

must refer to multiple other monarchs of Europe, ones not recorded by name, since the chancery scribe recorded that copies were sent *aliis Regibus* in the plural form. Why, then, did the pope or his staff elect to record only the variant texts sent to three royal recipients, and who were the other kings? The placement of the *in eundem modum* note (unless it is the product of laziness or a mistake on behalf of the scribe) could be significant. It appears after the full copy of the text sent to Philip Augustus and the lightly modified formulation of that letter sent to Andrew, but before the highly personalised text sent to Henry III of England. This suggests that, just like Andrew II, the „other kings“ perhaps also received lightly modified versions of the encyclical first addressed to the king of France, that is, essentially the same text as Philip’s, featuring similar minor alterations made perhaps to the same sections that the chancery refashioned in Andrew’s copy. We are fortunate that a copy of the letter addressed to the boy-king of Sweden, Erik XI, survives in an edition apparently made from the original single-sheet parchment letter issued in 1223, now lost. Judging from the evidence of Erik XI’s version, the only difference between his letter and that sent to the king of France was the exchange of „pious Gaul“ for „pious Sweden“ (*devota Suecia*) in the middle of the *narratio*⁶⁶. The extent of the modifications made to the other copies sent *aliis regibus* was probably similar, ranging somewhere between the one-word alteration in Erik’s copy and the more personalised modifications displayed by Andrew’s version. The extent of the tailoring was probably determined by the likelihood of each king departing on crusade. Although it is possible that the pope made more extensive revisions in the lost letters without preserving them in the register, the correlation between the personalised texts in the register and Frederick’s letter of March 1224 requesting extra crusade preachers in Germany, Hungary, France and England (see above), makes such an interpretation unlikely.

Yet kings alone did not a crusade make. In order to provide the backbone of crusader armies, the papacy had to reach out and appeal to a wider audience, the people of Christendom as a whole, which required a quite different rhetorical strategy. This is where the second branch of the text of *Iustus Dominus* comes in. We only have the texts of two copies of the encyclical sent to non-royal recipients, and one of these is preserved in the *in eundem modum* space following the variant wordings explored above. The register records the personalised copy that

66) *Vitis Aquilonia*, ed. VASTOVIUS (see n. 43) p. 173.