documentary ecclesiastical history, covering papal bulls concerning the Holy Land, form Sylvester II to Gregory XIV. The third book discusses the utility of pilgrimage. The remaining five books, in the second volume, describe the Holy Places in the form of peregrinations to each.” Shalev, \textit{Sacred Words}, 123-5.
\item[76] Shalev, \textit{Sacred Words}, 21, 259.
\item[78] “S’il est partisan d’une croisade, sur laquelle il s’étend très longuement, il doit consacrer de nombreuses pages à exposer, puis à combattre, les thèses défaitistes ou attentistes, fondées sur des arguments théologiques ou réalistes, parmi lesquels figurent la menace d’une attaque de revers des hérétiques, les rivalités entre le princes chrétiens, les difficultés financières et la ruine de peuples.” Heyberger, \textit{Les Chrétiens du Proche-Orient}, 197-8; Beaver, “Scholarly
that his “eschatological perspective” is inextricably linked with his call for Crusade.79

To all this, I would like to still add, and particularly emphasise, another defining feature of the Elucidatio: it is a text written from a Franciscan perspective. This fact has been largely ignored, even though most scholars of course mention that Quaresmio was a Franciscan friar. However, the Franciscan orientation of the Elucidatio goes much beyond the simple fact of its author’s affiliation. In this text, Quaresmio carefully crafts a history, or cultural memory if you will, for the Franciscans of the Holy Land as a group; based upon this memory he then constructs the identity of the Franciscans as keepers and possessors of the Holy Land. The highly territorial intent of the text is clearly aimed at claiming the Holy Land for the Franciscans and turning it into an entirely Franciscan space.

This very territorial perspective on the Holy Land becomes explicitly apparent already on the very first page of the Elucidatio, namely the frontispiece of the book (fig. 1). Even though such pages often functioned as a marketing device in the hands of the printer during the early modern period, it is very clear that in this particular case the frontispiece is an ideological tool entirely in the hands of the author.80 The model and the engraving were executed in 1637 by the successful Antwerp artist Erasmus Quellinus II (1607-1678), a student of Peter Paul Rubens, and a member of his studio in the 1630’s. From 1637 onwards Quellinus had a relatively free hand at designing and engraving several plates and illustrations for Plantin Press, based on Rubens’ instructions.81 In the case of the Elucidatio, Quaresmio must have given very specific instructions either to Rubens or Quellinus directly, so that the visual message of the frontispiece would be unmistakable.

To this end, he has also included a substantial section with the prefatory material of the Elucidatio, following a dedication to Christ, and pre-

---

ceeding the præfatio ad lectorem and approbationes. This section is titled Simulacri Terrae Sanctæ Elucidatio: explanation of the likeness of the Holy Land. The word simulacrum may refer to an image, a representation, or a likeness, and here it specifically points to the frontispiece, which represents Quaresmio’s perspective on the Holy Land. This eighteen-page section calls attention to the frontispiece with the words: “Behold, pious reader, the exemplar of the present state of the Promised Land, behold the likeness of the Holy Land.” Quaresmio has a certain emotive response in mind, because after lamenting the Holy Land has been abandoned by the faithful, and profaned and oppressed by infidels, he suggests: “Do not look at this without tears, and do not contemplate its explanation without sadness of the heart, commiseration, and sorrow of the soul. Oh, cruel spectacle!” Quaresmio cannot imagine anyone to keep from crying, upon “seeing the beloved mother of the faithful, the bride of God, stripped and naked, like on the day she was born [Hosea 2:3].” This refers to the naked woman sitting amongst rubble, in the middle lower register of the title page, with the words posita secundum diem nativitatis suæ (Hosea 2:3) inscribed below. By this reference, Quaresmio invokes the personification of Jerusalem as the adulterous wife of God in Hosea 2, who is eventually fully restored by her husband (Hosea 2:16-25).

In this simulacrurum, then, Quaresmio cultivates the same image of the Holy Land personified by a fallen woman in desperate circumstances, as he did in his Deprecatio directed at Phillip IV in 1626. In fact, bits and pieces the Deprecatio show up ad verbatim in the explication of the Simulacrum. This includes, for example, the reference to Hosea 2, but the vision of the Holy Land Quaremio represents in the Elucidatio is much more articulate. He now aims to historicise this image, first asking his reader to imagine Judea’s

---

82 Quaresmio, Elucidatio, v-xl.
83 “SIMULACRI TERRAE SANCTAE ELUCIDATIO. En, pie Lector, exemplar praesentis status Terræ promissionis, en simulacrum Terræ sanctæ, quæ hisce nostris calamitosis temporibus possidetur; melius dicam, a fidelibus & filiis derelicta, ab infidelibus, a spuriis, ab hostibus capta, tyrannice opprimitor, & turpiter profanatur: ipsum non sine lacrymis inspice; & eius explicationem, non sine cordis tristitia & commiseratione, animique moerore, contemplare. Heu crudеле spectaculum!” Quaresmio, Elucidatio, xiiij.
84 “Et quis non fleat, doloreque non afficiatur, videns dilectam fidelium matrem, Dei sponsam, ..., spoliatam, & nudatam, positam secundum diem nativitatis suae?” Quaresmio, Elucidatio, xiiij.
85 Restoration of the fallen woman, Jerusalem, is not universally expected by the Old Testament prophets, Ezekiel is for example very negative within the context of the marriage metaphor. cf. Galambush, Jerusalem, 86.
86 cf. Quaresmio, Ierosolymae Afflictae et Humiliatae Deprecatio, 6, 9.
first flowering under David and Solomon, and then to reconsider her image following the first Jewish-Roman War (66-73 AD), when the Jewish revolt had been defeated. For this, Quaresmio refers to the image of Judea on so-called *Judaea Capta* coinage, minted by both the Roman emperors Vespasian (r. 69-79) and Titus (r. 79-91) to celebrate and broadcast Roman dominance and victory.⁸⁷ On some of these coins, two of which are illustrated in the *Elucidatio* (fig. 2), Judea is represented as a downcast, but fully dressed, woman; the Romans are civilised rulers according to Quaremio. Nowadays, however, Judea is reduced to nakedness sitting among the rubble of her illustrious past, as we can see on the frontispiece, because the Ottomans are barbarians.⁸⁸ Quaresmio then sets out to further interpret Judea’s nakedness, relying on a profusion of scriptural places, eventually coming to the conclusion that her nakedness is without fault, and she deserves to be rescued from captivity by the Turks.⁸⁹ However, she has been abandoned by all, except a little ‘holy seed’ (Isaiah 6:13) that remains in the Holy Land against the odds: the Franciscan friars, and few other Catholics.⁹⁰

Having explained the image of the naked woman that represents the Holy Land on the frontispiece, Quaresmio now moves on, instructing his reader to “look on the right side of that woman.”⁹¹ It seems that Quellinus, when etching the copperplate, failed to mirror his work, because on the printed page we have to look to the left for the scene Quaresmio refers to. On the frontispiece, we see a man cutting a woman’s body into pieces, which is a reference to Judges 19, in which a Levite divides the body of his concubine, who had been raped to death by Benjamites, in twelve pieces, to be sent out to the twelve tribes of Israel to incite retribution; the Benjamites were duly crushed. Just so, according to Quaresmio, Christian princes should take up arms too,

---

⁹⁰  “Sed quoniam semen sanctum est quod manet in ea, ut docet idem propheta; Franciscanos dico Fratres, & paucos alios Catholicos; conservatur, ne penitus pereat.” Quaresmio, *Elucidatio*, xxij-xxij; cf. the *Deprecatio*: “Et nisi Dominus exercituum reliquisset in me semen, quasi Sodoma funditus destructa essem, & Gomorrhae similis, ut dixit Isaias, semen sanctum & electum, Franciscanos inquam fratres, & paucos alios pios homines, qui ne penitus euertar, & subuertar efficiunt.” Quaresmio, *Ierosolymae Afflictae et Humiliatae Deprecatio* (1626), 12.
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not against just one tribe, “but the entire Muslim people,” who took Judea from Christianity as the Benjamites did the Levite’s concubine.92 “But alas!” Quaresmio exclaims, “There is no one who considers it [Isaiah 57:1],” words that are, as he points out, also inscribed below the scene on the frontispiece: *non est qui recogitet.*93

Quaremio then turns to the scene portrayed to the other side of the naked Judea, which represents how Christian princes do act. It visualises the story told in the Gospel of Luke (Lk 16:19), in which Lazarus begs for the leftovers from a rich man’s table, but he is denied. “Just so our Judea, like another Lazarus, poor, famished, full of wounds and afflictions, and wanting to feed not on the most opulent returns, not on the great riches of Christian Princes, but on the crumbs that fall from those kingly and lavish tables,” but she too is denied, as the inscription below indicates: *et nemo illi dabat,* “and no one gave to her.”94 As long as Catholic monarchs wallow in their riches, but do not lift a finger to save the Holy Land from her predicament, they are unworthy of her, according to Quaresmio. Then he wonders: who does God judge honest and just enough to possess this abandoned land, consecrated with the blood of Christ?95 For the answer to this question Quaresmio refers to the frontispiece again:

Wherefore on both sides you see the holy fathers, and their sons, to whom the ownership of that land was promised and consigned: Abraham and other faithful on the one side, and on the other side our seraphic father St. Francis, and his friars, with hands raised and faces turned up to God, pouring out humble prayers for the salvation of that [land]. Regarding the possession of it promises were given to Abraham and his seed, that is St.

---

92 “Idque, eo potissimum fine, ut intelligerent fideles, & in primis Christianorum Principes, arma se capere debere, ut non dicam de una tribu, sed de tota gente Mahumetica, quae miserandam Iudaeae sponsae Dei desolationem operata est, vindictam sumant, & eam pentitus de medio tollant, ut de Beniamitica aliae fecerunt, propter mortem uxorii illius Liuitae turpiter illatam.” Quaresmio, *Elucidatio*, xxiii.
94 “Ita Juedaea nostra, velut alter Lazarus, pauper, famelica, vulneribus et afflictionibus plena, saturari cupit, non de opulentissimis reditibus, non de magnis divitiis Christianorum principum; sed de micos quae cadunt de illorum regis & lautissimis mensis, ... Sed heu! quis cogitat? ... itaque vere sit illa inscriptio apposita ex Sacro Textu: Et nemo illi dabat.” Quaresmio, *Elucidatio*, xxiii.
Francis, as is said in Galatians 3. To their sons it was indeed given and consigned, that is to the faithful Christians, and especially the Franciscan friars, as, God willing, will be explained elsewhere.96

Thus, on the frontispiece we see standing on pedestals the divinely elected proprietors of the Holy Land: Abraham and his seed, namely St Francis. Both are looking up in supplication to God the Father who sits enthroned above. Their respective ‘sons’ are represented above their heads, Moses conspicuously present on the left, and a few Franciscan friars on the right, all of them are engaged in fervent prayer to God. Quaresmio makes the contents of these prayers explicitly known to his reader; they are all praying for the recovery of the Holy Land in the following manner: “Spare, Lord, spare Thy people, and do not give Thine heritage over to disgrace, etc. Remember the disgrace of Thy servants; and, see, Lord for I am oppressed. Stand up, Lord, judge Thy cause, and similar prayers.”97 These prayers are indicated on the frontispiece below the praying groups, with the words Parce populo tuo and Iudica causam tuam. The goal of these prayers is that punishment will be given to the ungrateful sons, i.e. Christian princes, as well as to the enemies who oppress her. Quaresmio feels certain these prayers are heard, and says God answers from his throne of majesty, saying: “I shall judge,” as can be read below his throne on the frontispiece: ego iudicabo.98

Now that Quaresmio has explained the entire “likeness of the Holy Land” on the frontispiece, he begs his reader consider the image: the suffering of the naked woman, the scenes from Judges 19 and Luke 16, and Abraham and St Francis standing to the sides.99 He particularly stresses that God

96 “Quare hinc inde vides sanctos Patres, & illorum filios, quibus possesio illius Terrae promissa & et tradita fuit: Abraham & fideles alios ex una, & ex altera parte Seraphicum Patrem nostrum sanctum Franciscum, & fratres eius, elevatis manibus, & versis ad Deum vultibus, pro illius salute humiles preces fundentes. De illius enim possesione ABRAHAE DICTAE SUNT PROMISSIONES & SEMINI EIUS, id est S. Francisco, ut dicitur ad Galat. 3 filii vero eorum concessa & tradita, id est fidelibus Christianis, & singulariter Franciscanis Fratribus, ut, Deo favente, alibi explicabitur.” Quaresmio, Elucidatio, xxvij.
98 “Utque de ingratis filiis, qui non operiunt nuditatem matris suae, & de hostibus qui eam consulent, sumat vindictam. Quibus non surdas, sed attentas aures exhibet Dominus, sequi iudicaturum promittit. Ego iudicabo, respondet omnipotens Dominus, in solio Majestatis suae residens.” Quaresmio, Elucidatio, xxvij.
99 “Eadem nunc considera in nostro Terrae Sanctae simulacro: poenam in nuda muliere;
will judge the faithful who transgress, above all monarchs.\textsuperscript{100} The \textit{Simulacri Terrae Sanctae Elucidatio} finally concludes with an appeal to the faithful, princes in particular: “and I cry out to you: have pity at last on your mother, do not confound her face, and cover her nakedness and disgrace.”\textsuperscript{101} Recalling how Noah blessed his sons Sem and Japheth who covered his nakedness, and cursed Cham who spurned it, Quaresmio asserts that likewise God will damn those who have contempt for the nakedness in their mother, the Holy Land.

Again, as was the case with the \textit{Deprecatio}, the impression that Quaresmio is very serious about all of this, is inescapable. No Catholic monarch is being flattered into thinking he might already be a virtuous Crusader here; the \textit{Elucidatio} is dedicated to Christ, instead of any of the defective earthly monarchs, whom Quaresmio earnestly threatens with eternal damnation if they do not act. In addition, he sends out a clear visual, as well as verbal message, namely that the Holy Land belongs to the Franciscans. Franciscan Holy Land territoriality and Crusading zeal are thus defining features of Quaresmio’s \textit{Elucidatio}. The author sets out to fortify his claims in the main text of his book, primarily by significant reinterpretations of history as the following section demonstrates.

### 4.4 Francis’ pilgrimage-possessio of the Holy Land

The frontispiece or \textit{Simulacrum} conspicuously represents Quaresmio’s views on the Holy Land in a nutshell, and it serves as the main point of departure for his book; he elaborates these views extensively, directly in the first book of the \textit{Elucidatio}. This book is meant to introduce his readers to the Holy Land, and Quaresmio duly describes its various names, provinces, the dimensions and qualities based on the scriptures, as well as other authoritative sources, as early modern sacred geographers were wont to do. Yet, besides offering this type of general information, the first book of the \textit{Elucidatio} pays particular attention to who were the inhabitants, and more importantly, the possessors of the Holy Land through time. In this sense, it is reminiscent of the seventh

\textsuperscript{100} Quaresmio, \textit{Elucidatio}, xxvij.

\textsuperscript{101} “Vos, o fideles, demum alloquor, & in primis Christianos Praesules, & inclytos Principes, & universum omnes filios Abrahae & Ierusalem, secundum repromissionem & spiritualuem legem, et inclamo vobis: Miseremini saltem vos matris vestrae, ne confundatasi faciem eius, operite nuditatem & ignominiam eius; ut vos aeternam confusionem, nuditatem male-dictionemque fugatis.” Quaresmio, \textit{Elucidatio}, xxx.
book of Guglingen’s *Treatise*: it looks at the past, to see through whose hands the Holy Land passed, and runs up to the present, discussing the various nations of heretics and infidels living there now, under Muslim rule. Nevertheless, Quaresmio goes further than merely proposing Crusade to remedy the current situation: he also discusses the future of the Holy Land in detail, including the advent of Antichrist and up to final judgement.\textsuperscript{102}

In this first book of the *Elucidatio*, Quaresmio unfolds his rather territorial perspective on the Holy Land. He is the first author of the Franciscan custody of the Holy Land to explicitly reinterpret history in order to unequivocally bring St Francis to the Holy Land, and take possession of it for the Franciscans. Its claims were very influential with all subsequent early modern Franciscan authors of the *custodia*, transforming the face of Franciscan Holy Land writing, while some of its claims have received credence even running up to the present. The *Elucidatio* thus truly represents the act of taking possession, a *possessio*, based on events past. Quaresmio begins with the very beginning by asking who the first possessors of the Holy Land were.\textsuperscript{103} This is quite a tricky question to answer; following the great deluge of Genesis, the world was divided up between the sons of Noah, but the scriptures are not explicit about whose portion included the Promised Land. After a drawn-out discussion, Quaresmio decides on Cham, and his supposed descendants the Canaanites, as the first possessors of the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{104} They could not endure in this role indeterminately, Quaresmio explains, because among other reasons God was displeased with them, but most significantly because sacred history needed to take its course: requiring the Jews, sons of Sem who prefigured the elect, to possess the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{105}

Then follows a very brief, but crucial chapter in the *Elucidatio*: “Promises made by God to some very distinguished men that He would give the Promised Land to the seed of Abraham.”\textsuperscript{106} Citing Genesis 12:7 and 13:14-17,
Quaresmio then states that God promised the Holy Land to the offspring, or literally, seed of Abraham. This is a point he had already referred to in his explanation of the frontispiece or *Simulacrum*, and it forms part of the core of his understanding of the Holy Land. However, before he can develop this point further, Quaresmio has a large time gap to close. He first discusses how God’s promise was fulfilled, describes the Holy Land in more detail, and enumerates the other people that stayed there up to the time of Christ. He then turns to the various nations of faithful and infidels that live there now: Maronites, Greeks, Armenians, Jacobites, Georgians, Copts, Abyssians, Nestorians, Jews and Muslims, along with all their errors. After discussing countless vicissitudes in the history of Palestine, including those of Latin Crusader Kingdom, Quaresmio finally arrives to the chapter in which he proceeds to elaborate his ideas about who are the seed of Abraham: the chapter on St Francis’ pilgrimage to the Holy Land.

By positing this pilgrimage supposedly undertaken by Francis, Quaresmio knew very well that he is treading on dangerous ground. As we saw above, assertions about Francis visiting the Holy Sepulchre are very few and far between throughout the medieval period, and these are not picked up at all by friars of the Holy Land, who did not even seem to have paid much attention to the account of his meeting with the Sultan Malik al-Kâmil in Damietta in 1219. Towards the end of the fifteenth century, the legend about the conversion of the Benedictines of the Black Mountain near Antioch did come to include Francis as the agent of this conversion, which at least allowed for arguing that he founded the Franciscan province of Syria, but this did not bring him much closer to Jerusalem, nor could it very well be presented as a pilgrimage.

Quaresmio, therefore, needs to build up his argument carefully in order to convince. He starts in the most obvious place, the authoritative *Legenda* of Francis’ Life by St Bonaventure, quoting the portions that pertain to the Levant, and discussing Francis’ meeting with Malik al-Kâmil at length.

---


Quaresmio concludes his discussion of this meeting by observing rather abruptly that when Francis felt he could do no more good in Egypt, “he went to the region of Palestine, and travelled through Syria and Galilea,” claiming, spuriously, that this is supported by the *Vita* of St Francis by Thomas of Celano and other ancient order chronicles. Here, Quaresmio is creatively quoting Luke Wadding (1588-1657) without acknowledgement, and misrepresenting his meaning. As this is the point where at least some of his readers are likely to balk, Quaresmio has inserted a heading, “Doubt, and its solution,” directly following this statement. The question is, he resumes, which places did Francis visit in the Levant? He responds that Francis visited Damietta, Cairo, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Sichar, the Samaritan’s well, Nazareth, Mount Tabor, Cana of Galilea, Lake Tiberias, Antioch, and all the other sacred places in the region. By asking: which places did Francis visit? instead of: did he travel to Syria and Palestine at all? Quaresmio is creating an opening for the argument he is about to present.

The first argument to support the undocumented tour proposed by Quaresmio is that, according to him, it would be entirely inconceivable for a man of Francis’ piety not to visit the Holy Places of the Passion while he was in the area, especially since we know he visited so many sacred shrines in Western Europe. Now, a sceptic might object that in Europe Francis had easy access, while overseas this might not be the case. Quaresmio responds that Malik al-Kâmil gave Francis permission to travel around freely, so it must have been as easy as in Spain or Italy, also citing at this point Bartolomeo da Pisa’s *Liber de Conformitate*, which lists the Holy Sepulchre as one of the shrines Francis visited. Again, a sceptic might counter that Francis could not have had enough time to visit all these places, but Quaresmio responds that he

---


must have had around a year, so the time window is not a problem either.\textsuperscript{112}

The overriding argument for Quaresmio, however, is that it was part of God’s divine plan that Francis should see and travel in the Holy Land. When, in Genesis 13:14-17, Abraham is promised the Holy Land, he is encouraged to look at all of it, and walk around it in all directions; Francis therefore had to do the same in Quaresmio’s view: “For what purpose, I ask you, did God want his servant [Francis] to see and traverse that land which his descendants were to obtain later, other than making him understand that he was receiving possession of it for his descendants?”\textsuperscript{113} Thus, since it was part of God’s plan that Francis and his friars, as the seed of Abraham, should have possession of the Holy Land, he simply had to travel there. Quaresmio then perfects his circular reasoning by attributing Bonaventure’s and other early chroniclers’ silence on the subject to “historical licence”: they were mostly interested in demonstrating Francis’ desire for martyrdom, and therefore they did not feel any need to mention other places he visited apart from Damietta.\textsuperscript{114}

With the problem of a lack of early sources and uncertainty about Francis’ presence in the Holy Land out of the way, Quaresmio now turns to reconstructing Francis’ exact route. Fortunately, more recent authors make up for what their more ancient colleagues withhold.\textsuperscript{115} For this Quaresmio returns to Wadding’s \textit{Annales Minorum}, first published in 1625, this time with an acknowledgement, continuing the quotation he broke off a bit too soon (see above), in order to make it seem that Thomas of Celano and other


\textsuperscript{114} “Nec usque adeo est mirandum, quod Seraphicus Bonaventura, vel quicumque alius Historicus ex illis qui non multo post sanctissimi Patris tempora scripserunt, singula loca, ad quae Vir ille sanctus peregrinatus fuit, distincte non expresserit; hoc enim factum est vel licentia historica, vel quia in ista peregrinatione intenderunt illius praecipuum finem explicare, desiderium nimirum moriendi pro Christo.” Quaresmio, \textit{Elucidatio}, vol. I, 159.

early chroniclers confirm Francis went to Palestine.116 Quaresmio cites Wadding quoting a poem about St Francis by the Italian nobleman and scholar Giovanni Francesco Pico della Mirandola (1470–1533), which Wadding had in manuscript.117 This poem is based on Celano’s and other vitae, and it briefly states that after meeting the Sultan in Egypt, Francis travelled to Jerusalem and Syria.118 Based on this poem Wadding vaguely mentions the possibility that Francis, in conjunction with his stay in Egypt, travelled more widely in the region. He also discusses, quite critically, the tradition of the conversion of the Benedictines of the Black Mountain.119 Quaresmio also quotes at length another text, a heroic poem on the Life of Francis by the Venetian observer Franciscan Girolamo Malipiero, published in 1531.120 The portion of the poem that Quaresmio quotes, describes Francis’ itinerary through Rhodos, Cyprus, Jaffa, Rama, Lydda, Emmaus, Jerusalem, the Holy Sepulchre church,

117 This poem has since been lost, it seems. I have not been able to identify it among the works of this author as they are currently known.
118 “LXV. His similibusque prodigiis, & sanctitatis indiciis toto illo anno Franciscus illam Orbis partem, non tam lustravit, quam illustravit. Dolens vero non fuisse messem uberiorem, nec potuisse plenos manipulos in Domini horreum congregare, ascendit in Palestinae regionem, Syriamque, Galilaeam peragravit. Ita Legenda antiqua Thomae Celani, & vetusta Ordinis chronica, quibus cohaeret Illustrissmus heros Joannes Franciscus Picus Mirandolus in eleganti & locuplete de Francisco poëmate apud me in M.S., in quo dum praecipua Francisci gesta describit; iter hoc etiam ita perstringit: ... Niliacis scrutatus sedibus hospes/ Indigus, unde imo captivos carceris antro/ Eriperat, quos pertulerat furor impius olim,/ Cum Saladino Italum robur, dum praelia miscet;/ Pellaeo repetens Solymos, Syriamque rebellem,/ Atque ita per densos pietas accensa maniplos,/ Per cuneos, & per conserta umbonibus arma/ Quaesivit Latiam redimi sine munere pubem.” Luca Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, vol. I, 1291, LXV (1731), 327-8.
Bethlehem, Gaza, and then onto Egypt. Since Pico della Mirandola says that Francis went to Jerusalem after being in Damietta, Quaresmio concludes based on these two poems that Francis must have visited the Holy Land not once but twice.121

Quaresmio’s innovation in all of this is that he valorised the sparse late medieval and early modern suggestions that Francis visited the Holy Land for the Franciscan custody of the Holy Land; he made it into an important hagiographical, as well as historical, episode. For example, his contemporary, the prominent Franciscan scholar Luke Wadding was certainly aware of what some later sources suggested, and he did vaguely consider the possibility of Francis having travelled more widely in the Levant in his Annales Minorum, but he did not have any reasons to be very adamant about proving the worth of these suggestions. Quaresmio, on the contrary, has a clear purpose in mind for St Francis’ pilgrimage to the Holy Land: he went to take possession of the Holy Land for his friars, fulfilling God’s promise to Abraham and his seed. This message, also visualised on the book’s frontispiece, is central to the Elucidatio; by rewriting history to include that Francis travelled to the Holy Land, Quaresmio could lend legitimacy to Franciscan claims there. Quaresmio’s introduction of the pilgrimage-possessio by Francis in the Holy Land came at a time when the Franciscan position there was insecure - Jesuit and Capuchin incursions still fresh in memory, and the struggle over the Holy Places with Greeks ongoing – and it caught on widely in Franciscan literature on the Holy Land.

The Blumenbuch des H. Lands Palestinae (1661) by friar Electus Zwinner, for example, is clearly modelled on Quaresmio’s Elucidatio, providing what seems to be a concise vernacular summery of its main points. The first book of the Blumenbuch gives a description and history of the Holy Land up to Zwinner’s own day, and its two concluding chapters discuss the moment since when the Franciscans have been in the Holy Land, and why no other Catholic orders are allowed to settle there.122 Zwinner explains, with reference to Quaresmio, that this is because Francis personally went to take possession, or “possess”, of the Holy Land, and being the seed of Abraham,

he had to traverse the country as indicated in Genesis 13:14-17. 123 He backs this up with references to Bartolomeo da Pisa, Girolamo Malipiero, G. F. Pico della Mirandola, and above of all Quaresmio. 124

Friar Mariano Morone da Maleo, too, in his *Terra Santa Nuovamente Illustrata* (1669) explains that even though more ancient chronicles do not mention it, Francis was too pious a man not to visit Jerusalem and its Holy Places, citing the same sources. 125 Morone da Maleo’s personal addition to the story is the specification that Francis personally took possession of Mount Sion, and by treading on that hill with his bare feet, thus founding his first convent in the Holy Land. Here, he also makes a point of emphasizing the legal concept of *pedis possessio*, taking possession of a piece of ground by walking on it, defining its bounds. 126 When friar Jacques Goujon published his guide for armchair pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 1670, he too took care to make clear in some preliminary advice to the reader that only the Franciscans of the observance can administer the Holy Land for the Catholic Church, since Francis went to personally take possession of it. 127

The same personal *possessio* by Francis, is the starting point of the chronicle of the Franciscan province of the Holy Land by the Spanish friar Juan de Calahorra published in 1684. Calahorra describes how the Holy Land had been in a miserable state after the loss of Jerusalem to Saladin in 1187, until Francis after visiting Egypt determined to visit Jerusalem, going “like a true Israelite, to take possession of that most Holy Land.” 128

---


126 “Qui dunque giunto il Padre S. Francesco, e posto il piede sul Sacro Monte Sion, prese il possesso die quel sacro Colle, ove ritornatovi con diploma del Soldano, fondò il primo Convento, ...; e se dicono i Legisti, che *possessio nihil aliud est, quam pedum positio*; ponendo il piede Francisco in Terra Santa ne prese il ius,” Morone da Maleo, *Terra Santa*, vol. II, 218.


128 “Iba como verdadero Israelita, à tomar la possession de aquella Santissima Tierra, que la Divina Magestad le tenia prometida (como en el Capítulo siguiente se declara.).” Juan de Calahorra, *Chronica de la Provincia de Syria y Tierra Santa de Jerusalen. Contiene los Progressos que en Ella ha hecho la Religion Serafica, desde el Anno 1219. Hasta el de 1632.*
we can be sure that Francis was indeed meant to take possession, according to Calahorra, is to be found in a vision St Francis had during his earlier stages of conversion, of a building full of weapons signed with crosses. Francis’ first biographer Thomas of Celano explains this episode by saying that Francis would deliver Israel like a new David, while St Bonaventure makes it foretell Francis’ spiritual prowess. Calahorra states instead that with this vision God promised the possession of the Holy Land to Francis.129 Johan Tolan presents this novel interpretation of the vision as an innovation by Calahorra himself. However, Morone da Maleo had already briefly mentioned it fifteen years previously, while the credit for this re-interpretation of the past has to go to Quaresmio, who is indeed cited by both Morone da Maleo and Calahorra.130 In fact, Quaresmio already reinterprets this vision, in somewhat more guarded terms, to signify Franciscan possession of the Holy Land in his 1626 Deprecatio directed at Philip IV, asking: if these pauper religious can do it, why not mighty monarchs like Philip?131 In the Elucidatio, this reinterpretation of Francis’ vision reappears as the first reason why, out of all the Catholic orders, the Franciscans should govern the Holy Land: through this vision God gave the same promise to Francis, as he had given to Abraham previously.132

Calahorra gives a similar spin to the story: since the Holy Land was undoubtedly promised to Francis, he, like Abraham in Genesis 13, needed

---

129 “Que en esta misteriosa vision, y en aquel Palacio maravilloso, adornado de armas y Cruzes, prometiesse el Senor a su siervo Francisco la herencia, y posesion de los santos Lugares, es quanto mi discurso pretende.” Juan de Calahorra, Chronicca, 26.
131 “In palatio illo signo Crucis insignito caelestem Ierusalem significatam fuissetam dandum legitime certantibus, & crucem post IESUM portantibus, fateor, sed eodem simul Ciuitatem hanc tamquam illius caelestis aram vere Crucis insignitis promissam fuissetam nullus negare debet, euentu praesertim considerato. Etenim S. Francisci milites eius videlicet alumnui quod post Christum crucem detulerint, & impigre deferent obtinuerunt, & in dies tenent caelestium palatium, Sanctam inquam Ciuitatem, quod licet vere non possideant, quia nudi nudum Christum imitantes omnem proprietatem penitus abdicant, illi tamen praefecti fuere, & eiusdem regimen & administrationem omni sollicitudine exercent; Etenim a trecentis viginti & amplius annis in medio tribulationum positi laudabiliter loca sancta gubernarunt. Si ergo Christus loca sancta non deseguavit Francisco pro exiguo opere, quod vestes vno pauperi militi dederit, quomodo non dabit tibi pro opere heroico, quod non vnum militem, sed numerosum exercitum instruxeris pro sacri vexilli, & palatij redemptione?” Quaresmio, Ierosolymae Afflictae et Humiliatae Deprecatio, 71-2.
to go take possession of it also according to human law. For this, Francis had to pass from one side of the country to the other, to signify he had taken possession for the future friars of the Holy Land. The legal concept of *pedis possessio*, already brought up before by Morone da Maleo, is implicitly suggested. In the Italian translation of Calahorra’s chronicle, published in 1694, the translator friar Angelico di Milano, interpolates the Latin phrase *possessio fit a pedum positione*, to make this suggestion more explicit. Angelico, superior of the custody of the Holy Land at the time, also includes a visual representation of Francis’ *possessio*, inserted as a frontispiece among the prefatory matter of the Italian version of the Chronicle (fig. 3). This copper plate engraving shows St Francis with two companions on the foreground, tagged with the letter A: “St Francis and his companions setting out to visit the following sacred places.” Their path through the Holy Land is clearly marked out in the landscape, with twenty-four further letter tags identifying the locations visited. This attention for Francis’ specific route, which also receives ample attention in the text of the chronicle, is important because it corroborates *pedis possessio* of the entire Holy Land. With reasonably straightforward visual language, this frontispiece harks back to Quaresmio’s more complex *Simulacrum*: it visualises the Franciscan claim to the Holy Land, as

133 “Dado por assentado, que el Palacio de Cruze, y prometido à Francisco, significasse la dichosa Palestina, ..., facilmente podemos entender, come el venir à visitarla Francisco, no fue tanto por satisfazer à su ardiente devocion, y zelo, quanto por disponerlo assi la providencia divina, para que tomasse la posession de esta Santissima Tierra. Acerca de esto podemos considerar, que para darle [Gen. 13] Dios al Santo Patriarcha Abrahan la possession de la tierra de los Gananeos, aguardò su Magestad à que bolviesse de Egypto, y entonces le dize que vea, y passea la tierra, que le avia prometido para su Prosapia, que fue darle la embestidura; pues segun ensennan las leyes humanas, el pisar, ò ver las cosas, sun modos, conque se dà, ò recibe la posession, de ellas.” Juan de Calahorra, *Chronica*, 27.
134 “A este mode se huuo la Magestad Divina con el Serafico Patriarcha, pues aviendo el facado de su tierra, lo lleva A Egypt y de aqui dispone, que suba à la Palestina, que vea, y passe de Medio dia al Norte toda la tierra, en señal de que le dava su posession (conforme à la promessa, que le avia hecho en la vision referida) para que la gozasse con el tiempo su Religion Serafica.” Juan de Calahorra, *Chronica*, 27.

195
it was first formulated by Quaresmio.

In sum, by rewriting and reinterpreting the Life of St Francis, aided by his reading of Genesis 13, Quaresmio uses the, reinvented, past to strengthen the Franciscan claim to the Holy Land. Instead of asking whether Francis went to the Holy Land, he asks the more open question: which places did Francis visit? This question was answerable on the basis of recent literary sources: the poems by Giovanni Francesco Pico della Mirandola and Girolamo Malipiero. Moreover, by giving Francis’ supposed Holy Land pilgrimage a purpose and meaning: possessio of a divinely appointed heritage, Quaresmio turned what had been marginal hagiographical speculation into accepted, and much repeated, Franciscan order history. Although the initial territorial aspirations of this pilgrimage are often downplayed nowadays, the belief that Francis travelled to the Holy Land has survived. This is accepted by notable scholars of custody of the Holy Land such as friar Girolamo Golubovich as well as others, even though their arguments, that can in part be traced back to Quaresmio, have been deconstructed for example by friar Giulio Basetti-Sani.137

4.5 Prophecy, conformity, and apocalypticism

The same year that Quaresmio’s Elucidatio appeared, another colossal book dealing with the Franciscan claim to the Holy Land was published: Diego de Cea’s Thesaurus Terrae Sanctae quem Seraphica Minorum Religio de Observantia inter Infideles, per Trecentos & Amplius Annos Religiose Custodit Fideliterque Administrat (1639).138 This book has received much less attention in modern scholarship than Quaresmio’s, despite the fact that it too influenced how observant Franciscans formulated their claim to the Holy Land. De Cea (ca. 1600?- ca. 1650?), a Spanish Franciscan observant, became commissary general of the order at the Roman Curia in the beginning of the 1630s. He


138 Didacus (Diego) de Cea, Thesaurus Terrae Sanctae quem Seraphica Minorum Religio de Observantia inter Infideles, per Trecentos & Amplius Annos Religiose Custodit Fideliterque Administrat, 2 vols (Rome: Typis S. Congreg. de Fide Propaganda, 1639).
was a prolific author, and after publishing a number of sermons in Seville in the years 1620-1633, he went on to publish more books in Rome from 1634 onwards. The latter ones include a work on the *Archieologia Sacra* of the Apostles Peter and Paul published in 1636, as well as the *Thesaurus Terrae Sanctae* in 1639.

As with the *Deprecatio* and the *Elucidatio*, the *Thesaurus* too cannot be seen separately from Jesuit and especially Capuchin attempts to gain a presence in the Holy Land, the resulting conflicts with the observant Franciscans, and the arbitration thereof by *De propaganda fide*. The book was published by the printing press of *De propaganda*, and is dedicated to the cardinals of *De propaganda*. Moreover, in the preface to the reader De Cea says the labours of writing this book were amply rewarded, because he was able to prove that only the observant Franciscans are worthy of guarding the Holy Places, and *De propaganda* had now confirmed their possession of this right. Whether De Cea had indeed played such an instrumental role in this process is difficult to say within the scope of the present investigation, but it is clear the *Thesaurus* is a celebration of the reconfirmed rights of the observant Franciscans in the Holy Land, as opposed to other orders. In the *Thesaurus*, De Cea takes a different approach than Quaresmio does to cement the position of the Franciscans: instead of interpreting St Francis’s supposed pilgrimage to the Holy Land as a *possessio*, he relies on prophecy and proving Francis’s similarity to Christ.

The book opens with the assertion that St Francis and his order have a divinely appointed right to administer the Holy Land, to live among Muslims, and convert them to Christianity. De Cea briefly mentions that St Francis

---

142  “LIBER PRIMUS. SERAPHICUS P. FRANCISCUS, & religio per ipsum fundata, ius obtinens ex ordinatione divina, ut thesaurum sanctorum locorum Hierosolymae custodiant,
undoubtedly saw the Holy Places when he went overseas to preach to Malik al-Kâmil in Damietta. Francis converted him, and therefore also obtained the right to be protector (custos) of the Holy Land to himself, and his order. Before demonstrating this claim in more depth, the author first offers a very brief description of the Holy Land that concludes with the observant Franciscans being the rightful heirs to the country since the passion of Christ. For De Cea’s argument Francis’ presence in the Holy Land is of some importance, but not in order to take possession as the seed of Abraham, but as a perfection of Francis’ conformity to Christ. As the best imitators of Christ, and heirs to his poverty, St Francis and his friars must be rightful owners of the Holy Land. The following brief description and history of Jerusalem, again concludes with the observation that the friars minor of the observance are the “spiritual possessors of the Holy Land” because of their poverty and evangelic life in imitation of Christ and St Francis, and they have guarded the Holy Places for over three hundred years. Further on, De Cea cites the bull Gratias Agimus, issued by Pope Clement VI in 1342, which officially sanctions the Franciscan presence in the Holy Land; based on this he asserts that

143  “Palaestinam penetravit Franciscus, Damiate se tenuit, loca sancta invistit, (haud dubium, quod ordinante Deo id fecerit) Saracenis Mahumeti sectatoribus praedicavit, eorum Principem Sultanum ad Christianam fidem pertraxit: unde ius ipsi quësitum, ut thesauri in Terra sancta absconditi custos fieret, quod in filios transfudit, ... .” Diego de Cea, Thesaurus Terrae Sanctae, vol. I, 1.

144  De Cea even attributes the sanctity of some of the Holy Places to contact with St Francis’ naked feet. “& loca illa olim sancta; quia Christi pedibus sanctificata, aliqualem etiam spirant sanctitatem, quam a S. Francisci nudis pedibus illac deambulantibus hauserunt. ... Quidni de Seraphico parente meo Francisco opinabor, quod terram illam Christi præsentia olim sanctificatum suo aspectu, & incolatu, quomodolobet sanctam etiam reddiderit? Utpote qui Salvatoris nosti imago, ipsius virtutem, & sanctitatem spirabat. Et quidquid in terram ad Francisci introitum refundebatur, totum id a Christi imagine, & similitudine erat mutatum.” Diego de Cea, Thesaurus Terrae Sanctae, vol. I, 9.


the Franciscans are the only order to enjoy this privilege, within the context of his discussion of the first Franciscan convent of the Franciscans on Mount Sion.\footnote{147}

Like Quaresmio in both the \textit{Deprecatio} and \textit{Elucidatio}, De Cea allows Jerusalem personified to voice a lament, begging for salvation from her predicament.\footnote{148} However, this complaint is not geared towards calling for a Crusade, because Jerusalem’s plea was actually heard: St Francis and his friars have dried her tears and ended her disgrace.\footnote{149} This outcome is not at all surprising, De Cea explains in the fifth chapter of his book, because it was divine providence that Francis was to become the \textit{possessor novus} of the Holy Land.\footnote{150} Here, we start to approach the core of De Cea’s argument: when the Holy Land fell into the hands of the Saracens, and the church was assailed by heretics at home, God sent St Dominic and St Francis to put matters right. This is a relatively common interpretation of the prophecies of Joachim of Fiore that had been current since the middle ages (see chapter three). De Cea cites two sixteenth-century authors to this effect: Cornelio Musso (\textit{Conciones Evangelorum}, 1594), and Tommaso Bozio (\textit{De Signis Ecclesia Dei}, 1591).\footnote{151} Of the two saints, St Francis was the one especially elected to save the Holy Land, and to convert Muslims, as we can understand from his expedition to...
go preach to the Sultan in Damietta, and his visit to the Holy Land, according to De Cea.\textsuperscript{152} He then draws attention to the year of Francis’s birth in 1182, and the loss of Jerusalem to Saladin in 1187.\textsuperscript{153} Thus, much like the timely arrival of St Ignatius of Loyola and his Jesuits to tackle the Lutheran threat, Francis was sent by divine providence, at the right moment in history, to save the Holy Places from the Saracens, and convert the latter ones to Christianity.\textsuperscript{154}

De Cea then spends some two hundred pages on proving this particular role of Francis in history. For this, he first turns to prophecy.\textsuperscript{155} Many have predicted Francis’ role as \textit{Terrae Sanctae mysticus reparator}, De Cea says, and he will discuss the most important ones.\textsuperscript{156} First, he discusses how St Francis was foretold in the Apocalypse of St John by the figure of an Angel (Apoc. 7:2), as St Bonaventure had already confirmed.\textsuperscript{157} De Cea also cites Bartolomeo da Pisa’s \textit{Liber de Conformitate} to make this point, which moves his discussion in to the realm of the Franciscan Joachite Apocalyptic, and adds that Apocalypse also foretells Francis’ mission to the Muslims.\textsuperscript{158} He then turns to a prophecy from the Book of Haggai (520 BC), one of the Minor Prophets of the Hebrew Bible, that he interprets as signifying that God

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{152} Diego de Cea, \textit{Thesaurus Terrae Sanctae}, vol. I, 38-46.
\textsuperscript{154} “Pari etiam providentia S. Ignatium mirabili conversione e saeculo traduxit, & Societatis Iesu fundatorem instituit, quo tempore Lutherus totum pene Aquilonem haeretica pravitate labefecit; ... Quidni de S. Francisco, eandem cogitabimus Dei providentiam: Et Ecclesiae suae a Christo datum sentiemus? ut Passionis suae monumenta de manu Saracenorum eriparet, & Mahumetii sectatores ad fidem pertraheret.” Diego de Cea, \textit{Thesaurus Terrae Sanctae}, vol. I, 48.
\textsuperscript{156} “Novum, & insolitum in Ecclesia futurum erat sanctitatis prodigium Magnus ille Franciscus, Terrae sanctae mysticus reparator. Quid igitur mirum ut Prophetarum ore ipsius nativitas praedicaretur, & tot signis, ac figuris delineatus existeret; ... Plurima proferuntur, ex quibus praecipua haec proponam, divisimque explicabo.” Diego de Cea, \textit{Thesaurus Terrae Sanctae}, vol. I, 51-2.
\textsuperscript{157} “Dilectissimus Christi discipulus, cuius oculus amore illuminatus caeteris acutius intuebatur, Franciscum Magistri sui similitudinem in Angelo delineatum praevidit, futurumque agnovit. \textit{Vidi} (inquit) \textit{alterum Angelum ascendentem ab ortu solis, habentem signum Dei vivi.} S. Bonaventura in hoc Angelo expressum agnovit S. Franciscum, & prophetiam de illo literaliter intelligendum scripsit.” Diego de Cea, \textit{Thesaurus Terrae Sanctae}, vol. I, 52
\end{footnotesize}
gave Francis to the Church, to reform it, preach to the Saracens, and restore
the Holy Places. De Cea cites more prophecies, such as those in Zacharia-
as 11:7 and the Erythrean Sibyl, commonly taken to prefigure the advent of
the mendicant orders, and in the latter case to take on a horrible beast from
the East: Muhammad. De Cea concludes by citing a long passage from
Joachim of Fiore’s Book of Concordances, which he seems to have copied
from Luca Wadding’s Annales Minorum. An earlier version of this passage
also appears in Bartolomeo da Pisa’s Liber de Conformitate, and has been
identified as a Franciscan interpolation in Joachim’s Book of Concordances
by Marjory Reeves. It prophecies that the Dominicans and Franciscans,
implied rather obviously, will take on the forces of the Antichrist in the final
age. The Franciscans, identified as the Ordo Minorum, will preach the gospel
throughout the world, but especially in the Levant, opposing the Muslims and
converting multitudes in the final days. Based on these prophecies then,
we can understand that Franciscans were always destined to govern the Holy
Land and preach to Muslims, according to De Cea.

The second argument for the exceptional Franciscan right to the Holy
Land that De Cea defends in his book is Francis’s similarity or conformity
to Christ. The seventh and longest chapter of his book is titled: “St Francis’
birth, life, and death express greater similarity to Christ than those of the other
saints: he therefore obtained a greater right to inhabit the Holy Places, which

159 “Aggaeus Prophetæ cap. 2. ad illa verba. In die illa dicit Dominus exercituum, assumam
tes Zerobabel serve meus, dicit Dominus & ponam te quasi signaculum, quia te elegi, dicit
Dominus exercituum. ... Vel, in die illa, adde faustissima, in qua Deus S. Franciscum dedit
Ecclesiae, morum reformatorem, Saracenis praedicatorem, locorum Terrae Sanctae restaura-
torem: quinimo totius Orbis Magistrum.” Diego de Cea, Thesaurus Terrae Sanctae, vol. I,
54-6.
161 Diego de Cea, Thesaurus Terrae Sanctae, vol. I, 75; Luca Wadding, Annales Minorum,
162 Bartolomeo da Pisa, Liber de Conformitate, ed. Analecta Franciscana, IV, 53-4;
Reeves, The Influence of Prophecy, 182.
163 “Erunt, inquit, duo viri, unus hinc, alius inde, qui duo Ordines interpretantur: Unus Ita-
lus, & alter Hispanus. Et post ipsos duos ordines veniet alter Ordo saccis vestitus, sub cuius
tempore apparebit filius iniquitatis, qui dicitur Antichristus. ... Futurum est enim ut Ordo
Minorum viriliter se opponat contra mortis Angelum, & contra eum praedicando, plures,
& maxima multitudine de filiis ipsius Ordinis martyri ad Dominum transibit ... Gaudebunt
in Canticis suis, idest in praedicatione omnes tribus terrae: Et gens immunda Mahumetica,
quae remanabit: Et hi qui residui erunt ad Dominum convertentur.” Diego de Cea, Thesaurus
the Redeemer of mankind has consecrated with His birth, life, and death.”164 Eighteen sub-sections then discuss the outstanding parallels between the lives of St Francis and Christ. For this chapter, De Cea could rely on the existing medieval tradition of seeing Francis as the *alter Christus* and similar parallelism influentially codified in for example Bartolomeo da Pisa’s *Liber de Conformitate* (see chapter six).165 One hundred and twenty-five pages later, De Cea concludes that based on similarity to Christ, Francis, much more that other saints, is the spiritual possessor of the Holy Places.166 He argues that no one can be considered a brother to Christ as much as Francis, because of the discussed similarities; therefore, Francis can be said to have inherited the Holy Land from Christ through a fraternal right.167 Not only the papacy and *De propaganda fide* have confirmed this Franciscan right of possession, but also the Dominicans are on their side, as is testified by a long quotation from *Vox Turturis* (1625) by Domenico Gravina (1573-1643), a Sicilian Dominican theologian, which concludes De Cea’s chapter.168

After having thus argued for the Franciscan right of possession to the Holy Land, as opposed to other Catholic orders, based on prophecy and con-


167 “Nemo tamen (audeo dicere) tam Christi frater extitit, quam Franciscus; nullus Christo coniunctior, nullus maiorem cum illo similitudinem retulit. ... Quid mirum, ut speciali ratione Christi fratre appellaverim, & ipsum Christi Sponsam Terram Sanctam, & vrbem Hierusalem sponso viduatam, iure fraternitas obtenturum esse mihi persuaserim? ... Christi frater erat Franciscus, aetate & possessione minor, ipsi tamen per amoris transformationem coniunctior, ac similior: ... Ergo iure fraternitatis, ob quam B. Franciscus prae caeteris Christo coniunctior, & similior extitit, Terrae Sanctae possessor ei debita videbatur.” Diego de Cea, *Thesaurus Terrae Sanctae*, vol. I, 203-4.

168 “Plures huius possessionis obtinendae rationes supersunt; & alij fines respiciendi a Sede Apostolica, & Sacra Congregazione de Propaganda Fide considerati inferius proponentur; quibus stabilitum adhuc sanctorum locorum ius, Minoritis quasi hereditarium esse comprobatur. Favet possessioni a nostratibus obtentae viri eruditissimi ex. sac. Ordine S Dominici iudicium: Nam in libro, cui titulus est *Vox Turturis*, ... .” Diego de Cea, *Thesaurus Terrae Sanctae*, vol. I, 205; Gravina’s *Vox Turturis* is a polemic written in response to Roberto Bellarmino’s *De Gemiti Columbae* (1617) which criticises Catholic religious orders.
formity with Christ, De Cea has made his main point, although he still goes on to discuss the finesses of, for example, the deceit of the Greeks, while book II deals with all the privileges, customs, rules, and regulations of the *custodia Terrae Sanctae*. De Cea’s argument for the Franciscan right to the Holy Land was apparently acceptable enough to the Cardinals of *De propaganda fide* to be printed by the press of that missionary congregation. De Cea’s text was also picked up by later Franciscan authors connected to the Franciscan *custodia Terrae Sanctae*. For example, Bernardinus Surius, a Recollect friar from the Low Countries, cites De Cea in his books on the Holy Land. In a chapter on the foreign nations in the Holy Land, Surius observes that the Latins in Jerusalem can only be represented by the Franciscans, and no other order, because of the will of God and the authority of Rome. Surius then echoes De Cea by observing that the Franciscans were meant to possess the treasures of the Holy Places, and summarises his main prophecy-based arguments: St Francis was sent by divine providence at the very moment that the Holy Land fell into the hands of the Saracens, just like St Ignatius of Loyola appeared on the eve of the Reformation, also commenting on the role of Francis and Dominic in history as supposedly prophesied by Joachim of Fiore.169

In the following chapter, on the progress of St Francis in the Holy Land, Surius briefly mentions Francis’ pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and his foundation of the first Franciscan convent near Antioch, based on the tradition concerning the Benedictines of the Black Mountain, and concludes the Franciscan are the “true heirs” of the Holy Land. To this he adds the very same quotation from Domenico Gravina’s *Vox Turturis* as used by De Cea, translating its claim into Dutch, opening with “Rightfully God has chosen the friars minor for the Holy Land.”170 Nevertheless, Surius laments, some religious of other orders have tried to gain a presence in the Holy Land; fortunately, this was prevented by *De propaganda fide*, as was well recorded in De Cea’s *Thesaurus*: this the only direct reference Surius gives.171

169  Surius, *Den Godvrouwighen Pelgrim* (1665), Book I, Cap. XXXIV, 153-7; This popular text was first published in 1650. Bernardinus Surius, *Den Godvrouwighen Pelgrim ofte Ierusalemse Reyse* (Brussels: Ian Mommaert, 1650); I refer to the 4th edition of 1665, since it is more readily available for consultation, on Google Books.
another Recollect friar from the Low Countries whose text is dependent on Surius’, likewise observes that divine providence has instated the Franciscans in Jerusalem. He also cites, in Dutch translation, another passage from Gravina’s *Vox Turturis*, which was cited in two bits by De Cea. Calahorra also cites the same passage from Gravina, as proof of Quaresmio’s interpretation of the vision of the palace signed with crosses, but this reference is more likely independent from De Cea’s text.

Apart from De Cea’s pleas for Franciscan possession of the Holy Land, which is entirely based on prophecy and conformity with Christ, other Franciscan authors connected to the custody of the Holy Land here and there invoke prophecies to prove the same point. Juan de Calahorra asserts that the Franciscan role in the Holy Land was foretold in Isaiah 26, as well as by Sophonias (Zephaniah), another Old Testament prophet, concluding that these prophecies cannot be denied. Mariano Morone da Maleo too refers to a number of prophecies, including the Apocalypse of St John (Apoc. 7:3), as well as the Franciscan interpolation in Joachim of Fiore’s *Book of Concordances* that also appears in De Cea’s text, but Morone’s quotation seems to be dependent on Bartolomeo da Pisa’s *Liber de Conformitate*, not Wadding’s version of it. All of these prophecies and the associated interpretations, cited by both Calahorra and Morone da Maleo, are clearly dependent on Quaresmio’s defence of the Franciscans as the only Catholic order fit to guard the Holy Land. Quaresmio’s argument is not only based on the promises to Abraham, renewed to Francis in the Vision of the palace with crosses, but also on the role of the Franciscans as apocalyptic missionaries to the Muslims as prophesied in the Apocalypse of St John and the aforesaid interpolation to the


173 “Que la Tierra Sant sea el Palacio, y Casa de Dios, no es inteligencia que se debe à mi sicurso, sino al de un escritor Dominico, que dize de este modo: Por ser la Tierra Santa el Palacio, ó Casa de Dios y la puerta del Cielo, fue congruente, que escogiesse su Magestad para su guarda, y custodia los Religiosos Seraficos.” Juan de Calahorra, *Chronica*, 26; Gravina does not refer to this particular vision anywhere, but bases his phrasing on biblical characterisations of the Holy Land (Gen 28: 17).


Book of Concordances found in Bartolomeo’s Liber de Conformitate.\textsuperscript{176}

In addition, Quaresmio also briefly invokes St Francis’s exceptional conformity with Christ, but he dwells more on Franciscan poverty making the order fit for the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{177} In the first place because one has to be able to be content with very little comfort there, but more so because Franciscan poverty can make up for what was lacking in the clergy of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, failings that contributed to the loss of that kingdom and the conquests of Saladin. This is exactly the same argument as the one made by Guglingen in book VII of his \textit{Treatise} on the Holy Land, which presents the Franciscans as filling the gap left by the Latin clergy of the Crusader Kingdom, opening the door to a renewed Crusade with a decent chance of success this time (see chapter three). Whereas Guglingen solely relies on his reading of Jacque de Vitry’s \textit{Historia Orientalis} to make this point, Quaresmio also refers to Vitry’s \textit{Historia Occidentalis}, and Marino Sanudo the Elder’s (ca. 1260-1338) \textit{Liber Secretorum Fidelium Crucis} before concluding that no one comes closer to the poverty of Christ and the Apostles than the Franciscans; therefore, they should govern the Holy Places.\textsuperscript{178} Finally, Quaresmio argues that the Franciscans own the Holy Land through a heredity right, because a number of Catholic kings of Jerusalem took the Franciscan habit as tertiarys.\textsuperscript{179}

Prophecy and conformity with Christ play a minor role in Quaresmio’s \textit{Elucidatio} in comparison to De Cea’s \textit{Thesaurus}. It seems, however, that Quaresmio picks up where De Cea leaves off; the latter interprets prophecies made in the past in order to prove the propriety of the current situation: the Franciscans as the sole Catholic representatives in Jerusalem, while Quaresmio uses prophecy for outlining what is still to come, especially concerning the imminent end: he gives a truly apocalyptic perspective on the Holy Land, as has been pointed out by Bernard Heyberger.\textsuperscript{180} Quaresmio analyses at length why God permits schismatics, heretics, and infidels to be present in the Holy Land, whether or not Muhammad was the Antichrist (he

\begin{footnotes}
\item[178] Quaresmio, \textit{Elucidatio}, vol. I, 204-5.
\item[179] These kings are John of Brienne (ca. 1170-1237), Robert of Anjou (1277-1343), Liou IX of France (1241-1270), and Philip III of Spain (1578-1621). Quaresmio, \textit{Elucidatio}, vol. I, 205-6.
\end{footnotes}
is not), and discusses prophecies of his advent.181 Engaging with the prophecies about Christian liberation of the Holy Land, mostly from De Antichristo: Libri Undecim (1604) by the Spanish Dominican Thomas Malvenda, Quaresmio finally concludes that it is likely that the Holy Land will be liberated by a Spanish monarch of the house of Habsburgs, just like he had argued in his Deprecatio in 1626.182 However, contrary to Malvenda, Quaresmio fears that the Holy Land will not have been liberated by the time of the advent of the Antichrist, and that this is at least partly to blame on the inertia of the Catholic princes in question.183 In Quaresmio’s discussions on the liberation of the Holy Land, apocalyptic conversion, and a future reign of peace after victory over the Antichrist, the Franciscans of Mount Sion figure surprisingly little, almost not at all.184 The author seems to situate their role in the present, guarding the Holy Places until Catholic princes finally get up the nerve to mount a new and final Crusade: the subject of how to organise this Crusade is then elaborately discussed in book II of the Elucidatio.185

To recapitulate, Diego de Cea uses both prophecy and Francis’ conformity with Christ to prove his point that the Holy Land belongs to the Franciscans. He believes that, as the followers of the most perfect imitator of Christ, namely St Francis, the Franciscans have inherited the Holy Land via him from Christ by a fraternal right. Moreover, de Cea discusses numerous prophecies that he interprets as foretelling Francis’ advent at the opportune moment in history in order to save and guard the Holy Places. De Cea’s ideas received the approval of the missionary congregation de propaganda fide, and were taken over by a number of his confrères. Independently from his particular brand of Franciscan propheticism with regards to the Holy Land, other friars of the Holy Land also had recourse to such arguments in their writing, most notably Francesco Quaresmio, who has a decidedly apocalyptic outlook.

184 An exception occurs when Quaresmio briefly cites a prophecy by the Erythrean Sibyl from Bartolomeo da Pisa’s Liber de Conformitate, in the St Francis and St Dominic rise up against a horrible beast from the East, namely Muhammad. This prophecy and interpretation also appear in Diego de Cea’s Thesaurus. Quaresmio, Elucidatio, vol. I, 232, cf. 242.
on the matter. Prophesy, Francis’ conformity with Christ, and apocalypticism, were thus important ideological tools for the Franciscans of the custodia Terrae Sanctae to defend their especial rights in the Holy Land as a Catholic order, as well as, of course, to bolster the standing of the Franciscans as an order in Western Europe.

4.6 Conclusion

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, publications by observant Franciscans of the Holy Land became increasingly territorial or possessive: they claimed the Holy Land for the Franciscans. The intent of these texts is, for example, expressed through repeated calls for Crusade, benefitting from a revived atmosphere of Crusading fervour following the battle of Lepanto. Within the context of early Ottoman Jerusalem, the position of the Franciscans was marked by a great deal more insecurity than it had been the case under Mamluk rule. While the much strengthened Greek patriarchate presented the greatest threat, it did manage to wrestle them of a number of privileges at the Holy Places, Franciscan texts on the Holy Land are primarily aimed at gaining Catholic recognition and confirmation of their rights and position. In reaction to Jesuit and Capuchin attempts to establish in the Holy Land, and following the arbitration of the missionary congregation De propaganda fide in favour of the observant Franciscans, these texts defend and celebrate their unique right among all the orders to guard, and even possess the Holy Land.

In order to prove why only they, the observant Franciscans, could represent Catholicism in the Holy Land, these friars turned to look at the past, for example by rewriting the life of their founding saint, whose life and deeds, in their eyes, more than any other saint’s prefigured and paved the way for his order to hold exceptional rights in the Holy Land. Based on a number of scattered late medieval and early modern suggestions of St Francis’s presence in the Holy Land, Francesco Quaresmio argues for an extensive pilgrimage tour undertaken the saint, in an impressive feat of circular reasoning. This argument for Francis’s Holy Land pilgrimage is eagerly picked up by his confrères, because Quaresmio manages to valorise it by giving the tour the character of possessio, claiming the land for the future Franciscan custodia. Apart from re-interpreting the past, other Franciscans of the custodia also turned to prophecy, as represented by Diego de Cea’s Thesaurus Terrae Sanctae, for cementing their own possession of, as well as providing a happy ending for, the Holy Land.

All of these features of Franciscan Holy Land writing, sketched above,
were influentially codified during the first half of the seventeenth century, and remained part of the register of these texts for decades or even centuries to come, the myth of St Francis’ Holy Land pilgrimage surviving well into the modern era.  

186 The territorial outlook of these early modern texts, and their strategies to achieve possession, are mirrored by observant Franciscan efforts at their constructed Jerusalems in Italy, the sacri monti, as shall become clear in the two following chapters. In a struggle over the control of the sacro monte Varallo Sesia, the friars also turned to the memory of a founding father, namely Bernardino Caimi of Milan (chapter five). In the case of the primordial sacro monte of La Verna the very same brand of prophecy, conformity with Christ, and apocalypticism was used to turn the sacro monte into a new, Franciscan, Jerusalem (chapter six).