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On Good Friday, 1626, Franciscus Quaresmius delivered a sermon in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem calling on King Philip IV of Spain to undertake a crusade to ‘liberate’ the Holy Land. *Jerusalem Afflicted: Quaresmius, Spain, and the Idea of a 17th-century Crusade* introduces readers to this unique call to arms with the first-ever edition of the work since its publication in 1631. Aside from an annotated English translation of the sermon, this book also includes a series of introductory chapters providing historical context and textual commentary, followed by an anthology of Spanish crusading texts that testify to the persistence of the idea of crusade throughout the 17th century.

Quaresmius’ impassioned and thoroughly reasoned plea is expressed through the voice of Jerusalem herself, personified as a woman in bondage. The friar draws on many of the same rhetorical traditions and theological assumptions that first launched the crusading movement at Clermont in 1095, while also bending those traditions to meet the unique concerns of 17th-century geopolitics in Europe and the Mediterranean. Quaresmius depicts the rescue of the Holy City from Turkish abuse as a just and necessary cause. Perhaps more unexpectedly, he also presents Jerusalem as sovereign Spanish territory, boldly calling on Philip as King of Jerusalem and Patron of the Holy Places to embrace his royal duty and reclaim what is rightly his on behalf of the universal faithful. Quaresmius’ early modern call to crusade ultimately helps us rethink the popular assumption that, like the chivalry imagined by Don Quixote, the crusades somehow died along with the middle ages.
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In 1631, Franciscus Quaresmius published a lengthy sermon calling on King Philip IV of Spain to undertake a crusade to ‘liberate’ the Holy Land from Turkish ‘tyranny’. The work has almost entirely escaped scholarly scrutiny for close to four centuries. No studies, translations, or even partial transcriptions of the Latin original have ever been published. The present book aims to correct this trend.

*Jerusalem Afflicted* in many regards reads as markedly different from other contemporary calls for Spanish crusade, particularly by communing explicitly with centuries of crusade apologetics and oratory, and by largely eschewing the body of popular prophetic narratives monotonously invoked by Quaresmius’ contemporaries. Quaresmius favors, instead, reasoned exegetical arguments, layered with allusions to legal and economic claims surrounding the Spanish crown’s unique patronage of the Holy Places and possession of the throne of Jerusalem. His politically driven hermeneutic offers an intellectual and moral case for why the Spanish crown must undertake a new crusade, largely side-stepping both the abstractions of eschatology and the material practicalities of military strategy or funding. The Spanish national impetus that informs his arguments can thus be read very much as the product of the Franciscan’s unique situation as a deeply schooled Italian friar who is also a subject of the Spanish crown in the 17th century, steeped in crusade tradition and writing with righteous indignation, invoking the highest moral and spiritual authorities he can muster and twisting the rhetorical screws for all they are worth to spur the king to action.

Quaresmius overtly channels a long tradition of justifications for crusade that stretches back to the 11th-century foundations of the movement. In both invoking and adapting these traditions to his contemporary moment, Quaresmius’ work moves in parallel but distinct ways from the more familiar traditions of imperial messianism in Iberia that similarly call for a Spanish conquest of the Holy Land. The resulting work reads as diaphanously, even jarringly, traditional and, at the same time, breathtakingly fresh and unique. In sum, we are unaware of other works published during the period that are quite like *Jerusalem Afflicted*. We are optimistic that other scholars and students will share our conclusion that the work is worth our time and consideration, not as an historical curiosity but as a text that substantively complements what we know about the place of crusade in the 17th century and, more broadly, about the long postmedieval afterlives of the crusading idea.
Part 1 of this edition begins with a series of introductory chapters. Chapter 1 addresses the work’s place in the broader sweep of crusading chronology, briefly considering scholarly opinions surrounding the evolution of crusade into the early modern period, and reflecting on the fraught politics of time that govern how we understand the place of crusade in the world today. Chapter 2 critically situates Quaresmius’ work in the particular Spanish context for which it was crafted. The chapter foregrounds Iberian and Spanish crusading traditions, surveying the cultural and political resonance of the idea of crusade, considering Spain’s unique claims to possession of the Holy City, and teasing apart the Spanish crown’s complex relationship with the Franciscan Custody of the Holy Land—of which Quaresmius was a part—in the late medieval and early modern periods. Chapters 3 and 4 consider the rich rhetorical and theological armature of Quaresmius’ work itself. Chapter 5 offers a brief biography of Quaresmius. Chapter 6 surveys what we know of the work’s material history as a sermon first delivered in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher on Good Friday in 1626 and as a physical book printed in Milan in 1631, reflecting on the work’s subsequent critical reception as well. Finally, Chapter 7 succinctly lays out the criteria observed in translating the original Latin text of Quaresmius, as well as the Spanish and Italian texts translated here. We offer these initial chapters not as the definitive last word on Quaresmius but rather as a series of provisional possibilities and suggestions that we hope will orient the reader and serve as an invitation for future work on this hitherto unstudied text.

After these initial chapters, Part 2 presents the first modern language translation of Jerusalem Afflicted. The text references the original marginalia and is accompanied by extensive historical and theological annotations. To conclude the book, Part 3 offers a select anthology of contemporary Spanish and Italian language sources, each appearing for the first time in English translation, annotated, and accompanied by brief critical commentary. These latter sources each in different ways attest to the spiritual, cultural, and political values of the idea of crusade in 17th-century Spain, offering a broader context within which to understand Quaresmius.

This book first emerged as something of a footnote to a footnote. In researching the place of Jerusalem in the historical ‘invention’ of Spain, an obscure 19th-century bibliography yielded a reference to a title with which the researcher in question here—Chad—was wholly unfamiliar: Quaresmius, Ierosolymae Afflictae, Milan, 1631. Efforts to track down the suggestive title led to two separate trips to the Veneranda Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan, each visit marked by marathon transcription sessions. While the food and sights in Milan did not disappoint, the Milan exemplar itself yielded an unpleasant surprise: it was missing two leaves, including the all-important title page and another which we would later find contained the author’s outline. Fortuitously, a second obscure 19th-century book, this time a digitized catalog of the National Library of Argentina, yielded an unexpected and wonderful discovery: a second exemplar, that to our knowledge had so far escaped the attention of scholars. Supplementing the Milan lacuna with the Buenos Aires codex, we were left with the first ever complete transcription of
Quaresmius’ *Jerusalem Afflicted*. Further study of the text led us to the conviction that we truly had rediscovered something special that merited further research, a text that needed to be shared with other scholars and students.

This book would not have been possible without the help of many people. We are deeply indebted to W. Marshall Johnston for his scrupulous review of our Latin translation. His suggested emendations on many occasions opened up the clear meaning of the text. We wish to recognize Noah, Eli, Gideon, Mimi, and Neave, and most especially Carolyn and Cheryl, who have all lived with this book in many ways, and who have all helped to make it finally become a reality. We would also like to acknowledge the persistent encouragement of Paula Plastic, who, for more than a decade, urged Chad to track down the vague references that he found to *Jerusalem Afflicted* as far back as 2007 and who additionally lent vital assistance in the preparation of the manuscript of this book. A note of thanks also goes to Jonathan Rockey for his assistance in verifying our Latin transcription, to Jorge Terukina Yamauchi for years of discussion surrounding the topic of this book, and to the following people who in different ways provided feedback, support, and encouragement: Laura Bass, Victor Castellani, Donna Beth Ellard, Carmen Granda, Tayana Hardin, Nicholas R. Jones, Orna Shaughnessy, John Slater, Susanna Throop, Rachel Walsh, and Juan Vitulli.

Without the financial support of the University of Denver, the travel to complete the archival work necessary to undertake this project would not have been possible. We are grateful for the generous help of the staff of the Veneranda Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan and the Biblioteca Nacional Mariano Moreno in Buenos Aires, who facilitated access to the only two surviving exemplars of *Jerusalem Afflicted*, as well as the staff of the Archivo Histórico Nacional, Biblioteca Nacional de España, and Museo Casa de la Moneda in Madrid; Fr. Stéphane Milovich, Sara Cibin, and Marie des Neiges de l’Esprevie of the Franciscan Custody of the Holy Land, and all the staff of the Biblioteca Generale della Custodia di Terra Santa and the Archivio Storico della Custodia di Terra Santa in Jerusalem; Isbael Aguirre at the Archivo General de Simancas; John O’Neal at the Hispanic Society of America in New York; and David Yoon at the American Numismatic Society in New York.
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Part 1

Introduction
1 Quaresmius, a Don Quixote?

Jerusalem Afflicted in the longue durée

Steven Runciman concludes the third volume of his influential *A History of the Crusades* with an opinion that scholars today, in the main, flatly reject. Speaking of the 1464 crusading efforts of Pope Pius II, the historian declares with sweeping theatricality that

Nearly four centuries before, Pope Urban II by his preaching had sent men in their thousands to risk their lives in the Holy War. Now all that a Pope who took the Cross himself could raise were a few mercenaries who abandoned the cause before ever the campaign was begun. The Crusading spirit was dead.¹

Close to two centuries later, in 1631, Franciscus Quaresmius published *Jerusalem Afflicted*, a work that passionately calls on Philip IV of Spain to lead a new sacred expedition to liberate the Holy Land. In familiar terms that distill centuries of crusading tradition, adapting that tradition to the unique political and social conditions of his own 17th-century world, Quaresmius certainly appears to commune with the ‘spirit’ that Runciman declares dead.

What should we make of an appeal for crusading in the 17th century? One approach, which we do not embrace in the present book, would be to consider the friar as nothing more than a deeply anachronistic anomaly, a sort of delusional crusade-minded Don Quixote feverishly bent on reviving an ancestral practice unmoored from contemporary realities.² This is precisely the sort of image that two near contemporaries of Quaresmius—Francis Bacon (of Protestant England) and Francisco de Quevedo (of Catholic Spain)—share in referencing the prospect of a crusade at the start of the 17th century, despite the two hailing from two quite distinct political and confessional contexts. For the characters in the texts of Quevedo and Bacon, crusades are unambiguously the stuff of ‘locos’ and ‘cracked brains’.³ Such relevant contemporary dismissals might lend credence to the idea that a call for crusade published in 1631 should be read, at best, as an out-of-place relic of something already long gone.

Such an interpretation, however, does no justice to the messy complications of crusading—both as idea and as practice—in the early modern period and beyond. As Susanna Throop has recently argued, ‘even if we conclude that the crusades
ended in the mid-seventeenth century, the legacy of crusading continues to unfold. As a result, crusading cannot be decisively locked into the box of the Middle Ages and the key thrown away’. Reflecting on the complex persistence of crusading, particularly into the early modern period, Christopher Tyerman observes that the proliferation of calls for crusade published even two centuries before Quaresmius, in the 15th century, ‘sits awkwardly with the construct of the crusades as a representative aspect of the culture that the Renaissance was supposed to have abandoned. It challenges the facile, crude demarcation of “medieval” and “modern”’. Texts like Quaresmius’ *Jerusalem Afflicted* invite us to problematize the notion that crusading belongs to the pristine medieval world, and that the early modern—with its insinuations of a coming Enlightenment rationality and secularism—is somehow insulated from the backward feudal Catholic barbarism that is popularly associated with crusading.

Such an overwrought narrative derives its deceptive seduction from the politics of time and periodization that Kathleen Davis critiques in *Periodization and Sovereignty*. Liberally glossing Davis, by insisting on the radical otherness of the medieval past, by denying it a measure of continuity or co-presence with modernity, we engage in a problematic political flattening and obfuscation, both of the complex realities of the medieval world and of the contemporary world in which we live today. We should be similarly sensitive to interrogating the temporal frontiers that insulate the ‘medieval’ from the ‘modern’ when approaching the world of Quaresmius, who, in 1631, begs the King of Spain to conquer Jerusalem in ways that might look and sound suspiciously ‘medieval’.

Of course, this is also not to suggest that we should move in the other direction and deny differences. *Jerusalem Afflicted* and other crusade expressions of the 16th or 17th century cannot be considered to be of a seamless piece with the crusading movement as it was experienced a half millennium earlier in the 11th and 12th centuries. For some perspective, it bears noting that today we are closer to Quaresmius in time than Quaresmius was to Pope Urban. Norman Housley, who has explored the ‘Later Crusades’ in more depth than anyone else, takes care to underscore on this front that scholarly interest in exploring the outer temporal fringes of crusading ‘forms a legitimate field of enquiry, so long as we accept that the crusading movement, with its consequences not just of acquiescence but of broad-based popularity and support, had long since come to an end’ by the mid-17th century. Such a position need not enter into conflict with recognizing later phenomena that are clearly indebted to the practices or ideas of crusading. Such phenomena might include, for example, the drafting of an extensive crusade proposal by German philosopher and mathematician Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz in 1671–1672; the persistence of structural indices of crusading such as indulgences and taxes ‘during the Veneto-Ottoman struggle for Crete (1645–1669), the second siege of Vienna (1683), and the Holy League of 1684–1697’; the explicit crusading mission of the Order of the Knights Hospitaller, which operated through the end of the 18th century; the founding of the crusade-inspired L’Institut Religieux et Militaire des Frères Armés du Sahara toward the end of the 19th century; the incongruous persistence of the Spanish cruzada as a papally
recognized source of funding rooted in crusade, which puttered along until the reforms of Vatican II in the 1960s; or, today, the embrace of crusade ideas in the context of white supremacist or white nationalist ideologies. Elizabeth Siberry begins her study of images of 19th- and 20th-century crusades by recognizing this long history:

Recent writing on the crusades has underlined the fact that the crusading movement did not end with the fall of Acre in 1291... In fact, there is ample evidence that crusade schemes were discussed well into the nineteenth century and the term and image are still used widely today.

Speaking of such phenomena in terms of their connection to traditional crusade simply obliges us to acknowledge that a variety of historical, geopolitical, socio-cultural, and religious developments subject ‘crusading’ to diverse processes of reimagining over time. Recognizing the historical specificity of those processes is essential for the early modern period as for any other period in which the idea of crusade is activated or resignified.

What, then, of the specific context in which Quaresmius lived? Scholars have pointed to numerous factors that forced an evolution in crusade ideas in the 16th and 17th centuries. One of these is a shift in the focus of sacred warfare that emerges out of the internecine conflicts of the wars of religion. Contested interpretations of faith, mapped onto opposing political identities, recenter holy war as something waged just as much between Protestants and Catholics, or between Dutch rebels and Spanish tercios, as between Christendom and Islam. At the same time, diverse colonial-imperial endeavors around the world divert attention and resources, placing relevant monarchies at crossed purposes with the prospect of Holy Land conquest. Very significantly, the power of the Ottoman Turks and their allied client polities across the Maghreb also renders the Mediterranean itself a very complicated place, characterized by complex forms of alliance, exchange, conflict, piracy, slavery, and war. From a Habsburg perspective at least, the Ottoman presence in Palestine in this context might be relativized as just one issue in a whole vast sea of trouble centered around Constantinople, Paris, Venice, Malta, or Algiers, rather than around the Levant. Another issue relates to the increasing centralization of powerful monarchies, violently jockeying for position in ways that are not just expressed practically—through diplomacy, economics, or military confrontation—but also symbolically, in the sphere of culture and ideology. Here, the increasingly acute sacralization of national peoples, territories, and cultures yields opposing—and fundamentally incompatible—claims to an exclusive, providentially ordained essence. Divergent aspirations to embodying new Chosen Peoples in new Holy Lands, imagined by reference to the model Holy Land in Palestine, help to generate and sustain narratives that contribute to reinforcing proprietary claims over the Holy Land itself. In the case of Spain, as we will see in the next chapter, there was no doubt: Jerusalem was sovereign Spanish territory, under the patronage of the Spanish king, himself king of Jerusalem, and the only one called to lead the conquest of the Holy Land. Such complex
factors seem to spell doom for the hoary idea that global Christendom might unite to overcome differences and distractions, coalescing in a new bid to reclaim the patrimony of Christ from the clutches of Islam. Throop sums up current scholarly orthodoxy on the matter by noting that

whereas in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries we might describe crusades as Latin Christian holy wars with national inflections, by the sixteenth century we might describe crusades as national holy wars rooted in a Latin Christian tradition ... No longer were crusades even nominally supranational; instead they were an explicit expression of relations between nations ... Perhaps we can say that after 1600, wars of Christian nationalism replaced crusading.\(^{18}\)

Spain occupies a special place in scholarly accounts of such processes.\(^{19}\) We will turn our full attention to exploring specific Spanish connections with crusading in the next chapter. For now, we would simply like to underscore two key points in view of the preceding. First, while the idea of crusade may have been fundamentally different in 1631 than it was in 1464 or 1095, the idea of crusade was hardly ‘dead’, as Runciman would have it. On the contrary, it continued to manifest itself in a variety of important ways through the end of the 17th century and beyond, including through the granting of actual crusade privileges, as well as through the expression of powerful ideas of national or imperial destiny, and religious, cultural, and ethno-racial essence, ideas that together helped preserve aspirations of Holy Land conquest as something deeply relevant and resonant. Second, such relevance and resonance were expressed perhaps no more loudly than in Spain. For these reasons, we urge caution in approaching Quaresmius. The 17th-century idea of a Spanish crusade, for which the Franciscan advocates, cannot be cavalierly dismissed as a symptom of misplaced devotion or outsized religious fervor, vapid backward nostalgia, naked imperial propaganda, or fevered messianic fantasy. To consider it the dying embers of a fire long since extinguished would be overly simplistic and inaccurate, and would also be less interesting than alternative interpretations. Jerusalem Afflicted, on the contrary, deserves to be taken on its own terms as a complex text born at a complex moment in which the idea of crusade continued to matter a very great deal.

The crusade imagined by Quaresmius—led by the king of Spain in the pursuit of both universal Catholic and Spanish national interests—conforms to the general pattern reviewed earlier. While drinking deeply from the well of earlier tradition, as we will see, Quaresmius reflects the sensitivities and practical realities of his moment circa 1631. Jerusalem Afflicted is a text keenly aware of the balance of relevant international actors, including most particularly the Ottoman Turks in Palestine, the Franciscan Custody of the Holy Land in Jerusalem, the Holy See in Rome, and the Spanish monarchy, situating crusade within a network of tugging authorities and rival interests. For Quaresmius, the recovery of the Holy Land is a task that would be of universal benefit to all faithful Christians, but it is also one that demands to be framed unambiguously as an affair proper to the
King of Spain. Nevertheless, *Jerusalem Afflicted* also overflows the categories of traditional royal or imperial propaganda that we might be tempted to expect with such a ‘national’ crusade project. The Franciscan reminds Philip of his rights and duties as sovereign of Jerusalem, and in the process repeats narratives of a special Spanish relationship with Jerusalem that the crown itself promoted. At the same time, things are, again, complicated. If, on the one hand, he advances a flattering portrait of royal power and destiny, he is also very often critical of the monarch, and is not shy in meting out warnings of harsh judgments and condemnation. The marriage of Jerusalem and her bridegroom Philip that Quaresmius describes is thus a marriage at once of divine destiny, legal obligation, and convenience. Philip is the only king called by God, bound by law, and endowed with the practical resources to rescue his enslaved wife from Turkish oppression. This is, in sum, a nuanced call to crusade that takes the prospect seriously, whether or not such an idea was actually practicable or, as Quevedo and Bacon might say, ‘crazy’. The concluding anthology of texts assembled in Part 3 of the present book, in concert with the remaining introductory chapters of Part 1, urges us to think beyond the otherwise tempting idea of Quaresmius as an oddity, defending moribund traditions. In *Jerusalem Afflicted*, crusade is imagined as still very much alive.

**Notes**

2 For an approach to Quixotic idealism that challenges traditional accounts of Don Quixote’s relationship to the medieval past, see Palmer, ‘Don Quixote’.
3 ‘I am of opinion, that except you could bray Christendom in a mortar, and mould it into a new paste, there is no possibility of a holy war. And I was ever of opinion, that the Philosopher’s stone, and an holy war, were but the rendezvous of cracked brains, that wore their feather in their head instead of their hat’, Bacon, ‘An Advertisement’, 475. ‘I came upon a man on a saddled mule who was talking to himself with such speed, and so absorbed, that even being next to him, he didn’t see me. I greeted him and he greeted me; I asked him where he was going, and after we had exchanged responses, we started to talk about whether the Turk was coming down, and about the King’s forces. He started to talk about how the Holy Land could be won, and how Algiers would be won; in which discourses I figured out that he was a Republic and governance crazy-person’, Quevedo, *La vida del Buscón*, 105–6. All translations are our own unless otherwise noted.
5 Tyerman, *The Debate*, 211.
6 See Davis, *Periodization and Sovereignty* and ‘Theory in Time’.
7 Cohen, ‘Introduction: Midcolonial’, 5–6, for similar reason urges us to consider the past as neither entirely, radically Other nor as unproblematically equivalent to the present, insisting instead on ‘temporal interlacement’ as a mode of disrupting the ‘continuist
Introduction

or alterist ... metanarratives’ that mark divergent readings of the Middle Ages. Heng, ‘Holy War Redux’, 428, advocates for ‘strategic diachronicity’ as a way to ‘revisit what we think we know about the past and about phenomena identified and located in modernity’. In the specific context of Spanish national history, Fuchs, ‘1492’, 494, notes that an almost immovable periodizing split lodges itself in 1492, taken as either the apotheosis of the national teleology of Reconquista or as the starting point of a new culturally complex national modernity projecting itself into empire and colony. This leaves us with the challenge of trying to ‘reimagine the periodization of Hispanic studies so as to privilege neither supersession nor nostalgia’. More generally, De Certeau, The Writing of History, 36, locates tension between present and past as a fundamental aporia of historiography itself, generated by the fact that the old things we study can necessarily only be studied now: ‘founded on the rupture between a past that is its object, and a present that is the place of its practice, history endlessly finds the present in its object and the past in its practice’.

8 Housley, ‘The Crusading Movement, 1274–1700’, 290. Housley, Contesting, 142, writes that ‘[f]rom all points of view, between 1500 and 1600 crusading shrank to become a shadow of its former self’. The following pronouncement of Riley-Smith, What Were the Crusades?, 89, now some decades old, still remains largely relevant: ‘crusading in the seventeenth century still awaits intensive study’.


13 O’Banion, ‘Only the King’ and ‘The Crusading State’.

14 See note 4.

15 Riley-Smith, The Crusades: A History, 333–6, offers a taxonomy of appropriations of crusading, based on different degrees of ‘authenticity’. ‘Pseudo-crusading’ refers to imaginative borrows of crusade imagery and expression that are not substantive, while ‘para-crusading’ strives to carry the torch of the movement in more overt ways.


19 Tyerman, God’s War, 910, calls ‘the experience of late medieval Spain … most notable’. For Housley, The Later Crusades, 452, ‘the conjunction between national war and crusade was a close one in Habsburg Spain’. Such assessments could be multiplied. Throop, The Crusades, 170, expresses a robust consensus: ‘[t]he lack of crusading success in the fifteenth century used to be read as a lack of interest in crusading, but in fact, crusading enthusiasm was being harnessed in European national interests like never before … The gold standard example of this was in the Iberian peninsula’.
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