

Making the Case
for Spain's Possession
of Jerusalem:
Diego de Valdés's
*De dignitate regum
regnorumque Hispaniae*

CHAD LEAHY

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Departament de Filologia Catalana | Institut d'Estudis Medievals

How to Cite this Article

Chad Leahy. "Making the Case for Spain's Possession of Jerusalem: Diego de Valdés's *De dignitate regum regnorumque Hispaniae*." *Translat Library* 2, no. 2 (2020).



This work is published under a Creative Commons license (CC BY 4.0).

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7275/dsdz-f950>

ISSN: 2604-7438

Making the Case for Spain's Possession of Jerusalem: Diego de Valdés's *De dignitate regum regnorumque Hispaniae*

CHAD LEAHY
University of Denver

ABSTRACT: This article offers a brief textual history, summary, analysis, and complete edition of Chapter 17 of Diego de Valdés's *De dignitate regum regnorumque Hispaniae* (1602). This little-studied text merits our attention as a uniquely layered assertion of Spanish rights to the throne of Jerusalem in the early modern period. Valdés is unique among his contemporaries in not simply insisting on the legal validity of Spanish pretensions to Jerusalemite kingship but, more interestingly, in situating such claims within the broader historical sweep of dynastic transmissions of the title from the eleventh century to the present. Valdés's granular view of the history of the title yields a diachronic critique of Spain's perennial rival, France, that at the same time inscribes a more polyphonic set of Spanish connections to the throne of Jerusalem across the centuries.

KEYWORDS: Spain; France; Kingdom of Jerusalem; Philip III of Spain; Diego de Valdés

Spain merits a place of special distinction, particularly ahead of France, as preeminent among all Catholic crowns. Such is the core contention of Diego de Valdés's polemical political treatise *De dignitate regum regnorumque Hispaniae*, written in Spanish circa 1595 and published in Latin in 1602.¹ In the following pages, I offer a brief textual history, followed by

¹ I would like to express sincere gratitude to my dear colleague Victor Castellani, whose generous help with the Latin in this project was invaluable. I am also indebted to the anonymous reviewers of this article for their very helpful suggestions and corrections.

summary and analysis of the arguments that Valdés presents specifically in Chapter 17 of his treatise (fol. 141v–146r). The article concludes with a complete edition of Chapter 17, which is the first fragment of the work to be edited since the seventeenth century. The chapter in question lays out the case for Spanish claims to the throne of Jerusalem, and it has not garnered the critical attention that it deserves. Here, the legal expert Valdés—professor of Canon law at the University of Valladolid and judge (*oidor*) in the Royal Chancellery of Granada—offers a densely wrought appeal to various historical, genealogical, and juridical arguments in order to substantiate Spanish royal pretensions to Jerusalem.² In sum, Valdés’s Chapter 17 stands out among other early modern Spanish claims to the Holy City as a uniquely layered assertion of Spanish prerogatives.

De dignitate first appeared in Granada in 1602, courtesy of the printing house of Fernando Díaz de Montoya. Wolfgang Hofmann published a second edition in Frankfurt in 1626, with a generously amplified title.³ While the *aprobación* and *licencia* (“EL REY”) of the 1602 Granada edition are both dated 1600, the preliminaries make plain that *De dignitate* was already completed by 1595. A letter from the Marqués de Velada to Valdés included in the preliminaries (1602, n.p.), dated September 1595 from the Escorial, describes Philip II’s reception of the work:

Por No estar Bueno su Magestad quando llego la carta y libro de V.m. aguarde a que estuuiesse conualecido para darle lo vno y lo otro. Y leyo vn rato en el libro, y a lo que yo pude juzgar fue la tabla y otro poco del, tuuole tres o quatro dias, y despues me pregunto quien me parecia q[ue] le viesse, yo le respondi que Garcia de Loaysa: y assi se le dio, su Magestad holgo con el, y Garcia de Loaysa le tiene ya casi visto. Y me dize que es de las mejores y mas doctas cosas q[ue] a visto: y assi lo piensa dezir a su Magestad en acabandole, y que porque gozen del todas naciones le parece seria bien ponerle en Latin.

² For biographical details, see the preliminaries of Valdés (1602) and the entry in Antonio’s *Bibliotheca* (1783: 320).

³ See the Works Cited for complete references. In *Iberian Books*, Wilkinson and Ulla Lorenzo (2016: 2304) also list a Granada, 1607, edition, among the holdings of Coimbra University and the National Library of Brazil. This 1607 edition does not appear documented in early references to Valdés, however, and may be spurious.

This letter is followed by García de Loaysa's own opinion, drafted a month later in October 1595 from the Pardo (n.p.):

Sv Magestad me dio vn libro que V.m. le embio de la precedencia de España con Fra[n]cia, y me mando q[ue] le leyesse, yo lo he hecho: y hecho la relacion del, y el libro me ha parecido ta[n] docto y bien escrito, que he gustado mucho de su lection: y ansi lo he dicho a su Magestad, y me mando escriuu a V.M. q[ue] ha recebido mucho seruicio en este trabajo, y q[ue] le seria acepto q[ue] V.m. le escriuiesse en Latin, y el de vulgar ma[n]do poner en la libreria de S. Lore[n]ço.

Philip II's habits as a book collector are well-documented, as are his engagements with official historiography.⁴ The original Spanish language version alluded to here likely remains in the Escorial still today, in a manuscript entitled *Tractado de la precedencia de los reyes y reyno de España en los lugares, y assientos de la iglesia catholica, y concilios de ella*.⁵ Although the Escorial's catalogue describes the *Tractado* as a mere "traducción al castellano de la obra Latina," it seems reasonable to suspect that the manuscript may be the original alluded to in the preliminaries of *De dignitate*.⁶ This is especially so considering that the Latin imprint itself suggests that the work was composed first in Spanish and only subsequently translated with the king's blessing, upon the suggestion of García de Loaysa, and then shelved at the Escorial.⁷

While the Latinizing of the *Tractado* may have followed close upon the heels of these 1595 preliminary documents, it seems equally plausible to date the *Tractado*'s translation to some point between the ascension of Philip III to the throne in 1598 and the granting of permissions in 1600. This latter conjecture derives from the fact that the preliminaries include

⁴ On book collecting, see Páez de Castro (2014). For an introduction to royal historiography under Philip II, see Chapters 3 and 4 of Kagan (2009: 93–149).

⁵ El Escorial, Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, MS h-II-23.

⁶ Unfortunately, I have not yet been able to evaluate the manuscript in person in order to reach a more definitive conclusion.

⁷ García de Loaysa was a figure of considerable importance at court, occupying among other notable charges the position of royal tutor for the future Philip III. See Feros (2006: 16–17).

two separate dedications in Latin not to Philip II but to his son, Philip III. References to Philip III also pepper the body of the text itself.⁸ Such references, of course, do not preclude the possibility that an earlier Latin version may have been produced before 1598. Regardless, it seems noteworthy that the final Latin version would not appear in print until 1602, a full seven years after the work was first presented at court. The ultimate reasons behind the delay remain unclear, but the business of Latinizing the *Tractado* seems an unlikely culprit.

What is much clearer, however, is that the Latin edition responds to an explicit desire to reach readers beyond Spain: “y porque gozen del todas naciones le parece seria bien ponerle en Latin.” As Brian Tate has argued, from the mid-fifteenth century, apologetic Iberian chroniclers and historians turned to Latin “as a means of communicating with an international audience,” driven by the goal of defending the “national pride” and the “dignity and legitimacy of sovereign power” (1996: 93 and 101). The suggestion that other nations, and especially France, might enjoy (“gozar”) a work whose thesis is the universal superiority of Spain reads as deliciously sardonic. In any case, in deploying the *lingua franca* to polemicize across the Pyrenees, Valdés channels the same spirit animating other anti-French Spanish royal apologies, whether in the vernacular or in Latin, produced at the close of the sixteenth century. Most notable among these is perhaps López Madera’s *Excelencias de la monarchia y reyno de España* (Valladolid, 1597).⁹ Such works were successful at provoking the ire of France. In the dedication of *De l’excellence des Roys, et dv Royavme de France* (Paris, 1610), for example, Jérôme Bignon decries such Spanish propaganda as outrageous: “Et de plus enflame d’vne iuste indignation, de voir que depuis peu quelques étrangers par liures nouveaus s’estoient efforcez de mettre en dispute la preeminence & preesance certaine & ancienne des Roys de Fra[n]ce, par dessus les autres de la terre” (“Av Roy,”

⁸ For example, Philip III is mentioned directly twice in Chapter 17 (fol. 141v and 145r).

⁹ For additional bibliography, see Fedele (2017: 474–92) and García Ballesteros and Martínez Torres (1998: 155–56).

n.p.).¹⁰ The perceived power of official historiography as a means of waging symbolic war in the period is well-documented, and the international polemic of Bignon, López Madera, and Valdés follows well-trodden paths.¹¹ Unique within this abundant *corpus*, however, is Valdés's Chapter 17, which argues that among the weightiest reasons justifying Spain's entitlement to the "first seat" of honor within Latin Christendom is the fact that the Spanish crown—rather than the French—possesses legitimate and exclusive rights to the throne of Jerusalem.

Valdés, of course, is not the only Spanish authority to claim Jerusalemite kingship for Spain. The idea that Jerusalem belongs to Spain is widely attested.¹² As Housley has argued (2000; 2003), the progressively intensifying rhetoric of national sacralization that marks the early modern period draws significant power from association with the Holy Land. In this way, contested claims over Jerusalemite kingship demand to be viewed in light of what Gorski (2000) calls the early modern "Mosaic moment" when European Christian powers were leaning heavily into their pretended status as mutually exclusive new chosen peoples living in new promised lands with special connections to the Holy Land itself. In more concrete terms, Franco-Spanish competition over the throne of Jerusalem traces its historical roots to the decades-long conflicts of the

¹⁰ On the contours of French-Spanish preeminence polemics and the textual *corpus* that they engendered at the close of the sixteenth century, see Fedele (2017: 482–503), and García Ballesteros and Martínez Torres (1998). In his eighteenth-century biography of Bignon, Pérau claims that the work was drafted as a direct response to Valdés (1757: 55–56), although Bignon appears to target López Madera more directly (for example, 257, 294, 314, 509).

¹¹ See Kagan (2009), Montcher (2013), and Ranum (1980).

¹² Examples abound in diverse genres: travelogues, descriptions of the Holy Land, epic poetry, crusade sermons, prophecies, architectural treatises, Council of State reports, *memoriales*, chronicles. See, for example, the documents included in Leahy and Tully (2019), as well as the works of Alzedo Avellaneda (1642), Amico (1609), Buyza (1622), Castillo (1654), Pedrosa (late-sixteenth century; Madrid, BNE, MS 6035), Quaresmius (1631), Santesteban (1503), Vega (1609), Vera y Figueroa (1632), and Villalpando (1596, 1604). Habsburg numismatics additionally feature the so-called Jerusalem cross as a marker of Spain's possession of the crown of Jerusalem. On this, Leahy (2016).

Italian Wars (1494–1559), in which rival pretensions between Spain and France over the dynastically connected kingdoms of Naples, Sicily, and Jerusalem drove decades of conflict, resulting in the papal investiture of Ferdinand the Catholic with the title King of Naples and Jerusalem in 1510.¹³ Even before this date, authors such as Cristóbal de Santesteban in his *Tratado de la sucession de los Reynos de Jerusalem y de Napoles* (Zaragoza, 1503) were already offering juridical arguments in support of Spanish pretensions to Jerusalem, and such ideas are similarly repeated in sixteenth-century chronicles such as Zurita's *Historia del rey don Hernando el catholico* (Zaragoza, 1580), from which Valdés cites liberally. From this vantage, contending views over who has rights to the Holy City are built into the very essence of the international rivalry that Valdés stokes.

Where Valdés stands apart from others in defending Spanish prerogatives in Jerusalem, then, is not in the simple fact of claiming the Holy City for Spain. Such claims were commonplace, and they tended to be taken at face value in Spanish sources.¹⁴ It is rather in erecting an imposing historiographical and legal edifice aimed at propping up such claims that Valdés goes beyond his contemporaries. Chapter 17 aims to demonstrate why Spain deserves the “*primam sedem*” (fol. 141v) in the Church, beginning with how the title itself came to be and why it matters; how it was passed legitimately from pretender to pretender until coming to reside legally with Spain; and why contemporary French claims to the

¹³ See Abulafia (1995), Deveraux (2015), and Mallett and Shaw (2012). Doussinague (1944, 620–35) provides a Spanish translation of the Bull investing Ferdinand with these titles. The Spanish monarchy still today under Philip VI maintains its claims to the title, a right enshrined in Article 56.2 of the Spanish Constitution of 1978.

¹⁴ For example, Lope de Vega's dedicatory to Philip III of *Jerusalén conquistada* (1609): “Si entre los títulos de Vuestra Magestad respandece más el de rey de Jerusalén que el de emperador de las Indias Orientales y Antárticas, justamente se le debía dedicar la historia de su conquista” (2003: 6). Or, Franciscus Quaresmius's crusade sermon *Ierosolymae Afflictae* (1631), dedicated to Philip IV: “You are a king of immense power descended from the noblest Austrian family, Catholic king, King of Jerusalem and all the Holy Land, of the Spains and other vast regions, a knight and supreme commander and chief of the Most Holy Sepulcher of the Son of God, Jesus Christ” (Quaresmius, 2019: 95).

title are, on the contrary, illegitimate. Valdés offers an accounting of the title's transmission from its eleventh-century origins ("ab ouo," fol. 141v) up to the seventeenth-century present, prefacing this history by noting that French authors themselves agree on the underlying principle that "king of Jerusalem" must be considered the most important royal title in Christendom, and that whoever possesses the title commands respect as first in the Church (fol. 141v). For Valdés, the preeminence of the title emanates in a self-evident fashion from the inherent sacredness of the Holy Places themselves (fol. 141v). As Pedro Mexía (2003: 865) puts it in his popular *Silva de varia lección* (1540): "Ningún pueblo ni ciudad hay en el mundo que tantas preeminencias, y gracias haya alcanzado de Dios, ni gozado de tantas excelencias y misterios, como la Santa Ciudad de Hierusalem, pues haber sido allí sido Christo crucificado, muerto y sepultado y celebrado nuestra redempcion, basta para poder decir esto."¹⁵ To be king of such a sacred place is thus to possess something very special indeed. But if Valdés agrees with French authorities on this assessment of the title's value, he parts ways in arguing that Spain rather than France possesses rights to the title.

Spain's claims to the title are beyond question first of all because, as Valdés contends, the full weight of the papacy consistently acknowledges the legitimacy of such claims, a fact confirmed through official Church communications that routinely invoke the king of Spain as king of Jerusalem (fol. 141v). From this prefatory statement, Valdés turns to the historical, genealogical, and dynastic arguments that will structure the bulk of the chapter. From Urban's preaching at the Council of Clermont, an army was raised that resulted in driving out the "infidels" from Jerusalem, at which point Godfrey of Bouillon was proclaimed "King" of Jerusalem (fol. 142r).¹⁶ This preliminary accounting of the institution of the

¹⁵ Similar descriptions can be found in countless works in the period. See, for example, Adricomio (1603), Alzedo Avellaneda (1642), Buyza (1622), Castillo (1654), and Quaresmius (1631). For an introduction to the Christian theology of place on display here, see Levine (1999), Walker (1990), and Wilkens (1994).

¹⁶ On Godfrey, first ruler of the Latin Kingdom (1099–1100) who in fact famously rejected the title of king, see France (1983) and Murray (2000: 6–93). Godfrey came to be fashioned as a legendary, heroic figure, counted among the so-called

crusader kingdom proceeds with a dense overview of royal succession, beginning with Godfrey and ending with Philip III, gesturing additionally along the way towards several points of contact where tangential Spanish connections to the throne of Jerusalem might be insinuated. For example, Valdés notes the affiliation of the kingdoms of Castile and Jerusalem through the marriage union of Berengaria of Leon and John of Brienne in 1224 (fol. 142v–143r) and the transferal of the title from Conradin, king of Sicily and Jerusalem, to Peter III of Aragon by means of the casting of his glove “as a symbol of investiture” before his execution in 1268 (fol. 143r, 145v). Valdés reminds us that after his investiture with the title, the Emperor Frederick II went on pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela (fol. 142v–143r). Spain is thus never far from Jerusalem even when Valdés recognizes the long centuries during which the title rested legitimately with Valois or Angevine pretenders.

Another key approach in prosecuting the Spanish case here lies in documenting various points where rival pretensions were resolved in the name of peace (fol. 142r). Such arguments frame history as exemplary, laying the moral groundwork for viewing contemporary French pretensions as not only illegitimate but also contrary to the collective interests of the Christian commonwealth. For example, Robert, duke of Normandy, renounced his legitimate right to the title out of the interests of the good of his kingdom (fol. 142r); Eustace III desisted in pursuing his legitimate claim in deference to his other brother, Baldwin, out of a concern for “the public good and universal peace” and in order to avoid “civil wars” that might weaken Jerusalem (fol. 142v–143r); and, after lawsuits and counterclaims, Robert of Anjou embraced the title “for the sake of the utility of the kingdom” (fol. 144r). Throughout the document, France’s representatives are cast, on the contrary, as serially criminal aggressors, placing Spain always in the position of litigating defensive—and hence just—wars as a response to invalidated treaties

Nine Worthies of Antiquity (Hector, Julius Caesar, Alexander), the Old Testament (David, Judas Maccabeus, Joshua), and Christian times (Arthur, Charlemagne, Godfrey). Manion (2017: 123) notes the utility in of these figures—and particularly Godfrey—as vectors “to promulgate crusade ideology and to urge contemporary rulers and nobles to emulate those deeds.”

and broken accords. For example: “to him succeeded Alfonso II King of Naples, to whom Pope Alexander VI granted crown and investiture [...] King Charles VIII of France invaded to attack and win it; and when war was joined, Ferdinand [...] defended his kingdom” (fol. 144v); or, “the kingdom of Naples was attacked and taken by the Catholic king, and this successful attack was made because the alliance and its terms were not kept by the king of France, and he brought war upon the Catholic king” (fol. 145r). Charles of Anjou is cast directly “not as a king but as a tyrant” (fol. 143v). Such insistence on Spain’s warring activity as just and defensive resonates suggestively with stock justifications for Christian holy war, and particularly crusading, implying that the Italian Wars should be viewed as expressions of sacred warfare rather than as international conflicts between secular powers.¹⁷

Given the Vatican’s official position as of the 1510 investiture, much of Valdés’s archaeological labor in tracing such pre-investiture minutia might seem superfluous. If anything, Valdés’s detailed history ends up pointing rather to the considerable instability and contested positions to which the title has been subjected over time. As Valdés takes pains to insist, however, regardless of the details of the title’s transmission in the centuries before 1510, “afterwards Julius II declared, in his sentence after the matter was completely adjudicated and the title granted by feudal law, that the aforesaid kingdom of Naples belonged to the Catholic King Ferdinand simultaneously with that of Jerusalem, from which facts, by possession (about which there is no doubt), by proprietary ownership, and by right, this title belongs to the kings of Spain and to our Philip III” (fol. 145v–146r). In light of the preponderance of evidence that the lawyerly Valdés has amassed by this point in his narrative, and even regardless of whatever happened between 1095 and 1510, at this moment in history there can be no doubt: Jerusalem belongs to Spain, and Spain alone. “Non est dubitatio” (fol. 146r). Case closed.

¹⁷ Devereux (2015; 2020) considers the circulation of such narratives in the period 1479–1516, when the Franco-Spanish conflict over Naples and Jerusalem was in the process of playing out.

If this is so, then why not simply lean into the symbolic capital of the Holy See's endorsement, offered here as an unassailable fact of settled law? I would suggest that in embracing this idiosyncratic approach, Valdés pursues several overlapping rhetorical objectives: 1) the very overdetermining cultural logic of genealogy as a route to legitimation, power, and truth in the early modern period unavoidably renders Valdés's archaeological narrativization of Spain's claims a potent tool in manifesting Spanish grandeur precisely because of the historical minutia;¹⁸ 2) in this context, the narrative of continuity linking Philip III to Godfrey allows Spain at multiple points to tap into the rich vein of symbolic capital associated with the Frankish crusading hero, and with the long historical legacy of Holy Land crusading that he embodies, while also suggesting the multiple places where France on the other hand contravenes the interests of the Christian commonwealth; and 3) this same narrative allows Valdés to present a sustained rebuttal of French objections by highlighting at every turn the limits of French claims, thereby reinforcing the broader contention that Spain's possession of Jerusalem ultimately operates as a powerful signifier of Spanish preeminence over France.

In the end, the affirmation that Spain possesses Jerusalem may seem like run-of-the-mill imperial bombast or scholarly pedantry, especially given that the Holy City would remain under Ottoman control roughly between 1517 and 1917. Nevertheless, both crowns appear to have taken the title seriously. For example, just two years after the publication of *De dignitate*, the French ambassador to the Holy See petitioned the Pope to order the Franciscans residing in the Holy Sepulcher to pray first for the king of France in their *pro rege* prayers, ahead of the king of Spain.¹⁹ Even absent any direct influence of *De dignitate* in this diplomatic conflict,

¹⁸ On the power of etymology, genealogy, and origins in the Renaissance, see Rothstein (1990).

¹⁹ On this episode, including editions of relevant documents, see Arce (1970: 106–10), García Barriuso (1992: 385–87), and Leahy and Tully (2019: 164–68). For more on *pro rege* prayers in the Franciscan Custody of the Holy Land, see Cayuela (1955), who notes that this practice persisted in the Franciscan community in Jerusalem at least into the mid-twentieth century, with a small modification to the language used in praying for Franco at the time, invoking him not as *Rex noster* but as *Dux noster* (Cayuela 1955: 293).

the French petition represents a firm rebuke of Valdés's broader points that Spanish sovereignty in Jerusalem is unquestionable, and that France's legal claims to the Holy City are "null" (fol. 146r). The French petition would oblige formal recognition of French preeminence in the Holy City both by the Roman church and by those friars representing the church as part of the Franciscan Custody. The point by point refutation of these pretensions—recorded in a Spanish Council of State report and repeated in a diplomatic communiqué that Philip III sent to his ambassador at the Vatican—identifies concrete diplomatic and fiscal consequences if the Pope dares acquiesce to the French.²⁰ These include threats to cut diplomatic ties with the Vatican and to withdraw Spain's considerable financial support for the Franciscans in the Holy Land, effectively risking the surrender of the Holy Places into Ottoman hands. Jerusalem emerges here as a key location for the negotiation not just of Franco-Spanish relations but, more pointedly, for the broader negotiation of Muslim-Christian relations in the Eastern Mediterranean. In the end, while it is evident that Valdés's arguments regarding Spanish royal prerogatives align with the official Spanish position, it is no less evident that the stakes in such superficially vacuous debates were cast as transcendentally important by the parties involved. Within such debates, *De dignitate* offers a uniquely forceful effort to settle the matter once and for all.

²⁰ The relevant documents are housed in the Archivo General de Simancas, Estado 1858/12, and in legajo 170 of the Archivo de la Obra Pía section of the Archivo Histórico Nacional. For transcriptions and translations, see the sources cited in note 19.

Appendix

Edition of Chapter 17 of Diego de Valdés's

De dignitate regum regnorumque Hispaniae

In the following paleographic transcription of Chapter 17, I have limited editorial interventions simply to completing abbreviations. Original folio numbers corresponding to the 1602 imprint are indicated in the body of the text in brackets. For example, [fol. 143v]. *De dignitate* includes two types of marginal paratexts. A running summary of key themes addressed in the body of the text is enumerated with Arabic numerals. For the opening paragraph, for example, the following text appears in the right margin: “*1 Quod regnu[m] Iherosolymitanum primu[m] locum in Ecclesia temporale[m] obtineat.*” Opposite these summaries, the text includes a significant number of citations, keyed to Latin letters (*a, b, c*, etc.) that appear in the body of the chapter. In the present edition, all marginal annotations are transcribed in italics as footnotes. For the lettered citations, I have reproduced these intratextual markers in the body of the transcription. I have reproduced the enumerated marginal annotations in the approximate location that they appear in the 1602 imprint. I would again like to thank Victor Castellani for his assistance with the Latin here.

[fol. 141v] Capvt decimvm septimum, quo agitur deberi Regibus
Hispaniae primam sedem ab Ecclesia ex titulo,
& iure Regni Iherosolymitani.

Avctores¹ Ipsi Galli co[n]cedunt Regi Iherosolymitano primum tempora-
lem ab Ecclesia in eius pompis solemnibus, & locis publicis deberi locum,

¹ 1 Quod regnu[m] Iherosolymitanum primu[m] locum in Ecclesia temporale[m] obtineat

& sedem, vt a² Corsetus, Carolus Grasalius, & alij notant ideo debita[m] esse prima[m] sede[m] Regi Galliae afferentes, quod titulum, eius habeat regni. Sed quamuis antecedens, quod regno Iherosolymitano debeatur prima sedes, concedamus, cum ibidem Christus praedicauerit, cum hominibus consuetudinem, & colloquium habuerit, fidem seminauerit, Apostolos elegerit, ex quorum doctrina, & missione caeter[a]e nationes, vt ex fonte susceperint fidem, ibidemquê lex Euangelica sit instituta, & fundata sanguine Christi gloriosissimo, tamen consequens, quod titulus & ius regni pertineat ad Regem Hispaniarum debito, & posesso primus ei debeatur iure locus.

Primo³ quod Rex Hispaniae sit in possessione eius tituli, & iuris certu[m] est, cum quotiens Pontifices summi scribunt Regibus Hispaniae, vt Carolo V. Imperatori gloriosissimo, & Philippo. II. Catholico, & nostro tertio vel dirigunt executoriales, vel litteras apostolicas tam ipsi, quam Rotae, vel cancellariae apostolicae iudices semper Reges Hispaniae vocant Reges Iherusalem, non autem Reges Galliae, vt id experimur re, & facto. Secundo ab ouo, vt dicitur, initiu[m] faciendo explorati iuris est regnum Iherosolymitanu[m]⁴ ad Iolantem quam alij Violantem appellant, pertinuisse filiam Ioannis â Brena Regis Iherosolymitani ex stirpe & genealogia Goffredi primi regis Christiani ita ratiocina[n]do, na[m] diligentia, & pio zelo Petri h[a]eremite Morina ciuitate apud Belgas [na]ti accidit, qui cum profectus esset ad sanctu[m] sepulchru[m] cernens qua[m] crudeliter, quam auare Christianis im- [fol. 142r] peraretur, quod extremam per omnia vitam agerent, ipsaq[ue] te[m]pla ad sc[a]elus, ludibriumquê patere [a]egrê fere[n]s tantam indignitatem ex Oriente peruenit arguens Christianos Principes, qui occupati vanis in rebus hanc sui temporis labem ferrent, & eius diligentia, & hortatione Vrbanus Pontifex Claramonte Galli[a]e vrbe concilium congregauit anno millesimo nonagesimo quarto, quo expeditio decreta est ad expugnandam terram, prouinciamquê Iherosolymitanam vt Christiani ab

² a Corsetus de potestate Regia quaest. 14 & 21. Albericus Rub. ff. de stata hominum Aluarotous c. I. quis dicatur dux Carolus Grasalius Regalium Francia lib. I. iure. I. Bart. I. is quod apud hostes de legat. 1.

³ 2 Regi Hispaniae co[m]petit titulus, et ius regni Iherosolymitani.

⁴ 3 Linea Regu[m] Iherosolymitanorum.

infima, & infoelici seruitute liberarentur, & illa ciuitas sancta veneraretur *b*⁵ à catholicis, quam infideles occupabant & cum plures Principes Christiani vnirentur, vrbs, & prouincia a Christianis debellata est, eisque tradita expulsis infidelibus, & tunc titulus Regis Iherosolymitani Godofro Bullon tributus est eo renunciato à Roberto duce Normandiae filio Guillelmi Regis Angliae, eo quod mortuo Guillelmo absqu[e] liberis ad eum regnu[m] Angliae delatum est iure, & Gofredo Bullo[n] successit Balduinus frater Germanus eius ex sancto Antonino (9. c 13 tit. 16. Secunda part. hystoriae, & relatis in margine, &) 11. Prosequitur lineam c[a]eterorum Regum, nam Valduino primo successit Valduinus secundus propinquus sanguine Gofredi Bullon, & Valduini primi fratris sui, & ei electione habita successit, dum abesset Eustacius Comes Bononie[n] sis frater Gofredi Bullon, qui ignorans, & inscius an Rex electus esset decreuerat expeditionem vltra mare fauere pro successione ei debita, sed post quam comperta ei fit Brundusiae electio consanguinei magis visum fuit desistere, cum potius expediret bono publico, & quieti vniuersali, vt conseruaretur regnum Iherosolymitanum, & augetur, quam vt debilitarentur vires in bellis ciuilibus. Valduino *c*⁶ secu[n]do succedit Melisenda maior ex puellis, quae nupsit Fulconi Comiti Andogauensi; & alia minor aetate soror co[n]iuncta est matrimonio cum Boemundo Principe Antiochi[a]e, Fulconi successit Valduinus tertius filius eius, & illi Amalaricus *d*⁷ filius, seu frater ex aliquorum opinione, cui haeres extitit Valduinus quintus filius, & illius Valduinus *e*⁸ quintus filius Sybill[a]e sororis, quae primo nupsit Guillelmo Marchioni Monteferrato, & sec[n]

⁵ b Guillelmus Tyrius lib. 1. c. 17. de bello sacro Blondus decade. 2 libr 4 ab anno 1095 cum alijs de Roma triumphante Carolus sigonius de regno Italiae li 9. in Rege Co[n]rrado anno 1094. cum alijs S. Antonin[us]. 2. p. hystoriae c. 2. ti. 16. c. 13 § 7. sabelicus lib. 5. decade. 1. Benedictus Scoltus de Bello contra Barbaros à Christianis gesto pro Christi sepulchra Christianus Masse[us] lib. 16. Platina; & Papyrius Massonius in Urbano Papa. Monarchia lib. 20. c. 8. & 9. Benedictus de Aceoltis. Aretinus de bello contra Barbaros lib. 1.

⁶ c 5. Anton. 2. p. tit. 17. c. 6 §. 3. Paulus Aemilius lib. 6. Hystoriae Franco-ru[m] Monarchia li. 20. c. 15. hystoriae.

⁷ d. S. Anton. 2. p. tit. 16 c. 13. § fi. & tit. 17. c. 7. § 1. Monarchia li. 20. c. 16. § fi.

⁸ e S. Anto. d. c 13 § fi. et. tit. 17. c. 9. §. 4 et vlt. c. 28. & c. 29. §. 1.

do Guidoni Luginsiano ex stirpe Regia Galli[a]e ex sancto *f*⁹ Antonino, & alia Sybill[a]e soror Elysa nomine maritum habuit Honfredum Turonensem [fol. 142v] Valduino quinto successit mater Sybilla, & secundus eius maritus Guido Luginsianus, cuius saeculo cu[m] ab anno. 1099. Iherosolyma possideretur â Christianis per. 88. seu. 89. annos capta fuit per Soladinum anno 1187. & anno 1217. ad expugnandam, & recupera[n]dam reuersi sunt Duces Bauierae [sic], & Austriae, & Rex Hungariae Andreas adimplens votum â patre emissum eam expeditionem aggrediendi, cuius sit mentio in decretalibus cap. licet de voto, eoquâ tempore omnium consensu titulus regni Iherosolymitani¹⁰ co[n]cessus est Ioanni Brenae duci Viennae in Gallia, & in Tyro vrbe coronam susceperit, eo quod esset ex stirpe Gofredi de Bullon ipse, & successio pertineret etia[m] vxori filiae Elyssae ex primo marito Conrado Marchione Montisferrati, in cuius ditione Sybilla, *g*¹¹ vt supra diximus, primo nupsit, & Elyssa soror Honfredo Turonensi. Postea cum spes summa esset consequendi regnum ex seditione orta inter Ioannem â Brena, qui contendebat statim expugnandam vrbe[m] Iherosolymitanam absquâ alia pugna, donec recuperaretur, & legatum Pontificis Honorij Cardinalem Pelagium, qui expugnandas prius ciuitates Aegipti asseruit, eamquâ sexaginta millia militum secuti sunt censuris prolati aduersis eos, qui id non facerent, qua discordia excitata desperatus Ioannes â Brena relicta ditione, quam in Syria obtinebat in administratione constituta Italiam reuersus est, vt auxilium â Pontifice, & Regibus Christianis¹² peteret, cumquâ eo tempore Federicus Imperator Rex Siciliae, Neapolitanusquâ opione [sic], & dexteritate in bello, fortitudinequâ excelleret ad expeditionem sancti belli ad eum occurrit conciliatione eius, facta cum Papa Honorio cum quo dissensio erat, & vt vinculum fortius, & stricti[us] esset vxorem illi concessit filiam Yolante[m], nuptijs Romae celebratis, pollicitusquâ est Federicus intra biennium se profecturum

⁹ f S. Anton. dicto. C. 13. §. fin. & tit. 17. c. 9. Monarchia dicto lib. 20. c. 9. § 26.

¹⁰ 4 Ad textum. c licet [sic] de voto, de voto Regis Hungariae.

¹¹ g Sanctus Antoninus 3. p. tit. 19. c. 3. §. 1. Monarchia lib. 21. c. 20 §. 4. & 5. & c. 31.

¹² 5 Titul[us] regni Iherosolymitani Siciliae regno, & Neapolitano vnitus est.

Iherosolymam ad ea[m] expugna[n]dam, tuncquê Ioannes Brena omne ius, quod ad regnum Iherosolymitanum, & partes Suriae habebat, in eum tra[n]stulit, vt vnitum maneret regnis Neapolitano, & Siciliae, quod factum est regis ad vitam permanente ei tiulo [sic] auctoritate Papae Honorij. Qua re perfecta ad Co[m]postellanam Ecclesiam vt corpus beati Iacobi coleret vt peregrinus profectus est, & in regnis Castellae secundo nupsit Berenguelae fili[a]e Regis Alphonsi decimi Legion[en]sis, & ita est vnio [fol. 143r] Sicili[a]e vtiusquê facta, & regni Iherosolymitani, & Rex Iherosolymitanus Federicus est appellatus, vt litteris apostolicis, & testimonio Gregorij Pontificis scribit Carolus Signoius de regno Italiae libr. 17. anno. 1223. In tertio tomo, & omnes hystorici in eo conueniunt duabus Sicilijs Tinacrijs, ^h¹³ vt sunt regna Siciliae, & Neapolitanum, vnitum regnum Iherosolymitanum eo iure, & quamuis sanctus Antoninus tertia part. hystoriae tit. 19. cap. 3.§.5. Federicum accusat, quod votum expeditionis non implèuerit, Blo[n]dus asserit relatus in margine quod incoepit bellum, & Pandolfus Colenucius lib. 4. c. 6. quod anno. 1227. Apparatum instituit licet no[n] perfecit & anno. 1228. expeditionem fecit, & anno 1229. recuperauit Iherosolymam concordia cum Soldane per decem annos facta, coronamquê regni suscepit, idemquê Sigonius li. 17. de regno Italiae anno 1227. & 1228. & 1229. Affirmat, & idem sanctus Antoninus titul. 19. cap. 4. §. I, confirmat notam Federico imponens, quod secu[n]dam expeditionem absquê Pontificis consultatione fecerit, pacemquê cum Soldane, non vt decebat, conciliauerit, cum sepulchrum sanctum apud infideles maneret.

Cum¹⁴ ex annalibus, & chronicis constet hoc initiu[m], & originem extitisse, vt titulus regni Iherosolymitani annexus, & vnitus esset vtriquê Sicili[a]e, reliquum est declarare qua de causa regnum Siciliae, & Neapolitanum Regibus Hispani[a]e competat, quod ex hystorij Siciliae, & Neapoli facile est inuestigare eas euoluendo â Federico Imperatore,

¹³ h Platina in Honorio 3. Blondus lib. 7 decade 2. a[n]no 1226 Albertus Krantz[us] lib. 7. Saxoniae. c. 39 Pandolphus Colenucius in compendio regni Neapolitani lib. 4. cap. 5. Monarchia li. 21. c. 31. Tarcagnota 3. to. fol. 148. & 152. Infortunio fol. 89. hystoriae.

¹⁴ 6 Genealogia ab Imperatore Federico; ex qua ad reges hispaniae iur regni Iherosolymitani pertinet.

cui successit Conrradus ex eo & Iolante, seu Violante secunda vxore filia Ioannis Brenae natus cum Iordanus obijsset antea, vt sanctus Antoninus supra memorat. Conrradus autem decedens absquê liberis Corradinu[m] filium fratris He[n]rrici, qui primonatus erat ex Federico, & in vinculis decessit in vita patris instituit & quia Corradin esset impubes tener[a] [a]etatis & in Germania maneret Manfredum filium spurium Federici tutorem ei, & in Neaplitano regno reliquit administratore[m], vt hanc lineam describunt Pandolfus Colenucius, Angelus Constanzzus in hystoria Neapolitana, & Tacagnota, infortunius, Blondusquê Alexander scultetus in chronologia, quamuis Monarchia Pinedae lib. 26. cap. 5. Scribat Corradinum filium fuisse Corradi, et Margaritae Austriacae vxoris, et Martinus Vicia- [fol. 143v] nus in lib. 3. Chronicae Valentinae Manfredum legitimum filium Federici narret, cum ex ancilla nothum, & sceleratum appellet Hugonis Falcandi de rebus siciliae proemium. Cum vero Manfredus tutoris nomine relicto Regis propij vellet assequi, & vi occupauerit regnum Neapolitanu[m] Pontifices Alex et Vrbanus quartus. Clemes quart[us], ex Platina in eorum vita inuestituram regni Neapolitani Caroli duci Andegauensi fratri Regis Galli[a]e diuui [sic] Lodouici concesserunt, qui non solum Manfredum â regno expulit sed Conrradinum adolescentem, qui ad recuperandum regnu[m] sibi iure delatum profectus erat, coepit, in vinculaquè coniecit, & immanitate fera ab omnibusquê scriptoribus, reprehensa, vniuersaliq[ue] omnium dolore, & gemitu iuuenem charum omnibus in flore aetatis, qu[a]e specimen pr[a]e ebebat summ[a]e virtutis, capite tru[n]cari fecit simul cum Duce Austriae pulchro, & generoso, omnibus naturae dotibus cumulatissimê ornato adolescente Co[n]rradini soci, cu[m] vterq[ue] esset ex illa inclyta, & nobilissima supra omnes Sueui[a]e vt radice, ex qua tot Imperatoru[m] rami Regum, & Herou[m] procedunt, descendens ex linea masculina, & foemenina ex generosis Clodoueis, & Pipinis: sed licet Coradinus omnium adstantium, vt viuientium ea [a]etate moerore, & lacrymis decederet, non extinctu[m] omnino eius ius fit, nam vt referet Pa[n]dolfus Colenucius â Pesaro lib. 4. c. 22. in compendio regni Neapolitani eo tempore, quo ei atrox, & violenta mors inferebatur alta voce protulit, quod Carolus Audegauensis crudeliter, tyranuquê iure, & iniusto quia recuperare regnum naturalem, & propriam haereditatem contendebat,

eum vita priuauat, cum Rex aduersus Regem [a]equalem dignitate ius non haberet: sed quia non vt Rex sed vt tyrannus id efficiebat, Deum vltorem poscebat, in quo fiducia posita erat, qua propinqui eius necis adeó seuae vltiores essent, & chiroteca[m] ex manu iecit ad populum in signum inuestiturae alta voce clamans, quod regnum, & h[a]ereditatem relinquebat Federico Castellae filio amitae suae, vt Aeneas Sylvius, qui postea Papa Pius extitit, scribit in hystoria quam edidit, quod illam chirotecā seruauit quidam nobilis equestris ordinis ex circumstantibus, & Regi Aragoniae Petro tradidit.

Neapolitano, & Siciliae regnis à Carolo Andegauensi expugnatis iugum Gallorum à se expellentes [fol. 143v] Siciliani viri Petrum Aragonensem maritum Constantiae filiae Manfredi in auxilium vocantes ei tradiderunt Pontificis suasionē regnum, vt proemium Hugonis Falcandi de rebus Siciliae asserit, & ei inducijs habitis cum Carolo Andegauensi successit Federicus filius ita vt Siciliae regnum apud Aragonensem familiam, & Neapolitanum apud Gallos manere[n]t,¹⁵ & ideo regnum Siciliae in regia stirpe Aragonensi co[n]tinuatum est, ⁱ¹⁶ ita Federico haeres filius Petrus extitit in regno, & Petro gnatus Lodouicus, & Lodouico fratres eius Federicus tertius qui nupsit Constantiae filiae Regis Aragoniae Petri, & illi successit Maria filia, quam duxit in vxorem Martinus filius alterius Martini fratris Ioannis Regis Aragoniae, Martinusque defectu Federici filij regnum moderatus est, nupsitquē Blancae filiae Regis Nauarrae, & successit deinde Martinus pater eius Rex Aragoniae, & illi successor extitit Ferdinandus nepos ex fratre in Sicili[a]e, & Aragoni[a]e regnis, & ei Alphonsus. V. magnanimus cognomine, qui vtramquē Siciliam vltra, & citra Pharum coniunxit, & ita copulata sunt regna Neapolitanum, & Sicili[a]e, & cum à te[m]pore, quo separata sunt narratus sit ordo succedendi in regno Siciliae, de regno Neapolitano agendum erit.

Neapolitanum¹⁷ autem regnum, cum Carolus Andegauensis teneret, reliquit in eo successorem Robertu[m] filium tertio loco natum alijs primis in vita eius decedentibus, & cum lis [sic] ageretur à Capua ex

¹⁵ 8 Linea regu[m] Siciliae.

¹⁶ Monarchia Pinedae lib. 26. c. 6.

¹⁷ 9 Linea regu[m] Neapolitanorum.

Angelo Constanzzo in principio lib. 5. hystoriae, & Pandolfo Colenucio lib. 5. c. 7. Cuius editio vitium habet dum legitur, quod consuluit pro Roberto Baldus, cum fuerit co[n]sulens Batholomeus Capua, & tandem ob publicam regni vtilitatem obtinuit Robertus, qui regnavit post obitum Caroli patris Neapoli, & Roberto successit Regina Ioanna prima neptis, quae adoptavit in filium dum deficerent liberi Loduicum ducem Andegauensem, sed Vrbanus sextus Pontifex regno priuauit eam, & inuestitura[m] eius concessit Carolo Durazzo qui regnum obtinuit ei in successit Otho Ladislaus Bonifacio nono Pontifice adiuuante, & illi Ioanna secunda soror, quae vidua erat [fol. 144v] marito Guillelmo duce Austriae defuncto, quae adoptavit Alphonsum quintu[m] Aragonensem ei tradens regna Neapolitanum, & Siciliae, quae ipse obtinebat, & in eo coniuncta regna manserunt id confirma[n]te Martino quinto Pontifice, vt scribunt Zurita analium Aragoniae lib. 13. cap. 6. & 7. Pandolfus Collenucius in compendio regni Neapolitani lib. 5. c. 20. & quamuis postea concesserit Lodouico duci Andegauensi, tamen iterum adoptionem Lodouici inutilem declarauit, & confirmauit anno 1423. adoptione[m] Alphonsi ex Iheronymo Zurita lib. 13. cap. 7. & cap. 16. & 17. & 19. & lib. 14. cap. 12. Pandolfo Collenucio. cap. 22. Ex qua variatione decernenda causa tam lite iudicibus nominatis relicta est, vt Zurita aduertit lib. 14. cap. 12. 37. & 38. quam etiam bello quo Alphonsus regnum Neapolitanum obtinuit superatis Lodouico, & Renato ducibus Andegauensibus, cui anno 1443. Inuestituram Neapolitani regni concessit Eugenius Papa coniungens vtramquê Siciliam in Alphonso quinto ex Zurita libr. 15. Capit. 18. & 32. Bartholomeo Facio de regibus gestis ab Alphonso V. Neapolitano Rege & Alphon[o] quinto successit Ferdina[n]dus eius filius spurius â patre nominatus, cui Papa Pius secundus in regno vtriusquê Siciliae corona[m] concessit, & illi successit Alphon[us] secun[dus] Rex Neapolitanus filius, cui coronam, & inuestituram concessit Alexa[n]der sextus Pontifex, qui regnum Ferdinando filio reliquit, cum ad illud expugna[n]dum pergeret Carolus octauus Rex Francia, & bello excitato Ferdinandus auxilio catholici Regis Hispaniarum Ferdinandi, & illius ducis cognomento magni Gu[n]daluui Fernandez â Cordoua defendit regnum. Et Ferdinando successit Federicus patruus eius, quem auxilio Regis Catholici Ferdinandi â regno expulit Lodouicus vndecimus Galliarum Rex diuisione auctoritate

Alexandri sexta facta, vt inuestitura regni Neapolitani, & Iherosolymitani Regi Franciae concederetur, & Calabria, & Apulia Regi catholico manere[n]t cum Rex Siciliae esset legitimus, quod ita intelligeretur, vt ius saluum remaneret Regi, ex iure Alphonsi patru[m], quod sibi & descendentibus, & in defectu eorum transuersalibus competeret ad regnum Neapolitanum consequendum vt concesserat Eugenius Papa ex Zurita lib. 4. cap. 43. In hystoria Regum catholicorum, postea autem dissensione eueniente expugnatu[m] [fol. 145r] est â Rege catholico regnum Neapolitanum, eaque facta est expugnatio quia foedera, & conditiones non seruauit Rex Franciae: sed bellum intulit Regi catholico in comitatu Rosellon, vt norat Petrus Mexia libr. I. cap. 3. in hystoria Caroli quinti quod consecutus est diligentia, & fortitudine magni ducis Gundisaluu[m] [sic] Fernandez â Cordoba, & facta fuit inuestitura vtriusquè Siciliae Tinacriae, & Iherosolymitani regni â Pontifice maximo Iulio secundo, ex Zurita libr. 9. capit 11. Regum catholicorum; & Huberto Goltzio genealogiam scribe[n]te, & Ferdinando Catholico successit filia eius Regina Ioanna, & ei gnatus Carolus quintus Imperator, cui Catholicus Philippus secundus filius extitit successor, & ei Philippus tertius catholicus, & maximus, qui diu regnet, & foeliciter, cui duobus titulis, & iuribus sanguinis pertinet successio tam ex linea legitima Alphonsi Regis Neapolitani, cui regnum sibi posteris, & transuersalibus concessum erat foedi iure, quam ex linea Federici iniuste priuati, & Ferdinandi filij ducis Calabriae, qui obiit dum vicerex in Valentina ciuitate esset, tum etiam ex inuestitura Pontificum, & Iulij. II. qui declarauit, vt Zurita. c. 11. libr. 9. Regu[m] catholicorum aduertit causas legitimas inuestiturae. & priuationis Regu[m] Franci[a]e, cu[m] nec conditiones foedi, nec iuramentu[m] fidelitatis seruasset, qua[m]uis Andreas Palladi[us], & alij auctores faue[n]tes Gallis aliu[m] ordine[m] ferue[n]t in successione narra[n]da.

Nec¹⁸ supra dicto iuri â Pontificibus probato, & confirmato & in rem iudicata[m] [sic] transacto obstare potest; [quod] â Regibus Francorum obijci solet, tum [quod] Po[n]tifices inuestituram concesserunt Carolo Andegauensi regni Neapolitani, & Iherosolymitani [quod] postea auferri absq[ue] causa non potuit ex reg. id quod nostru[m] est sine causa nostra

¹⁸ 9 Respondetur obiectioni regum Fra[n]ciae.

â nobis auferri no[n] potest, tu[m] etia[m] [quod] eide[m] Carolo alia via titulus regni Iherosolymitani â Po[n]tificibus concessus est; cu[m] subditiōe Turcaru[m] esset; vt nota[n]t Bart. I. id [quod] apud hostes delegar. 1. Carolus Grasalus lib. I. regaliu[m] Franci[a]e iure. r. causa aute[m] ex historijs ea videtur [quod] anno 1276. Maria filia Principis Antiochiae resignauit ius ei compete[n]s ad regnu[m] Iherosolymitanu[m] in Carolum Andegauem ex quo corona[m] suscepit, ad Syriamq[ue] missit gubernatore[m] Roggieru[m] â sancto Seuerino, qui ministros nomine Caroli elegit; & fidelitatis iuramentum â vasallis recepit auxilio [fol. 145v] Albertini Mouresini Veneti in Acrensi vrbe, quo iure etiam Pandolfus Collenucius in compendio Neapolitani regni libr. 5. Cap. I. affirmat regno Neapolitano ius regni Iheroslymitani competere, fatetur tamen quo nunquam inuenire potuit euolutis hystorijs quo iure ad Mariam regnum Iherosolymitanum pertineret, & Angelus Constanzzus libr. 2. fol. 29. in Historia Neapolitana solum asserit, quod Regina Iherusalem quae adhuc Anthiochiam moderabatur, auxilium â Pontifice petens, ad recuperandam sancta[m] regionem omni solemnitate adhibita ius suum Carolo concessit, non tamen nominat Maria[m], nec Reginam, quae tunc erat, neque quo titulo, & iure, & quia Ioanna secunda postea Lodouicum Andegauensem adoptauit, Reges Galliae ius ad Neapolitanum regnum simul cum Iherosolymitano sibi co[m]petere contendunt.

Sed dictis obiectionibus satisfieri potest primo quod Pontifex nunquam Corradino legitimo successori Neapolitano abstulit ius regni, nec illo priuauit, sed Manfredum solum declarauit priuatum: vnde Carolus eijciendo vi armata Corradinum â regno violentus possessor extitit, nec sibi ius adquirere potuit, nec titulum legitimum, & iuste Corradinus inuestituram per chirotecam demissam, & haereditatem transtulit in familia[m] Regum Hispaniae. Item licet Carolus Andegauensis ex duobus titulis, & caussis superius relatis ius haberet legitimum ad regna Neapolitanum, & Iheroslymitanu[m] adoptione Ioannae secundae postea Alphonsus Rex in Neapolitano regno successit, quam & donationem acceptatam [sic] iure non potuit ipsa Ioanna, & id quod semel donauit & placuit postea displicendo reuocare ex iuris regulis, quod si contendatur potuisse, & in Lodouicum Andegauensem transtulisse, eadem ratione potuit reuocare adoptionem in dictum Lodouicum factam, & transferre

in Alphonsum, vt iterum fecit prima[m] confirmando, & ita eodem iure, quo Carolus Andegauensis successit, eodem vti potest regnum Hispaniaru[m], tum etiam iure Siciliae regni, [quod] semper Regi catholico Ferdina[n]do delatu[m] fuit, & ab eo possessu[m], & ei regno vnitu[m] est Iherosolymitanu[m] à Ioanne Brena sicuti Neapolitano, quia vtriq[ue] Sicili[a]e Tinacri[a]e annexu[m] fuit. & diuidi, separariq[ue] non potuit, quinimo etia[m] postea Iulius. II. declarauit sente[n]tia in re[m] iudicata[m]] tra[n]- [fol. 146r] sacta, & titulo inuestitur[a]e co[n]cesso iure foedi dictu[m] regnu[m] Neapolitanum Regi Catholico Ferdinando competere simul cum Iherosolymitano, ex quibus, & possessione de qua non est dubitatio, & propietate, & iure titulus hic ad Reges Hispaniae, & Philippum nostrum tertium pertinet. Item vt aduertit Petrus Mexia in manuscripta hystoria Caroli quinti Imperatoris maximi libr. I. cap. 3. Manfredus, qui anno 1208. Regnauit in regnis Neapoli, & Siciliae vnicam gnatam Constantiam habuit, quae nupsit Petro Regi Aragoniae, quem spoliavit regnis Carolus Andegauensium dux, sed ius semper mansit apud Constantiam, ex qua Alfonsus Rex Neapolitanus, & Ferdinandus Catholicus Rex Aragoniae Siciliam obtinuit. Item licet Caroli Andegauensium ducis esset iusta successio Ioanna secunda Regina Neapolis, vt dictum est, Alphonsum adoptauit ratione iuris ei competentis Eugenio quarto approbante, & quamuis postea ea adoptauerit Lodouicum Andagauensem tamen, vt dictum est, ea adoptio nulla fuit, cum prima reuocari non posset, & etiam fuit conditionalis, si ea decederet sine liberis & ipse absquê liberis decederet priusquam Ioanna secunda expirauit conditio, & no[n] impleta fuit, quia adoptanti non potuit succedere, & ius, quod ex hac adoptione contendunt habere Reges Galliae, nullum. Item Regi Alfonso filius spurius Ferdinandus non potuit succedere: sed Ioannes Rex Aragonum frater legitimus, qui pater Ferdinandi catholici extitit.

Manuscripts Cited

Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, MS 6035.

[fol. 134–54]: Gaspar de Pedrosa. *R[elacion] summaria del modelo de la antigua Hierusalem q[ue] ymbio a su Mag[esta]d de Roma el P[adr]e Joan Baptista Villalpando y le presento y mostro el P[adr]e Gaspar de Pedrosa en Madrid con el primer Thomo sobre Ezechiel y con la estampa y aparato de el Templo de Salomón.*

El Escorial, Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, MS h-II-23.

Diego de Valdés. *Tractado de la precedencia de los reyes y reyno de España en los lugares, y assientos de la iglesia catholica, y concilios de ella.*

Works Cited

Abulafia, David. 1995. *The French Descent into Renaissance Italy, 1494–1495: Antecedents and Effects* Aldershot: Variorum.

Adricomio Delpho, Christiano. 1603. *Breve descripcion de la ciudad de Iersalem y lugares circunvecinos.* Valencia: Roque Sonzonio.

Alzedo Avellaneda, Mauricio de. 1642. *Irevsalen captiva, y motivos sobre sv destruicion: svcessos, y entrega de los Santos Lugares de Palestina, a la Serafica Religion de S. Francisco. y el directo dominio que sobre Ellos tiene sv Rey y Señor nvestro, la Magestad Catolica de Filipo Quarto Rey de las Españas, y Emperador del Nvevo Mvndo. Discvrsos en declaracion de cvan aceta es à Dios la limosna que hazen los Fieles a su S. Sepulcro.* Madrid: Maria de Quiñones.

Amico, Bernardo da Gallipoli. 1609. *Trattato delle piante et imagini dei sacri edificii di terra santa diseguate in Giervsalemm secondo le regole della prospettiuua, & vera misura della lor grandezza.* Rome: Typographia Linguarum Externarum.

Antonio, Nicolás. 1783. *Bibliothca Hispana Nova sive Hispanorum Scriptorum qui ab anno MD. Ad MDCLXXXIV. floruerunt.* Vol. I. Madrid: Joachimum de Ibarra Typographum Regium.

Arce, Agustín. 1970. *Documentos y textos para la historia de Tierra Santa y sus santuarios, 1600–1700.* Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press.

Bignon, Jérôme. 1610. *De l'excellence des roys, et dv royaume de France. Traitant de la preseeance, premier rang et prerogatiues des Roys de France par dessus les autres, & des causes d'icilles.* Paris: Hierosme Drovart.

Buyza, Blas de. 1622. *Relacion nvueva, verdadera, y copiosa, de los sagrados lugares*

de Jerusalem, y Tierrasanta. De las misericordias diuinas, que en ellos resplandecen. De los muchos trabajos, y affliciones, que por conseruarlos en piedad Christiana padecen los Religiosos del Serafico Padre san Francisco, que los habitan: y de los grandes gastos que tienen con los Turcos. Madrid: Viuda de Alonso Martin.

Castillo, Antonio del. 1654. *El devoto peregrino: Viage de Tierra Santa.* Madrid: Imprenta Real.

Cayuela, Arturo M. 1955. "Un caso de humanidades aplicadas: Análisis literario de una oración litúrgica." *Helmantica* 6: 291–314.

Devereux, Andrew W. 2015. "The ruin and slaughter of ... fellow Christians': The French as a Threat to Christendom in Spanish Assertions of Sovereignty in Italy, 1479–1516." In *Representing Imperial Rivalry in the Early Modern Mediterranean*, edited by Barbara Fuchs and Emily Weissbourd, 101–25. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Devereux, Andrew W. 2020. *The Other Side of Empire: Just War in the Mediterranean and the Rise of Early Modern Spain.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Doussinague, José María. 1944. *La política internacional de Fernando el Católico.* Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

Fedele, Dante. 2017. *Naissance de la diplomatie modern (XIII^e–XVII^e siècles): L'ambassadeur au croisement du droit, de l'éthique et de la politique.* Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.

Feros, Antonio. 2006. *Kingship and Favoritism in the Spain of Philip III, 1598–1621.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

France, John. 1983. "The Election and Title of Godfrey de Bouillon." *Canadian Journal of History* 18: 321–30.

García Ballesteros, Enrique, and José Antonio Martínez Torres. 1998. "Una historiografía en tiempos de Felipe II: las *Excelencias de la monarchia y reyno de España*." In *Felipe II (1527–1598): Europa y la monarquía católica. Congreso Internacional "Felipe II (1598–1998), Europa dividida, la monarquía católica de Felipe II" (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 20–23 abril 1998)*, edited by José Martínez Millán, vol. 4: 149–69. Madrid: Parteluz.

García Barriuso, Patrocinio. 1992. *España en la historia de Tierra Santa. Obra Pía Española a la sombra de un Regio Patronato (estudio histórico-jurídico). Tomo I: Siglos XIV, XV, XVI y XVII.* Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores.

Gorski, Philip S. 2000. "The Mosaic Moment: An Early Modernist Critique of Modernist Theories of Nationalism." *American Journal of Sociology* 105, no. 5 : 1428–68.

Housley, Norman. 2000. "Holy Land or Holy Lands? Palestine and the Catholic West in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance." *The Holy Land, Holy Lands, and Christian History*, edited by Robert N. Swanson, 228–49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Housley, Norman. 2003. "Pro deo et patria mori: Sanctified Patriotism in Europe, 1400–1600." *War and Competition between States*, edited by Philippe Contamine, 221–48. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kagan, Richard L. 2009. *Clio and the Crown: The Politics of History in Medieval and Early Modern Spain*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Leahy, Chad. 2016. "'Dineros en cruzados': The *Morisco* Expulsion, Numismatic Propaganda, and the Materiality of Ricote's Coins." *Hispanic Review* 84, no. 3 : 273–98.
- Leahy, Chad, and Kenneth Tully. 2019. *Jerusalem Afflicted: Quaresmius, Spain, and the Idea of a 17th-Century Crusade*. London: Routledge.
- Levine, Lee I., ed. 1999. *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. New York: Continuum.
- López Madera, Gregorio. 1597. *Excelencias de la monarchia y reyno de España*. Valladolid: Martín de Córdoba.
- Mallett, Michel, and Christine Shaw. 2012. *The Italian Wars 1494–1559: War, State and Society in Early Modern Europe*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson.
- Manion, Lee. 2017. "'Perpetuel Memorye': Remembering History in the Crusading Romance." *Remembering the Crusades and Crusading*, edited by Megan Cassidy-Welch. London: Routledge.
- Mexía, Pedro. 2003. *Silva de varia lección*, edited by Isaías Lerner. Madrid: Castalia.
- Montcher, Fabien. 2013. "La historiografía real: El contexto de la interacción hispano-francesa (c. 1598–1635)." PhD Dissertation, Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
- Murray, Alan V. 2000. *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: A Dynastic History, 1099–1125*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Páez de Castro, Juan. 2014. *Una biblioteca para el rey: Memoria al rey Don Felipe II, sobre las librerías*, edited by Antonio Bernat Vistarini and John T. Cull. Palma de Mallorca: José J. Olañeta.
- Péreau, Gabriel-Louis. 1757. *Vie de Jérôme Bignon Avocat General et Conseiller d'État*. Paris: Jean-Thomas Herissant.
- Quaresmius, Franciscus. 1631. *Ierosolymae Afflictae et humiliatae deprecatio ad Philippum IV Hispaniarum novi orbis suumque Regem Potentissimum et Catholicum. Vt libertatem ex Turcarum tyrannide assequatur*. Milan: Melchioris Malateste.
- Ranum, Orest A. 1980. *Artisans of Glory: Writers and Historical Thought in Seventeenth-Century France*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Rothstein, Marian. 1990. "Etymology, Genealogy, and the Immutability of Origins." *Renaissance Quarterly* 43, no. 2: 332–47.
- Santesteban, Cristóbal de. 1503. *Tratado de la succession de los reynos de Jeru-*

salen y de Napoles y de Çecilia y de la p[ro]uincias de Pulla y Calabria. Zaragoza: Jorge Coci.

- Tate, Robert Brian. 1996. "The Rewriting of the Historical Past: *Hispania et Europa*." *Historical Literature in Medieval Iberia*, edited by Alan Deyerdmond. 85–103. London: Queen Mary and Westfield College.
- Valdesio, Iacobo. 1602. *De dignitate regvm regnorumque Hispaniae, & honoratori loco eis, seu eorum legatis a conciliis, ac Romana sede iure debito*. Granada: Ferdinandum Diaz a Montoya.
- Valdesio, Iacobo. 1626. *Praerogativa Hispaniae, Hoc est, De dignitate et praeminentia regvm regnorumque Hispaniae, & honoratori loco ac titulo eis eorumque legatis a conciliis, necnon Romana sede iure debito, tractatvs eximivs, Reges Catholicos Christianissimis aliisque iure, regnis, sede ac titulo potiores exitisse & adhuc liquido demonstrans*. Francofvrti: Gvulfgangi Hofmanni.
- Vega Carpio, Lope de. 2003. *Poesía, III. Jerusalén conquistada. Epopeya trágica*. Ed. Antonio Carreño. Madrid: Biblioteca Castro.
- Vera y Figueroa, Juan Antonio de. 1632. *El Fernando o Sevilla restavrada*. Milan: Henrico Estefano.
- Villalpando, Juan Bautista. 1991. *El templo de Salomón según Juan Bautista Villalpando. Comentarios a la profecía de Ezequiel*, edited by J. A. Ramírez, translated by José Luis Oliver Domingo. Madrid: Ediciones Siruela.
- Walker, P. W. L. 1990. *Holy City, Holy Places? Christian Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Wilkins, Robert Louis. 1994. *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Wilkinson, Alexander S., and Alejandra Ulla Lorenzo, eds. 2016. *Iberian Books Volumes II & III: Books published in Spain, Portugal and the NewWorld or elsewhere in Spanish or Portuguese between 1601 and 1650 / Libros Ibéricos Volúmenes II y III: Libros publicados en España, Portugal y el Nuevo Mundo o impresos en otros lugares en español o portugués entre 1601 y 1650*. Leiden: Brill.
- Zurita, Jerónimo. 1580. *Historia del rey don Hernando el Catholico: de las empresas, y ligas de Italia*. Zaragoza: Domingo de Pottonarijs y Vrsino.