Amnon Linder

Individual and Community in the Liturgy of the Liberation of Christian Jerusalem

Although most historians nowadays would acknowledge the importance of liturgy in forming Western Christianity's reaction to the defeat of Hattin and the loss of Christian Jerusalem, the exact scope and nature of the new liturgical practices evolved for this purpose have not yet been sufficiently investigated. This paper is an interim report on the results of such a study¹.

Two assumptions underlie this research. First, that the loss of Jerusalem was perceived in Europe as a calamity, a crisis that undermined the popular simplistic belief in the history of Christianity on earth as a continuous triumphal march. Enough evidence points in this direction to need elaboration. Rigordus' observation in his *De gestis Philippi Augusti* is perhaps extreme, but by no means untypical: "Senescit enim ipse mundus, senescit et omnis regiminis usus et declinat in senium, et tamquam iterato relabitur in puerum, ut effluat in omne voluntatis suae profluvium. Et nota quod ab eodem anno Domini, quando crux Dominica in transmarinis partibus ab eodem Saladino capta fuit, infantes qui ab eo tempore nati sunt, non habent nisi viginti duos dentes aut tantum viginti, cum antea triginta duo habere consueverant."² Rigordus – a physician, and one charged with the welfare of a king, at that – should have known better, but the general ideas he expressed in this passage were probably shared by a good number of his contemporaries. They were repeated in the next generation by Vincent of Beauvais³, and he certainly should have counted his teeth, as one who had the singular misfortune to be born at about that fateful date. The belief that the defeat of Hattin signified an

¹ A preliminary draft of this paper was presented in the framework of the international workshop "Interactions between Religious Communities in the Holy Land", The Ben-Zvi Institute, Jerusalem (October 1994). The first scholarly notices on this practice were published in *Josef Andreas Jungmann*, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development* (Missarum Sollemnia), trans. *Francis A. Brunner* (from the 1949 revised edition) (New York 1955) vol. II, 292–293, 339; *Robert Amiet*, *La Messe pour l'unité des chrétiens*, in: *Revue des sciences religieuses* 28 (1954) 1–35, esp. 19–22; *idem*, *La messe 'Pro unitate Ecclesiae'*, in: *Ephemerides liturgicae* 76 (1962) 296–334, esp. 316–319.

² *Martin Bouquet*, *Recueils des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, vol. XVII (1818) ad a. 1187.

³ *Vincentius Bellovacensis*, *Speculum historiale*, ad a. 1187.

important and ominous turning-point in the history of the world seems to have been quite common among contemporaries of that event, and it is reasonably documented in later periods as well.

I assume, furthermore, that the crisis was met by a considerable liturgical response. A society that perceived itself in terms of an *Ecclesia* was almost bound to respond by evolving a special *Jerusalem Liturgy*. Like any other liturgy it comprised the two complementary elements of instrumental, result-oriented acts on the one hand, and declaratory, deictic manifests on the other.

It is important to realize that these two elements are complementary and not contradictory, and that they usually combine in most given rituals. Whether a given ritual is primarily instrumental or deictic is consequently a matter of degree rather than essence, of the extent to which either the one or the other element predominates and imprints its particular characteristics on any given ritual. Furthermore, both the instrumental and the deictic rituals should be perceived as operating on two different planes, a vertical and a horizontal plane. On the vertical plane we observe the various forms of the Church's communion with the Divinity, while the horizontal plane is that of the links that assemble the believers in a community of faith (Church) and connect its individual members with each other. The instrumental ritual could be seen, therefore, as a means to "influence" Divinity to take a desired action, on the vertical plane, and as a complex of practical measures of action (e.g. communicating information and mobilization of human and material resources, actual operation on the field), on the horizontal plane. Similarly, the deictic ritual serves the purpose of affirming the "right" position and relation of Man towards God (as an isolated individual and within the collective framework of the ecclesiastical community), while on the horizontal plane it affirms and reaffirms periodically those values, beliefs and modes of action that unite men into a community of faith and action.

Even a cursory examination of the history of the last medieval centuries (from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries) suffices to substantiate these two assumptions. Christian Europe did respond to the loss of Jerusalem with both a protracted and costly effort to regain the city and – sometimes concurrently and mostly in a much later stage – to come to terms with its loss. Liturgy was pivotal in both endeavors. A complete study of this problem should encompass, therefore, a detailed examination of the *Jerusalem liturgy* as it evolved through the centuries from inception to demise, expose and explain its immediate and wider contexts, and gauge its impact on the history of Christian Europe at large. Our brief today, happily, is much more limited. It is restricted to a description of the basic typology of the *Jerusalem liturgy* in the initial stages of its evolution, and to some general observations on one aspect of this liturgy, the shifting balance between Community and Individual in the time comprised between the thirteenth and the fifteenth century.

Basic Typology

Office and Mass, the two main components of liturgy, were the two pivots around which revolved the spiritual and public life of any Christian community. This is almost self-obvious in religious communities like the monastic “families” and the Chapters of the regular clergy, but it also applies (though to a much lesser extent) to most lay communities. Both Office and Mass provided the fabric of the liturgical response to Hattin.

The first liturgical response consisted of the application of existing practices and texts; creating new forms and new texts obviously required some time and leisure, and the Roman Curia, similar to all the other ecclesiastical authorities in Europe, had to react fast while still in a state of shock. The very Incipits of the bulls betray that sense of alarm and despondency: *Nuntio cladis Hierosolymitanae*⁴, *Numquam melius superni*⁵, *Audita tremendi severitate*⁶... Peter of Blois, who stayed with the Curia at that time, described graphically in the letters he sent to England how dazed and disarranged the Curia was⁷.

There was, of course, no shortage of supplications in the Psalter that were applicable to the new catastrophe, and a good number of propitiatory prayers – Litanies, in particular – existed in the Breviary. As for Mass – Missals and Pontificals offered a rich choice of Votive Masses and special Eucharistic prayers (designed for special occasions, mainly crises of one sort or another) that could be added to the regular Mass prayers or even replace them altogether and thus turn any Mass into a special Mass, one dedicated to a special cause.

When the news arrived from the Holy Land people turned immediately, therefore, to their Breviaries and Missals, especially to their Missals. They found there several votive Masses that they could celebrate for the sake of Jerusalem and the crusaders: such were the Masses in Time of War, For Peace, In Tribulation, For the Salvation of the People, Against the Persecutors of the Church, the Holy Ghost Mass. They also frequently celebrated in the crusading context – and for obvious reasons – the various Masses for the Dead. One traditional Votive Mass that was already chosen in that first stage was the Mass Against the Pagans, known and celebrated at the appropriate circumstances at least since the eighth century. It was

⁴ *Nuntio cladis Hierosolymitanae*, issued on 21 October 1187 (Philipp Jaffé, Wilhelm Wattenbach, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, vol. II [Leipzig 1886] No. 16,013).

⁵ *Numquam Melius Superni*, issued on 29 October 1187 (Philipp Jaffé, Wilhelm Wattenbach, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, vol. II [Leipzig 1886] No. 16,018; ed. Johannes Radamackers, *Papsturkunden in Frankreich*, N.F., 2. Band: Normandie [Göttingen 1937] No. 290, pp. 385–6; Migne, *Patrologia Latina* [Henceforth Migne, PL] vol. 202, col. 1539).

⁶ *Audita tremendi severitate*, issued on 29 October 1187 (Philipp Jaffé, Wilhelm Wattenbach, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, vol. II, [Leipzig 1886] No. 16,019; ed. Migne, PL vol. 202, col. 1539).

⁷ Peter of Blois reported to Henri II about the measures personally undertaken by the Cardinals immediately after Hattin, in a letter sent from Ferrara. See: Richard Southern, *Peter of Blois and the Third Crusade in: Studies in Medieval History Presented to R. H. C. Davis*, ed. Henry Mayr-Harting, Robert Ian Moore (London 1985) 207–218.

destined to become one of the more popular Masses for the Holy Land during the next three centuries. Complete Masses were adopted, but also separate prayers and even shorter texts, such as single versicles; they were retained for use and integrated in the new forms that were evolved almost immediately after Hattin.

At the same time, and in almost less than a decade, appear completely new liturgical practices dedicated to Jerusalem. By 1197 the Cistercians, for example, were praying for the liberation of Jerusalem and for the success of crusades and crusaders in nine different liturgical practices, established in General Chapters held since 1188. It is safe to assume that the Cistercians were not untypical in that respect (although they were traditionally committed to the cause of the Holy Land, certainly since the days of Bernard of Clairvaux), and that most other monastic and Regular communities practiced similar and identical liturgical forms. The particular interest of the Cistercian case derives from the fact that this Order provides us with a relatively complete and consecutive series of *Statuta* legislated by annual General Chapters, an obvious advantage in any attempt to retrace the chronological evolution of the *Jerusalem liturgy*. We shall use the Cistercian practice, therefore, as our main framework in describing that liturgy during the first decade after Hattin.

The *Jerusalem liturgy* consisted of the following basic forms.

a) A prayer sequel to the daily Chapter⁸. Each day, with the exception of Friday, Chapter was extended (immediately after the *Adiutorium nostrum*) by a sequence consisting of the *Kyrie eleison*, the *Pater noster* prayer, four supplicatory versicles, and a special *Omnipotens sempiterne deus* prayer offered for persons taking part in the crusade. This prayer sequel depends, obviously, on the Major Litany.

b) A special ceremony was celebrated on Fridays⁹. The whole community went after Chapter to the chapel in a penitential procession (one version says “bare-footed” – *discalciatus*), and the monks recited there the Seven Penitential Psalms¹⁰ lying prostrate on the ground. A special sequence of prayers followed, consisting of the *Pater noster*, three “preces” (i.e. versicles) – *Exsurgat Deus, Salvum fac populum tuum, Fiat pax* – and two Collects, *Ecclesiae tuae* and *Deus a quo*. The choice of Friday for this crusading rite was clearly determined by the Cistercian custom of celebrating on that day the *De sancta Cruce* Mass as Conventual Mass, and by the penitential character of Friday, traditionally a day of fasting and mourning.

c) Since 1188/89 a special prayer for Jerusalem – the *Adesto domine* – was attached to the Hours of the Virgin¹¹. This was originally a Postcommunio prayer in the votive *Missa in tempore belli* of the Roman Missal (at least since the eighth

⁸ *Statuta* ad a. 1190, Stat. 16, in: Joseph Marie Canivez, *Statuta Capitulum Generalium Ordinis Cisterciensis*, (henceforth cited as *Canivez*), vol. I (Louvain 1933) 122.

⁹ *Statuta* ad a. 1195, Stat. 1, *Canivez*, vol. I (Louvain 1933) 181–182.

¹⁰ Psalms 6 (*Domine ne in furore*), 32 (*Exultate iusti in Domino*), 38 (*Dixi custodiam vias meas*), 51 (*Quid gloriatur in malitia*), 102 (*Benedic anima mea Domino*), 130 (*Domine non est exaltatum cor meum*), 143 (*Benedictus Dominus Deus meus*).

¹¹ *Statuta* ad a. 1190, Stat. 16, *Canivez*, vol. I (Louvain 1933) 122.

century). The notion that the entire Little Office of Our Lady was instituted in 1095 as an intercession for the success of the First Crusade is not supported by any contemporary source¹².

d) The 1188/89 General Chapter directed persons unable to take part in Mass or in the communal prayers – the sick in the Infirmary and travelers on the road – to say privately after Prime the ferial post-capitular sequence¹³. Recitation of the Seven Penitential Psalms was similarly imposed on absent monks in 1194 as a substitute for the obligatory chastisement (*disciplina*)¹⁴.

e) Private, weekly chastisement (*disciplina*) “pro tribulatione terrae Ierosolymitanae” (among other worthy causes) was decreed in 1194¹⁵. Only the very sick were exempted. Repeated in 1195, this personal obligation was commuted to voluntary chastisement in 1196¹⁶. In a spirit of leniency the 1196 General Chapter also alleviated the fast enjoined on the monks every Friday “pro terra Ierosolymitana” and allowed them two dishes of pottage. The 1197 General Chapter maintained these measures “pro terra Ierosolymitana”¹⁷.

f) Traditional Votive Masses, such as the De Tribulatione, the Pro Pace or the Holy Ghost Masses were said in a specific Holy Land context.

g) The Mass for the Dead, another traditional Votive Mass, was celebrated on a regular basis. Since 1190 the Cistercians associated the fallen crusaders with those they commemorated in their daily Mass for the Dead¹⁸.

h) The insertion of three special *Pro Terra Sancta orationes* into a regular Mass – either in place of the ordinary prayers or in addition to them – turned such a Mass into a *Pro Terra Sancta Mass*.

i) The earliest, the most popular and the better documented *Preces Pro Terra Sancta* service originated in London, probably as a local initiative. Roger of Howden reports that Londoners in 1188 were so elated by rumors coming from Constantinople about the grave difficulties and defeats that Saladin was confronted with right then, and encouraged by prophecies foretelling his imminent downfall and the approaching occupation of Constantinople by the French, that they instituted in Westminster Abbey, probably also at St Paul, a special program of supplication for the deliverance of Jerusalem¹⁹. It consisted of a series of seven

¹² Urban II is believed to have established this Office in the Council of Clermont in 1095. To my knowledge Baronius was the first to combine this with Urban's role as initiator of the First Crusade during the same Council, and to explain the Office as motivated by the crusade (see his *Annales Ecclesiastici* ad A. 1095, #51). He was later followed by *Giovanni Bona*, *De divina psalmodia* (Coloniae Agrippinae 1677) 324–327, and more recently by *Joseph Marie Canivez*, *Le rite cistercien*, in: *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 63 (1949) 299.

¹³ *Statuta* ad a. 1190, Stat. 16, *Canivez*, vol. I, (Louvain 1933) 122.

¹⁴ *Statuta* ad a. 1195, Stat. 1, *Canivez*, vol. I (Louvain 1933) 182.

¹⁵ *Statuta* ad a. 1194, Stat. 9, *Canivez*, vol. I (Louvain 1933) 172.

¹⁶ *Statuta* ad a. 1196, Stat. 57, *Canivez*, vol. I (Louvain 1933) 208.

¹⁷ *Statuta* ad a. 1197, Stat. 2, *Canivez*, vol. I (Louvain 1933) 210.

¹⁸ *Statuta* ad a. 1190, Stat. 16, *Canivez*, vol. I (Louvain 1933) 122.

¹⁹ Roger of Howden's report has survived in two different works. The first is *Ps. Benedict of Peterborough's Gesta regis Henrici Secundi*, vol. II, ed. *William Stubbs* (Rolls Series vol. 49b,

different daily Masses celebrated throughout the week. Each Mass had a special group of supplications inserted between the *Pater Noster* and the *Agnus Dei*. It consisted of a Psalm with its Antiphon, 12 versicles²⁰, and a prayer, the traditional *Contra Paganos* Collect, said by the congregation prostrate on the floor of the church: "Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, in cuius manu sunt omnium potestates et omnia iura regnorum, respice ad Christianorum benignus auxilium [ad Chistianum benigne exercitum], ut gentes quae in sua feritate confidunt potentiae tuae dextera [potentia dexteræ tuae] comprimentur, Per Christum Dominum nostrum [per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum]." ²¹

Seven different psalms were assigned to seven different week-days, in the following sequence:

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
2	53	59	73	78	82	93

The ascending order of this scheme and its ferial character suggest that it was compiled on the basis of a similarly ascending ferial scheme, most probably the ferial Roman Psalter²²; and a closer examination uncovers, indeed, the underlying Roman structure. Four of the seven psalms retain their original places, and even the "misplaced" three psalms still follow the general ferial order.

The entire sequence consists, obviously, of two kinds of texts. The first comprises the constant elements, the versicles and the prayer, which remain unchanged from one day to another, while the second kind is variable, 7 different Psalms assigned to the seven weekdays. The two groups differ also in the nature of their applicability to the specific circumstances of 1188. While the first (constant) group consists of versicles and a prayer of a very general relevance, applicable to almost any situation of a military conflict between Christians and Non-Christians, the second (variable) group of Psalms reveals a conscious effort to inject into the proceedings a strong element of topicality, of a direct reference to the events of 1187/1188. Examined from this point of view the *Jerusalem liturgy* expresses admirably the topicality of most liturgical practice.

The week begins on Sunday with *Ps. 2* (*Quare fremuerunt gentes*); it narrates the war waged against the Lord and his Christ by the Gentiles and the People, the

London 1867) 53–54, and the *Chronica*, vol. II, ed. *William Stubbs* (Rolls Series vol. 51b, London 1869) 359–360. For the relationship between the two works and the authorship problem consult *David Corner*, The 'Gesta regis Henrici Secundi' and 'Chronica' of Roger, Parson of Howden, in: *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 56 (1983) 126–144.

²⁰ 1) *Ostende nobis, Domine, misericordiam*; 2) *Fiat misericordia tua*; 3) *Domine, non secundum*; 4) *Ne memineris Domine*; 5) *Adjuva nos*; 6) *Saluum fac populum*; 7) *Esto eis Domine*; 8) *Nihil proficiat inimicus*; 9) *Fiat pax*; 10) *Domine Deus virtutum*; 11) *Domine exaudi orationem*; 12) *Dominus vobiscum*.

²¹ Square brackets indicate the St. Paul's version.

²² *Stephen Joseph Peter van Dijk*, The Bible in Liturgical Use, in: *Geoffrey William Hugo Lampe* (ed.), The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. II (Cambridge 1969) 246.

kings of the earth and the princes. Jerusalem is seen as the site of that struggle, for “Ego autem constitutus sum rex ab eo super Sion montem sanctum eius”²³. The psalmist announces the coming defeat of the enemies of the Lord.

The title of *Ps. 53 (Deus in nomine)*, recited on Monday, combines the psalmist’s general cry for help against his enemies with the historical circumstances of David’s flight from Saul and the treachery of the inhabitants of Ziph. While the text itself does not refer explicitly to Jerusalem, traditional interpretations of its closing verses (“voluntarie sacrificabo tibi etc.”)²⁴ saw Jerusalem as the scene of both sacrifice and victory.

Ps. 59 (Deus reppulisti nos), on Tuesday, raises the cry of the oppressed people of Israel against its historical enemies, a cry for help in war and a supplication for military victory and retribution. The title identifies the enemies by relating this psalm to Joab’s victories against “Mesopotamiam Syriae et Syriam Sobal”²⁵, while the text mentions also “Moab” and “Idumea”²⁶. Londoners in 1188 needed no commentator to identify for them, under these very names, some of Saladin’s chief domains.

The choice for Wednesday, *Ps. 73 (Ut quid reppulisti)*, was probably influenced by the strong similarity between its *incipit* and that of the preceding Tuesday psalm, but the text itself is perfectly appropriate to a commemoration of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by a cruel and God-hating enemy. Few psalms are more eloquent than this plea for help against the enemy, than this appeal to God – “memento... liberasti virgam hereditatis tuae mons Sion”²⁷.

Come Thursday, and *Ps. 78 (Deus venerunt gentes)* was obviously the right choice, for it narrates the occupation of Jerusalem by the Gentiles as well as the martyrdom of God’s servants. It confesses the sins committed by the faithful, and asks for mercy and retribution against Gods enemies.

Friday was assigned *Ps. 82 (Deus quis similis)*. Like the preceding psalms it is a pray for help against Israel’s enemies who plot and say “hereditatem possideamus nobis sanctuarium Dei”²⁸, and it calls for harsh retribution. In his choice of this Psalm the London liturgist recognized another level of topicality in the psalmist’s enumeration of the enemies of God: “tabernacula Idumeorum et Ismahelitum, Moab et Aggareni, Gebal et Ammon et Amalech”²⁹. Once again, Londoners in 1188 could be in no doubt who are destined here to the fate of the biblical princes of Midian and Sisra with Jabin at the brook of Cisson.

The series terminates on Saturday with *Ps. 93 (Deus ultionum Dominus)*, a cry for vengeance and justice against “qui operantur iniustitiam, populum tuum

²³ *Ps. 2:6*.

²⁴ *Ps. 53:8*.

²⁵ *Ps. 59:2*.

²⁶ *Ps. 59:10*.

²⁷ *Ps. 73:2*.

²⁸ *Ps. 82:13*.

²⁹ *Ps. 82:7–8*.

Domine humiliaverunt et hereditatem tuam vexaverunt"³⁰. The psalmist assures, however, "quia non repellet Dominus plebem suam, et hereditatem suam non derelinquet"³¹.

While the "constant" element, the versicles and the prayer, expresses a sense of comprehensiveness, vague and general enough to apply to numerous other situations, the "variable" element, the seven psalms, expressed sentiments and ideas directly pertinent to the situation of Latin Jerusalem as it was perceived in the immediate aftermath of the defeat of Hattin.

A one day sequence, similar to the Thursday program in London, was introduced by the Cistercians into their daily Conventual Mass (the Low Mass when two Masses were celebrated) as early as 1188/89, accompanied by a repeated ringing of the minor bell³². From later sources (prior, however, to 1195) we know that it consisted, among other items, of Ps. 78, designated in 1194 as *Oratio pro terra Ierosolymitana*, and the prayer *Omnipotens sempiterne deus in cuius manu*³³.

j) A tenth form of the Jerusalem liturgy is quite rare and appeared considerably late (it was not practiced by the Cistercians, to our knowledge). This is the complete Jerusalem Mass, that is, a Mass dedicated entirely to the Jerusalem crusade. All its Scriptural readings and prayers were selected because of their relevance to this theme.

Ps. 78 as the central Scriptural text in the *Jerusalem Liturgy*³⁴

At the center of the *Jerusalem liturgy* one finds Ps. 78, *Deus venerunt gentes*. It appears in this context quite early, as early as 1188. We have already met it as a local initiative in London, but according to Arnold of Lübeck the use of this Psalm ("orationes publicas in canone... psalmum videlicet Deus venerunt gentes")³⁵ was enjoined by the Curia on all Christendom, to be said in all churches, monasteries and parishes. Arnold's evidence is supported by the contemporary testimony of Roger of Howden³⁶ and the later confirmation of Conrad of Scheyern³⁷. The first Cistercian regulation that refers explicitly to Ps. 78 in this context defines it in

³⁰ Ps. 93:4–5.

³¹ Ps. 93:14.

³² *Statuta* ad a. 1190, Stat. 16, *Canivez*, vol. I (Louvain 1933) 122.

³³ *Statuta* ad a. 1194, Stat. 10, *Canivez*, vol. I (Louvain 1933) 172.

³⁴ An extensive discussion of this problem in: Amnon Linder, *Deus venerunt Gentes: Ps. 78 (79) in the Liturgical Commemoration of the Destruction of Latin Jerusalem*, in: Bat-Sheva Albert (et alii) eds., *Medieval Studies in Honour of Avrom Saltman* (Ramat-Gan 1995) 145–171.

³⁵ *Arnoldus Lubecensis*, *Chronica Slavorum*, IV, 6, ed. J.M. Lappenberg (MGH SS) vol. 21 (1869) 170.

³⁶ *Roger of Howden*, *Chronica*, ed. William Stubbs, vol. II (Rolls Series vol. 51b, 1869) 359.

³⁷ *Chounradus Schirensis*, *Chronicon*, ed. Philippe Jaffé (MGH SS) vol. 21 (1861) 630.

1194 as “oratio pro Terra Ierosolimitana”³⁸, but already in 1190 the General Chapter probably referred to the very same psalm among the “iam statutas orationes”³⁹. Ps. 78 remained the central Scriptural text in this rite in many parts of Europe even after the Curia replaced it in 1298, and again in 1328⁴⁰, with Ps. 121.

The choice of Ps. 78 in preference to numerous other Scriptural texts, theoretically no less susceptible to a topical interpretation linking Scripture with the fate of Christian Jerusalem, was determined by two types of interpretative approach to the Scriptures.

The first approach – increasingly typical to Biblical exegesis since the Twelfth Century – underlined the historicity of the Scriptures. Of the four traditional modes of interpretation only the tropological is ahistorical. The three others are characteristically historical in that they depend on – and refer to – unique events taking place in a specific time and space. Historicity explains the predominant position of the Old Testament as against the New Testament as a focus of recurrent legitimization of present events and circumstances in the light of past manifestations of divine dispensation. The long and rich history encompassed within the Old Testament, in itself the history of a community, offers better and more numerous points of reference in this context of “decoding the present” than the New Testament, with its very thin historical coating and an almost absolute indifference to historical collectivities and social or political demarcations. The Old Testament remained, therefore, the preferred source of inspiration and guidance, particularly in times of collective crisis, and such, precisely, was the situation in Europe following the loss of Jerusalem.

The particular choice of Ps. 78 in that specific context, however, depended on a much more sensitive and discriminating approach to the Scripture. Ps. 78 was not the only psalm to lament the destruction of Jerusalem, but it was almost uniquely appropriate to lament the fate of Christian Jerusalem in the sorry light of its Jewish, Biblical prefiguration. Traditional exegesis identified the destruction and profanation it describes with the historical events under Antiochus, while other “destruction psalms” were interpreted in the contexts of the Babylonian⁴¹ and the Roman⁴² destructions. This resulted in at least four good reasons why this particular psalm should be chosen in 1187.

In the first place, it contributed a distinct “Christian dimension” to that psalm through the recognition that the Temple profaned was the very same Temple so closely connected with Jesus. Furthermore, the martyrological halo of the Antiochian persecution reflected in this psalm (and so conspicuously absent from the “Babylonian” and the “Roman” tales of woe) corresponds admirably to the Christian martyrology, most particularly to the persecution of Christian Jerusa-

³⁸ *Statuta* ad a. 1194, Stat. 10, *Canivez*, vol. I (Louvain 1933) 172.

³⁹ *Statuta* ad a. 1190, Stat. 16, *Canivez*, vol. I (Louvain 1933) 122.

⁴⁰ In the Bull *Discipulorum Christi Gesta*, ed. *Edmund Martène, Ursin Durand*, *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, vol. II (Paris 1717) cols. 748–749.

⁴¹ Ps. 136.

⁴² Ps. 73.

lem as it was perceived in Europe after Hattin. Thirdly, Christian exegesis generated an emotional empathy with the sufferings recounted in the psalms in regard to the Babylonian and the Antiochean persecutions only, while it perceived the Roman destruction as a divine and just retribution inflicted on the Jews for their criminal denial of God and their Deicide. Unlike the other two destructions it was final, already extraneous to the bond that associated, formerly, God with his People. The fourth element, finally, consists of Ps. 78's better potential to carry forward in time allegorical interpretations referring to specific historical persecutions.

On all four counts, therefore – direct association of the Temple with Jesus' life, martyrdom, empathy and applicability to further allegorical interpretation – Christian commentators and liturgists found the Antiochus' persecution, hence also Ps. 78, to be the right choice in the post-1187 situation.

Foci of initiative

The Roman Curia played an essential role in keeping throughout Europe a constant, high awareness of the fate of Latin Outremer, and it worked ceaselessly to mobilise support for the liberation of Jerusalem; but the special *Jerusalem liturgy* that emerged during the first decade after 1187 resulted, on the whole, from local, spontaneous initiatives.

We have examined, at some detail, the local initiative documented in London in 1188. Another case of special prayers instituted through a local initiative is known from Sicily, in the immediate aftermath of the German Crusade of 1197–98 and during the early preparations for the Fourth Crusade. In a bull issued on 5 January 1199 Innocent III approved the suggestion made by the commissioners for preaching the crusade in Sicily, “de consilio religiosorum virorum,” that an “oratio specialis” “pro peregrinis” be said daily during Mass in all churches, and that a Mass *Pro tribulatione* be publicly celebrated once a week. He further directed that these measures should be applied “per universam Siciliam”⁴³.

The papacy did not attempt to mould in detail and enforce a universal *Jerusalem liturgy* prior to Innocent III, and even he initiated in this field only in 1213, towards the end of his pontificate. That year marked, however, the beginning of a more uniform liturgical response to the fall of Jerusalem.

⁴³ *De vestra discretione*, Reg. I, No. 508, *Othmar Hageneder*, vol. I, 741–743; *Migne*, PL, vol. 214, cols. 470–471; *Helmut Roscher*, *Papst Innocenz III. und die Kreuzzüge* (Göttingen 1969) 66. This is one item suggested among others, and the exact wording indicates that it was not yet applied: “Scripsisti etiam, quod de consilio religiosorum virorum *procedit*, ut in missa... *dicatur* oratio specialis et semel in ebdomada pro tribulatione missa populo *decantetur*” (p. 742, emphasis mine). A similar structure follows further on, though the Chancery officials did not distinguish as clearly, that time, between indicative and subjunctive (“... et, quod de consilio *procedat* quorundam, ut redditus... *convertantur*”).

Among numerous other plans and directives to mobilize support for the forthcoming crusade Innocent directed, in the bull *Quia maior*⁴⁴, that a monthly penitential procession be held in every community, and that all men and women shall take part in it and offer prayers for the liberation of the Holy Land; in the course of which the crusade shall be preached. He obviously applies to the Holy Land crusade an innovation he instituted a year before, prior to the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa, when the entire population of Rome was called to take part in a symbolic *iter crucis* of penance and prayer to the *Basilica of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem* (16 May 1212, expecting a battle on the 20)⁴⁵. The men, women and the clergy of Rome assembled and prayed in three different churches, and then made their way to the Lateran in three separate processions. They finally assembled together on the open grounds facing the Lateran, attended there a giant prayer meeting presided by the pope, and then moved to the nearest churches to finish the service, to adore the relic of the True Cross in the *Basilica of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem*, and to offer there the *Omnipotens sempiterne deus in cuius manu* prayer for the success of the Spanish crusade.

The next item in the *Quia maior* bears directly on the *Jerusalem liturgy*. Every day, a special prayer sequel should be inserted into Mass, just before the Communion of the faithful, with the entire congregation prostrate on the floor, and the clergy shall say loudly Ps. 78 ("Deus venerunt gentes"), finish with the versicle "Exsurgat Deus et dissipentur inimici ejus, et fugiant a facie ejus qui oderunt eum" (Ps. 67:1), and then the presiding priest shall say a special prayer for the liberation of Jerusalem. This is the first time that we encounter this prayer; for all we know it could have been composed by Innocent III himself (he had quite a good opinion of his talents in this direction). It became, at any rate, one of the more common prayers recited during this part of the daily Mass throughout Europe for a very long time to come. Complete devotion to Jerusalem was its most distinctive characteristic. The traditional prayer (*Omnipotens sempiterne Deus in cuius manu*) was of the *passpartout* type, applicable to all sorts of crisis precisely because of its generalized character; the *Deus qui admirabili providentia*, on the other hand, was devoted to Jerusalem, and to Jerusalem alone. Christianity waited for almost a generation before it devised a special Jerusalem liturgy anchored on a new, original Jerusalem prayer; a delay that should attract the historian's attention. It might indicate a dawning realization that the 1187 loss was not a temporary setback soon to be remedied, but a permanent reality, a reality that Christianity should learn to come to terms with. Subsequent crusading activities might appear – in the terms of this hypothesis – under a considerably new light.

⁴⁴ A good study of the process by which this bull was drafted and issued, as well as a critical edition, in *Georgine Tangl*, *Studien zum Register Innocenz' III* (Weimar 1929).

⁴⁵ The detailed program of this procession was published in *Baronius*, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, ad a. 1212, #19–21, and in *Migne*, PL, vol. 216, cols. 698–699.

Individual and Community

All medieval liturgical acts combine the Communal and the Individual. Even the most private, solitary devotion – let alone the *Communio* celebrated in and with the community – implies belief in the Ecclesiological nature of the religious act, and belief in the Ecclesiological means by which the individual attains to God and merits his individual salvation: “Nulla salus extra Ecclesiam”, referring to the *Ecclesia militans* on earth as well as the *Ecclesia triumphans* in Heaven. The balance between the specifically Communal and the typically Individual varies in any liturgical act, of course, and the changing weight of either one of them testifies not only to different conceptions of the sacramental nature of the liturgical act, but also to its functional role. Our initial distinction between the instrumental and the deictic roles of ritual contributes, in fact, towards the better demarcation of the two aspects: it is easier to identify and delimit the communal and the individual areas once the functional role is recognized and clarified.

The Jerusalem Liturgy starts with a very strong accent on the Communal. It takes place in church, in the community, and it involves the entire community. The religious community in the strictest sense – monks and Regular clergy – but the lay elements as well through their participation in the Mass. Even those outside the church, in the fields or in the streets, even they are drawn to the circle of the acting community when the bell rings, when it informs them of the exact moment of *Preces Pro Terra Sancta*, and they too participate by kneeling and saying the *Pater Noster*. Another means of wide participation was the general procession, uniting the entire community – religious and lay people together – in a dramatic expression of personal commitment within the larger devotion of the entire community⁴⁶. It is interesting to note that private prayers for Jerusalem during the first half of the Thirteenth Century were assigned to exceptional circumstances only, when a person was unable to participate in the communal rite, either for reasons of sickness or absence. The message transmitted in the different prayers (*Collecta*, *Secreta*, *Postcommunio*) was predominantly Communal, stressing the general character of the challenge and the need for a general mobilization of the “*Populus christianus*”, the “*fideles*” and the “*Propugnatores Christiani*” in order to face it. The loss of Jerusalem was seen as a challenge thrown before all Christianity, and the response had to be conceived, again, in all-Christian terms.

This overwhelming accent on the communal at the expense of the individual could not last long in a situation that demanded, in the last analysis, an essentially individual commitment and decision. On the instrumental level that liturgy aimed at raising funds and recruiting crusaders, just as it attempted – on the deictic level – to decode the hidden meaning of the loss of Jerusalem and to offer to all believers an interpretation that would integrate with the existing, “correct” Weltan-

⁴⁶ See the recent illuminating study of the procession as “rite rassurant” in *Jean Delumeau*, *Rassurer et protéger: le sentiment de sécurité dans l’Occident d’autrefois* (Paris 1989) particularly 134–176.

schauung. On both accounts it had to address the individual rather than the community at large. A similar, parallel shift from the general to the individual can be observed (chronologically and in subject-matter) in the legal status of the crusader. Crusaders as individuals were granted more and more privileges, some of them temporal, others spiritual, the most important of which was the promise/means of salvation. A somewhat weaker, but essentially identical, incentives and promises were offered to contributors of money for that purpose. We cannot discuss here with any detail the evolution of liturgy as penitential means, capable of buying an almost automatic salvation or at least commutation of pains of Purgatory, means that on the more popular and vulgar level were seen as open to sale, quantifiable according to a precise penitential and pecuniary scale, and susceptible for use in favor of a third party. It is important to realize, however, that the special *Jerusalem liturgy* was marked by this trend, and that one of the results of this process was the emergence of a completely new structural balance between the Communal and the Individual elements.

St Gregory's Trental provides us with a typical example of this trend⁴⁷. The usual Trental consisted of a sequence of thirty Masses representing thirty feasts, "encapsulating", in a way, the entire liturgical year, and performed vicariously for the salvation/liberation of the souls of the dead from Purgatory through the care and at the expense of their living relatives. The English variety of this practice appears in the thirteenth century. It attached thirty Masses to the ten principal feasts of the year – three Masses to be celebrated in each of them or during their Octaves – and the explicitly stated purpose combines the liberation of the Holy Land with the liberation of the departed from the pains of Purgatory. A typical Trental Collect reads as follows: "Deus summa spes nostre redemptionis, qui in Terra promissionis ante omnes terras nasci elegisti et mortem ibidem sustinuisti, libera propitius animam famuli tui N. de manibus demonum, et eandem terram de potestate paganorum, ut populus qui in te non credit per virtutem tuam emendationem habeat, et illis omnibus qui in te confidunt per tuam magnam succurre pietatem. Qui cum deo Patre etc." The Holy Land is still a communal goal, pertaining to the *Populus Christianus*, but the enormous popularity of this custom in England down to the Reformation is to be credited chiefly to its private aspect, to the sort of Tibetan Prayer Wheel it offered first and foremost to N., the Individual.

Practice

We have at hand, as I have tried to demonstrate, quite a sizable body of evidence that proves beyond any doubt the existence of liturgical prayers and forms dedicated to the liberation of Jerusalem. Where they really practiced? Could we enter

⁴⁷ The fundamental study is still *Richard Pfaff*, *The English Devotion of St Gregory's Trental* in: *Speculum* 49 (1974) 75–90. See also *Eamon Duffy*, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1440–1580* (New Haven 1992) esp. 370–375.

at random any church on the right day and find ourselves in the midst of a ceremony for the liberation of Jerusalem – a ceremony designed to kindle in our hearts a burning desire to liberate Jerusalem, to take the cross and start on our way? In other words – did real practice follow prescription?

No one answer is possible, of course, and any attempt at an answer would have to take into account varying circumstances throughout the duration of the documented practices. Let me demonstrate some of the difficulties involved by quoting two texts.

The first is the rather bitter report that Gerold, Patriarch of Jerusalem, sent to Rome after Frederick II signed his treaty of peace with El-Kamil in 1229. Commenting on the clause that reserved the Temple Mount to Muslim control, the furious Patriarch commented: “haec est abusio manifesta que expositione non indiget, hec est conventio Christi ad Belial; per hoc apparet, si frequentatio psalmi illius ‘Deus venerunt gentes’ cessare debeat, cum adhuc templum sanctum poluant infideles.”⁴⁸

The second text refers to the general mobilization of the French kingdom during the crusade that Louis IX led in 1248. It was written by Salimbene of Adam, who tells, quite casually, how he stayed with the Franciscans of Provins during the preparations for the crusade, how two Joachimite friars tried to win him over by showing him Joachimite commentaries and prophecies; “Et cum diceretur per totam Franciam in missa conventuali qualibet die per totum annum psalmus ‘Deus venerunt gentes in hereditatem tuam’ et cet., ipsi similiter deridebant dicentes; ‘Oportet impleri scripturam que dicit’, Tren. 3:44: ‘Opposuisti nubem tibi, ne transeat oratio.’” “Nam rex Francie capietur et Gallici debellabuntur et pestilentia multos consumet. Et facti sunt isti duo exosi fratribus de Francia, qui dicebant quod in precedenti passagio fuerant ista completa.”⁴⁹

Obviously both the Patriarch and Salimbene witnessed and reported a real practice, celebrated in 1229 and again in 1248, but can we be sure that the same practice was carried out in other years as well? The real question – to which I have as yet no clear answer – is the following: to what extent was the *Jerusalem liturgy* a regular or an exceptional ritual, where and when? It was not anchored on a specific date in the *Calendarium*, unlike the commemoration of the destruction of Jewish Jerusalem, or the liberation of Jerusalem by the crusaders on 14th July, and it was not assured, therefore, of a permanent yearly celebration. I am not yet sure to what extent the *Pro Liberatione Terre sancte* rite was integrated into the Ordinary of the Mass. It formed an integral part of the Sarum Usage (up to the Reformation), of the Carmelite Rite (until quite recently), of certain French churches (mainly the Paris Usage); and when it entered the Pontifical of Guillaume Durand it was assured of both status and dissemination⁵⁰. Guillaume Durand’s Pontifical

⁴⁸ Ed. Karl Rodenberg, *Epistolae saeculi XIII e regestis pontificum Romanorum selectae*, vol. I, Ex Honorii III et Gregorii IX registris, No. 380 (MGH, *Epist. saec. XIII*, 1883) 297.

⁴⁹ Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica*, ed. Giuseppe Scalia, vol. I (Bari 1966) 340.

⁵⁰ Michel Andrieu (ed.), *Le Pontifical romain au Moyen-Age*, vol. III: *Le Pontifical de Guillaume Durand* (Studi e Testi 88, Vatican City, 1940) pp. v-ix, 17-19, and consult the impres-

includes, in fact, an *Ordo pro liberatione terre sancte a fidei inimicis*, beginning “Pro terre sancte liberatione dicitur in missa, statim post *Pater noster*, ps. *Deus venerunt gentes* etc.”⁵¹, and this ordo was of non-Roman origins⁵². But this last example underlines the exceptional character of the *Pro Liberatione Terre Sancte* rite: it was celebrated when the situation demanded it, exceptionally.

Regularity or exceptionality denote the extent of the actual practice of these liturgical forms, and they might suggest also something about their information-content (assuming a higher information-content in the less regular and expected activities). But even complete knowledge on this questions could not lead us, necessarily, to recognize a simple proportion between the regularity (or exceptionality) of this liturgy and the extent as well as the intensity of Europe’s commitment to the cause of the crusades. One should further ask whether any specific liturgy was perceived by the officiating clergy and the assembled congregation as pertinent to the liberation of Jerusalem alone or to other causes, and whether it was charged – according to their lights – by more than one message. The deictic element was rarely unidirectional. A good case-study of this problem is provided by the English custom to say the traditional *Preces Pro Terra Sancta* in Mass, a custom that survived until the large-scale liturgical reforms introduced in the sixteenth-century. In the course of time this liturgical form was expanded by the addition of prayers for the bishop and for the king, the traditional *Pro Terra Sancta* prayer still remaining the first prayer in a series of three, but sharing attention and dedication with the two others. Even a cursory examination of the manuscript missals (mainly of the Sarum usage, of course) brings out the resultant indeterminacy of this form in the later stages of its existence. It was certainly seen, and not infrequently, as a supplication for the Realm, for King and Realm, for the Peace of the Realm, more than it was perceived as a call for the liberation of the Holy Land. A similar question should be answered in regard to the St Gregory’s Trental. The twin goals of the liberation of the soul from Purgatory and the liberation of the Holy Land from the hands of the heathen are consistently combined in its particular prayers. And English translations made these texts accessible and largely comprehensible to the wide public. But our documentation seems to suggest that the Holy Land aspect of this usage was almost invisible, probably quite negligible, in the eyes of the people who asked for this particular remedy in their wills. They always stipulate that a “St Gregory’s Trental” be celebrated for their souls, and only very rarely – if at all – does one detect faint traces of any recognition that their individual salvation is coupled, in principle, with that of the Holy Land. These questions are still to be posed, therefore, and answered, before any overall statement could be offered on the subject of the actual celebration of the *Jerusalem liturgy* and its significance.

sive list of manuscripts and their classification in pp. 23–309, a good indication of the influence exerted by this Pontifical.

⁵¹ III: XVI, Op. cit., 630–631.

⁵² Op. cit., 318.

On the whole, however, the various forms of the *Jerusalem liturgy* were associated with the crusade. It is true that there was always some crusading activity going on in some part or another of Europe – mobilization of new crusaders, collection of money for that purpose, supplication for the survival of the Latin Orient, supplications for the crusaders – and all these demanded the appropriate liturgy. Yet the relationship between actual crusades and crusading liturgy cannot be explained in simple – not to say simplistic – terms of cause and effect. We are dealing here with quite complex phenomena, best assimilated to a vicious – or enchanted – circle rather than a simple linear relation; the implications of such an approach are clear.

At the end of the day, finally, it is obvious that the fortunes of the Jerusalem liturgy were closely linked with the fate of the crusading movement. Liturgy and crusade flourished and vanished together, liturgy somewhat later, more gradually and leaving behind some extremely fascinating traces. Like old soldiers and unlike the crusades, it never died, it just faded away.