Chapter 4

Franciscan *Via Crucis* in late medieval Jerusalem

One of the friars’ hagiopolite processions, the devotional exercise known as the *Via Crucis*, illustrates best their dialogue with local liturgical traditions, as well as their role in the transfer of Latin devotions to the Holy Land. In this chapter, I explore the development of the ritual of the *Via Crucis* under Franciscan guidance in late medieval Jerusalem. I start by defining this ritual and discussing the scholarship dedicated to it. Then, in order to understand the friars’ contribution to its development, I proceed with tracing the topography and the liturgy of the ritual in two stages: in the period immediately preceding the installation of the friars in Jerusalem, and the form developed after their arrival.

Derek Krueger, a scholar of the Byzantine Church, has coined the term “liturgical self” to describe the identification of the faithful with biblical characters in liturgical rituals of expiation. In Byzantium, the shift to “ritual performance as biblical reenactment” started in the sixth century, elicited by liturgical innovations introduced by hymnographers hailing from Eastern Mediterranean regions: Romanos the Melodist, Andrew of Crete, Theodore the Stoudite and Symeon the New Theologian¹. In their hymns, the faithful assumed the voice of a biblical character, such as Adam, David or Peter, and, in the likeness of their biblical prototypes, the congregation singing the hymn publicly acknowledged its sinful nature and pleaded for deliverance, in an act of ritualized penitence². At the base of this liturgical discovery of the self lay mimetic intention.

In the Latin tradition, a similarly ritualized performance of the Christian self emerged as a result of the late medieval flourishing of Passion devotions. Jerusalem produced a unique ritual of the performance of the Christian self, the *Via Crucis*. In it, the flamboyance of the late medieval Western Passion devotions merged with the fundamentally mimetic and stational character of the hagiopolite liturgy. I define the *Via Crucis* as the ritual itinerary connecting the Calvary to the Praetorium, in which the passion of Jesus was commemorated. Pilgrims walked between stations recollecting various episodes from the Passion, to which prayers and chants were ascribed.

The diary of one of the guardians of the Holy Land, the Observant Franciscan Antonio Cruzado, writing in late fifteenth century, suggests that *Via Crucis* induced the faithful’s identification with the suffering Christ through the ritual remembrance of his Passion. Cruzado began his diary with a discussion of the hypostatic union of Christ, both as man and God, introducing his exploration of the country as both the landscape of Jesus’ earthly life and as God’s dwelling. His description of Jerusalem’s “misteries” was structured around the commemoration of Christ’s suffering, with whom the pilgrim sympathetically identified by following the commemorative route of the Passion. Cruzado’s description of the Jerusalem *misterios* fulfills his lifetime longing of seeing the places where “Christ worked for salvation”. The strength of the description borrows from the accuracy of sensorial details. The friar longed to “see with my eyes and kiss with my mouth and discover with my hands”, all those “places where the holy flesh was united to the divine [nature]”.

The mimetic commemoration of the Passion shaped the pilgrimage experience in Jerusalem. Cruzado registered minutely both his explanations when he acted as guide to the various *estaciones* (many on the *Via Crucis*) and the pilgrims’ compassionate response. They were meant to celebrate ritually the memory of the redemption fulfilled by Christ Dios y hombre. Cruzado called the *Via Crucis* the “way of sorrows” (*la calle del amargura*), a Spanish equivalent for the *via dolorosa*. The guided tours given by Cruzado in Jerusalem appear to have been motivated by ritual imitation, in which the pilgrim “emptied” himself (rarely herself) and became a vessel for the remembrance of Christ’s Passion. Walking

---


4 “Que [Dios] por su sola bondad y por nos en si endereçar obro visiblemente sobre la tierra assi en el tiempo del testamento viejo como en el tiempo del testamento nuevo, especialmente queriendo se venir por union ypostatica a nuestra humana natura, para mas claramente se nos dar a conocer en la qual en la sancta ciudad de Jerusalem y contratd della assi en su sanctissima natividad en la ciudad de Bethleen como en todo el curso y proceso de su vida, predicando y enseñando se ser Dios y hombre en la sobredicha ciudad y provincias comarcanas obro nuestra redencion. Lo quel por distancia de gran tiempo fui el desseo de ver con mis ojos y besar con mi boca y contratar con mis manos donde Jesu Christo Nuestro Señor obro la sobredicha redencion. Assi los lugares donde fue su incarnacion como el lugar donde fue su sanctissima natividad, y a quel sacratissimo lugar donde ultimamente el cruz obro nuestra redencion. E assi todos los otros lugares donde a quel la sagrada carne unida a la divinidad”. *Los misterios de Jerusalen*, s.p.

5 In the literal understanding of the word *compassion* as a “partaking in suffering”, which describes the experience of those who shared and participated in the performance of the memory of the Passion.

6 *Los misterios de Jerusalen*, s.p.

between the stations of the Jerusalem Via Crucis pilgrims were stirred to compassion by ritually identifying with Christ, a process similar to the discovery of the “liturgical self” discussed by Krueger. For instance, at the House of Caiaphas, one of the stations of the Via Crucis in Jerusalem, guide and pilgrims kissed the ground and shed tears because “the place invited us to do so”\(^8\). There, pilgrims commiserated with St Peter as well: they wept as he wept in that place where he denied Christ three times (Mk. 6,16; Matt. 13,54-58; Lk. 4,16-30). The wording of the description is striking: pilgrims do not repent for their sins thinking of them as the sinner Peter, here they seemed to assume his identity, and they wept *qua* Peter\(^9\).

The ritual mimesis of Christ is even more striking at the House of Annas, another station on the Via Crucis. Here, in memory of the buffeting of Christ by one of Annas’ soldiers (Jn 18,19-23), pilgrims “shed tears and slapped themselves in the face”\(^10\). In the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, at the Chapel of the Calvary, pilgrim and guide were bound in kenotic community through a lachrymose empathy (*los lloros y gemidas y solloços*) with the suffering of Christ. Weeping, moaning and sobbing, they deprecated on the very spot of the Crucifixion\(^11\). Self-emptied, pilgrims ritually “crucified” themselves, by lying down in a crucified position, in a frenzy of mimetic kenosis, which allowed them a vision of the suffering Christ\(^12\).

---


\(^11\) “Aqui junto a este retablo en el suelo en la misma peña esta el agujero en la piedra viva, el quel entra quantidad de tres palmos por la peña donde fue puesto el madero de la cruz, donde Jesu Christo Nuestro Señor obro nuestra redempcion”. *Ibid.*, s.p.

\(^12\) “Quando especialmente los peregrinos de qualquier nacion que sean primeramente llegan a lo visitar son tan grandes los lloros y gemidas y solloços que no solamente incitan de devocion de cada uno a lagrimas, mas las lagrimas de los otros y gemidas dan ocasion que no seria corazon de hombre que se pueda abstener que no llorar, se y non solamente quando nuevamente vienen, mas cada y quando este santo templo se abre vereys aqui tanta diversidad de toda la christianidad: assi viejos como moços, como niños en diversos modos y maneras: llorar, gemir, orar unos en cruz, otros las bocas en tierra, otros tendidos y crucificados en tierra, otros puestos en cruz, las caras y los ojos levantados en el cielo. Y cada uno en si mismo mirando el lugar donde fue posta la cruz, contemplando en el ayre en el lugar donde poco mas o menos estava el cuerpo de Jesu Christo crucificado y muchas vegadas en la yimaginacion se le representa al hombre que lo vee estar crucificado”. *Ibid.*, s.p.
In the *Los misterios de Jerusalen*, Cruzado emphasized the empathy of pilgrims processing the sites of the Passion with the pain that Christ suffered in his human body. They lived the memory of the Passion by ritual mimesis, bound in a community of compassion.

Despite Jerome Murphy-O’Connor statement that “the ritual of the *Via Crucis* is a historical product, the result of centuries of development”\(^\text{13}\), most scholarship on the topic has focused on only one segment of its historically long and geographically mixed development, namely its European embodiment. From previous scholarship dedicated to the *Via Crucis*, the study by Amédée Teetaert de Zedelgem is considered the most thorough analysis\(^\text{14}\). He considered that the practice of the *Via Crucis* originated in the Low Countries and was, essentially, a Flemish and north European devotion that was imposed on the Franciscan guides in Jerusalem by European pilgrims\(^\text{15}\). Some recent scholarship, such as contributions by Murphy-O’Connor and Mitzi Kirkland-Ives partake in the same opinion\(^\text{16}\). However, de Zedelgem focused primarily on the study of manuals for virtual pilgrimage coming from the Low Countries. Moreover, he did not pay a particular attention to the Jerusalem format of the ritual, discussing mostly the Western variant of the *exercitium Viae Crucis*. To a certain extent, the profile of the material he studied determined the contents of his argument. He considered the forms of the *Via Crucis* occurring in Jerusalem, starting in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, as marginal influences in the formation of the ritual, as it was later adopted in Europe. He considered the format proposed by Flemish manuals of spiritual pilgrimage, especially those by Herr Bethlem and Jan Pascha, or those written in the tradition of Jan Pascha, later adopted and popularized by Adrichomius in the *Theatrum Terrae Sanctae et Bibliarum Historiarum* as paramount in the development of this exercise\(^\text{17}\). However, many of the manuals of spiritual pilgrimage from which the later European format of the exercitive developed were either produced under the influence of Franciscan preachers, in

---

\(^{13}\) Murphy-O’Connor, *The Holy Land*, 37.


\(^{15}\) de Zedelgem, “Saggio storico”, 94.


Franciscan milieus, from Franciscan pilgrimage accounts or written by pilgrims guided by Franciscans on the Jerusalem sanctus circulus\textsuperscript{18}.

Spain was also considered the country of the first European \textit{Via Crucis}. The Observant Dominican Alvaro de Córdoba († 1430) is said to have erected the stations and followed the exercise in the monastery of Escalaceli, which he founded outside Cordoba\textsuperscript{19}. He supposedly founded the convent and the stations of the \textit{Via Crucis} following a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1418/1420. However, his earliest biographies mentioning the Jerusalem connection were produced in the sixteenth century, part of his canonization process\textsuperscript{20}. The enquiry of the earlier sources of Alvaro de Córdoba’s life does not support the argument for the European origins of the \textit{Via Crucis} in the Escalaceli complex.

My approach to the ritual of the \textit{Via Crucis} is based on its understanding as a religious and cultural process, essentially defined by versatility and adaptability, with a special emphasis on the Jerusalem friars’ contribution. Thus, in this chapter I focus only on the pattern developed by the friars in Jerusalem. I do not take into consideration all the extraliturgical devotions that flourished in the later Middle Ages in commemoration of the Passion, such as the Falls of Christ, the Seven Sorrows, the Nine “Leadings” of Jesus (with variants in various languages: \textit{Leydingen, Gänge, Führungen, ductus, marches}, etc)\textsuperscript{21}. Nor do I discuss the various forms of spiritual exercises commemorating the Passion that flourished in Western Europe in the Later Middle Ages and were recently thoroughly investigated in Kathryn M. Rudy’s book \textit{Virtual Pilgrimages in the Convent: Imagining Jerusalem in the Late Middle Ages}\textsuperscript{22}.

The development of the ritual of the \textit{Via Crucis} is a diachronic but continuous phenomenon. Its defining features are constant along its history and they offer uniformity to a practice that began in the Holy Land, was transmitted to Western Europe and, from here, to the New World. The history of another Latin devotion, the Rosary, presents a similar pattern of development as the exercise of the \textit{Via Crucis}. The Rosary originated in the twelfth-

\textsuperscript{21} Kirkland-Ives, “Alternate Routes”, 249-270.
\textsuperscript{22} Kathryn M. Rudy, \textit{Virtual Pilgrimages in the Convent: Imagining Jerusalem in the Late Middle Ages} (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011).
thirteenth century, in a German milieu connected to the Dominican order, as a devotion to the Virgin, to whom the recitation of successive *Ave Marias* was dedicated. In the fifteenth century short meditations on the life of Christ were added to the succession of prayers. The practice received papal approval and became universal practice in 1569, when the pope sanctioned the rosary with fifteen meditations on events from the life of Christ.\(^23\)

The exercise of the *Via Crucis* presents a similar pattern of emergence. The sources I survey below suggest that the ritual of the itinerant commemoration of Christ’s Passion originated in Jerusalem, in the guided tours given by friars in the city. The friars built on previous traditions of itinerant commemorations, to which they added devotions specific to Latin Christianity. Their most notable contribution to the ritual of the *Via Crucis* was the standardization of the itinerary, marked with ritual stops at various *stationes* and completed with its own liturgy, chants and prayers associated to these *stationes*.

In order to illustrate the stages of this process of standardization, and the brethren’s role in its development, in this chapter I survey, in chronological order, samples taken from primary sources describing the itinerary from Calvary to Praetorium in the period before their settlement in the Holy Land and in the period when they acted as guides to European pilgrims.

---

Figure 2 Stations most often mentioned on the Jerusalem *Via Crucis* (14th-15th centuries)

1. Before the friars’ arrival

The ritual of the *Via Crucis* evolved from a specific segment of the Holy Land pilgrimage. Under Franciscan guidance, the pilgrimage in Jerusalem and the holy sites of Palestine, Syria and Egypt became an institution that imposed great regularity. In time, the friars standardized the itineraries they followed with pilgrims.

For instance, at the end of the fifteenth century, the upper chronological limit of this investigation, a guidebook presenting the standard *peregrinatio* *Terre Sancte* proposed the following stages: from Jaffà to Jerusalem, the Church of Holy Sepulchre, the other holy sites of Jerusalem, Valley of Josaphat, Mount of Olives, Valley of Syloe, Mount Sion, from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, in Bethlehem, the Judean Mountains, Bethany, the Jordan River, Hebron (Valley of Mamre), Nazareth, Damascus, Baruth, Mount Sinai and Egypt. The friars impressed regularity in the itinerary by following the same route year after year and through the guidebooks they made available for pilgrims.

The ritual of the *Via Crucis* developed from the processions that were followed in the second segment (most times coinciding with the second day in the Holy Land for pilgrims) of the Holy Land pilgrimage. This stage was designated in the pilgrimage guidebooks, as in the examples above, as *Peregrinationes infra/ in civitatem sanctam Jerusalem*, or as the stations of Jerusalem, or as “walking the holy circle” or, in the language of Italian pilgrims as “fare le cerche”. Later on, since the stations celebrated by the processions of the “circle” commemorated mostly the route followed by Christ carrying the cross from Praetorium to Calvary, they called this segment of their pilgrimage the *Via Crucis*.

---


25 In the colophon of this manuscript, it was mentioned that it was copied on Mount Sion in January 1471. Régine Pernoud, “Un guide du pèlerin de Terre Sainte au XVe siècle”, *Cahiers d’histoire et de bibliographie* 1 (1940): 5.


A report on the Holy Land, produced on the eve of the friars’ appointment as guardians, underscores their achievement. The Dominican Humbert de Dijon’s *Liber de locis et conditionibus Terrae sanctae et Sepulcro* was written at the request of queen Sancha of Naples, who, as discussed in the *Introduction*, was instrumental in settling Franciscans in the Holy Land.

Humbert provided a survey on the current status of the Holy Places\(^{28}\). This information was necessary given the Angevin monarchs’ ongoing negotiations with the Mamluk sultan for the return of Latin clergy to the Holy Land. The Dominican undertook the Outremer journey in 1330 as a member of the retinue of the titular Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem, the Dominican Pierre de la Palu, who was sent to Cairo to negotiate the pacific return of the Holy Places to the Latins. Although Pierre de la Palu’s mission did not yield the expected outcome, the account Humbert presented to the queen in 1332 proved helpful in successive negotiations with Cairo\(^{29}\). In the standard itinerary set in place by the Franciscans, most pilgrims arrived in the Holy Land at Jaffa. In 1330 when Humbert and the patriarch’s retinue arrived, their first port of call was the former crusader stronghold of Acre, from which they made their way down the coast, through Gaza, to Cairo, the goal of their mission. On their return from Egypt, they visited the Holy Places in Palestine. Humber de Dijon’s account indicates that before the Franciscan standardization there was no fixed *ordo peregrinationis* set in place.

Once in Jerusalem, the Dominican wrote: “within and outside the city there are many holy places to be devoutly visited” (*ubi tam intus quam extra civitatis sunt multa loca sancta cum devotione visitanda*)\(^{30}\). However, there was no pre-imposed logic in the order of his visit, which did not form a *sanctus circulus* as was the case in the Franciscan-led tours. From the order in which he recorded his pilgrimage, he went first to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which he visited in the following order, recording these chapels and monuments: the Stone of the Anointing, the Edicule, the Stone of the Anointing (again), Golgotha, the Tombs of the crusader kings, the Calvary, a fragment of the Column of the Flagellation (on


\(^{29}\)Ibid., 514-515.

\(^{30}\)Ibid., 528
the right side of the choir), the Chapel of St Helen/ the Chapel of the Finding of the Cross, the place where Christ appeared to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection (Jn 20,17), the chapel commemorating the Virgin’s vigil at the foot of the Cross, the chapel commemorating St John’s vigil at the foot of the Cross, the chapel commemorating Mary Magdalene’s vigil at the foot of the Cross. 

A visit to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre prior to the brethren’ settlement was thus not structured in the stations characteristic of the *ordo peregrinationis in ecclesia Sancti Sepulchri*, which, under Franciscan management, took the form of a solemn processional entry. Certainly, the votive altars, chapels and relics recorded were more or less the same, but they were not followed in the systematic fashion imposed by the friars. The most likely explanation for the unritualistic character of Humbert’s visit is that the Latin clergy were not an acknowledged community in the service of the church in this period. Thus, the visit lacked the liturgical element, which lent it its ritual character when the Franciscans arrived as a legitimate and accepted community.

The same lack of pre-established order or liturgical character appears to have characterized Humbert’s, and likely pre-Franciscan era pilgrimages in general, description of the other Holy Places in Jerusalem, including the section which in the fifteenth century came to be called the “via crucis”. After the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, Humbert visited the other Christian Holy Places in Jerusalem in the following order. The first place of notice he recorded was situated within sight from the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (*in conspectu ecclesiae Sancti Sepulchri*). This was “the square stone in the middle of the pavement, on which Christ laid the cross he was carrying, and thence it was carried by Simon of Cyrene, who was coming from the city”. In Humbert’s account the commemoration ascribed to the “square stone” seems to conflate two distinct episodes of the later, standardized *Via Crucis*. By the fifteenth century, this episode of the Passion was commemorated in the *Via Crucis* with two stations, namely Christ falls carrying the cross and Simon of Cyrene takes the...
cross. Humbert’s enumeration continued with the Hospital of St John, situated “near the sepulchre”, and, further down from the hospital, the Temple of the Lord, with, in close proximity, the House of Solomon.

The itinerary continued with the Beautiful Gate, “where Blessed Peter the Apostle cured the lame”, situated near the Temple Mount. Thence, the pilgrim waked to the House of Herod, in a street close to the Beautiful Gate. On the other side of that street was the House of Pilate, where Christ was scourged and sentenced to death. Nearby was the House of Annas, where Christ was further humiliated. Next to the the House of Annas was the House of Caiaphas, where Christ was brutally seized and tied.

34 In the later version of the Via Crucis this was the place where Christ fell for a second time carrying the cross. However, already at the end of the thirteenth century, the Judicial Gate, situated between the Citadel and the Damascus Gate was pointed out as a place where Christ fell. E. Alliata and P. Kaswalder, “La settima stazione della via crucis e le mura di Gerusalemme”, Liber annus Studii Bibliici Franciscani 45 (1995): 217.

35 Humbert correctly noted that in his days there was a mosque there: “templum Domini quod Salomon acidificavit, mirae pulchritudinis, quod Saraceni nullum christianum permittunt intrare nisi abnegare fidem suam”. “Un pèlerinage dominicain inédit, 530. Templum Domini is the generic name given to the Dome of the Rock by late medieval pilgrims. Robert Schick, “Christian Identifications of Muslim Buildings in Medieval Jerusalem” in Jerusalem as Narrative Space/ Erzählraum Jerusalem, eds. Annette Hoffmann and Gerhard Wolf (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 367-373.

36 “domus et manerium Salomonis”. “Un pèlerinage dominicain inédit”, 530. The usual name given by late medieval pilgrims to this monument was Templum Salomonis, and it referred the al-Aksa mosque of the Temple Mount. Murphy-O’Connor, The Holy Land, 89.


38 “Item in vico qui est iuxta portam Speciosa ex uno latere est domus Herodis, in qua Christus fuit illusus ab eodem’. This stop remembered the mocking of Christ in the House of Herod, recounted in Lk 23, 8-12. The building identified in the Middle Ages as the “House of Herod” was in the near vicinity of the Praetorium and the “House of Pilate”, on the Via Dolorosa, approximately where today the Greek Orthodox Chruch of St Nicodemus is situated. Pringle, Churches of the Crusader Kingdom, vol. 3, 161-162.

39 “In alió latere eiusdem vici est domus Pilati, in qua Christus fuit morti adiudicatus, in columna flagellates et corona spinea coronatus”. “Un pèlerinage dominicain inédit”, 530. The episode of Christ in the House of Pilate appears in Mk 15,16; Matt. 27,27 and Jn 18,28-33, 19,9. Mark and Matthew called it “praetorium” while John 19,13 mentioned that it was called “lithostroton” in Greek and “Gabbatha” in Hebrew. The location of this place is highly debated. The most probable residence for the Roman procurator when he came to Jerusalem would have been Herod’s palace (on the site where today the Citadel is located). However, in the late Middle Ages the “House of Pilate” was placed at the Antonia fortress on Temple Mount, on the site where today the Omariyya School functions, hence at the opposite end of the city from the historical Praetorium (on the place of the Citadel). Murphy-O’Connor, Keys to Jerusalem, 16, 108-110.

40 “Item prope domum Pilati est domus Anne, in qua Christus fuit conspatus, velatus et derisus”. “Un pèlerinage dominicain inédit”, 530. Apparently Humbert followed the account of the Synoptic Gospels, according to which Jesus was first led to Caiaphas and then sent to Annas (Matt. 26, 57-75; Mk. 14, 53-73; Lk. 22, 54-62), while in the Gospel of John, Jesus was taken first to Annas, Caiaphas’ father-in-law, and then sent to the latter (Jn. 18, 12-23). This becomes apparent when he mentioned the House of Caiaphas, where Jesus was brought after his arrest. Until late in the fourteenth century the “House of Annas” was showed on the spot of the Crusader church of the Repose, situated near the Praeortium, the remains of the church being today in the Omariyya School. However, because a madrasa was built in the church at the beginning of the fourteenth century, by the end of...
The next stop commemorated the Swoon of Mary, when she met Christ carrying the cross, an episode rooted in a fragment of the apocryphal *Gospel of Nicodemus*. This stop was particular to Jerusalem and did not enter the various types of *Viae Crucis* practiced in the West. Although a station commemorating Jesus meeting his mother on the way to Calvary exists in the later format, it does not include the reference to the swooning of Mary. Moreover, the episode, as remembered in descriptions of the station of the Swoon of Mary in Jerusalem, appears to come from a Late-Byzantine recension of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, the Greek B recension, and not the Latin recensions popular in the West during this period. Thus, in the case of this station we are probably dealing with a case of devotional “contamination” from Eastern Christian traditions. This devotion outlasted the end of Latin rule in Jerusalem because of the construction of a church dedicated to the Swoon of Mary.

Although the church was transformed in a madrasa in the fourteenth century, the memory of its place and its devotions continued, thanks to its inclusion in the standard *peregrinatio civitatis Iherusalem* operated by Franciscans. The friars continued the Crusader devotion to the Swoon of Mary by including its station in the *ordo*. They did not only continue a local tradition, but they enriched it with the emphasis laid by Franciscan spirituality starting with St Bonaventure on the suffering of Mary during the Passion. At the

---

42 “Item prope domum Anae est domus Caiphae, ad quam Christus a Judeis fuit adductus, captus crudeliter et ligatus”. “Un pèlerinage dominicain inédit”, 530-531. Building on an earlier, Byzantine tradition, in late thirteenth-early fourteenth century, the House of Caiaphas, together with the House of Annas, started to be located on Mount Sion. The place of the House of Caiaphas was shown in the Armenian church of St Saviour on Mount Sion. Pringle, *Churches of the Crusader Kingdom*, vol. 3, 365-368.

43 “Item in eodem vico est quidam locus, in quo B.V. Maria stiabat extra domum Pilati, dum filius suos intra dictam domum male tractaretur, cui exeunti et toti de verberibus sanguinolento ac crucem portanti, una cum aliis mulieribus obvians, prae dolore nimio quai crepuit et cadens in terram examinis sincopizavit.” “Un pèlerinage dominicain inédit”, 530-531.

44 The church was probably built between 1229 and 1241, when Jerusalem belonged for a short period to Christians. By the end of the fourteenth century it functioned as mosque and in the fifteenth century fell into ruin. It was located where today the Armenian Catholic Church is found. Pringle, *Churches of the Crusader Kingdom*, 319-321.

Swoon of Mary, as well as in the case of stations at the House of the Evil Rich, the House of Simon the Pharisee, the House of St Anne, the School of Mary, the Franciscans encompassed local devotions, popular in crusader times, into their version of the Jerusalem Via Crucis. These stations were not translated to the West, where there were no monuments to signal their places as in Jerusalem. However, given the fact that in the Holy City, most of these crusader churches were by the time of the friars’ arrival either ruined or turned into private houses, mosques or madrasas, the friars’ upkeep of their memory seems indicative of the nostalgic character of the Franciscan mission in the Holy Land.

After the stop in memory of the Swoon of Mary, Humbert proceeded to the stop commemorating Jesus’ meeting the Daughters of Jerusalem. The story of this encounter is related in the canonical gospel of Luke 23, 27-28: “And there followed him a great company of people, and of women, which also bewailed and lamented him. But Jesus turning unto them said, Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children”. However, Humbert and the early tradition of this station of the Via Crucis (see also the relevant passage from Jacopo da Verona below) seem to follow the description of this encounter given in the already mentioned Greek B recension of the Gospel of Nicodemus, in which the Virgin is one of the women meeting Jesus carrying the cross, with some of the other women being named.

The last stops mentioned by Humbert de Dijon were in the north-east corner of the city: the House of Joachim and Anne, and, nearby, the Sheep Pool. The inclusion of the Sheep Pool as a stop on the Via Crucis was connected to a version of the Wood of the Cross legend. According to a twelfth century Latin version of this legend, the queen of Sheba had a

---

46 “Quod Christus advertens, dirigens verbum aliis mulieribus, quae cum ipsa erant et secutae fureunt eum, dixit: ‘Filiae Jerusalem, nolite flere super me etc.’” “Un pèlerinage dominicain inédit”, 531.
47 “Évangile de Nicodème ou Actes de Pilate”, 274. In this period, the station of the Daughters of Jerusalem was situated towards the Judicial Gate, near the station of Symon of Cyrene, with variations in the fifteenth century, when it was placed by some pilgrims between the station of the Swoon of Mary and Simon of Cyrene. Storme, The Way of the Cross, 105.
48 “Item illo eodem vico est domus Joachim et Annae parentum B.V. Mariae, in qua est adhuc quaedam camera, ubi B. V. fuit nata”. “Un pèlerinage dominicain inédit”, 531. The Crusaders built the Church of St Anne in the first years of their rule in Jerusalem, on the place of an earlier church destroyed by al-Hākim. From the seventh century, pilgrims located here the house of Joachim and Anne, the parents of the Virgin, where she was born and brought up, as written in the Proto-Gospel of James. In 1192 Saldin turned it into a madrasa and Christians were banned to enter it, with the exception of the cave beneath the altar, where it was thought that the Virgin was born. The church is situated (a new church was built in the same place in the nineteenth century) immediately to the north of present-day Via Dolorosa. Pringle, Churches of the Crusader Kingdom, vol. 3, 142-145.
49 “Iuxta quam domum satis prope est illa piscine, in qua Christus curavit languidum, dicendo sibi: Tolle grabatum tuum et ambula”. “Un pèlerinage dominicain inédit”, 531. The story of the lame cured by Jesus at the Sheep Pool is related in Jn 5, 2-9. The pool was by the Sheep Gate, one of the gates to the Temple. Although by the the fifteenth century on the place of the dried pool stood a private house, pilgrims continued to refer to it as one of Jerusalem’s holy sites. Pringle, Churches of the Crusader Kingdom, vol. 3, 389-391.
premonition about this piece of wood that was prepared to be used in the building of the palace of Solomon. She told the king that it will be used in the ordeal of someone who will cause the ruin of Israel. Hearing this, the king threw out the wood on the spot where later the Sheep Pool was dug, hence the healing quality of its waters. At the time of the Passion, this piece of wood resurfaced in the pool and was used to make the cross. The last places mentioned by Humbert were the House of Simon the Pharisee, on a different street, with the Gate of St Stephen as ending point.

Although most of these stops figure in the later, standardized, *ordo peregrinationis civitatis Iherusalem*, some of them were located in other parts of the city or they were rebranded. I will point out these differences when discussing the itinerary followed under Franciscan guidance. For the moment, I underline two striking differences between Hugo de Dijon’s account and later versions of the Jerusalem pilgrimage. One case illustrates the much-used practice of rebranding and the other a change in location.

In the first instance, the Dominican gave the name House of Solomon to the al-Aqsa mosque, whilst most pilgrims called it *Templum Solomonis*. Changes in the political status of

---


51 “Prope istam piscinam, in quodam alio vico, est domus Simonis Pharisaei, in qua Christus recubuit et ipsum a lepra curavit ac Marie Magdalene peccata dimisit.” “Un pèlerinage dominicain inédit”, 531. The Syrian Orthodox church of St Simon the Pharisee and St Mary Magdalene was built in the ninth century in a place where the house of Simon the Pharisee was thought to have been, where Jesus forgave the sinful woman (Lk. 7, 36-50). This church stood in the north-east corner of the city, close to the Church of St Anne. The church was turned first into a mosque, then functioned as a madrasa, later abandoned. In the sixteenth century, the place was quarried for building materials. Pringle, *Churches of the Crusader Kingdom*, vol. 3, 328-329. Humbert de Dijon, as many other pilgrims, recorded the conflation of several traditions in connection with this place. The fragment from the Gospel of St Luke related the story of Jesus’s stay in the house of Simon the Pharisee where he had forgiven the sins of an unnamed woman. But pilgrims named this woman as Mary Magdalene, reflecting the medieval confusion concerning the identity of this “composite saint”. At the origin of this confusion laid a homily of Gregory the Great who “collapsed into one individual the identities of three distinct women”: the unnamed woman whose sins were forgiven in house of Simon the Pharisee (Lk. 7,37-50); Mary of Bethany, sister of Martha and Lazarus (Jn. 11,1-45; 12,1-8); Mary of Magdala, the disciple of Christ whom he cured (Mk. 16,9). Katherine Ludwig Jansen, *The Making of the Magdalen. Preaching and Popular Devotion in the Later Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 32-35. Yet another medieval tradition recorded by Humbert is that of the leprosy of Simon the Pharisee, which is a confusion of Simon the Pharisee with Simon the Leper from Bethany, in whose house Jesus was anointed by a woman (Mk 14,3; Matt 26,6; Jn 12, 1-9). The woman is unnamed in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, and named “Mary” in the Gospel of John. Jospeh B. Modica, “Bethany and Bethphage”, *Encyclopedia of the Historical Jesus*, ed. Craig A. Evans (New York and London: Routledge, 2008), 62.

52 “In fine cuius vici est quaedam porta, quae vocatur porta S. Stephani, quia per illam portam eiecerunt eum extra civitatem Judaei et de templo, ubi disputatabat cum eis, ita quod extra civitatem lapideraverunt eum in quodam campo, qui erat tunc temporis domini Gamalielis, qui doctor fuit magnus in lege”. “Un pèlerinage dominicain inédit”, 531. The Gate of St Stephen corresponded, in Crusader times, to the present-day Damascus Gate. Its name came from its proximity to the place where tradition situated the martyrdom of St Stephen (Acts 7, 54-60). Humbert also mentioned a field belonging to Gamaliel, another reference to Acts 5, 34, where it is written that Stephen’s body was taken by Rabbi Gamaliel an buried on his own estate. The place outside the Damascus Gate, where the first church of St Stephen was built commemorated thus the place of the stoning. Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades*, 50, 53; Pringle, *Churches of the Crusader Kingdom*, vol. 3, 372.
the city also impacted where the memory of certain sites was celebrated. For instance, after Saladin reconquered Jerusalem, visiting pilgrims were not allowed to roam in the northern part of the city, deemed the most vulnerable. Thus certain sites situated there, such as the church of St Stephen, were moved to the Kidron Valley, which Christians could reach easier. To a great extent, Humbert de Dijon followed the Crusader layout of the Jerusalem pilgrimage. For instance, he placed the House of Annas and the House of Caiaphas near the Praetorium and the Temple Mount. However, in the itinerary standardized by the Franciscans in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, these stations were moved to Mount Sion. This was also a direct consequence of the Islamic reconquest, after which Christians were banned from the Temple precinct and their access was forbidden as far as the Gates of Grief and the south-end of today’s Via Dolorosa street, where the crusader chapel of the Repose used to stand.

Therefore, the itinerary of the Jerusalem pilgrimage and its stations responded to political changes in the city but also to certain devotional fashions. This type of circumstantial fluidity occurred periodically even in the period of increased standardization under Franciscan guidance. I turn now to this Franciscan shaped itinerary.

2. Under Franciscan guidance

The Franciscans’ exclusive privilege as the only Latin clergy licensed to activate in the Holy Land meant that they were able to set in a standard itinerary for European pilgrims coming to the Holy Land. They shaped it on the pattern of the ancient hagiopolite stational liturgy, with a greater emphasis on compassionate recollection. The Via Crucis developed as a ritual of commemoration within the guided tours led by the friars in Jerusalem. In doing so, the friars built on previous traditions, and on the eminently commemorative character of the religious topography of Jerusalem. Acting between traditions, they connected these different strands of devotion in a coherent ritual of remembrance.

I chart the development of this standardization by discussing descriptions of the Via Crucis section of the peregrinationes civitatis Iherusalem, as recorded in accounts produced

55 The way in which the Holy Places were remembered was based on the collective recollection of pilgrims throughout centuries, which built on local traditions connecting various landscapes to biblical events. Halbwachs, *La topographie légendière*, 2-7; 81-89.
in fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. I start by discussing two pilgrimage guidebooks written in the fourteenth century.

Jacopo da Verona, an Augustinian friar, went on pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 1335. Travelling only two years into the Franciscan settlement in the Holy Land, he recorded a state of affairs not very different from Humbert’s description. However, his report attests that change was already underway.

The manuscript containing his account consists of four different codicological units: *Peregrinationes et indulgentie Terre Sancte; Conductus de via; Benedictio vini in amorem S. Johannis Baptiste* and *Liber peregrinationis fratriis Iacobis de Verona, lectoris fratum heremitorum Sancti Augustini*. Its editor, Ugo Monneret de Villard, has argued that the first three units were not authored by the Augustinian, who just copied them in his booklet in preparation for the pilgrimage. Michele Campopiano, who has worked on Holy Land compilations, argues that the first unit, a typical Holy Land list of indulgences, was indeed added to the manuscript, but not by the Augustinian himself.

Of interest for the itinerary corresponding to the *Via Crucis* segment are the first and the last units. The *Peregrinationes et indulgentie Terre Sancte* listed the Holy Places in an abbreviated form without describing them but carefully recording the indulgences. This type of list of indulgences was very common and probably came from one of the *libri indulgentiarum*, which pilgrims could buy in Venice, write down during the voyage at sea from a fellow pilgrim or copy in the friars’ convent on Mount Sion. These standardized lists helped the friars to implement their own itineraries.

The indulgencery copied in Jacopo’s manuscript preserved a list of the Holy Places similar to the one recorded by Humbert de Dijon. Thus, the *Peregrinationes et indulgentie Terre Sancte* enumerated the following points on the way from Calvary to Praetorium: the Chapel of St Mary and St John the Evangelist, “where they stood at the foot of the Cross”; the Chapel of St Michael; the Chapel of Mary Magdalene; the place where Christ rested.

---

57 Ibid., XV-XVI.
60 The chapel of St John and St Mary and the chapel of St Mary Magdalene were placed by Humbert of Dijon, rather more accurately, inside the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Very likely the book of indulgences copied in Iacobo da Verona’s manuscript reproduced the itinerary before the installment of the friars, as these chapels do not figure in the standard Franciscan itinerary of the pilgrimage outside the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.
while carrying the cross; nearby was the House of the Rich Man “who refused to give Lazarus crumbs of bread”;61 the place where they compelled Simon of Cyrene to carry the cross for Jesus; nearby was the School of the Blessed Virgin Mary;62 also nearby the House of Pilate, “where Jesus was sentenced to crucifixion at the place called Lithostratos”; the House of Simon the Leper, “where Mary Magdalene’s sins were forgiven”; also nearby the House of Herod, “where Christ was dressed in white”; the House of Annas, Caiaphas’ father-in-law, “where Christ was brought first”; the House of St Anne, “where the saint Virgin Mary was born”; the place where Christ gave the Veronica; nearby the Sheep Pool, “where the sick man was cured”; also the Temple of Simeon the Just, “where Jesus was presented on the feast of Purification”;63 the last place enumerated in the indulgence list is “the place where St Stephen was stoned”, beyond the Gate of St Stephen, through which pilgrims exited the city to continue their pilgrimage towards the Valley of Josaphat.

The presence of the Veronica, the “Holy Face” station, in the indulgence lists circulated by Franciscans shows their role in the transfer of devotions from Europe to Jerusalem as well. The version of the Veronica legend commemorated by them in Jerusalem was a form of the Western tradition of the cult, spread in the late twelfth century but became popular only in the fourteenth century. The cult of the Veronica in the West was initially

---

61 This stop usually was mentioned under the name of “The House of the Rich” or “The House of the Evil Rich Man”. It is tempting to place this stop on the spot where the Crusader church of St Lazarus, situated in the north-west of the city between the Citadel and Damascus Gate, stood. This stop commemorated the story of Lazarus the beggar (Lk. 16:19-31), who, in the Middle Ages, was thought to have suffered from leprosy. A hospital with a church dedicated to St Lazarus was built here to accommodate the knights with leprosy, who formed a military order, the Lazarites. Pringle, Churches of the Crusader Kingdom, vol. 3, 215-216; David Marcombe, Leper Knights: The Order of St. Lazarus of Jerusalem in England c.1150-1544 (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2003), 4-9. Given that most stops mentioned by pilgrims, which were supposed to be followed in some sort of order, were situated in the north-east of the City, I incline to agree with the placement of the “House of the Evil Rich Man” to a spot on today’s el-Wad Street, rather than on the spot occupied by the Crusader hospital of St Lazarus, in the north-west corner of the city, outside the walls. Storme, The Way of the Cross, 92; Boas, Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades, XVI.

62 The school were the Virgin learned to read was shown in the twelfth century in the southern part of the Temple precinct; in the fourteenth century near the Ecce homo, and in the fifteenth century in the madrasa situated in the north of the Temple. Storm, The Way of the Cross, 91.

63 Lk 2:25-35. The station at the Temple of Simeon the Just was called by most pilgrims the Temple of the Lord.

promoted by Innocent III. The Roman Veronica was linked to the Byzantine Mandylion, a cloth on which Jesus imprinted his bleeding face during the agony in the Garden of Olives. However, in late twelfth century, the Western tradition connected the image of the Holy Face to the episode of the Hemorrhisa and the way to Calvary. This version of the legend became predominant in Western devotions and iconographic representations only after 1300. The devotion to the “Holy Face” reached Jerusalem, where it had a station ascribed, probably through the friars’ and European pilgrims’ mediation.

Jacopo da Verona’s account is revealing for the dynamics of pilgrimage, because it presents us with the tension between the prescribed order of pilgrimage, represented by the former tradition of the Franciscan. The latter format is recorded in the Liber peregrinationis, the part of the diary that Jacopo da Verona actually authored. Although the Franciscans do not appear in Jacopo’s account, it is clear that his pilgrimage was connected to the Franciscan presence in the Holy Land. However, contrary to the friars’ efforts to implement a uniform itinerary, apparently, in this early stages of the Franciscan guiding programme, there was still liberty for pilgrims to follow the route of their choice.

Thus, for the Via Crucis segment, Jacopo apparently walked the reverse of the itinerary prescribed by the standard Peregrinationes et indulgencie Terre Sancte, in which pilgrims walked from the Church of the Holy Sepulchre toward the exit of the city, at St Stephen’s Gate. It his own account, the Liber peregrinationis, Jacopo mentioned walking in reverse, from the north-east end of the city towards the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. He

---

65 The legend of Veronica and the Holy Face originates in the conflation of details from three apocrypha: the Cura sanitatis Tiberii, the Vindicta Salvatoris and the Acts of Peter and Paul. In the first two, the emperor Tiberius is cured of leper, some years after the death of Jesus, when a messanger he sent to Jerusalem in search of Jesus for a cure, bringing back a woman named Veronica, who had a portrait of Jesus. Tiberius was cured by this portrait. The legend of the cloth with which Veronica wiped the blooded face of Jesus on his way to Calvary is a contamination from the apocryphal Acts of Peter and Paul, where is related that a woman named Perpetua/Plautilla wiped the face of St Paul when he was taken to his martyrdom. Rémi Gounelle, “Les origines littéraires de la legende de Véronique et de la Sainte Face: La Cura Sanitatis Tiberii et la Vindicta Salvatoris” in Sacre Impronte e oggetti “non fatti da mano d’uomo” nelle religioni. Atti del Convegno Internazionale Torino, 18-20 maggio 2010, ed. Adele Monaci Castagno (Turin: Edizioni dell’Orso, 2011), 231-251;


68 This omission was explained by de Villard through the animosity characterizing Franciscan-Augustinian relations at the time. Liber peregrinationis de Jacopo da Verona, XVI. However, Jacobo, like most clerics making the Holy Land pilgrimage, was put up in the Franciscans’ convent on Mount Sion, where he was able to say mass. Ibid., 25. On arrangements for the accomodation of lay and religious pilgrims, see: Saletti, I francescani in Terrasanta, 144.
understood this particular itinerary, from Praetorium to Calvary, as a distinct section within the _peregrinatio civitatis Iherusalem_. At several points in his description, he emphasized that this was “the street going to the Lord’s sepulchre” (_viam qui vadit ad sepulcrum Domini_), that he “walked on the same street towards the Sepulchre” (_procedendo usque sepulcrum super eandem viam_). In Jacopo’s itinerary, he entered through the Sheep Gate⁶⁹, onward to the Beuatiful Gate, where, across the road, he saw the House of Annas. From there, proceeding on the same street, the pilgrim went to the House of Herod, and further to the House of Pilate. Close to the House of Pilate, was “the place where the Virgin Mary swooned”. Thence toward the Lord’s Sepulchre (_inde usque sepulcrum Domini_), the street leading to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre crossed with the street coming from the Fish Gate. At this junction was the place where Simon of Cyrene was made to carry the cross⁷⁰. Further down the road, Jacopo recorded the gate through which Christ exited the city and met the Daughters of Jerusalem⁷¹. Thence, descending Mount Sion towards the Sepulchre, he walked to the House of Caiaphas⁷². This is the last section mentioned as part of the distinct commemorative route passing by monuments _versus sepulcrum_⁷³.

---

⁶⁹ The Sheep Gate was by the Sheep Pool and the Crusader church of the Sheep Pool in the north-east corner of the city. Pringle, _Churches of the Crusader Kingdom_, vol.3, 389.

⁷⁰ Jacopo da Verona was more specific than Humbert de Dijon about the location of the place where Simon of Cyrene took the cross from Jesus. He mentioned that it was a junction. This junction where the station of Simon of Cyrene of the _Via Crucis_ was placed was situated at the crossroad of present-day Via Dolorosa and al-Wad street. Pringle, _Churches of the Crusader Kingdom_, vol.3, 97.

⁷¹ If in Humbert de Dijon, the episodes of the Swoon of Mary and the Daughters of Jerusalem were conflated, Jacopo da Verona, as most late medieval pilgrims, made the distinction between them. He placed the commemoration of Jesus’ meeting the Daughters of Jerusalem at the gate leading outside the city, to Calvary. This gate was called since the thirteenth century, the Judicial Gate. Alliata and Kaswalder, “La settima stazione della via crucis”, 218-221.

⁷² Here again Jacopo da Verona gave further details on the place where tradition ascribed the House of Caiaphas. He mentioned that Jesus was flagellated here as well, a tradition which went back to the fourth century. Pringle, _Churches of the Crusader Kingdom_, vol.3, 365.

⁷³ “Intrando Portam gregis per viam que vadit ad sepulcrum Domini, que via communis ad jactum baliste ad partem sinistram, est una porta, que vadit ad Templum, ubi nunc est edificatum unum palacium de novo.ILLA porta dicitur Porta speciose temple: ad hanc portam Petrus et Johannes apostoli invenerunt hominem claudum et debilem petentem elemosinam et, dum transiret Petrus cum Johannes, dixit: ‘Aurum et argentum’ [...]. Ab alia parte vie, contra illam portam, est una mosceta Saracenorum, ubi fuit domus Anne, ad quam ducet Christus, cum esset captus, et ibi receptam alapam, et ibi prima vie negavit eum Petrus; non intravi hunc locum, sed vidi, cum esset mosceta. Inde procedendo usque sepulcrum super eandem viam ad jactum lapis est domus Herodis, ubi ducet Christus, quem dixit se esse Galileum, quod Herodis erat vicarius imperatoris in provincia Galileae. Ulterius procedendo usque sepulcrum Domini, ad jactum lapidis vel modicum plus, est domus Pilati, ubi ducet Christus, ad Judaeis dixit ducet, et ibi est una volta antiqua in medio vie, que dicitur Licostratos vel Gabatha. Ibi clamabant Judei: ‘Crucifige, crucifige eum’. Et in domo Pylati fuit ducet Christus, et ibi verberatus, ad colunnumus ligatus, corona spinea coronatus, veste purpurea indutus, et ibi data fuit sententiæ, ut ducetur ad Montem. Prope illam volat, que est juxta domum Pilati, que dicitur Licostratos, vidit virgo Maria filium suum taliter flagellatum et ceedit feminam in manus Marie Jacobi et Salome, et ibi incipit planctum suum, sed perfecto juxta montem Calvarie et super sepulcrum, quem Joseph at Arimathia sepelivit eum. Inde usque sepulcrum Domini ad unum bonum jactum lapidis est una via que venit de Porta piscium usque Rama et Joppe; et per illam viam veniebat Symon Cyreneus, et dum Christus esset ibi, propter flagellaque sustinuerat, crucem
The comparison of descriptions of the *Via Crucis* segment in Humbert de Dijon, the indulgence list *Peregrinationes et indulgencie Terre Sancte* and Jacopo da Verona’s own *Liber peregrinationis* indicates fluidity in the itinerary, which was far from the standardized format imposed by Franciscans in decades to come. The stations mentioned were almost constantly the same, but names changed, as did the direction of walking. Thus, in the indulgence list, the stop at the House of Caiphas missed from the enumeration. On the contrary, Jacopo’s account featured the House of Caiphas, but overlooked the House of Annas. Moreover, it appears that by the time of his pilgrimage, the House of Caiaephas was already remembered on Moun Sion, and not as in the previous tradition in which the House of Annas and the House of Caiaphas were placed near the Temple Mount. The stops at the School of the Blessed Mary and the Veronica featured only in the indulgence list. The friars inherited this topographical tradition, which they fashioned into an increasingly fixed itinerary.

Fifty years into the Franciscan presence in the Holy Land, the pilgrimage guidebook written by Lionardo di Niccolò Frescobaldi, who travelled to the Holy Land in 1384, reveals a different picture. He described the Jerusalem procession as “facemo le cerche”74. His description enumerated nine stations from the Church of the Holy Sepulchre to the Golden Gate, which in his version of the pilgrimage replaced the Gate of St Stephen as ending point in the city’s northeast. These were the mentioned stations: the House of the Rich Man; the place where Simon of Cyrene took the cross from Christ; the Swoon of Mary; the School of the Blessed Virgin; the House of Pilate; the House of Herod; the Temple of Solomon; the Church of St Anne; and the Golden Gate75. He did not mention stations such as the Daughthes
of Jerusalem, the Sheep Pool or the Temple of the Lord, usually featured in pilgrimage accounts of the period.

We learn more about the early fifteenth-century format of the Via Crucis from the Descriptio Terrae Sanctae written by Johannes Poloner, a pilgrim from Regensburg travelling to Jerusalem in 1422. He took exact measurements of the distances between various holy sites in Jerusalem, an act that Zur Shalev argues “was an act of piety in itself, a service to fellow believers back home”, because these measurements, used in virtual devotional exercises, insured that the devotee followed exactly the same path as Jesus.

Poloner’s keen observations provide essential information for the Via Crucis as part of the Ordo peregrinationis civitatis Jerusalem et aliorum locorum ibidem. He underscored that the itinerary from Calvary to Praetorium was a distinct fragment within the Jerusalem ordo peregrinationis, which, according to his measurements, amounted to a distance of 450 steps. Along this route, he enumerated the following commemorative stops, which Poloner called stationes: the House of the Rich, the place where Simon of Cyrene was forced to carry the cross, the Daughters of Jerusalem, the Swoon of Mary, the Lithostrotos, “where Pilate interrogated Jesus” (the House of Pilate I), the School of the Blessed Virgin, the Praetorium, “where Jesus was condemned and scourged” (the House of Pilate II), and the House of Herod. Although he followed his description with references to the Temple of

si può entrare pe’Cristiani. Poi si trova la Chiesa di Santa Anna, Madre della Vergine Maria, nella quale essa nacque. Dipoi si trova la porta aurea, donde entrò Cristo la Domenica dell’Ulivo in Gerusalem, e sta oggi chiusa, e non vi si può andare pe’ Cristiani”. Ibid., 143-144.


78 Poloner, Descriptio Terrae Sanctae, 228-244.

79 “Et est notandum, quod a loco Calvariae usque ad idem praetorium sunt CCCCL passus, quos omni diligentia, qua potui, numeravi”. Ibid., 229.

80 Johannes Poloner is one of the pilgrims who distinguished between the events placed in the House of Pilate. First he mentioned Jesus’ trial before Pilate in the Lithostrotos. In the gospel narrative this was also the place where Jesus was condemned to be scourged and crucified (Matt 27, 2, -26; Mk 15, 1-15; Jn 18, 29-40; Jn 19,1). The distinction between Lithostrotos and Praetorium made by Poloner was artificial and inaccurate as they designated different points within the same space, that is the palace of Pilate. Storm, The Way of the Cross, 29-32. However, in many pilgrimage accounts there are mentioned two stations in relation to the Praetorium, one commemorating the Condemnation and the other the Flagellation. The place where Jesus was condemned to be crucified was probably shown at the place of a chapel on whose ruins the present-day chapel of the Condemnation by the Praetorium stands. On the chapel of the Condemnation: Pringle, Churches of the Crusader Kingdom, vol. 3, 89.

81 Here Poloner conflated the condemnation and the scourging of Jesus. The place of the scourging was shown at the place where today the church of the Flagellation stands. Ibid., 93-96.

82 “Nam ad domum divitis, qui Lazaro languido micas denegavit, sunt ducenti LXXV passus. Deinde a sinistris per XLV passus est locus trium platearum in acie concurrentium, non longe a valva, quae ducit ad Samariam et
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Solomon, the Beautiful Gate, the Temple of the Lord, the House of Simon the Pharisee or the House of St Anne, by now usual stops of the *Via Crucis*, Poloner did not include them in the itinerary remembering the Passion.

The image of the Jerusalem itinerary at the beginning of the fifteenth century, suggested by Poloner’s account, is reinforced by the diary left by Mariano di Nanni da Siena, rector of San Pietro a Ovile and chaplain of the Chapel of the Crucifixion, of the Duomo di Siena. He made the Holy Land pilgrimage in 1431. With regard to the *Via Crucis* section of the itinerary, Mariano da Siena recorded approximately the same path as Johannes Poloner. However, his travelogue stands out among other pilgrimage accounts produced in this period by virtue of two features: his emphasis on his personal experience of the *Via Crucis* and the inclusion of the prayers and chants associated with each station. He broke the monotony of the formulaic listing of stations by bursts of sympatetic emotion that the pilgrim experienced while walking in the steps of Christ carrying the cross. He also registered the liturgical part of the pilgrimage (the prayers were copied probably from one of the booklets compiled by Franciscans *ad usum peregrinorum*) and noted how the itinerary unfolded under Franciscan guidance.

Mariano da Siena also pointed out that the section of the *Via Crucis* was a distinctive segment in the Jerusalem itinerary, on which pilgrims “processed through the Holy City following the same street, which the sweet and tormented Jesus followed carrying the cross.”

---

83 Ibid., 231-232.
84 “Come fummo raunati, el Guardiano ci fece una bella, e devote diciaria, e tutti co’lumi in mano cominciamo la santissima Processione con tanta devozione, con tante pianti, con tante lacrime, con tanto gaudio, con tanta festa, che non è a me possibile el dirlo, e chi non mi crede el vadi a pruovare, e come è gionto ine gli possi crepare el cuore d’amore, di tenerezza, e di contrizione.” *Del Viaggio in Terra Santa fatto e descritto da ser Mariano da Siena*, 27.
The first station mentioned on this route was the “Old Gate through which Jesus exited the city carrying the cross”. Thence, they proceeded to the House of the Rich, and onwards to where Simon of Cyrene helped Christ, and where he met the Daughters of Jerusalem, and his mother, the Swoon of Mary. The itinerary continued with stations placed in the vicinity of the Temple Mount: at the “balcony where Pilate showed Christ to the people” (the Ecce homo arch), the School of the Blessed Mary and the House of Herod. The description of the ninth station, the House of Pilate, on the commemorative path quale fece Iesu colla Croce in collo is more detailed, with a description of the current and ancient state of the building, and the hymns and prayers assigned to it in the liturgy of the pilgrimage.

The pilgrims’ commemorative walk continued with stops at: the House of Simon the Leper, the Sheep Pool, the House of St Anne, the Temple of Solomon, and the Temple of the Lord. The last station of the Jerusalem procession recorded by Mariano da Siena was the Gate of St Stephen.

---

85 “Da poi cominciamo la santa Processione per la Santa Città tenendo quella propria via, che tenne el dolce, et affannato Iesu colla Croce in collo”. Ibid., 28.
86 “Trovasi una porta vecchia pur nella città, et èvi pieno di buttighe, e mercatanti, per la quale usci el docle, et umile Iesu colla Croce in collo, quando andò al Monte Calvario […] tuovasi la casa di quello ricco, che ne parla Santo Luca, che non volse dare delle briciole a Lazarro povaro, e suo cani lo leccavano […] si tuvo una incrocianta. Qui si riposo l’amoroso affaticato, e tribolato Iesu colla Croce in collo […] In questo proprio luogo quegli cani Giuderi presero, e sforsorono Simone Cireneo, che veniva di villa, che portasse la Croce dirieto allo affanato Iesu. Anco in questo proprio luogo si volse el dolce Iesu a quelle donne di Ierusalem, e disse: ‘Non piagnete sopra di me, ma piagnete sopra di voi, e de’vostri figliuoli’. Fucci fatta una bella Chiesa, ora è disfatta. Per questa via alta fu fatta una bella Chiesa; ora è guasta; chiamasi S. Maria del Plasmo. Essendo menato l’Agnello immaculato Cristo Iesu Benedetto al Monte Calvario flagellato, deriso, schernito, tutto sanguinoso colla Croce in collo, e volendo la dolce Madre Vergine Maria, piena d’affanni, tribolazioni, dolore, e miseria, abbandonata da tutte le creature, vedere el suo unico, e diletto figliuolo: e perchè quegli rabbiosi cani Giudei la stempegiavano, davanle pugna, e calci, cacciavanla per terra, e svillaneggiavanla, salì in su questa via alta, e quando el vinde tanto maltrattato, e concio, cadde in terra come tramortita, e col plasmo’”. Ibid., 29-31.
87 “Quì appresso circa dodici braccia si è uno arco sopra la via, e nella facciata dinansi sono due pietre quadre larghe fr’amendue circa duo braccia, e mezzo, sopra delle quali stette lo inamorato Iesu tutto flagellato, et incoronato di spine, quando Pilato lo mostrò al populo. Non erano in quel tempo lassù”. Ibid., 31. Mariano da Siena referred here the moment when Pilate presented Christ to the people with the words “Ecce homo” (Jn. 19.5). Already in the Middle Ages, the place where these words were uttered was associated to the Ecce homo arch, which spans over the Via Dolorosa. Pringle, Churches of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem, vol. 3, 91.
88 “A pièi questo ponte […] Poche braccia di lunga a questo ponte si è la casa di Erode, nella quale la salute del mondo, Iesu, fu schernito, e vestito di porpora, e rimandato a Pilato”. Del Viaggio in Terra Santa fatto e descritto da ser Mariano da Siena, 31-32.
89 “Qui presso si trouava la casa di Pilato, e fu già una bella cosa. Non vi possono intrare Cristiani, perchè la tegnno e’Sarraini per loro, nella quale il Re de’Re, el Signore de’Signori, l’Agnello immaculato, el Creatore dell’Universo, el Salvatore del mondo, Dio et Uomo Iesu Benedetto fu flagellato, schernito, deriso, beffato da quelli ribaldì, battuto alla Colonna, incoronato di spine, et alla fine condennato a morte brutta’”. Ibid., 32-33.
90 “è la casa di Simone lebroso, nella quale el dolce Iesu andò a desinare, e la inamorata Maddalena, non invitata, andò al gran convito, e colle sue dolcissime lacrime lavò quelli santissimi piedi, e co’ suoi biondi capelli gli asciugò, e meriti, che le fussero perdonati tutti e’ suo peccati. Non vi si può entrare. […] si è una casa, nella
The examples illustrating the development of the *Via Crucis* in the first half of the fifteenth century, namely Johannes Poloner and Mariano da Siena, reflect the dynamics of a changing itinerary that had, however, a constant number of stations that feature in all accounts. At the same time, these examples underline the dynamics of constructing a narrative of the Holy Land pilgrimage, with dry standard renditions of the *ordo peregrinationis*, in the manner of pilgrimage manuals provided by the friars (the case of Johannes Poloner) and very personal insights, with a focus on the emotions generated by the commemoration of Christ’s final path (the narrative of Mariano da Siena).

A list of Jerusalem stations and their indulgences in a manuscript produced in mid-fifteenth century, MS Guelf. 391 Helms. Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel, mentioned a station featuring in earlier accounts, but excluded from many a fifteenth-century records. This was the ritual stop at the place marking Christ’s rest or fall before the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. This station, of Christ’s fall carrying the cross was turned by another fifteenth-century pilgrim, Bernhard von Breydenbach, in one of the icons of the Holy Land Pilgrimage. The painter who accompanied him in this pilgrimage, Erhard Reuwich, and drew the sketches of the Holy Places included in Breydenbach’s guidebook, depicted the stone and
the devotions pilgrims performed at this station\textsuperscript{93}. The caption beneath the drawing read: “This stone, on which Christ carrying the cross fell, is before the temple of the Lord’s Sepulchre”\textsuperscript{94}.

\textbf{Figure 3} Pilgrims' devotions at the Fall of Christ station. The parvis before the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (15th century)

Source: 
\textit{Sanctorum peregrinationum in montem Syon ad venerandum Christi Sepulchrum in Hierusalem atque in montem Synai opusculum} Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden, s.p.

\textsuperscript{93} Jean Meyers, “La \textit{Perregrinatio in Terram Sanctam} de Berhnard von Breidenbach (1486) comme instrument de propagande. À propos d’un ouvrage récent”, \textit{Le Moyen Âge} 2 (2009), 365.

Surviving accounts of the Jerusalem pilgrimage multiply for the second part of the fifteenth century, also reflecting the increased number of pilgrims undertaking the Holy Land travel and writing about it. Two further accounts by Milanese noblemen, Gabriele Capodilista (1458) and Santo Brasca (1480), provide crucial information into the early history of the Via Crucis, since they are the first pilgrims, as far as I know, who used the expression “via crucis”, for the itinerary linking Calvary to Praetorium.

Although, as I pointed out, earlier pilgrims did use circumlocutions to the same effect, such as “the street followed by Christ carrying the cross”, it seems that by the mid-fifteenth century the term “via crucis” was commonly used to describe the ritual of the commemorative walk in Christ’s footsteps. Capodilista and Brasca also recorded the devotions related to certain stations and the liturgy of this ritual. Arriving in the Holy Land, the group of pilgrims to which Capodilista belonged began to follow the standard sequences of the Holy Land pilgrimage. In their second day in Jerusalem, they processed from the Church of the Holy Sepulchre to the Gate of St Stephen. On this road, which Capodilista noticed that “it was called the way of the cross” (*appellata Via Croce*), the friars showed them the following places: the House of the Rich, where Simon of Cyrene was forced to carry the cross, where Christ met the women of Jerusalem, the Swoon of Mary, the arch where Jesus stood when he received the sentence (the Ecce homo arch), the School of Mary, the House of Herod, the House of Pilate, the stone where Christ forgave Mary Magdalene’s sins (usually this station was mentioned as the House of Simon the Pharisee), the Sheep Pool, the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of Solomon (indicated by Capodilista as one station), the House of St Anne.

---

95 Shalev, Sacred Words, 79.
97 See Annex 3, for euchology.
98 “E giunti su la via per la qual si va dreto a essa porta [the Gate of St Stephen], appellata Via Croce, gli furono mostrati li enfrascripti luoghi: et primo caxa de quel richo el qual negò li fragmenti de pane a Lazaro […] Poy al cantone de la prima casa a mano dextra andando verso dicta porta è el locho nel qual Christo molto afflìcto per le grande battiture e lasso per lo peso de la croce che portava, incontrò Simone Cirreneo, al qual gli fu posto adosso dicta croce, e tolta ch e fu a Christo essa croce, si volse verso le done de Iherusalem, le quale havendogi compassionne lacrimavano, et disselì: ‘Filie Iherusalem, nolite flere super me, sed super vos et filios vestros’. Contiguo a dicta casa è lo loco ove spaxemò la gloriosa vergine Maria, vedendo el suo fiolo, tanto acerbamente flagellato, portar la croce per esser crucifixo. Et in esso locho fu da christianì hedifficata una chiesia, la qual fu appellata Sancta Maria da Spasmo, di presente ruinata, et solamente appareno certe ruine. Contiguo a dicta chiesia è uno archivoltò come è quello che è a Padoa dritto a la corte, e sopra esso sono due grosse pietre del marmo, sopra le quale sedete Pilato quando dette la iniqua sententia contra Jesu Cristo, non trovandoli né podendogli trovare contra de lui algun caxon di morte; et apresso dicto archo e a dicta mano è una picola casa et bassa, la qual fi appellata la Scola de Maria perhochè in essa la vergine Maria andò a imparar...
Late-fifteenth century itineraries reveal an increased degree of cohesion in the practice of the *Via Crucis* in Jerusalem. The standard pattern followed by the friras and popularized through booklets distributed to pilgrims filtered in the accounts that recorded the pilgrims’ personal experiences in Jerusalem.

Some of the pilgrims noted the chants and prayers for some of the stations, probably copied from the booklets circulated by Franciscans. The guidebooks produced by Mariano da Siena, Gabrile Capodilista and Santo Brasca included the euchology for six of the stations: the Swoon of Mary, the House of Pilate, the Sheep Pool, the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of Solomon and the House of St Anne. Only two stations had the same euchology at the beginning and the end of the fifteenth century, namely the House of Pilate and the House of St Anne. Even these two stations did not have an identical liturgy but they did commemorate the same event, that is, Christ’s condemnation and derision in the house of Pilate. At the House of Pilate, the liturgy commemorated this sequence through verses, responsories and collects taken from the liturgy of the Quadragesimal time.

---

99 See Annex 3.

100 The versicle *Cicumdederunt me hic viri mendaces* and responsory *Quonium tribulatione proxima est* came from the office and mass of the Fourth Sunday of Lent, Passion Sunday, Palm Sunday, Maudy Thursday and Good Friday. CAO, vol. 4, 73. The versicle *Collaphisabant Dominum*, responsory *Verberibus flagellatum*, collect *Domine Iesu Christe, qui tempore tuae passionis*, were taken from Pseudo-Bonaventura’s *Officium quinque plagarum Iesu Christi*. Pseudo-Bonaventura, *Officium quinque plagarum Iesu Christi* (Venice: Apud Nicolaum Misserinum, 1609), 17; the hymn *Tu qui velatus facie fuisti* from the *Officium de Passione Domini* of St Bonaventure. The Fathers of the Collegium S. Bonaveturae, ed., *Seraphici Doctoris S. Bonaventurae Decem opuscula ad theologiam mysticam spectantia* (Quaracchi: Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1965), 352; In some accounts, as in the case of MS 5-1-22, Sevilla, Biblioteca Colombina, a different prayer was ascribed to...
The liturgy of the House of St Ann came from the feast of the Nativity of Mary\textsuperscript{101}. Liturgically, the devotions ascribed by Mariano da Siena to the Temple of the Lord are close to those at the Temple of Solomon station in the Capodilista-Brasca version\textsuperscript{102}. The confusion between the two stations was not uncommon. Instead, the later versions associated the Temple of the Lord with prayers commemorating the Presentation of Jesus in the Temple\textsuperscript{103}. The Capodilista-Brasca version also contains the euchology for the Swoon of Mary, a simple collect, and for the stop at the Sheep Pool\textsuperscript{104}.

In the euchological form preserved in Mariano da Siena’s Viaggio in Terra Santa, great emphasis was laid on the extraordinary circumstances of the deliverance, namely the historical Jerusalem. The prayers had the demonstrative hic included in their generic versions: Nativitatis tua hic, Dei Genitrix; Nativitas fuit hic Sanctae Mariae Virginis; Beatae Mariae Virginis hic partus extitit; ut Templum hoc devote visitantes; hora diei prima hic coram Pontio Pilato. By this indicative addition, Mariano stressed the uniqueness of this space, where biblical events were commemorated in their historical setting.

3. Conclusions

The ritual that came to be known as the Via Crucis originated in the guided tours led by friars in Jerusalem. It was not an invention \textit{ex nihilo}. The friars built on the crusader legacy, and on the ancient stational liturgy of Jerusalem. Moreover, they conflated purely local devotions, such as the Swoon of Mary, with European imports, such as the Veronica. Nonetheless, it was in Jerusalem, and under Franciscan guidance, that a specific liturgy, with prayers and chants, started to be attached to the various stations. Thus, the friars developed a

\textsuperscript{101} CAO, vol. 3, 345; CO, vol. 4, 125-126.

\textsuperscript{102} The antiphon Domus meus domus orationis vocabitur, versicle Vere locus iste sanctus est and antiphon In domum Domini ibimus are taken from the office for the dedication of the church. CAO, vol. 3, 532; vol. 4, 134, 326.

\textsuperscript{103} Antiphon Postquam replete sunt dies purgationis Marie and versicle Obtulerunt pro eo Domino par turturn come from the feast of the Purification of Mary. CAO, IV, 326.

\textsuperscript{104} The antiphon is taken from the office of the first week of Lent. CAO, vol. 3, 49; The prayers related to the station of the Sheep Pool seem to have remained unchanged for the rest of the century, because they are registered in the same form in: Peroud, Un guide, 54. However, in the incunable Peregrinationes totius Terre Sancte, printed in 1491, in Venice, by Johannes Baptista Sessa (now in the British Library), a different liturgy was associated with this station: antiphon Era autem quidam homo ibi tringita et octo annos habbens infirmitatem etc; versicle Surge, tolle grabatum tuum et ambula; responsory Et statim sanus factus est homo; collect Infrimitatis nostras respice, Domine etc. Peregrinationes totius Terrae Sanctae, British Library IA 23516, 20v.
standardized and ritualized version of the itinerary, into which they adopted local traditions and Western influences.

In the sources I examined a varying number of stations were mentioned between Calvary and Praetorium. However, approximately fifteen stations occurred most consistently, sometimes under different names, but linked to the remembrance of the same episodes of the Passion.

As in the case of the other rituals carried out by friars in Jerusalem, the Via Crucis changed and adapted to specific conditions within the city. When the movement of Christians was restrained in the north of the city and in the area of the Haram, they moved the commemorative places in the east or the south-east, which they could access more easily. This is how the stations of the House of Annas, the House of Caiaphas, or the martyrdom and the Gate of St Stephen were translated. Pilgrims noted why they could not enter most places along this itinerary, because the earlier churches have either been destroyed or converted into mosques or private houses. Given the fluid character of the itinerary, that had to adapt permanently, the Via Crucis was not a linear path but resembled more a succession of circumventions.

These restrictive circumstances resulted in the exclusion of some of the earlier stations from the form standardized by Franciscans in the fifteenth century. This was the case with the House of Annas and the House of Caiaphas, constantly mentioned in fourteenth century accounts, when pilgrims still referred to them in the crusader tradition that placed them near the Praetorium. They gradually vanished in fifteenth century accounts, once they were relocated on Mount Sion and pilgrims could not remember them in the succession of stops from Calvary to the Praetorium.

The Via Crucis is the friars’ contribution to the stational liturgy of Jerusalem. They continue to lead pilgrims in procession along this path even today. The influence of the ritual developed by Franciscans in Jerusalem reverberated beyond the confines of the Holy City. Adopting the pattern of the Jerusalem Via Crucis was one of the means to translate its sanctity to European outposts. The next chapter analyzes the cases of two such translations.