



Shaping Society Through Text:

A Contextual Analysis of "Prior Geoffrey of the Temple, on the Books of Maccabees"

Steffen Dingemans



Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen



Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen

Shaping Society Through Text:

A Contextual Analysis of "Prior Geoffrey of the Temple, on the Books of Maccabees"

Master thesis

Steffen Dingemans

S4348281

June 2020

Supervisor: Dr. Rutger Kramer

Table of Contents

Introduction..... Page 1.

Status Quaestionis and Method..... Page 6.

Chapter 1: Key concepts..... Page 17.

Chapter 2: The Templum Domini and Achard of Arrouaise..... Page 25.

Chapter 3: Digression I..... Page 33.

Chapter 4: Digression II..... Page 43.

Chapter 5: Digression III..... Page 46.

Conclusion..... Page 50.

Acknowledgements..... Page 53.

Bibliography..... Page 54.

Introduction

Crusading and the crusader states have served as a rich soil for the writing of history in the past nine centuries.¹ On the one hand there are the stories about Christian armies that marched from the Latin West into the Levant and fought in the blistering heat over cities like Antioch and Jerusalem, while on the other hand the formation and development of the crusader polities like the Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Principality of Antioch have elicited much interest. While a substantial amount of research has been done on the developmental stages of the crusader polities I still feel something can be added to this body of research.² The reason for this is that I have stumbled upon a source which has as of yet received little scholarly attention but in my eyes offers tantalizing new insights in how the crusading community of the Latin East developed. The source is a strong reflection of the concerns of a person that had a high standing in both political and ecclesiastical life and as such is very telling of the concerns that might have plagued the community of the crusader states as a whole.

As such, this thesis will revolve around a poem authored in 1137 which goes by the title: "Prior Geoffrey of the Temple, on the Books of Maccabees". As the title gives away the poem is written by Geoffrey who at the time of writing was prior of the *Templum Domini* in Jerusalem and it consists mostly of a retelling of Maccabees I and II. Geoffrey takes these two texts and merges them into one linear story. His concerns about society are reflected in three digressions which he inserts into the story at places where they logically follow up on certain passages from Maccabees. The

¹ Christopher MacEvitt, 'What Was Crusader About the Crusader States?', *Al-Masaq* 30:3 (2018), 317 – 330 at 317.

² Malcolm Barber, *The Crusader States* (New Haven 2012); Adrian J. Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades: Society, Landscape and Art in the Holy City under Frankish Rule* (London 2001); Bernard Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: the Secular Church* (London 1980); Nikolas Jaspert, *The Crusades* (New York 2006).

concerns which Geoffrey raises in the digressions deal mostly with simony and a wavering trust in God's divine aid.³

The title of the poem and the concerns mentioned immediately raise questions: who was Geoffrey? Of what Temple was he prior? What is simony and what importance did it have in Christian society? What is written in the books of Maccabees and what importance do these texts have? I think it is worthwhile to immediately disclose the information we have about Geoffrey's life, but I will treat the other subjects mentioned here in a chapter dedicated to key concepts. Further, the title in the poem will be abbreviated to OM for readability purposes.

Nothing is known about Geoffrey's life before he became prior of the *Templum Domini*. We will treat the *Templum* in more detail later but for now it suffices to say that the site was a formerly Muslim building called the Dome of the Rock, situated on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem, and was identified by the crusaders as the Temple of the Lord.⁴ This identification led to the building being converted into a church ran by Augustinian canons.⁵ Since it was considered the Temple of the Lord it quickly became the second most important church in the Kingdom of Jerusalem.⁶

We don't know much of Geoffrey's deeds as prior, but we can give quite a detailed sketch of Geoffrey's life as abbot. Although he began his abbacy shortly after publishing OM, and thus all of which we will talk about in the following will take place after the writing process, this period contains important information about Geoffrey's ambitions and character. Thus, by studying his life we might be able to gain an understanding of what Geoffrey might have tried to accomplish with his poem.

Rudolf Hiestand was the second historian, after Ammon Linder, to both recognize and expand on the importance of Geoffrey, who played an important role in the Kingdom of Jerusalem

³ Eyal Poleg, 'On the Books of Maccabees: an Unpublished Poem by Geoffrey, *Prior of the Templum Domini*', *Crusades* 9 (2010) 13-56; Julian Yolles, 'The Maccabees in the Lord's Temple: Biblical Imagery and Latin Poetry in Frankish Jerusalem', in Elizabeth Lapina and Nicholas Morton eds., *The Uses of the Bible in Crusader Sources* (Leiden 2017) 421-439.

⁴ Reginald Denys Pringle, *The Churches of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: a Corpus/Vol. III, The City of Jerusalem* (New York 2007) 399.

⁵ Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time*, 91, 102, 109; Benjamin Zeev Kedar and Reginald Denys Pringle, '1099-1187: The Lord's Temple (*Templum Domini*) and Solomon's Palace (*Palatium Salomonis*)', in: Oleg Grabar and Benjamin Zeev Kedar eds., *Where Heaven and Earth Meet* (Jerusalem 2009) 133 – 149 at 135.

⁶ Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time*, 109.

from 1135 until 1160 when he presumably died.⁷ From his time as prior, starting from 1137, we know he authored a letter to Count Geoffrey of Anjou (r. 1129 – 1151), the son of king Fulk I of Anjou (r. 1131 – 1143) who was king of Jerusalem when Geoffrey rose to prominence, requesting material support. The further contents of the letter relate to the dignity of the Temple and the miracles which had been performed there. Moreover, Geoffrey mentions that Jesus had ejected all the buyers and sellers from the Temple. The most interesting part of the letter is that Geoffrey explains that it would require more than a letter to recount all the miracles and that a book is necessary.⁸

Now the question is: what book is Geoffrey mentioning? Hiestand believed it to be a poem written by Geoffrey's predecessor Achard of Arrouaise who held the priorate from 1112 – 1136, but Eyal Poleg, author of the first article concerning OM, asserts correctly that Geoffrey was mentioning his own work. Hiestand considered the possibility that the book mentioned by Geoffrey could have been included with the letter as a fitting gift for the count. Poleg does not entertain the option but in my opinion, looking to the dissemination of the manuscripts of which one has been dated end twelfth century and has been found in Northern France, it is highly likely that Geoffrey's poem came to France as a gift to king Fulk's son.⁹ In any case, it shows that Geoffrey would at least have been writing his poem with the higher nobility in mind and that he knew how to properly approach men of power.

In the same year as his promotion to the priory, the *Templum Domini* itself was elevated to the status of abbey. Geoffrey thus enjoyed his second promotion within a year when he attained the position of abbot. Since such a change would have required the King's consent it is entirely possible that Geoffrey had Fulk to thank for this higher position. As such, Geoffrey must have had enjoyed a

⁷ Rudolf Hiestand, 'Gaufridus Abbas Templum Domini: an Underestimated Figure in the Early History of the Kingdom of Jerusalem', in: Peter Edbury and Jonathan Phillips eds., *The Experience of Crusading 2: defining the Crusader Kingdom* (Cambridge 2003) 48-59 at 48; Ammon Linder, 'An Unpublished Charter of Geoffrey, Abbot of the Temple in Jerusalem', in: Benjamin Zeev Kedar, H.E. Mayer and R.C. Smail eds., *Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Jerusalem 1982) 119 – 129 at 119; Yolles, 'The Maccabees in the Lord's Temple', 431.

⁸ Hiestand, 'Gaufridus Abbas Templum Domini', 52 – 53.

⁹ Hiestand, 'Gaufridus Abbas Templum Domini', 52 – 53; Poleg, 'On the Books of Maccabees, 15 – 18, 22 – 23.

good relation with the King and since we know that Fulk favored men close to him in the high positions of the kingdom it is very probable that Geoffrey belonged to a wave of new men which travelled to the Holy Land with or for Fulk.¹⁰

As abbot, Geoffrey was involved in the political, ecclesiastical and cultural spheres of the Kingdom which shows that Geoffrey was a talented man filled to the brim with ambition. In 1141 the *Templum Domini* was consecrated as a Church by the patriarch and the papal legate after Geoffrey had overseen its renovation. As diplomat of the crown, Geoffrey was sent to the Byzantine emperor John II Comnenus (r. 1118 – 1143) to dissuade him from visiting Jerusalem (1142) and a second time in 1158 to Manuel I Comnenus (r. 1143 – 1180) on behalf of king Baldwin III (r. 1143 – 1163). Moreover, between 1137 and 1160 Geoffrey was a regular witness to charters issued by the patriarch and the crown. In these charters he appears just after the archbishop and bishops but before all other ecclesiastical witnesses like the prior of the Holy Sepulcher Church.¹¹ In conclusion, we can say that Geoffrey was a creative and shrewd church official who was able to heighten the standing of the *Templum Domini* by being a loyal servant of the crown.

This thesis will revolve around an analysis of the aforementioned three digressions inserted by Geoffrey in his retelling of I and II Maccabees. As such the digressions will be treated one by one, whereby every digression's content will be analyzed with the help of the established context. In this way it is my hope that we can establish a satisfying authorial intent which in turn can offer insights into the developments of the Christian community in the infant crusader states and consequently will aid me in answering convincingly the following research questions: How did events happening in the crusader polities, Geoffrey's position in the *Templum Domini*, and Geoffrey's social context influence the writing of "Prior Geoffrey of the Temple, on the Books of Maccabees"? How did Geoffrey, through his text, try to influence the Christian community of the Latin East? To be able

¹⁰ Hiestand, 'Gaufridus Abbas Templum Domini', 54; Hans Eberhard Mayer, 'Angevins Versus Normans: The New Men of King Fulk of Jerusalem', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 133:1 (1989) 1 – 25.

¹¹ Hiestand, 'Gaufridus Abbas Templum Domini', 48 – 51; Poleg, 'On the Books of Maccabees, 13 -14; Yolles, 'The Maccabees in the Lord's Temple', 432.

to establish for the reader a context which will make my analysis and my answer of the research question plausible we will embark on a journey to the Kingdom of Jerusalem and its neighboring crusader polities in the first half of the twelfth century. We will visit the *Templum Domini*, study the development of the ecclesiastical landscape, experience the calamities that befell the fledgling states and meet the historical actors who in some way or through their actions might have spurred Geoffrey to write what he wrote. Before we will start our analysis of the digressions it is important to first establish the scholarly field which I will be engaging with and discuss some of the key concepts which are essential for understanding the full implications of Geoffrey's digressions.

Status Quaestionis and Method

Since I am writing about a literary text authored in the Kingdom of Jerusalem I find it important to touch on the research which has been done on OM, the research method which inspired me, and also on the state of research concerning the crusader polities. As such this SQ will discuss different fields of scholarship. The way research has been done on these polities and the terminologies used have recently become a point of debate and it is important to establish where this thesis will position itself in that discussion.

In a recent article Christopher MacEvitt pointed out that the development of the crusader states has been treated over and over by historians in largely the same way: First Crusade, political event, battle, political event etc. MacEvitt states that the historian's addiction for juicy stories can be blamed for a manifold of general works that recycle the same stories over and over.¹² Furthermore, crusader history has been linked so tightly to the history of the crusader polities that it almost seems as if these two different facets cannot be examined separately.¹³ MacEvitt argues, and I agree, that a separate approach can be extremely beneficial for the development of the connected fields of crusading and the crusading states.¹⁴

Another assertion MacEvitt makes is that the crusader states should be completely separated from the Latin West, and rather should be studied in its Middle Eastern context solely. Although I agree that a Middle Eastern focus definitely has its merits, I think that a Western viewpoint also still has value.¹⁵ MacEvitt questions the approach because it relies on two centuries of scholarship that saw the crusader states as extensions of the Latin West, which he calls the colonial view. And this colonial view can't be sustained since that would require the Franks living in the East to uphold a Western crusader ideology, something MacEvitt does not think was the case.¹⁶ He bases this on the

¹² MacEvitt, 'What Was Crusader', 317, 320.

¹³ Ibidem, 318.

¹⁴ Ibidem, 318.

¹⁵ Ibidem, 318.

¹⁶ Ibidem, 323, 324.

ideas that Frankish leaders did not care if military aid came under the cross or not. Further, if a crusader had fulfilled his vow to aid in the conquest of the Holy Land he became a settler and was no longer engaging in an armed pilgrimage.¹⁷ An important example MacEvitt presents is that of Christian-Muslim alliances. He shows that these alliances were incredibly widespread and that both the Franks and Muslims had a strong understanding of the balance of power in which both sides saw one ruler as unbeneficial.¹⁸

I think the colonialist view can indeed not be sustained; these states were of course very much influenced by the surrounding Muslim polities. Having said that I do believe that strong ties with the West and a sense of crusading ideology still existed in the Latin East. As such I strongly agree with the viewpoints of Andrew Buck who wrote an article in reaction to MacEvitt.

Buck argues that the idea of crusading still influenced the behaviors and collective identities of the Franks settling in the East. As such the term crusader states does tell us something about society and group identity of the communities of the crusader polities.¹⁹ For example, there exist many names for the inhabitants of the East: Franks, Latins, Jerusalemites, Antiochenes and these names are used by different groups within society. The term Franks was mostly used by writers while Latins was used by the Kings of Jerusalem and Antiochenes by the rulers of Antioch. So on the one hand we can see a group identity evolve based on the fact that many of the crusaders came from France and the Latin West in general while on the other hand on many occasions they chose to identify with the name of the city conquered through a crusade. So, we see group identities evolve both on the basis of being a new group in a foreign state, but also on the basis of belonging to a certain polity. This certain polity had the name of the city conquered through crusading so even the names of the polities cannot be separated from their crusading past.²⁰

¹⁷ MacEvitt, 'What Was Crusader' , 328 - 329.

¹⁸ Ibidem, 326.

¹⁹ Andrew D Buck, 'Settlement, Identity, and Memory in the Latin East: An Examination of the Term 'Crusader States'', *English Historical Review* (2020) 1 – 32 at 3.

²⁰ Buck, 'Settlement', 7 – 11.

Further, Buck demonstrates that crusader *chansons* were created in the Latin East such as a story of crusaders that had to fight a dragon (devil) after the conquest of Antioch. Since this *chanson* was created in the 1140's it shows that the idea of fighting to combat sin was still prevalent in the Levant forty years after its initial conquest.²¹ A more obvious argument that Buck brings to the fore is that authors like William of Tyre (1130 – 1185) and Fulcher of Chartres (1059 – 1127), who both wrote histories of the crusader states, deeply indebted the origins of the crusader polities in the First Crusade (1096 – 1099). Another example of this is the *Historia Nicaena* (composed in the 1140s), in which the Franks are presented as having sworn a never-ending crusading oath. The anonymous author also does not make a distinction between the crusades and the beginning of the crusader states.²²

The crusading memory was also kept alive in liturgy. The most vivid memorialization of the results of the crusade can be found in Jerusalem where a liturgical procession existed which evoked the conquest of the city. This procession went by three important sites related to the capture: namely the Holy Sepulcher Church, the *Templum Domini* and the place where the walls were breached. A sermon would accompany the procession which touched upon the miraculous nature of the capture and that those present should imitate those that breached the walls. Both inhabitants of the city and pilgrims coming from the West would thus celebrate and foster crusading memories together.²³ As such, it is one of the strongest examples of a shared heritage between the East and West.

A strong example for crusader memorialization can also be found in a letter written by Patriarch Warmund of Jerusalem (patriarch from 1118 until 1128) to the archbishop of Santiago de Compostela in 1120 in which he states that the settlers of the Holy Land actively defended it and thus all of their time was spent in the Lord. Further, he states that the everybody was willing to die for the

²¹ Buck, 'Settlement', 11 – 12.

²² Ibidem, 15 – 16.

²³ Ibidem, 17.

Holy land. As such, Warmund illustrates that, even after settling in the Levant, a sense of perpetual penitential warfare persisted.²⁴

Whereas MacEvitt believes that the Latin East should be studied in its Middle Eastern context and should therefore be completely separated from the Latin West, Buck questions this separation, even if he agrees that the settlers were not living in a crusader bubble and thus were influenced by their Muslim neighbors.²⁵ Both scholars agree that the alliances between Christians and Muslims deserve attention. Buck underpins this by stating that the Latin states became an active part of the political patchwork and not states which were constantly seeking war. A great example of this is that in 1115 a coalition of crusader forces and Muslims of Damascus and Aleppo fought together against the warlord Bursuq of Hamadan who attempted to invade Northern Syria. On a more local level, non-Latin communities were allowed to live in the crusader states and even enjoyed some autonomous government. In the Kingdom of Jerusalem Muslims could swear their testimony of the Quran.²⁶

MacEvitt uses these examples to show that the settlers completely lost their crusading ideology. Buck is not willing to go this far and brings a number of arguments in contention to MacEvitt's beliefs. First, the alliances as mentioned above were an important part of the First Crusade showing that crusading and alliances with Muslims were not mutually exclusive.²⁷ Second, a lot of wars with Muslims were fought by the settlers, and the description of these battles in the beginning of the twelfth century convey an image of holy war. Remission of sin was promised by the Patriarch of Antioch, Bernard of Valence (Patriarch between 1100 and 1135), for battles against Muslims. Further, in retellings of a battle between the Kingdom of Jerusalem and Damascus in 1113 it is said that king Baldwin I (r. 1100 – 1118) did this for the love of God.²⁸ Fulcher of Chartres described those that were fighting to protect the Holy land as Knights of Christs. When Tancred of Hauteville, one of the leaders of the First Crusade, achieved victory over Muslim forces in 1105, it

²⁴ Buck, 'Settlement', 18.

²⁵ *Ibidem*, 20.

²⁶ *Ibidem*, 21 – 21.

²⁷ *Ibidem*, 23.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, 24.

was described by Ralph of Caen (1080 – 1120) as a victory brought about by divine aid and not human strength.²⁹ As such, it can definitely be said that crusader ideology was also kept alive even when the battles with Muslims were mainly fought over the protection of territory, and not the conquest of new lands.

The examples as shown above illustrate that although the Christians settling in the East adapted to their new environment, crusader ideology remained strong. As such crusading and the crusader states can be seen as very much overlapping fields of study. The following will be a case study, wherein I will examine a poem and try to figure out for whom and wherefore it was written. The text will therefore be examined as a reflection of crusader society. It will thus be focused on the East and it remains to be seen how strong Western religious and societal developments influenced those of the crusader polities. Since I do agree with Buck that these polities cannot be separated from the West, I will use the terms crusader states and polities as well as Latins or Franks when I am talking about the Christian settlers.

State of Research concerning OM

Only two scholars really examined Geoffrey's poem: Eyal Poleg and Julian Yolles.³⁰ Poleg was the first to publish an edited version of the complete text in Latin which he composed out of five extant manuscripts, which can now be found in Oxford, Besancon and Saint-Omer, and can be dated to the twelfth century.³¹ His main areas of interest are the structure of the text and the traces of intertextuality which can be found in the digressions.

Yolles's article does not focus on Geoffrey's text but instead uses it next to another poem written by Geoffrey's predecessor Achard of Arrouaise to examine the use of the Maccabees in

²⁹ Buck, 'Settlement', 25.

³⁰ Poleg, 'On the Books of Maccabees',; Yolles, 'The Maccabees in the Lord's Temple',.

³¹ Poleg, 'On the Books of Maccabees', 15 – 18.

crusader texts written in Jerusalem.³² To do this he relies heavily on Poleg's work but does add some of his own observations which enrich the analysis of Geoffrey's text. As such, both articles will function as important building blocks for this thesis. In the following I will give a summary of their observations which allows me to immediately give a detailed illustration of the text. The purpose of this is to have a thorough understanding of how the text is constituted before we begin with the analysis of the three digressions which form the focal point of this thesis. Therefore, this means that the lines between SQ and analysis will blur somewhat in the following but I strongly believe this will benefit our analysis later on. Poleg and Yolles's observations concerning the three digressions will not be touched upon here but in the following chapters as to avoid repetition.

The common thread running through the poem is Maccabees I with episodes from II inserted into the story. These insertions deal with the corruption of the priesthood and one of them is about the Maccabean martyrs. The poem does not start with a prologue or an addressee but immediately dives in how the Maccabean revolt came to be. After this introduction the story shifts into a first-person perspective:

"I have decided to abbreviate in a short book the many battles of the Maccabees that they fought, but first it is useful to relate how the land came to be abandoned and the Temple deserted. As long as the Law was dutifully observed by the people, no enemy invaded or attacked them. Instead God's Temple and his people, whom the Lord protected, were venerated by all other peoples."³³

In this passage it is immediately made clear that Geoffrey is concerned about attacks on his people. He also states that as long as the Law (Jewish covenant) was observed by the Jews these attacks did not occur since they were under divine protection.

³² Yolles, 'The Maccabees', 421 – 422.

³³ Geoffrey, *Prior Geoffrey of the Temple, on the Books of Maccabees*. Julian Yolles trans. (Leiden 2017) 433.

At the very end of the poem Geoffrey mentions the reason for writing his poem:

“The history has been treated with the utmost brevity, for I have omitted much and spoken but little about many things. My intention is to show through these books that the vice of simony arose in ancient times, from Simon and afterwards from a certain Jason”.³⁴

As such the poem was thus written to attack simony. In our analysis of the three digressions we will see how and why Geoffrey does this.

In between beginning and end, Geoffrey crafted an intricate story which has been first deconstructed by Poleg. Some of Poleg’s most important findings will be discussed in the following: Poleg identified biblical elements in the text which are taken from the Vulgate. The biblical references are liturgical echoes that would have evoked recognition from a reader familiar with Mass and Lauds. Moreover, the mother in the story of the seven brothers is described as standing immobilized, a play on John 20:11 where Mary is crying over her son. She is also described as *felix mater* (blessed mother). Both the play and the identification as a blessed mother were common Marian attributes, and as such this can be read as a connection to the *Templum Domini* which was dedicated to the Virgin Mary.³⁵

Poleg discerns seemingly detached passages of Maccabees I and II being put into a causal sequence by Geoffrey. For example, the corruption of the Temple priesthood in Jerusalem is connected with the persecutions of the Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes (r. 175 – 164 BC.). Once these persecutions reach the point where the seven Maccabean brothers are tortured and killed, the sins of the priesthood are cleansed by their blood and the Maccabean revolt against Antiochus is enabled.³⁶

³⁴ Geoffrey, *Prior Geoffrey of the Temple, on the Books of Maccabees*. Julian Yolles trans. (Leiden 2017) 434.

³⁵ Poleg, ‘On the Books of Maccabees’, 18 – 19; Pringle, *The Churches*, 402; Yolles, ‘The Maccabees’, 433.

³⁶ Poleg, ‘On the Books of Maccabees’, 19.

Aside from the unique causal relations Poleg also shows a passage wherein Geoffrey reflects on his own time, which reveals the importance Geoffrey attributes to the Maccabean times as prefiguration for his own:

“But now many, ignorant of the past, say that never was there a time like that of our own; but if they knew the past, they would call these happy times”³⁷

With this sentence Geoffrey is berating those authors like Guibert of Nogent (1055 – 1124) who tried to contest the direct comparison between the crusaders and the Maccabees. In the eyes of Guibert for example, the crusaders fought in knowledge of God while the Maccabees fought for dietary laws and Jewish customs. Thus, for whatever reason Geoffrey equated the Maccabees completely to the crusaders.³⁸

Poleg then shows the intertextual connection between saint’s *vitae*, in which the word *consortium* is often used in description of martyrs, and the story of the Maccabean brothers; in Geoffrey’s work this word is used relating to the seven brothers. Thus, according to Poleg, Geoffrey underpins his assertion that the Maccabean past is equal to his own time by elevating the Maccabean brothers to Christian Martyrs.³⁹

The Maccabees, be it the warriors or the martyrs (this distinction will be made clear in the key concepts chapter) do not represent the main concern of Geoffrey’s work. That honor goes to the subjects of simony, the corruption of the priesthood and the sins of the Christian community in the Holy Land. In our analysis we will see that these concerns are represented in the three digressions inserted by Geoffrey. As such, we will not engage with Poleg’s and Yolles’s analysis of them here since they will be extensively dealt with as part of my own analysis.

³⁷ Geoffrey, *Prior Geoffrey of the Temple, on the Books of Maccabees*. Julian Yolles trans. (leiden 2017) 437.

³⁸ Poleg, ‘On the Books of Maccabees’, 19 – 20.

³⁹ *Ibidem*, 20.

Method

The method used for the analysis of our source is highly indebted to two articles: one by Gabrielle Spiegel and one by Stuart Airlie.⁴⁰ Spiegel shows that by examining language in its local or regional social context of human relations and networks of power we can recover the meaning of a text which it not explicitly stated in the text itself.⁴¹ An important observations she makes is that texts both generate but also mirror social realities; the creation of a text is thoroughly influenced by the social reality in which the author finds him or himself, but the text can also seek to influence that same society. As such, texts can be of a sustaining, resisting or transforming nature.⁴² And thus an examination of text and context can reveal this nature and answer questions about why the text needs to carry this nature.

When we look at context we need to examine the specific social world of the author.⁴³ In our case that means that we need to take into careful consideration Geoffrey's environment. We need to look into the power struggles that unfolded around Geoffrey, historical actors that interacted with him but also developments, both manmade and natural, which occurred in the Holy Land when he was in charge of the *Templum Domini*. It is by looking into these social and political factors which shaped the text, we can find what Geoffrey might have wanted to shape. By engaging in a relational reading of text and context, by looking into explicit and implicit meaning and purposes it must be possible to shine light on what we cannot read in the text directly.⁴⁴

A great example of such a strategy is Airlie's article: 'Sad Stories of the Death of Kings': Narrative Patterns and Structures of Authority in Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle*'. In this article he analyses Regino of Prüm's chronicle about the disintegration of the Carolingian empire by

⁴⁰ Stuart Airlie, "Sad Stories of the Death of Kings': Narrative Patterns and Structures of Authority in Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle*", in: Elizabeth M. Tyler and Ross Balzaretto eds., *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West* (Turnhout 2006) 105 – 31; Gabrielle M. Spiegel, 'History, Historicism, and the Social Logic of the Text in the Middle Ages', *Speculum* 65:1 (1990) 59 – 86.

⁴¹ Spiegel, 'History', 77 – 78.

⁴² Ibidem, 77.

⁴³ Ibidem, 78.

⁴⁴ Ibidem, 83.

establishing the contexts which would have surrounded Regino and thus would have shaped his text.⁴⁵ Airlie describes the political context surrounding Regino and addresses his role in this. He sees Regino's text as a response to a politically changed world wherein the Carolingians were no longer undisputed. When investigating the intended audience Airlie considers them to be the persons to whom the text was dedicated and the persons whom Regino might have met at royal meeting and synods. Since Regino was a higher clergyman himself his position and relations would have influenced his writing. The subject of the text makes Airlie consider that this could be a text that would be brought before kings who would be struggling with crises himself.⁴⁶ Airlie's last consideration, before his analysis of the text, is the impact Prüm might have had on Regino's writing. To establish the influence of the place he crafts the entire political and ecclesiastical context relating to it. For example, the abbey was closely linked to the Carolingian dynasty and as such it had obligations to it like prayer and commemoration. Next to this, members of the dynasty that posed threats to those that ruled were often put away in the abbey. The aura of the Carolingians remained strong in Prüm and anybody living and writing there would be influenced in some way by the dynasty.⁴⁷

Airlie thus makes great use of the reading method as introduced above. He sees the text as shaped by the political and social surroundings of Regino. An important addition he makes to these societal factors is that he delves into the influence of "place" on the narrative created by Regino. The influence of place will also be very important in our understanding of Geoffrey's context since his constant exposure to the ideas exhibited in the *Templum Domini* might definitely have influenced his writing. The ideas and connotations connected to this place will be expanded upon in the following chapter.

There is one last consideration which Airlie touches upon and is also important for my work: the danger of circularity. This circularity comes into effect when analyzing a selected text with a

⁴⁵ Airlie, "Sad Stories", 105.

⁴⁶ Ibidem, 111 – 113.

⁴⁷ Ibidem, 114 115.

selected context. It is however integral to this methodology as we have seen above: context influences text, but text also influences context. The circle can't be broken so it is of utmost importance that the selected context is as complete as possible. When this is the case, and I believe that in this thesis that is the case; the selected context works as strong ground layer to enrich our analysis of the digressions with and will lead to a satisfactory answer of the research-questions.

Chapter 1: Key Concepts

The Books of Maccabees I and II and their place in crusader narratives

The book of Maccabees I and II form the basis of Geoffrey's narrative into which he weaves his three digressions and both books were part of the biblical canon in the Middle Ages. The first book of Maccabees tells about the priest Mattathias and his sons of whom Judas Maccabeus became the most famous. Together they started a rebellion, lasting from 175 until 134 BC, against the Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes because the king wanted to forbid Jewish dietary laws and customs.⁴⁸

The second book of Maccabees is most famous for the story of the seven brothers and their mother. Whatever torture the Seleucid's used to get the brothers to abandon their dietary laws, they did not budge. As a consequence, all of them were brutally murdered in front of their mother.

Both the Maccabean warriors (Mattathias and sons) and the Maccabean martyrs (seven brothers) enjoyed a place in Christianity albeit in different ways. The Maccabean martyrs had their place on the Christian liturgical calendar of the Latin West. Their place on that calendar was not uncontested since questions arose in the twelfth century why only the martyrs were revered on the Christian calendar but no other worthy Old Testament figures. Bernard of Clairvaux (1090 – 1153) responded to this question by asserting that the brothers suffered martyrdom in the same way Christian martyrs did; they died for the truth of God and refused to denounce him in any way. Their martyrdom was entirely internal and of a spiritual truth.⁴⁹

For the Maccabean warriors it was harder to find a place in Christian commemorating. In the period before the crusades, spiritual fighting was seen as infinitely more valuable than actual warfare and as such the Maccabees were largely ignored. There exist however examples of Christian authors giving importance to the Maccabees. One such an example is a collection of saints *vitae* composed by

⁴⁸ Daniel Joslyn-Siemiatkoski, *Christian Memories of the Maccabean Martyrs* (New York 2009) 1; Nicholas Morton, 'The Defense of the Holy Land and the Memory of the Maccabees', *Journal of Medieval History* 36 (2010) 275 – 293 at 275 – 276; Poleg, 'On the Books of Maccabees', 18.

⁴⁹ Joslyn-Siemiatkoski, *Christian Memories*, 107 – 108.

Aelfric (late tenth early eleventh century), an Anglo-Saxon abbot, in which the Maccabees are included because fighting for one's home and faith was just. Still Aelfric found it necessary to add that spiritual fighting should still be regarded as a more valuable effort.⁵⁰ Another form in which the Maccabean warriors became used was in the papal reform sphere: Gregory VII's (Pope from 1073 – 1085) fight with emperor Henry IV over lay investiture was likened to the fight between Antiochus IV the Seleucid king and Judas Maccabeus. Gregory was defending the Church against lay rulers the same as Judas had fought to protect the Jewish Law against a tyrannical overlord. As such, military virtue became linked with the protection of the Church, an ideology which could also fit the crusading movement.⁵¹

This crusading movement did not exactly fit the belief that when Christ came he taught that Christians should uphold peace and that conflict should be directed inwards to fight the devil in one's self.⁵² Nevertheless, the idea of a Christian army protecting the Church at all cost came into full swing at the end of the eleventh century. That the crusader spirit would come into full action was caused by a myriad of different reasons of which the most important are the following: first, a papal conscientious had developed which sought to rid the Church of corrupting influences like lay control. The idea of protecting the Church could also be directed to hostile forces like Islam. Gregory VII imagined a community of seculars under papal command which would form an army as soldiers of Christ.⁵³ Second, an intellectual movement started to develop the idea that under certain circumstances force could be used, especially when protecting the Christian faith.⁵⁴ Third, during the eleventh century the idea of penitential pilgrimages to be rid of one's sin started to become increasingly popular which in turn fostered an idea of individual reform.⁵⁵ Fourth, nobleman and

⁵⁰ Elizabeth Lapina, 'The Maccabees and the Battle of Antioch', in: Gabriela Signori eds., *Dying For the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old-Testament Faith-Warriors (1 and 2 Maccabees) in Historical Perspective* (Leiden 2012) 148 – 159 at 150 – 151.

⁵¹ Morton, 'The Defense, 279.

⁵² Ibidem, 279.

⁵³ Barber, *The Crusader*, 10 – 11.

⁵⁴ Barber, *The Crusader*, 11.

⁵⁵ Ibidem, 11 – 12.

petty lords became increasingly worried about their place in Christ's kingdom. Their position in the material world forced them into the defense of their land and on the other hand they could not live chaste since they had to protect their lineage. As such, the remission of all sins for somebody taking the cross would be an attractive reason to join a Holy war.⁵⁶ Fifth, for non-nobles the promise of attaining instant martyrdom when one died for the protection of the faith proved to be very attracting as well.⁵⁷ As such the crusader spirit of a penitential pilgrimage combined with warfare opened the door for the veneration of military figures in the Old Testament.

Once the crusading spirit had been put to action and Christian armies in the name of God had occupied lands, belonging to Muslims, the Maccabean warriors became a popular trope. For example, authors like Fulcher of Chartres (1059 – 1127) and Raymond d'Aguilers (who wrote his work in 1099) equated the victories of the crusaders to the victories of the Maccabees. Fulcher of Chartres called the Maccabees a chosen people just as the crusaders.⁵⁸ According to historian Nicolas Morton, readers who would be living in the crusader states were constantly engaging with Old Testament monuments and places and would thus find the allusion appealing while those living in the West who had never seen those places would find the equation tantalizing since they knew about the deeds of the Maccabees and could make a comparison. For the crusaders living "in the Old Testament" the allusion to the Maccabees reinforced their own position as being a chosen people.⁵⁹

Still, the use of the Maccabees as a crusader trope was distressing to some writers, so in the first decades of the twelfth century authors like Guibert of Nogent (1055 – 1124) and Peter Tudebode (fought in the first crusade) styled the Maccabees very negatively. Guibert stated that the Maccabees were fighting to eat pork while Peter Tudebode compared Judas Maccabeus to Satan. This shows that even when the idea of the Maccabees as prefiguration's of the crusaders became widespread it was still contested. Nevertheless, as the twelfth century progressed the concern about

⁵⁶ Barber, *The Crusader*, 12.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, 12.

⁵⁸ Morton, 'The Defense, 277 – 278.

⁵⁹ *Ibidem*, 276 - 277.

stylizing the Maccabees as proto-Christian warriors ceased and authors like Orderic Vitalis (1075 – 1143) mentioned Judas Maccabeus as ‘memorable champion of the Christian people’, while Bernard of Clairvaux used Judas to comfort crusaders by stating that Judas Maccabeus had defeated a multitude with few, a comfortable thought for the Christian armies in the East which were constantly outnumbered.⁶⁰ The pinnacle of the Maccabees being seen as proto-Christian warriors can be found on the tombstone of Baldwin I (K. 1100 – 1118):

King Baldwin, a second Judas Maccabeus
Hope of the nation, strength of the Church, virtue of both,
whom Lebanon and Egypt, Dan and murderous
Damascus fear and bring tribute to,
*alas is enclosed in this humble tomb.*⁶¹

Here we thus see the king of Jerusalem being actively compared with a king from the Old Testament. Additionally, we know that Baldwin III (1143 – 1163) was compared to Judas Maccabeus as well.⁶² Concludingly, we can say that the story of Judas Maccabeus written in the Books of Maccabees I and II was used to champion the idea that salvation could be won through arms, and on the other hand the story of the Maccabean martyrs who died for salvation could be used as an example that crusaders attained redemption by suffering for the faith. As such, the Maccabees became a role model for the crusaders.⁶³ Both the Maccabean martyrs and the Maccabean warriors are present in Geoffrey’s poem.

After the death of the first generation of settlers. the militaristic story of the Maccabees became increasingly less useful since the Christian ruling class entered into a power relation with the

⁶⁰ Morton, ‘The Defense, 282 – 283.

⁶¹ Yolles, ‘The Maccabees’ ,429.

⁶² Morton, ‘The Defense, 285.

⁶³ Poleg, ‘On the Books of Maccabees’, 19.

Islamic world. This relationship was based on coexisting rather than war. As such, Geoffrey's work is one of the last which is so overtly dedicated to the story of the Maccabees and as such it holds an important place as a work which can tell us something about society. It is evident that Geoffrey was trying to harken back to the image of the Maccabees so popular to the first generation of settlers.⁶⁴

Simony

Two of Geoffrey's digressions engage immediately with the debate on simony which was prevalent in the Latin West during the eleventh and twelfth century. So, it is important to gain a full understanding of what simony is and how it affected the Latin Church. Before we dive into the history of the concept a definition is in order. This definition is based on the definitions given by Joseph Lynch and Timothy Reuter, who wrote important works on the subject: simony is the buying and selling of 'spiritual things and powers' for money, favors or services rendered. The 'spiritual things' in this definition can be church offices, monastic offices, sacraments etc.⁶⁵

Interestingly the charge of simony was not new since one of the Church fathers, Gregory the Great (Pope from 590 – 604), already voiced concerns about this and called it a heresy. Gregory even expanded the scope of the accusation to favors and services rendered. Still, the issue of simony only became a hot topic in the eleventh century, five centuries after it had been brought to the fore.⁶⁶

Different approaches have been taken to explain why this happened and I will discuss the most important ones in the following. For Reuter, the "simony wave" can be explained by the desire of churches and ecclesiastical institutions to free themselves from the proprietary system. In this system churches were "owned" by lay powers, such as noblemen, who held claims over churches which they had endowed with favors and gifts. By naming this a simoniacal practice it released

⁶⁴ Morton, 'The Defense', 285.

⁶⁵ Joseph H. Lynch, *Simoniacal Entry into Religious Life from 1000 to 1260: a Social, Economic and Legal Study* (Columbus 1976) 68; Timothy Reuter, 'Gifts and Simony', in: Esther Cohen and Mayke de Jong eds., *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context* (Leiden 2001) 157 – 168 at 159.

⁶⁶ Reuter, 'Gifts', 161.

clergyman of these claims and as such loosened the grip of secular powers over ecclesiastical matters.⁶⁷

Lynch discusses the matter from the viewpoint of the church reformers who brought this issue to the forefront in the eleventh century. In the reformer's eyes simony could occur when lay powers like kings, noblemen and petty lords were exerting control over ecclesiastical matters like the elections of bishops and the devotional practices which were selected in churches. For instance, a church office like a bishopric could be sold to the highest bidder. So as long as lay control existed simony would be practiced. Consequently, the reformers stamped simony as a gruesome heresy and as such it became completely intertwined with the battle against lay control.⁶⁸

Of course, simony could be found in small monasteries or proprietary churches of the nobility but it was in the struggle between Pope and Emperor concerning the investiture of (arch)bishops that the reform movement moved to the forefront of the Church. It was in this struggle that lay investiture not only became intertwined with the practice of simony but lay investiture became seen as a form of simony.⁶⁹

A pivotal event in the development of the accusation of simony was the investiture controversy (11th and 12th century). This controversy lasted more than a century and essentially revolved around the question of who should invest a newly elected bishop.⁷⁰ Of course this was part of the question of lay control in general but it was fought on the highest possible political ground: that of the Holy Roman Emperor and the Pope.

In 1080 pope Gregory VII (pope from 1073 until 1085) decreed that no cleric could accept lay investiture and if he did anyway should in no way be regarded as a man of the church.⁷¹ Gregory's determination to reform the church and root out heresies taking place in it, among them simony, led

⁶⁷ Reuter, 'Gifts', 164 – 165.

⁶⁸ Lynch, *Simoniactal Entry*, 65.

⁶⁹ Colin Morris, *The Papal Monarchy: the Western Church from 1050 to 1250* (Oxford 1991) 154 – 156.

⁷⁰ Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, 119.

⁷¹ Patrick Healy, *The Chronicle of Hugh of Flavigny: Reform and the Investiture Contest in the Late Eleventh Century* (Aldershot 2006) 176 – 177, 200.

to a confrontation with Henry IV (1050 – 1106) at that time king of the Germans. In 1075 Gregory had decreed rulings against simony and clerical concubinage which resulted in outrage among the clergy of the Empire. Siegfried, Archbishop of Mainz was so afraid for clerical opposition that he moderated the degrees. This kind of behavior was not taken kindly by Geoffrey and as an example he accused the Bishop of Bamberg of simony and deposed him.⁷² In the same year, king Henry invested a bishop in Milan which was against Gregory's decrees since he regarded simony as the natural consequence of lay investiture.⁷³ As such, he wrote a letter to Henry stating that if he would not revoke his action he would be excommunicated. Henry, who was not willing to revoke his investiture was then fully excommunicated.⁷⁴ After the famous reconciliation at Canossa in 1077 the relationship between the two men remained strained and this led eventually to a Papal schism in 1084 when Henry instated anti-pope Clement III (r. 1084 – 1099).⁷⁵

Something I want to touch upon is how ecclesiastical and political matters intersected when it came to the subject of simony. Henry was not only embroiled in a contest with the Pope but also with the Saxons. The Saxons, who probably could not care that much for the investiture contest, therefore joined the papal side since they were in open rebellion to Henry. As such they hoped that by joining the papal side they could secure Henry's removal.⁷⁶

The conflict about lay investiture by the Emperor would remain relevant until 1122 when it was resolved in Worms. Paschal II (r.1099 – 1118), in 1102, forbade lay investiture and the performance of homage to laymen on the punishment of excommunication.⁷⁷ He was able to more or less defend his principles until 1111 when the coronation of Holy Roman Emperor Henry V (1111 – 1125) went wrong and Paschal was taken captive. In order to procure his release Paschal granted Henry free investiture, a coronation and to never excommunicate him.⁷⁸

⁷² Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, 113 – 114.

⁷³ *Ibidem*, 154 – 156.

⁷⁴ *Ibidem*, 115 – 116.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*, 117 – 121.

⁷⁶ *Ibidem*, 114, 116

⁷⁷ *Ibidem*, 155 – 157.

⁷⁸ *ibidem*, 155, 158 – 160.

Calixtus II (1119 – 1124) was willing to attack the practice of lay investiture, and once again had extreme difficulty imposing a ban on the practice. Nevertheless, he was able to resolve the schism between Emperor and Pope in 1122 with the concordat of Worms. In the concordat it was decided that the emperor would forfeit his right to investiture by ring and staff, and that he granted free canonical elections and free consecration in all churches of the empire. The concordat was a serious compromise since the Emperor was still allowed to be present at the elections, could settle disputes between elects, and could invest the new bishop with a scepter. Furthermore, although not stated explicitly, it was permitted that the bishop would do homage to the emperor before consecration. So, in practice nothing had changed. The emperor was still able to heavily influence elections, he was now just able to do this under a guise of piety.⁷⁹

In conclusion, the issues of simony and lay investiture profoundly influenced the ecclesiastical landscape in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. With the concordat of Worms, lay investiture could remain a prevalent practice and it is thus of no wonder that Geoffrey was concerned with simony as well. In the following chapters issues of simony and lay investiture in the crusader states will form an important part of the social context which possibly influenced Geoffrey's writing.

⁷⁹ Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, 161 – 164.

Chapter 2: The Templum Domini and Achard of Arrouaise

The Templum Domini

This chapter will be dedicated to a thorough description of the *Templum Domini* and the connotations attached to it, and a treatment of Geoffrey's direct predecessor as prior Achard of Arrouaise. In doing so I strive to create a spatial reflection of the environment which would have surrounded Geoffrey constantly, but also an image of the man that must have had an influence on Geoffrey's ideologies as prior. As such, I invite the reader to walk with me and follow in the path Geoffrey might have taken on his daily strolls while he lingered on thoughts concerning the wellbeing of the Church in the crusader states. Together then we can discover how "space" and "place" might have influenced Geoffrey. Since Reginald Pringle has published a formidable corpus containing all the churches in the Kingdom of Jerusalem, our description of the *Templum Domini* will be largely based on his work.⁸⁰

Nowadays and shortly before the crusaders gained control of the property it was known as the Dome of the Rock: the rock on which Muhammed landed when he was transported from Mecca to Jerusalem on his Night Journey.⁸¹ When the crusaders captured Jerusalem, the site quickly became one of the most important places for the new inhabitants of the city since the building carried both Old and New Testament associations. As such it did not take long for the building to assume a prime liturgical function as a church and as important station during processions. On a more practical level it was also one of the few buildings which could house a multitude of people.⁸² The importance of the building was heightened, according to Fulcher, by processions like the one on

⁸⁰ Reginald Denys Pringle, *The Churches*, 397 – 415.

⁸¹ Pringle, *The Churches*, 399.

⁸² Francis Peters, *The Holy City in the Eyes of Chronicles, Visitors, Pilgrims, and Prophets from the Days of Abraham to the Beginnings of Modern Times* (Princeton 1985) 317; Pringle, *The Churches*, 400; Yolles, 'The Maccabees in the Lord's Temple', 423.

August 5 1099 in which a reliquary containing a piece of the “True Cross” was brought to the church. William of Tyre (c. 1130 – 1186) describes an event in 1099 wherein Godfrey of Bouillon (1060 – 1100) and his men offered their prayers before their victory over the Muslims of Ascalon (1099) at the *Templum Domini*.⁸³

Although most of the learned people travelling with the crusaders knew that the building was not the actual Temple built by Solomon, it was situated on what they believed was the same place and that it had a similar shape thus from the beginning the crusaders called it the *Templum Domini*.⁸⁴ Proof that knowledge about a Muslim heritage was present can be found in works by the Russian pilgrim Daniel (travelled the Holy land in the beginning of the twelfth century), Frettelus canon of the cathedral at Nazareth (wrote his work in 1137), and John of Würzburg (travelled the Holy land in the 1160s). Daniel wrote that the building had been built by a Saracen called Amor, Fretellus posed the possibility that an Egyptian emir built it and John of Würzburg also considered an Islamic heritage.⁸⁵

Creating a narrative that supported the Old and New Testament heritage was easily done as a strong foundation to build the narrative on was already in place: the Dome of the Rock’s layout. In the middle of the building there was a big rock. Below this rock was a cave which the pilgrim Saewulf (his work is identified as being written around 1102) identified as the Holy of Holies: the space described in the Hebrew Bible in which the Ark of the Covenant was kept. Although a reader of the Old Testament would know that the Ark had been hidden in the desert by the prophet Jeremiah, as described in II Maccabees, the idea began to exist among the crusaders that the Ark of the Covenant was kept in the *Templum Domini*.⁸⁶

Next to this most important Old Testament connotation the *Templum Domini* was also rife with New Testament associations. Saewulf listed the places which could be found in the Temple like

⁸³ Pringle, *The Churches*, 400; William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*. Emily Atwater Babcock and A. C. Krey trans. (New York 1943) 395.

⁸⁴ Peters, *The Holy City*, 314.

⁸⁵ Kedar and Pringle, ‘1099-1187: The Lord’s Temple, 136 – 137.

⁸⁶ Peters, *The Holy City*, 315; Pringle, *The Churches*, 400.

the place where the angel appeared before Zechariah (Luke 1.8-1) to tell that his wife would bear fruit to his son who would become known as John the Baptist, the place where Jesus was circumcised (Luke 2.21), and the place where Jesus was presented to Simeon (Luke 2.22-35) who had received a divine revelation from the Holy Spirit telling him that he would not die before he had seen the Christ (messiah) of the Lord. Furthermore, Saewulf also identifies the place where Christ was seen deliberating with the teachers in the Temple at age twelve (Luke 2.42-52) and the place where he drove out the money-changers and traders from the temple (Matthew 21.12-16). Then he describes the place where Jesus saved the woman taken in adultery from stoning (John 8.3-11). Finally, he describes the place where Jesus hid when he had told the Jews in the temple that they did not truly know God (John 8). Saewulf adds here that at this place the footprint of Jesus can still be seen.⁸⁷

As Saewulf's description shows, active steps were taken to create a sacred topography. The space of the Dome of the Rock was reshaped and reinterpreted to make it consistent with both the Old and New testament past.⁸⁸ The way the Holy Sepulcher Church acted as a place of sanctity might have inspired those who wanted to imbue the *Templum Domini* with Christian meaning. In this church the crucifixion, burial and resurrection of Christ could be actively remembered at the actual places where those events happened. The specific "historical" links of this place with Christianity gave the church an immense symbolic power and it is something which those that were promoting the *Templum Domini* will probably have noted.⁸⁹

The layout was thus put to perfect use in creating a powerful narrative enabling the *Templum Domini* to become the second most important place in the liturgical landscape of Jerusalem just behind the Holy Sepulcher Church. Next to this, visitors could interact with some of the most important events from the New Testament and could actively relive moments of Jesus's life. Aside

⁸⁷ Pringle, *The Churches*, 401.

⁸⁸ Michelina Di Cesare, 'The Eschatological Meaning of the "Templum Domini" (The Dome of the Rock) in Jerusalem', *Aevum* 88:2 (2014) 311 – 329 at 318.

⁸⁹ Robert G. Ousterhout, 'The Sanctity of Place and the Sanctity of Buildings: Jerusalem Versus Constantinople', in: Bonna D. Wescoat and Robert G Ousterhout eds., *Architecture of the Sacred: Space, Ritual, and Experience from Classical Greece to Byzantium* (Cambridge 2012) 281 – 306 at 281, 283, 292.

from the New Testament connotations visitors could also interact with the place where the Ark of the Covenant had been stored which represented the alliance between God and his followers. In order to fully understand how powerful this place could have been for a Medieval Christian audience we have to shortly dive into the meaning of the Temple in Christianity.

The sacrifice made by Jesus Christ when he was crucified was often likened to the sacrifices which were made in the Temple by the Jews to appease God. As lambs and bulls were sacrificed in the temple to live according to God's law, Jesus made the ultimate sacrifice to atone for humanities sins and appease the Lord for eternity. In the Letters to the Hebrews, part of the biblical canon, Christ is described as the New High Priest of the Temple and with his death he ushered in a new and better Covenant in which no physical sacrifices were necessary anymore.⁹⁰ Part of this new covenant was the belief that no physical Temple was necessary anymore but that Christian society constituted the Temple. This belief can be found in I Corinthians 3, II Corinthians 6, Ephesians 2 and I Peter II. All four parts of the New Testament canon follow the same outline but I find the description in Ephesians II the most telling; in this passage it is written that those that follow Christ have access to the Father and that they are citizens in God's house. This house is built on the fundament of the apostles and prophets of which Jesus Christ is the most important cornerstone. On this foundation is built a holy Temple of the Lord, in which every Christian constitutes both a building block and a inhabitant.⁹¹ So a Christian audience could also have an intense spiritual experience seeing the physical representation of their own covenant which they had made with Christ.

The importance the *Templum Domini* gained after its establishment as a Church can also be illustrated by listing some of the events in which the *Templum* took a prominent place. It was the principal place where the feast of the Purification of the Virgin (Candlemas: the presentation of Jesus at the Temple to Simeon), one of the most important feasts of the liturgical year, was celebrated. On

⁹⁰ John M. Lundquist. *The Temple of Jerusalem: Past, Present, and Future* (Westport 2008) 151 – 152.

⁹¹ Timothy Scott Wardle, *Continuity and Discontinuity: The Temple and Early Christian Identity* (Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Religion in the Graduate School of Duke University, Durham, 2008) 323.

the fifteenth of July, the celebration of the capture of Jerusalem would start at the Temple and then go in procession to the place where the Crusaders breached the walls in 1099. As such it seems that the Temple also became the symbol of the crusader's victory.⁹² The Temple also played an important part in the coronation of the Kings of Jerusalem: when a king was crowned in the Holy Sepulcher Church he would go in procession to the *Templum Domini* while carrying the crown on his head. Then in the *Templum Domini* he would take off the crown and offer it to the Lord to gain redemption.⁹³ The *Templum Domini* was also prominently featured on the seals of the king of Jerusalem already from Baldwin I (1100 – 1118) onwards.⁹⁴

To conclude our journey which led us through the *Templum Domini* and its physical and ritualistic attributes I want to mention the inscriptions which, during at least a part of the twelfth century, could be seen in the *Templum Domini*. They were written down by the pilgrim John of Würzburg and tell us of the figures this church was mostly devoted to: the Virgin Mary and Jesus Christ. As such one of the inscriptions speaks of the Virgin Mary at the age of three who was presented to the Lord as his servant at this place. Another inscription tells of Jesus as he threw out the money lenders. The Western entrance is described by John as having an image of Christ accompanied by the words: *"This my house shall be called a house of prayer"*. This is a very strong evocation of Matthew 21:13 in which Jesus scolds those that bought and sold in the Temple that they had made God's Temple into a den of robbers. On the outside of the *Templum Domini* there were numerous inscriptions as well which are meant to elevate the 'building's importance: *"Truly the Lord is in that place and I knew it not. In your house, O Lord, all will declare your glory"*, *"The house of the Lord is well founded on a firm rock. Blessed are they who live in your house, O Lord: they shall praise you forever and ever"*, *"this is the house of the Lord firmly built"*. These inscriptions strongly

⁹² Pringle, *The Churches*, 402.

⁹³ Ibidem, 407.

⁹⁴ Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time*, 109; Arnold Spaer, 'A Seal of Baldwin I, King of Jerusalem', *The Numismatic Chronicle* 142 (1982) 157 – 159 at 157.

represent the idea that the *Templum Domini* was the physical representation of the New Covenant. As such this physical Temple represented Christian community as a whole.⁹⁵

Although these inscriptions might have belonged to Geoffrey's world it is not sure that they were already there when Geoffrey wrote his poem. Nevertheless, these inscriptions were there during Geoffrey's time as abbot and the ideas which can be distilled from the inscriptions might definitely have influenced Geoffrey. It is even more plausible that Geoffrey had a hand in the commissioning of the inscriptions himself. Geoffrey in his everyday life interacted constantly with the places of sanctity as described above. Furthermore, from a point of view he was interacting everyday with the physical representation of the Church, which was constituted by all Christian as a temple.

Achard of Arrouaise (Priorate 1112 – 1136)

Achard of Arrouaise helped shape the culture and ideology surrounding the *Templum Domini* and thus he was a formative force in Geoffrey's development as highest ranking member of the *Templum Domini*. It is entirely reasonable to assume that these men discussed ideas, ideologies and the agenda of the church. As such it is important to outline Achard's involvement in the reappraisal of the Dome of the Rock.

The most important evidence of Achard's involvement with the church is a lengthy poem in which he tries at length to establish to the reader or listener the dignity of the site. Furthermore, he touches upon the despoliation of the place immediately after the conquest and that the King (probably Baldwin I), who owned much of these treasures through inheritance from Godfrey of Bouillon (r. 1099 – 1100), should return the stolen treasures. The poem has no consistent style but it uses a pattern which was mostly used in hymns in the early Middle ages. An outstanding passage is the one in which Achard connects the salvation of the King to the return of the treasures.⁹⁶

⁹⁵ Pringle, *The Churches*, 405.

⁹⁶ Yolles, 'The Maccabees', 424 - 425.

It seems though that to achieve his goal he also had to create a Christian history for the church, carefully shoving under the rug the fact that the *Templum Domini* had been created as an Islamic building. As seen earlier, this was a known fact in the Christian world. Thus, when Achard wrote the poem he had to compose such a convincing piece that the doubts regarding the building would disappear. Unfortunately it is not known if the treasures were returned to Achard since this would have said much about the reception of his narrative. However, we do know that the restorations on the *Templum Domini* started around 1114 – 1115 which might indicate that Achard succeeded in conveying the importance of the site to the king.⁹⁷ The establishment of this importance would have meant that, for Geoffrey, there was no question that the building was the Temple of the Lord.

Achard poses that either Helena (248 – 239), Justinian (482 – 565) or Heraclius (575 – 641) built the current *Templum Domini*.⁹⁸ After establishing the heritage of the building as unequivocally Christian he continues to establish links between the biblical past and current time: he states that the Ark of the Covenant prefigured the sacraments and thus connects the *Templum Domini* to the Eucharist. Since the Holy of Holies was believed to be still inside the *Templum Domini* this made for a powerful assertion and of course helped to elevate the Temple's prestige.⁹⁹

After establishing the site's Christian heritage Achard returns to his main goal: retrieving the stolen treasures. His method was to retell the story of I and II Maccabees while putting special emphasis on Judas Maccabeus who warred against the Seleucids to restore and purify the Temple which had been desecrated by the Greeks. Achard even gives a list of all the items which the Greeks stole and Judas Maccabeus restored.¹⁰⁰ Achard might thus have tried to appeal to Baldwin's idea of himself (tombstone), or inspired the king to become a second Judas Maccabeus and restore the stolen treasure.¹⁰¹ Geoffrey had thus been in the presence of a man who started the process of

⁹⁷ Yolles, 'The Maccabees', , 424 - 425.

⁹⁸ Kedar and Pringle, '1099-1187: The Lord's Temple', 136; Yolles, 'The Maccabees in the Lord's Temple' , 426.

⁹⁹ Yolles, 'The Maccabees in the Lord's Temple', 427.

¹⁰⁰ Ibidem, 427 – 429.

¹⁰¹ Ibidem, 429.

“cleansing” the Temple of any non-Christian connotations, heightening its importance and who did not scare away from engaging in politics. Now that we have established key subjects and influential factors on Geoffrey’s life it is time to engage with the digressions written by Geoffrey.

Chapter 3: Digression I

In this and the following chapters I will start by giving the translation of the three digressions written by Geoffrey. Then the text will be analyzed and proper context will be brought to the fore to see how context and text shaped each other. Emphasis will be put on how Geoffrey's surrounding and relevant context might have influenced his writing.

The relevant passages were of course originally in Latin but will be treated in their English translation for important reasons; not every student or scholar is familiar with the Latin language and as such I find it important that an as wide as possible public is included in the dissemination of knowledge. The following will thus contain the first publication of the digressions about simony in English translation. The Latin passages can be found in Poleg's edition. For the translations I want to express my gratitude to Ivo Wolsing, for without his help these translations would have never come about.

Digression I:I

"It seems to be far from useless to make a digression
and to insert other exceptions out of the volume
by Augustine who was bishop in Carthage.
He who wrote many books in opposition to heretics
against the mistake of Symon, who wanted from the Apostles
the grace of the spirit through money,
he brought an admittedly short but mystic message to the forefront: (Augustine)
in the Old Testament which is a worthy prefiguration
the fire in the sanctuary was continuously extinguished,
when Jason had acquired the priesthood through a price.
This sacrificial fire was by the priests of the Lord
lighted diligently so it would burn right for eternity.
For this fire is once been kept in a well
This was only kept through the mercy of God without the material of firewood,
when the people of Israel were in Babylon.

After seventy years had finally passed, while at that moment the anointed King Cyrus, who killed Baltasar in Shinar, had dissolved the capture of the people of the Lord Christ, the entire people and the priesthood did not know what had to be done with the fire of sacrifice, because it is not permitted that another fire would be ignited. Although very upset they advanced to the well, when they went down and sought for the fire, they discovered thick water and carried it after it was drawn in vessels. A priest of the Lord ordered a pile of firewood to be constructed and he poured from above confidently and immediately fire came from the water which is impossible by nature while all stood by wholly taken by surprise.”¹⁰²

In the first part of this digression Geoffrey voices his belief that since the high priesthood of the Temple had been bought by Jason, the fire which was necessary to sacrifice to God, was extinguished. The sacrificial fire was pivotal in Jewish belief since God had prescribed that sacrificing in this fire was the only way of proper worship (Exodus 20:21). The higher power that extinguished the flame thus did not see Jason as a priest who could perform a worthy sacrifice to God.

In Medieval Christian thought, and Geoffrey’s eyes, the clergy was a stand-in for Christ when reenacting his sacrifice but also the one who brought the sacrifice when administering the Eucharist. To be able to perform this duty clergyman had to be models of purity, essentially their whole life was a form of martyrdom since they sacrificed worldly pleasures to lead the people of God.¹⁰³ So buying the priesthood made a clergyman impure and unable to substitute Christ, rendering his administering of the Eucharist ineffective.

Geoffrey thus makes the sacrificial fire from the Old Testament equal to the sacrifice priests make when it comes to their reenacting of the Passion and the administering of the Eucharist.

Geoffrey’s appreciation of the Old Testament as a prefiguration is further expanded upon when he

¹⁰² Geoffrey, *Prior Geoffrey of the Temple, on the Books of Maccabees*. Eyal Poleg ed. (2010) 27.

¹⁰³ Robert N. Swanson, ‘Apostolic Successors: Priests and Priesthood, Bishops, and Episcopacy in Medieval Western Europe’, in: Greg Peters and C. Colt Anderson eds., *A Companion to Priesthood and Holy Orders in the Middle Ages* (Leiden 2016) 4 – 42 at 24.

mentions that the people of Christ the Lord were released by Cyrus from their Babylonian captivity. He directly compares the Jews of the Old Testament with Christians of his time, making every effort to show that the lessons of the past are the lessons for today.

Furthermore, something Poleg already noted is that Geoffrey might have gotten his inspiration to link the buying and selling of the priesthood to the dying of the sacrificial flame from Algerus Leodiensis's (1055 – 1131) *Liber de misericordia et Justitia*.¹⁰⁴ Written approximately at the very beginning of the twelfth century, the work, rooted in pro papal reformist ideas, vehemently attacks the practice of simony and states that mercy would be inappropriate an approach to such a grave heresy.¹⁰⁵ Geoffrey, in the same way as Algerus, attributes the selling of the priesthood and the dying of the fire comparison to a work written by Augustine.¹⁰⁶

Something I would like to add to Poleg's and Yolles's analysis of this digression is that the mention of Jason buying the priesthood is not only important in the context of simony it also alludes to the practice of lay investiture. Jason bought the priesthood from the Seleucid king Antioch IV Epiphanes who had just become king of the Seleucid's. Next to paying a hefty sum for the position he offered an additional sum if he could also built a Gymnasium under his authority. Jason thus bought the priesthood from somebody who should not have had the right to appoint the most important religious position in Old Testament Judaism and to make matters worse he did it for impure reasons.¹⁰⁷

What underpins this theory is the fact that the passage just before the digression is a rewriting of II Maccabees 4: 1-9. This passage of Maccabees tells the story of Jason going to Antioch to buy the priesthood.¹⁰⁸ Geoffrey might be expressing a pro papal reformist attitude here since it

¹⁰⁴ Poleg, 'On the Books of Maccabees, 21.

¹⁰⁵ Ortwin Huysmans, 'The Investiture Controversy in the Diocese of Liege Reconsidered: an Inquiry into the positions of the Abbeys of Saint-Hubert and Sant-Laurent and the Canonist Alger of Liege (1091 – 1106)', in: Steven Vanderputten, Tjamke Snijders and Jay Diehl eds., *Medieval Liege at the Crossroads of Europe: Monastic Society and Culture, 1000 – 1300* (Turnhout 2017) 183 – 217 at 206 – 207.

¹⁰⁶ Poleg, 'On the Books of Maccabees, 21.

¹⁰⁷ Vasile Babota, *The Institution of the Hasmonean High Priesthood* (Boston 2014) 48 – 49.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibidem*, 26 -27.

was not unheard of to compare the German Emperor Henry IV with Antiochus IV when the battle over lay investiture was fought. On that note, I strongly believe that Geoffrey's concerns over simony were linked to concerns of lay investiture.¹⁰⁹ When Geoffrey mentions that the priests diligently kept the fire burning so it would burn forever and thus worship could be performed in the right way forever, it is entirely possible that Geoffrey alludes to the priests of his own time being concerned with diligently procuring the right way to serve God. If Geoffrey was pro papal, which seems to be his stance looking at his attack on lay investiture and his usage of the same examples as Algerus he might be alluding to those priests not involved with simony and very possible the pope himself.

It seems that simony and lay investiture ran rampant in the crusader states and a number of examples can be brought to the fore to show this. In 1120 a council was held in Nablus where the first canons of the Kingdom of Jerusalem were established.¹¹⁰ Crusader historian Hans Eberhard Mayer has treated this council in detail: the council consisted of the highest ranking members of the clergy and nobility and dealt with issues like sexual transgressions, larceny, false accusations in court and ecclesiastical tithes (tax that was reserved for the clergy).¹¹¹ This last issue is important for our story because it links the council to the act of simony.

Mayer convincingly shows that the council was of a penitential nature since the King and barons restored the tithe of all their income, in the diocese of Jerusalem, to the Patriarch. Moreover, in new bishoprics the patriarch could set the tithe, albeit with the King's council.¹¹² The canons in which these rulings are recorded also show that the King and barons had withheld these tithes and were guilty of lording over the Church.¹¹³ Calamities that had befallen the crusader states like the devastating defeat of the army in Antioch in 1119, famine and, earthquakes, might have pushed the rulers towards loosening their grip on the Church. But a convincing theory put forward by Mayer is

¹⁰⁹ Morton, 'The Defense, 279.

¹¹⁰ Jaspert, *The Crusades*, 105; Benjamin Zeev Kedar, 'On the Origins of the Earliest Laws of Frankish Jerusalem: The Canons of the Council of Nablus, 1120', *Speculum* 74:2 (1999) 310 – 335 at 310.

¹¹¹ Hans Eberhard Mayer, 'The Concordat of Nablus', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 33:4 (1982) 531 – 543 at 531 – 533.

¹¹² Mayer, 'The Concordat of Nablus', 533.

¹¹³ *Ibidem*, 534.

that Patriarch Arnulf of Chocques (patriarch in 1099 and 1112 until 1118) was able to convince Baldwin II (r. 1118 – 1131) to restore the tithes. In return for this Arnulf would support Baldwin II's claim to the throne which was much less strong than the one of his opponent and brother of Baldwin I, Eustace III (count of Boulogne from 1088 until 1025).¹¹⁴

The grip of the secular arm on the Crusader Church is expressed in the fact that there existed many proprietary churches where layman controlled revenues.¹¹⁵ Even after the concordat of Worms they reserved their right to choose between candidates.¹¹⁶ Furthermore, the influence of the Crown in episcopal elections in Jerusalem was incredibly strong and remained so until the 1190s. This custom can also be found in the principality of Antioch where episcopal elections were controlled by the princes and barons. Although cathedral chapters made the formal election they chose whomever was most favored by the princes. Of course favor could be gained by promising cooperation with the princes on many levels among them the funneling of ecclesiastical funds to them.¹¹⁷ The bishops who were elected at Tarsus and Mamistra at the beginning of the eleventh century seem to have achieved their "election" by showing military prowess since these area's had an important strategical position.¹¹⁸ Another interesting case, admittedly taking place a year after Geoffrey composed his poem, is that of Ralph of Domfront (patriarch from 1135 – 1140), the patriarch of Antioch, who had been accused of simony in 1138 probably because he did not work together with the count of Antioch to well.¹¹⁹

Returning to the Kingdom of Jerusalem more examples can be given especially when looking at the Patriarchy. Residing in the Holy Sepulcher Church, the place that commemorated the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, the Patriarch was the highest-ranking clergyman in the crusader states and in that function needed to be both an administrator and politician as well as a

¹¹⁴ Mayer, 'The Concordat of Nablus', 533, 539.

¹¹⁵ Ibidem, 536.

¹¹⁶ Ibidem, 538 – 539.

¹¹⁷ Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, 21 – 22.

¹¹⁸ Ibidem, 24.

¹¹⁹ Ibidem, 34.

pious man. a relationship had to be crafted with the king that would benefit both men and the stability of the kingdom. To find these qualities in a man and the willingness to work together on equal foot with the King proved difficult.¹²⁰ In the following I will give some examples of the relationship between King and Patriarch in which it becomes apparent that the demands of the office also ensured that lay investiture and simony were connected to it.

Patriarch Dagobert of Pisa (patriarch from 1099 until 1105) was expected by Baldwin I to provide knights for the latter's army with income meant for the Church.¹²¹ When he refused this he was accused of treason. To keep his position Dagobert resorted to bribing Baldwin I with a large sum of money. This chain of events shows us that when Dagobert fought against lay infringement he had to engage in an act of simony to keep his position.¹²² Shortly after this Baldwin found another way to get rid of Dagobert and accused him of embezzling funds which were meant to defend the Kingdom. This led to a short deposition until 1102 when Baldwin I needed help against Fatimid infringements. This aid was to come from Tancred who demanded that Dagobert would be returned to his position. As such, the patriarchal see was now filled purely because of secular reasons and because of a service rendered to the King.¹²³

An investigation into the patriarchal elections from Dagobert until Geoffrey's time onwards shows just how much influence the King exerted over the elections. Evremar (Patriarch from 1102 until 1108) a very pious man lacked in the areas of government. As such he was not able to help Baldwin when it came to administrative questions. Therefore Baldwin actively sought the deposition of Evremar eventually succeeding in this in 1108 when the papal legate Gibelin of Arles (patriarch from 1108 until 1112) declared his election as patriarch invalid.¹²⁴

For the next two patriarchs no real links with lay investiture can be found. This might also be because the history books have been kind to them. Both Patriarch Gibelin of Arles and Arnulf of

¹²⁰ Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, 52 – 85.

¹²¹ Mayer, 'The Concordat of Nablus', 536.

¹²² Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, 55; Jaspert, *The Crusades*, 106.

¹²³ Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, 55 – 56.

¹²⁴ *Ibidem*, 57.

Chocques are remembered as skillful clergyman that were willing to work together with the King. Both their elections were uncontested and there is no proof that any of them gained the office through royal providence although Baldwin probably had some say in the matter.¹²⁵

When Baldwin II came to power in 1118 he was free to choose his own Patriarch. He nominated Warmund (Patriarch from 1118 until 1128) through what can only be called blatant lay investiture. Interestingly his nomination was ratified by Calixtus II removing any stain of lay investiture. This goes to show that the Papacy was willing to be lenient when it came to the election of Patriarchs.¹²⁶ When Warmund died in 1028 his successor Stephen (Patriarch from 1128 – 1130), kinsmen of the King, was appointed by the King without any contest. Again the lay-investiture is apparent here and again it is not contested.¹²⁷ The same goes for Stephen's successor William (Patriarch from 1130 – 1145) who was also appointed by Baldwin II.¹²⁸ Warmund, Stephen, and William all worked together quite well with the King so it seems that for most in the Latin Kingdom the control of the King over the Church was not a problem.

When looking at the buyers of Church offices it is relatively easy to track lay investiture and thus simony through the line of succession of patriarchs. However a large group of buyers which needs mentioning as well are the other bishops of the Latin East. Very little is known about them so giving examples is hard. Nevertheless, we can still find hints that lay investiture and simony might be represented in this group by looking at their general make up.

Most of the bishops that held office in the first half of the 12th century in the Latin East came from France and thus they were brought over to the crusader states to work in the crusader churches. This can be attributed to the fact that the crusader states were in constant need of soldiers, as such but few of the crusader nobles sought church offices for their sons. Furthermore, whereas dioceses in the West were great land owners this was not the case in the East and as such

¹²⁵ Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, 57 – 64.

¹²⁶ *Ibidem*, 64.

¹²⁷ *Ibidem*, 67 – 68.

¹²⁸ *Ibidem*, 68 – 69.

there was no great financial gain of having a son holding an ecclesiastical office.¹²⁹ There was another way in which the nobility could benefit from the Church without sacrificing one of their sons to the institution and this was done by appointing kinsmen from the West. One can easily imagine that either those kinsmen were chosen for their administrative abilities or their deep pockets, both could of course also be possible. By securing the position of kinsmen the ruling class could be sure their influence in the Church would be maintained.¹³⁰ As such, the bishops that held office in the first half of the twelfth century were a reflection of the interests of the ruling class.¹³¹ Kinsmen from the West might have outbid one another for the offices in the East. Such an appointment in the crusader states must have also brought prestige to the family which might have been an incentive.

As we have seen the Popes did not upset this state of being by questioning lay investiture. It seems that when it came to the Kingdom of Jerusalem the papacy was generally more lenient since they probably did not want to upset the infant state by entering into a conflict with its rulers. Furthermore the Kingdom of Jerusalem was led firmly in the camp of Innocent II (r. 1130 until 1143), a non-reformist pope, by William patriarch of Jerusalem and the bishop of Bethlehem in 1132. This underpins the point also made by Hamilton that the Church of the Latin East was dominated with clergy which had not been very much influenced by the principles of Gregorian reform.¹³² As such if one would be reform minded the Kingdom of Jerusalem was a place in which the message against simony remained fresh and relevant.

To summarize, It seems that cooperation with the respective rulers was necessary to attain a clerical position in the crusader states. Geoffrey will probably, and uniquely in the crusader states, have perceived this as an issue. Since he must have felt that the more lay control was asserted over ecclesiastical life, the higher the risk that simony, the buying of spiritual goods like a church office, would rear its head.

¹²⁹ Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, 123 -124.

¹³⁰ *Ibidem*, 127.

¹³¹ *Ibidem*, 127.

¹³² Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, 30, 70, 134; Mayer, 'Angevins Versus Normans', 5; Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, 183 – 184.

Digression I : II

“Bishop Augustine gives another example

It is about Joseph and Potiphar the prince of the eunuchs:

after he had given the price because he wanted to abuse the boy

he lost his reproductive powers and became meager in his loins.

Joseph and the priesthood, the one sold and the other sold,

they prefigure as spiritual gifts which are not for sale.

This, with Symon’s money comparable,

these things do not generate spiritual sons but unnecessary,

they are stolen from the holy spirit for money.

Hence they cannot present, because they have not received

and the spiritual fire doesn’t burn within their ranks.

Now our pen will return to that which it proposed to do.”¹³³

Poleg already showed that this *exemplum* belonging to the first digression can be found in the same way and in the same sequence in Algerus’s work. This further underpins my theory that Geoffrey was heavily influenced by reformist ideas since it seems he had Algerus’s work on his desk when he wrote his own poem.¹³⁴ The exemplum deals with the purchase of Joseph by Potiphar. After the purchase God castrated Potiphar because he was intending indecent actions. Potiphar’s sterility is thus linked to him buying Joseph. Nothing of such nature can be found in the bible passage (Genesis 37:36) from which this story derives. As such, this chain of events was put in place in both Geoffrey’s as Algerus’s work to connect the buying of an office with the creation of an ineffective priest. This priest cannot perform the duties expected from his office since God will not work through impurity. As the buying of the priesthood makes the buyer incapable of performing the duties of the bough office, so is Potiphar unable to perform what he intended to do.¹³⁵

¹³³ Geoffrey, *Prior Geoffrey of the Temple, on the Books of Maccabees*. Eyal Poleg ed. (2010) 27 – 28.

¹³⁴ Poleg, ‘On the Books of Maccabees’, 21.

¹³⁵ Poleg, ‘On the Books of Maccabees’, 21.

Furthermore, it could also be read as an argument against buying the priesthood from those who should not have any influence over ecclesiastical matters. By engaging in lay investiture the church essentially becomes a “slave” from lay rulers. The last sentence of this digressions shows us that Geoffrey was writing for an audience that would read his work. He actively engages with the reader.

Chapter 4: Digression II

Digression II:I

“With this poem I urge the readers to consider carefully how unlawful it is, and in opposition to the holy spirit at this moment in time to acquire the priesthood through purchase. For now we do not sacrifice the fat of bulls or rams to the lord, nay, instead the flesh and blood assumed by the son of God from the Virgin Mary for us sinners. If the fire was extinguished then, when Jason acquired the priestly glory by bribing the King, what do we believe will happen now with the fire of the holy spirit? It is extinguished both for the buyers and sellers.”¹³⁶

As Yolles thoughtfully notices Geoffrey once again equates his time to the biblical past even going as far as stating that the sacrifice of bulls and rams in biblical times can be compared to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ as symbolized in the Eucharist. By doing this, Geoffrey harkens back to the claim made by Achard in his poem that the Ark of the Covenant prefigured the Eucharist.¹³⁷ Thus the corruption of the priesthood by the purchase of ecclesiastical offices will have the same effect on the Eucharist as it would have had on the sacrifices in biblical time. Essentially, Geoffrey attacks here those priests that administer sacraments while they have not rightfully acquired this responsibility. The peril for the Church is obvious: if the practice spreads Christians are no longer receiving the grace of God. After Geoffrey makes this claim, he again invokes the buying of the priesthood by Jason from Antiochus, hereby making his concerns about the connection between simony and lay investiture clear once more.

Interestingly, in this passage the connection between the *Templum Domini* and the Eucharist is invoked. This is done by comparing the sacrifice in the Holy of Holies with that same Eucharist. Since it was believed that the Holy of Holies from biblical times was still existing inside the *Templum*

¹³⁶ Geoffrey, *Prior Geoffrey of the Temple, on the Books of Maccabees*. Eyal Poleg ed. (2010) 30; Geoffrey, *Prior Geoffrey of the Temple, on the Books of Maccabees*. Julian Yolles trans. (leiden 2017) 434.

¹³⁷ Yolles, ‘The Maccabees in the Lord’s Temple’, 435.

Domini, Geoffrey draws a direct comparison between the *Templum* and Christ's sacrifice. In voicing his concerns he is able to interweave a passage which makes his church incredible important for Christianity.¹³⁸

Digression II:II

"Leprosy sticks to Gehazi and his offspring,
they who sell for money the gifts which God has given freely;
the Symoniacs are punished by the words of Peter the Apostle
those who buy from those who sell the kindness of the Holy Spirit.
Those who buy are called Symoniacs, and from Gehazi,
are called Gehazites, the name for those who sell because they do that which is equal to Gehazi,
they do not mind the merit of persons but if anything else their prices because of their greed.
He sold his health, that Elisha returned
to the highest military leader which was sent from the king of Syria;
he has been punished with lepra from which Naaman has healed.
What he did in that time in the body of the seller
what the begging of the Prophet did, happens undoubtedly in all who sell the gifts of God.
These things which are said against the worst of the kin of heretics
may it encourage us that Catholics will not be stained by heresy."¹³⁹

In this passage Geoffrey makes clear that he is not only worried about those that buy offices. He is evenly appalled by those that offer the offices. Geoffrey invokes II Kings 5 in which the prophet Elisha restores the health of Naaman for free. Gehazi, Elisha's servant, then follows Naaman and lets him pay for the cure. When Elisha finds out about this deed he transports Naaman's leprosy over to Gehazi. An important sentence is the one where Geoffrey notes that those who sell offices do not look at merit but to the highest amount of money. Thus the less qualified can attain offices. It is clear that Geoffrey shows his concerns about lay investiture: investiture by those who are not qualified to

¹³⁸ Yolles, 'The Maccabees in the Lord's Temple', 435 -436.

¹³⁹ Geoffrey, *Prior Geoffrey of the Temple, on the Books of Maccabees*. Eyal Poleg ed. (2010) 30.

select the best persons for the offices. As such the context which we have established for the first digression also applies here.

In the last sentence Geoffrey is afraid that all Christians will eventually be stained by heresy if the practice of simony pertains. This seems to be based on ideas which can be found in II Corinthians 6: 16-18 and I Corinthians 3: 17. In the first passage it is written that by polluting themselves with unclean and unchristian practices Christians pollute the Temple of God itself. In the second passage it is written that anybody who violates himself with impure behavior is violating the house of God since this house consists of the believers.¹⁴⁰ Since Geoffrey was in charge of the physical representation of the House of God he might have seen himself as some sort of protector of the Church as a whole.

¹⁴⁰ Wardle, *Continuity and Discontinuity*, 324.

Chapter 5: Digression III

“The holy pope Gregorius told about this in his *Moralia* (erroneous reference)¹⁴¹

Joseph and Judas Maccabeus who were protected by the Lord

his compassion governed all works of the one in battle and the other in prison.

When they laid hope in humankind and not in the higher power

they were deprived of continuous divine help:

the cupbearer, in whom he had placed hope for himself, did not take away Joseph from the house of the dungeon or the hand of Potiphar,

but rejoicing in his wealth he forgot the explainer of dreams (Joseph)

And after two years of undergoing suffering he was rendered to supplication;

Maccabeus profited not from having with the Romans

societal grace from a peace agreement,

for as soon as this was obtained he was slain by Bachhus.

It is good therefore, for us to place hope in God the just judge, but not in man or the gold of Arabia.”¹⁴²

In this digression Geoffrey tells about Judas Maccabeus and Joseph who did no longer trusted solely in God to help them: Judas made a peace treaty with the Romans. Joseph, who was imprisoned by Potiphar, trusted the cupbearer of the Pharaoh, for whom he had explained a dream and predicted that he would be reinstated as cupbearer, to put in a good word with the Pharaoh for his release (Genesis 41-41).¹⁴³ Since both men decided to put their faith in humans they were punished. Judas was slain, Joseph had to spend more time in prison.

this digression does not deal with the subject of simony, but it definitely voices one of Geoffrey’s major concerns: the fact that the crusader states were becoming more and more dependent on alliances with the Muslim polities surrounding them. Geoffrey wanted to show that these kinds of alliances might lead to suffering and defeat for the Franks bringing to the fore two examples in which the grace of God was retracted since Judas and Joseph did no longer trust on God

¹⁴¹ Poleg, ‘On the Books of Maccabees’, 22.

¹⁴² Geoffrey, *Prior Geoffrey of the Temple, on the Books of Maccabees*. Eyal Poleg ed. (2010) 45 – 46.

¹⁴³ Poleg, ‘On the Books of Maccabees’, 22.

to come to their aid. The last sentence reveals that the crusaders were starting to lose their unwavering faith in God in favor of alliances with Muslim forces.¹⁴⁴ Furthermore, this can also be read as a warning to rulers who made peace agreements with non-Christian forces. Although peace for the crusader states could be obtained, the wellbeing of the obtainer might be in peril since he or she would leave God's grace and thus risked becoming victim to God's wrath; just like Judas and Joseph.

Yolles suggests that Geoffrey might be referring to an alliance in 1115 between Antioch and Damascus.¹⁴⁵ Although this is plausible it would be tempting to look for alliances and treaties which would have been existent more close to Geoffrey's own time. Michael Köhler, who authored a monograph dealing with Frankish-Muslim treaties and alliances in the Middle East, explains that a treaty between Damascus and Jerusalem must have existed from 1130 onwards which stipulated that no raids would be inflicted upon one another. Treaties like this would often be broken and restored as the balance of power was constantly shifting. We know that in 1134 another peace treaty between Jerusalem and Damascus was established.¹⁴⁶

In this digression Geoffrey also seems to speak to those who can make the right choices when it comes to the protection of the crusader states. In Geoffrey's case that would have been the King of Jerusalem: Fulk of Anjou (r. 1131 – 1143). Now Fulk was quite a contested king. On the one hand this came forth out of his desire to exclude his wife Melisende (r. 1131 – 1153), daughter of Baldwin II, from her share of the agreed joint rule.¹⁴⁷ On the other hand it could have come forth from the fact that Fulk started to interfere in the political makeup of the Kingdom of Jerusalem by relieving counts from their position and exchanging them with Angevin (French nobles from the house of Angevin) nobleman who had followed him to the Holy Land. Moreover Fulk also made them

¹⁴⁴ Poleg, 'On the Books of Maccabees, 22; Yolles, 'The Maccabees in the Lord's Temple', 435 -436.

¹⁴⁵ Yolles, 'The Maccabees in the Lord's Temple', 437.

¹⁴⁶ Michael Köhler, *Alliances and Treaties between Frankish and Muslim Rulers in the Middle East: Cross-Cultural Diplomacy in the Period of the Crusades* (Leiden 2013) 132.

¹⁴⁷ Mayer, 'Angevins Versus Normans', 1.

his direct councilors.¹⁴⁸ These decisions led the Kingdom into substantial turmoil when a part of the nobility revolted in 1134 to see themselves and Melisende restored to power.¹⁴⁹

The rebellion failed for different reasons. One of them was the fact that patriarch William was able to obtain lenient terms for the rebels if they returned back to the king's fold. The other reason was that count Hugh II of Jaffa (r. 1123 – 1134), one of the leaders of the rebellion, allied himself with the Fatimids of Ascalon against Fulk. This was such an incredible outrage to the other revolting nobility that they distanced themselves from Hugh and ended the rebellion.¹⁵⁰ Although it can be said that Fulk did not lead the kingdom into its most stable period it should also be noted that Fulk was concerned with the defense of the kingdom. As such he is known for building an extensive ring of defensive works that severely weakened the raiding power of the Fatimid's of Ascalon.¹⁵¹

Interestingly, Fulk also was no stranger to Muslim – Frankish alliances. In 1137 he send his army in assistance of the city of Hims, which was under the rule of Damascus and besieged by Zengi. Fulk, instead of pushing his army against that of Zengi, accepted a treaty which saw the liberation of Frankish soldiers who were Zengi's prisoners of war. As a gift Fulk received a robe of honor from the atabeg.¹⁵² Taking the evidence about Fulk into consideration Geoffrey might have seen Fulk as a king who was increasingly involved with Muslim powers and relied on treaties rather than believing that God would aid him on the battlefield. In any case it is clear that both the safety of the crusader states and power struggles between Christian rulers became more and more dependent on Islamic aid.

So very subtly Geoffrey might have tried to compare the actions of Fulk with the actions of Judas Maccabeus. Aside from Fulk, we must also ask what further calamities were befalling the crusader states which might have spurred Geoffrey's anxiety about God's divine wrath. In the 1130s Antioch was especially suffering from setbacks; in 1135 Antioch suffered major defeats at Zengi's hands and in 1136 his lieutenant Sevar pillaged hundreds of villages in Antioch and surprised the

¹⁴⁸ Mayer, 'Angevins Versus Normans', 19 – 20.

¹⁴⁹ Ibidem, 2, 25.

¹⁵⁰ Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, 69; Köhler, *Alliances*, 134; Mayer, 'Angevins Versus Normans', 2.

¹⁵¹ Mayer, 'Angevins Versus Normans', 5.

¹⁵² Köhler, *Alliances*, 138.

defenders of Latakia, subsequently destroying the city. A Muslim contemporary cited by historians Marshall Baldwin and Kenneth Setton noted that “such a calamity as this has never befallen the Northern Franks”.¹⁵³ To make matters worse, in 1137, John II Comnenus (Byzantine emperor from 1118 – 1143) led his armies into Armenian Cilicia and annexed the region to his empire. After his victory at Cilicia he marched on to Antioch to demand that the prince, at that point Raymond of Poitiers (r. 1136 – 1149) would pay homage to him. Fulk of Anjou then advised Raymond to submit, which Raymond subsequently did. This of course instilled a legitimate fear that the Latin Church in Antioch would be replaced with an Orthodox one.¹⁵⁴

Before the situation would become truly dangerous, the Byzantines retreated for doing battle with Muslim forces had weakened their ranks. Nevertheless, it made abundantly clear that the principality of Antioch was weak and after John II Comnenus death in 1144 both Edessa and large parts of Antioch were quickly occupied by the Seljuk Turks.¹⁵⁵ When Geoffrey was writing his work these cracks in the strength of the Northern provinces might already have been apparent and thus he might have been afraid that the developments at Antioch might be a prelude to troubling situations in the Kingdom of Jerusalem.

To conclude, this digression can be linked to the first two since it is the culmination of the retraction of God’s aid. If the crusader states are riddled with simony and lay investiture they lose God’s aid. Without God’s aid they have little choice but to rely on temporal aid to evade God’s wrath. The only way to solve both problems is to stop the practice of simony and lay investiture; then no temporal alliances are necessary anymore and the Christian polities are safe.

¹⁵³ Marshall W Baldwin and Kenneth Meyer Setton, *A History of the Crusades. Volume 1, The First Hundred Years* (Philadelphia 1958) 435 – 436.

¹⁵⁴ Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, 33 – 34.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, 40.

Conclusion

Taking all the evidence into consideration I am convinced that the research questions can be answered in a satisfactory way. When we look at the events which took place around Geoffrey it is clear that he must have been witness to an extensive amount of lay investiture and lay control across the board. Not only did he witness it, he can also have heard about the succession of Patriarch's which was infested by lay control. Furthermore, being influenced by the Gregorian reforms, the Papacy's unwillingness to do anything about the practice of simony in the Holy Land must have annoyed Geoffrey greatly.

Aside from the matter of simony, Geoffrey also notices how the safety of the crusader polities becomes increasingly dependent on alliances with Muslim leaders like Zengi. Even infighting among the Christian ruling class involved Islamic aid.¹⁵⁶ For Geoffrey who was witnessing widespread simony this must have been a sign that God's grace had left the crusaders.

So what inspired Geoffrey then to move into action and grab the pen? This can be attributed to him being prior of the *Templum Domini*. As we have seen this church carried strong connotations. On the one hand it could be perceived as a physical symbol of the New Covenant between God and Christians and a physical representation of God's house of which every Christian was considered a building block.¹⁵⁷ As such the building represented the Church as a whole and Geoffrey might have felt it his obligation to protect the Church. The Temple had been cleaned by Jesus Christ of the moneylenders and Geoffrey must have felt it was his obligation to do the same. One can imagine Geoffrey standing in front of Christ's image accompanied by the words "*This my house shall be called a house of prayer*" while thinking of the negative events which are happening in the crusader states.

¹⁵⁶ Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, 69; Köhler, *Alliances*, 134; Mayer, 'Angevins Versus Normans', 2.

¹⁵⁷ Pringle, *The Churches*, 401; Wardle, *Continuity and Discontinuity*, 323.

Since we know that Geoffrey was the one under whose watch the *Templum Domini* was officially consecrated as a Church, we know he was also engaged in furthering the position of the church. In his poem he does this by constantly making the connection between the sacrifices made in the Old Testament and the ultimate sacrifice that Christ made. Essentially by connection the sacrifice of Jesus Christ to the *Templum Domini* he crafts an intricate narrative which makes the *Templum Domini* incredibly important for the Church as a whole.¹⁵⁸ Achard of Arrouaise who started the process of heightening the standing of the *Templum Domini* must have been of influence for Geoffrey to tie his warning against simony with an apparent attempt to heighten the standing of his church.

As shown in the analysis of digression III, Geoffrey was probably trying to find an audience which would read his poem, be inspired by it, and then would be able to do something about the current state of things. As such it seems that he hoped that the poem would be read by king Fulk of Anjou. King Fulk was of course somebody who was for a large part responsible for the wellbeing of the crusader states and especially the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Of course, an outright scolding would not have helped Geoffrey's case but the allusion to the peace agreement between Judas Maccabeus and the Romans should be familiar to a king which was entering in peace agreements with Muslim warlords.¹⁵⁹ Wrapping this message in between a retelling of the heroic deeds of the Maccabees, a popular exemplary story for the crusaders and especially the Jerusalemite kings, could have inspired Fulk to do everything in his power to attain divine aid.¹⁶⁰

So how did Geoffrey, through the poem, try to shape society? On the one hand he was trying to influence those in power to rid the Latin East of heresies like lay investiture and simony, by getting them to stop selling the offices. On the other hand he was also trying to inspire aspiring clergyman not to buy their offices. As we have seen Gregorian reforms did not really touch the Latin East and it

¹⁵⁸ Geoffrey, *Prior Geoffrey of the Temple, on the Books of Maccabees*. Julian Yolles trans. (Leiden 2017) 434.

¹⁵⁹ Köhler, *Alliances*, 138.

¹⁶⁰ Morton, 'The Defense', 276 – 277.

is very possible that Geoffrey wanted to disseminate these ideas among the clergy.¹⁶¹ By trying to influence both those that sell and those that buy Geoffrey was actively trying to reshape the way in which the clergy and ruling class looked upon lay control.

Interestingly, this case study can be used as a proponent for both MacEvitt and Buck. It is clear that the Gregorian Reforms, so prevalent in the West, were not really touching the crusader states. But on the other hand, it is very clear that Geoffrey was trying to bring over the reforms to the East. Showing that Geoffrey was very much influenced by the ideas of the Latin West. As such the crusader states definitely developed different from the Latin West, but its influence was still present.

Text and context are powerful agents and they both influence each other. I hope this thesis has shown that an analysis of sources in combination with an analysis of context can further our understanding of what a text aims to do and why a text aims to do what it does. Moreover, I think that an analysis such as the one here can shine light on more societal aspects of the crusader polities when revisiting any of the known crusader sources. So although a lot has been written about the crusader states new and tantalizing insights can still be found.

¹⁶¹ Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, 30, 70, 134; Mayer, 'Angevins Versus Normans', 5; Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, 183 – 184.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Rutger Kramer, for his advice, feedback and support during the process of writing this thesis. I am especially grateful for all the discussions we had concerning the source under investigation, and for empowering me to dive into this particular, never translated, source. Furthermore I would like to thank Ivo Wolsing for helping me translating the source from Latin to English. Without his help this thesis could never have come about.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Geoffrey, *Prior Geoffrey of the Temple, on the Books of Maccabees*. Eyal Poleg ed. (2010).

Geoffrey, *Prior Geoffrey of the Temple, on the Books of Maccabees*. Julian Yolles trans. (Leiden 2017).

Tyre, William of, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*. Emily Atwater Babcock and A. C. Krey trans. (New York 1943).

Secondary sources

Airlie, Stuart, "Sad Stories of the Death of Kings': Narrative Patterns and Structures of Authority in Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle*", in: Elizabeth M. Tyler and Ross Balzaretti eds., *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West* (Turnhout 2006) 105 – 31.

Babota, Vasile, *The Institution of the Hasmonean High Priesthood* (Boston 2014).

Baldwin, Marshall W and Setton, Kenneth Meyer, *A History of the Crusades. Volume 1, The First Hundred Years* (Philadelphia 1958).

Barber, Malcolm, *The Crusader States* (New Haven 2012).

Boas, Adrian J, *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades: Society, Landscape and Art in the Holy City under Frankish Rule* (London 2001).

Buck, Andrew D, 'Settlement, Identity, and Memory in the Latin East: An Examination of the Term 'Crusader States', *English Historical Review* (2020) 1 – 32.

Cesare, Michelina Di, 'The Eschatological Meaning of the "Templum Domini" (The Dome of the Rock) in Jerusalem', *Aevum* 88:2 (2014) 311 – 329.

Hamilton, Bernard, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: the Secular Church* (London 1980).

Healy, Patrick, *The Chronicle of Hugh of Flavigny: Reform and the Investiture Contest in the Late Eleventh Century* (Aldershot 2006).

Hiestand, Rudolf, 'Gaufridus Abbas Templum Domini: an Underestimated Figure in the Early History of the Kingdom of Jerusalem', in: Peter Edbury and Jonathan Philips eds., *The Experience of Crusading 2: defining the Crusader Kingdom* (Cambridge 2003) 48-59.

Huysmans, Ortwin, 'The Investiture Controversy in the Diocese of Liege Reconsidered: an Inquiry into the positions of the Abbeys of Saint-Hubert and Sant-Laurent and the Canonist Alger of Liege (1091 – 1106)', in: Steven Vanderputten, Tjamke Snijders and Jay Diehl eds., *Medieval Liege at the Crossroads of Europe: Monastic Society and Culture, 1000 – 1300* (Turnhout 2017) 183 – 217.

Jaspert, Nikolas, *The Crusades* (New York 2006).

Joslyn-Siemiatkoski, Daniel, *Christian Memories of the Maccabean Martyrs* (New York 2009).

Kedar, Benjamin Zeev and Pringle, Reginald Denys, '1099-1187: The Lord's Temple (*Templum Domini*) and Solomon's Palace (*Palatium Salomonis*)', in: Oleg Grabar and Benjamin Zeev Kedar eds., *Where Heaven and Earth Meet* (Jerusalem 2009) 133 – 149.

Kedar, Benjamin Zeev, 'On the Origins of the Earliest Laws of Frankish Jerusalem: The Canons of the Council of Nablus, 1120', *Speculum* 74:2 (1999) 310 – 335.

Köhler, Michael, *Alliances and Treaties between Frankish and Muslim Rulers in the Middle East: Cross-Cultural Diplomacy in the Period of the Crusades* (Leiden 2013).

Lapina, Elizabeth, 'The Maccabees and the Battle of Antioch', in: Gabriela Signori eds., *Dying For the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old-Testament Faith-Warriors (1 and 2 Maccabees) in Historical Perspective* (Leiden 2012) 148 – 159.

Linder, Ammon, 'An Unpublished Charter of Geoffrey, Abbot of the Temple in Jerusalem', in: Benjamin Zeev Kedar, H.E. Mayer and R.C. Smail eds., *Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Jerusalem 1982) 119 – 129.

Lundquist, John M, *The Temple of Jerusalem: Past, Present, and Future* (Westport 2008).

Lynch, Joseph H, *Simoniacal Entry into Religious Life from 1000 to 1260: a Social, Economic and Legal Study* (Columbus 1976).

MacEvitt, Christopher, 'What Was Crusader About the Crusader States?', *Al-Masaq* 30:3 (2018), 317 – 330.

Mayer, Hans Eberhard, 'Angevins Versus Normans: The New Men of King Fulk of Jerusalem', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 133:1 (1989) 1 – 25.

Mayer, Hans Eberhard, 'The Concordat of Nablus' , *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 33:4 (1982) 531 – 543.

Morris, Colin, *The Papal Monarchy: the Western Church from 1050 to 1250* (Oxford 1991).

Morton, Nicholas, 'The Defense of the Holy Land and the Memory of the Maccabees', *Journal of Medieval History* 36 (2010) 275 – 293.

Ousterhout, Robert G, 'The Sanctity of Place and the Sanctity of Buildings: Jerusalem Versus Constantinople', in: Bonna D. Wescoat and Robert G Ousterhout eds., *Architecture of the Sacred: Space, Ritual, and Experience from Classical Greece to Byzantium* (Cambridge 2012) 281 – 306.

Peters, Francis, *The Holy City in the Eyes of Chronicles, Visitors, Pilgrims, and Prophets from the Days of Abraham to the Beginnings of Modern Times* (Princeton 1985).

Poleg, Eyal, 'On the Books of Maccabees: an Unpublished Poem by Geoffrey, Prior of the Templum Domini', *Crusades* 9 (2010) 13-56.

Pringle, Reginald Denys, *The Churches of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: a Corpus/Vol. III, The City of Jerusalem* (New York 2007).

Reuter, Timothy, 'Gifts and Simony', in: Esther Cohen and Mayke de Jong eds., *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context* (Leiden 2001) 157 – 168.

Spaer, Arnold, 'A Seal of Baldwin I, King of Jerusalem', *The Numismatic Chronicle* 142 (1982) 157 – 159.

Spiegel, Gabrielle M, 'History, Historicism, and the Social Logic of the Text in the Middle Ages', *Speculum* 65:1 (1990) 59 – 86.

Swanson, Robert N, 'Apostolic Successors: Priests and Priesthood, Bishops, and Episcopacy in Medieval Western Europe', in: Greg Peters and C. Colt Anderson eds., *A Companion to Priesthood and Holy Orders in the Middle Ages* (Leiden 2016) 4 – 42.

Wardle, Timothy Scott, *Continuity and Discontinuity: The Temple and Early Christian Identity* (Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Religion in the Graduate School of Duke University, Durham, 2008).

Yolles, Julian, 'The Maccabees in the Lord's Temple: Biblical Imagery and Latin Poetry in Frankish Jerusalem', in Elizabeth Lapina and Nicholas Morton eds., *The Uses of the Bible in Crusader Sources* (Leiden 2017) 421-439.

