

2005

The relationship between the papacy and the Jews in twelfth-century Rome: papal attitudes toward biblical Judaism and contemporary european Jewry

Marie Therese Champagne

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Champagne, Marie Therese, "The relationship between the papacy and the Jews in twelfth-century Rome: papal attitudes toward biblical Judaism and contemporary european Jewry" (2005). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 1931.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/1931

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PAPACY AND THE JEWS
IN TWELFTH-CENTURY ROME:
PAPAL ATTITUDES TOWARD BIBLICAL JUDAISM
AND CONTEMPORARY EUROPEAN JEWRY

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of History

by
Marie Therese Champagne
B.S.N., Southeastern Louisiana University, 1977
M.A., Louisiana State University, 1999
May, 2005

For my Father,
Leo Pierre Champagne, Sr. (1921-2005),
who gave me his integrity, his love, and his faith,

and for my second Mother,
Lorraine Edwards Champagne,
who has steadfastly loved, supported, and encouraged me

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My mentors, friends, and family have provided me with invaluable support and inspiration. Dr. Maribel Dietz, my major professor, not only gave me her time, wisdom, knowledge, and insight, but also offered encouragement when the obstacles confronting me seemed insurmountable. Her belief in me and my abilities sustained and motivated me, and for that I will always be grateful. Professor Brenda Bolton generously translated portions of Latin texts, graciously facilitated my contacts with other scholars, and propelled me in my professional life through her faith in my work. Professor Kenneth Stow of Haifa University cheerfully and kindly offered encouragement and advice as my research progressed.

The late Dr. Robert Edgeworth offered valuable corrections to my Latin translations in Chapter II until his untimely death in October of 2004. Dr. Edgeworth's extraordinary kindness and humanity surpassed his incredible talents as a classicist and linguist. I am grateful to the scholars who offered their help after his death, including Dr. Mary Sirridge and Dr. Lauge Nielsen, and to those who translated portions of Latin inscriptions and Italian and German texts: Drs. Rex Stem, Steven Ross, Sarah Ross, and Anna Rocca.

My friends, family, and colleagues have steadfastly stood with me on this journey through graduate school; I could not imagine succeeding in this goal without their help and support. My thanks extend especially to my brother Mike Champagne, and my friend Mary Ann Henchy. My fellow graduate student, Jean Anne Hayes Williams, generously listened and supported me through the most stressful moments. My children Tommy, Sarah, and Lauren, as always, remind me of what is most important in my life.

PREFACE

As the start of my graduate studies in history, in a graduate seminar in Art History, I read about the Treasures of the Temple of Herod, taken from Jerusalem in the first century CE, and lost to public notice after the sixth century. Textual mention of the Treasures re-emerged in an ecclesiastical text from a Lateran cleric in the late eleventh century. Fascinated with the history of the Catholic Church and Judaism and their relationship through the past two millennia, and confronted by seemingly endless popular publications about the Ark of the Covenant and mysterious secrets of the Church, I wondered what had actually happened to the Treasures and why that eleventh-century cleric suddenly promoted the idea that the Treasures were in the Lateran basilica. As I researched the subject, I decided to focus on the beliefs about the Treasures, and how those beliefs were utilized, not on whether the Treasures actually existed in the Middle Ages. That will probably never be known definitively.

The story that emerged revealed that a particular relationship existed between the popes and the Roman Jews in the twelfth century, especially between 1145 and 1181. The Treasures formed an important component of biblical Judaism that was utilized by the papacy during that period. My investigation into that usage of the Temple Treasures by the popes, while they maintained a restrictive and protective relationship with the Jews, revealed an incredibly complex mosaic of papal attitudes toward the Jews and toward biblical Judaism. In light of the often tortuous journey that Christians and Jews have followed in their interactions and associations from the beginning of the Common Era, it is my wish that this dissertation will spur further research into that relationship in the latter twelfth century, a truly unique era in papal/Jewish relations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
PREFACE.....	iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	vii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
II FROM JERUSALEM TO ROME: THE ORIGIN, LOSS, AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TREASURES OF THE TEMPLE OF HEROD.....	16
The Origin of the Treasures and the Temple.....	18
The Final Destruction of the Temple and Transport of the Treasures to Rome.....	29
The Papacy's Claim to Possess the Temple Treasures.....	41
III CHRISTIAN AND JEWISH RELATIONS AND INTERACTIONS FROM THE CHURCH FATHERS TO THE TWELFTH-CENTURY POPES.....	58
The Relationship between Christianity and Judaism.....	60
The Relationship between the Papacy and the Jews.....	81
Twelfth-Century Christian/Jewish Contact.....	86
IV POLITICAL AND DOCTRINAL INFLUENCES ON THE ATTITUDE OF EUGENIUS III TOWARD THE JEWS.....	99
The Struggle between Church and Empire: The Reform Papacies.....	104
Papal Protection of the Jews: <i>Sicut Judaeis</i>	113
Political Upheaval in Rome: 1130-1145.....	124
Eugenius III: 1145-1153.....	137
V CONTINUITY OF TRADITIONS AND ATTITUDES THROUGH ALEXANDER III: THE CHURCH'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF BIBLICAL JUDAISM.....	159
The Holy Thursday Ritual and the Temple Treasures.....	163
Alexander III: 1159-1181.....	173
Conclusion.....	188
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	198
APPENDIX: LIST OF POPES 1049-1216.....	216
VITA.....	217

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>BT</i>	<i>Babylonian Talmud</i>
<i>DBV</i>	Petrus Mallius, <i>Descriptio basilicae Vaticanae</i>
<i>DLE</i>	<i>Descriptio Lateranensis ecclesiae</i>
<i>Gesta</i>	Albinus, <i>Gesta pauperis scolaris</i>
<i>HIS</i>	Nicolaus Maniacutius, <i>Historia Imaginis Salvatoris</i>
<i>Lib. Cens.</i>	Cencius, <i>Liber Censuum</i>
<i>Lib. pol.</i>	Benedict, <i>Liber Politicus</i>
<i>LP</i>	Duchesne, <i>Liber Pontificalis</i>
<i>MGH</i>	<i>Monumenta Germania Historiae</i>
<i>SS</i>	<i>Scriptores</i>
<i>Const.</i>	<i>Constitutiones</i>
<i>MUR</i>	Benedict, <i>Mirabilia Urbis Romae</i>
<i>Ordo</i>	Bernard, <i>Ordo officiorum ecclesiae Lateranensis</i>
<i>PL</i>	Migne, <i>Patrologia cursus completus. Series latina</i>
<i>Regesta</i>	Jaffé, <i>Regesta Pontificum Romanorum</i>
<i>Sacrorum cons.</i>	Mansi, <i>Sacrorum consiliorum nova, et amplissima collectio</i>
<i>Vulg.</i>	<i>Vulgate</i>

ABSTRACT

The relationship of the papacy to the Jews in the Middle Ages, which had developed under the influences of Patristic writers, Roman law, and papal precedent, was marked in the twelfth century by toleration and increasing restriction, but also by papal protection. Between the First Crusade massacres of Jews and the restrictions and persecutions of the thirteenth century, the twelfth century is set apart as a unique era in the lives of European Jews. As Eugenius III (1145-1153) and Alexander III (1159-1181) extended their protection to the Jews of Rome and perhaps all of Christendom through the papal document *Sicut Judaeis*, and simultaneously proclaimed Christianity's doctrinal superiority over Judaism, the Roman Jews also acknowledged the pope as their temporal lord and ruler in Rome through their presentation of the Torah. Other motivations for that contractual relationship perhaps existed, including the popes' need for financial backing. Eugenius III and Alexander III lived in exile through much of their reigns and struggled to maintain control of the Patrimony, a major source of papal revenues.

During the same era, Eugenius III and Alexander III publicly promoted the Church's inheritance of biblical Judaism in the claim that the Treasures of the Temple of Herod existed in the Lateran basilica. Lateran texts, special liturgical rituals, and papal processions through Rome reinforced that claim. At the same time, the attitudinal influences of the Cistercians Nicolaus Maniacutius and Bernard of Clairvaux on Eugenius, and the Jewish steward Jechiel in the papal household on Alexander, cannot be measured definitively but suggest a paradoxical relationship with the Jews. The history of continuing papal conflicts with the Roman Commune and the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa confirms that Eugenius and Alexander unceasingly sought to establish their authority and power over

Rome, the Patrimony, and Christendom throughout their papacies, and used popular perceptions that the Church possessed the Temple Treasures to buttress that authority. The popes' emphasis on biblical Judaism and actions toward the Roman and European Jews reflects a multi-faceted mosaic of papal attitudes toward the Jews and biblical Judaism between 1145 and 1181.

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

Relationships are based on opinions and attitudes, beliefs and perceptions. These facets of the relationship between Christians and Jews have varied in character, value, and intensity over the centuries since the inception of the movement within Judaism by followers of Jesus Christ.¹ As Christianity grew and developed doctrinally into a religious system separate from Judaism, attitudes voiced by Church leaders, and particularly by the papacy, often determined the nature of the relationship between Christians and Jews, reinforcing or promoting popular perceptions and beliefs.²

During the twelfth century, the papacy apparently encouraged commonly-held Christian and Jewish perceptions that the legendary Treasures of the Temple of Herod were in Rome, and used them to promote publicly the Church's identification with the heritage of the biblical Jews, and to buttress papal power and authority.³ This dissertation focuses on a portion of that century, during which Popes Eugenius III (1145-53) and Alexander III (1159-1181) reigned as popes.⁴ The Temple Treasures, as physical and symbolic elements intrinsic

¹ Although an ethnic identification as Jewish in the twenty-first century does not necessarily correspond to any personal religious practices, ancient and medieval writers did not seem to distinguish between variations of religious zeal among Jews, and grouped together those followers of the one God, Yahweh, as Jews. Therefore, in this paper, the terms Jew and Judaism will be used interchangeably to refer to those considered Jewish by non-Jews. Shaye D. Cohen, in "Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew," *Harvard Theological Review* 82 (1989), 15-30, provides a detailed explanation of the numerous ways that one could be considered Jewish in antiquity, from mere sympathy with the Jews, to full conversion to Judaism.

² While the attitudes of individual popes toward the Jews throughout the ages have reflected philosophical, theological, and personal influences, those attitudes may also be interpreted as indicative of the official position of the Church. This study will examine both the "official" doctrines of the Church in the twelfth century and the individual attitudes and actions of two particular popes, Eugenius III and Alexander III, toward the Jews of Rome.

³ In this dissertation, the terms "Treasures" and "Temple Treasures" will denote the table of the showbread, the menorah, the altar of incense, and any other ritual implements that were believed to be present in the first-century Temple of Herod when it was destroyed by Roman forces in CE 70, according to the eye-witness account of Josephus Flavius.

⁴ While only a fraction of the papal registers of Eugenius and Alexander are extant, a certain amount of their papal texts along with the dates and locations of papal actions can still be found in several collections, including *Magnum bullarium Romanum a Beato Leone Magno usque ad S.D.N. Benedictum XIII*, 8 vols., (Luxumburgi:

to the Covenant between the Jews and Yahweh, remained powerful and revered objects in the minds of both Christians and Jews. Throughout the Middle Ages the sculptures on the Arch of Titus in Rome reminded Roman Jews of the loss of both the Treasures and the Temple during the first-century CE war with Rome.⁵ Ecclesiastical ritual at St. John Lateran, and papal *adventus* processions through the city of Rome *and* the Arch of Titus reinforced Christian beliefs that the Church had inherited the heritage of biblical Judaism and superseded the Temple in validity.⁶

The Church's twelfth-century promotion of its possession of the Temple Treasures demonstrated the continued appropriation of a common symbolic vocabulary of power that served to justify Christianity's legitimacy. During that century, the Church's legitimacy and supremacy was not endangered in the Christian/Jewish polemical war, but in real political power in Rome and throughout Christendom. It is in that arena that the Temple Treasures were used and public perceptions manipulated. How the papacy used the Temple Treasures to bolster its authority in Rome, particularly during the reigns of Eugenius III and Alexander III, reveals the particular political pressures on these two popes from 1145 to 1181.

The cultural milieu of twelfth-century Rome suggests several reasons for the papacy's promotion of this identification with biblical Judaism. A heightened awareness of the glory of ancient Rome, surrounding and pervading life in medieval Rome, reminded the public on a

Andreae Chevalier, 1727); *Bullarum diplomatum et privilegiorum sanctorum Romanorum pontificum*, 24 vols. (1857-72); *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* 22 & 23, J.-D. Mansi, ed. (Florence and Venice, 1759-98); and *Regesta pontificum romanorum*, Phillippus Jaffe, ed., 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1888), and *Le Liber Pontificalis.*, L'Abbé L. Duchesne, ed., 2 vols. (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1886-1892); *Additions et Corrections de Mgr. L. Duchesne*, Cyrille Vogel, ed., vol. 3, (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1955-1957).

⁵ This dissertation will focus on Christian attitudes, but the attitudes of the Jews are no less important to our understanding of the relationship between Christians and Jews in the Middle Ages. A future study may revolve around the Jewish perspective toward the Church and the popes in the twelfth century.

⁶ This writer defines the term "biblical Judaism" as a composite of the sacred texts, ritual observances, beliefs, and leaders of the ancient Hebrews before the birth of Jesus.

daily basis of the glory of the ancient past. In the twelfth century, the popes embraced the theme of *renovatio* throughout the city, as they collected and displayed ancient artifacts and statuary, renovated churches with ancient *spolia*, and deliberately re-enacted imperial ritual in the *imitatio imperii*.⁷ Pilgrims and travelers toured both ancient and holy sites in Rome, using popular travel guides such as the *Mirabilia Urbis Romae* [*MUR*].⁸ Secular and Christian travel guides, and texts written by Lateran basilica clergy, suggest that during the twelfth century Christians and Jews both believed that the Temple Treasures were housed in Rome as relics possessed by the Church, as aspects of the glorious imperial Roman past adopted by the Christian Church, and as central elements of biblical Judaism and its relationship with God. In its claim to stand as the “New Temple,” the Church could not have possessed more potent artifacts of ancient Judaism than the ritual objects made under the direct instructions of Yahweh, and revered for centuries by the ancient Hebrews.

The papacy also maintained a continuing relationship with the Jews of Rome. Since at least the first century BCE, Rome had been the site of a thriving Jewish community. Protected through the late Republic and Empire by Roman law, the Jews were allowed to practice their religion undisturbed as a *religio licita*. Although the Jews were granted full Roman citizenship in the early third century CE, the imperial government gradually enacted laws that prevented Jews from proselytizing. With the fourth century CE official toleration of Christianity and imperial patronage of the Church, civil laws and episcopal decisions both reflected narrowing limits on the daily practices of the Jews. Throughout the early Middle

⁷ Herbert Bloch, “The New Fascination with Ancient Rome,” and Ernst Kitzinger, “The Arts as Aspects of a Renaissance: Rome and Italy,” both in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 615-636, 637-670.

⁸ Benedict, *The Marvels of Rome, Mirabilia urbis Romae*, 2nd edition, ed. Francis Morgan Nichols (New York: Italica Press, 1986).

Ages, several influences affected papal actions toward the Jews, including Augustine of Hippo's justification for the necessity of the Jewish presence in Christian society. Kenneth Stow succinctly captures the essence of the papal attitude toward the Jews in the twelfth century, which was aimed at:

. . . finding a balance between the two competing tendencies of toleration . . . [and] to repress or even eliminate the Jews from Christian society. It was, rather, in arriving at a formula justifying the retention of Jews *within* Christian society while simultaneously exploiting the Jewish presence to advance Christian teachings and interests.⁹

The "Christian interests" of the twelfth-century papacy would revolve around securing power over *regnum* and *sacerdotium*, using biblical Judaism to support that supreme power.

By the twelfth century, a complex dynamic characterized the relationships between the Church and the Jews in Europe, and between the papacy and the Roman Jews. Despite often negative perceptions of Jews, in the city of Rome Christians co-existed with Jews in a milieu of cooperation, communication, and toleration, albeit with increasing restrictions. The attitudes of the two general groups that interacted with Jews, the papacy and clergy, and the general Christian population, must be distinguished, because they were not always alike. At different times either the Church or the general public expressed more restrictive or punitive opinions about the Jews. After the call of Pope Urban II to the First Crusade, anti-Semitic fervor erupted in the brutal violence of the Jewish massacres in the Rhineland in 1096, even though the papal call had been to defeat Muslim occupiers of the Holy Land. By the end of the twelfth century and the powerful papacy of Innocent III (1198-1216), decrees issued by the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 seriously restricted Jewish life and required Jews to wear identifying clothing. The century between the First Crusade and the papacy of Innocent III is

⁹ Kenneth Stow, *The '1007 Anonymous' and Papal Sovereignty: Jewish Perceptions of the Papacy and Papal Policy in the High Middle Ages* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1984), 12.

a complex and fascinating period of interaction between Christians and Jews. The circumstances of the relationship of the Roman Jewish community with Eugenius III and with Alexander III suggest papal attitudes that may have extended well past toleration and protection. The obscurity of the evidence for the extent of the relationship leads to questions of dependence of the Jews on the popes for protection and the popes on the Jews for financial support.

After the First Crusade massacres, as apparently resulting from the continued threat of violence against European Jewish communities and in response to Jewish pleas for protection, Pope Calixtus II issued *Sicut Judaeis* circa 1123 and, in it, urged communities to protect their Jews. The complex political relationship between the pope and the Holy Roman Emperor, evident in the Concordat of Worms in 1123 suggests other papal motivations for issuing the first decree of *Sicut*, which would become papal tradition during the twelfth century. Two decades later, Eugenius III re-issued *Sicut*, and two decades after that, Alexander III followed suit. No record exists of other popes bestowing that decree in the intervening periods between Calixtus II and Alexander III. Special circumstances undoubtedly led to Eugenius and Alexander both following Calixtus's actions in issuing *Sicut*.

The twelfth-century era of papal protection through *Sicut* was also the era of biblical exegesis among both Jewish and Christian scholars. Christian exegetes often used the Hebrew Old Testament to check and correct inaccuracies in Jerome's Latin Vulgate. Scholars have proven that some Christian exegetes consulted with rabbis about their own interpretation of the Old Testament scriptures.¹⁰ While Christian biblical scholarship was centered in Paris and Oxford, it also extended to Rome. One such exegete in Rome, in addition to correcting

¹⁰ Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 3rd edition (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983), Chapters III and IV, 83-186.

Jerome's translation of the Book of Psalms, also composed a text for his pope that openly acknowledged that the Treasures of the Temple of Herod were in Rome. The claim was made again in the late twelfth century by another cleric at the Lateran. At the same time, the popes reiterated their authority over ecclesiastical and secular society, including the Jews, in processions and in mosaics on the Lateran portico. This pattern of acknowledgement followed centuries of Christian claims to have inherited the Old Testament Covenant with Yahweh as part of the New Covenant with Jesus Christ; however, the latter twelfth-century Church seemed to be intensifying its doctrinal stance that identified the Church as the new Temple, the pope as the new high priest, the *Sancta Sanctorum* as the new Holy of Holies, and *ecclesia* as the rightful successor to *synagoga*.

Other texts produced at the Lateran basilica reiterated the claim that the Temple Treasures remained in the basilica. The circumstances that drove the increased focus on the Temple Treasures as elements of papal power were bound with the efforts of the papacy to regain its authority in Rome. The papacy also attempted to support its position by intensifying the *imitatio imperii* through papal ritual and public processions through the city of Rome. Public processions such as papal *adventus* were laden with symbolism. A deliberate re-enactment of Roman imperial *adventus*, these processions often traveled through the ancient spaces of Rome and through the Arch of Titus. Among both Christians and Jews, these processions, which passed by relief sculptures of the confiscated Temple Treasures, probably reinforced powerful, collective memories of the Jews' supposed crime of deicide and their subservient status in Christian society.

Reportedly taken from Jerusalem by Roman legions under Titus in CE 70, the Treasures were brought to Rome in the first century and lost to public knowledge after the

sixth century. Even though the Treasures existed only in legend throughout the later Middle Ages, physical reminders of their presence in Rome, particularly through the relief sculptures on the Arch of Titus, kept alive the memory of the Treasures' confiscation by the Romans and removal to Rome. By the mid-twelfth century, a Lateran cleric, Nicolaus Maniacutius, declared in his text that not only were the Treasures in Rome, but the Romans had been God's agents, destroying the Temple in order that the Christian Church could become the New Temple.¹¹

This heightened promotion that the Temple Treasures were possessed by the Church began in the reign of Eugenius III, in 1145. He and Alexander III led the Roman Church for a majority of the latter half of the twelfth century and were major players in the Church's acknowledgement of its inheritance of biblical Judaism. Eugenius III, Bernardo Pignatelli of Pisa, began his ecclesiastical career as a canon of the Cathedral of Pisa. He met the abbot of Cîteaux, Bernard of Clairvaux, in 1135 when Bernard attended a Church council in Pisa.¹² In that same year, Bernardo joined the Cistercian Abbey of Clairvaux, where he established a close relationship with Bernard.¹³ That relationship proved to be a major factor for the rest of his life. Bernard saw Eugenius' papacy as a divinely ordained route to reforming the papacy; the views of this powerful abbot of Cîteaux about Jews, especially during the Second Crusade, may suggest a similar attitude of Eugenius.¹⁴

¹¹ Gerhard Wolf, "Laetare filia sion. Ecce ego venio et habitabo in medio tui: Images of Christ Transferred to Rome from Jerusalem," *Jewish Art* 23/24 (1997/98), 425.

¹² Martha G. Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity, Cistercian Culture and Ecclesiastical Reform, 1098-1180* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), 196.

¹³ Dom Gabriel, abbé d'Aiguebelle, *L'abbaye des Trois-Fontaines, située aux eaux-salviennes, près de Rome* (Landerneau: P.B. Desmoulins, 1882), 78-80.

¹⁴ *The Letters of Bernard of Clairvaux*, translated by Bruno Scott James (London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, 1953), no. 391.2,6; no. 393.

In 1140, Pope Innocent II, in gratitude for Bernard of Clairvaux's loyal support of his contested papacy, gave the deserted Roman monastery of S. Anastasius at Tre Fontane to Bernard, who sent the monk Bernardo of Pisa to lead it as abbot.¹⁵ That monastery at Tre Fontane near Rome had been abandoned by Benedictine monks during the papal schism of 1130-1138.¹⁶ Reportedly admired for his piety and simplicity, Bernardo of Pisa was elected as Pope Eugenius III in 1145 on the same day that the previous pope, Lucius II, died from injuries received when he led papal forces against the militia of the Roman Commune on the Capitoline Hill.¹⁷ The establishment of the Roman Commune in 1143 and its direct opposition to papal authority made Rome an unsafe city for the pope, and Eugenius spent most of his reign outside of Rome.¹⁸ Eugenius traveled through France, Germany, and Italy, as he struggled to maintain papal authority and achieve specific goals, while utilizing diplomacy to negotiate with both allies and opposition.¹⁹ Major events in Europe drew his attention and involvement, from calling the Second Crusade to urging the French King Louis VII and his queen Eleanor to resolve their marital difficulties, to carrying on diplomatic efforts with German Emperor Conrad III, Roger II and William I, the Norman kings of Sicily, and Byzantine Emperor Manuel I Comnenus. Near the end of his reign in 1152, Eugenius

¹⁵ Gabriel, *L'abbaye des Trois-Fontaines*, 78-91.

¹⁶ The intricacies of papal and monastic politics are demonstrated by that entire episode, because the monastery was located in a swampy area and many of the Cistercian monks contracted malaria. Nevertheless, they were required to stay and restore the monastery to full function. Mary Stroll, *The Jewish Pope* (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 133-134.

¹⁷ Even after being elected to the papacy, Eugenius reportedly wore the rough Cistercian habit beneath his papal attire. *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* II, ed. P. Jaffe (Leipzig: Veit, 1888), 19.

¹⁸ One description of the civil turmoil in Rome and dangerous milieu was included in John of Salisbury's *Historia pontificalis* (London: Thomas Nelson, 1956), 51-59. John described one of Eugenius' very brief stays in Rome from March to April 1149, when he was driven out by "the turbulence of the citizens."

¹⁹ *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, E. A. Livingstone, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 571-572; Nicolas Cheetham, *Keepers of the Keys* (London: MacDonald & Co., 1982), 110-113.

faced a new strong ruler in Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa, who would persistently challenge papal power through the reigns of Eugenius's successors.²⁰

Back in Rome, Eugenius' patronage is apparent in the work of Nicolaus Maniacutius, a Cistercian exegete who wrote the *Historia imaginis Salvatoris [HIS]*, circa 1145; that text proclaimed the Church's possession of the Temple Treasures, including the ark of the covenant, as components of the Lateran's relic collection.²¹ Nicolaus Maniacutius' production of the *HIS* for his former abbot Eugenius suggests a desire, at the highest level of the Church, to focus intensively on biblical Judaism. Nicolaus' career as a Hebraist and Biblical exegete within a Cistercian monastic environment may indicate an impetus for such study within Cistercian circles. Nicolaus also called the private papal chapel the *Sancta Sanctorum* or Holy of Holies, a name that conjured up images of the ancient Hebrew Temple in Jerusalem. The designation remained; from that time the chapel was known as the *Sancta Sanctorum*.²² Nicolaus' text brings the Temple Treasures to the forefront of the prestige and authority of the papacy.

The papacies of Eugenius III and Alexander III are separated by the reigns of Anastasius IV (1153-54), and Adrian IV (1154-59).²³ The elderly Anastasius served as pope for only seventeen months; Frederick Barbarossa reportedly dominated his papacy and heavily influenced papal policy. Adrian IV, Nicholas Breakspear, the first and only Englishman elected pope, had served in the administrations of both Eugenius and Anastasius as cardinal and legate. As pope, Adrian was embroiled in many of the same political and

²⁰ Marcel Pacaut, *Frederick Barbarossa* (London: Collins, 1970), 58-63.

²¹ While most modern historians believe that the ark of the covenant was lost to the Babylonians in the sixth century BCE, the idea was promoted in the twelfth century that it was indeed held in the high altar of the Lateran basilica.

²² Wolf, "Laetare filia sion," 423.

²³ The papacy of Adrian IV has recently been explored in *Adrian IV, The English Pope 1154-1159*, Brenda Bolton and Anne J. Duggan, eds. (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).

social issues as Eugenius and Alexander, and used his papal powers, including interdiction, to curb the Commune's authority in Rome. Adrian also was forced to negotiate with Frederick Barbarossa for his support against the Commune and finally crowned Frederick as Holy Roman Emperor in 1155.²⁴ The continuation of the political instability in Rome and difficult balance of power with the German king demonstrates the political milieu that Alexander inherited upon Adrian's death and Alexander's election. Even though Adrian also struggled to maintain his papal power, evidence for particular instances in which the papacy intensively focused on biblical Judaism *and* maintained close contact with Roman Jews survives primarily from the two papacies of Eugenius III and Alexander III, thus their reigns will be the focus of this study.

A certain continuity of leadership flowed through papal reigns, which is demonstrated in the service of Cardinal Roland Bandinelli, who served Eugenius III and Adrian IV as Chancellor prior to his own election as pope. Cardinal Roland was quickly elected pope upon Adrian's death in 1159. Forced to leave Rome almost immediately, Alexander traveled throughout France during a papal schism that lasted until 1177. Four different antipopes were elected by an opposing faction of cardinals during Alexander's reign, demonstrating the political instability of the College of Cardinals. Constantly working to gain acceptance from reigning kings and to establish his authority as the rightful pope, Alexander was at the center of historic controversies such as the struggle between Henry II of England and Archbishop Thomas Becket. In 1172 Alexander canonized Becket, two years after his murder. As pope, Alexander also called and presided over the Third Lateran Council in 1179, after he had safely returned to Rome.

²⁴ Pacaut, *Frederick Barbarossa*, 68-69.

Alexander was certainly familiar with intellectual currents in Europe from his early years as a student at the University of Paris, and acquaintance with such notable scholars as Peter Abelard. The widespread interest in biblical exegesis in scholarly circles, including the use of Hebrew texts of the Old Testament, may explain why the papacy under Alexander continued the emphasis on elements of biblical Judaism.

During his reign, Alexander acknowledged the Church's possession of biblical Judaic heritage with narrative mosaics on the façade of the new Lateran portico, in processions through the city, and in his patronage of a revision of the eleventh-century text, the *Descriptio Lateranensis ecclesiae* [*DLE*]. An anonymous writer originally had composed the *DLE*, and another revised it circa 1153-1154. While John the Deacon, a canon at the Lateran, perhaps had carried out the 1153-1154 revision, he definitively identified himself as the author of a second revision completed between 1159 and 1181. John added a new prologue, revised the text, and dedicated that edition to Alexander. In his textual additions, John focused attention on the Temple Treasures as part of the Lateran's relic collection, and described papal ceremonial and processions in Rome. His edition of the *DLE* was issued in the same era as the construction of the new Lateran portico and its decoration with mosaics referring to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. At virtually the same time, Alexander personal actions demonstrated the complexity of the papal attitude toward the Jews; this pope employed Jechiel, a Roman Jew, as steward or *senescalcus* of the papal household. Meanwhile, in his official documents, Alexander emphasized that Jews were not to employ

Christians nor hold public office.²⁵ Alexander also followed the papal precedent of Calixtus II and Eugenius III, and re-issued *Sicut Judaeis* to the Roman Jewish community.²⁶

By referring to the Temple Treasures in these different programs, the Lateran officially and publicly emphasized the connection between the Church and biblical Judaism. The Lateran held a position of central importance in Rome as the residence of the pope as the bishop of Rome and the headquarters of the papal administration, the Curia. Twelfth-century texts refer to the Lateran as *mater et caput* of the Church.²⁷ Even though the prestige and power of the papacy was increasing within Christendom, the pope's position of authority paradoxically was often under siege within the city of Rome, especially as a result of the Roman Commune's power.²⁸ As the political climate in Rome shifted, the pope and the Curia often were forced to flee the city for a period of time. When the pope was able to return to Rome, the citizens' acceptance of a pope's temporal power formed an integral component of his ceremonial entrance to the city, involving representatives of prominent citizen groups, including the Jews. Eugenius and Alexander both reissued *Sicut* as a ceremonial component of their accession to the papal throne during the *adventus* ceremony, which served as a statement of papal authority upon entering the city after periods of exile. The Roman Jewish community, which claimed it had originated during the late Roman Republic,²⁹ participated actively in the civic life of twelfth-century Rome and during *adventus* presented their scrolls

²⁵ Simonsohn, *Documents*, no. 48, 55, 57, 59. According to Shlomo Simonsohn, since these letters were sent to individuals in France, Spain, and England, it is unclear whether they also applied to the Roman Jews.

²⁶ Based on a late sixth-century document of Pope Gregory I, *Sicut* was issued in the twelfth century by Calixtus II (1119-1124) and re-issued by Eugenius III (1145-1153), Alexander III (1159-1181), Clement III (1188), Celestine III (1191-1198), and Innocent III (1199). Perhaps other popes during that century did issue the decree, but no physical evidence survives. Shlomo Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews, Documents: 492-1404* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1988), #19, 35.

²⁷ "Mater et caput" translates to "mother and head," and refers to the Lateran Basilica's position as the chief church in Rome, and the residence of the pope as Bishop of Rome and head of the Church.

²⁸ Mann, *The Lives of the Popes* IX: 153.

²⁹ Harry Leon, *The Jews of Ancient Rome*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1960, 1-5.

of the Law, the Torah, to the pope. The Jews maintained their schools and synagogues in Rome, while their scholars of the Talmud communicated with other Jewish scholars in Palestine and in Europe. The vibrancy of the Roman Jewish community and its interaction with others colors in a more complete picture of the cultural milieu of twelfth-century Rome.

The reception of *Sicut* during *adventus*, however, came at a price for Roman Jews, because they reciprocally presented their Torah to the pope as their temporal Lord. The pope's spiritual role as the leader of Christianity added another dimension to his relationship with the Jews, because the Church continued to acknowledge the contemporary Jews' stubborn rejection of Jesus as the messiah. This mixture of respect and ceremonial deference on the part of the Jews, with condescending acknowledgement and toleration from the pope, also demonstrated the mixed attitude of the Church hierarchy toward the Jews. The Jews would be protected in Christian communities, but conditionally. Meanwhile, the papacy continued to emphasize to the Church-at-large that Christianity had inherited the venerable history of biblical Judaism.

While the issue and promotion of *Sicut* during the twelfth century could be interpreted as a gesture of papal protection, during that same era the popes also called church-wide councils that issued restrictive legislation against the Jews. Although the restrictive decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 signaled a turning-point in the lives of European Jews in many ways, earlier twelfth-century councils, especially the Third Lateran Council presided over by Alexander III in 1179, also issued restrictive legislation pertaining to the Jews. The twelfth century thus emerges as a paradox, a period of intensifying protection *and* restriction of the Jews, just before the far-reaching changes of the Fourth Lateran Council and a sharp increase in Christian suspicion of and hostility toward the Jews. Accusations of horrible

crimes by Jews that had sporadically occurred in the latter twelfth century, sharply increased in the thirteenth. Jews were charged with desecrating the consecrated host, ritually murdering Christian children, and blindly obeying a corrupted body of tradition in the *Talmud*.³⁰ The end of the twelfth century is truly a turning point in Christian/Jewish relations.

Why the Church intensified its promotion of Christianity's common heritage with Judaism is not certain. Perhaps some personal motivation or philosophy prompted these two particular popes to proclaim the intrinsic link between Judaism and Christianity. Indeed the Church may have publicized aspects of biblical Judaism within the *renovatio* milieu of Rome, to identify with a heritage that had preceded and out-lasting even that of the Roman Empire. The popes' quest for spiritual and temporal authority may have prompted these Church leaders to use public perceptions of the immense power and prestige of the Temple Treasures to buttress the papacy's own hegemony. The brisk traffic in pilgrims to Rome and attraction of relics suggests that the Treasures were promoted also as components of the Lateran's relic

³⁰ A vast literature continues to explore the sharp increase in persecutions of Jews in Europe during the thirteenth century. See Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Semitism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982); *ibid.*, *Living Letters of the Law, Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); Solomon Grayzel, "Popes, Jews, and the Inquisition from 'Sicut' to 'Turbato'," in *Essays on the Occasion of the Seventieth Anniversary of the Dropsie University 1909-1979* (Philadelphia: Dropsie University, 1979), 151-188; William C. Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989); James Given, "The Inquisitors of Languedoc and the Medieval Technology of Power," *The American Historical Review* 94, no. 2 (April, 1989), 336-359; Michael Jones, "'The Place of the Jews': anti-Judaism and Theatricality in Medieval Culture," *Exemplaria* 12, no. 2 (Fall, 2000), 327-357; Robert E. Lerner, "Antichrists and Antichrist in Joachim of Fiore," *Speculum* 60, no. 3 (July, 1985), 553-570; John M. McCulloh, "Jewish Ritual Murder: William of Norwich, Thomas of Monmouth, and the Early Dissemination of the Myth," *Speculum* 72, no. 3 (July 1997), 698-740; R.I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society, Power and Deviance in Western Europe 950-1250* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990); Robert C. Stacey, "The Conversion of Jews to Christianity in Thirteenth-Century England," *Speculum* 67, no. 2 (April, 1992), 263-283; Kenneth R. Stow, *Alienated Minority, the Jews of Medieval Latin Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992); *ibid.*, "The Church and the Jews," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History V*, c. 1198-1300, ed. David Abulafia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 204-219; *ibid.*, "Conversion, Apostasy, and Apprehensiveness: Emicho of Flonheim and the Fear of Jews in the Twelfth Century," *Speculum* 76, no. 4 (October, 2001), 911-933; Sandra Tozzini, "Legal Discrimination against Italian Jews: From the Romans to the Unification of Italy," in *The Most Ancient of Minorities, The Jews of Italy*, ed. Stanislao G. Pugliese (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 2002), 13-34. See also several essays in: Diana Wood, ed., *Christianity and Judaism*, Studies in Church History 29 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992).

collection, to increase the prestige of the Lateran and to attract pilgrims. And perhaps the prestige associated with these relics was used to enforce the Lateran's supremacy over the Vatican in a rivalry between the two churches that continued through most of the twelfth century.³¹

These incidences of contact between the papacy and the Roman Jews, and of the Church's public identification with biblical Judaism, cluster during the second half of the twelfth century. They indicate a unique period in papal-Jewish relations in the city of Rome. My aim in this dissertation is to explore the documentation and interpret the evidence, not to stand as apologist for Christians or for Jews. The complexity of the evidence suggests moments of cooperation and close contact between the papacy and the Roman Jews, and protection of the Jews by the papacy. The evidence also supports and delineates the incredible complexity of papal attitudes toward the Jews. That this story revolves around ancient Hebrew Treasures from the Temple of Herod suggests a papal desire to utilize perceptions and beliefs about the Treasures and the power of God to advance papal authority.

³¹ Michele Maccarrone, "La cathedra Sancti Petri nel medioevo: da simbolo a reliquia," *Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia* 36 (1985), 349-447.

CHAPTER II
FROM JERUSALEM TO ROME:
THE ORIGIN, LOSS, AND SIGNIFICANCE OF
THE TREASURES OF THE TEMPLE OF HEROD

In order to fully appreciate the significance of the Church's twelfth-century claim to possess the ancient Treasures of the Temple of Herod, it is essential to understand the importance of the Temple *and* these Treasures to the ancient Hebrews, to medieval Jews, and to the Church.¹ Although the Temple Treasures had originated as functional liturgical objects in ancient Judaism, they gradually became, to Jews and to Christians, powerful representations of the ancient Hebrews' original Covenant with Yahweh. The stories of the Treasures contained in the Pentateuch texts recount again and again the power of the ark of the Covenant, one of the Temple Treasures, against the Hebrews' enemies. In the twelfth century, the Church used its reputed possession of the Temple Treasures as vital elements in the Church's claim to theologically encompass the fullness of both the Hebrews' Old Covenant with Yahweh *and* the New Covenant with Jesus.

The story of the origin of the Treasures and the Temple, and how the Treasures were confiscated in the first century by the Romans and subsequently moved to Rome, Carthage, Constantinople, and possibly Jerusalem, shows how different powers, Jewish, Christian, and secular, perceived the Treasures' importance. The association of these ritual objects with the ancient worship of Yahweh further explains the continued collective memory of the Temple Treasures by Jews throughout the Middle Ages, long after the Temple was destroyed and the

¹ Because this investigation concerns attitudes based on beliefs and draws from secular and religious writings of the twelfth century, the sacred writings of the ancient Hebrews, which were utilized by the Church during the twelfth century in the *Vulgate* edition of the Christian Bible, will be used here as a primary source. The conclusions of modern biblical scholars about the historical events described below often differ from beliefs drawn from the Hebrew Bible, and will not be the major focus of this discussion; however, the conclusions of current scholars will be cited where appropriate and can be more fully explored in Rainer Albertz, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*, Vol. I & II (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), which also contains an extensive bibliography.

objects confiscated.² After the destruction of the Temple in the first century CE, the Treasures would have had no ritual purpose in Judaism, but remained revered objects in the collective memory of the dispersed Jews; the menorah from the Temple became a familiar symbol to the Roman Jewish community, appearing on tombs and in the Jewish catacombs of Rome in the first three centuries CE.³ The memory of the last Temple in Jerusalem remained a viable component of medieval Jewish culture.⁴

After the last textual mention of the Temple Treasures in the sixth-century account of Procopius, the whereabouts of the Treasures apparently dropped from public notice. Then in the late eleventh century, circa 1073, an anonymous Lateran cleric definitively announced in the *Descriptio Lateranensis ecclesiae* [DLE], that the Treasures, the ark of the covenant and the menorah, in addition to other fabulous relics from the Old and New Testament eras, were kept in the Lateran basilica.⁵ The writer of the *DLE* claimed supreme authority for the Lateran basilica, as the *caput et mater* of the Church in the twelfth century, the residence of the pope and the location of the Curia, the administrative body of the Church, through his claim that the Lateran basilica was the repository of the Temple Treasures. Two twelfth-

² Albertz's proposition that the essence of the relationship between the ancient Hebrews and Yahweh was centered in the historical experience of the Exodus, explains the importance attached to these cultic objects, the Temple Treasures, which were fashioned upon Yahweh's commands directly after Moses led the Hebrews from Egypt. Albertz, *Israelite Religion*, I:56.

³ Harry J. Leon, *The Jews of Ancient Rome* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1960), 196-198.

⁴ The Temple and Temple Treasures are mentioned in several instances in the *Babylonian Talmud*, an extensive collection of opinion on Judaic tradition and law that wielded huge influence within Jewish communities during the Middle Ages, Nicholas de Lange, *An Introduction to Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 56. The comments in the *Talmud* about the Temple demonstrate the effect on Jews of the catastrophic loss of the Temple and its Treasures, even centuries afterward, and as an event that later Jews believed had occurred because of the unreliable and inconstant faith of the ancient Jews. While there are two *Talmud*, the *Babylonian* and the *Palestinian*, the *BT* became the predominant document by which Jewish communities governed personal, religious, and civil affairs after the eighth century. Jacob Neusner, ed., *The Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds*, vol. 2 of *The Study of Ancient Judaism* (New York: KTAV Pub. House), 122-124.

⁵ *Descriptio Lateranensis ecclesiae*, in *Codice topografico della città di Roma* III, eds. Roberto Valentini and Giuseppe Zucchetti (Roma: tipografia del Senato, 1946), 336-337. Philippe Lauer included the text of the *DLE* in his *Le Palais de Latran, Étude historique et archéologique* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1911), 391-409. Lauer referred to Mabillon, *Acta sanctorum ordinis S. Benedicti* (Paris, 1668-1701), as his source for the text.

century revisions of the *DLE*, produced circa 1153-1154 and 1159-1181, emphatically reiterated the claim. The *Mirabilia Urbis Romae* [*MUR*], a popular pilgrim guide from the mid-twelfth century, repeated the association of the Temple Treasures with Rome.⁶ A Jewish traveler's account of Rome, the *Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, circa 1169-1171, showed that Jews also believed that the Treasures resided in Rome.⁷ These texts, along with the *Historia Imaginis Salvatoris* [*HIS*], written circa 1145 by another Lateran cleric Nicolaus Maniacutius, all affirmed that the papacy was increasingly focusing attention on the Church's inheritance of biblical Judaism, theologically and physically.⁸ This textual acknowledgement occurred while papal processions were conducted in imitation of imperial ritual, and the papacy struggled to assert its authority in continued conflicts with the German emperor and the Roman Commune. To understand why the Church asserted repeatedly that it possessed the Treasures, it is first necessary to understand the history and perceived power of these liturgical objects, first created in the era of the Exodus.

The Origin of the Treasures and the Temple

The Temple Treasures originated in the period just after the ancient Hebrews' Exodus from Egypt, probably during the thirteenth century BCE. According to the sacred writings of the ancient Hebrews,⁹ Yahweh presented the tablets of the law to Moses on Mount Sinai. The

⁶ Benedict, *MUR*, 29.

⁷ Benjamin of Tudela, *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela, Travels in the Middle Ages*, introduction by Michael A. Signer (Malibu: Joseph Simon, 1993), 64.

⁸ Nicolaus Maniacutius, *Historia imaginis Salvatoris*, in Gerhard Wolf, *Salus Populi Romani* (Weinheim: VCH, 1990), 321-325.

⁹ The Latin *Vulgate* Bible, containing the Old Testament (Hebrew Bible) and New Testament, was translated by St. Jerome in the fourth century (390-405 CE) from the original Hebrew, and was the version in widespread use by Christian clergy during the twelfth century. The *Vulgate* will be cited in this paper in order to facilitate a perspective nearest to that of Christian clerics and hierarchy in that era. The *Vulgate* utilized herein is *Biblia Sacra, iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1969). All translations into English are by Marie Therese Champagne, unless otherwise noted. Assistance with the translations from the Vulgate in this chapter was provided by the late Professor Robert Edgeworth.

Hebrews preserved the tablets in an ark fashioned according to the specific directions of Yahweh,

Frame the ark of acacia wood, with a length of two and one-half cubits, a width of one and one-half cubits, and a height the same as the width, a cubit and a half . . . And you will put in the ark the evidence which I shall give to you.¹⁰

Though made of acacia wood,¹¹ the ark was covered with gold on both the inner and outer surfaces, and a gold cover, the “propitiatory” or “mercy-seat,”¹² that was ornamented with two Cherubim.

And you shall also make a propitiatory of the finest gold, it will be two and one-half cubits in length and its width one and one-half cubits . . . From there I shall advise you and speak to you, that is, from above the propitiatory and from the midst of the two cherubim, who will be above the ark of testimony, I shall speak all the commands which I shall give to the sons of Israel through you.¹³

Along with His commands for building the ark and liturgical implements, Yahweh instructed Moses to have a dwelling place fashioned for Him, “And they will make a

¹⁰ “...arcam de lignis setthim conpingite cuius longitudo habeat duos semis cubitos latitudo cubitum et dimidium altitudo cubitum similiter ac semissem...ponesque in arcam testificationem quam dabo tibi...” Exod. 25:10, 16. The measurements in cubits correspond to four feet two inches in length, and thirty inches in width and in height. *Encyclopedia Judaica*, s.v. “Ark of the Covenant.”

¹¹ The *Vulgate* used the Hebrew term for acacia wood, *setthim*, also written as *settim* and *setim*. Some English translations of the Hebrew Bible use the term acacia to describe the wood used to build the ark, while others adhere to the Hebrew term.

¹² Ellen Frankel and Betsy Platkin Teutsch, in *The Encyclopedia of Jewish Symbols* (Northvale, N.J.: Jason Aronson, 1992), 12, described the mercy-seat or *kapporet* in this manner, “atop the Ark was the Mercy seat...a slab of gold flanked by the golden cherubim, two divine beings representing the Throne of God, whose wings arched over the Mercy Seat and covered it.” Albertz describes the seat as “a mighty cherubic throne of olive wood decked with gold...the outer wings of this composite being formed the armrests, and the inner ones came together and formed the seat. Under them the ark had its place as a kind of footstool.” Albertz, *Israelite Religion*, I:130. According to the *Encyclopedia Judaica*, the two cherubim “screened...guarded or protected, as it were, the ark cover, as well as the tables of the covenant in the ark.” The function of the ark as repository for the tablets of the law mimics a custom among ancient peoples of “placing documents and agreements between kingdoms ‘at the feet’ of the god, the guardian of treaties and documents, who supervised their implementation.” *Encyclopedia Judaica*, s.v. “Ark of the Covenant.”

¹³ “...facies et propitiatorium de auro mundissimo duos cubitos et dimidium tenebit longitudo eius cubitum ac semissem latitudo...inde praecipiam et loquar ad te supra propitiatorio scilicet ac medio duorum cherubin qui erunt super arcam testimonii cuncta quae mandabo per te filiis Israel...” Exod. 25: 17, 22.

sanctuary for me, and I shall live in their midst.”¹⁴ The Tabernacle structure was essentially a booth surrounded by a curtained enclosure; within the Tabernacle, the space was separated by a veil into the Holy of Holies, where the ark was located, and the Holy Place where the ritual implements were kept: the altar of incense, the table of the showbread, the candlestick or menorah, and the other sacred vessels.

Moreover, the veil will be hung by rings and within it you shall place the ark of testimony, and by this veil the Sanctuary and the Sanctuary of Sanctuaries will be divided, and you shall place the propitiatory over the ark of testimony in the Holy of Holies, and you shall place the table outside of the veil and the candlestick opposite the table on the south side of the tabernacle, for the table will remain on the north side.¹⁵

Like the ark, the altar of incense was fashioned of acacia wood plated with gold.

You shall also make an altar of acacia wood, which will be five cubits in length and the same number in width, that is, square, and three cubits in height.¹⁶

Once completed, the altar of incense was positioned in the Holy Place.

And you shall place the altar facing the veil, which will hang before the ark of testimony, near the propitiatory, with which the testimony is covered, where I shall speak to you.¹⁷

The table of the showbread was constructed of acacia wood overlaid with gold and held twelve cakes, also called the “bread of display” or “the regular bread.”¹⁸ Each Sabbath the priests placed fresh cakes surmounted by pure frankincense on the table and consumed the

¹⁴ “...facientque mihi sanctuarium et habitabo in medio eorum...” Exod. 25: 8.

¹⁵ “...insetur autem velum per circulos intra quod pones arcam testimonii et quo sanctuarium et sanctuarii sanctuaria dividuntur, pones et propitiatorium super arcam testimonii in sancta sanctorum, mensamque extra velum, et contra mensam candelabrum in latere tabernaculi meridiano mensa enim stabit in parte aquilonis...” Exod. 26: 33-35.

¹⁶ “...facies et altare de lignis sethim quod habebit quinque cubitos in longitudine et totidem in latitudine id est quadrum et tres cubitos in altitudine,” Exod. 27:1.

¹⁷ “...ponesque altare contra velum quod ante arcam pendet testimonii coram propitiatorio quo tegitur testimonium ubi loquar tibi...” Exod. 30: 6.

¹⁸ *Encyclopedia Judaica*, s.v. “Shewbread.” The proper spelling may be either showbread or shewbread.

twelve cakes from the previous Sabbath. The cakes numbered twelve, a reference to the number of tribes of Israel.¹⁹

And you shall also make a table of acacia wood . . . And you shall place the bread of proposition upon the table, always in my sight.²⁰

The seven-branched candlestick, also called the lampstand, candelabrum, or menorah,²¹ was fashioned of the purest gold.

You shall also make a candlestick hammered from the finest gold, whose shaft, stalks, cups, spheres, and lilies will project from it . . .
You shall also make seven lamps and shall place them upon the candlestick so that they may shine from the other side.²²

Other liturgical implements including plates, cups, pitchers, and bowls for libations were created and placed within the Holy Place.

You shall also prepare cups, bowls, censers, and ladles from the purest gold, in which libations are to be offered.²³

Upon the construction of the Tabernacle and placement of the liturgical implements and ark within it, “the cloud covered the tabernacle of testimony and the glory of the Lord filled it.”²⁴

¹⁹ Such a customary practice as offering bread to a god in his sanctuary may be found in other ancient cultures, especially in Babylonia, *Encyclopedia Judaica*, s.v. “Shewbread.” Frankel and Teutsch, in *Jewish Symbols* (25), consider a modern type of bread, *hallah*, which Jews consume on the Sabbath and special holy days, to symbolize the showbread which was eaten by the temple priests each Sabbath.

²⁰ “...facies et mensam de lignis sethim ...et pones super mensam panes propositionis in conspectu meo semper ...” Exod. 25: 23, 30.

²¹ The menorah signifies “the continuity of the tradition, linking the generations from Moses to our own day.” Frankel and Teutsch, *Jewish Symbols*, 105. During the two millennia of the Common Era, the menorah served as “a symbol of Jewish identity.” De Lange, *Introduction to Judaism*, 229, 232.

²² “...facies et candelabrum ductile de auro mundissimo hastile eius et calamos scyphos et spherulas ac lilia ex ipso procedentia...facies et lucernas septem et pones eas super candelabrum ut luceant ex adverso...” Exod. 25: 31, 37. The curious phrase, “so that they may shine from the other side,” is explained as “the spouts of the lamps and the wicks faced northward, so that their shadow was cast on to the wall,” *Encyclopedia Judaica*, s.v. “Menorah.”

²³ “...parabis et acetabula ac fialas turibula et cyatos in quibus offerenda sunt libamina ex auro purissimo...” Exod. 25: 29. The word *fialas* in this translation is considered to be equivalent to *phiala* (Latin) or *phialē* (Greek), denoting a shallow bowl.

²⁴ “...operuit nubes tabernaculum testimonii et gloria Domini implevit illud...” Exod. 40: 32.

Thus the ancient Hebrews believed that Yahweh inhabited this most sacred space and accompanied them as they wandered through the desert.

Before the construction of the first Temple in Jerusalem, the history of the ark of the covenant and the Temple Treasures, as related through Hebrew sacred scripture, is a narrative of repeated conquest and capture, gain and loss. During those centuries, the ark was viewed as a special source of protection; the ancient Hebrews even carried it into battle with them. With the ark present on the battlefield, both the Hebrews and their enemies felt the presence of Yahweh.²⁵

Solomon, the son of King David, built the first Hebrew Temple in Jerusalem c. 950 BCE as both a permanent home for the ark of the covenant and a permanent dwelling place for Yahweh, because of the Hebrews' continued belief that Yahweh Himself dwelt in the tabernacle with the ark of the covenant. As Yahweh instructed Solomon,

As to this house which you are building, if you shall walk in my precepts, practice my judgments, and preserve all of my commands, walking by them, I shall confirm my discourse with you, which I spoke to David your father, and I shall dwell in the midst of the sons of Israel, and I shall not abandon my people Israel . . .²⁶

Part of an extensive complex of buildings and courts surrounded by walls, the main building contained the Holy of Holies or Most Holy Place, and the Holy Place, an anteroom of the same dimensions as the Holy of Holies but twice as long. The two holy spaces were respectively termed *devir* and *heikhal*,²⁷ and a small vestibule preceded both spaces.²⁸ As in

²⁵ Joshua 6:4, 20. For an assessment of the power of the “Ark Narrative” within ancient Judaism, see R.P. Gordon, *1 & 2 Samuel* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987).

²⁶ “...domus haec quam aedificas si ambulaveris in praeceptis meis et iudicia mea feceris et custodieris omnia mandata mea gradiens per ea firmabo sermonem meum tibi quem locutus sum ad David patrem tuum et habitabo in medio filiorum Israhel et non derelinquam populum meum Israhel.” III Rg. 6:12-13.

²⁷ In the Hebrew Bible, the term *hēkāl* was also used to denote a king’s house or palace, *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, s.v. “Temples.” In modern usage among Sephardic Jews, the *heikhal* denotes the “ark of the

the moveable Tabernacle of the post-exilic Hebrews, within the *heikhal* of the Temple stood the sacred liturgical implements: the menorah, the altar of incense and the table of showbread (from left to right before the entrance to the Holy of Holies).²⁹ The *devir*³⁰ contained the ark with its golden propitiatory and cherubim. When the Temple was completed and the ark and the implements were placed in their separate spaces, the presence of Yahweh filled the area.

And the priests carried the ark of the covenant of the Lord into its place in the oracle of the temple in the Holy of Holies, underneath the wings of the cherubim . . . However when the priests had gone out from the Sanctuary, it happened that a cloud filled the house of the Lord, and the priests could not continue to stand and serve on account of the cloud, for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of the Lord.³¹

These scriptural accounts of Yahweh’s presence in the Temple were later referred to in the twelfth-century Lateran texts, the *DLE* and the *HIS*, in reference to the Lateran basilica, the New Temple.

sanctuary,” the shrine in which the Torah scrolls are kept in the synagogue, De Lange, *Introduction to Judaism*, 226-229.

²⁸ *Encyclopedia Judaica*, s.v. “Tabernacle.” The dimensions of the Temples of Solomon and Herod have been estimated at 60 cubits in length, 20 cubits in width, and 40 cubits in height, *The Jewish Encyclopedia* s.v. “Temples,” and *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, s.v. “Temples.” The Temple of Solomon imitated a well-known type of temple in the eastern Mediterranean which Albertz calls the “long-house temple with antechamber, of the kind attested in Syria from the third to the first millennia.” Albertz, *Israelite Religion*, I:130.

²⁹ Although Solomon had new liturgical implements made for his Temple (10 golden menorah, a golden table and golden altar), he brought the original Temple Treasures with the ark of the covenant when the Temple was completed. “et portaverunt arcam Domini et tabernaculum foederis et omnia vasa sanctuarii quae errant in tabernaculo et ferebant ea sacerdotes et levitae...” III Rg. 8:4.

³⁰ Albertz notes in *Israelite Religion*, I:85, that early Yahweh sanctuaries allowed the ancient Hebrews to interact on a more personal and community level with Yahweh than the grand Temple instituted by Solomon, which “enclosed [God] in the darkness of a temple building.” He claims (131) that the unique connection between Yahweh and the Hebrews “found no expression at all in this temple architecture.” Perhaps this progression of the Yahweh cult from personal to distant, from local, community-based worship to rituals facilitated by a religious hierarchy in the depths of the Temple, paralleled the progression of Christianity from the early *domus ecclesiae* worship communities to the cavernous, mysterious cathedral liturgy facilitated by another hierarchy of religious professionals.

³¹ “...et intulerunt sacerdotes arcam foederis Domini in locum suum in oraculum templi in sanctum sanctorum subter alas cherubin...factum est autem cum exissent sacerdotes de sanctuario nebula implevit domum Domini, et non poterant sacerdotes stare et ministrare propter nebulam impleverat enim Gloria Domini domum Domini.” III Rg. 8:6, 10-11.

Throughout the centuries in which a Temple stood in Jerusalem, a clear connection emerges between the unhindered execution of liturgical rituals in the Temple, and the political independence and power of the Hebrew people as a nation. This relationship demonstrates the continuing importance of the Temple Treasures and the Temple as a central focus for the Hebrew people. Solomon's Temple stood in Jerusalem for nearly four hundred years until 587 BCE. At that time, Babylonians under the rule of Nebuchadnezzar conquered the Hebrew kingdom and destroyed the Temple. They then carried the ark and Temple Treasures to Babylon.³²

The destruction of the Temple by the Babylonians and the forced dispersion of the ancient Hebrews from the kingdom of David began the Diaspora. Over the following centuries, the dispersion of the Hebrews recurred under the domination of foreign powers, including the Romans, and added another dimension and definition to Hebrew identity.³³ The exiled Hebrews remained in Babylon for only five decades, until Cyrus the Great of Persia (r. 559-530 BCE) conquered Babylon in 538 BCE and encouraged the Hebrews to return to their homeland and rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem.³⁴ Upon the completion of the building in 515

³² Josephus *Antiquities of the Jews* 10.144-145. The Hebrew term *hurban* translates to "destruction;" it was originally applied to the destruction of the First and Second Temples in Jerusalem. In contemporary Judaism, the term is used to refer also to the Holocaust of European Jews by the Nazis during the Second World War. De Lange, *Introduction to Judaism*, 230. Josephus, who served as a Judean general at the start of the Jewish War in 66 CE, ended the war as a loyal client of Vespasian, and was considered to be a traitor by many first-century Jews. While his history of the conflict, *The Jewish War*, may be apologetic in tone, Josephus nevertheless serves as a valuable resource because he was an eye-witness to many of the events during the destruction of the Temple and subsequent movement of the Temple Treasures. Josephus' other works, *Antiquities of the Jews*, *Against Apion*, and *Concerning Hades* all provide a valuable although sometimes questionable first-century perspective on Hebrew history and current events.

³³ The Diaspora and the relationship of Jews to each other within the Diaspora attracts continuing historic study. See Erich S. Gruen, *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002). The importance of the Diaspora lies in the particular relationship of Roman Jews to their spiritual brothers in Palestine from the second century BCE, and the twelfth-century Roman Jews' memory of the Temple Treasures.

³⁴ 1 Esr 1:2-4.

BCE, the Temple implements were returned to Jerusalem from Babylon and deposited in the new structure.³⁵

Ancient accounts of that event generally concur that the ark of the covenant with the tablets of the law had not survived the Babylonian attack on the Temple and the Israelites' exile in Babylon, and were not ever present in the Second Temple.³⁶ Josephus suggests that the Holy of Holies was empty when conquerors from the second century BCE to the first century CE entered that space, “. . . when the temple was occupied by successive conquerors . . . they found there nothing of the kind but the purest type of religion, the secrets of which we may not reveal to aliens.”³⁷ Traditional Jewish beliefs recorded in the Babylonian Talmud differ over the existence of the ark after the Babylonian Captivity. One view holds that the ark was indeed taken to Babylon, while another suggests that the ark was hidden beneath the flooring in the Temple to prevent its seizure.

R. Simeon b. Yohai said: “The Ark went into exile to Babylonia, as it was said: ‘Nothing shall be left, saith the Lord,’ i.e., the Ten Commandments contained herein.” R. Judah b. Il’ai said: “The Ark was hidden [buried] in its own place, as it was said: ‘And the staves were so long that the ends of the staves were seen from the holy place, even before the Sanctuary; but they could not be seen without; and there they are unto this day.’”³⁸

Whether the ark survived the Israelites' exile to Babylon or not, the Holy of Holies remained empty and retained its essential meaning as the most sacred space in the Temple, and the dwelling place of Yahweh.

³⁵ 1 Esr 1:7.

³⁶ Smallwood, *The Jews Under Roman Rule*, 27. Nevertheless, in its assertion to possess the fullness of the Covenant, the twelfth-century papacy claimed that the ark of the covenant was contained in the main altar of the Lateran basilica in the twelfth century.

³⁷ Josephus *Against Apion* 2.82-82.

³⁸ *BT Yoma* 53b.

In the fourth century BCE, Alexander the Great annexed Palestine, followed by his Hellenistic successors, first the Ptolemies and then the Seleucids. In 169 BCE, the Seleucid King Antiochus IV Epiphanes conquered Jerusalem, removed the ark and the Temple Treasures, and dedicated the Temple to Olympian Zeus.³⁹ Under the leadership of Judas Maccabeus, the Hebrews soon revolted against Seleucid rule and its Hellenistic culture, and regained Jerusalem.⁴⁰ Hebrew scripture records that Judas re-created the liturgical implements and placed them in their former positions in the Temple, and re-consecrated the Temple to Yahweh.⁴¹ After the defeat of Antiochus, the first official contact between the Hebrew theocracy in Palestine and the Empire took place when representatives of Judas Maccabeus visited Rome and concluded a treaty with Rome.⁴² Merely a century later, Roman forces under Pompey, after annexing Syria, took advantage of the ongoing dynastic conflict in Palestine to bring the area under Roman control.⁴³ After laying siege to the Temple enclosure for several months, Roman forces forcibly entered the Temple precinct in 63 BCE and Pompey himself entered the Holy of Holies, not removing any of the liturgical objects, but merely investigating what was actually kept in the innermost sanctum.⁴⁴ Popular Latin literature had made outrageous claims about what exactly remained in the Holy of Holies; for instance, over a century later Tacitus repeated the claim that the head of an ass or a ram was the actual object worshiped by the high priest.

³⁹ 1 Mcc 1:20-23; *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Temples;" Smallwood, *Jews under Roman Rule*, 3.

⁴⁰ 1 Mcc 4:36.

⁴¹ The new menorah was created from iron spears and covered with tin. As soon as it was possible, the new Hasmonian rulers replaced it with a menorah of gold. Leon Yarden, *The Tree of Light: A Study of the Menorah, the Seven-branched Lampstand* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1971), 4; 1 Mcc 4: 49-51.

⁴² Josephus *Antiquities of the Jews* 12.415-419.

⁴³ Mary Smallwood handily sums up Pompey's intention to establish a client king in Palestine, "a client king ruling by grace of Rome, owing his position to Roman support and goodwill, and possessed of only limited freedom of action," Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 23.

⁴⁴ Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 26.

In their holy place they have consecrated an image of the animal by whose guidance they found deliverance from their long and thirsty wanderings.⁴⁵

Pompey's action reveals the mystique surrounding the Holy of Holies and its mysterious contents, which no one other than the high priest was ever allowed to view. Josephus reported that Pompey found nothing in the Holy of Holies.⁴⁶ Although Pompey did not confiscate the Treasures, just his entrance into the Holy of Holies was an act of such violation that nearly two centuries later, in CE 115, mobs of Jews revolting in Alexandria destroyed Pompey's tomb.⁴⁷

After subduing Jerusalem and destroying the Temple defenses, Pompey razed the walls of the city, initiated taxation, and reduced the size of the Jewish state in Palestine. He allowed the role of the high priest to resume and expanded that role into the secular position of ethnarch, but ended the Hebrew monarchy. The seeds of the Jewish revolt of CE 66 were sown.

⁴⁵ Tacitus *The History* 5.4. Smallwood, in *The Jews under Roman Rule* (27), states that those popular rumors originated long before Tacitus' lifetime in the first century AD. John G. Gager in *The Origins of Anti-Semitism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 40, states that the first person to promote that story was Mnaseas of Patara, c. 200 BCE. The same rumor was reported in Josephus *Against Apion* II.80. Apparently this derogatory rumor was later applied to the crucifixion of Christ and used as a slur against Judeo-Christians. It is evident in the Alexamenos Graffito, also called the Palatine Cross, discovered in 1856. The graffito was incised in the stone wall of servants' quarters on the Palatine Hill. In *Ante Pacem, Archaeological Evidence of Church Life before Constantine* (Mercer University Press, 1985), 27-28, Graydon F. Snyder concurs with previous scholars that the character of the graffito is derogatory against Christians. The figure would appear to repeat the centuries-old rumors about Jews worshipping the head of an ass, and transfers that slur to Judeo-Christians. One figure with a horse-like head appears on a cross, while another figure raises one hand. The figure is described by Heikki Solin and Marja Itkonen-Kaila as "a crucified man viewed from the back, with the head of an ass (or a horse), and dressed in a *colobium* (slave dress) without sleeves." Heikki Solin and Marja Itkonen-Kaila, eds., *Graffiti del Palatino* (Helsinki, 1966), 209.

⁴⁶ Josephus *Antiquities of the Jews* 14.71-72. According to the *Vulgate* quoted above, the ark with the propitiatory was the only object ever to be kept in the Holy of Holies. Smallwood comments, in *The Jews under Roman Rule* (27 n. 20), that Pompey found the Holy of Holies empty because the ark had been lost in the Babylonian sack of the Temple.

⁴⁷ Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 27.

Although sporadic outbreaks of violent resistance to Roman control punctuated the next two decades while different Judean factions vied for positions of power, Rome continued to regard Judea as a client kingdom, and official relations between Rome and Judea remained stable. In 44 BCE, Julius Caesar demonstrated his appreciation for the official loyalty of Judea's leaders by granting the residents of Jerusalem the right to rebuild the Temple walls and also by reducing the tax burden on the Jews.⁴⁸ The next powerful Jewish leader of Judea, Herod the Great, ruled until 4 BCE; Herod rebuilt and redecorated the Temple during his reign. For over four decades Herod maintained an iron rule over Judea.⁴⁹

The Temple of Herod, the third structure erected by the ancient Hebrews on the site of Solomon's Temple, was constructed during Herod's reign and generally followed Solomon's Temple in size and plan, while vastly superior in its lavish decoration.⁵⁰ The interior plan of the Temple remained the same, the *devir* or Holy of Holies, preceded by the *heikal*, and in turn preceded by a broad porch. A curtain again separated the *devir* from the *heikal*. The

⁴⁸ Even though Caesar was assassinated about a month after his pronouncement, the Senate adopted his decree posthumously, and the Jews were allowed to rebuild the Temple fortifications Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 42-43.

⁴⁹ Herod "the Great" (73-4 BCE), was the son of Antipater, an Idumaeen. Herod rose to power during the recurring rivalry between two dynasties, the Hasmoneans, beginning with Judas Maccabeus in the mid-second century BCE, and the Idumaeans, Herod's own family. After his appointment as client king of Judea by Senatorial decree in 40 BCE, Herod skillfully maintained his favored position with the Roman leadership while controlling the violence in Judea. He sacrificed to the Roman Gods in Rome, and built temples in Judea, Rhodes, and other sites. During his reign, Herod eliminated perceived enemies (wife, father-in-law, two of his sons, etc.), and solidified his alliances with other groups of Jews in Judea. Herod used his political skills to appease his subjects and maintain the appearance of a faithful Jew, while using ruthless control to maintain political order. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, chapters 3 and 4, 44-104. Macrobius recorded that Emperor Augustus remarked, "I would rather be Herod's pig than his son." Macrobius *Saturnalia* 2.4.11.

⁵⁰ Smallwood claims in *The Jews under Roman Rule* (92-93) that Herod began re-building the Temple in Jerusalem in 23/22 BCE with his own resources. Josephus *The Jewish War*, 21.1.

lavish decorations included “huge doors surmounted by a golden vine with grape clusters as big as a man . . . a vast Babylonian tapestry, and . . . a liberal amount of gold plating.”⁵¹

During the reign of Augustus, Judaism gained the Roman distinction of a *religio licita*, a phrase that protected the Jews’ right to conduct their rituals under official state protection.⁵² That religious protection continued when the newly named province of Judea came under the complete domination of Rome in CE 6. Judea remained under the control of the Roman Legate of Syria, with subsequent Jewish royalty serving as client-princes at Rome’s discretion.

The Final Destruction of the Temple and Transport of the Treasures to Rome

Roman historians largely ignored the events in Judea described above, but did record the story of the Jewish War of CE 66-70 because it involved a father and son who would both become emperors, and four Roman legions.⁵³ The Jewish War began as different factions leading the revolt fought among themselves while challenging Roman authority.⁵⁴ Even though the Jews’ desire for independence from imperial rule was clearly a central issue, they

⁵¹ Herod’s sumptuous Temple and other building projects throughout Judea serve as evidence of his determination to establish Hellenistic culture in the area and for it to exist alongside Hebrew culture. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 92.

⁵² Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 135. The term *religio licita* appears to continue to generate disagreement among scholars. While Smallwood adopts and accepts it, Gruen disagrees with the term *religio licita*, saying that it “has no technical authority,” Gruen, *Diaspora*, 265, n. 71. He finds the term cited in antiquity only by Tertullian in *Apologeticum* 21.1. In the Romans’ permission granted to Jews to continue their ancestral practices and to refrain from sacrifices to the emperor, Gruen sees no special Roman concern for the ancestral practices of Jews, merely the repeated recognition of precedent set during the reigns of Julius Caesar and Augustus, and a general disinterest in the Jews as a group. Imperial actions toward groups of Jews resulted from the need for peace and stability in the Empire, rather than any desire to confer special status. On the other hand, in another recent publication, Martin Sicker describes how Rome allowed the Jews not to participate in the imperial cult, a distinct privilege allowed to no other group in the Empire, Sicker, *Between Rome and Jerusalem*, 135.

⁵³ Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 144.

⁵⁴ Sicker, *Between Rome and Jerusalem*, 136.

did not present a united front against Rome until nearly the end of the war.⁵⁵ Since the province of Judea made up such a small portion of the vast Roman Empire, the tremendous effort that Roman forces expended to subjugate the small province seems illogical. The segregated and non-traditional-Roman nature of Jewish customs and worship traditions suggests one reason for imperial determination to bring Judea under its complete control; however, the continued rise in terrorist activity during the decade of the 50s provoked Roman counter-measures.⁵⁶ In 65, two events in Judea forced the break with Rome and brought a formidable Roman response. Jews captured the Roman garrison at Masada and massacred the Roman contingent there. Soon afterward, the high priest, in response to public demand, halted daily sacrifices in the Temple for the divine emperor. This daily offering, which had been celebrated since Augustus' reign, signaled a decisive break with Rome.⁵⁷

In 66, the Roman general Vespasian and his son Titus traveled to Judea under Nero's mandate to subdue and stabilize the province. In the initial phase of the war, troops under Josephus were defeated and their leader taken hostage.⁵⁸ Roman troops slowly subdued areas of the country until only Jerusalem remained as the last stronghold of the rebels.⁵⁹ By the

⁵⁵ Smallwood states that the Temple leadership was generally pacifist and led the "peace-party," while Zealots and revolutionaries, in the spirit of a contemporary movement of messianistic expectation, fought for a return to the Hebrew theocracy of the past. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 274-275, 293.

⁵⁶ Sicker, *Between Rome and Jerusalem*, ix. Jews followed non-traditional Roman practices, namely circumcision, the Sabbath rest, and abstention from pork, which certainly were perceived as not following Roman tradition. Gager, *Origins of Anti-Semitism*, 55-66. In addition, Smallwood assesses the Roman-Jewish conflict from CE 6-66 as a growing explosive interaction between the occupying Romans and the militant Jewish factions that eventually exploded into the Jewish War of 66-70. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 155.

⁵⁷ Sicker, *Between Rome and Jerusalem*, 148. Smallwood suggests that the daily sacrifices for the divine emperor substituted in Jerusalem for the emperor-worship required throughout the Empire, and had begun when Judea became a Roman Province in CE 6. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 147.

⁵⁸ Josephus' subsequent actions to support the Roman side and its commander led to his status among the Romans as a prisoner of special status, while he faced anger and rejection by his fellow Jews. Sicker, *Between Rome and Jerusalem*, 153.

⁵⁹ Sicker, *Between Rome and Jerusalem*, 154. Following the conventions of ancient warfare, the Jewish War was prosecuted by the Romans during a favorable seasonal period each year, until the appropriate season in the next year. Various administrative delays, including the civil war between different Roman factions after the

spring of 70, Roman legions under Titus completed preparations to attack Jerusalem. Slowly and methodically, the Romans broke down Jerusalem's walls and entered the city until they stood at the walls of the Temple and the adjacent Antonia, the fortress at the Temple's northwest corner. On that day in the month of Ab (August), 70, when the Romans began to bombard the Antonia, the supply of lambs for the daily Temple sacrifice finally ran out. Stopping that traditional offering resulted in widespread despair among the population of the city that had fled to the Temple compound.⁶⁰

On the eighth of Ab, Roman forces finally destroyed the gate in the outer wall of the Temple. As the Romans established control of the outer court on the following day, Jews continued to resist and even to mount brief counter-attacks. When the inner wall was breached on the tenth of Ab, Roman troops entered the inner court and massacred the resisters.⁶¹ Finally able to approach the Temple itself, Titus entered the Holy of Holies and viewed that sacred place which had been the subject of legend and popular literature for centuries.

Caesar . . . passed with his generals within the building and beheld the holy place of the sanctuary and all that it contained - - things far exceeding the reports current among foreigners and not inferior to their proud reputation among ourselves.⁶²

death of Nero in 68, and the raising of Vespasian to emperor upon the death of Emperor Galba in 69, resulted in the prolongation of the war for four years.

⁶⁰ During that period, Josephus delivered a message from Titus to the rebels to withdraw from the Temple and allow the Romans to restore the daily sacrifice, a message that was heartily rejected by the crowds. Although the section of *The Jewish War* that contains the story of the final assault on the Temple has obvious historical value, Josephus' version of the events has a decidedly apologetic tone, which has led many historians to discount the authenticity of his account. Josephus *The Jewish War* 6.93-95.

⁶¹ Josephus *The Jewish War* 6.258-259. Jews traditionally remember the burning of the Temple on the 9th of Ab, a tradition that continues to today, while Josephus sets the date of the Temple's destruction on the 10th of Ab. F. E. Peters, in *Jerusalem, The Holy City in the Eyes of Chroniclers, Visitors, Pilgrims, and Prophets from the Days of Abraham to the Beginnings of Modern Times* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 595 n. 40, suggests that both dates are correct, and Jews presently remember the 9th of Ab because it was on that day that the Romans destroyed the gates to the Temple and the desecration.

⁶² Josephus *The Jewish War* 6.260. Jewish tradition holds that Titus later suffered a horrible manner of death as punishment for this total desecration of the Temple. The *Babylonian Talmud* states that Titus "blasphemed and

Although Titus had instructed his troops not to destroy the Temple building, according to Josephus, a torch was thrown into an adjacent room and the conflagration began to spread.⁶³ Roman troops, despite their initial hesitation, rushed inside and brought out the Temple Treasures before the building was consumed.⁶⁴

One result of this war, the destruction of the Temple, resulted in a major change in Judaism.⁶⁵ Jewish worship shifted to a focus on prayer and the law centered in the synagogues; that change made worship available to Jews in Synagogues anywhere, not just in the Temple in Jerusalem. The tradition of sacrifice ended, and rabbis took the place of the high priest and Temple priesthood.⁶⁶ In addition, the removal of the Temple Treasures to Rome began the association of the Treasures with Rome itself, while the huge number of slaves brought to Rome after the conquest swelled the established community of Jews in the city. During the reign of Augustus earlier in the first century, the Roman Jewish community had grown to approximately four thousand, already a sizeable number in the city.⁶⁷

During the destruction of the Temple, although the vast majority of the crowd both inside the Temple courts and in the lower city were killed, several thousand Jews remained

insulted Heaven . . . took a harlot by the hand and entered the Holy of Holies and spread out a scroll of the Law and committed a sin on it.” Later when Titus’ returned to Italy, he received his punishment from God, “. . . a gnat came and entered his nose, and it knocked against his brain for seven years.” *BT Gittin* 56b.

⁶³ Titus’ orders to his troops have been disputed among historians. Josephus takes pains to show that Titus respected the Temple and did not want it destroyed. For further discussion of this see Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 325-236.

⁶⁴ Dio Cassius *Dio’s Roman History* 65.2-3..

⁶⁵ According to Erich Gruen, in *Diaspora* (2-3), that horrific event forced all Jews to redefine their identity within foreign and non-Jewish communities, because a majority of Jews in 70 lived outside of Judea. The destruction of the Temple was an event of such magnitude, and so central to Judaism, that today it is still commemorated each year in Israel.

⁶⁶ Victor Klagsbald, “The Menorah as Symbol; its Meaning and Origin in Early Jewish Art,” *Jewish Art* XII-XIII (1986-87): 129.

⁶⁷ Josephus, in *Antiquities* 17.4, 17.11, claims that the number of Jewish men in Rome numbered eight thousand toward the end of Augustus’s reign. Harry Leon, in *The Jews of Ancient Rome* (15), states that this figure indicates a Roman Jewish community of forty thousand or more.

alive and were selected for slavery in the mines, gladiatorial shows, and other work, while the elderly, infirm, and those identified as rebels were executed. Josephus records that Titus' officers chose seven hundred male Jews from the captives, "the tallest and most handsome of the youth, and reserved them for the triumph."⁶⁸ When Titus returned to Rome, his father, Emperor Vespasian, and huge crowds greeted him in the capital city as both men staged a joint triumph to celebrate the defeat of Judea. Josephus described the lavish displays carried along which depicted those conquered peoples and places, including models of the captured cities and Roman ships. But commanding the attention of each viewer were the Temple Treasures,

The spoils in general were borne in promiscuous heaps; but conspicuous above all stood out those captured in the temple at Jerusalem. These consisted of a golden table, many talents in weight, and a lampstand, likewise made of gold, but constructed on a different pattern from those which we use in ordinary life . . . After these, and last of all the spoils, was carried a copy of the Jewish Law.⁶⁹

One of the triumphal arches erected to commemorate Titus and Vespasian's victory, the Arch of Titus in the Forum, still stands where it was erected on the Via Sacra, marking the path that the triumphal procession would have followed. The parade progressed to the base of the Capitoline Hill, and halted for the execution of one of the leaders of the revolt, Simon son of Gioras.⁷⁰ Titus and the emperor then climbed the Capitoline hill to the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus where priests offered a sacrifice.

⁶⁸ Josephus *The Jewish War* 6.417-418, 7.118.

⁶⁸ Dio Cassius *Dio's Roman History* 65.2-3. At the end of the Jewish War in 70, many Jews left Judea and settled in different areas of the Empire, including Rome. The new Jewish slaves brought for the triumph also swelled the population of the Jewish community of Rome; many were freed over time by their fellow Jews and remained in the city. Leon, *The Jews of Ancient Rome*, 37

⁶⁹ Josephus *The Jewish War* 7.148-152.

⁷⁰ Mary Smallwood, in *The Jews under Roman Rule* (329), explains that the other captive leader of the revolt, John of Gischala, was imprisoned for life.

The senate awarded the title of *imperator* to both Titus and Vespasian, but not *Judaicus* to designate the conquered nation, as was usually customary following a great victory.⁷¹ Vespasian then placed the Temple Treasures, along with other spoils and artistic works, in his Temple of Peace, which was built in 75.⁷² Once again, Josephus provided an eye-witness account:

. . . Vespasian decided to erect a temple of Peace . . . he also embellished it with ancient masterpieces of painting and sculpture. . . . Here, too, he laid up the vessels of gold from the temple of the Jews, on which he prided himself; but their Law and the purple hangings of the sanctuary he ordered to be deposited and kept in the palace.⁷³

The Temple of Peace stood for a little over a century, until near the end of the reign of Commodus (180-192), when it burned to the ground.⁷⁴

The Romans memorialized their victory over Judea with traditional Roman media: coins and triumphal arches. In 71, the Senate minted coins with Vespasian's image on the obverse, and a seated female Jew guarded by a Roman male figure underneath a palm tree on the reverse, with the caption "IVDAEA CAPTA."⁷⁵ From 72, Titus' image was placed on coins that held a similar scene and caption on the reverse side.⁷⁶ The personification of a defeated Judea with the caption conveyed the powerful message of certain destruction that awaited those provinces that dared to challenge Roman authority.

⁷¹ Dio Cassius *Dio's Roman History* 65.7.2.

⁷² Dio Cassius *Dio's Roman History* 65.15.1. L. Richardson, Jr., *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 93.

⁷³ Josephus *The Jewish War* 7.158-162.

⁷⁴ Herodian *Herodian* 1.14.2-3. Herodian apparently does not mention the fate of the Temple Treasures. Apparently the Treasures survived the fire because later historians wrote about the Treasures being taken from Rome in the fifth century by the Vandals.

⁷⁵ Harold Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum II* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1966), no. 533-547; Harold Mattingly and Edward A. Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage II* (London: Spink & Son, 1923-1981), no. 424-427, 489-491, 595-596. Although the coins all commemorated the Roman victory over Judea, the captions varied between "IVDAEA CAPTA" and "IVDEA CAPTA."

⁷⁶ Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire*, no. 652, 672; Mattingly and Sydenham, *Roman Imperial Coinage*, no. 608, 620, 653.

The two triumphal arches commemorating the victory remained standing in Rome well into the twelfth century, and reminded both Jews and Christians of the ancient Romans' transfer of the Temple Treasures to the city. The arch in the Circus Maximus, constructed circa 80-81 CE during a general rebuilding campaign of the Circus under Titus,⁷⁷ carried the following inscription commemorating the destruction of Jerusalem and conquest of Judea:

The Senate and the people of Rome built this for Emperor Titus Caesar Vespasian Augustus, son of the divine Vespasian, Pontifex Maximus, in the tenth year of his Tribunician power, hailed Emperor seventeen times, Consul for the eighth time, Pater Patriae, their own Princeps, because he conquered the race of the Jews by means of the instructions, plans and auspices of his father, and destroyed the city of Jerusalem, which either had been sought out in vain or had been entirely untried by all generals, kings, and races before him.⁷⁸

The triumphal arch in the Circus Maximus no longer stands, but the Arch of Titus in the Forum, erected circa 81, still proclaims the victory of Titus in relief sculptures and in a similar but shorter inscription, dedicated to the deceased and deified Titus:

The Senate and the people of Rome built this for the divine Titus Caesar Vespasian Augustus, son of the divine Vespasian.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ John H. Humphrey, *Roman Circuses, Arenas for Chariot Racing*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 101.

⁷⁸ The actual inscription on the arch reportedly read as follows:

SENATUSPOPULUSQROMANUSIMPTITOCAESARIDIVIVESPASIANIFVESPASIANAUGUSTOPONTIF
MAXTRIBPOTXIMPXVIIOSVIIIPPPINCIPISUOQUODPRAECEPTISPATRCONSILIISQETAUSPICIISG
ENTEMIUDAERUMDOMUITETURBEMHIERUSOLYMANOMNIBUSANTESEDUCIBUSREGIBUSAR
TFRUSTRAPETITAMAUTOMNINOINTEMTATAMDELEVIT, as recorded in Hermann Dessau,
Inscriptiones Latinae selectae I, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Weidmann, 1954-55), no. 264. The full inscription may be interpreted to be: SENATUS POPULUSQUE ROMANUS IMPERATORI TITO CAESARI DIVI VESPASIANI FILIUS VESPASIANO AUGUSTO PONTIFICI MAXIMO TRIBUNICIA POTESTATE X IMPERATORI XVII CONSULI VIII PATRI PATRIAE PRINCIPI SUO QUOD PRAECEPTIS PATRIS CONSILIISQUE ET AUSPICIIS GENTEM IUDAERUM DOMUIT ET URBEM HIERUSOLYMAM OMNIBUS ANTE SE DUCIBUS REGIBUS GENTIBUS AUT FRUSTRAPETITAM AUT OMNINO INTEMPTATAM DELEVIT. Dessau indicates (71) that the ninth-century Codex Einsidlensis recorded the existence of this arch and its inscription. Translations of the two inscriptions from the Arches of Titus are by Professors Rex Stem and Steven Ross.

⁷⁹ The actual inscription on the second arch reads as follows:

SENATUSPOPULUSQUEROMANUSDIVOTITODIVIVESPASIANIFVESPASIANO AUGUSTO, as recorded in Dessau, *Inscriptiones* I: no. 265. The full inscription may be interpreted to be: SENATUS POPULUSQUE ROMANUS DIVO TITO DIVI VESPASIANI FILIO VESPASIANO AUGUSTO.

Two panels sculpted in high relief decorate the single arch passageway, facing each other. They depict different aspects of the *triumphus* of Titus and Vespasian. One panel shows Roman soldiers carrying the Temple Treasures through the Forum, with the huge seven-branched menorah dominating the scene, along with placards explaining the various battles and conquered cities.⁸⁰ Although Josephus mentioned the “copy of the Jewish law” in his account of the triumph, it is not visible on the arch today. The other panel shows Vespasian riding in a quadriga led by a personification of Roma and crowned with a laurel wreath by the goddess Victory.⁸¹ The inscriptions on both Arches of Titus proclaimed the divinity of the emperor, while the message on the Arch at the entrance to the Circus Maximus emphatically reminded all readers of the tremendous defeat suffered by Judean Jews. Eleven centuries later, the twelfth-century popes would process through the Arch in the Forum on ceremonial occasions, symbolically taking possession of the Jewish law and emphasizing the Church’s possession of biblical Judaism in the Temple Treasures themselves.⁸²

While the Arch of Titus publicly displayed images of the Temple Treasures, as early as the second century, visitors to Rome reportedly could view the actual Treasures. The *Babylonian Talmud* recorded a mid-second-century eyewitness observation of the Treasures.

⁸⁰ The menorah that was removed from the Temple by Roman troops and memorialized on the Arch of Titus in the Roman forum was probably created during the era of the Hellenistic Hasmonaean kings of the late second and early first centuries BCE, because of the form of the base and its decoration with animal figures. H. Strauss, in “The Fate and Form of the Menorah of the Maccabees,” *Eretz Israel* 6 (1960): 35, believes that the original candlestick to have stood on a three-footed base with supports shaped like animal feet. The trumpets that appear in one of the Arch of Titus reliefs were not mentioned by Josephus in his account of the triumph. William Knight in *The Arch of Titus and The Spoils of the Temple* (London: Longmans, 1867), 107, suggests that if such trumpets were carried with the other Temple spoils in the triumph, they may have been those mentioned in Num. 10:1-2.

⁸¹ Nancy H. Ramage and Andrew Ramage, *Roman Art* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1996), 141-142, identified the figure riding in the quadriga as Vespasian, and the carriers of the Jewish spoils as Roman soldiers because they wear laurel wreaths.

⁸² William Knight, *The Arch of Titus* (89), refers to a 15th c. text by Biondo Flavio, *De Roma Triumphante* (Venice: Philippo Pincio Mantuano, 1511), that mentions that the “Book of the Jewish Law” was visible in the sculpted scene of the Temple Treasures on the Arch during his lifetime. What was still evident on the Arch in the 15th c. was probably even more visible during the twelfth century.

According to the *Talmud*, Rabbi Eliezer ben Jose traveled to Rome in the mid-second century, and claimed to have seen certain Treasures from the Temple.⁸³ In reference to the curtain from the Holy of Holies, he said:

I saw it in Rome and there were upon it many drops of blood both of the bullock and the he-goat of the Day of Atonement.⁸⁴

R. Eliezer also claimed to have seen the gold ornament once worn by the high priest:

. . . the plate of gold two finger-breadths broad and stretching from ear to ear, and upon it were engraved two lines . . . I saw it in Rome, and it had *Kodesh Ladonai* [Holy to the Lord] on one line.⁸⁵

Although the *Babylonian Talmud* does not refer to the specific location of these Treasures, the mid-second century date of these observations suggests that the location may indeed have been the Temple of Peace. While in Rome, the visitors also could have seen the relief sculptures on the Arch of Titus erected over fifty years earlier, which were to present such a degraded view of Jews in the centuries to come.

The Temple Treasures apparently remained in Rome until captured by the Vandals, a Germanic tribe, and taken to Carthage in North Africa. Theophanes, an early-ninth-century Byzantine chronicler, wrote about the sack of Rome in 455 by Gizerich the Vandal and the seizure of the Temple Treasures along with the Empress Eudoxia and her daughters.⁸⁶

⁸³ Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 329 n. 161. The *Babylonian Talmud* also explains that the main purpose of the rabbis' visit was to plead with Emperor Antoninus Pius (r. 138-161) to relax his recent imperial decree against circumcision. According to this account, the rabbis were successful in having the decree rescinded after curing the emperor's daughter of a demon; Jews would thereafter be allowed to perform circumcision only on their own children and not on converts. *BT Me'ilah* 17 a-b.

⁸⁴ *BT Yoma* 57a; *Me'ilah* 17b.

⁸⁵ *BT Sukkah* 5a.

⁸⁶ As an official Byzantine chronicler, it was to Theophanes' advantage to write well of Eudoxia, who was daughter of the eastern Emperor Theodosius II (r. 402-450). Theophanes claimed that Eudoxia chose to appeal to Gizerich for help against Maximus because her father and powerful sister Pulcheria were both dead and she could expect no help from the eastern ruler. Theophanes, Confessor, *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284-813*, trans. by Cyril Mango (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 167; Kenneth G. Holum, *Theodosian Emperresses, Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 209.

So Gizerich sailed to Rome with a large fleet and Maximus fled in fear. His associates killed him after he had ruled one year. Gizerich, with no one to stop him, entered Rome on the third day after the murder of Maximus, and taking all the money and the adornments of the city, he loaded them on his ships, among them the solid gold and bejeweled treasures of the Church and the Jewish vessels which Vespasian's son Titus had brought to Rome after the capture of Jerusalem. Having also taken the empress Eudoxia and her daughters, he sailed back to Africa.⁸⁷

The chronicler Theophanes, in the above account, continued the historical connection between the Temple Treasures and the Roman emperors Titus and Vespasian.

Procopius, advisor to the Byzantine General Belisarius, chronicled the next known movement of the Temple Treasures in 534 from Carthage to Constantinople. Led by Belisarius, Byzantine forces captured Carthage and defeated the Vandals under the command of Gelimer. When the victorious army returned to Constantinople, Belisarius led his forces in a triumph, evidently unusual at that time in the Roman Empire.

. . . a period of about six hundred years had now passed since anyone had attained these honours, except, indeed, Titus and Trajan . . . he displayed the spoils and slaves from the war in the midst of the city, and led a procession which the Romans call a "triumph."⁸⁸

Apparently Procopius saw Belisarius' triumph as a deliberate reenactment of imperial Roman triumphal processions, including Titus' first-century procession, and another awesome public display of the stolen Treasures of the Temple of Herod.

. . . and among these were the treasures of the Jews, which Titus, the son of Vespasian, together with certain others, had brought to Rome after the capture of Jerusalem.⁸⁹

Following the triumph, a Jew with access to the court expressed concern about Emperor Justinian's plan to bring the Treasures into his palace. A message was sent to the

⁸⁷ Theophanes *The Chronicle of Theophanes* 167.

⁸⁸ Procopius *History of the Wars* 4.9.2-3.

⁸⁹ Procopius *History of the Wars* 4.9.5-6.

emperor that the Vandals had sacked Rome precisely because of the presence of these Treasures, therefore, the palace would be safer without these powerful artifacts. As Procopius wrote, the rightful home for the Treasures was in Jerusalem, “the place where Solomon, the king of the Jews, formerly placed them.”⁹⁰ Procopius further recorded the emperor’s decision:

When this had been brought to the ears of the Emperor, he became afraid and quickly sent everything to the sanctuaries of the Christians in Jerusalem.⁹¹

Evidently the lore of the Temple Treasures still engendered respect and awe, enough to lead the emperor to fear for the safety of the imperial city, and to send the Treasures away from Constantinople. The whereabouts of the Treasures in the city of Jerusalem are not recorded in any extant texts after their reported translation there. Perhaps the Treasures disappeared into the East with the Persians when they sacked Jerusalem in 614, since the Persians reportedly seized certain well-known Christian relics, including a relic of the true cross, and probably would have known of the presence in Jerusalem of these famous and valuable Jewish artifacts.⁹²

At this point in the narrative of the Temple Treasures, an alternative tradition emerged which implied that the menorah was brought to Constantinople by Constantine I in the fourth century and remained there until 1204 when Crusaders sacked the city. Christian texts from Constantinople suggested that during the Middle Ages the menorah stood in the imperial

⁹⁰ Procopius *History of the Wars* 4.9.7.

⁹¹ Procopius *History of the Wars* 4.9.9.

⁹² Leon Yarden, *The Spoils of Jerusalem on the Arch of Titus, a Re-investigation* (Stockholm: Svenska Institutet I Rom, 1991), 64-65. Several accounts of the Persian capture of Jerusalem exist, including: Sebaeus, *Histoire d’Heraclius*, trans. F. Macler, as listed by L. Yarden; A. Couret, *La prise de Jérusalem par les Perses* (Orleans, 1876), 29f.; and Sophronius, *Patrologia cursus completes: Series Graeca* 87, ed. J.P. Migne, (Paris, 1857-66), c. 3809f., as cited in M. Avi-Yonah, *The Jews under Byzantine and Roman Rule* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1984), 276-277. My future research may probe those accounts for any mention of the Temple Treasures in Jerusalem at the time of the Persian conquest.

palace in Constantinople. Two Byzantine texts, *De cerimoniis aulae byzantinae*, by Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (circa tenth century), and *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitarum*, by Georginus Kodinus (circa twelfth century),⁹³ both imply that a ceremonial lampstand was used in a portion of the imperial palace known as the Dome of *heptalychnos*,⁹⁴ constructed during the fourth-century reign of Constantine I.⁹⁵ The two references to the Dome of *heptalychnos* may be no more than suggestions with no substantive basis; however, a seventh-century Jewish source, *The Wars of King Messiah*, reportedly stated that some of the Temple Treasures were indeed hidden in the palace in Constantinople.⁹⁶ Strauss notes that no proof exists that the Treasures were sent to Jerusalem.⁹⁷

⁹³ According to *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* I, Alexander P. Kazhdan, ed., 3 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 1:502-503, Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos (r. 945-959) supposedly participated in the production of three works detailing his administration's inner workings and diplomatic efforts, *De administrando imperio*, *De thematibus*, and *De ceremoniis*. Leon Yarden, in *The Spoils of Jerusalem*, 65, claims that the emperor suggested in *De ceremoniis* that a seven-branched lamp was used in palace ceremonies.

⁹⁴ The term *heptalychnos* translates to "seven-lamped." Translation by Professor Steven Ross.

⁹⁵ Strauss, "The Menorah of the Maccabees," 35. The date of the construction and naming of the *heptalychnos* is important, because if the menorah was not brought to Constantinople until the sixth century, then the *heptalychnos*, if it existed during Constantine's fourth-century reign, may not have referred to the menorah of the Hebrews. Further research is needed to determine when that particular section of the palace was first known as *heptalychnos*. If such a designation did not begin until the sixth century, then the presence of the menorah there is more plausible. Other medieval chronicles of Constantinople exist and may well mention the Temple Treasures of the Hebrews. Two such sources were examined in this study, *Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae*, ed. Otto Seeck (Berlin: Weidmann, 1876), and *Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai in Constantinople in the Early Eighth Century*, eds. Averil Cameron and Judith Herrin (Leiden: Brill, 1984). These sources were not found to contain any references to the menorah or any other structure or object linked to the ancient Hebrews.

⁹⁶ Yarden, *The Spoils of Jerusalem*, 65. Adolph Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash* (Jerusalem: Wahrman Books, 1967). Because Jellinek's text is in Hebrew, I am not able to use it at this time. An investigation of the tradition of the Temple Treasures remaining in Constantinople will not be explored in my present research.

⁹⁷ Strauss, "The Menorah of the Maccabees," 35. Strauss also mentions a "Jewish apocalyptic book of the seventh century," which may refer to the source noted above, *The Wars of King Messiah*, and the writings of Constantine Porphyrogenitos that refer to a menorah in Constantinople. Strauss also mentions the large menorah donated to the Church in Essen circa 1000, which stood on a base of three animal-shaped feet, and was given to the church by Abbess Mathilda, a relative of the Byzantine imperial family. This donation supposedly suggested Byzantine knowledge of the traditional form of the menorah, but if the menorah taken by the Romans in 70 was shaped like the image on the Arch of Titus, then Mathilda's gift may suggest nothing more than a thorough knowledge of the Old Testament texts about the original menorah. Like Jellinek's text, Strauss's article is in Hebrew, thus it will be investigated in my future research.

Another possible explanation for the use of *heptalychnos* may be the fourth-century identification of the Christian Church as the New Temple, Rome as the New Jerusalem, and Constantinople as the New Rome. Even though the Byzantine palace in Constantinople was not an ecclesiastical structure, the close association of the Christian Church with the imperial government in the eastern Roman Empire may explain the association of a religiously significant term with a secular building. While the above textual sources mentioned the Treasures and may have suggested the presence of the menorah in Constantinople after the sixth century, textual references to these objects in Rome suddenly resumed in the eleventh century.

The Papacy's Claim to Possess the Temple Treasures

The Church in Rome began to proclaim its possession of the Temple Treasures at the Lateran basilica with the first edition of the *DLE*, produced circa 1073 by an anonymous Lateran cleric.⁹⁸ Numerous reasons have been advanced for the Church's effort to focus attention on these Treasures at that time. The Church's identification with the power and glory of ancient Rome was one facet of the widespread renewed interest in antiquity that influenced religion, education, science, art, literature, and law in Europe in the twelfth century, and has been called the Twelfth-Century Renaissance or *renovatio*.⁹⁹ The production of the *DLE* began over a century of heightened focus on the Treasures by the Church in Rome. Christians had adopted the Old Covenant and proclaimed the New Covenant from the early days of Christianity; however, in the eleventh century, the Church

⁹⁸ *DLE* 319-373.

⁹⁹ While the Twelfth-Century Renaissance encompassed movements in many different areas of society and culture, it will be referred to in this paper primarily in reference to the twelfth-century papacy's imitation of Roman imperial processions and in the Church's renewed interest in Roman, Christian, and Jewish antiquity. For further information on the Twelfth-Century Renaissance, see particularly Charles Homer Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (New York: Meridian Books, 1957) and *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. by Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

began to claim to possess the physical relics of that Old Covenant. The pope's role at that time as the acknowledged head of the Church in Rome makes his actions representative of the Western Church. Of the several different methods that the twelfth-century papacy used to acknowledge the Church's possession of the Temple Treasures, the texts that proclaimed that message will be examined first.

Papal emphasis on the physical remains of the Temple Treasures increased with the papacy of Eugenius III, and continued through the reign of Alexander III. While those popes focused attention on the Lateran basilica's connection to biblical Judaism, the association of that Church with the Temple Treasures and Judaism originated in the fourth century.

Constantine had started his Christian building program in Rome with the establishment of the Lateran basilica circa 312-313, the first large-scale Christian worship space in Rome.¹⁰⁰

Constantine's patronage also included the basilica built on Vatican Hill to honor the remains of the apostle Peter, martyred in Rome circa 64, and other churches in Rome and the Holy Land.¹⁰¹ The change in official policy completely altered the fortunes of the Christian Church throughout the Empire but also in Rome, by giving official sanction to Christian worship and

¹⁰⁰ Constantine and Licinius, the western and eastern Roman emperors, issued a joint imperial letter in 313 that granted religious freedom to Roman subjects in the eastern Empire and ordered that property seized in the recent persecution be returned to its Christian owners. According to Timothy D. Barnes, in "The Constantinian Settlement," in *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, eds. Harold W. Attridge and Gohei Hata (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992), 645-649, that letter extended the same freedom of religion to Christians in the East that had been given already to Christians in Constantine's western Empire. Constantine defeated Licinius in 324 to become the sole emperor of the Romans

¹⁰¹ An ancient necropolis had been located on Vatican Hill in the early Christian era. Whether or not the site that Christians today revere as Peter's burial place is authentic has not been established, although excavations beneath the high altar of the Vatican since 1939 have uncovered a mid-second-century CE cemetery and a trophy inscribed with graffiti including the name of the Saint. Debra J. Birch, *Pilgrimage to Rome in the Middle Ages, Continuity and Change* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998), 28-29.

providing continuing financial support for the Lateran basilica and baptistry from imperial lands.¹⁰²

The Lateran basilica, originally called the *Basilica Constantiniana*, was constructed on the site of the imperial Horse Guard camp and a privately owned mansion of the Laterani.¹⁰³ A strong association of the Lateran basilica with the relics of both John the Baptist and John the Evangelist led to its modern Italian name, S. Giovanni in Laterano.¹⁰⁴ The association of John the Baptist with the Lateran is particularly significant, because John was considered by medieval Christians to be the final Jewish prophet before Christ, and moreover, pointed out Christ to his following. John the Baptist is therefore an important link between the Old Covenant and the New.¹⁰⁵ From its origin in the fourth century, however, the Lateran Church was purposefully and deliberately connected to the heritage of Biblical Judaism.

¹⁰² The *Liber Pontificalis* lists Constantine's donation of the revenues from numerous imperial estates dedicated to the upkeep of the Lateran basilica and baptistry. He donated other estates for the upkeep of each Church in Rome that he founded. L'abbé L. Duchesne, ed. *Le Liber Pontificalis I* (Paris: 1886-1892), 75-79. A new English translation can be found in Raymond Davis, ed. and trans., *The Book of Pontiffs (Liber Pontificalis), The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*, rev. ed. (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), 17-19.

¹⁰³ Richard Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 45-48. In the first century before construction of the Horse Guard camp, the general area had been occupied by the mansions of the Laterani and other wealthy families. That name survived in popular memory, for the entire quarter around the Constantinian church was popularly known as *Lateranus* by the fourth century. Krautheimer, *Corpus V*, 25. According to Eileen Gardiner in the gazetteer to the *MUR*, 75, the property reportedly was confiscated from Plautius Lateranus, a condemned criminal, under the orders of Nero. Timothy Barnes, in *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981), 49, concurs on the original ownership of the property. Philippe Lauer's study of the Lateran complex, *Le palais de Latran*, still provides valuable information and will be cited in this essay where indicated. A more recent study of the early modern Lateran by Jack Freiberg, *The Lateran in 1600, Christian Concord in Counter-Reformation Rome* (Cambridge: CUP, 1995), includes important information on the structure, decoration, and customary rituals in the pre-seventeenth-century Lateran.

¹⁰⁴ According to Richard Krautheimer in *Corpus basilicarum Christianarum Romae*, vol. V (Città del Vaticano: Pontificio istituto di archeologia Christiana, 1977), 10, the *Epitome de Locis Sanctorum*, written circa 635-642, first recorded three names for the basilica, "The Basilica Constantiniana, which is also called of the Savior himself and St. John." Krautheimer interprets (10) from that passage that by the mid-seventh century, the basilica was popularly known by all three names.

¹⁰⁵ Freiberg, *The Lateran in 1600*, 41.

An identification of the Lateran with the Jewish Temple probably began with the original donations of Constantine to his new basilica.¹⁰⁶ The *Liber Pontificalis* listed Constantine's extravagant donations to many churches in Rome, including the Lateran.¹⁰⁷ Whereas the candelabra given to the churches were decorated with Christian saints and martyrs, the candelabra given to the Lateran basilica alone carried the images of the Old Testament prophets:

In this time Constantine Augustus built those basilicas which he adorned: He gave those gifts to the Basilica Constantiniana . . . a roof of the purest gold . . . seven candlesticks of precious metals in front of the altars, on ten feet, with embellishment of silver, with seals of the prophets, . . .¹⁰⁸

The "Constantinian Basilica" and its baptistry are first in the list of Constantine's churches in the *Liber Pontificalis*, and received the most extensive donations of precious vessels and estates for its support. The lavish patronage of Constantine to his first Church conferred both favor and authority on the Bishop of Rome and the Lateran.

That association between the Lateran and biblical Judaism continued through the following centuries.¹⁰⁹ An inscription in the apse, created under the pontificate of Sergius III (904-911), proclaimed the connection between the Lateran and Mount Sinai:

This house of God is similar to Sinai, bearing the sacred rites, as

¹⁰⁶ Freiberg, *The Lateran in 1600*, 338, n. 131.

¹⁰⁷ Constantine donated liturgical objects and revenues from properties to St. Peter's, St. Paul's, S. Croce in Hierusalemme, St. Agnes, St. Laurence, and SS. Marcellinus and Peter in Rome, and to churches in Ostia, Albanum, Capua, and Naples. Davis, *The Book of Pontiffs*, 19-27.

¹⁰⁸ "Huius temporibus fecit Constantinus Augustus basilicas istas quas et ornavit: basilicam Constantinianam ubi posuit ista dona . . . cameram ex auro purissimo . . . candelabra auricalca VII ante altaria, qui sunt in pedibus X cum ornatu ex argento interclusum sigillis prophetarum," *LP I*: 77-79.

¹⁰⁹ Freiberg notes in *The Lateran in 1600* (32-35), that the renovations to the Lateran Palace under Sixtus V (1585-1590) included painting cycles comparing the typology of the pope as head of the Christian Church to the Old Testament patriarchs. Even in the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries, the association of the Lateran with biblical Judaism still was firmly in place.

the law demonstrates, the law which once had been brought forth here, which went forth from here, which leads minds from the lowest places, and which, having become known, gave light throughout the regions of the world.¹¹⁰

By the twelfth century, the popes' promotion of that connection took the form of the claim that the Temple Treasures resided in the basilica, a claim that would reverberate through texts, visual programs, and liturgical rituals.

The original *DLE*, circa 1073, claimed that the ark of the covenant and the menorah were kept in the Lateran basilica.¹¹¹ The two late-twelfth-century recensions of the *DLE*, along with the *HIS*, produced by another Lateran cleric circa 1145, reiterated and emphasized the papacy's claim to possess the Temple Treasures and the Lateran basilica's association with biblical Judaism. The official Church's acknowledgement of its possession of the Temple Treasures demonstrated its appropriation of a legacy decidedly older and more lasting than even that of the Romans, the heritage of the ancient Hebrews. The Temple Treasures embodied several different aspects of antiquity, all related to power: they were relics of biblical Judaism that pre-dated Rome, they were spoils of war transferred to imperial Rome, and most of all, they were witnesses to the destruction of Jerusalem and defeat of the Jews.

¹¹⁰ "AVLA DEI HAEC SIMILIS SYNAI SACRA IVRA FERENTI VT LEX DEMONSTRAT HIC QVAE FVIT EDITA QVONDAM LEX HINC EXIVIT MENTES QVAE DVCIT AB IMIS ET VULGATA DEDIT LUMEN PER CLIMATA SAECLI." Ciampini, *De sacra aedificiis a Constantino Magno constructis* (Roma: 1693), 16. Translation by Professor Rex Stem. Ciampini noted that the inscription was not extant in his day and claimed to have derived its words from a text by Onofrio Panvinio, *De praecipuis urbis Romae sanctioribusque basilicas quas septem ecclesias vulgo vocant liber* (Rome, 1570). Lauer, *Le palais de Latran*, 49, and Freiberg, *The Lateran in 1600*, 338 n. 131, also noted this tenth-century inscription, although Freiberg records "lumen" as "nomen". According to Freiberg (338 n. 131), Panvinio related that the inscription had been lost by his time, and he had learned of it from archival records. Another inscription nearly identical to the Lateran apse inscription was created in the new abbey church at Monte Cassino circa 1071: "haec domus est similis Synai sacra iura ferenti, / ut lex demonstrat hic quae fuit edita quondam. / Lex hinc exivit mentes quae ducit ab imis, / et vulgata dedit lumen per climata saecli." Herbert Bloch, *Monte Cassino in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), I: 53. Krautheimer, in *Rome 312 to 1308* (178), explains that Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, re-built the abbey church and consecrated it in 1071. The abbot modeled the church on Roman churches, especially the Lateran, St. Peter's, and St. Paul's. Krautheimer (178) and Bloch (I: 54) both state that the inscription in the apse at Monte Cassino was modeled on the one in the apse at the Lateran. Desiderius was later elected Pope Victor III (1086-1087).

¹¹¹ *DLE* 336.20.

The Treasures and their connection to the Temple in Jerusalem also represented the power and majesty of the Jewish kingship of David and Solomon, which was instituted by God. Though the Romans had seized the Treasures in Jerusalem, the Christian Church had, in a sense, replaced the Roman Empire and now owned the Treasures in Rome. Those connotations of power that were associated with the Treasures, in addition to their intrinsic spiritual significance, made them relics *par excellence* for the papacy.

The Temple Treasures, as relics of pre-Christian Judaism, supposedly remained in the Lateran basilica along with many relics of Christian saints and martyrs. The widespread veneration of relics in the Middle Ages encouraged pilgrims to travel to view relics and pray in the presence of those tangible reminders of holiness, in Rome and elsewhere in Christendom.¹¹² During the twelfth century, as a renewed interest in ancient Rome spread, writers produced travel guides to direct Christians to the sites of both ancient and Christian Rome.¹¹³ These guides repeated popular legends from the city's history, and included stories and figures from biblical Judaism, including the Temple Treasures. Benedict, a canon of St. Peter's basilica, composed perhaps the most popular of the Christian guidebooks, the *MUR*, circa 1143. His text includes both secular and religious history, and even provides a biblical

¹¹² Birch explains, in *Pilgrimage to Rome*, 23-37 that pilgrims had traveled to Rome since the late second century, but such travel to Rome dramatically increased with the growing popularity of the cult of the saints in the early fifth century. The martyrdom of both Peter and Paul in Rome in the first century added special holiness to the city.

¹¹³ According to Birch, in *Pilgrimage to Rome* (158, 180-182), three major pilgrimage destinations attracted numerous pilgrims in the twelfth century, Rome, Jerusalem, and Santiago de Compostela, although in that period Rome lagged behind Jerusalem and Santiago in the numbers of pilgrims. The majority of twelfth-century pilgrims to Rome appear to have been new converts and ecclesiastics. In the twelfth century, the popes occasionally attempted through decrees to attract pilgrims to Rome, but their efforts were not successful because of the unstable and dangerous condition of the city, especially after the establishment of the Roman Commune in 1143.

explanation for the founding of Rome, in effect Christianizing the origins of the ancient city.¹¹⁴

In his list of the triumphal arches of Rome, Benedict included the two imperial arches built to honor Titus, showing the importance of these arches to Christian pilgrims:

. . . in the Circus the Arch of Titus and Vespasian . . . at Santa Maria Nova between the Greater Palace and the Temple of Romulus, the Arch of the Seven lamps of Titus and Vespasian where is found Moses' candlestick with seven branches with the Ark, at the foot of the Cartulary Tower . . .¹¹⁵

Note that Benedict mentions both arches of Titus, but the Arch of Titus in the forum is clearly identified more with biblical Judaism rather than with Roman imperial history. Referring to the arch as “the Arch of the Seven Lamps,” and one part of the image as “Moses’ candlestick” indicates the importance for pilgrims to see those historical sights, as well as “the Ark.” Later in his text, Benedict returns to the Temple Treasures, but in the context of the relics preserved in the Lateran basilica:

During the days of Pope Silvester, Constantine Augustus built the Lateran Basilica, which he adorned beautifully. He put there the Ark of the Covenant, which Titus had carried from Jerusalem with many thousands of Jews, and the Golden Candlestick of Seven Lamps with vessels for oil. In the Ark are these things: the golden emeralds, the mice of gold, the Tablets of the Covenant, the rod of Aaron, manna, the barley loaves, the golden urn, the coat without seam, the reed and garment of Saint John the Baptist, and the tongs that Saint John the Evangelist was shorn with.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ Benedict, *MUR*, I:1. Francis Morgan Nichols notes in the introduction to *MUR* (xv), that between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries, this text was the most frequently used guidebook by travelers to Rome, and had a lasting influence on later visitors to the city, including Petrarch. Magister Gregorius, an English traveler, composed another text with nearly the same title, the *Narracio de Mirabilibus Urbis Romae*, and focused primarily on the secular sites of ancient Rome. See *Master Gregorius, the Marvels of Rome*, trans. by John Osborne (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1987).

¹¹⁵ Benedict, *MUR*, 6. Benedict explains later (X, p. 41), that the Cartulary, a public library, had been called the Temple of Aesculapius in ancient Rome.

¹¹⁶ Benedict, *MUR*, 29. Benedict’s description of St. Peter’s and St. Paul’s revolved around the remains of the two apostles, while his section about the Lateran basilica focused primarily on the Old Testament relics it contained, even though its vast relic collection included both pre-Christian and Christian relics. The widely-believed association of the Lateran with Judaism explains Benedict’s emphasis on the Lateran’s possession of the Temple Treasures.

Although historical texts from the sixth through the ninth centuries had chronicled the movement of the Treasures to North Africa, Constantinople, and Jerusalem, a tradition prevailed in Rome that the Temple Treasures were kept at the Lateran basilica, along with other fantastic relics from Jewish and Christian history. Benedict's inclusion of these items in his account of the Lateran basilica indicates a desire to promote that belief and support the Lateran's claims to have those relics.

Guides for Jewish travelers in the twelfth century also existed, such as *The Itinerary* of Benjamin of Tudela. This guide included the Lateran basilica and its Jewish artifacts on its list of prominent sites in the city. According to the Jewish traveler Benjamin,

In the church of St. John in the Lateran there are two bronze columns taken from the Temple, the handiwork of King Solomon, each column being engraved "Solomon the son of David." The Jews of Rome told me that every year upon the 9th of Ab they found the columns exuding moisture like water. There also is the cave where Titus the son of Vespasianus stored the Temple vessels which he brought from Jerusalem . . . In front of St. John in the Lateran there are statues of Samson in marble, with a spear in his hand, and of Absalom, the son of King David . . .¹¹⁷

Benjamin implied that local Jews were his guides, thus indicating a belief among Roman Jews that columns from Solomon's Temple stood in the Lateran. In addition, his account suggests that Jews actually went into the Lateran basilica, a Christian church, on the 9th of Ab and saw the two columns emitting water. That date would be the anniversary of the final desecration of the Temple in 70, commemorated by Jews throughout the Middle Ages and to the present day. As far as the actual Temple Treasures, Benjamin did not state where he believed they were kept in his day, but did mention the Roman translation of the objects to the city.

¹¹⁷ Benjamin of Tudela, *The Itinerary*, 64.

These texts of Benjamin and Benedict indicate that a visit to the Lateran was an important sight for travelers visiting Rome, whether Jewish or Christian, as well as local residents of the city. The mentions of the Treasures of the Temple of Herod in *The Itinerary* and in the *MUR*, and the relief sculptures on the Arch of Titus, all indicate that these two writers associated the Temple Treasures with Rome and the Lateran basilica, and intended to convey that belief to their readers. The prevalence of these pilgrim guides and their circulation among visitors to Rome disseminated the stories of these Treasures and promoted the belief that they indeed were in Rome.

The Church claimed to keep in the Lateran other sacred and instrumental objects from pre-Christian Jewish history along with relics from Christ, his mother, Mary, and from sites in the Holy Land. The *DLE* listed these numerous relics:

And so, in this most holy basilica of the Lateran Savior, which is consecrated by God for Jesus Christ, the head of the world, the patriarchate and the imperium, is the pontifical seat of the apostolic cathedrals, and in the principal altar of the same church is the ark of the law of the Lord . . . And there the staff of Aaron, which became leafy; and the tablets of the testament; and the rod of Moses, with which he hit the rock twice, and water flowed. Also there are the relics from the cradle of the Lord, and from the five loaves and two fish. Likewise, the table of the Lord; the canvas by which he wiped off the feet of his disciples; the seamless tunic which the Virgin Mary made for her Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, which was drawn lots for by the soldiers at his death and not torn apart; which as long as the Savior is preserved there, no heresy or division of faith will be in it.¹¹⁸

Apparently by combining relics from biblical Judaism with early Christian relics into one list, the author added emphasis to the Church's claim of inheriting the promises of the Old

¹¹⁸ "In hac itaque sacrosancta Lateranensi basilica Salvatori Ihesu Christo Deo dicata, quae caput est mundi, quae patriarchalis est et imperialis, sedis est apostolicae cathedrae pontificalis, et eiusdem ecclesiae ara principalis est arca foederis Domini . . . Et ibi virga Aaron, quae fronderat; et tabulae Testamenti; et virga Moysi, qua percussit bis silicem, et fluxerunt aquae. Item sunt ibi reliquiae de cunabulis Domini. De quinque panibus ordeacii et duobus piscibus. Item mensa Domini; linteum unde extersit pedes discipulorum suorum; tunica inconsutilis, quam fecit virgo Maria filio suo domino nostro Ihesu Christo, quae in morte ipsius a militibus sortita est, non scissa; quam dum Salvator inibi reservaverit, haeresis vel scissura fidei diu non erit in ea." *DLE* 336.17-20, 337.9-17.

Covenant. The statement in the *DLE* that the Lateran basilica had these incredible relics also supported the unique status of that particular Church.¹¹⁹ John the Deacon, a canon of the Lateran basilica, probably authored the second and third revisions of the *DLE*, circa 1153-55 and again during the reign of Alexander III (1159-1181), although only in the third edition did John identify himself as the author.¹²⁰ In the prologue that John added to his revision, he dedicated it to Pope Alexander III; that dedication suggests that Alexander was fully aware of the claims of the text.¹²¹ The prologue also contains John's own statement of his purpose in revising the *DLE*:

. . . for all who rejoice in the memory of this book that I do not in any way insert in it for the sake of superstition any novelties of presumption: but in simply maintaining in my writing the series of ancient events, if I add any other things, they are without doubt things which either I have myself seen with my own eyes over the space of twenty years, living in the position of a canon in this basilica, or which I have learnt by true recounting from our predecessors. . . . or even from the histories and authorities of holy men for rejecting the ambiguity of certain men concerning the hiding of the tabernacle and the ark and those things which were contained in it, or of the burnt altar . . .

¹²²

¹¹⁹ Freiberg, *The Lateran in 1600*, 34.

¹²⁰ R.P. Ceillier, *Histoire generale des auteurs ecclesiastiques* IV (Paris: Louis Vives, 1863), 689-691; C. Vogel, "La *Descriptio Ecclesiae Lateranensis* du Diacre Jean, Histoire du texte manuscrit," *Melanges en l'honneur de Monseigneur Michel Andrieu* (Strasbourg: Palais Universitaire, 1956), 457-476. C. Vogel and Valentini and Zucchetti, in the introduction to the *DLE* (319-320) agree on the date of the first and third editions of the text; however, Vogel places the second recension between 1154 and 1159, and Valentini and Zucchetti place it slightly earlier, 1153-1154. All three scholars agree that John the Deacon could have authored the second edition as well as the third.

¹²¹ *DLE* 326.3-7.

¹²² ". . . universos, qui huius libelli memoria gaudent, me nullatenus superstitionis causa aliquas novitates praesumptionis inserere: sed simpliciter antiquorum seriem scribendo conservans, si qua alia superaddo, illa sunt procul dubio, quae vel ipse iam per quinque lustrorum spatia, in hac sacrosancta basilica in canonicali proposito vivens, propriis oculis vidi, vel ab antecessoribus nostris veridica relatione cognovi. . . . vel etiam quae de historiis et auctoritatibus sanctorum ad repellendam ambiguitatis opinionem quorundam de absconsione Tabernaculi et Arcae, et his quae continebantur in ea, vel altaris incensi;" John the Deacon, prologue to *DLE* 327 lines 11-17, 19-22. Translation by Professor Brenda Bolton.

John's stated purpose, "for rejecting the ambiguity of certain men concerning the hiding of the Tabernacle and the Ark and those things which were contained in it,"¹²³ shows his intent to clarify the location of those objects in the Lateran basilica, during the reign of Pope Alexander III. Valentini and Zucchetti suggest that John revised the text and reissued it to support the Lateran canons' claim of superiority over all other churches in Rome, particularly over that of the Vatican basilica.¹²⁴ By the mid- to late twelfth century, a rivalry between the canons of the Lateran basilica and St. Peter's had been raging for over a century.¹²⁵ A text in opposition to the Lateran basilica's primacy, the *Descriptio basilicae Vaticanae* [DBV], was penned during the same era, circa 1145-1181, by the Vatican canon Petrus Mallius.¹²⁶ According to Cyrille Vogel, Petrus Mallius went to great lengths to enumerate the positive attributes of the Vatican basilica, including the tomb of St. Peter and the tombs of numerous popes. Despite that rivalry, the two canons, John from the Lateran, and Petrus from St. Peter's, may have been familiar with each other's work. Vogel notes several similarities in their two texts in the structure of the argument and the style.¹²⁷

¹²³ John the Deacon, prologue to *DLE* 327 lines 20-22.

¹²⁴ Valentini and Zucchetti, introduction to *DLE*, 321. For further information about the rivalry between the canons of the two basilicas, see Michele Maccarrone, "La cathedra Sancti Petri nel medioevo: da simbolo a reliquia," *Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia* 36 (1985), 349-447.

¹²⁵ Freiberg, in *The Lateran in 1600* (2), notes that the rivalry between the canons of the two churches continued through the fifteenth century.

¹²⁶ Petrus Mallius, *Descriptio basilicae Vaticanae*, in Valentini and Zucchetti, *Codice topografico della città di Roma* III, eds. Roberto Valentini and Giuseppe Zucchetti (Roma: tipografia del Senato, 1946), 375-422.

¹²⁷ Vogel notes in "La *Descriptio*" (457-460) that many similarities are found in the prologues of the two texts and in the terms that the two writers use to describe their respective churches. The two texts are not identical, but enough commonalities exist to suggest that the two writers were familiar with each other's written work. Despite their different loyalties, the two churches' clerical communities served the same pope and were probably well acquainted.

The modern editors Valentini and Zucchetti included in their commentary on the *DBV* two short poems that had been bound into manuscript Vatic. 6757 after Mallio's text.¹²⁸

These poems had negatively referred to the Lateran basilica as "synagoga."¹²⁹

Here let the nations worship and revere the throne of Peter,
Let them adore the church of the Prince, head of the world and of the city.
I, the first parent, the mother, the head of churches,
Was established at the time when Peter held primacy among all
his companions, and God assigned it to me so that the clergy and people
Would consider me the cathedral of the Prince,
As the sole mistress and teacher of the world.
I glory in Peter and Paul, but you, O Synagogue,
Rejoice only in signs and ancient anointings,
I consider those men at once Jews and followers of Moses
Who believe that the old synagogue is the head church.
For in the absence of a similar Prince let that ancient symbol keep silent.¹³⁰

This application of the word "synagogue" to the Lateran basilica apparently stemmed from that Church's association with biblical Judaism, and showed that it was well known among clergy in Rome; nevertheless, the tone of this poem indicates the animosity between the clergy of the two churches. It also suggests that the canons' of the Lateran basilica openly

¹²⁸ Valentini and Zucchetti, introduction to *DBV*, 379.

¹²⁹ Vogel, Valentini and Zucchetti, and Freiberg all credit De Rossi with the discovery of the poems. The two short works are included in Vogel's *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae saec. VII antiquiores*, II (Roma, 1888), 195-196. Valentini and Zucchetti, in the introduction to the *DBV* (377), note that the author of the poems is not identified. The date of the text of the poems, the early thirteenth century, may indicate the atmosphere of increased support for St. Peter's in the reign of Innocent III (1198-1216). Freiberg, *The Lateran in 1600*, 340 n. 134.

¹³⁰ "Hic cathedram Petri populi venerentur, honorent / Principis ecclesiam, caput orbis et urbis adorent. / Tunc ego prima parens, mater, caput ecclesiarum / Constituta fui; socios cum Petrus in omnes / Primatum tenuit, Deus et mihi contulit illum, / Ut clarus populus cathedrales Principis aedes / Me solam dominam teneat orbisque magistram. / Glorior in Petro Paulo, sed ut, synagoga, / In signis tantum gaudes vetustisque lituris / Hos ego iudaeos reputo simul et moysistas, / Qui caput ecclesiae veterem credunt synagogam: / Principe absque pari taceat vetus illa figura." *DBV*, 379. The English translation is from Freiberg, *The Lateran in 1600*, 34. Freiberg (33-34) calls the author of the above invective, "a partisan of St. Peter's." Valentini and Zucchetti also record (380) a second poem, probably also by Mallius, that carried similar sentiment: "Cum Petrus ecclesiae det pallia, non Lateranum, / Linguosi tacitam ponit in ore manum, / Et caput et princeps Laterani Petrus habetur, / Ut fidei pietas omnibus una detur. / Hic Vaticanum fuit antea quam Lateranum, / Cum Petrus esset ibi tractus ab ore canum, / Raptus et inde fuit, rediit tamen, ut locus idem / Per stabilem toto praesit in orbe fidem."

claimed that connection and its ancient prestige; one facet of that venerable connection was the basilica's supposed possession of the Temple Treasures.

In 1145, Nicolaus Maniacutius, a Cistercian monk probably brought to the Lateran basilica by Pope Eugenius III in early 1145, composed his text, the *HIS* and described the origin and history of the Temple Treasures in Rome. Nicolaus proclaimed that the spoils from the Jewish Temple had been brought to Rome in the first century by Titus, and referred to the relief sculptures of the Arch of Titus in the Forum, as visual evidence that those Treasures were in Rome:

At that time, the ark and tablets, the candelabrum and trumpets, and other vessels of the Temple had been carried away to Rome, or at least those vessels that are read about in the Second book of Maccabees or those that had been concealed in another way by the patriarchs following the restoration of the Temple, and which obviously appear on the triumphal arch which was erected for the divine Titus, by the son of the divine Vespasian, by the Senate and People of Rome.¹³¹

Nicolaus further explained that in his day the relics of biblical Judaism, the Temple Treasures, were enclosed in the main altar of the Lateran basilica. Many other relics in the Lateran Palace were contained in the private papal chapel, the Sancta Sanctorum:

Indeed, all that is sacred, which was carried off from Jerusalem, was contained in the sacred altar of the Lateran, where this image of the Savior was preserved for a long time, until it inspired the high priest of the Lord, so that he removed it to the Palace, and indeed placed it with honor above the most holy altar of the basilica of Blessed Lawrence, which is in the Sancta Sanctorum.¹³²

¹³¹ "Tunc arca, et tabulae, candelabrum, et tubae, atque alia vasa templi Romam delata sunt, seu illa utique, quae Jeremias occultasse in secundo Machabeorum libro legitur, seu alia post restaurationem templi a Patribus sequentibus condita, quod evidenter apparet in arcu triumphali, quem erexit Divo Tito Divi Vespasiani filio Senatus, Populusque Romanus." Maniacutius *HIS* 322.

¹³² "Sane omnia illa Sacra, quae de Hierosolymis asportata fuerunt, in Sacro Lateranensis Patriarchii continentur Altari, ubi et haec Salvatoris Imago longo tempore conservata est, donec Summo Pontifici Dominus inspiravit, ut eam in Palatium hoc subveheret, atque super Altare Sacrosanctae Basilicae B. Laurentii, quae est ad Sancta Sanctorum, honorifice collocaret." Maniacutius *HIS* 323.

According to Gerhard Wolf, Nicolaus's designation of the papal chapel as the Sancta Sanctorum, was the first time that the chapel in the Lateran was known as the "Holy of Holies."¹³³ Erik Thunø traced the use of the term in biblical Judaism to not just the holiest space in the moveable sanctuary of the ancient Hebrews or in the Temple in Jerusalem, but also to the Temple Treasures, other Temple implements and offerings. In Christian tradition, the term Sancta Sanctorum has been applied to "the community of Christians, the Church or its altar, the inner part of the baptistery, or for God himself, both the Father and the Son . . . [also] the altar and its relics, or simply the relics themselves."¹³⁴ Thunø notes that an ancient cypress chest attributed to the reign of Pope Leo III (795-816) in the papal chapel still carries the inscription, "SCA SCO RU," or Sancta Sanctorum.¹³⁵ The presence of that chest within the papal chapel in the late eleventh and twelfth century is evident from its mention in the *DLE*. Even though the term Sancta Sanctorum had been used previously for several different sacred objects, places, or for God himself, if Nicolaus's attribution of that term to the papal chapel as a whole was new in 1145, it indeed signaled a heightened identification of the Church as the New Temple and the pope as the new high priest.

In the *Historia*, Nicolaus used several phrases that directly referred back to the Old Testament texts' stories of the Temple Treasures and the Holy of Holies:

For at that time only the high priest was allowed to enter within the Sancta Sanctorum, so that only the pope may celebrate the divine mysteries; no one, except that one, the high priest himself, entered into this place in remembrance

¹³³ Gerhard Wolf, " 'Laetare filia sion. Ecce ego venio et habitabo in medio tui': Images of Christ Transferred to Rome from Jerusalem," *Jewish Art* 23/24 (1997/1998), 423; Gerhard Wolf, *Salus Populi Romani, Die Geschichte römischer Kultbilder im Mittelalter* (Weinheim: VCH, 1990), 64, 271 n. 239.

¹³⁴ Erik Thunø, *Image and Relic, Mediating the Sacred in Early Medieval Rome* (Rome, 2002), 163.

¹³⁵ Thunø, *Image and Relic*, 163. Thunø credits the research of Otto Nussbaum, in "Sancta Sanctorum," *Romische Quartalschrift* 54 (1959): 234-246, for the basis of his investigation into the term *Sancta Sanctorum*.

of death, and because we rush to death through Eve, no woman is allowed to enter.¹³⁶

In his text, Nicolaus compared the Synagogue to the Church, and the Jewish high priest to the pope, thus directly indicating parallels between Judaism and Christianity, further legitimating Christianity's direct inheritance of the Old Covenant from Judaism. He related the Old Covenant presence of Yahweh in a cloud within the Holy of Holies, to Christ's presence in the *Acheropita*, a revered icon of Jesus that was kept in the Sancta Sanctorum:

O most true promise of the Savior, in this place we determine now to be fulfilled, that which was promised in return to the Disciples: "Behold," saying, "I am with you for all days," as long as he displays his person in a certain way through this image, which will remain in his Vicar's Palace. Moreover, in it, he is seen to distinguish this Sanctuary of the Church from the Sanctuary of the Synagogue, because the majesty of the Lord, as often as he appeared there in a cloud, lasts continuously in this Image; and so the Lord indeed promises through the Prophet of the Church: "Rejoice and be glad, O daughter Zion; behold I am coming, and I am living in the midst of you."¹³⁷

In the above passage, Nicolaus referred to several verses from the Old Testament that described the early history of the Temple Treasures. "The majesty of the Lord, as often as He appeared there in a cloud," refers to the cloud that filled the *devir*, the Holy of Holies in the moveable tabernacle of the Hebrews when the ark was first placed within it.¹³⁸ Another sentence from Nicolaus's *Historia*, "Rejoice and be glad, O daughter Zion; behold I am coming, and I am living in the midst of you," reinforced that the Old Covenant promise of

¹³⁶ "Nam ut intra Sancta Sanctorum soli Summo Pontifici licebat olim intrare, ita super hoc Altare soli Summo Pontifici divina licet mysteria celebrare; illuc praeter ipsum Pontificem nemo ingrediebatur, huc in memoriam mortis, quam per Evam incurrimus, femina non ingreditur." Maniacutius *HIS* 323.

¹³⁷ "O verissima promissio Salvatoris, nam et in hoc impleri cernimus, quod Discipulis repromisit: 'ecce Ego,' inquit, 'vobiscum sum omnibus diebus,' dum in Palatio, quo Vicarii ejus resident, suam quodammodo personam per hanc Imaginem exhibet. Videtur autem et hoc Ecclesiae Sanctuarium in eo excellere Sanctuarium Synagogae, quia majestas Domini, quae illic quandoque apparebat in nube, hic continue permanet in Imagine; sic enim Ecclesiae per Prophetam Dominus pollicetur: Gaude, et laetare filia Zion; ecce Ego venio, et habito in medio tui." Maniacutius *HIS* 323.

¹³⁸ III Rg. 8:6, 10-11.

Yahweh to the ancient Hebrews was fulfilled by Jesus.¹³⁹ While Nicolaus's references to biblical texts was not unusual among religious writers of his era, his claim that the Temple Treasures were contained within the high altar of the Lateran basilica brought those relics of the ancient Hebrews into the Lateran clergy's argument for primacy in Rome, by focusing on that Church's centuries-old, special relationship with Judaism. His direct analogy between the moveable Sanctuary of the Hebrews and the Sancta Sanctorum at the Lateran Palace reinforced that relationship. Gerhard Wolf states that "the pair of opposites Synagogue – Church is put into concrete terms by Nikolaus through the antithesis – and the transition – from the Temple of Solomon (e.g., the Temple of Herod) to the Lateran."¹⁴⁰

Another explanation for Nicolaus' focus on the Temple Treasures may have been his familiarity with the original eleventh-century *DLE*, which contained some common elements with the *Historia*. The third edition of the *DLE*, revised and re-issued by John the Deacon at the Lateran circa 1170, contains an addition at its end by Nicolaus, according to Valentini and Zucchetti.¹⁴¹ Nicolaus may well have been very familiar with the first version of the *DLE*, added his own writings to it, and included parts of the *DLE* in the *Historia*. Perhaps also because of the knowledge of the *DLE* among clergy of the Lateran basilica and St. Peter's, Nicolaus had decided to use portions of it in his own text, the *Historia*.

These texts demonstrate the pervasive association of the Lateran basilica with Judaism and a desire among several writers between circa 1140 and 1180, John the Deacon, Nicolaus

¹³⁹ III Rg. 6:12-13.

¹⁴⁰ "Der Gegensatz Synagoge – Ecclesia wird von Nikolaus knokretisiert durch die Antithese – und den Übergang – vom Templum Salomonis (bzw. Herodis) zum Lateran." Wolf, *Salus Populi Romani*, 64. Translation by Sarah Ross.

¹⁴¹ Valentini and Zucchetti, introduction to *DLE*, 323.

Maniacutius, Benedict, and Benjamin of Tudela, to proclaim that the Temple Treasures were in Rome, and even contained in the Lateran basilica's high altar.

That recurring proclamation that the Church held the Temple Treasures drew on the long history of those Treasures, from their creation by the ancient Hebrews to their loss in the destruction of the Temple, and reflected the reverence and awe that was still accorded to their memory in the twelfth century, among both Christians and Jews. From the early Middle Ages through the twelfth century, the attitudes of Christians and the papacy toward the Jews of the pre-Christian era diverged from their attitudes toward the Jews in contemporary society.

Papal treatment of those two different components of ancient Judaism and medieval Jewish society clearly indicates the complexity of papal attitudes in the twelfth century.

CHAPTER III
CHRISTIAN AND JEWISH RELATIONS AND INTERACTIONS
FROM THE CHURCH FATHERS TO THE TWELFTH-CENTURY POPES

Interactions between the twelfth-century popes Eugenius III and Alexander III, and the Roman Jewish community were guided by centuries of Christian tradition regarding the Jews' place in Christian society, and grounded in numerous papal precedents. The texts of the Pauline epistles that concern the Jews and were incorporated into the New Testament exercised great weight on developing Christian-Jewish relations; however, the doctrinal foundations of twelfth-century papal actions were rooted particularly in the writings of Augustine of Hippo (354-430) and Pope Gregory I (r. 590-604).¹ Those two Fathers of the Church wrote that the dispersed Jews should be preserved within Christian society as witnesses and living testimonials to the obvious error of their continued anticipation of the Messiah. Augustine and Gregory both wrote that although the Jews had erred, they deserved the traditional protections of Roman law, while continuing to live within the restrictions set forth by Roman legal precedents and developing Christian doctrine.

From the earliest centuries of Christianity, some Christian clergy expressed attitudes about the Jews that were harsher than those of Augustine or Gregory. These writings have been collectively termed *adversus Judaeos* literature, and generally claimed that the Jews

¹ According to Jeremy Cohen, Augustine of Hippo, through his many works, tremendously influenced medieval theologians' writings about the Jews. The exegetical texts of Pope Gregory the Great drew on the Augustinian tradition and Roman law that was still followed in his day in developing his view of the Jews' place in medieval society. Jeremy Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law, Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 15-17. As pope, the letters of Gregory to other bishops regarding the treatment of Jews established precedents and had great effect on later popes, especially in their official proclamations of protection for the Jews in the twelfth century. Shlomo Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews: History, Studies and Texts* 109 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1991), 10-12. Attention will be focused on the writings of primarily these two Fathers of the Church, along with brief mention of other important influences on papal attitudes toward the Jews and Judaism, to understand the basis of the twelfth-century popes' perspectives.

possessed an evil nature and blamed them for the crime of deicide.² By the late eleventh century and the beginning of the Crusade movement, complex attitudes had developed toward the Jews in Christian society; antagonism toward the Muslim occupants of the Holy Land fed the Crusaders' furor that erupted in the massacres of many Jews in Northern Europe. In the twelfth century the papacy issued repeated directives to protect the Jews, and many instances of Christians protecting groups of Jews did occur. Still, despite those papal decrees, violence toward European Jews continued to recur sporadically after the First Crusade, and accusations of Jewish atrocities against Christians that began in the 1140s, slowly spread throughout European society.

Despite the negative attitudes of many Christians, some Christian scholars enjoyed close contact with their Jewish counterparts, and even depended on Jews for assistance with translating Hebrew texts. One of those scholars, Nicolaus Maniacutius, was a close associate of Pope Eugenius III from Eugenius's days as the abbot of S. Anastasius at Tre Fontane in Rome. A Cistercian monk, Nicolaus had joined S. Anastasius circa 1140, and probably followed Eugenius to the Lateran in February of 1145 when his abbot was elected pope. Before coming to the Lateran, Nicolaus's work as a Christian exegete brought him into close contact with Jewish biblical scholars. The comradeship that Nicolaus expressed in his contact with Jewish exegetes went beyond mere tolerance and may have suggested an attitude that was shared with his former abbot. Apparently Nicolaus worked closely with some Jewish scholars and respected their knowledge. Nicolaus's attitude toward the Jews, which may be discerned from his writings, may help to explain Eugenius's actions toward the Roman Jews.

² See Rosemary Radford Reuther, "The *Adversus Judaeos* Tradition in the Church Fathers: The Exegesis of Christian Anti-Judaism," in *Aspects of Jewish Culture in the Middle Ages* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1979). A complete overview of the *adversus Judaeos* literature is outside of the scope of this dissertation; however, a selection of important and influential writers in that genre will be presented.

During their papal reigns, Eugenius III and Alexander III not only emphasized the Church's claim to have inherited the Old Covenant of biblical Judaism, but also maintained a relationship with Roman Jews that was perhaps more than mere tolerance. The Roman Jews' probable support for Eugenius III during the early days of his pontificate may have established a relationship of mutual respect. Alexander's employment of the Jew Jeziel as the steward of his papal household in the 1160s indicated not only closer papal relations with the Roman Jewish community, but also intimate trust on the highest levels of the Church. These popes' actions regarding the Jews were the result of various influences: their personal attitudes toward the Jews combined with centuries of Christian tradition, doctrine, and papal precedent. During the same decades, the 1160s, the revision of the *Descriptio Lateranensis ecclesiae* [DLE] by John the Deacon for Pope Alexander emphasized the claim that the Temple Treasures of the ancient Hebrews were contained in the high altar of the Lateran. By their actions to focus attention on the Church's claim to have the Treasures and support that claim, both Eugenius III and Alexander III indicated a heightened acknowledgement of the Church's inheritance of biblical Judaism. It is precisely the parallel papal attitudes toward biblical Judaism and contemporary Jews that characterize the latter twelfth century as unique.

The Relationship between Christianity and Judaism

The Separation of Christianity from Judaism

To fully understand the meaning behind Eugenius and Alexander's attitudes toward the Jews and biblical Judaism, it is necessary to explain the origin of the relationship between Christians and Jews, and how that relationship gradually developed and changed over the centuries. The close connection between the early Christians and the Jews was broken and distorted by each group's actions to de-legitimize the other, so as to enhance its own

legitimacy.³ Christianity began within the belief system of Judaism, sharing a common origin, revering some of the same divinely-inspired texts, and holding fast to several common elements of faith.⁴ Christian disagreements with some Jewish beliefs, anti-Judaism, eventually changed to anti-Semitism and beliefs that the Jews retained an inherently evil nature. A clear distinction must be made first between anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism, two distinctly different attitudes. According to Gavin Langmuir, “anti-Judaism is a nonrational reaction to overcome nonrational doubts, while anti-Semitism is an irrational reaction to repressed rational doubts.”⁵ Anti-Judaism involved a nonrational disagreement with the Jews about personal beliefs over Jesus’ divinity; therefore, the initial dispute that separated the early Christians from the larger faith community of the Jews was the “nonrational” belief that Jesus was divine.⁶ The concept of a promised Messiah was familiar to Jews at the time of

³ Gavin Langmuir, *History, Religion, and Antisemitism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 282-283. Numerous historians of religion have written extensively about the relationship between Judaism and Christianity in the first centuries of the Common Era. For further reading see Alan T. Davies, *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979); Jules Isaac, *The Teaching of Contempt: Christian Roots of Anti-Semitism* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964); James Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue. A Study in the Origins of Antisemitism*, reprint of first edition, (London: Soncino Press, 1934; New York: Atheneum, 1969). ; Rosemary Radford Reuther, *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism* (New York: Seabury, 1974); Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel Étude sur les relations entre chrétiens et juifs dans l’empire romain (135-425)* (Paris, 1964).

⁴ *Jewish-Christian Encounters over the Centuries, Symbiosis, Prejudice, Holocaust, Dialogue*, Marvin Perry and Frederick M. Schweitzer, eds. (New York: Peter Lang, 1994), ix; Langmuir, *History, Religion, and Antisemitism* (283) succinctly states that the difficulties between Christianity and Judaism were a “birth trauma,” precisely because the ancient heritage that Christians cited as proof of their legitimacy was shared with Jews.

⁵ Langmuir, *History, Religion, and Antisemitism*, 276. While other historians may offer different distinctions between anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism, Langmuir’s definitions of the two attitudes will be used in this paper.

⁶ This writer will use the term “early Christians” to denote any follower of Jesus Christ during the first three centuries of the Common Era. For a full discussion of the historiographic dangers in the broad use of the term, see Gavin Langmuir, “The Faith of Christians and Hostility to Jews,” *Christianity and Judaism* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1992), 77-78. Langmuir, *History, Religion, and Antisemitism*, (277) proposes that Jesus’ appeal centered on his claim of a unique and direct contact with the God of the Jews, while using symbols that were familiar to all Jews.

Jesus's ministry, but a majority of Jews in Judea refused to acknowledge that He was the one they awaited.⁷

In the gospel accounts of Jesus' life, the stories of the confrontations between Jesus and the Jews in Jerusalem have been blamed for continuing antagonism between Christians and Jews since the Early Christian era.⁸ The New Testament accounts describe the growing clash between the Jewish hierarchy and Jesus, to the point that they called for his punishment by the Romans. While the Roman Governor of Judea, Pontius Pilate, ordered the execution of Jesus because He was viewed as a possible political threat to Roman rule, the writers of the New Testament accounts generally blamed the Jews more than the Romans for Jesus' tortuous crucifixion and death.⁹ Soon after Jesus' execution in Jerusalem, a public profession of Jesus's divinity by some of His followers within the Jewish community resulted in the violent death of His disciple Stephen, who was ordered executed by the Jewish elders after his conviction by the Sanhedrin for blasphemy.¹⁰ The Jews' violent reaction to early disciples of Jesus such as Stephen demonstrated the strong emotional response that was evoked by his challenge to orthodox belief, much like Christianity's response to heretical movements through Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. This conflict continued even while the first Judeo-Christians, Jews who accepted that Jesus was the Messiah, followed Judaic law and

⁷ A different perspective may be found in the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, which calls early Christianity "a Jewish messianic sect." *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s.v., "Christianity," 507.

⁸ Wolfgang S. Seiferth, *Synagogue and Church in the Middle Ages: Two Symbols in Art and Literature* (New York: Ungar, 1970): 18-19.

⁹ Daniel Harrington, "The Jewishness of Jesus: Facing Some Problems," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987), 12; Norman A. Beck, "The New Testament and the Teaching of Contempt," *Jewish-Christian Encounters over the Centuries: Symbiosis, Prejudice, Holocaust, Dialogue* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994), 88-89.

¹⁰ Acts 7:54-59. Langmuir, *History, Religion, and Antisemitism* (281) posits that the Jewish authorities initially reacted vehemently to Jesus's Jewish followers, but paid less and less attention to them during the first three centuries of the Common Era, since more gentiles than Jews eventually joined the early Christian community. According to Gager, in *Origins* (115), gentile converts to Christianity did not bring anti-Semitic attitudes with them into the Church.

worshipped in the Temple.¹¹ The differences between Christians and Jews, which began as a nonrational dispute, took on irrational vehemence as time went on, until Christian accusations of the Jews' inherently evil nature could be categorized as anti-Semitic.¹²

A major turning point in the early Christians' existence within Judaism came with the teachings of Paul of Tarsus, who occupied a central place in the developing attitudes of Christians toward Jews. Paul's numerous statements about the Jews, that have survived in his written texts and were incorporated into the Christian New Testament, have contributed to Christianity's complex perspectives toward the Jews and Judaism over the centuries.¹³ During his mission Paul proclaimed that Jesus had replaced the Torah as the route to salvation, even though, as an educated Jew and a Pharisee, Paul knew the radical nature of his proclamation of salvation through faith in Jesus Christ.¹⁴

Truly Christ, the end of the law, is for the uprightness of all believing . . .¹⁵

Paul further presented his view of justification through Jesus, from the viewpoint of a Jew:

We Jews by nature and not sinners from the Gentiles, knowing that man is not judged by works of the law except through faith in Jesus Christ, we believe in Christ Jesus, so that we may be judged through the promise of Christ and not

¹¹ Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 6. According to Kenneth Stow, in *Alienated Minority, The Jews of Medieval Latin Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 13, these early Christians carried many Jewish ritual traditions into Christianity, such as "table fellowship and the sacred meal."

¹² Langmuir, *History, Religion, and Antisemitism*, (259) cites disputes within the Church, doctrinal decrees of Church Councils since the fourth century, and the Inquisition of the thirteenth century as evidence of the often vehement reaction of orthodoxy to what may be perceived as heretical and dangerous. Paralleling the Church's actions in those instances with the increasingly violent Christian treatment of Jews and Judaism in the High Middle Ages further explains the often violent attacks on Jewish communities in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. R. I Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society, Power and Deviance in Western Europe 950-1250* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 29-34.

¹³ Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 393.

¹⁴ Gager, *Origins of Antisemitism*, 115.

¹⁵ ". . . finis enim legis Christus ad iustitiam omni credenti," Rm 10:4.

through works of the law, because through works of the law, no flesh of any man will be judged.¹⁶

This perceived disavowal of the basis of Jewish life resulted in a severe reaction of some Jews against Paul and the beginnings of the definitive independence of the followers of Jesus from Judaism.¹⁷

Paul reserved for the Jews, his own people, a special place in the coming salvation of all and revered them as the people of the Covenant, but also acknowledged the Jews' blindness to the divinity of Jesus.

Did I say that God rejected His people for he is distant? I am an Israelite from the race of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God has not rejected his people whom he knew before. Surely you are not ignorant of Elijah, and how Scripture says he intercedes with God against Israel? . . . So at this time, the remainder, are made the chosen according to grace, but by grace, not from works, otherwise grace is not grace. Therefore what Israel was seeking, this it did not attain. On the other hand, the chosen reached it, for the rest were truly blinded . . . Therefore, I say, did they offend so that they should diminish? He is distant, but through their offense is the salvation of the Gentiles, but if the offense of those Jews are the wealth of the world, and if their decrease is the wealth of the Gentiles, how much more their full number.¹⁸

The idea that the Jews who rejected Jesus were “truly blinded” to the truth, and that by “their offense is the salvation of the Gentiles,” would be repeated in the writings of Augustine, Gregory I, and even in the twelfth-century papal protection of the Jews.

¹⁶ “. . . nos natura Iudaei et non ex gentibus peccatores scientes autem quod non iustificatur homo ex operibus legis nisi per fidem Iesu christi et nos in Christo Iesu credidimus ut iustificemur ex fide Christi et non ex operibus legis propter quod ex operibus legis non iustificabitur omnis caro . . .” Gal 2:15-16.

¹⁷ Gager, *Origins of Antisemitism*, 115; Langmuir, *History, Religion, and Antisemitism*, 281; *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s.v. “Christianity,” 507-508.

¹⁸ “. . . dico ergo numquid reppulit Deus populum suum absit nam et ego Israhelita sum ex semine Abraham tribu Benjamin non reppulit Deus plebem suam quam praesciit an nescitis in Helia quid dicit scriptura quemadmodum interpellat Deum adversus Israhel, Domine prophetas tuos occiderunt altaria tua suffoderunt et ego relictus sum solus et quaerunt animam meam . . . sic ergo et in hoc tempore reliquiae secundum electionem gratiae factae sunt si autem gratia non ex operibus alioquin gratia iam non est gratia quid ergo quod quaerebat Israhel hoc non est consecutus electio autem consecuta est ceteri vero excaecati sunt . . . dico ergo numquid sic offenderunt ut caderent absit sed illorum delicto salus gentibus ut illos aemulentur quod si delictum illorum divitiae sunt mundi et deminutio eorum divitiae gentium quanto magis plenitudo eorum. . .” Ro 11:1-3, 5-7, 11-12.

John Gager interprets Paul's views to mean that since the Jews were the first to receive the law from God, they remained His first chosen people; even though the Jews had not accepted the truth, they still retained holiness.¹⁹ Jeremy Cohen, on the other hand, credits Paul's views with initiating centuries of complex and widely differing Christian attitudes toward Jews.²⁰ Even though modern scholars obviously continue to discuss and disagree over exactly what Paul meant by his statements, Paul's anti-Jewish texts that were incorporated into the canon of the New Testament were used by Christian writers after him against the Jews.²¹

Augustine and the Jews as Witnesses

Starting in the early centuries of Christianity, Christian theologians, writers, and leaders proclaimed the belief that the Jews had an essential role to play in Christian society and indeed in the ultimate salvation of all people at the end of the world. According to Jeremy Cohen, over the centuries from Augustine of Hippo (354-430) to Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), theologians and exegetes created the "hermeneutically crafted Jew . . . the Jew as constructed in the discourse of Christian theology, and above all in Christian theologians' interpretation of Scripture."²² Examining how key theologians and influential writers created the Jews' particular position within Christian doctrine and in medieval Christian society helps

¹⁹ Gager, *Origins of Antisemitism*, 260-261.

²⁰ Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 393.

²¹ Robert Michael, in "Antisemitism and the Church Fathers," *Jewish-Christian Encounters over the Centuries: Symbiosis, Prejudice, Holocaust, Dialogue*, ed. by Marvin Perry and Frederick M. Schweitzer (New York: Peter Lang, 1994), 105, suggests that Paul's original intent may have merely been to discourage Judaizing among Christians, which will be discussed in the context of John Chrysostom's preaching. Michael suggests that Paul's original intent was then misread and manipulated by the Patristic writers. The numerous studies of St. Paul's writings continue to grow and include: Jouette M. Bassler, ed., *Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991); Daniel Harrington, *Paul on the Mystery of Israel* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992); Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989); Stephen Westerholm, *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988).

²² Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 5. Hermeneutics is defined by *Webster's New World Dictionary* as the science of interpretation, especially the study of the principles of Biblical exegesis.

to explain how papal attitudes toward the Jews developed into the complex perspectives of the twelfth century.

Augustine's numerous works probably exerted the most pervasive and long-lasting influence on the theology and doctrine of the Christian Church, and provided the basis for the Church's policies toward the Jews in the Middle Ages.²³ In his monumental work, *The City of God*, written soon after the Visigothic sack of Rome in 410, Augustine expressed the idea that Jerusalem had been destroyed and the Jews had been dispersed by the Romans to provide lasting testimony in Christian society to the incompleteness and inadequacy of the Jews' religious traditions.²⁴

But the Jews who slew him, and would not believe in Him, because it behoved Him to die and rise again, were yet more miserably wasted by the Romans, and utterly rooted out from their kingdom, where aliens had already ruled over them, and were dispersed through the lands (so that indeed there is no place where they are not), and are thus by their own Scriptures a testimony to us that we have not forged the prophecies about Christ. . . . And therefore He has not slain them, that is, he has not let the knowledge that they are Jews be lost in them, although they have been conquered by the Romans, lest they should forget the law of God, and their testimony would be of no avail in this matter of which we treat. But it was not enough that he should say, "Slay them not, lest they should at last forget Thy law," unless he had also added, "Disperse them;" because if they had only been in their own land with that testimony of the Scriptures, and not everywhere, certainly the Church which is everywhere could not have had them as witnesses among all nations to the prophecies which were sent before concerning Christ.²⁵

Augustine's claim that the Romans' defeat of the Jews fulfilled God's plan, according to prophecies in the Jews' own Scriptures, was used and embellished by Nicolaus Maniacutius in the *Historia Imaginis Salvatoris [HIS]*.²⁶ Nicolaus wrote of Titus's motivation

²³ Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 19.

²⁴ Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 83, 32.

²⁵ Augustine *The City of God* XVIII.46.

²⁶ Wolf, " 'Laetare filia Sion' ," 425.

to destroy Jerusalem and bring the sacred image of Christ, the *Acheropita*, to Rome along with the Temple Treasures, in effect Christianizing Titus:²⁷

And we believe that Titus venerated this image, because he heard that it was the figure of the one the Jews had crucified, and for whose retribution they suffered so greatly. And it was the enactment of this retribution that had healed Titus from cancer.²⁸

Moreover, Nicolaus stated that in addition to being the agents of divine will, Titus led the Romans to defeat the Jews because of their crime of killing Jesus. As Gerhard Wolf explains, “Titus, who could see himself as the one to carry out the divine will against those who had killed Christ, had venerated the painting and was healed by it.”²⁹

Augustine also claimed that the Jews and their holy books continued to fulfill an essential role in Christian society, in their prophecies of the Messiah:³⁰

And if they [Jews] had not sinned against Him with impious curiosity, which seduced them like magic arts, and drew them to strange gods and idols, and at last led them to kill Christ, their kingdom would have remained to them, and would have been, if not more spacious, yet more happy, than that of Rome. And now that they are dispersed through almost all lands and nations, it is through the providence of that one true God; that whereas the images, altars, groves, and temples of the false gods are everywhere overthrown, and their sacrifices prohibited, it may be shown from their books how this has been foretold by their prophets so long before; lest, perhaps, when they should be read in ours, they might seem to be invented by us.³¹

²⁷ Nicolaus focused the *HIS* primarily on the history and tradition surrounding the *Acheropita*, a painted icon of Jesus believed then to be of divine origin and to have been among the spoils which the Romans had brought to Rome in the first century with the Temple Treasures. Since the eighth century, documents attest to the central place that the *Acheropita* held in the ecclesiastical life of Rome, especially the position of the icon in the Assumption Eve procession from the Lateran basilica to S. Maria Maggiore. Although the painted image is in an advanced state of deterioration today, scholars believe that it originally consisted of a seated figure of Christ holding a book in one arm, with the other hand raised in blessing. The *HIS* of Nicolaus is a vital primary source in this dissertation in regard to papal acknowledgment of biblical Judaism, therefore the *Acheropita* will be referred to only as it reflects on the central questions in this investigation. For further reading, see Gerhard Wolf, *Salus populi Romani* (Weinheim: VCH, 1990).

²⁸ “Magnopere autem credimus Titum hanc Imaginem fuisse reveritum, audiens figuram illius esse, quem Judaei crucifixerant, in cujus ultionem haec omnia passi essent, et quem ipse dudum vindicare proponens a cancri ulcere sit curatus.” Maniacutius, *HIS*, 322-323. Translation by Gerhard Wolf, “‘Laetare filia Sion’,” 422.

²⁹ Wolf, *Salus populi Romani*, 63. Translation by Sarah Ross.

³⁰ Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 31-33.

³¹ Augustine, *The City of God* IV.34.

Thus the Jews, in their continued presence in Christian society, prove the existence of the prophecies that Augustine believed were fulfilled in Jesus. Since Christianity had been prefigured in Judaism, the Temple had been superseded by the Christian Church. Gerhard Wolf claims that in the *HIS*, Nicolaus emphasized the typology of *synagoga* and *ecclesia* throughout the entire text.³² That method of contrasting the Church/Christians as *ecclesia*, and Judaism/Jews as *synagoga*, continued to be used through the High Middle Ages in visual media and written texts.³³

Augustine gradually formed his own explanation of the Jews' place in Christendom, articulated in several texts between 397 and 429.³⁴ Jeremy Cohen has condensed what he calls Augustine's "doctrine of Jewish witness" into six essential points: (1) the Jews rejected Jesus, therefore they are dispersed in exile and servitude to Christians; (2) the Jews' present situation was foretold in the scripture and so their continued presence proves that Christianity is the proper and true successor to Judaism; (3) the Hebrew Bible, preserved by the Jews, gives the proof of Christianity's sound basis; the Jews serve Christian society in this way, while remaining ignorant of the true fulfillment of their holy books; (4) the loyalty of the Jews to their law, maintaining their way of life despite severe restriction, should be respected; (5)

³² Wolf, " 'Laetare filia Sion', " 424-425. According to Edward Lucie-Smith, in the *Dictionary of Art Terms* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1984), 193, typology is "the study of types of representation in iconography, particularly the study of the way in which figures and scenes from the Old Testament were thought to prefigure those found in the New." While Lucie-Smith's definition applies to visual representation, the comparison of Old Testament figures, events, and beliefs to those in the New Testament within the Christian textual tradition will be considered here as a typological representation using words.

³³ While a multitude of examples of the *ecclesia/synagoga* typology in visual media from the Middle Ages could be presented, this dissertation will restrict the discussion of that typology to textual media.

³⁴ Cohen states in *Living Letters of the Law* (35-41), that Augustine stated different parts of the six tenets of this doctrine in several texts: *Contra Faustum* (397-398), *De consensus evangelistarum* (circa 400), *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 58 (circa 414), *De civitate Dei* (420-425), *De fide rerum invisibilium* (420-425), and *Tractatus adversus Iudaeos* (circa 429), along with several sermons and letters.

“Slay them not, lest at any time they forget your law; scatter them in your might;”³⁵ this injunction forbids violence against Jews, and prohibits any interference with Jewish religious rituals, while also justifying the Jews’ continued dispersion from their homeland; (6) the Jews will be converted eventually; in the meantime, they are invaluable as witnesses and as contrasts to Christian society.³⁶ Jewish stereotypes that developed in the Middle Ages were based on Christian belief in the special role of the Jews in Christian salvation, but also on the belief in the Jews’ stubbornness and blindness to Christian truth.³⁷ The belief that the Jews fulfilled a purpose as witnesses consigned them to a distinct place in Christian society.³⁸

While Augustine’s words must have helped to protect many Jews, his doctrine nevertheless relegated the Jews to a status inferior to Christians. Still, despite his strong influence on later doctrines of the Church, apparently not all Christians followed the teachings of Augustine. According to him, Jews could only see the literal sense of the law, while Christians could interpret the spiritual or allegorical sense; the Jews were a link between the earthly realm and the heavenly realm, and reminded Christian society of the promise of the eventual apocalypse when they would be converted; and the Jews had remained static in doctrinal development after the fall of the Temple.³⁹ Nicolaus Maniacutius and other

³⁵ The above quotation is directly from Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 36. Both Cohen and Shlomo Simonsohn, in *History*, 5, cite Psalm 59:12 as the source of the admonition, “Slay them not . . .” The Latin *Vulgate, Psalmi iuxta Hebraeos* includes that verse as Psalm 58:12, and the text reads, “Deus ostendit mihi in insidiatoribus meis ne occidas eos ne forte obliviscantur populi mei disperge eos in fortitudine tua et destrue eos protector noster Domine.” The entire verse may be translated as: “O God, reveal to me in my treachery, May you not slay them, that by chance my people may not forget. Disperse them in your strength, and destroy them, O Lord our shield.”

³⁶ Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 35-36.

³⁷ Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 5.

³⁸ Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 18.

³⁹ Within Judaism, continued rabbinic exegesis of sacred texts during the Middle Ages contradicted that supposition of Augustine’s. Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 59-65.

Christian scholars' communication with and dependence on Jewish scholars' exegesis of the Old Testament texts show that not all Christians took to heart the words of Augustine.

Christian Polemic against the Jews

Over the history of the Church, many prominent ecclesiastical writers produced polemical texts directed against Jewish beliefs and traditions, and eventually against the Jews themselves. This genre of Christian writing, known generally as *adversus Judaeos* literature, includes many texts that are both vehemently negative and extremely disparaging to Jews.⁴⁰ The Patristic texts, which contain some of the *adversus Judaeos* literature, were produced during the early centuries of Christianity, when the Christian Church was defining its hierarchy, doctrine, and proper Christian behavior.⁴¹ According to Rosemary Reuther, that literature generally adhered to a common theme, which stated that even though Jesus's coming had been predicted by the Hebrew prophets, the Jews continued to persist in their blind rejection of the Christian faith.⁴² The writers used textual passages from the Old Testament or Hebrew Bible to prove that Jesus was the fulfillment of Hebrew prophecies, and to contradict the opinions of rival rabbinic exegetes, who were analyzing the same texts.⁴³

On another level, the Patristic writers' attitudes toward Jews and Judaism became an integral part of how Christian society dealt with the Jews living within it, in legal, social, and

⁴⁰ The types of texts include debates from the early Church, as well as testimonials, thematic treatises, dialogues, disputations, liturgical dramas, and collections of sermons from all of Christian history. A sampling of the broad literature on the texts includes *Church, State, and Jew in the Middle Ages*, Robert Chazan, ed. (New York: Behrman House, Publ., 1980); A. Lukyn Williams, *Adversus Judaeos* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935); Michael Jones, "The Place of the Jews': Anti-Judaism and Theatricality in Medieval Culture," *Exemplaria* 12, no. 2 (Fall, 2000), 327-357.

Gager, *Origins of Antisemitism*, 153-154.

⁴¹ Beck, "The New Testament," 90-91.

⁴² Reuther, "The Adversus Judaeos Tradition," 28.

⁴³ Reuther, "The Adversus Judaeos Tradition," 27.

political terms.⁴⁴ Christianity's *theologiae gloriae*, or message of triumphalism, proclaimed that since Christianity had replaced Judaism as the true faith, the Jews' collective crime of deicide means that they will forever suffer, and moreover that their suffering is deserved because of their evil nature.⁴⁵ In the fourth century, Eusebius of Caesarea wrote of the Jews:

The same author [Philo] shows that, besides these, countless other revolutions were stirred up in Jerusalem itself, indicating that revolts and wars and mutual machinations of evil never departed the city and all Judaea from that time until the time when, as the last episode of all, the siege under Vespasian came upon them. In this way, then, did the events of divine justice pursue the Jews for the crimes which they committed against Christ.⁴⁶

Even the Jews of antiquity were portrayed as rejecters of the prophets; their rejection of Jesus, the final prophet, confirmed their true character. In the eyes of these Christian writers, all of Jewish history took on an evil character heading toward the climax, the Jews' rejection and execution of Jesus.⁴⁷

The Church Fathers used Judaism to legitimize Christianity while still undermining the Jewish people. First, by encompassing Jewish history and scripture within Christianity, the new religion gained an ancient history and respectability. Second, denigrating the Jews prevented Christians from being enticed back to Judaism. Third, using Judaism as a contrast enabled Christianity to establish its identity and define its legitimacy against that of the Jews. Since Christianity had to preserve its connection with Judaism in order to derive ancient legitimacy from it, Christianity continued to revere the pre-Christian form of Judaism while reviling contemporary Jews. Fourth, the Jews became a scapegoat for all ills within Christian

⁴⁴ Reuther, "The *Adversus Judaeos* Tradition," 30.

⁴⁵ Michael, "Antisemitism and the Church Fathers," 102. Michael also claims that such attitudes began with the Church Fathers' writings from the first eight centuries of the Common Era.

⁴⁶ Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* II.6.

⁴⁷ Reuther explains that over time the Jews were accused of idolatry, sensuousness, blasphemy, rebelliousness, adultery, and carnality. Reuther, "The *Adversus Judaeos* Tradition," 30-31.

society. Fifth, some Christian writers followed a tradition called *Concordia Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, which emphasized that certain aspects of Judaism, particularly the traditions of prophecy, monotheism, and ethics, must be seen and noted within Christianity. That tradition placed emphasis on those aspects of ancient Judaism that were valuable to Christians.⁴⁸ The Church's claim to possess the Temple Treasures of the ancient Hebrews in the twelfth century used those elements from ancient, biblical Judaism because of their value to Christian authority. At that time, the Church claimed that those physical elements from biblical Judaism were present in the high altar of the Lateran. The perception that the pope celebrated Holy Thursday Eucharist over the ark of the covenant transformed the Temple Treasures into quasi-Christian relics, thus further supporting the Church's claim to be the rightful inheritor of the Old Covenant.⁴⁹

As Christian polemic developed against Judaism, a dualism grew within Christian theology, which increasingly pitted Judaism against Christianity as direct opposites. Judaism was viewed as a literal religion, while Christianity was spiritual. Judaism was viewed as static, frozen in an unredeemed state, while Christianity was the fulfillment of ancient prophecies and the route to eternal salvation. The Jews were condemned to suffer God's judgment, while Christians enjoyed God's promise of happiness. Each of these dualisms influenced Christian theology and doctrine, and added to the formation of regulations and restrictions on the lives of Jews in Christian society.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ Reuther, "The *Adversus Judaeos* Tradition," 42-43. The patriarchs of ancient Israel enjoy a special status within this tradition; they belong to a special class that supersedes the Jews as the original spiritual race. The traditional reverence for the Hebrew patriarchs may be found in both medieval art and literature. Michael, "Antisemitism and the Church Fathers," 107-108.

⁴⁹ Sible DeBlauuw, "The Solitary Celebration of the Supreme Pontiff. The Lateran Basilica as the New Temple in the Medieval Liturgy of Maundy Thursday," in *Omnes Circumstantes, Contributions Towards a History of the Role of the People in the Liturgy* (Kampen: Kok, 1990), 120-143.

⁵⁰ Reuther, "The *Adversus Judaeos* Tradition," 44-45.

One prominent voice of anti-Jewish polemic emerged from John Chrysostom (347-407), a bishop in Antioch during the same era as Augustine. John's rhetoric would leave a lasting influence on Christian attitudes toward the Jews.⁵¹ In a series of eight sermons to his Christian congregation in Antioch in 385, delivered because of his concern over the widespread celebration of Jewish festivals, John attacked the intrinsic character of the Jews in his attempts to persuade Christians to reject Jewish influences in their community.⁵² Many members of that community had continued to follow certain Jewish practices and rituals, to celebrate Jewish festivals, and to honor the Sabbath.⁵³ The attempts by fourth-century Church councils in both the eastern and western regions of Christendom to discourage Judaizing tendencies among Christians and stop the association of Christians with Jews indicate that judaizing by Christians was prevalent and considered to be a problem.⁵⁴ John Gager characterizes the language in John Chrysostom's sermons as anti-Semitic, since it did not

⁵¹ John Chrysostom had been educated as a scripture scholar and was ordained a priest in 385 in Antioch, a city that was still religiously pluralistic, with Jews, Christians, and pagans living side by side. According to Paul W. Harkins, trans., *Saint John Chrysostom, Discourses against Judaizing Christians* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1979), xxiii, the style of John's scriptural exegesis, in the manner of the School of Antioch, focused on the "literal, historical, and grammatical sense" of the sacred texts. His priestly ministry coincided with the edict which established Christianity as the official religion of the Roman Empire, proclaimed by the emperor Theodosius I in 380.

⁵² The Jewish and Christian communities in Antioch seem to have peacefully coexisted in the mid-third century CE, over a century before John Chrysostom delivered his sermons. Weitzmann and Kessler have demonstrated that probable situation from the common images used as patterns for narrative frescoes by both Christians and Jews at that time. Apparently relations between the two groups had significantly worsened by the late fourth century. See Kurt Weitzmann and Herbert L. Kessler, *The Frescoes of the Dura Synagogue and Christian Art* (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1990), 146-147.

⁵³ Gager, *Origins of Antisemitism*, 132-133; Leonard Victor Rutgers, "Archeological Evidence for the Interaction of Jews and Non-Jews in Late Antiquity," *American Journal of Archaeology* 96, No. 1 (January, 1992), 104; also see Shaye D. Cohen, "The Significance of Yavneh: Pharisees, Rabbis, and the End of Jewish Sectarianism," in *Origins of Judaism: Religion, History, and Literature in Late Antiquity* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1990).

⁵⁴ The Council of Elvira (300) decreed that Christians may not eat with Jews, and Christians may not have Jews bless their crops. The Council of Nicaea (325) set Sunday as the day of the week for the celebration of Easter, and said that it was not to occur at the same time as the Jewish Passover. The Council of Laodicea (360) specified that Christians were not to rest on the Sabbath (Saturday), but rather on Sunday, the Lord's Day. See Jacob R. Marcus, *The Jew in the Medieval World* (Cincinnati: The Sinai Press, 1938), 101-102, 105-106. John Gager interprets the continuing adherence of Christians to Jewish practices as evidence of "popular Christianity," as distinct from that of the clergy. Gager, *Origins of Antisemitism*, 133.

merely oppose Judaism, but saw sinister elements in individual Jews and advocated violence against Jews.⁵⁵ As John wrote:

Many, I know, respect the Jews and think that their present way of life is a venerable one. This is why I hasten to uproot and tear out this deadly opinion. I said that the synagogue is no better than a theater . . . the synagogue is not only a brothel and a theater; it also is a den of robbers and a lodging for wild beasts . . . when God forsakes a people, what hope of salvation is left? When God forsakes a place, that place becomes the dwelling of demons . . . If, then, the Jews fail to know the Father, if they crucified the Son, if they thrust off the help of the Spirit, who should not make bold to declare plainly that the synagogue is a dwelling of demons? God is not worshipped there. Heaven forbid! From now on it remains a place of idolatry. But still some people pay it honor as a holy place.⁵⁶

This inflammatory rhetoric encouraged a continuing anti-Jewish polemic from within the Christian Church, using some of the same arguments.⁵⁷

The Influence of Roman Law

The influence of Roman law on the lives of European Jews lasted well past the decline of Roman power in the west in the fifth century. Formulated and reiterated in the decrees of Roman emperors, Roman legal precedent exerted tremendous influence on the medieval popes as they formed papal policy toward the Jews.⁵⁸ As the Church gained power and authority, restrictions on Jewish life and activities increased. Jews in the Roman Empire enjoyed certain freedoms because Judaism had been regarded as a *religio licita* since the first-

⁵⁵ Gager, *Origins of Antisemitism*, 118-120.

⁵⁶ John Chrysostom *Discourses against Judaizing Christians*, I.III.1-3. .

⁵⁷ Cohen, in *Living Letters of the Law*, 15, agrees that John Chrysostom's rhetoric has much in common with the anti-Jewish rhetoric of the later Middle Ages, but that later polemic is much more than just a duplication of familiar themes; Gager, *Origins of Antisemitism*, 290 n. 5.

⁵⁸ Edward A. Synan, *The Popes and the Jews in the Middle Ages* (New York: Macmillan: 1965), 18. Although exact Jewish rights and privileges still differed somewhat from region to region because of the variations between local laws, this investigation is concerned with laws affected Jews throughout the Empire, and especially Rome. Gilbert Dahan, *The Christian Polemic against the Jews in the Middle Ages*, trans. by Jody Gladding (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1998), 14. It must be noted that the reorganization and codification of Roman law from 527-534 into the *Corpus iuris civilis* under the Byzantine emperor Justinian (r. 527-565) resulted in far-reaching and detrimental effects for the Jews within his empire, and primarily in the eastern portion, but apparently did not have a tremendous influence on the Jews in western Europe, until the late eleventh century, when the *Corpus* was discovered by western scholars.

century reign of Augustus; in 212, free Jews in the Empire were granted Roman citizenship by Caracalla.⁵⁹ With the advent of imperial Christianity in the fourth century, the Jews' status as citizens was maintained, but with increasing restrictions. Soon after consolidating his power in the western Roman Empire in 312 and declaring his support for the Christian Church, Constantine began to decree penalties and restrictions on the Jews and their practice of Judaism. In 315, Constantine decreed the death penalty by fire for any Jew who attacked another Jew who had converted to Christianity, and for any Christian who converted to Judaism. Marriages between Christian men and Jewish women were declared illegal in 339 by Emperor Constantius.⁶⁰

That firm bond between Christianity and the Roman Empire was briefly broken just two decades later, during the reign of Emperor Julian (360-363). With the troops' acclamation of Julian in Paris in 360, the only openly-pagan and Christian apostate emperor after Constantine I assumed the office.⁶¹ By November of 361 Julian had eliminated any rivals to the throne and began to publicly revere the pagan Gods, making thank-offerings and animal sacrifices. Imperial orders soon reopened the pagan temples and proclaimed that regular sacrifices be offered to the gods.⁶² Julian's antipathy to Christianity resulted in an improvement in the status of Judaism across the Empire, including an unexpected opportunity for Jews to rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem.⁶³

⁵⁹ Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 135; Avi-Yonah, *The Jews under Roman and Byzantine Rule*, 46.

⁶⁰ Marcus, *The Jew in the Medieval World*, 3-5.

⁶¹ G.W. Bowersock in *Julian the Apostate* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978), 18, states that Julian acted the role of the observant Christian for ten years in public service before being acclaimed emperor.

⁶² Bowersock in *Julian the Apostate* (61), claims that Julian acted very quickly to reinstate pagan religious practices, thus confirming that he secretly had harbored those sympathies all along, a fact corroborated by Julian's own letters. See *Julian Hymn to King Helios Dedicated to Sallust 353.B.C.*

⁶³ Since the Bar Cochba revolt, Jews had been officially forbidden to even enter the former site of the Temple, except for one day a year. Although the Roman authorities in Judea had gradually ignored that decree,

Julian's plan to rebuild the Temple apparently challenged the established hierarchy of Jewish authority in Palestine. Julian first met with Jewish leaders in Palestine and questioned their refusal to sacrifice as he had ordered, then commanded that the Temple be rebuilt when he learned that sacrifices could only be offered at the Temple.⁶⁴ Both the *Jerusalem Talmud* and the *Babylonian Talmud* contain almost no mention of the brief attempt to rebuild the Temple. That apparent silence in the Talmudic record may indicate a concern within rabbinic Judaism at that time, that if the Temple were rebuilt, the new high priest would then supersede the present patriarch in power and authority.⁶⁵ According to Judaic law, the current patriarch from the House of Hillel would not be eligible to be high priest. In addition, most of the Jewish leadership in Palestine were neutral about Julian's plan because the emperor was a gentile and an idolater; however, some rabbis did support Julian's plan.⁶⁶

While it is clear that the rebuilding effort did begin, it ended abruptly. Soon after actual construction of the Temple began in March of 363, natural disasters that were viewed as miraculous events ended the effort:

. . . on the following day, when they were about to lay the first foundation, a great earthquake occurred, and by the violent agitation of the earth stones were thrown up from the depths, by which those of the Jews who were engaged in the work were wounded . . . many were caught thereby, some perished immediately, others were found half-dead and mutilated . . . they had scarcely returned to the undertaking when fire burst suddenly from the

Constantine re-enforced it; when Julian came to power, the decree was officially revoked. M. Avi-Yonah, *The Jews of Palestine* (New York: Schocken Books, 1976), 195.

⁶⁴ Bowersock in *Julian the Apostate* (88, 89) claims that Julian was not especially sympathetic to Judaism, but acted to rebuild the Temple out of antipathy to Christianity, out of a common interest in public animal sacrifices such as the Jews had traditionally offered at the Temple, and to solicit the help of Jews in his campaign with the Persians to the East. Gager in *Origins of Antisemitism* (97) claims that Julian's main desire was the establishment of a "universal pagan church," and agrees that Julian's motivation for rebuilding the Temple was mainly to line up Jewish support in Judea for his war against the Persians. Julian did decisively improve the lot of Jews throughout the Empire by abolishing the *fiscus Judaicus* and even destroying the tax records so that no later emperor could re-establish the collection. Leon, *The Jews of Ancient Rome*, 31.

⁶⁵ Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate*, 90.

⁶⁶ Avi-Yonah, *The Jews of Palestine*, 197.

foundations of the Temple and consumed several of the workmen . . . a more tangible and still more extraordinary prodigy ensued: suddenly the sign of the cross appeared spontaneously on the garments of the persons engaged in the undertaking . . . many were hence led to confess that Christ is God and that the rebuilding of the Temple was not pleasing to him . . .⁶⁷

The above passage must be viewed in light of the Christian orientation of its writer; the disasters that stopped the re-building of the Temple were interpreted by Christians as proof of God's judgment against Julian and the re-building effort.⁶⁸ The death of Julian in June of 363 during a battle with the Persians ended his rule and effectively eliminated any further Jewish hopes of rebuilding the Temple.⁶⁹

The failure of the fourth-century attempt to rebuild the Temple provided Christians with further evidence of the just position of the Church as superior to Judaism. Since the Gospel accounts of Jesus' life contained His prophecy that the Temple would be destroyed, the Church's claim of legitimacy rested in part upon the destruction of the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem.⁷⁰ John Chrysostom made that claim in a series of sermons he presented in 386:

When He came into Jerusalem and saw the temple, He said: "Jerusalem will be trodden down by many nations, until the times of many nations be fulfilled." By this He meant the years to come until the consummation of the world. And again, speaking to His disciples about the temple, He made the threat that a stone would not remain upon a stone in that place until the time when it would be destroyed. His threat was a prediction that the temple would come to a final devastation and completely disappear . . . You Jews did crucify Him. But after He died on the cross, He then destroyed your city; it was then that He

⁶⁷ Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History* 5.22, as cited in Peters, *Jerusalem*, 146-147.

⁶⁸ Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 21.

⁶⁹ Peters, *Jerusalem*, 147, notes that despite the strong Christian perspective of the previous account, work on the Temple did cease at that time because of the death of Emperor Julian, which took on a miraculous nature in stories of the event.

⁷⁰ Mt 24:2, Mc 13:2, Lc 19:44. Avi-Yonah in *The Jews of Palestine*, 141, states that during the Jewish War, Christians in Jerusalem evacuated the city when the Romans began their assault and did not participate in the defense effort against Rome; those Christians saw the coming confrontation foretold in the statements of Jesus Christ and proof of their rightful place as successors to the Jews. Michael, in "Antisemitism and the Church Fathers," (103), states that not just the destruction of the Temple, but also the loss of the independent jurisdiction of Jewish royalty over Judea, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the Diaspora, were used as "historical proof of [Christian] theology."

dispersed your people; it was then that He scattered your nation over the face of the earth. In doing this, He teaches us that He is risen, alive, and in heaven.⁷¹

That claim, which was reiterated throughout the Middle Ages,⁷² was restated in the twelfth century by Nicolaus Maniacutius in the *HIS*.

After the death of Julian in 363, the following emperors cemented the official position of Christianity in the Empire and further restricted the Jews. With the official proclamation *Cunctos populos* in 380, Emperors Valentinian II and Theodosius I asserted that the official imperial religion would be Christianity.⁷³ Still, the emperors continued to protect the Jews in some aspects of their traditions and customs.

One famous disagreement between leaders of the Roman Empire and the Church about the Jews is preserved in letters between Emperor Theodosius I and Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, who disagreed about the protection of a Jewish synagogue. Roman law had protected synagogues, and Theodosius had ordered the punishment of a Syrian Bishop who had led a group of Christians to defile and destroy a synagogue in Asia Minor. Ambrose wrote in protest to the emperor and denigrated the Jews:

Shall a place be provided out of the spoils of the Church for the disbelief of the Jews, and shall this patrimony, given to Christians by the favor of Christ, be transferred to the treasuries of unbelievers? . . . The Jews will write on the front of their synagogue the inscription: “The Temple of Impiety, erected from the spoils of the Christians.” . . . There is really no adequate cause for all this commotion, people being punished so severely for the burning of a building, and much less so, since a synagogue has been burned, an abode of unbelief, a house of impiety, a shelter of madness under the damnation of God himself . . . Will you grant the Jews this triumph over God’s Church? this trophy over

⁷¹ John Chrysostom, *Discourses against Judaizing Christians*, V.I.6-7.

⁷² A similar statement was made by Amulo, Archbishop of Lyons, c. 842-853, in a letter to Charles the Bald. Amulo stated that the Jews rejection of Jesus was the cause of the destruction of their Temple and that the Jews were the cause of Christ’s suffering and death. That example of Christian perspective on the destruction of the Temple and many others could be given, but are outside the scope of this investigation. See Williams, *Adversos Judaeos*, 361ff.

⁷³ Joseph Canning, *A History of Medieval Political thought, 300-1450* (London: Routledge, 1996), 5.

Christ's people? these joys, O Emperor, to unbelievers? this festival to the Synagogue? this grief to the Church? The Jewish people will put this solemnity among their feast days . . . They will have this solemnity marking the triumphs they have wrought over the people of Christ . . .⁷⁴

When Theodosius did not respond in the manner Ambrose expected, Ambrose confronted him while the emperor attended Mass in Milan, and ultimately obtained Theodosius' agreement not to punish the Bishop.⁷⁵ Asserting imperial power, Theodosius later decreed (393) that any Christian who damaged a synagogue would be prosecuted:

. . . It is sufficiently established that the sect of the Jews is forbidden by no law. We are gravely disturbed that their assemblies have been forbidden in certain places. Your Sublime Magnitude will, therefore, after receiving this order, restrain with proper severity the excesses of those persons who, in the name of the Christian religion, presume to commit certain unlawful acts and attempt to destroy and to despoil the synagogues.⁷⁶

Apparently Theodosius followed the precedent set by earlier Roman emperors, and acted to maintain order and the rule of Roman law.⁷⁷

The *Theodosian Code* gathered previous imperial decrees into one Code, and protected traditional rights of the Jews while still restricting them from many areas of social and civic life. Apparently violence against synagogues continued to erupt, because not only did the *Code* include the decree of Theodosius from 393, but enacted another law concerning protection of synagogues:

. . . in the future no synagogue at all of the Jews shall be indiscriminately taken away from them or consumed by fire, and that if, after the issuance of this law, there are any synagogues which by recent attempt have been thus seized,

⁷⁴ Ambrose *Letters* 2.

⁷⁵ Neil B. McLynn in *Ambrose of Milan, Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 300-302, explains that Ambrose's main motivation was to assert the status of the Church in *causa religionis*. In Ambrose's later letter to his sister, in which he recounts the incident, he described himself as though he had been in control of the entire interaction with the emperor.

⁷⁶ *The Theodosian Code* 16.8.9. According to Synan, in *The Popes and the Jews*, 17, Theodosius II ordered the compilation of the law codes that took effect on January 1, 439 and affected Jews in the eastern and western parts of the empire.

⁷⁷ Gager, *Origins of Antisemitism*, 98.

vindicated to the churches, or at any rate consecrated to the venerable mysteries, the Jews shall be granted as compensation therfor [*sic*], places in which they can construct synagogues . . . In the future no synagogues shall be constructed, and the old ones shall remain in their present condition.⁷⁸

The *Code* included many laws protecting Jews: Jewish religious leaders were released from compulsory civil service and Jews were allowed to serve on municipal senates; at the same time, Jews were forbidden from imperial service.⁷⁹ Jews were also forbidden from attacking any former Jew who had converted to Christianity, from proselytizing, association with Christian women, or owning Christian slaves.⁸⁰ Any Christian who converted to Judaism would lose his property,⁸¹ but at the same time Jewish tradition was protected from slander:

. . . If any person should dare in public to make an insulting mention of the illustrious patriarchs, he shall be subject to a sentence of punishment.⁸²

The restrictions that kept Jews from positions of power over Christians demonstrated that Jews were employed in just such occupations at that time. Similarly, laws prohibiting Jews from associations with Christians or from owning Christian slaves proves that such situations occurred, and were considered a problem by Church officials. The prohibition on owning Christian slaves gradually excluded Jews from agricultural occupations; in the early Middle Ages, slave labor was commonly used by both Christian and Jewish owners on farms. Jews also were excluded from feudal relationships because of their ineligibility to take the feudal oath of homage over relics. As a result, the Jewish population gradually concentrated

⁷⁸ *The Theodosian Code* 16.8.25.

⁷⁹ *The Theodosian Code* 16.8.2, 16.8.3, 16.8.4, 16.8.16

⁸⁰ *The Theodosian Code* 16.8.5, 6; 16.9.1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Leon, *The Jews of Rome*, 44. According to Synan, in *The Popes and the Jews*, 17, Theodosius II ordered the compilation of the law codes that took effect on January 1, 439 and affected Jews in the eastern and western parts of the empire. The decree of Theodosius I in 393, cited above in n. 77, was included in the Theodosius II's *Codex Theodosianus* of 439, at 16.8.9 of 439.

⁸¹ *The Theodosian Code* 16.8.7.

⁸² *The Theodosian Code* 16.8.11.

in the cities and narrowed in urban occupations. As the urban guilds developed into Christian economic unions, the Jews were also excluded from those occupations.⁸³

The Relationship between the Papacy and the Jews

Attitudes toward the Jews expressed by the pope, the official leader of the Church, obviously held substantial weight within the Church. Those attitudes can be traced through papal reigns in the early Middle Ages to better understand eventual papal policy toward the Jews in twelfth century. Even when the seat of Roman imperial power shifted to the east, and the popes became the *de facto* civil rulers of Rome, traditional Roman law continued to exercise some influence on their decisions toward the Jews, along with precedents established by their predecessors. Pope Leo I (440-461) used the term *perfidia* to refer to the Jews and reiterated the claim that the Jews' rejection of Jesus was the true cause of the destruction of their Temple and their dispersion.⁸⁴ While Pope Damasus I (r. 366-384) was apparently the first pope to use the term *perfidia* to refer to the Jews, the meaning of the term in that context gradually grew from "unbeliever and disbelief, along with treachery," to "intentional and malevolent infidelity . . . and treachery."⁸⁵

Pope Gregory I

In addition to Augustine's writings, the attitude of Gregory I (r. 590-604) toward the Jews determined much of the medieval Church's official policy that regulated the status of Jews in Christian society.⁸⁶ The papal record of Gregory, the most influential pope of the

⁸³ William C. Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989), 26-28.

⁸⁴ *PL* 54-56 as cited in Simonsohn, *History*, 293.

⁸⁵ Simonsohn, *History*, 9-11.

⁸⁶ Marcus, *The Jew in the Medieval World*, 111. It must be noted that a significant portion of Gregory's papal record survives, and has obviously influenced contemporary scholarship. Between Gregory I in the sixth century and Gregory VII in the eleventh century, papal records sporadically survived. The story would be much more detailed and intriguing if the full record existed today.

early Middle Ages, reveals influences from Augustinian and Patristic texts, and indicates an influence from Roman law.⁸⁷ As pope, in his broad execution of authority over Christendom, Gregory expressed an attitude that was a combination of legal protections and restrictions for Jews, while enhancing Christianity's superior status and encouraging Christians in their conversion efforts. Jeremy Cohen sees in Gregory's writings an anxious expectation that the end-time was rapidly approaching and society was apparently changing. "The conversion of the Gentiles, the decline of classical culture, the downfall of pagan Rome, the victory of Catholicism, and the consolidation of papal authority in the West" all indicated major shifts in the basic orientation of society.⁸⁸ Throughout his letters, decrees, and biblical exegesis, Gregory's incorporation of Roman law, Augustinian principles, and Church tradition resulted in policies that were influential on canon law for centuries to come.⁸⁹

First, the pope's intervention on behalf of Jewish supplicants indicates a continuation of the precepts of Roman law. On several occasions Gregory dealt fairly with Jewish communities, by ordering that Jews not be baptized by force, Jews be compensated for their synagogues that had been confiscated and consecrated as Christian Churches, and that the Jews were not to be prevented from continuing their traditional festivals.⁹⁰ Kenneth Stow attributes the lasting continuity of the Jewish community in Rome to the enduring legacy of the policies of Gregory I toward them, which restricted many facets of Jewish life, but still protected them.⁹¹ The community of Roman Jews, originating in the second-century BCE Roman Republic, functioned within their traditions but also under the temporal sovereignty of

⁸⁷ Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 67.

⁸⁸ Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 90.

⁸⁹ Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 74.

⁹⁰ Shlomo Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews, Documents: 492-1404*, v. 94 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1991), nos. 3, 5, 20, 28.

⁹¹ Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 24.

the pope.⁹² Gregory's letters indicate not only the continued presence of a Jewish community in Rome, but also their intermediary status with the pope.⁹³ In 598, Roman Jews intervened with the papacy on behalf of their fellow Jews in Palermo, who had complained of treatment under the Bishop of Palermo, Victor. Gregory sent instructions in June 598, to Victor to treat the Jews in a just manner.⁹⁴ Apparently the first letter did not achieve its goal, because four months later in a second letter, Gregory directed Victor to ensure that the Jews were paid a proper price for their synagogues and land that had been seized.⁹⁵

Gregory's work in biblical exegesis also reflected his attitude toward Jews. Although Gregory's decrees may have seemed relatively fair-minded, his biblical exegesis reveals a much harsher estimation of Jews. Gregory's most well-known exegetical work, *Moralia*, a commentary on the Book of Job, along with his homilies and exegesis on the Book of Ezekiel, primarily concerned the Jews of the first century and their error, but also reflected the status of contemporary Jews. Points stated by earlier Church Fathers were restated: the typology of the Church and the Synagogue, the Church as the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies, and the blindness of the Jews in their literal knowledge of the law in contrast to Christians' spiritual enlightenment.⁹⁶

⁹² For further information on the Jews of Rome in the Middle Ages, see Abraham Berliner, *Storia degli Ebrei di Roma* (Milano: R.C.S. Libri, 2000), and Anna Esposito, *Un'altra Roma, Minoranze nazionali e comunità ebraiche tra Medioevo e Rinascimento* (Roma: Il Calamo, 1995). In the present day the Roman Jewish community considers their heritage and particular liturgical rituals to have descended directly from the original Jews who settled Rome in the second and first centuries BCE.

⁹³ Cecil Roth, ed., *The World history of the Jewish People*, vol. 2 in Second Series: Medieval Period, *The Dark Ages, Jews in Christian Europe 711-1096* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1966), 117; Shlomo Simonsohn, "The Jews in the Papal States to the Ghetto," *Italia Judaica* (1998): 12. Between the fifth century and the turn of the first millennium, information about the Jews of Rome as well as the Jews in Europe is sporadic. Much of the scant evidence that does exist regarding European Jews before the seventh century comes from Christian churchmen and popes. Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 42

⁹⁴ Simonsohn, *Documents*, no. 19.

⁹⁵ Simonsohn, *Documents*, no. 20.

⁹⁶ Simonsohn, *History*, 293-294.

Gregory also expressed his revulsion for the Jews' continuing worship in the Synagogue,

The synagogue opposes its founder, not out of fear as previously, but now in outright resistance. Being transformed into the limbs of the devil and believing that the man of lies is God, the more it is raised up high against the faithful, the more it prides itself that it is the body of God.⁹⁷

The tone of the writer's words indicates more than merely opposition to a belief system, or a perceived persistence of stubborn belief. Despite Gregory's protection of existing synagogues, this passage indicates a harsher view of the Jews' continued adherence to their traditional beliefs.

Gregory followed Christian tradition in restricting the rights of Jews to a status beneath that of Christians, while pushing for Jewish conversion because of apocalyptic anticipation. Gregory attempted to prohibit Christians from following the Jewish practice of honoring the Sabbath on Saturdays, evidence of continued Judaizing among Christians.⁹⁸ Gregory's adherence to Augustinian doctrine led to his support of the Jews' presence in society; however, he separated from Augustine in his encouragement of conversion efforts. The pope suggested exemption from taxation as a method of obtaining Jewish conversions and even ordered clerics to provide financial support for new converts.⁹⁹ Gregory ordered that Jews be prohibited from owning Christian slaves in individual cases, and instructed Queen Brunhild and kings Theoderic and Theodebert of the Franks that Jews in their realms not be allowed to own Christian slaves.¹⁰⁰ One letter from Gregory in August, 599, to King

⁹⁷ “. . . quando suo conditori Synagoga non ut antea formidando, sed aperte iam repugnando contradicit. In membra quippe diaboli transiens, et mendacii hominem Deum credens, contra fideles tanto in altum extollitur, quanto et Dei corpus se esse gloriatur.” Gregory Magni, *Moralia*, 31.23.42.

⁹⁸ Simonsohn, *Documents*, no. 27.

⁹⁹ Simonsohn, *Documents*, no. 9, 13, 14.

¹⁰⁰ Simonsohn, *Documents*, no. 24, 25.

Reccared of the Visigoths commended the king for not having accepted a bribe from a group of Jews. Jews reportedly had asked the king to reduce certain legal penalties.¹⁰¹

As Gregory urged protection of the Jews, he also used harsh language in his communications about them, including superstition, vomit, perdition and *perfidia*, and described the Jews as enemies of Christ; harsh language would continue to punctuate papal letters and decrees.¹⁰² The term *perfidia* will recur in later papal documents, especially in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries as contemporary Jews' lives were increasingly restricted and a negative attitude against them became more pervasive in society.¹⁰³ In the next century, Pope Stephen IV (768-772) expressed his displeasure over Jewish land ownership and Jewish and Christian contact:

For this reason are We touched by sorrow, anxious even unto death, since We have known through you that the Jewish people, ever rebellious against god and derogatory of our rites, within the frontiers and territories of Christians, thanks to some rules or other of the Kings of the Franks, own hereditary estates in the villages and suburbs, as if they were Christian residents; for they are the Lord's enemies. . . . Christian men cultivate their vines and fields, and Christian men and women, living with those same deceivers, both in town and out of town, are day and night stained by expressions of blasphemy. . . . What was sworn to and handed over to those unbelievers by the Lord himself . . . has been taken away deservedly, in vengeance for the crucified Savior.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰¹ Simonsohn, *Documents*, no. 26.

¹⁰² Simonsohn, *History*, 10.

¹⁰³ Moore, *Persecuting Society*, 34-45. Synan, in *The Popes and the Jews* (175 n. 15) notes that the twentieth-century Catholic Good Friday liturgy contained the words *perfidia* and *perfidus* in reference to the Jews; however, the words were removed from the liturgy by Pope John XXIII during his reign (1958-1963). The twelfth-century Holy Thursday liturgy at the Lateran will be discussed in this dissertation; however, the Good Friday rites, which will not be explored at this time, are a promising avenue of research for the future.

¹⁰⁴ “. . . sumus dolore tacti, usque ad mortem anxiati, cum cognovissemus per teipsum, quod plebs Judaica Deo semper rebellis, et nostris derogans caeremoniis infra fines et territoria Christianorum allodia haereditatum in villis et suburbanis, quasi incolae Christianorum, possideant per quaedam regun Francorum praecepta: quia ipsi inimici Domini . . . sunt, et periculose mercati sunt: et quod vineas et agros illorum Christiani homines excolant: et infra civitates et extra, masculi et feminae Christianorum cum eisdem praevaricatoribus habitantes, die noctuque verbis blasphemiae maculantur, et cuncta obsequia quae dici aut excogitari possunt, miseri miseraeve praenotatis canibus indesinenter exhibeant . . .” *PL* 129.857. Translation by Edward Synan in *The Popes and the Jews*, 62.

Pope Stephen's language indicates his belief that the Jews did not deserve to live as Christians did, owning land and employing Christians. He claimed that the Jews should be forced to live at a lower status than Christians as punishment for their crime of killing Jesus, in effect advocating vengeance.

Two centuries later, another papal letter directed that Jews that refused to convert should be expelled. In a letter from Pope Leo VII (936-939) to the Archbishop of Mainz, he indicated how Christians should act toward Jews regarding conversion:

As to the Jews, concerning whom, dear brother, you have requested our instructions, whether it is preferable to subjugate them to the holy religion or to expel them from your towns, . . . if they are willing wholeheartedly to believe and be baptized, we thank the omnipotent Lord with immense praises. If, however, they refuse to believe, expel them from your towns with our authority. Since we must not live in society with God's enemies, since the Apostle says: What communion hath light with darkness? . . .¹⁰⁵

These two examples are not characteristic of all papal directives about the treatment of the Jews. For the most part, Jews living in Christian society in the early Middle Ages co-existed peacefully with Christians, and apparently many popes did direct that the Jews be respected while restricted. The papal letters above, however, demonstrate that harsh, punitive, and vengeful papal attitudes toward the Jews did exist; with the onset of the Crusade movement in the late eleventh century, attitudes toward Jews in Christian society quickly turned vengeful.

Twelfth-Century Christian/Jewish Contact

Biblical Exegesis: Nicolaus Maniacutius and the Rabbis

While papal documents from the Middle Ages attest to mixed attitudes of protection, restriction, and sometimes denigration of the Jews, other ecclesiastical contacts between Christians and Jews indicate a positive relationship. The writings of Nicolaus Maniacutius,

¹⁰⁵ Simonsohn, *Documents*, no. 34; Simonsohn, *History*, 11.

the Cistercian monk, exegete, and associate of Pope Eugenius III, suggest respect for the Jewish scholars that he consulted. Nicolaus's attitude toward those scholars may in turn indicate the attitude of his former abbot, Eugenius, toward the Jews.

Exegesis, the work of studying, analyzing, and interpreting texts, especially sacred scripture, occupied both Christian and Jewish scholars in the Middle Ages. Since the Talmudic era, from the late first century CE, a tradition of exegesis had characterized the Jewish academies in Palestine and Baghdad, and communities in the Diaspora, including Rome. According to Ariel Toaff, the historical record indicates a vibrant Jewish scholarly community in Rome at the turn of the first millennium, and a community wielding influence and commanding the respect of other enclaves of Jewish scholars.¹⁰⁶ Jewish scholars in Rome no doubt felt the influence of Solomon ben Isaac of Troyes, known as Rashi (1040-1105), probably the most-influential Jewish exegete in western Europe before the twelfth century.¹⁰⁷ In Rashi's day, communication flowed between rabbinic scholars in Paris, Rome, and Baghdad. Both Christian and Jewish exegetes were familiar with Rashi's work in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries.¹⁰⁸ Both groups were consumed with exploring the Hebrew Bible and supporting their own doctrinal views with the texts.¹⁰⁹ For Jews, God's promises of a Messiah and his unfailing protection were both contained within their Torah. For

¹⁰⁶ *Medieval Jewish Civilization*, s.v. "Rome, 570; Hermann Vogelstein, *Rome*, (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1940), 130-136. Several Jewish religious poets were active in Rome between the eleventh and the thirteenth centuries. The Roman community was particularly known for its scholars, both in the law and in biblical exegesis; Italian scholarly texts proved to be influential on Ashkenazic Jewry in northern Europe. Stow notes the important Kalonymos family of Jewish scholars that migrated from Rome north to Lucca and then to Mainz in the mid-tenth century. Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 68, 64, 70, 92-93.

¹⁰⁷ Rashi's influence and that of his followers were widespread and felt long after his death; indeed his commentary on the Talmud is considered the classic work. *The Encyclopedia of Judaism*, s.v. "Rabbinic Literature in Medieval and Modern Times"; Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 140.

¹⁰⁸ Beryl Smalley, in *The Study of the Bible* (80) suggests that Nicolaus Maniacutius was also influenced by the works of Rashi.

¹⁰⁹ Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 2.

Christians, the Old Testament was the repository of prophecies that were fulfilled by Christ; to them, His coming irrefutably proved that Christianity had inherited the Old Covenant.¹¹⁰ Nevertheless, the Hebrew Bible, written in the original language of the ancient Israelites, was considered by many Christian exegetes to contain the true meaning of the Old Testament scriptures. Some Christian scholars, including Nicolaus Maniacutius, learned Hebrew in order to compare different versions of the Old Testament text with the Hebrew.¹¹¹

Christian exegesis began in the first centuries of Christianity. Jerome and Augustine of Hippo laid the basis for medieval scriptural exegesis and left a profound and lasting influence on later Christian scholarship.¹¹² Two of the earliest Christian exegetes, Origen and Jerome, both consulted with Jews about the Hebrew texts, and Jerome learned Hebrew to facilitate his exegesis.¹¹³ Jerome's Latin Bible, the *Vulgate*, was based on the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, what he called the *Hebraica veritas*.¹¹⁴ Jerome's *Vulgate* influenced Augustine's exegetical work, since Augustine used the *Vulgate* along with different versions of the Old Latin text; nevertheless, Augustine evidently preferred the Greek Septuagint version of the Old Testament.¹¹⁵ Augustine ranked the spiritual or allegorical sense of scripture above the literal, and reinforced the concept that the Old Testament had prefigured the New.

¹¹⁰ Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 2.

¹¹¹ Nicolaus Maniacutius, *Libellus de corruptione et correptione psalmodum et aliarum quarundam scripturarum*, in Vittorio Peri, " 'Correctores immo corruptores' un saggio di critica testuale nella Roma del XII secolo," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* XX (1977): 91, lines 2-11.

¹¹² Smalley, *The Study of the Bible*, 23.

¹¹³ Smalley, *The Study of the Bible*, 21.

¹¹⁴ The other Old Testament text in frequent use in Jerome's day was the "Old Latin text," which had been translated from the Greek Septuagint. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible*, 21.

¹¹⁵ Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 43. Augustine, *The First Catechetical Instruction [De catechizandis Rudibus]*, trans. by Joseph P. Christopher (New York: Newman Press, 1946), 99-100, especially 99 n. 40. Jerome's *Vulgate* was produced between 382 and 405, thus contemporary with portions of Augustine's oeuvre. In *The City of God* XVIII.43, Augustine expressed his preference for the Greek Septuagint over the Hebrew text.

Modern scholarship has shown that the Cistercian monk and biblical exegete, Nicolaus Maniacutius, was a skilled Hebraist who wrote several texts and labored for years on his correction of Jerome's translation of the Book of Psalms.¹¹⁶ Nicolaus is vitally important to this study because he not only knew the Old Testament texts and communicated with rabbis in his scholarly work, but also wrote the *HIS*, perhaps his final work, which claimed that the Temple Treasures were stored in the Lateran basilica. Nicolaus's work bridges the Christian exegetes' consultations with Jewish scholars and the Church's claim to possess biblical Judaism both spiritually and physically.

The details of Nicolaus' birthplace, early life, and education are not clear at this time; however, clues to some of these aspects of his life can be found within his texts. In the last century, scholars have identified nine texts probably by Nicolaus.¹¹⁷ It is also apparent that

¹¹⁶ For the modern investigations into Nicolaus' life and work, see Heinrich Denifle, O.P., "Die handschriften der Bibel-correctorien des 13. Jahrhunderts," *Archiv für literature und kirchen geschichte des middlealters*, 1888; P.J. Van den Gheyn, "Nicolas Maniacoria correcteur de la Bible," *Revue biblique* 8 (1899), 289-295; A. Wilmart, "Nicolas Manjuacoria cistercien a Trois-Fontaines," *Revue bénédictine* 33, no. 3 (1921), 136-143; Giovanni Mercati, "Maniacoria Nicola (Manjacoria, Manicoria, Mangiacoze, Maniecutius, Magnacucius)", *Opere Minori* II (Citta del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1937), 48-51; Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952), 78-81; Robert Weber, "Deux préfaces au psautier dues à Nicolas Maniacoria," *Revue Bénédictine* 63 (1953), 3-17; Vittorio Peri, "Nicola Maniacutia, autore ecclesiastico romanzo del XII secolo," *Aevum* 36 (1962), 534-588; idem, "Nicola Maniacutia—un testimone della filologia romana del XII secolo," *Aevum* 41 (1967), 67-90; idem, "Correctores immo corruptores, un saggio di critica testuale nella Roma del XII secolo," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* XX (1977), 19-125; Robert Weber, "Un nouveau manuscript de la révision du psautier *Iuxta Hebraeos* due a Nicolas Maniacoria," *Revue Bénédictine* 85 (1975), 402-404; Émile Brouette and Eugène Manning, "Nicolas Maniacoria," *Dictionnaire des auteurs Cisterciens* II (Belgique: Abbaye Notre-Dame de St-Remy, 1977), s.v. "Nicolas Maniacoria;" Lucinia Speciale, "Una cellula e i suoi libri: I SS. Vincenzo ed Anastasio alle Tre Fontane e Casamari," *Arte medioevale*, II serie, Anno VIII, n. 2 (1994), 47-76. The *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* also contains a reference to "Nicolai Maniacutii" as a canon of the Church of St. John Lateran from the time of Eugenius III to Alexander III, *MGH SS XXVIII*: 529. In addition, in reference to the *HIS*, see Wolf, *Salus populi Romani* and Herbert L. Kessler, *Spiritual Seeing, Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 135-136.

¹¹⁷ Brouette and Manning, *Dictionnaire des auteurs Cisterciens*, 522 ; Peri, "Correctores immo corruptores," 20; Mercati, *Opere Minori* II: 48-51. Of the nine texts, five are undated: *Psaltarium quod Hebrei vocant Spher tellim* Parma, Bibliothéque Palatine 316; *Vita Hieronymi*, *PL* 22:183-202; *De ecclesiasticis officiis secundum ordinem ecclesiae Romanae*, MS [lost], *Opusculus de modis editus quibus solent exemplaria vicari* [Unpublished work]; and *Ad incorrupta pontificum nomina conservanda*, Lambeth 8, in Ralph de Diceto, *Abbreviationes chronicorum* I:259-263. The following four texts have been assigned approximate dates: *Suffraganeus bibliotheca* (probably before 1140), Venice, St-Marc X 178 fol. 141-181, Bruxelles, Bibliothéque

Nicolaus served as a deacon of the titular church of San Lorenzo in Damaso in Rome, then as a member of the Cistercian monastic community of S. Anastasius, on the southern outskirts of the city.¹¹⁸ The abbey had stood empty since its abandonment by Benedictine monks during the papal Schism of 1130-1138; the Cistercian community was established in 1140, by a monk Bernardo, who would, five years later, be elected as Pope Eugenius III. Undoubtedly Nicolaus and Abbot Bernardo became acquainted sometime between 1140 and 1145 in the monastic setting of Tre Fontane. After Eugenius's election, Nicolaus composed the *HIS*, probably to honor his fellow Cistercian and former abbot. While the late-nineteenth-century compiler of the *Monumenta Germaniae historica* indicated that Nicolaus served through the reigns of both Eugenius III and Alexander III, Brouette and Manning have claimed that Nicolaus died sometime in 1145, which would be in the first year of Eugenius's papacy.¹¹⁹

In the *Dictionnaire des Auteurs Cisterciens*, Émile Brouette concluded that Nicolaus' work demonstrates “. . . an unusual fact of the era, that he was not afraid to gather information from rabbis knowing the Jewish tradition of the Scriptures, in particular the Babylonian

Royale 4031-4033; *Libellus de corruptione et de correptione psalmodum et aliarum quarundam scripturarum* (probably 1140-1145), Montpellier, École de Médecine 294 fol. 144-159; *Historia Imaginis Salvatoris* (1145), BAV, S. M. Maggiore 2, fol. 237-244; A Revision of the Roman Psalter [Untitled] (late 1145), S. M. in Trastevere, Arm. I, litt. A, num. 2, in capsula ferrea.

¹¹⁸ Tre Fontane was located on the southern outskirts of the city and is now occupied by the Chancery building, Brouette and Manning, *Dictionnaire des auteurs Cisterciens* II: 523. The monastery of S. Anastasius is mentioned in the eighth- and ninth-century records of Adrian I, Leo III, and Gregory IV, *LP*, XCVII, c. 51; *LP*, SCVIII, c. 38.75; *LP*, CIII, c. 28. Christian Hülsen, *Le chiese di Roma nel medio evo*, 173; Wilmart, “Nicolas Manjuacoria,” 138.

¹¹⁹ *MGH, SS XXVIII* (Hanover, 1888), 529; Brouette and Manning, *Dictionnaire des auteurs Cisterciens* II:523. Perhaps the earlier conclusion in the *MGH* resulted from one text of Nicolaus's, *Ad incorrupta pontificum nomina conservanda*, that was incorporated into a manuscript circa 1200 by Ralph de Diceto, Dean of St. Paul's in London, found in *The Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto, Dean of London* I, ed. by William Stubbs (London: Longman & Co., 1876, 259-263). *Ad incorrupta* is a metrical rhyming list of popes, from the first popes to Innocent III (1198-1216), therefore it would appear that Nicolaus was alive at the end of the twelfth century. However, the lines of poetry extend only through Eugenius III, and the rest of the list is just that, a list of names, which could have been added by any writer. Further investigation of the text preserved in Lambeth 8 may reveal the answer to this mystery. The next to last line in the poem (262), which concerns Eugenius, indicates the close relationship between Nicolaus and his abbot/pope: “Donec vult vivat, demum super astra levatur,” which may be translated as, “May he live as long as he wishes, and at last may he rise above the heavens.”

Talmud.”¹²⁰ Twelfth-century Christian exegetes studying the Old Testament could hardly avoid considering the Hebrew text at some point, and comparing it with the Old Latin version. Apparently some Christian scholars respected the work of the Jewish scholars to such a degree that they incorporated the Jewish perspective into their own methods.¹²¹ In his *Libellus de corruptione et de correptione psalmodum*, Nicolaus revealed that he had consulted with Jewish scholars, and he wrote of his decision to learn Hebrew:

For perhaps I might not have had that copy of the psalms, unless a certain Hebrew, discussing with me and defending nearly each one of the psalms, which he himself otherwise claimed to have, had declared that this copy had been brought from Monte Cassino in the possession of a certain priest. Then for the first time I attained the knowledge of the Hebrew tongue. And while I would eagerly write down, and shortly purify the Library from the many, superfluous texts, for this edition I conscientiously considered the passage of the examined psalter . . .¹²²

In this text Nicolaus also mentioned a certain *Magister Hugo* who had commented on the Book of Lamentations. Vittorio Peri claims that this reference was to Abbot Hugh of the Parisian monastery of St. Victor, an influential scholar who taught in Paris from 1125 to 1141,

¹²⁰ “. . . du fait inhabituel à l’époque, qu’il ne craignait pas de se documenter auprès de rabbins connaissant la tradition juive des Écritures, en particulier le Talmud de Babylone.” Brouette and Manning, *Dictionnaire des auteurs Cisterciens*, 523.

¹²¹ Smalley, *The Study of the Bible*, xxxii. Andrew, an early twelfth-century student of Hugh of St. Victor, claimed to be following in the footsteps of Jerome in his exegesis. Like Jerome, Andrew spoke with Jews, although in French, when he consulted them about their texts. His writings show an awareness of not only the customs of the biblical Jews, but also contemporary Jews. Andrew’s work also shows the influence of the works of Rashi. Apparently Andrew’s method and perspective was not appreciated by all the Victorines; his fellow Victorine, Richard, accused Andrew of judaizing. Smalley, *the Study of the Bible*, 157; Garry A. C. Hadfield, *Andrew of St. Victor, A Twelfth-Century Hebraist: An Investigation of his Works and Sources* (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 1971); Herman Hailperin, *Rashi and the Christian Scholars* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963), 105-106.

¹²² “Nam et ego illud forsitan non haberem, nisi quidam Hebraeus, mecum disputans et paene singula quae ei opponebam de psalmis aliter habere se asserens, hoc de Monte Cassino allatum esse penes quendam praesbyterum indicasset. Tunc primum ad Hebraeae linguae scientiam aspiravi. Et cum postmodum Bibliothecam studiose conscriberem multisque superfluitatibus expiarem, huic editioni diligenter discussae locum psalterii deputavi. Cui et praefatiunculam addidi de diversis translationibus disserentem, numerum psalmodum iuxta Hebraicum sed et versuum indicantem, quot psalmi titulis careant, quot alphabeto texantur, quotiens repetatur in psalterio diapsalma, quotiens alleluia et quid utrumque significet.” Nicolaus Maniacutius, *Libellus de corruptione et correptione psalmodum et aliarum quarundam scripturarum*, in Vittorio Peri, “‘Correctores immo corruptores’ un saggio di critica testuale nella Roma del XII secolo,” *Italia medioevale e umanistica* XX (1977), 91, lines 2-11.

and wrote many exegetical works.¹²³ Hugh followed the example of Jerome, to examine sacred scripture in its original languages. Hugh consulted with Jewish scholars, attempted to learn Hebrew, and was also familiar with the work of Rashi.¹²⁴ Perhaps Nicolaus studied in Paris with Hugh's community, the Victorines, in the years before his emergence in Rome c. 1140.¹²⁵ Hugh's influence would explain Nicolaus's Hebrew scholarship and ease of consultation with rabbis about the sacred texts. Nicolaus's affinity for the study of Hebrew and consultation with Jewish scholars may indicate a more positive attitude of his Roman community of S. Anastasius and its abbot, the future Pope Eugenius III, toward Jews.

Nicolaus' apparent proficiency in Hebrew was not unheard of among Christian exegetes in the schools of Paris or in the community of Cistercians. Beryl Smalley notes that Peter Abelard's text, the *Dialogus*, demonstrates that Abelard, along with other scholars in Paris at the beginning of the twelfth century, found merit in the unique perspective of Jews.¹²⁶ Abelard taught in Paris for a good portion of his public life, and also advocated learning the original languages of the Bible in order to understand the Scriptures in their original languages.¹²⁷ Early Cistercian exegetes apparently followed the same model as the Parisian scholars did in their consultations with rabbis. Stephen Harding, an early abbot of Cîteaux from 1108 to 1133, devoted himself, at least in the early years, to correcting the Old

¹²³ Peri, "Correptores immo Corruptores," 89 note to line 31 of the *Libellus*. The Abbey of St. Victor began c. 1110 on the left bank in Paris under William of Champeaux and followed the Augustinian rule. Hugh left many exegetical works on the Old Testament books, and followed the tradition of Augustine's scholarship.

¹²⁴ Smalley, *The Study of the Bible*, 102-103.

¹²⁵ Circumstantial evidence may also support my thesis that Nicolaus resided in Paris before coming to Rome in 1140. Lucinia Speciale has found that several volumes indicating "a mixed French and Roman work force," were in the library of Tre Fontane at the time of Nicolaus's residence there, among them an illuminated passionary of the mid-twelfth century. This could indicate that Nicolaus brought that French influence with him to Tre Fontane c. 1140. Speciale, "Una cellula e i suoi libri," 47-48.

¹²⁶ Smalley, *The Study of the Bible*, 78.

¹²⁷ Smalley, in *The Study of the Bible* (79) indicates that Abelard admonished Heloise and her nuns at the Paraclete to learn Greek and Hebrew to better understand Scripture in the languages of the original texts.

Testament text to its original form.¹²⁸ Disturbed by the differences he found between various Old Testament texts in Latin, Harding undertook to identify the correct text. He wrote the earliest extant Cistercian encyclical, the *Monitum* c. 1109, as a warning to his monks not to disturb the biblical texts he had corrected. He also revealed that he had consulted with Jews in French and was dependent on their translation of the original Hebrew texts, because they were not knowledgeable of Latin and he was not fluent in Hebrew:¹²⁹

Astonished therefore at the discrepancies in our books, which all come from one translator, we approached certain Jews who were learned in their Scriptures, and inquired most carefully of them in French about all those places that contained the particular passages and lines we found in the book we transcribed, and had since inserted in our own volume, but did not find in the many other Latin copies. The Jews, unrolling a number of their scrolls in front of us, and explaining to us in French what was written in Hebrew and Aramaic . . . found no trace of the passages and lines that were causing us so much trouble. Placing our trust therefore in the veracity of the Hebrew and Aramaic versions and in the many Latin books which . . . are in full agreement with the former, we completely erased all these unnecessary additions . . . To all future readers of this book we make the strongest appeal not to put back these passages and superfluous lines.¹³⁰

In acknowledging that he had consulted Jews about the correct texts, and in his description of the encounter, Harding constructed an extraordinary image of Christian-Jewish scholarly cooperation: a Cistercian monk meeting with Jews, perhaps even in a synagogue, and poring over their sacred scrolls unrolled before him. In light of the attitudes of many patristic writers and popes about the Jews, Harding's actions show his respect for his Jewish exegetical counterparts.

¹²⁸ Smalley, *The Study of the Bible* (79).

¹²⁹ David Kaufman, "Les Juifs et la bible de l'abbé Etienne Harding de Citeaux," *Revue des études juives* XVIII (1889), 131-133 ; Smalley, *The Study of the Bible*, 79. Jean-Baptiste Augerger, in Volume III, *Cîteaux : studia et documenta, of l'unanimité cistercienne primitive : mythe ou réalité ?* (21-22), noted that Stephen Harding did not shrink from speaking with rabbis about the Hebrew texts, which was not a common practice in the early twelfth century. It is unclear if Augerger is indicating an uncommon practice among all Christian exegetes at that time, or just among Cistercian exegetes.

¹³⁰ Stephen Harding, *The Admonition of Stephen Harding*, from *The Cistercian World: Monastic Writings of the Twelfth Century*, trans. and ed., Pauline Matarasso (London: Penguin Books, 1993), 11-12.

Nicolaus apparently carried on his work of correcting the Vulgate in the spirit of Jerome, Hugh of St. Victor and Stephen Harding. Nicolaus called the Hebrew text the *Hebraica veritas*, just as Jerome had, and considered it the most accurate of the various versions of the Old Testament available to him.¹³¹ Like his Cistercian forerunner Steven Harding, Nicolaus also admonished his readers not to alter the texts he had corrected.

Moreover, the texts that many exegetes had are being read, and joining together diverse translations and the words of the prophets, and extorting contrary meanings, they add to the lies of translators, imputing many prophecies which never came from their hearts. Insolence appears besides certain men, who, believing their senses too much, make themselves correctors of the books of the Church, or rather corruptors. Truly, no one may have the truth, but anyone may be seen caring for it, showing their mistakes, while they value themselves to correct others.¹³²

Another unanswered question about Nicolaus' scholarly life is whether he consulted with rabbis while living in Rome. Modern scholars who have researched Nicolaus' life and work have concluded that he did indeed discuss the Hebrew texts with rabbis at some point in his career, and indeed in the text of the *Libellus*, Nicolaus himself says so. A tradition of Jewish scholarship in the city of Rome indicates that the rabbinic resources probably existed in the mid-twelfth century.¹³³ Since Nicolaus resided in Rome at least as early as 1140, he could well have continued his consultations with rabbis while in Rome. The evidence suggests that Nicolaus respected the rabbis for their knowledge and cooperated with them in

¹³¹ Salo Wittmayer Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews* VI (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), 273. According to Smalley, in *The Study of the Bible* (80), when working on correcting the psalter, Nicolaus had the Roman and Gallican psalters, and the Hebrew text.

¹³² Praeterea multos habuisse leguntur expositores, qui translationes varias commiscentes et ad diversos sensus dicta extorquentes prophetica, addunt ad mendacia translatorum multa imponentes prophetis, quae nunquam venerunt in cor eorum. Accedit ad hoc quorundam praesumptio, qui suo nimium credentes sensui correctores ecclesiasticorum librorum immo corruptores se faciunt. Non enim quid veritas habeat, sed quid sibi videatur curantes, errores ostendunt suos, dum emendare se aestimant alienos. Maniacutius, *Libellus* 97, lines 1-8.

¹³³ Vogelstein, *Rome*, Chapter III. According to Kenneth Stow, in *Alienated Minority* (70-72), the Roman Jewish community transmitted much of their learning to the Ashkenazic communities in northern Europe in the mid-tenth century. Menahem ben Solomon composed a commentary on psalms in Rome in 1139, according to Cecil Roth, in *The History of the Jews of Italy* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1946), 92.

his investigations of the holy texts. The association of Nicolaus and Pope Eugenius III before 1145 and at the Lateran after Eugenius's election indicates that Nicolaus's positive attitude toward the Jewish scholars could have been encouraged by his monastic mentor, or could have in turn encouraged his former abbot.

Pope Alexander III and His Steward, Jechiel

Another indication of positive relations between the papacy and Roman Jews occurred just two decades after Nicolaus Maniacutius's Lateran service. Pope Alexander III (1159-1181) apparently enjoyed a trusted relationship with his papal steward, Jechiel, a member of the Roman Jewish community. Benjamin of Tudela recorded in his *Itinerary*, written between 1169 and 1171:

Rome is the head of the kingdoms of Christendom, and contains about 200 Jews, who occupy an honourable position and pay no tribute, and amongst them are officials of the Pope Alexander, the spiritual head of all Christendom. Great scholars reside here, at the head of them being R. Daniel, the chief rabbi, and R. Jechiel, an official of the Pope. He is a handsome young man of intelligence and wisdom, and he has the entry of the Pope's palace; for he is the steward of his house and of all that he has. He is a grandson of R. Nathan, who composed the *Aruch* and its commentaries.¹³⁴

Rabbi Jechiel claimed descent from an ancient Roman family at the time of Julius Caesar, probably a century after Jews first settled in Rome.¹³⁵ His grandfather, Rabbi Natan left a scholarly legacy in the *Arukh*, composed circa 1101, an enduring and well-respected product of Roman Jewish scholarship.¹³⁶ The *Arukh* clearly demonstrates the quality of

¹³⁴ Benjamin of Tudela, *The Itinerary*, 63. It must be noted that the analysis in this section is based on acceptance of Benjamin's account of R. Jechiel, the pope's steward, as factual, although that is not assured. Further research is needed in this area.

¹³⁵ Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 69. Roth in *World History* II:181-184, notes that R. Nathan traced his ancestry back to "the Judean nobility brought to Italy by Titus." Vogelstein, *Rome*, 157.

¹³⁶ Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 69-70; Roth, *World History* II:181-184. The *Aruk* was one of the first Hebrew books to be printed and is still published today. For further information, see Nathan ben Jehiel, *Arukh ha-shalem* (Israel, 1969) and Luisa Ferretti Cuomo, "Le Glosse Volgari nell' Arukh di R. Natan ben Yehi'el da Roma," *Medioevo Romano* XXII (Roma, 1998), 232-283.

Jewish scholarship in Rome at that time because it was not merely an encyclopedia of the Talmud, but also defined and explained the Talmud and the terms it contained. In addition, the *Arukh* included commentaries from previous and contemporary rabbinic scholars, indeed “a compendium of all Talmudic study in Natan’s day,” preserving many such accounts.¹³⁷ Its widespread dissemination and use by Jewish scholars throughout northern Europe and Spain shows the reverence and respect which other scholars felt for R. Natan’s scholarship; Rashi even referred to the *Arukh* in his commentaries.¹³⁸

The prominent nature of Jechiel’s background and the intimate position of his office in the papal household suggest a relationship of trust and respect between the pope and his steward. Modern historians have described Jechiel’s position in various ways from a financial officer to a papal attendant.¹³⁹ The position of papal “steward” or *dapifer* apparently involved the oversight of food preparation.¹⁴⁰ During Alexander III’s reign, the position of *dapifer* became known as *senescalcus*, which can be defined as “steward, a household officer having the care of victuals.”¹⁴¹ While Jechiel apparently was not employed by Alexander as a scholar, the evidence suggests that he descended from a widely respected family of scholars.

¹³⁷ Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 69-70.

¹³⁸ Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 139-140. Stow further states (140) that Jewish scholarship had grown to an international level in the early twelfth century, as responsa questions traveled between scholars in Paris and Rome.

¹³⁹ Heinrich Graetz, *History of the Jews III* (Philadelphia: the Jewish Publication Society of America, 1945), 421; Vogelstein, *Rome*, 152; Simonsohn, “Jews in the papal States,” 13.

¹⁴⁰ I.S. Robinson, in *The Papacy 1073-1198* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 17-18. Robinson states that Urban II (1088-1099) reorganized the papal *Curia* while spending most of his reign outside of Rome. The papal court was in disarray after the turmoil of the preceding papacies. The high-level positions of *camera* (financial officer), *chancery* (records and correspondence), and *chapel* were adopted by the *Curia Romana* from the model of secular courts, such as the French court. Other positions of *dapifer* or *senescalcus* (steward), *pincerna* (cupbearer), *buticularii* (cellarers), and others, which were instituted at that time, also imitated contemporary royal courts. Robinson states that this hierarchy in the *Curia Romana* demonstrated a ceremonial aspect of the papacy that increasingly modeled itself on secular royalty.

¹⁴¹ J.F. Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 956. According to Niermeyer, *senescalcus* equates to the modern term of *sénéchal*. In future research, it will be essential to discern the translation of the word “steward” in the Hebrew text of Benjamin of Tudela’s *Itinerary*, to attempt to clarify the exact position that Jechiel supposedly held in the papal household.

Perhaps that aspect of his background enabled him to acquire a position within the papal household.

Jeziel's employment in the papal household was truly remarkable and even ironic, despite evidence that some Jews enjoyed close relationships with the popes at different times in history.¹⁴² During his reign, Alexander reiterated restrictions on Jews and Saracens in Canon 26 of the Third Lateran Council in 1179. These restrictions included forbidding Jews from employing Christian servants:

Jews and Saracens are not to be allowed to have Christian servants in their houses, either under pretence of nourishing their children or for service or any other reason. Let those be excommunicated who presume to live with them. . . .¹⁴³

Apparently the canonical restrictions that had been designed to minimize Jewish contact with Christians and prevent Jews from exerting any influence over Christians were disregarded in the case of Alexander's steward, Jeziel.

The question remains, however, what circumstances provided the contact between this Jewish man and the officials in charge of the papal household that led to his employment and supported his position close to the pope. In the twelfth century and in Alexander's papacy, contact between the pope and the Roman Jews also included a traditional, ceremonial link in which the Jews acknowledged their allegiance to the pope, their temporal ruler, and the pope in turn urged Christians to protect the Jews. The employment of Jeziel proves that papal/Jewish contact in the twelfth century occurred on several levels, in a complex dynamic of toleration, respect, and restriction.

¹⁴² Simonsohn, *History*, 402-403.

¹⁴³ Norman P. Tanner, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, Volume I*. London: Sheed & Ward, 1990, *Third Lateran Council* 26.

From the earliest centuries of Christianity, the writings of the Church Fathers and popes show an effort to distance Christianity from Judaism while claiming the venerable antiquity and origin of Judaism for Christianity. While the Jews were initially protected by Roman law and papal directives, the attitudes of Christians and some of the popes gradually deteriorated into negative and destructive sentiments. Nevertheless, despite evidence of increasingly antagonistic attitudes towards Jews through the Middle Ages, instances of respect, collaboration, and assistance did occur between Jews and Christians in the twelfth century. The positive contact with Jews seen in the life and work of Pope Eugenius III's fellow monk, Nicolaus, and the employment of the Roman Jew Jechiel as Pope Alexander III's *senescalcus* both indicate positive relationships between those two popes and certain Jews. Several other events and instances of contact between those two popes and the Jews, and an investigation of other aspects of their papacies that referred to biblical Judaism, will further explain the particular attitudes of Eugenius III and Alexander III toward the Jews and biblical Judaism.

CHAPTER IV
POLITICAL AND DOCTRINAL INFLUENCES ON
THE ATTITUDE OF EUGENIUS III TOWARD THE JEWS

The twelfth-century popes' interactions with contemporary Jews and acknowledgement of biblical Judaism certainly reflected the official doctrinal position of the Church, but it also reflected the influences of powerful outside forces. The political struggles between the papacy and secular rulers, primarily the German emperor and the Roman Commune, which extended from the late eleventh through the twelfth century, were the most powerful forces that affected papal actions and decisions regarding the Jews and the acknowledgement of biblical Judaism. The popes proclaimed their power with whatever tools were available to them, including authority over the Jews and superiority to Judaism.

This chapter will demonstrate how the relationship between the pope and the emperor, and the political upheaval in Rome before 1145, directly led to specific actions of Eugenius III toward the Roman Jews and indirectly led to the claim of the Church's possession of the Temple Treasures. These events involving the Roman Jews and biblical Judaism occurred primarily at the start of Eugenius's reign, although the instability in Rome and diplomatic negotiations with other powers complicated this pope's entire office. While the twelfth-century *renovatio* in Rome had embraced the imperial heritage of ancient Rome, and while the Church had claimed the texts and theology of biblical Judaism for centuries, both movements intersected in the mid-twelfth century in public papal acknowledgement of the Church's claim to hold the symbols of biblical Judaism.

As the Church gradually identified with the aura of ancient Rome, the papacy adopted the pomp, ceremony, and trappings of imperium.¹ According to Susan Twyman, by the twelfth century, the ancient Roman rituals of *adventus* and *triumphus* had been conflated into one event, papal *adventus*. The Church celebrated an *adventus* upon several occasions, including the election of a new pope and the entrance of a pope into the city after a period of exile. *Adventus* was also conducted during intra-mural occasions, such as the annual papal procession on Easter Monday, and the procession to one of the stational churches for a particular liturgy, such as the Assumption Eve procession.² These ceremonial processions involved Roman Jews in a new manner, which emphasized their dependence on the pope for their safety and reminded all present of Judaism's doctrinal inferiority to Christianity.

Events in Rome during the years 1130-1145 led to the dangerous urban environment during the papacy of Eugenius III. The papal schism of 1130-1138 between Innocent II and the antipope Anacletus II resulted in division among the cardinals and the public airing of anti-Semitic sentiments against Anacletus as a member of the Pierleoni family.³ The long association between the Pierleoni, a wealthy banking family, and the popes since the mid-eleventh century had included both financial support and physical protection. Between 1059

¹ As the papacy grandly emulated Rome's imperial past, ironically reformers called for a return to apostolic simplicity. George William Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1931), 3 n. 2.

² During a stational liturgy the pope and clergy processed through Rome to one of the city churches to celebrate the major liturgy of the day there. While stational practice had begun in the second or third century, the system of stational liturgy gained organization in the late fifth century and by the twelfth century, was a regular routine of liturgical processions and celebrations in different locations in the city. These stational events will be explored in the instances in which they involved the Jews of Rome, referred to the Jews that rejected Christ, or referred to elements from biblical Judaism. John F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship, the Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy* (Roma: Pont. institutum studiorum orientalium, 1987), 36-37, 166. Information on the stational liturgies in Rome in the twelfth century is contained in the *Gesta pauperis scolaris* of Albinus, Cardinal-Bishop of Albano, written c. 1189, in *Le Liber Censuum de l'église Romaine*, 2 vols. (Paris: Fontemoing, 1910).

³ Whether a pope was considered to be a legitimate successor of St. Peter or an illegitimate claimant (antipope) depended on the judgement of councils, contemporaries, or successors.

and 1124, the Pierleoni strongholds would provide shelter, safe passage, and financial assistance more than once to the reform popes.⁴ When one of the Pierleoni's own members, Petrus Pierleoni, attained the papacy in 1130, several prominent churchmen, including Bernard of Clairvaux, reminded the Church-at-large of the new pope's Jewish ancestry and discredited him with it. Instability in Rome continued to grow after the end of the schism in 1138 and Innocent II's return to Rome. The widening rift between Innocent II and the Roman people during his final years in office (1139-1143), and the growing popularity of the movement for independent rule in Rome both led to the formation of the Roman Commune in 1143. By 1145, when Eugenius III became pope, the Commune controlled the city and forced him to leave Rome for his safety only three days after his election. After ten months in exile, Eugenius returned to the city, eager to show his authority. Eugenius's interactions with the Roman Jews when he entered Rome in December, 1145 were clearly intended to demonstrate his supreme authority in Rome, and possibly were meant to repay the Roman Jews' loyalty to him during the Commune uprising and to foster continued financial backing from the Jewish community.

The necessity of asserting his authority against both the Roman Commune and Holy Roman Emperor Conrad III (1138-1152) moved Eugenius to claim the prestige of biblical

⁴ The Pierleoni provided Pope Nicholas II (1059-1061) with an escort through Trastevere, across the island, and to the Lateran to take possession of the papal throne after his election, when it was unsafe for him to travel through other sections of the city. During the power struggle between Pope Gregory VII and Emperor Henry IV, the Pierleoni were custodians of Castel Sant'angelo, and provided shelter for Gregory as he fled from Henry's forces besieging the Vatican in 1082. The family supported Urban II (1088-1099) in his long-standing struggle against the emperor, and it was the Pierleoni who sheltered Urban in their home near Santa Maria Nova, where he died in 1099. Demetrius B. Zema, "The Houses of Tuscany and of Pierleone in the Crisis of Rome in the Eleventh Century," in *Traditio, Studies in Ancient and Medieval History, Thought, and Religion*, ed. by Johannes Quasten and Stephan Kuttner, Vol. II New York: Cosmopolitan Science and Art Service, 1944): 171-172.

Judaism.⁵ The unique relationship between the pope and the Holy Roman Emperor was rooted in interdependence between the two rulers, which dated from the late eighth century. Disagreement in the eleventh and twelfth centuries over the investiture of bishops had re-ordered that relationship, resulting in a weaker link between the two rulers, and an increasingly powerful papacy. The emperor's traditional role as king of Italy motivated the twelfth-century German emperors to ally with the papacy in order to obtain that title. At the same time, imperial determination to control all of Italy led German kings into ongoing disagreements and military clashes with the papacy, King Roger II of Sicily (1130-1154), and Byzantine Emperor Manuel I Comnenus (1143-1180).⁶

Responsibilities of the papal office included more than just spiritual authority over Christendom; the popes ruled Rome and the papal territories in Italy, the Patrimony, as temporal Lords and military leaders. The tremendous challenges to Eugenius's authority led him to use the methods available to him to assert and establish his power. Texts written by Lateran clergy for this pope, the liturgical rites in use at the Lateran, and papal processional rites all provide evidence from Eugenius's papacy that shows his determination to assert his authority by claiming the prestige and power of biblical Judaism.⁷ An analysis of the evidence also reveals both protective and restrictive attitudes of Eugenius III toward the Jews,

⁵ For the purpose of clarity, the two German kings who had been elected to the office of Holy Roman Emperor during the time span of this dissertation will be called "emperor" whether crowned by the pope or not. In actual practice, coronation by the pope in Rome was considered essential to the prestige of the German king, but Frederick I Barbarossa was not crowned until 1155, three years after his election, by Adrian IV. Nevertheless, Frederick acted with imperial authority from the day of his election. Marcel Pacaut, *Frederick Barbarossa* (London: Collins, 1970), 11, 53; Horace K. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages IX* (London: Kegan Paul, 1925), II: 260-266.

⁶ Pacaut, *Frederick Barbarossa*, 22, 36.

⁷ A full accounting of the contacts between Eugenius and the Jews is not possible because of the loss of a large portion of the papal registers from his papacy. Indeed, according to James K. Farge, Librarian of the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies Library at the University of Toronto, the first nearly complete papal registers from the twelfth century come from the reign of Innocent III (1198-1216). As a result, numerous studies have been made of Innocent's reign, and very few of the twelfth-century popes before Innocent.

while he openly pointed to biblical Judaism as the precursor of Christianity and supported the claim that the Church possessed the Temple Treasures.

Strong allegiances supported Eugenius during his papacy, primarily those with King Louis VII of France (1137-1180), and with Eugenius's former abbot, Bernard of Clairvaux. Throughout his reign, Eugenius maintained a firm alliance with Louis VII, evident in this pope's long period of exile in France.⁸ Eugenius, with the help of Bernard of Clairvaux, was able to rouse Europeans to undertake the Second Crusade (1147-1149), which was led by Louis VII and Conrad III of Germany. The disastrous results of the Crusade placed further pressures on him to strengthen his legitimacy.⁹ Bernard was careful to avoid the violence against German Jews that had marred the First Crusade, yet his attitude toward the Jews was a mixture of denigration and toleration. In his letters and in a text dedicated to Eugenius, *De consideratione*, Bernard expressed at times very harsh anti-Jewish sentiments. His criticisms of the Pierleoni antipope Anacletus II a decade earlier had recalled Anacletus's Jewish ancestry in a derogatory and inflammatory manner. Bernard undeniably exerted a strong influence on Eugenius throughout his papacy; the mixed attitudes toward Jews that Bernard demonstrated in his writings may indeed have influenced Eugenius.

Another facet of the early eleventh century that was intertwined with the drive of the popes to assert their authority was the new interest in Roman law and canon law. Exploration in the new universities of recently re-discovered texts of Roman law (circa 1070) grew

⁸ According to Philippus Jaffé, et al., *Regesta pontificum romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII*. 2 vols. Lipsiae: Veit, 1888 (39-58), Eugenius traveled within France from March 1147 to May 1148, and called and presided over the Council of Rheims in March 1148.

⁹ While the Second Crusade was conducted on three fronts, in Iberia, the Baltic, and the Holy Land, only the result of the Holy Land expedition and the involvement of Pope Eugenius and Bernard of Clairvaux will be investigated in this dissertation. For further information on the Second Crusade, see Alfred J. Andrea, *Encyclopedia of the Crusades* (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 2003), and *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, Michael Gervers, ed. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992).

alongside the efforts of many canonists to compile and organize canon law. That compilation reached a high point of organization and clarity with the work of Gratian circa 1141, in the *Concordia discordantium canonum*, commonly called the *Decretum*.¹⁰ According to Stanley Chodorow, Gratian's effort to organize a system of constitutional law for the Church was a direct result of the controversy between Church and State.¹¹ The release of Gratian's text as the communal movement was building in Rome is a significant factor in the papacy's struggle for authority at that time.¹²

The Struggle between Church and Empire: The Reform Papacies

The struggle of the twelfth-century popes for undisputed supremacy over secular and ecclesiastical authorities was a continuation of the movement for reform in the Church from the previous century. Increased control of papal elections by the Holy Roman Emperor and Roman nobility during the early eleventh century, and the widespread acquisition of episcopal positions throughout Europe by local nobles had led, by the mid-eleventh century, to a call for reform from within the Church and from the Holy Roman Emperor.¹³ The advocates of reform in the Church also urged a return to apostolic ideals, including clerical celibacy, a state that was not strictly or universally followed. The Roman nobility also gained greater control

¹⁰ The *Decretum* was designed to create "harmony out of dissonance in the collected *auctoritates* of canon law." Stephan Kuttner, "The Revival of Jurisprudence," in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable, eds. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 304-305. For the modern translation and discussion of the *Decretum*, see Stanley Chodorow, *Christian Political Theory and Church Politics in the Mid-Twelfth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), and Gratian, *The Treatise on Laws, with the Ordinary Gloss*, in *Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Canon Law II* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1993).

¹¹ Chodorow, *Christian Political Theory*, 248.

¹² One papal text from 1063 that called for the safety of the Jews in Spain and was later added to the *Decretum*, will be discussed in this chapter. The place of the *Decretum* in the papal battle for authority is another area in need of investigation, as well as a full exploration of the *Decretum* for references to Jews and Judaism; however, it is outside the focus of this dissertation and will not be explored.

¹³ The Church officially condemned the purchase of episcopal offices by the nobility as the sin of simony. Eamon Duffy, *Saints and Sinners, A History of the Popes* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 87-90.

of the papal office itself, eventually resulting in their direct selection of the pope.¹⁴ The papacy, under the control of Roman nobility from the ninth to the early-eleventh centuries, has been characterized as primarily a position of power that led to extreme abuses of the office.¹⁵

The reform papacies initiated by Emperor Henry III in 1046 led to a new component of the ceremonial reception of the pope in Rome. Under the banner of reform, the Holy Roman Emperor Henry III had finally intervened personally in Roman affairs. After the imperial Synod of Sutri in 1046 deposed three concurrent claimants to the papal office, Henry III installed his choice for pope, Clement II, the first of several German popes over the next ten years.¹⁶ Leo IX (1049-1054), elevated to the papacy in December of 1048, was welcomed into Rome in January 1049 by the entire populace in a papal *adventus*, and during his entrance procession, was acclaimed by different groups of Roman citizens in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin.¹⁷ From the sixth century, in several instances of a secular ruler entering into a city, the Jews offered acclamations in Hebrew along with Latin and Greek *laudes* from other groups.¹⁸ The trilingual acclamations for Leo IX in 1049, repeated for Callixtus II in 1120, were the first such presentation for a pope. The involvement of the Jewish segment of the city in the

¹⁴ According to Jacques Heers, in *Family Clans in the Middle Ages* (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1977), 247, these large family clans operated more as tribes, with intense loyalty of all members for the family. While individuals living in towns belonged to several different types of social groups (guilds, confraternities, communities, and others), family identification was a strong basis for social alliances.

¹⁵ Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 82.

¹⁶ Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 88. Horst Fuhrman, in "Quis Teutonicos constituit iudices nationum? The Trouble with Henry," *Speculum* 69, no. 2 (April, 1994), 350-351 notes that at the time of Henry III's intervention in the papacy, the emperor was widely denounced in the Church; Henry's actions ultimately led to a weakened imperial office, as demonstrated by the later conflict between Henry IV and Pope Gregory VII.

¹⁷ Susan Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial at Rome in the Twelfth Century*, Henry Bradshaw Society, *Subsidia* vol. IV (London: St. Edmundsbury Press, 2002), 91.

¹⁸ Twyman, in *Papal Ceremonial* (203-204), cites various records of the entrance of the Merovingian king Gunthram into Orleans in 585, the praises required from the Jews for the Frankish emperors Lothar and Charles the Bald in the ninth century, and the entrance of King Alphonso VII of Castile into Toledo in 1139.

welcome of a new pope would continue and take on much greater significance in the mid-twelfth century during the reign of Eugenius III.

In the late eleventh and twelfth centuries, Henry III's control of the papacy did lead to a series of reform-minded popes, and ultimately to a more powerful papacy.¹⁹ One far-reaching result of these reform papacies was the Lateran Synod of April 1059, called by Pope Nicholas II and under the supervision of the monk Hildebrand, which decreed that the election of the pope would be the duty of the seven cardinal-bishops, followed by the approval of the cardinal-priests and cardinal-deacons, and finally the people of Rome.²⁰ Not surprisingly, Hildebrand was elected as Pope Gregory VII in 1073, and fought for reform of the liturgy and the Church in general throughout his papacy.²¹

Upon his election as pope, Gregory's reform agenda attempted to enforce both spiritual and temporal papal authority, which eventually led to extended conflict with Henry IV over the matter of investiture of bishops.²² Investiture is commonly accepted as the

¹⁹ Ironically, the reforms begun at that time led to changes that would greatly strengthen the papacy and lead to greater conflict between the powers of the pope and the Holy Roman Emperor in the twelfth century.

²⁰ *Decretum electionis pontificiae, a. 1059*, ed. L. Weiland (1893), in *MGH Const.* 1, no. 382, 539-41. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes*, VI: 236-237; Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 92. In the mid-eleventh century, the term cardinal applied to cardinal bishops, cardinal priests, or cardinal deacons; clearly the cardinal bishops were higher in rank than the other cardinals. Robinson, in *The Papacy*, 35-36, explains that the college of cardinals of the twelfth century gradually took shape during the reform papacies of the eleventh. The role of the cardinal bishops in the 1050's became primarily advisory to the pope, whereas the cardinal priests and cardinal deacons, in charge of liturgical functions in Roman churches, gained power and stature during the investiture conflict between Henry IV and Pope Gregory VII.

²¹ The legacy of Pope Gregory VII endures in his institution of what modern historians term the "Gregorian Reform." His insistence on papal supremacy laid the groundwork for the strong papal monarchies of the thirteenth century, which attained the summit of papal power in the history of the Church. According to Eamon Duffy in *Saints and Sinners* (107), as the reform popes operated in a more international manner, they separated themselves more from the people of Rome. That in turn resulted in a disconnection between the Romans and their pope. The new papal election rules of 1059 effectively placed the Roman people in the least powerful position during the selection of a new pope, which separated the people and the pope even more.

²² While the "Investiture Conflict" in reality involved more issues than merely the investiture of bishops, the wider diplomatic and military conflicts that extended from this disagreement between the pope and the emperor will not be explored in this dissertation. A compromise reached in 1122 at the Concordat of Worms allowed both parties to claim victory, but the conflict between the pope and the emperor was not resolved and continued long past 1122. For further study of the "Investiture Controversy" see I.S. Robinson, *Authority and Resistance*

primary issue in this conflict, but at its core the disagreement concerned the authority of the pope and of the emperor, and the critical issue of which one possessed the superior power.²³

A succinct statement of the principles of papal power is contained in *Dictatus papae*, which Gregory VII issued circa 1075; in his text, Gregory clearly listed the supreme powers of the pope over any secular ruler, even the power to dethrone an emperor.²⁴

. . . That the Roman church was established by God alone; that the Roman pontiff alone is rightly called universal; that he alone has the power to depose and reinstate bishops . . . that all princes shall kiss the foot of the pope alone . . . that he has the power to depose emperors . . . that he can be judged by no one . . . that the Roman church has never erred and will never err to all eternity, according to the testimony of the holy scriptures . . . that he has the power to absolve subjects from their oath of fidelity to wicked rulers.²⁵

Gregory's decree not only declared that the Church was unerring in its authority, but that the pope possessed supreme power and was the ultimate judge on earth. He further declared that ultimate authority not only gave him the power to depose rulers, but to dissolve the feudal bonds between a ruler and his vassals. The social structure in Germany at that time consisted of tightly forged feudal links between noble fighting men and their lords. Such a declaration from the pope, that he could negate those linkages, threatened the real power of the rulers.

As the dispute over ultimate authority consumed both Church and State in Europe, the issue of the proper connection between the Church and the Jews became more prominent.

Both the papacy and the emperor demonstrated their authority in their actions toward the Jews, a group that was not only subject to both powers, but also considered to be inferior in

in the Investiture Contest (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1978) and Walter Ullman, *The Growth of Papal Government* (London: Methuen, 1955).

²³ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 146-147.

²⁴ Canning, *Medieval Political Thought*, 88.

²⁵ Pope Gregory VII, *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII, Selected Letters from the Registrum*, Ephraim Emerton, ed. and trans. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), 226.

Christian society. According to Salo Baron, out of the total decrees that were issued by the German kings between 1090 and 1238, decrees that concerned the Jews originated from emperors who were actively engaged in conflict with the papacy. Baron suggested that these emperors were determined to demonstrate that their power over all of their subjects, including the Jews, was a direct continuation of that of the Roman Empire, and not at all reliant on the power of the Church.²⁶

In the light of that ongoing conflict between the papacy and the Holy Roman Emperor, it is not surprising that modern scholars have estimated the *terminus post quem* of the first version of the text of the *Descriptio Lateranensis ecclesiae* [*DLE*] at 1073, during the pontificate of Gregory VII.²⁷ The *DLE*, composed by an anonymous Lateran cleric, extolled the supreme status of the Lateran and its most special relic collection, which included the Temple Treasures. In the midst of the papal push for reform and supreme authority over Christendom, the special claims of the author of the *DLE* clearly supported papal authority at the Lateran and suggested a firm extension of that power over all of Christendom. The writer of this first version strongly emphasized the exalted position of the Lateran and the pope in the beginning of his text,

Here begins the writing about the supreme sanctuary of the Holy Roman, that is, the Lateran church of God, composed concerning the archives and ancient history of the Roman pontiffs, which patriarchal and imperial church by the privilege and prerogative of the Holy Apostolic Throne, by the gift of the grace of God, the Saviour Jesus Christ, *holds dominion and leadership over all the churches of the whole world, and which also by divine permission possesses the glorious name of the apostolic summit and the Roman imperium. And since*

²⁶ Salo Wittmayer Baron, "Plenitude of Apostolic Power and Medieval Jewish Serfdom," in *Ancient and Medieval Jewish History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1972), 296.

²⁷ Lauer in *Le palais de Latran* (391) dates the first version of the *DLE* between 1073 and 1159. Valentini and Zuchetti, in the introduction to the *DLE* (319), place its composition shortly after 1073 and no later than 1118. Both authors place the *terminus post quem* as 1073 because the tomb of Alexander II is the last papal tomb mentioned in the document, and 1073 is the date of Alexander's death.

the world ought to show the obedience of subjection owed to this mother church, many speakers meet here from diverse regions, who are unaware how great and how very precious a sanctuary of God is sited in this aforesaid church, we wish it to be known by the publication of these letters, at least when they meet here to pray to God, the Son of God, Jesus Christ our Lord, our most Holy Saviour, for the peace of the Holy Church, for the remission of all sins, for acquiring the glory of the eternal vision of God, for the company of celestial citizens and holy souls.²⁸

This introductory part of the *DLE*, especially the wording of the italicized portions, clearly demonstrated the author's perspective, that the Lateran and the pope within it possessed the *imperium*, and that the entire world was subject to it.²⁹

The modern editors of the *DLE*, Valentini and Zucchetti, claim that the author's intent was to honor the Lateran, the greatest sanctuary of the Roman Church, and to describe the relics contained therein for the many pilgrims visiting Rome.³⁰ The declarations in the *DLE* that the Temple Treasures were part of the relic collection of the Lateran, were apparently the first time that the Roman Church had claimed to physically possess the remains of biblical Judaism in the relics of the Temple of Herod. The text of the *DLE* would be revised twice between the death of Eugenius III (1153) and the death of Alexander III (1181); the additional

²⁸ "In nomine sanctae et individuae Trinitatis Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Incipit scriptum de supremo sanctuario sanctae Dei Romanae, idest Lateranensis, ecclesiae compositum de archivis et antiquis Romanorum pontificum gestis, quae videlicet ecclesia patriarchalis et imperialis privilegio ac prerogativa sanctae Sedis apostolicae, dono gratiae Dei Salvatoris Ihesu Christi super omnes ecclesias totius orbis terrarum obtinet dominationem atque principatum, quae etiam divino nutu apostolici culminis et Romani imperii nomen possidet gloriosum. Et quoniam totus orbis terrarum huic matri ecclesiae debitae subiectionis exhibere debet obsequium, multi ex diversis regionibus hic conveniunt oratores, quibus nescientibus quantum et quam pretiosissimum in hac praedicta ecclesia sanctuarium Dei sit reconditum, per istarum insinuationem litterarum volumus esse notatum, saltim quando hic conveniunt ad exorandum Deum Dei filium Ihesum Christum dominum nostrum salvatorem sanctissimum pro pace sanctae Ecclesiae, pro remissione omnium peccatorum, pro acquirenda gloria aeternae visionis Dei, pro societate superiorum civium et sanctarum animarum." *DLE* 328.14-329.8. Italics in the English translation are mine, added for emphasis. Translation by Professor Brenda Bolton.

²⁹ *Imperium* may be defined as "a kingdom . . . [or] a principality" according Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, 514. Evidently the term was used in the beginning of the *DLE* to refer to the rule of the pope over an earthly kingdom. Further investigation and translation of the entire *DLE* is necessary to determine more definitively what the original author intended by the term.

³⁰ Valentini and Zucchetti, introduction to *DLE*, 319. That aspect of the *DLE* is also evident in other pilgrim guides of the twelfth century, especially the *Mirabilia Urbis Romae*, which also claimed that the Temple Treasures were preserved in the Lateran.

texts in the revised versions further emphasized the supreme authority of the pope and the supreme position of the Lateran among the churches in Rome.³¹ During Gregory VII's pontificate, however, the *DLE* apparently was created as a tool for the papacy to garner the prestige associated with the Lateran and convince visiting pilgrims of the papacy's supremacy, a message which they would then take back to their home churches.

From 1117, although they had been allies in the previous century, bitter rivalry raged between two Roman families, the Pierleoni and the Frangipani, resulting in continued unrest in Rome.³² According to Robinson, in the late eleventh and early twelfth century the newer noble families, including the Pierleoni and the Frangipani, were firm allies of the reform popes and provided financial assistance and physical protection; at that time, the older, established Roman nobility were hostile to the popes.³³ By 1117, however, the Frangipani moved to oppose the Pierleoni and the papacy, and allied their family with the Holy Roman Emperor. Robinson suggests that the Frangipani's change of loyalty was a direct result of conflict with the Pierleoni.³⁴ Competition between these and other Roman families for power over the papacy disrupted several papal elections and directly contributed to the papal schism of 1130-1138.³⁵

³¹ Valentini and Zucchetti, *DLE*, 319-322.

³² Richard Krautheimer in *Rome, Profile of a City 312-1308* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 150, notes one such instance when the Pierleoni came to the aid of Pope Gelasius (1118-1119) following his kidnapping by the Frangipani family. Zema, "The Houses of Tuscany and Pierleone," 174.

³³ Krautheimer, *Rome, Profile of a City*, 150. Mary Stroll in *The Jewish Pope, Ideology and Politics in the Papal Schism of 1130* (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 180, calls the Pierleoni "the bankers of the reform papacy." Starting with the election of Nicholas II outside of Rome in 1058, the Pierleoni steadfastly supported and protected the reform popes. They were instrumental in ushering Nicholas safely to the Lateran by way of Trastevere and the Tiber Island, as well as providing the funds to win the support of the people. Zema, "The Houses of Tuscany and Pierleone," 171-172. Petrus Leonis and Leo Frangipane were both entrusted with the rule of the city when Paschal II left Rome in 1108. Robinson, *The Papacy*, 9.

³⁴ Robinson, *The Papacy*, 10.

³⁵ Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 107.

The story of the Pierleoni family and their interactions with the papacy forms an integral part of the story of the reform papacies from the mid-eleventh to the mid-twelfth century papacy of Eugenius III. Their story shows the benefits available to a Roman Jewish family that converted to Christianity and allied with the papacy, while demonstrating that conversion did not ensure general acceptance of one's descendants as Christians, even generations later. The dynasty originated with a Roman Jew named Baruch who converted to Catholicism c. 1041 and adopted the Christian name of Benedictus Christianus.³⁶ At the time of his Baptism, Benedictus was already married to a Christian noblewoman from the Frangipani family.³⁷ Very quickly, the Pierleoni closely associated themselves with the papacy; Leo, Benedictus's son, was named for Pope Leo IX (r. 1049-1054). Leo's son, Petrus Leonis, established the powerful Pierleoni dynasty and continued the family alliance with the papacy.³⁸ The Pierleoni originally lived in Trastevere, the traditional Jewish quarter since at least the first century BCE, and built and maintained defensive towers there long after they

³⁶ Zema, "The Houses of Tuscany and Pierleone," 170. Zema cites Fedele, "Sull'origine dei Frangipane," *Archivio della R. Società Romana* 33 (1910), 493ff., and idem, "Carette del monasterio dei SS. Cosma e Damiano in Mica Aurea," *Archivio della R. Società Romana* 22 (1899), doc. 56, p. 97.

³⁷ Zema, "The Houses of Tuscany and Pierleone," 169-170; Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 40. It is ironic that the Pierleoni dynasty began with a marital alliance between Benedict and a Frangipani woman, because the two noble houses were to be bitter rivals after 1117. Krautheimer in *Rome, Profile of a City* (156), stated that "the Frangipani [were] always close to the Pierleoni as allies or competitors." The claim of Zema that Baruch and the Frangipani woman, a Jew and a Christian, were married before his conversion is intriguing because the penalty for a Jew associating with Christians was severe, expulsion from the synagogue. Herman-Judah, in the *Short Account of His Own Conversion*, in *Conversion and Text, the Cases of Augustine of Hippo, Herman-Judah, and Constantine Tsatsos*, edited by Karl F. Morrison (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992), 95, describes the reaction of his Jewish community in Cologne circa 1128-1129, to merely his investigation of Christianity. Morrison comments (42) that the penalty for a Jew convicted of idolatry was stoning. It seems unlikely that Baruch and his Frangipani wife would have married before his conversion. Further investigation is needed into Zema's claim that Baruch married a Christian before his formal conversion, in "The Houses of Tuscany and Pierleone," 170 n. 51 and 52.

³⁸ Petrus Leonis acted as benefactor to the Roman Church, meriting burial near the altar of St. Paul's Outside the Walls, one of the major basilicas in the city of Rome. Petrus Leonis left nine sons, one of whom was elected to the papacy as Anacletus II. Thus the great-grandson of Benedictus, a convert, attained the papacy, although he was ultimately discredited. Zema, "The Houses of Tuscany and Pierleone," 169-170. Both Zema and Stow acknowledge that Popes Gregory VI and Gregory VII were related to the Pierleoni. Zema, "The Houses of Tuscany and Pierleone," 170-171; Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 40.

had moved to residences on the east bank of the Tiber.³⁹ The family gradually spread their control to the Ripa, and in the eleventh and twelfth centuries “were dominant in Trastevere, on the Tiber Island . . . in the Ripa,”⁴⁰ and apparently also in the north-east corner of the Forum near the Mamertine Prison.⁴¹ In the twelfth century, Pierleoni power was centered in a fortress-tower built into the ancient Theater of Marcellus that also guarded the approach to the Tiber Island.⁴²

The Pierleoni house in the Forum near Santa Maria Nova was not far from the Arch of Titus.⁴³ Apparently the relief sculptures were visible on the arch, since it was popularly known as the “Arch of the Seven Lamps,” clearly a reference to the Jewish menorah depicted in the relief sculpture. Canon Benedict recorded the itinerary of the papal procession on Easter Monday circa 1160, which passed through the Arch of Titus:

³⁹ Krautheimer, *Rome, Profile of a City*, 274. According to Jacques Heers, in *Family Clans in the Middle Ages, A Study of Political and Social Structures in Urban Areas* (Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1977), 249, the “social structures in cities perpetuated those of the fiefs, . . . [the family] kept close ties with the areas where they had been formed, where they had estates and castles, and raised armies; where, too, they retained peasant clientele.”

⁴⁰ Krautheimer, *Rome, Profile of a City*, 157. Today, the northern border of the Ripa is adjacent to the Great Synagogue of Rome, located on Lungotevere dei Cenci next to the Tiber River, directly across from the Tiber Island, and adjacent to the location of the Jewish Ghetto created in 1550 by Pope Paul IV. Just south of the Great Synagogue, alongside the Theater of Marcellus, Lungotevere dei Cenci becomes Lungotevere Pierleoni. See www.romaclick.com/Pages/Rome/Rome-map.

⁴¹ Zema, “The Houses of Tuscany and Pierleone,” 171. Zema mentions a Pierleoni “strong place at the north-east corner of the Forum” (171) and also a “fortified house near Santa Maria Nuova” (174 n. 72) where they sheltered Urban II at the end of his life. It is unclear whether those two descriptions apply to the same structure; nevertheless, this account shows the power and influential position of the Pierleoni in Rome.

⁴² According to Heers, in *Family Clans*, 174, it was a common practice for noble families to take over ancient Roman buildings and convert them into fortresses, especially in the early years of the communal movement in the twelfth century. See also Ferdinand Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages* Vol. IV, Part II (London: George Bell & sons, 1896), 690-691.

⁴³ Noting the close location of the Pierleoni house in the Forum to the Arch of Titus, it would be interesting to investigate how they referred to the Arch in personal documents and letters. Perhaps the Pierleoni preferred to distance themselves from their Jewish ancestry even though it had been publicly broadcast during the schism of 1130-38.

. . . It continues under the triumphal Arch of Titus and Vespasian, which is called of the Seven Lamps, it descends to the Meta Sudens before the triumphal Arch of Constantine; . . .⁴⁴

During the eleventh century, the Frangipani had constructed a palace onto the Arch of Titus in the Forum. The family also controlled the Arch of Constantine. In 1145 while fiercely opposing the Pierleoni and supporting the papacy, the Frangipani were given control of the Circus Maximus by Pope Lucius II;⁴⁵ they constructed a defensive tower onto the Arch of Titus located there.⁴⁶ It is interesting that the Frangipani, enemies of the Pierleoni, the descendents of Jews, controlled both Arches of Titus, memorials that reminded all of the ancient Jews' defeat and humiliation under Rome.

Papal Protection of the Jews: *Sicut Judaeis*

The conflict between the popes and the German emperors continued through at least 1177, even though a compromise agreement, the Concordat of Worms had been reached by Pope Callixtus II and Emperor Henry V in September of 1122.⁴⁷ The two rulers' directives to

⁴⁴ “. . . Pergit sub arcu triumphali Titi et Vespasiani qui vocatur Septem lucernarum, descendit ad metam sudantem ante triumphalem arcum Constantini; . . .” Benedict, *Lib. pol.* in *Le Liber Censuum de l'eglise Romaine IV* (Paris, 1910), [51], 154.

⁴⁵ The history of the alternating ally and enemy relationship between the Pierleoni and the Frangipani is too complex to completely discuss here. Patriarchs of the two families had both supported the reform popes and had jointly ruled Rome for Pope Paschal II during the pope's absence in 1108. Robinson claims that Paschal's extensive support and promotion of members of the Pierleoni family, including the appointment of Petrus Pierleoni as Cardinal resulted in a breach between the two families. The Frangipani supported the emperor against the pope in 1117, and kidnapped the Pierleoni-supported pope, Gelasius II, in 1118. During the schism of 1130-1138, the Frangipani family allied with Cardinal Haimeric, papal chancellor of Innocent II. Their firm alliance with the papacy probably originated during that schism from 1130-1138, and continued with Innocent's successors. Robinson, *The Papacy*, 8-11.

⁴⁶ Mann, *The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages*, IX: 118; Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome IV.II*: 690-691; Humphrey, *Roman Circuses*, 99. Also see Heers, *Family Clans*, 176 n. 24.

⁴⁷ Briefly, the provisions of the Concordat of Worms allowed for the emperor to be present at the election of new bishops, to negotiate disputed elections, and to invest new bishops with their physical benefices, while the pope controlled their spiritual investiture with staff and ring. The text of the *Concordat* may be found in *MGH Const.*, Vol. I, 161 n. 108. See also K.J. Leyser, *Medieval Germany and its Neighbours, 900-1200* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1982), 212-213. In this dissertation, the conflict between the two rulers is most significant during the reign of Pope Alexander III, because his conflict with Frederick Barbarossa lasted through most of Alexander's reign and prevented him from residing in Rome for a majority of his rule. Even so, Eugenius III apparently considered the German emperor to be an important ally because he sought and obtained Emperor

protect the Jews also reflected their competition over power and authority. In 1123 Pope Callixtus II issued the first decree of *Sicut Judaeis*, in which he urged the Roman Christian community to protect the Jews.⁴⁸ It is significant that at approximately the same time, Callixtus finalized the Concordat of Worms and for a time stopped the papal/imperial conflict over investiture of bishops. *Sicut Judaeis*, later re-issued by Eugenius III in 1145, was a major component of the popes' protection of the Jews in the twelfth century. Eugenius's presentation of the decree also illustrates that pope's proclamation of his supreme authority, which included the superiority of Christianity over Judaism.

The papal precedent for protection of the Jews had been established in a letter of Pope Gregory I in 598.⁴⁹ Gregory I first used the phrase "Sicut Judaeis" in a letter to Bishop Victor of Palermo, instructing him to deal fairly with the Jews in his community.

Just as the Jews should not have license in their synagogues to arrogate anything beyond that permitted by law, so too in those things granted them they should experience no infringement of their rights.⁵⁰

Indeed, Gregory I's text urged protection of the Jews within Roman law; however, he also prohibited any extension of those rights. Although the above text may appear to extend

Conrad III's support and involvement in the Second Crusade, but never did receive the military support that Conrad had promised him against the Commune.

⁴⁸ Simonsohn, *Documents*, no. 44. Baron, in "Plenitude of Apostolic Powers," 287, claims that *Sicut Judaeis* was first issued in 1122 only to the Jews of Rome. Twyman, in *Papal Ceremonial*, 194, proposes that the decree was issued in 1123. Using either date equally supports my thesis that the text was issued by Calixtus as a part of his assertion of authority at nearly the same time as the Concordat of Worms in 1122.

⁴⁹ Solomon Grayzel, "Popes, Jews, and the Inquisition from 'Sicut' to 'Turbato,'" *Essays on the Occasion of the Seventieth Anniversary of the Dropsie University, 1909-1979* (1979), 155.

⁵⁰ "Sicut Iudaeis non debet esse licentia quicquam in synagogis suis ultra quam permissum est lege praesumere, ita in his quae eis concessa sunt nullum debent praeiudicium sustinere." Simonsohn, *Documents*, no. 19. See Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 74-79, translation on p. 76. It is important to note that the above phrase appears to be the only portion of Gregory's letter that was re-used almost verbatim by Pope Calixtus; that re-use was enough to hearken back to the power of Gregory the Great, and probably was another attempt to garner greater papal authority.

tolerance to the Jews, Gregory I's main motivation, according to Sandra Tozzini, may have been conversion of the Jews.⁵¹

Calixtus II apparently decreed *Sicut* to answer Jewish requests for protection, and in the hopes of stopping any further violence, such as the massacres and forced Baptisms of the First Crusade. Pope Urban II's call to Frankish nobility in November 1095 at Clermont to retrieve the Holy Land from Islamic domination had resulted in the First Crusade, as large crusading armies moved overland toward Palestine, often with little oversight or governance.⁵² As a crusader army left for the Holy Land in the spring of 1096, they first attacked and massacred a community of Jews in Rouen.⁵³ By May, the army reached the Rhineland and attacked three Jewish communities. Even though many Jews chose to convert to escape death, huge numbers were killed outright, and many chose to kill their children and themselves first.⁵⁴ Over time, both Christians and Jews wrote about the massacres. Jewish accounts memorialized those slaughtered; still today the Jews recite prayers in the

⁵¹ Sandra Tozzini, "Legal Discrimination against Italian Jews: From the Romans to the Unification of Italy," in *The Most Ancient of Minorities, The Jews of Italy*, Stanislao G. Pugliese, ed., (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 2002), 16.

⁵² The historiography of the First Crusade continues to grow and seek to understand the crusade movement and its results. Urban's exile from Rome and need to assert his authority in Christendom appears to be a major reason for his call, in addition to the vitality of northern European society at that time, the emotional call to holy war, and the vastly different groups that responded to the call. The resulting execution of several Jewish communities in Europe and recurring violence against Jews during future crusades is one of the tragic results of that call. See Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusading* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1977); Johathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London: Athlone, 1986); *Ibid.*, *The First Crusaders, 1095-1131* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Robert Chazan, *In the Year 1096, The First Crusade and the Jews* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1996). Johathan Riley-Smith claims that the papacy was swept into the crusading movement because of a spreading atmosphere of "Christian secular militarism."

⁵³ Jordan, *The French Monarchy*, 51.

⁵⁴ Historians have debated how the ideal of Jewish martyrdom developed; the idea may have come from the story of Abraham and Isaac, from accounts of the Masada massacre in antiquity, or from knowledge of Christian martyrologies. Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 117.

Synagogues to remember the “German martyrs” from the First Crusade.⁵⁵ While the pope’s initial directive had been to rout the Muslims out of the Holy Land, crusading fervor to defeat non-Christian infidels far away translated into a violent hatred of the Jews within Europe, “the other” within Christian society.⁵⁶ The ideal of a Europe united under Christianity, what the Crusaders proclaimed was the one true religion, drove the crusaders’ fervor to eliminate non-Christians.⁵⁷ After the massacres and mass-suicides of Jews, Christians were horrified at the news that parents had slaughtered their own children; ironically, such accounts only fed anti-Semitism among Christians. The First Crusade massacres signaled a horrific turning point in Christian attitudes toward the Jews.

Pope Calixtus’ command to Christians to protect and respect the Jews may have been motivated also by a desire to assert his temporal power, and probably was issued as a response to earlier imperial proclamations protecting the Jews in the Empire. Soon after the First Crusade massacres, in 1097, Emperor Henry IV had allowed forced converts from the previous year’s pogroms to return to Judaism. In 1098, he visited Mainz, the scene of the worst massacre of Jews just two years before, and commanded that an investigation be conducted into the fate of those massacred Jews’ property.⁵⁸ Henry returned to that city frequently and in January 1103, presided over the council of Mainz, at which he proclaimed the “peace of God” throughout his empire. In addition to protecting clergy, monks, nuns,

⁵⁵ Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, 50. In his book, Riley-Smith analyzed three Jewish narratives of the massacres. They can be found in English in Shlomo Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders, The Hebrew Chroniclers of the First Crusade* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1977).

⁵⁶ R.I. Moore has analyzed the similar treatment of those who were excluded from Christian society and considered to be “the other,” including Jews, Lepers, Heretics, and Prostitutes. Moore, *Persecuting Society*. Chazan, *In the Year 1096*, 8, points out that the crusade massacres of Jews were a direct result of centuries of accusations of deicide against the Jews, which in Crusaders’ minds, superseded any legitimate right of Jews to live within Christian society.

⁵⁷ Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 104.

⁵⁸ I.S. Robinson, *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 302-303.

women, and merchants, Henry also extended his protection to the Jews, a group not normally protected in such declarations.⁵⁹ At that time the emperor also announced his own plans to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.⁶⁰ Modern historians have proposed that the emperor's inclusion of the Jews into groups under imperial protection, coupled with his announcement of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, were actions designed both to imitate the original call of Pope Urban II to crusade in 1096, and to enhance the imperial position against the papacy.⁶¹

The exhortations of Pope Urban II to French nobility in 1095 to regain the Holy Land from the infidel and undertake the Crusade had unleashed a wave of passion among some knights against the Jews in the Rhineland. No record exists of Urban ever denouncing the massacres and forced conversions of the Jews.⁶² Only three decades before the First Crusade, in 1063, Pope Alexander II had praised those Christians who protected Jews in Narbonne and areas within Spain during a crusade against Muslims, and urged the lord of Benevento not to allow Jews to be forced into conversion.⁶³ A letter sent by Alexander II to the Bishops of

⁵⁹ "Turaverunt, dico, pacem aecclesiis, clericis, monachis, laicis, mercatoribus, mulieribus ne vi rapiantur, Iudeis." Julius Aronius, *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden, im Frankischen und Deutschen Reiche bis zum Jahre 1273* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1970), no. 210. Despite its outward positive appearance, this decree resulted in forbidding the Jews to carry weapons and defend themselves, and is believed to have directly led to the Jews' status in Germany as *servi camerae*, or serfs of the chamber. Grayzel, "Popes, Jews, and the Inquisition," 154 n. 14.

⁶⁰ Robinson, *Henry IV*, 318.

⁶¹ Both Salo Baron and more recently, Robinson, claim that Henry IV's proclamation of protection for the Jews, and pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1103, were a deliberate assertion of authority that directly refuted the authority of the pope. Robinson, *Henry IV*, 318; Salo Wittmayer Baron, "Plenitude of Apostolic Power," 297.

⁶² While Urban did not speak out against the massacres, he also did not object to the new converts returning to Judaism. His rival, the antipope Clement III, did. Grayzel, "Popes, Jews, and the Inquisition," 154. Simonsohn, *Documents*, no. 42.

⁶³ Simonsohn, *History*, 12-13; Simonsohn, *Documents*, nos. 36-39. Kenneth R. Stow, "Hatred of the Jews or Love of the Church: Papal Policy toward the Jews in the Middle Ages," in *Antisemitism Through the Ages*, Shmuel Almog, ed. (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1988), 77. Stow presents another aspect of Alexander's letters, in that he urged protection for the Jews since they were "subservient" to Christians, which implied that those Jews who were not willing to live within the confines of their inferior status, would not deserve protection. That "contractual" document would be cited centuries later to justify the expulsion of Jews from areas in northern Italy, since those Jews had supposedly violated the contract. Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 39.

Spain and France commended them for protecting the Jews in their communities and explained the Church's position on the Jews,

We are pleased by the report which we have heard concerning you that you have protected the Jews living among you, lest they be slain by those who set out to war against the Saracens in Spain. These warriors, moved surely by foolish ignorance and strongly by blind cupidity, wished to bring about the slaughter of those whom divine charity has perhaps predestined for salvation. In the same manner Saint Gregory also admonished those [who] agitated for annihilating them, indicating that it is impious to wish to annihilate those who are protected by the mercy of God, so that, with homeland and liberty lost, in everlasting penitence, damned by the guilt of their ancestors for spilling the blood of the Savior, they live dispersed throughout the various areas of the world. The situation of the Jews is surely different from that of the Saracens. Against the latter, who persecute Christians and drive them out of their cities and homes, one may properly fight; the former, however, are prepared to live in servitude.⁶⁴

Alexander II alluded to precedents set by Fathers of the church and to current attitudes toward the Jews. From the Augustinian tradition, he urged protection for the Jews, “those whom divine charity has perhaps predestined for salvation.” He directly mentioned Gregory I’s precedent-setting papal leadership in protecting the Jews of his time, “Saint Gregory also admonished those [who] agitated for annihilating them.” Alexander’s reference to the knights, “these warriors, moved surely by foolish ignorance and strongly by blind cupidity,” is a strong, definitive condemnation of Christian anti-Semitic fervor against the Jews, amazingly contradicted just three decades later by the massacres of Jews in Germany. The

⁶⁴ “Placuit nobis sermo quem nuper de vobis audivimus, quomodo tutati estis Iudaeos qui inter vos habitant, ne interimerentur ab illis qui contra Sarracenos in Hispaniam proficiscebantur. Illi quippe stulta ignorantia, vel forte caeca cupiditate commoti, in eorum necem volebant saevire, quos fortasse divina pietas ad salutem praedestinavit. Sic etiam beatus Gregorius quosdam qui ad eos delendos exardescabant prohibuit, impium esse denuntians eos delere velle, qui Dei misericordia servati sunt, ut, patria libertateque amissa, diuturna poenitentia, patrum praedicio in effusione sanguinis Salvatoris damnati, per terrarum orbis plagas dispersi vivant. Dispar nimirum est Iudaeorum et Sarracenorum causa. In illos enim, qui Christianos persequuntur et ex urbibus et propriis sedibus pellunt, iuste pugnatur; hi vero ubique parati sunt servire. Quemdam etiam episcopum synagogam eorum destruere volentem prohibuit.” Simonsohn, *Documents*, no. 37. Chazan, *Church, State, and Jew*, 99-100. This text, known as *Dispar nimirum est*, was eventually included in Gratian’s collection of canon law, the *Decretum*, circa 1141.

distinction that Alexander II made between Saracens and Jews is also very significant, because just such a distinction was completely ignored during the massacres of the First Crusade. The First Crusade was the turning point into a century of growing violence against Jews, and a unique era in papal/Jewish relations, all while the popes accelerated their acknowledgement of biblical Judaism.

The text of the original *Sicut Judaeis* that was issued by Calixtus II c. 1123 no longer exists; however, it was referred to in the *Sicut Judaeis* decree pronounced by Alexander III between 1159 and 1181, which is the earliest text of *Sicut* to survive.⁶⁵ This decree of Alexander III is believed to be essentially the same as that of Calixtus II.⁶⁶

Since freedom ought not to be allowed to the Jews, beyond what is permitted by the law, to be in charge in their synagogues, which were granted to them, thus in them they ought to bear no legal disadvantage. Therefore, since they wish more to endure to the end in their hardness, than to recognize the secret language of the prophets, still, because they demand our defense and help, by the gentleness of Christians of love, clinging to the footsteps of our predecessors of happy memory, Callistus and Eugenius, popes of the Romans, we give access to the petitions of the same ones, and we grant to them our power of protection. In fact, we establish that no Christian may compel those Jews reluctant or unwilling to come to Baptism, but, if with purpose, any of theirs take refuge near Christians of faith after their inclination will have been disclosed, but for a Christian, violence may be caused. Of course he who does not come to be identified voluntarily at the Baptism of Christians, but against his will, is not believed to have the true faith of Christians. Also, no Christian, without a judicial assembly of earthly authority, may presume to wound or kill any of theirs, or may presume to take away their money or property from them, which in the case of those Jews who lived in former times, contained in a quarter till now, had to change customs. In no way may anyone upset them at the celebration for their church festival, especially with clubs or stones, nor may he thrust someone into forced slavery, except at the right time to make those into Christians, who were themselves accustomed to slavery, by praying beforehand. To this, we decree that no one may venture into the cemetery of Jews, meeting men of evil for depravity and worthlessness, to seize or to maim, or to dig up human bodies for the pretext of money. Moreover, if

⁶⁵ The exact date of the presentation by Alexander III is not known for certain, but may well have been 1165 on his first adventus into the city of Rome. Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 204.

⁶⁶ Simonsohn, *Documents*, nos. 44, 46, 49; *History*, 16-17, n. 61-62.

anyone, by understanding the wording of this decree, which may be distant, would thoughtlessly presume to infringe on them, he suffers the loss of his position and retinue, or may be punished by the judgement of expulsion from the Christian community, unless he will have corrected his effrontery with a proper apology.⁶⁷

This text defines papal policy toward the Jews and opens a window into the status of Jews in Christian society, as well as the problems they faced at that time. The phrase “. . . clinging to the footsteps of our predecessors of happy memory, Callistus and Eugenius, popes of the Romans, we give access to the petitions of the same ones, and we grant to them our power of protection. . . .” clearly established the text as following a precedent established by Calixtus II and Eugenius III. Unfortunately no texts of the Jewish requests have survived; however, since *Sicut* includes a reference to those requests, the Jews probably did originally petition Calixtus II for protection. Alexander’s statement that the Jews were “. . . to be in charge in their synagogues, which were granted to them, thus in them they ought to bear no legal disadvantage. . . .” refers to the provisions in the Theodosian Code that protected synagogues from attacks.⁶⁸ The accusation that the Jews’ spiritual blindness preventing them from accepting the Christian interpretation of the Old Testament was contained in the phrase

⁶⁷ “Sicut Judaeis non debet esse licentia, ultra quam permissum est lege in synagogis suis praesumere, ita in eis, quae concessa sunt, nullum debent praesudicium sustinere. Nos ergo, cum in sua magis velint duritia permanere, quam prophetarum verba arcana cognoscere atque Christianae fidei et salutis notitiam habere, quia tamen defensionem et auxilium nostrum postulant, ex Christianae pietatis mansuetudine praedecessorum nostrorum felicitatis memoriae Callisti et Eugenii Romanorum pontificum vestigiis inhaerentes, ipsorum petitiones admittimus eisque protectionis nostrae clypeum indulgemus. Statuimus enim, ut nullus Christianus invitos vel nolentes eos ad baptismum venire compellat, sed, si eorum quilibet ad Christianos fidei causa confugerit, postquam voluntas ejus fuerit patefacta, Christianus absque calumnia efficiatur. Veram quippe Christianitatis fidem habere non creditur, qui ad Christianorum baptismum non spontaneus, sed invitus cognoscitur pervenire. Nullus etiam Christianus eorum quemlibet sine iudicio potestatis terrenae vulnerare vel occidere vel suas eis pecunias auferre praesumat aut bonas, quas hactenus in ea, quam prius habitabant regione habuerunt, consuetudines immutare. Praesertim in festivitatibus suarum celebratione quisquam fustibus vel lapidibus eos nullatenus perturbet nec aliquis ab eis coacta servitia exigat, nisi ea, quae ipsi praefato tempore facere consueverunt. Ad haec, malorum hominum pravitate et nequitiae obviantes, decernimus, ut nemo coemeterium Iudaeorum mutilare vel invidare audeat, sive obtentu pecuniae corpora humana effodere. Si quis autem, hujus decreti tenore agnito, quod absit, temere contraire praesumpserit, honoris et officii sui periculum patiat, aut excommunicationis sententia plectatur, nisi praesumptionem suam digna satisfactione correxerit.” Mansi, Joannes Dominicus. *Sacrorum consiliorum nova, et amplissima collectio* 22 (Venetiis: Antonium Zatta, 1776), cols. 355f.

⁶⁸ *The Theodosian Code* 16.8.25

“. . . they wish more to endure to the end in their hardness, than to recognize the secret language of the prophets.” The text forbids the commission of several atrocities against the Jews, which obviously indicates that such crimes were occurring: punishing a Jew or taking away his property without the approval of secular authorities, forcibly baptizing Jews, disrupting their religious festivals, taking them into slavery, or desecrating their cemeteries to obtain extortion payments. The complexities of the papal attitude toward the Jews is demonstrated clearly by the punishment proscribed for Christians who disobeyed the order. After listing all the indignities and violent acts perpetrated against the Jews, the punishment for committing such acts is expulsion from the Christian community, certainly a serious punishment, but one that could easily be corrected with a mere apology.

Other theories have been advanced to explain why Calixtus issued *Sicut* at that particular time. Since the text mentions Jewish pleas for protection, the logical conclusion has been that *Sicut* was a response to Jewish requests. Even though the text of *Sicut* mentions the petitions of the Jews, Salo Baron suggests that the first issue of *Sicut* may have been a response to Jewish fears about the outcome of the Lateran Council that Calixtus had called for 1123;⁶⁹ Baron further proposes that such fears were commonplace among Jews whenever a council of the Church was called during the twelfth century.⁷⁰ As evidence, Baron cited an account of Shem-Tob Sonzolo, who recorded that when the Jews in his community heard of Innocent II’s call to the Second Lateran Council in 1139, they panicked in fear of renewed violence against them:

⁶⁹ Baron, “Plenitude of Apostolic Power,” 288. Apparently Jews are not mentioned at all in the decrees of Lateran I. Tanner, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils I*: 187-194.

⁷⁰ Baron, “Plenitude of Apostolic Power,” 288.

. . . all the Jewish communities were terrified. They [the Jews] fasted for three consecutive days. God showed them favor, however, and they . . . spoke only kindly words about the Jews.⁷¹

Susan Twyman agrees with Baron's theory because of the time delay between the massacres and the issue of *Sicut*;⁷² however, regardless of the intervening years, the massacres of 1096 would still have been a recent and vivid memory to Jews in 1123, and the fears of recurring violence must have been foremost in their minds.

Another factor in Calixtus's decision to issue *Sicut* may have been the influence of the Pierleoni family. The Pierleoni, as powerful supporters of the papacy, and patrons and protectors of the Jews of Rome, may have intervened with Pope Calixtus II to help to protect the Jews just as they probably did with Pope Alexander II in 1063.⁷³ In 1061, Leo, the son of the Jewish convert Baruch, had provided invaluable support to Alexander II in his dispute with the antipope Honorius II. The family continued to support the reform popes against the emperor and the Roman nobility, through at least Calixtus II.⁷⁴ Kenneth Stow credits the text of *Dispar nimirum est*, which was written by Alexander II, as the inspiration for the first decree of *Sicut*. In that case, the Pierleoni, Christian descendants of Roman Jews and patrons of the Jewish community of Rome, probably played a major role in protecting the Jews of Rome through *Sicut*.⁷⁵ Calixtus II, in decreeing *Sicut Judaeis*, used the precedent set by the powerful and revered Pope Gregory I, demonstrated his papal power to the emperor with

⁷¹ Baron, "Plenitude of Apostolic Power," 288. Translation by Baron. According to Baron, Shem-Tob Sonzolo's account is included in R. Salomo aben Verga, *Shevet Jehudah*, trans. by M. Weiner (Neudruck, 1924), 112.

⁷² Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 195.

⁷³ Kenneth Stow explains that the Pierleoni had given strong support to Alexander II in his election, and Alexander probably intervened in Spain as repayment for Pierleoni support. Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 40.

⁷⁴ Zema, "The Houses of Tuscany and of Pierleone," 175.

⁷⁵ Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 40.

whom he had just recently concluded the Concordat of Worms, and probably acted in response to both Jewish pleas for protection and urging from the Pierleoni.

Another facet of the *Sicut* decree sheds light on the particular attitude of the twelfth-century popes toward the Jews. Apparently the decree was effective in protecting the Jews of Rome, because the Roman Jews did not experience the violent pogroms that other communities in Europe did during the Middle Ages. According to Shlomo Simonsohn, the Roman Jews and the popes maintained a special relationship; that relationship helped the Roman Jewish community to persist virtually intact throughout the Middle Ages, while other communities in Europe were persecuted.⁷⁶ Beyond papal protection, the decree signified a contract between the pope and the Jews: the pope would protect them, and they would support him and be subservient to his rule. As the twelfth century progressed, and restrictions from the Church increasingly controlled the lives of the Roman Jews, *Sicut* was re-issued again and again, renewing the contract.

The support of the Roman Jews for Calixtus II is evident by their participation in the official papal entrance to the city in 1120. Susan Twyman describes Calixtus' entrance for the first time as pope, perhaps three years before he decreed *Sicut*.⁷⁷ Uodalscalcus of Augsburg recorded an account of the papal *adventus* and celebration; he clearly indicated the Roman Jews' participation in the ceremony:

Then crowned, and so that you may believe that the Church is taken possession of by a regal pontificate, he is led away through the middle of the city, adorned completely with golden streets, precious stones, or the most valuable tapestries, to flow past not only the applauding from choruses of Greek and Latin, but

⁷⁶ Simonsohn, *History*, 402-403.

⁷⁷ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 92. While papal *adventus* into Rome had been recorded as early as 799 for Leo III, it occurred sporadically until the twelfth century, *Lives of the Eighth-Century Popes*, 188-189.

also the inarticulate choruses of the Jews, so that the unseeing or unseen nation may acknowledge from whom Jesus may be more avenged.⁷⁸

This description equates the papacy with royal rulers by calling the pope “regal,” by describing the opulent decoration of the city, and the trilingual acclamations in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, previously offered only for secular rulers.⁷⁹ While Calixtus’ decree of *Sicut* circa 1123 apparently was not connected to his entrance into the city, by 1145 papal decree of *Sicut* had become a traditional act of the pope that established his relationship with the Roman Jewish community. During the twelfth century, five successors of Calixtus II re-issued the document: Eugenius III (r. 1145-1153), Alexander III (r. 1159-1181), Clement III (r. 1187-1191), Celestine III (r. 1191-1198), and Innocent III (r. 1198-1216). In the cases of Eugenius III and Alexander III, their bestowal of the decree on the Jews of Rome probably was an integral part of the papal adventus procession, as they each took possession of the city of Rome after periods of exile. In that context, the decree of *Sicut Judaeis* gained added significance as a component of the pope’s expression of temporal and spiritual power over all of Rome.

Political Upheaval in Rome: 1130-1145

In 1130, a dispute within the community of cardinals resulted in the election of two popes, a not-uncommon occurrence during that century. According to the decrees of the synod of 1059, the cardinals had the sole responsibility of electing the pope; however, if their choice did not coincide with the people’s preference or with the choice of another faction of

⁷⁸ “Deinde coronatus, ut regali sacerdotio ecclesiam credas potiri, per medium deducitur civitatis, plateis auro, gemmis seu pretiosissimis palliis undique adornatis. Nec defuere Graecorum et Latinorum concentibus confusi Iudaeorum plausus, ut caeca gens vel invita confiteatur, unde magis puniatur.” *Uodalscalcus de Eginone et Herimanno*, *MGH SS* 12: 446.

⁷⁹ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 201-203.

cardinals, an antipope would often be elected or chosen by lay acclamation.⁸⁰ Indeed, within the entire twelfth century, no fewer than eleven antipopes and seventeen popes claimed St. Peter's chair, a higher percentage than in any century of the medieval papacy.⁸¹ The comparatively large number of rival popes in the twelfth century clearly demonstrates the political instability in Rome and in the Church during that particular period.

That political instability helped to bring about the quick, quiet election of Innocent II in 1130 by a small group of Cardinals following the death of Honorius II; Innocent's election was supported by the Frangipani and by Haimeric, the papal chancellor.⁸² Innocent belonged to the Papareschi family, another noble Roman clan with origins in Trastevere, but with thoroughly Christian origins.⁸³ When the news of Innocent's election circulated in Rome, the excluded Cardinals, who constituted a majority of the entire college, elected Cardinal Petrus Leonis as Pope Anacletus II.⁸⁴ Anacletus's forces overtook the Lateran, St. Peter's and the Leonine city, and Innocent soon was forced to leave Rome.⁸⁵ The resulting schism in the Church from 1130-1138, caused by these rival papacies, divided European rulers on either side.⁸⁶ Both Innocent and Anacletus initially courted an alliance with Emperor Lothar;

⁸⁰ Greenaway in *Arnold of Brescia* (9) points out the irony that several rival antipopes were selected by powerful factions of Cardinals, actions which were made possible by the reforms originally introduced by Hildebrand (Gregory VII) in 1059 which gave the Curia and Cardinals much more power than ever before.

⁸¹ In the previous eleventh century, a total of four antipopes and twenty popes were elected, while in the thirteenth century, no antipopes were chosen during the reigns of the seventeen legitimate popes. Krautheimer, *Rome, Profile of a City*, 328.

⁸² See Chodorow, *Christian Political Theory*, 18-27, for a deeper discussion of the political aspects of Innocent's election.

⁸³ Mann, *Lives of the Popes*, IX: 14.

⁸⁴ The future Pope Innocent II and the antipope Anacletus II both had represented Calixtus II as cardinals in the negotiations for the Concordat of Worms in 1122. Stroll, *The Jewish Pope*, 157.

⁸⁵ Mann, *Lives of the Popes*, IX:14. Innocent spent most of his papacy outside of Italy, and returned in 1138 after Anacletus's death.

⁸⁶ After several councils and diplomatic efforts, Innocent received the support of most of the Bishops and rulers in western Europe. Anacletus was supported by Scotland, Aquitaine, and the Norman king Roger II of southern Italy and Sicily. Stroll, *The Jewish Pope*, xv. The Holy Roman Emperor Lothar III also supported Innocent II, and indicated so with the "stirrup service" when he first met the new pope. This involved holding the stirrup of

Innocent managed to obtain Lothar's military help to re-enter Rome in 1133 by agreeing to crown the emperor at that time.⁸⁷

Mary Stroll believes that Bernard of Clairvaux's constant support for Innocent's cause had a major influence on his endorsement by most European powers and his ultimate attainment of the papal throne.⁸⁸ Cardinal Haimeric, Innocent II's papal chancellor, had sought the assistance of Bernard to argue the legitimacy of Innocent before the leaders of Europe, and Bernard used traditional prejudices about the Jews to turn opinion against Anacletus.⁸⁹ The derogatory comments made by Bernard about Anacletus' Jewish background demonstrate how effective such sentiments were at manipulating attitudes and deflecting secular support from Anacletus, and may perhaps suggest the personal attitude of Bernard of Clairvaux toward the Jews. In trying to determine Eugenius III's attitudes toward the Jews, the attitude of his very influential mentor, Bernard of Clairvaux, may suggest Eugenius's perspective.

In a letter to Hildebert, Archbishop of Tours circa 1131, Bernard wrote the following about Anacletus:

. . . it seems that, according to Isaias, they have made a covenant with death and a compact with hell. Innocent, the anointed of the Lord, has been set up for the fall and rise of many. Those who are of God have freely chosen him, but he who stands over against him is either Antichrist or his follower. The abomination of desolation is standing in the Holy Place, to gain possession of which he has set fire to the sanctuary of God. He persecutes Innocent . . .⁹⁰

the pope's horse for him and leading the horse by the bridle. These services held huge symbolic meaning, because Constantine had reputedly performed them for Pope Sylvester, and Pepin for Pope Stephen, thus signifying fealty of the emperor to the pope. Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, 108.

⁸⁷ The ceremony was represented in a Lateran mural as though Lothar had become the pope's vassal. Stroll claims that the emperor and Pope did not enter into a feudal relationship at that time, contrary to the picture represented by the mural. That mural would later be a point of contention with Frederick Barbarossa. Stroll, *The Jewish Pope*, 76.

⁸⁸ Stroll, *The Jewish Pope*, 181.

⁸⁹ Stroll, *The Jewish Pope*, 156-159.

⁹⁰ Bernard of Clairvaux, *The Letters of Bernard of Clairvaux*, no. 127.

Bernard did not merely disparage Anacletus as a descendant of Jews, but framed him in the context of the Antichrist and the Devil. At the same time, by describing Innocent as “the anointed of the Lord, [who] has been set up for the fall and rise of many,” Bernard directly compared Innocent II to Christ by placing him in the context of Luke’s account of the presentation of Jesus in the Temple:

. . . and Symeon blessed them and said to Mary his mother, “Behold, this child was appointed for the fall and the rise of many in Israel, . . .”⁹¹

No greater antithesis could contrast the two men than to compare them as Christ and Antichrist.

Only a few years later, in 1134, Bernard further expressed his disgust for Anacletus’s Jewish ancestry in a letter to Emperor Lothar:

. . . it is the concern of a friend of the Church to save her from the mad fury of the schismatics . . . it is to the injury of Christ that a man of Jewish race has seized for himself the See of Peter. . .⁹²

By claiming that Anacletus had gained the papal throne unlawfully, Bernard attempted to win over any churchmen still supporting the antipope. After Anacletus’s death and Innocent’s restoration to the papal throne, Bernard wrote to Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny, about the triumph of the Church over the recent schism:

I give thanks to God who has given her victory, who has “cherished her and brought her safely through all her strivings” . . . that impious one, who made Israel to sin, has been swallowed up in death and gone down into the pit. In the words of the Prophet he “made terms with death and a compact with hell” . . .⁹³

⁹¹ “. . . et benedixit illis Symeon et dixit ad Mariam matrem eius ecce positus est hic in ruinam et resurrectionem multorum in Israhel . . .” Lc 2:34.

⁹² Bernard *Letters* no. 142.

⁹³ Bernard *Letters* no. 147.

Even after Anacletus had died and the papacy was securely in Innocent's rule, Bernard analogized the former papal rival, Anacletus, to an ally of the devil.

Anacletus's Jewish ancestry did not necessarily win him the support of Jewish communities in Europe. The Jews of Paris demonstrated their loyalty to Pope Innocent while he was in exile in France, perhaps in the hopes of obtaining his protection. They honored Innocent with the first recorded presentation of the scrolls of the law to a Pope. On Easter of 1131, the Jews approached him as he was processing to the monastery of St. Denis.⁹⁴ This highly significant act involving the very word of God demonstrated the Jews' temporal and spiritual subservience to the pope, and unquestioned loyalty to Innocent.⁹⁵ The Jews' acclamation of Innocent in such a way also added special significance to Innocent's claim of legitimacy, in light of the public derision of his opponent's Jewish ancestry. The act of presenting the Torah to Innocent showed that not even a descendant of Jews, Anacletus, could command the Jews' loyalty.

With the death of Anacletus in 1138, Innocent returned to Rome. The emperor Lothar had died in 1137 and the energy of the newly elected Emperor Conrad of Hohenstaufen was directed to consolidating his rule at home.⁹⁶ After Innocent's return to the Lateran, his political authority in Rome deteriorated with the establishment of the Roman Commune and re-constituted Senate in 1143. The communal movement had originated in northern Italy in

⁹⁴ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 197. Greenaway, in *Arnold of Brescia*, 4, claims that the pomp and splendor of papal ceremonials increased significantly with the reign of Innocent II; this pope skillfully used rich display to enhance the special nature of his office and support the legitimacy of his claim.

⁹⁵ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 199.

⁹⁶ The clash between the Welfs (Guelfs) and the Waiblingen (Ghibelline) parties originated in conflict between Conrad III and Duke Henry the Proud of Bavaria and his brother Welf c. 1140. While this conflict would endure into the next century and grow in scope into the papal (Guelf) and imperial (Ghibelline) parties, it is mentioned at this point to note that Conrad's involvement in Roman affairs from his election until his death in 1152 was limited by his attention to controlling disturbances in his kingdom. Mann, *Lives of the Popes at the Height*, IX:63. See also, Jacques Heers, *Parties and Political Life in the Medieval West* (Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1977) and Leyser, *Medieval Germany*.

the previous century; several cities in Lombardy and Tuscany began to demand self-government during the same period as the push for reform grew in the Church. By the mid-twelfth century, not only were those cities free of episcopal or royal rule, but the wealthy merchants in those communities had grown very powerful and independent.⁹⁷ A product of one of those northern communes, Arnold of Brescia, became a passionate reformer who would inflame the Roman Commune during Eugenius III's papacy and complicate the political and diplomatic situation in Rome.⁹⁸ Arnold's incitement of the Commune against the papacy further explains the great difficulty that Eugenius experienced in trying to establish authority in Rome.

Arnold of Brescia's life story is associated with another well-known figure in the intellectual history of the early twelfth century, Peter Abelard. What little is known of Arnold's early life indicates that he adopted the rule of the Augustinian canons and moved to Paris c. 1115 to study with Abelard.⁹⁹ The young monk only stayed with Abelard for a few years, but apparently maintained a long-term association with him. Arnold lived an ascetic life, drew numerous followers with his charismatic preaching, and publicly criticized the clergy's ownership of property and other material possessions.

In 1138, after inciting the people of Brescia to refute the authority of the Bishop, Arnold was banished from Italy by Innocent II. As he accompanied his colleague Peter Abelard to the Council of Sens in 1140, Arnold earned the notice and wrath of Bernard of

⁹⁷ Krautheimer, *Rome, Profile of a City*, 148; Robert L. Benson, "Political *Renovatio*: Two Models from Roman Antiquity," in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 340. The political situation in Milan and Brescia was complicated by the fact that the Bishops of those cities, while nominally obedient to the Bishop of Rome, were also powerful landholders who owed a feudal allegiance to the German emperor.

⁹⁸ Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia*, 20-23.

⁹⁹ John of Salisbury, in the *Historia Pontificalis*.XXXI, noted that Arnold was "a priest by office, a canon regular by profession."

Clairvaux.¹⁰⁰ In a letter to Innocent II, Bernard called Arnold the “armour-bearer” for Abelard.¹⁰¹ After summoning the bishops to the Council, Bernard wrote to Innocent,

Masters Peter and Arnold, the pest of which you rid Italy, have made common cause against the Lord and against his anointed. . . . Their lives are corrupt and hateful and by the leaven of their corruption they are corrupting the faith of simple people, upsetting moral values, defiling the purity of the Church. . . . We have escaped the roaring of Peter the Lion who occupied the see of Simon Peter only to encounter Peter the Dragon who assails the faith of Simon Peter. The former openly persecuted the Church of God . . . but the latter lurks like a dragon in hidden places . . .¹⁰²

In Bernard’s comparison of Innocent’s former rival Anacletus II or Cardinal Petrus Leonis, “Peter the Lion,” to Peter Abelard, Bernard raised the seriousness of the charges against Abelard to the level of Anacletus’s perceived offenses. Bernard’s fury and determination to sanction Abelard must have been enormous in light of Bernard’s past opinions of Anacletus as the Antichrist and ally of the devil. Innocent condemned Abelard’s books and doctrines, and ordered the two men to separate and enter different monasteries.¹⁰³ While Abelard obediently entered Cluny and submitted to the pope, Arnold reportedly traveled to Paris where he openly lectured, complained of the vices he saw in the Church, and denounced Bernard.¹⁰⁴ In 1146 Arnold reappeared in the historical record when he appealed to Pope Eugenius at Viterbo and asked forgiveness, then settled in Rome and became involved in the Roman Commune.¹⁰⁵ In a very short time Arnold’s charismatic preaching would exert

¹⁰⁰ Abelard had agreed to debate Bernard of Clairvaux at the Council of Sens about theological positions that Abelard had advocated in his texts, and to answer charges of heresy. Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia*, 27-47, 56-57.

¹⁰¹ Bernard *Letters*, no. 239; Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia*, 76-77.

¹⁰² Bernard *Letters*, no. 242.

¹⁰³ Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia*, 79-80.

¹⁰⁴ John of Salisbury *Historia pontificalis* XXXI.

¹⁰⁵ Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia*, 92. Marjorie Chibnall, in the Introduction to *John of Salisbury’s Memoirs of the Papal Court* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1956), xli, notes that John of Salisbury’s story of Arnold’s appearance before the Pope at Viterbo, or later in Rome, may have been an eye-witness account during John’s service in the Curia. She also considers the account reliable because John wrote the *Historia Pontificalis* for a

tremendous influence on the Roman Commune and magnify the difficulties that Eugenius would face in achieving and maintaining authority in the city.

The formation of the Roman Commune and the re-establishment of the Senate in 1143 demonstrated another aspect of the widespread interest in antiquity that pervaded twelfth-century Rome in the *renovatio*; that interest extended to the ideals of republican government from Roman antiquity.¹⁰⁶ In northern Italy and in the Papal Patrimony, the civic reformers' ideals were in conflict with the relationships of loyalty and patronage then in place within the ecclesiastical and secular segments of society.¹⁰⁷ Those same sentiments of self-government grew among the people of Rome throughout the early 1140's, until they took the decisive step of forming the Roman Commune; however, the city of Rome was very different from the northern Italian communes, because it was both the seat of the papacy and the site of the coronation of the Holy Roman Emperor by the pope.¹⁰⁸

While Pope Innocent II was initially not opposed to the Commune, communal determination to rule ruthlessly over Latium resulted in a breach.¹⁰⁹ Papal and communal forces worked together to defeat Tivoli in 1143; however, when Innocent peacefully concluded matters with a treaty and took Tivoli under his own authority, the Commune

friend, not for public consumption, and did not even finish the manuscript. However, she also notes that if John's service in the Curia began in 1148, then John could not have been an eyewitness to all the events that he described.

¹⁰⁶ Mann, in *The Lives of the Popes IX*: 68, claims that factional fighting between noble Roman families, and between the pope and antipope fostered independence among the common people in Rome. This movement of self-governance led to the formation of guilds in Rome during the eleventh century. The Commune not only established the Senate on the Capitoline Hill, but also issued its own coinage. Nicholas Cheetham, *Keepers of the Keys, the Popes in History* (London: MacDonald, 1982), 108. Benson in "Political *Renovatio*" (341) states that the Roman Commune used the model of ancient Rome primarily during the period of 1144 to 1155.

¹⁰⁷ Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia*, 25.

¹⁰⁸ Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia*, 100.

¹⁰⁹ Robinson claims that the leaders of the Commune planned to rule Latium as the *contado* of Rome, and conquer Tivoli as the first step. Robinson, *The Papacy*, 13.

objected.¹¹⁰ The Roman people then began to directly refute the pope's authority in Rome.¹¹¹ Robinson claims that the communal movement in Rome began as a small rebellion against the pope, but escalated into a revolution.¹¹² The Commune grew more powerful through the death of Innocent II in September 1143, and the short pontificate of Celestine II from September 1143 to March 1144.

In June 1144, the Commune took the decisive step of re-establishing the Senate during the brief reign of Celestine's successor, Lucius II.¹¹³ Seating that governmental body on the Capitoline Hill in the restored *tabularium* deliberately recalled the ancient Roman Republic, as well as the new office of *patricius*, which replaced the papally-appointed prefect of the city.¹¹⁴ The new Senate was constituted from the citizens, including lawyers and "lesser nobility," not from the powerful nobility or clergy in the city.¹¹⁵ The senators' meeting place on the Capitoline was even referred to in the guide to Rome, the *Mirabilia Urbis Romae*,

These are the hills within the city: the Janiculum, commonly called the Janarian . . . the Capitoline or the Tarpeian Hill, where the Senators' Palace is . . .¹¹⁶

¹¹⁰ Benson, "Political Renovatio," 340; Mann, *The Lives of the Popes*, IX: 70; Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia*, 103.

¹¹¹ Cheetham, in *Keepers of the Keys*, points out that different factions in Rome had disagreed with the pope before; the difference in 1143 was the "sudden rise of Republicanism at Rome," which enlarged a disagreement into a full-scale revolt against papal rule. Benson, "Political Renovatio," 340.

¹¹² Robinson, *The Papacy*, 13.

¹¹³ Roger II, the king of Sicily, was allied with Lucius; see Mann, *The Lives of the Popes*, IX: 115. This alliance, according to Mann, encouraged the Commune to further rebel and appoint a *patricius* and expel the papally-appointed Prefect of Rome. Bernard of Clairvaux also wrote to Conrad to beg his support of Lucius II. Bernard *Letters*, no. 320. For the different offices and administrative assemblies of the Commune, see Mann, *The Lives of the Popes*, IX: 148-152.

¹¹⁴ Mann, *The Lives of the Popes*, IX: 73. The Commune began to date its documents from the re-constitution of the Senate in 1144. Benson in "Political Renovatio" (344) notes that the *patricius* received all financial income that normally would go to the pope, except for tithes and offerings.

¹¹⁵ Krautheimer, *Rome, Profile of a City*, 152.

¹¹⁶ Benedict *Mirabilia Urbis Romae* 8, 58. According to Frances Morgan Nichols, the editor of the *Mirabilia* (58), the *tabularium* on the northeastern corner of the Capitoline Hill was restored c. 1143 and occupied by the new Senate. The *tabularium* had been originally built in 78 BCE and served the Roman Republic as a "record office," M. Cary, *A History of Rome Down to the Reign of Constantine*, 3rd ed., (New York: St. Martin's Press), 304.

The Roman Senate in ancient Rome had met in the Curia building in the Forum; in 1144 the new Senate chose to meet on the Capitoline Hill, an important religious center in ancient Rome. Their meeting place, the restored *tabularium*, had been an administrative building in antiquity, but was still located in an ancient religious area. In light of the Commune's deliberate focus on Roman antiquity, and antipathy to the pope, they may have deliberately chosen the Capitoline Hill as the center of their authority to challenge the religious authority of the pope. Pope Lucius answered the Senate's demand for total temporal power by enlisting more aristocratic support for the papal cause; it was at this point in January of 1145 that Lucius gave the Frangipani family control of the Circus Maximus for their use as a fortress.¹¹⁷

The Commune abolished the office of prefect of the city, the principal officer that had been traditionally appointed by the pope, and instituted the office of *patricius*, the chief administrator for the Commune.¹¹⁸ Jordan Pierleoni, brother of the former antipope Anacletus, was chosen as the first *patricius*.¹¹⁹ Jordan Pierleoni's support of the Commune against the papacy was perhaps inevitable, despite his noble status, since the Church had totally discredited his brother, the antipope Anacletus II, in the previous decade. While the leadership of the Commune was not sympathetic to the Roman nobility in general, the Pierleoni had skillfully managed to maintain their power in the city and in the Commune. Robinson notes that the Pierleoni were the only Roman nobility that sided with the Commune;

¹¹⁷ Mann, *The Lives of the Popes*, IX: 117-118. Mann states that the Arch of Titus in the Circus still stood at that time. By the 1140s, since the Frangipani were enemies of the Pierleoni, it is understandable that the Frangipani were allied with Lucius II.

¹¹⁸ The Prefect of the city was apparently a very powerful official and traditionally nominated by the pope. According to Mann, the office of Prefect served whoever was in control of Rome at the time, the German emperor or the Pope. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes*, IX: 150 n. 3.

¹¹⁹ This *patricius* was a brother of the antipope Anacletus II (d. 1138), Krautheimer, *Rome, Profile of a City*, 152.

soon after Jordan Pierleoni was named *patricius*, communal forces destroyed the fortress of the Pierleoni arch-rivals, the Frangipani, on the Palatine Hill.¹²⁰

The Commune's choice of Jordan Pierleoni as *patricius* also leads to questions about the Roman Jews' political position during those years, namely whether they supported the Commune and Jordan Pierleoni, or the papacy. Kenneth Stow suggests that a patron/client relationship very probably existed between the Roman Jews and the Pierleoni in the early twelfth century, regardless of the conversion of the Pierleoni patriarch Baruch to Christianity in the previous century.¹²¹ According to Ariel Toaff, in the twelfth century the Roman Jewish community included a small number of families in Trastevere and on the Tiber Island; the majority lived within the area of Pierleoni dominance, the Ripa, across the Tiber River from Trastevere, in the area of the Pierleoni stronghold in the Theater of Marcellus.¹²² In the tradition of Roman family clans, the Pierleoni probably maintained strong alliances with the residents of Trastevere, the area in which the family had originated, and maintained patron-client relationships with the residents there and in the Ripa.¹²³ Whether or not the Roman Jews were involved in the Commune is not clear; it is also debatable if the residents of Trastevere participated. Mann claims simply that Trastevere was not included in the Commune.¹²⁴ According to Louis Halphen, the "islanders" and "Trasteverins" considered themselves separate from the "Romans;" Halphen states that although some Roman senators

¹²⁰ John of Salisbury, *Historia pontificalis*.XXVII.

¹²¹ Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 40.

¹²² *Medieval Jewish Civilization*, s.v. "Rome." The old Jewish synagogue and Jewish cemetery still remained in Trastevere; therefore, even though Jewish settlement was not primarily in that area, Trastevere probably still retained a Jewish flavor. Vogelstein, *Rome*, 126.

¹²³ Heers, *Family Clans*, 248.

¹²⁴ Mann, *The Lives of the Popes*, IX: 148.

apparently came from Trastevere, the distinctly separate identifications of Trasteverins and Romans lasted at least through 1155.¹²⁵

At first glance, as clients of the Pierleoni, it would seem that the Roman Jews would have been obligated to support the Pierleoni position and Jordan Pierleoni. A far more likely scenario suggests that the Jews chose not to participate in the Commune movement for safety's sake, or were excluded from it to start with. If, as has been suggested, the non-noble people of Rome including the merchants and laborers of the city formed the majority of the Commune, then the Jews may not have been welcome to join them. Any Roman Jew who worked as an artisan would not have belonged to a guild; Christian guilds did not admit Jews.¹²⁶ Based on the recurring violence against Jewish communities, Jews probably withdrew and tried to protect themselves by not actively supporting or opposing the Commune movement, and at the same time quietly maintained their support for the pope.¹²⁷ At that point, the Jews of Rome had been temporal subjects of the papacy for several centuries; just two decades earlier, Calixtus II had publicly protected the Jews.¹²⁸ Even if Jews were welcome to join the communal movement in Rome, the Roman Jews needed the protection of the pope and could not risk losing it.

¹²⁵ Louis Halphen, *Etudes sur L'administration de Rome au Moyen Age (751-1252)*, (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1907), 58.

¹²⁶ Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 215. For many reasons, while the number of Jews supporting themselves through usury gradually increased, twelfth-century Jews still worked as craftsmen, merchants, and small-scale producers of goods such as wine. The revival of trade in the northern Italian cities in the eleventh and twelfth centuries made commercial trade and long-distance commerce lucrative for Jews.

¹²⁷ Eugenius's actions toward the Roman Jews during his papal adventus in December of 1145 will support this theory.

¹²⁸ Whether Calixtus II's document, *Sicut Judaeis*, was just "lip service" or whether it actually was put into use to protect the Roman Jews, the fact remains that the Roman community never did experience the massacres or expulsion that other Jewish communities in Europe suffered during the Middle Ages. Simonsohn, *History*, 402; Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 6.

In February 1145, Pope Lucius led an armed force to confront the Commune and was mortally wounded in an attack on the Capitoline Hill.¹²⁹ Both Lucius and Bernard of Clairvaux had requested assistance from Emperor Conrad, but the emperor was consumed with his own affairs in Germany. After Lucius' death, the dangerous atmosphere of Rome forced his successor to leave the city almost immediately for safer territory. This was the state of the papacy that Eugenius III inherited.¹³⁰

Through the papacies of Eugenius III, Anastasius IV, Adrian IV, and Alexander III, the Commune would continue to disrupt and usurp papal rule in Rome and the Patrimony, adding a political antagonist to the already-complex diplomatic world of papal politics. The Commune's eventual failure to secure permanent rule in the late twelfth century resulted from the papacy's strength, influence, and vital contribution to the Roman economy.¹³¹ The northern Italian communes' success depended in large part on their commercial vibrancy, which enabled them to act independently of secular or episcopal rule; however, even though the Roman economy was negatively affected when the pope and Curia did not reside in the city, the Commune frequently drove the popes out of Rome, and for extended periods.¹³²

¹²⁹ Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia*, 104-107; *L'Italia dell'alto Medioevo*, Ovidio Capitani et al., eds., *Storia della Società Italiana*, Parte secunda, Vol.V (Milano: Nicola Teti & C., 1984), 37. Mann credits Godfrey of Viterbo with the account of Lucius' death from injuries from boulders during the battle with the Commune forces on the Capitoline Hill.

¹³⁰ The primary information for the life of Eugenius III is provided in the *Liber Pontificalis* by Boso, a cleric who served several papal administrations through his posts in the Curia from 1149 to 1178. Boso was made Cardinal by Alexander III in 1165/66, and composed the vitae of Alexander and several earlier popes, including Eugenius III. Modern studies of Eugenius III include Mann, *The Lives of the Popes*, Helmut Glaber, *Papst Eugen III* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1936), G. Spinabella, *Un grande Pontefice Riformatore, Eugenio III, pisano* (Pisa: Valenti, 1964), and Michael Horn, *Studien zur geschichte Papst Eugens III (1145-1153)* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1992).

¹³¹ Benson, "Political *Renovatio*," 341.

¹³² Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 155-156.

Eugenius III: 1145-1153

Papal Election in the Midst of Anarchy

Upon his election to the papacy, Eugenius III was confronted by the Roman Commune, which directly refuted his authority and that of the hierarchy of the Church. The conflict between the pope and the Commune extended through Eugenius's entire papacy and resulted in his exile from Rome three times. In fact, Eugenius resided outside of Rome for the majority of his reign.¹³³ Following the death of Pope Lucius II on February 15, 1145, the cardinals quickly met at S. Caesarius on the Palatine Hill, under the protection of the Frangipani, and chose Bernardo of Pisa, who was serving as abbot of the Cistercian monastery of S. Anastasius, to succeed Lucius as Eugenius III.¹³⁴ Greenaway claims that the Commune then demanded that Eugenius give up all claims to temporal authority in Rome and the Patrimony, which he refused to do.¹³⁵ At that point, the already-difficult political situation in Rome deteriorated quickly. After ceremonies at the Lateran, the new pope and his entourage immediately left the city and traveled to Farfa, where Eugenius was consecrated on February 18.¹³⁶ The *Liber Pontificalis* clearly described the difficulties that this pope faced on his election,¹³⁷

This choice by the bishops and cardinals was made unexpectedly and amicably at the Monastery of S. Caesarius, where all the brothers had assembled into one

¹³³ According to Jaffé in the *Regesta*, II:21-89, Eugenius resided in Rome for only about seventeen months of his more than eight years as pope.

¹³⁴ *Regesta* II:21; Horn, *Papst Eugens III*, 38.

¹³⁵ Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia*, 111.

¹³⁶ *LP* II:386; *Regesta* II: 21. Richard P. McBrien, in *Lives of the Popes, The Pontiffs from St. Peter to John Paul II* (New York: Harper Collins, 1997), 200, explains that since Bernardo, as an abbot, had not yet been consecrated a Bishop when elected to the papacy on February 15, he did not become officially the Bishop of Rome until February 18 when he was consecrated in Farfa, near Rome. Following the consecration, the pope and his court resided in Viterbo for several months.

¹³⁷ The biographies of several popes in the *LP*, including Innocent II, Eugenius III, Adrian IV, and Alexander III, were compiled by Boso, a member of the Curia since at least 1149 and Cardinal from 1157. Twyman in *Papal Ceremonial* (38) suggests that Boso may have served as chancellor to Eugenius III from 1149 to 1153, and Chamberlain for Adrian IV from 1153 to 1159.

group on account of fear of the senators and Roman people rousing to arms. He was led away to the Lateran Palace and was situated in the apostolic seat, following the practice of the Church. The perverse council of senators had arranged to censure his election violently, unless he might support their wish and by his apostolic authority strengthen the unlawful senate, and had foreseen that the service of consecration at St. Peter's, as the *ordo* of customary law required that he should undertake, had been arranged on the next Lord's Day, so in the silence of the night, with a few brothers, he left the city and withdrew in safety to the Arch of Monticellus. Assembling on another day with all the same brothers who had been dispersed on account of fear of the raging public, he advanced to the monastery at Farfa with his private family, and received on the following Sunday the grace of consecration and the entirety of his papal dignity following the custom of the Church from the Lord, the founder.¹³⁸

The author of the *Liber Pontificalis* wished to convey the dangerous situation in Rome and the commune's antipathy to the pope. Eugenius's election was not held in the Lateran or St. Peters, "on account of fear of the senators and Roman people rousing to arms." The tone of the story of Eugenius's escape from Rome sounds like a desperate escape from a mob, leaving the city quietly during the night, and "assembling on another day with all the same brothers who had been dispersed on account of fear of the raging public."

According to the *Liber Censuum*, compiled by Censius Camerarius in 1192, the traditional events in a papal inauguration included a procession from the site of election to the Lateran basilica and Palace and particular rituals in each location, and a procession to St.

¹³⁸ "Hic electus ab episcopis et cardinalibus ex insperato concorditer apud monasterium sancti Cesarii, ubi omnes fraters propter metum senatorum et populi romani consurgentis ad arma convenerant in unum; et deductus ad Lateranense patriarchium, in apostolica sede secundum morem Ecclesie positus fuit. Qui cum proxima die dominica consecrationis munus apud beatum Petrum sicut consuetudinis ordo poscebat et dispositum fuerat deberet suscipere, precognito senatorum perverso consilio, quod eius electionem violenter retractare disposuerant nisi eorum voluntati faveret et usurpatum senatum eis auctoritate apostolica confirmaret, in silentio noctis Urbem cum paucis fratribus exiit et ad arcem Monticelli se in tuto recepit. Congregatis vero alia die ibidem cunctis fratribus qui dispersi fuerant propter metum furientis populi, processit ad Farfense monasterium cum domestica familia, et consecrationis gratiam in sequenti dominica et plenitudinem sui apostolatus secundum morem Ecclesie Domino auctore suscepit." *LP* II: 386. According to Jaffé, in the *Regesta* II:21, Eugenius travelled to Monticelli (Monticellus?) on February 17, 1145. Mann explains that the destination was "Monticelli in the Sabina," Mann, *The Live of the Popes*, IX:138.

Peter's for the consecration and coronation.¹³⁹ Since the Commune's control extended to St. Peter's basilica, Eugenius was able to complete only a portion of the traditional rites of installation at the Lateran complex, and was not crowned at St. Peter's, as shown in the *Liber Pontificalis*. The combination of these rites in different places together indicated the pope's authority over the Church as descended from St. Peter, and authority over Rome by his enthronement in the Lateran basilica and Palace, where he received the acclaim of the people.¹⁴⁰ The important point is that Eugenius was disrupted by the Roman Commune from fulfilling the entire sequence of ceremonies, which would necessitate a triumphal *adventus* when he was finally able to re-enter Rome in December of 1145.

The customary rituals at the Lateran signified that the newly elected Bishop of Rome took possession of his Church, an act known as the *possessio*.¹⁴¹ Since Eugenius was hurriedly enthroned at the Lateran after his election and the Commune was decidedly anti-papal in nature, it is doubtful that he received the traditional acclaim of the citizens of Rome at the Lateran. Censius Camerarius described the traditional rites that would normally be conducted first at the Lateran for a newly-elected pope,

When he had come before the same basilica, over whose arch supported by two columns of porphyry is an image of the Savior that was once struck by a certain Jew on the forehead and discharged blood, it is understood today that the chosen sits to the right in the porphyry seat, where the prior from the basilica of S. Lawrence in the Palace gives him the staff, which is the sign of

¹³⁹ *Le liber Censuum de l'eglise Romaine* I, ed. P. Fabre and L. Duchesne (Paris, 1910), 290-316. Fabre and Duchesne's publication contains two other texts that describe twelfth-century papal rituals, the *Liber Politicus* (c. 1140) and the *Gesta pauperis scolaris* (c. 1189). Censius Camerarius compiled the *Liber Censuum* c. 1192 while serving as Chamberlain for Pope Clement III (1187-1191). Censius perhaps served also as an unofficial Chamberlain for Pope Celestine III (1191-1198), and was elected as Pope Honorius III (1216-1227). For papal inauguration rituals, also see Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 115-139.

¹⁴⁰ Robert T. Ingoglia, " 'I have neither Silver nor Gold': An Explanation of a Medieval Papal Ritual," *The Catholic Historical Review* 85, No. 4 (October, 1999), 531-532.

¹⁴¹ Ingoglia, " 'I have neither Silver nor Gold,' " 531-532.

command and amending, and the keys to the basilica itself and the Holy Lateran Palace . . .¹⁴²

In his description of a traditional papal ritual, it is significant that Censius chose to include a story of Jewish desecration of an image of Christ, a type of anti-Semitic story that began to circulate through Europe in the twelfth century, along with other rumors of ritual murder and desecration of the host. Perhaps the passage demonstrates the pervasive nature of societal attitudes toward the Jews in the twelfth century.

After leaving Rome for Farfa shortly after his election, Eugenius then traveled to Viterbo and remained there until December.¹⁴³ While in Viterbo, Arnold of Brescia approached Eugenius and asked for forgiveness.¹⁴⁴ Eugenius required Arnold to fulfill his penance in the city of Rome, which some historians have called a miscalculation or a grave mistake, because it placed Arnold in the midst of the Roman rebellion against papal rule; the political fervor of the Commune members increased with Arnold's preaching about the excesses of the Church and its clergy.¹⁴⁵ According to Otto of Freising, as the Commune grew in power, it terrorized the clergy, citizens, and pilgrims visiting the city.

They did not even shrink from turning into a fortress, in sacrilegious and godless manner, the Church of Blessed Peter, the head of all the churches. In

¹⁴² "Ubi vero ventum est ante basilicam ipsam, super cuius arcum, qui sustentatur de duabus columnis porfiredicis, est ymago quedam Salvatoris que a quodam Judeo percussa olim in fronte sanguinem emisit, sicut hodie cernitur, idem electus sedet ad dexteram in sede porfiredica, ubi prior basilice sancti Laurentii de palatio dat ei ferulam, que est signum regiminis et correctionis, et claves ipsius basilice et sacri Lateranensis palatii . . ." *Lib.Cens.* I:312. Note that in the midst of his record of a typical papal *possessio*, Censius included a story of Jewish desecration of an image of Christ on the Lateran facade. That image may have been the mosaic likeness of Christ within the roundel that was located just beneath the peak of the pediment of the facade of the Lateran, as shown in Ciampini's drawing of 1693. Ciampini, *De sacris aedificiis* II:10-11, Tab. 1.

¹⁴³ *Regesta* II:21-26.

¹⁴⁴ Arnold's works had been condemned at the Council of Sens in 1140. Both Abelard and Arnold then had appealed to the pope, and Innocent II upheld the provisions of the Council; he also exiled both men to different monasteries, outside of Italy. Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia*, 79-80, 92.

¹⁴⁵ Cheetham, *Keepers of the Keys*, 108; Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia*, 97-98.

their eagerness for gain they exacted, by stripes and blows, offerings from pilgrims who came to pray.¹⁴⁶

The Adventus of 1145

Eugenius attempted to negotiate his re-entry to Rome with the Commune leaders; finding that his excommunication of the *Patricius* Jordan Pierleoni and other Commune members did not dissuade them from their demands, Eugenius then allied his party with the military forces of Tivoli, and the Commune agreed to terms.¹⁴⁷ Just before Christmas, on December 21, 1145, Eugenius finally re-entered the city in a grand papal *adventus*, an appropriate ritual to welcome this pope who had been consecrated outside of the city and had not completed the ritual at St. Peter's.¹⁴⁸ The *Liber Pontificalis* recorded a grand entry, a papal *adventus* into Rome.

Then it was brought about unexpectedly by God, the author of great joy in all Rome, and at the longed-for entrance of the pope himself, the greatest and most numerous populace ran to him, a great number with boughs, and rushing to his footsteps in the greatest numbers, they raised up kisses to the shepherd's crook and to his mouth. The banner-bearers led the way with banners, they followed the scribes and judges; also, that the Jews might not go astray, they carried on their arms the law of Moses, with so much joy; yes, the entire Roman clergy sang psalms as one, saying: "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord." And so, with great joy and a shout of the people, the pope merited to ascend to the Lateran Palace.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁶ Otto of Freising, *The Two Cities: A Chronicle of Universal History to the Year 1146*, eds., Austin P. Evans and Charles Knapp (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), VII.31. Otto, uncle of Frederick I Barbarossa, Cistercian monk, and later Bishop of Freising, recorded his chronicle between 1143 and 1147. Although Otto wrote his history in the customary manner of the day, beginning with the creation of the world and arranging the narrative to teach a lesson, Charles Christopher Mierow, in the introduction to *The Two Cities* (3-4), believes that the chronicle is valuable for historical insights into the many events that Otto witnessed.

¹⁴⁷ Otto of Freising *The Two Cities* VII.31.

¹⁴⁸ *Regesta* II:27.

¹⁴⁹ "Factum est igitur Deo auctore gaudium magnum in tota Urbe; et in optato ingressu ipsius pontificis occurrit ei maxima et frequens populi multitudo cum ramis, et ad eius vestigia frequentissime corruentes, post pedum oscula elevabantur ad oris oscula. Precedebant signiferi cum bannis, sequebantur scriniarii et iudices; Iudei quoque non deerant tantae letitiae, portantes in humeris suis legem Mosaycam; universus etiam Romanus clerus psallebant in unum, dicentes: *Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini*. Sic itaque cum magno populorum gaudio et clamore idem pontifex Lateranense palatium conscendere meruit." *LP* II:387. Mann says "They kissed his feet and his face," *The Lives of the Popes*, IX:147. I prefer to translate "pedum" as "shepherd's crook."

This account of Eugenius's *adventus* from the *Liber Pontificalis* definitely shows that the Torah was presented to Eugenius. That presentation of the Torah to a pope, the first-ever presentation in Rome, added a new component to papal *adventus* in the city.

Boso's account of this *adventus* indicates a desire to frame it in the terms of a gospel narrative, because the grand entrance of the pope into the city deliberately incorporated aspects of the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem as told in the four Gospels.¹⁵⁰ According to the New Testament, when Jesus approached Jerusalem the people of the city had greeted Him with palm branches and the acclamation, "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord."¹⁵¹ As Eugenius entered Rome, a city that had been unfriendly to him and would again reject him, he filled the role of Christ entering the holy city of Jerusalem.

In this particular ceremonial entry, several rituals that indicated papal sovereignty over the Jews occurred at the same time. As Eugenius entered the city, the various *scholae* came to greet him, including the *schola* of the Jews.¹⁵² The Jewish *schola* would have presented certain luxury goods to the new pope on that coronation day, along with the Torah, and acclaimed him in Hebrew, as listed in the *Liber Censuum*:

The Jews hasten with their laws to the lord pope on the road on the day of Coronation and give praise to him; and they carry three and one-half pounds of pepper and two and one-half pounds of cinnamon to the Chamberlain.¹⁵³

¹⁵⁰ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 10. It must be acknowledged that these events were not necessarily recorded with the historical accuracy that is expected in the present. While the primary source texts are in some cases the only available evidence, the polemical value to the author of framing an account in a particular familiar manner must be noted.

¹⁵¹ The phrase, "Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini" is nearly or exactly the same as the acclamations found in the stories of Christ's entry into Jerusalem in Mt 21:8-9, Mc 11:8-9, Lc 19: 38, and Io 12:13.

¹⁵² These *scholae* were societies and groups of workers within the city who "were all servants of the papal court," performed certain functions for the papal services, and welcomed the pope during *adventus*. Each *schola* received a sum at Christmas and Easter, and during the *adventus* procession for their services. Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 105-106, 189-193. The *Liber Censuum* includes a list of seventeen *scholae* that greeted the pope during *adventus*, the last group being the Jews. *Lib. Cens.* II:304-306.

¹⁵³ "Judei vero representant domno pape in die coronationis sue legem in via et ei faciunt laudes; et III libras et dimidiam piperis et duas libras et dimidiam cinnamomi afferunt ad cameram." *Lib. Cens.* II:306.

The Torah presentation of 1145 occurred along with changes in the trilingual acclamations, another form of ritual ruler acclamation. Calixtus II's *adventus* into Rome in 1120 had included acclamations in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin; those acclamations had previously been presented to different secular rulers, and once before to the pope in 1049.¹⁵⁴ Innocent II's Easter procession in Paris in 1131 had included the Jews' presentation of the Torah to the pope for the first time, but this happened outside Rome.¹⁵⁵ Starting with the *adventus* of Eugenius III into Rome in 1145, the acclamations in Latin and Greek were deleted from the ritual, while the Jewish acclamations in Hebrew accompanied their presentation of the Torah.¹⁵⁶ Twyman suggests that the Jews' dependence on the pope for protection, demonstrated in the text of *Sicut Judaeis*, resulted in the continuation of their praises in Hebrew, but accompanied by a greater act, their presentation of the Torah.¹⁵⁷ According to Noël Coulet, the significance of the Torah scrolls to Jews was comparable to the meaning of the cross and relics to Christians, thus it was an act of much deeper significance than the acclamations in Hebrew.¹⁵⁸ In addition, because the Torah was written in the original language of the ancient Hebrews, what were considered the words of God himself, the Jews held the scrolls of the Torah in a unique and exalted position.¹⁵⁹ In addition, according to

¹⁵⁴ *Uodalscalcus de Eginone et Herimanno*, 446. See notes 15 and 16 above.

¹⁵⁵ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 197-199. See notes 89 and 90 above. Also see Abbot Suger, *Vita Ludovici grossi Regis*, ed. H. Waquet, *Vie de Louis VI le Gros*, Les Classiques de l'histoire de France au moyen-âge 11 (Paris, 1929), 262-264.

¹⁵⁶ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 200, 204.

¹⁵⁷ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 204.

¹⁵⁸ Noël Coulet, "De l'intégration à l'exclusion : La place des juifs dans les cérémonies d'entrée solennelle au Moyen Age," *Annales* 34, No. 4 (July-August, 1979): 675. This concept of the equivalency of the Torah to cross and relics for Christians has been traced to the Carolingian period; to take a judicial oath (*juramentum Judaeorum*), a Jew was required to place his right hand on the Pentateuch. Joseph Ziegler, "Reflections on the Jewry Oath in the Middle Ages," in *Christianity and Judaism*, ed. Diana Wood, *Studies in Church History* 29 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992): 209.

¹⁵⁹ "C'est ce privilège d'être écrit dans la propre langue de Dieu qui justifie la primauté d'honneur qui est due au rouleau de la Thora." Coulet, "De l'intégration à l'exclusion," 677.

Hans Belting, “Yahweh was visibly present only in the written word . . . His icon was the Holy Scripture, which is why Torah scrolls are venerated like cult images by the Jews.”¹⁶⁰

While it is not known exactly when Eugenius presented *Sicut* to the Roman Jews, the mention of it in Alexander III’s text of *Sicut* demonstrates that the decree was presented. By the thirteenth century, papal presentations of *Sicut* apparently were “part of the ceremonial connected with the official entrance of the pope” into Rome, in which the Torah was also presented.¹⁶¹ In his proclamation of *Sicut*, Eugenius was re-enacting a decree that had previously been bestowed only once, over twenty years before; therefore, special circumstances must have prompted him to re-issue *Sicut*. As discussed earlier in this chapter, the Roman Jews, to maintain the safety of their community during the Commune uprising, probably did not participate or publicly support the Commune. The loyalty of the Roman Jews to Eugenius during the Commune uprising may have been the circumstance that led to his decision to favor them with *Sicut*. Thus it is reasonable to propose at this point that Eugenius presented the Jews of Rome with *Sicut* during his *adventus* in 1145, to reward them for their support of their papal lord and to voice his protection of them as their temporal lord, in a ceremonial exchange of honors during the presentation of the Torah.¹⁶² Eugenius’ interactions with the Roman Jews during this *adventus* demonstrated both toleration of the Jews’ presence and protection of them.

Another motivation for the papal presentation of *Sicut* in 1145 may have been Eugenius’s need for financial services from the Roman Jews. Despite protestations by

¹⁶⁰ Hans Belting, *Likeness and Presence, A History of the Image before the Era of Art* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 7.

¹⁶¹ Grayzel, “Popes, Jews, and Inquisition,” 156.

¹⁶² Twyman suggests that a sort of contract or understanding existed between the pope and the Jews, in which he would protect them through *Sicut* and they would demonstrate their loyalty to him through the ritual presentation of the Torah, in addition to other services. Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 194-208.

leading churchmen against usury in general and while Christians were prohibited from lending at interest, Jewish moneylenders were allowed to conduct their business under a regulated amount of interest.¹⁶³ William Jordan has equated secular authorities' permission to Jews to conduct money-lending at interest, to the authorities' protection of the Jews.¹⁶⁴ Based on that contractual arrangement of services, it is entirely plausible that such an arrangement may have existed between Eugenius and the Roman Jews.¹⁶⁵

Twyman suggests that from the mid-twelfth century, the Jewish *schola* would have participated in papal adventus not just on the day of the election, but also on coronation day, in situations when the pope had been already elected and consecrated outside of Rome.¹⁶⁶ The various *scholae* greeted the pope as he processed through the city, but the *Liber Pontificalis* does not say at which point the Jewish *schola* would have greeted him. The *Liber Censuum* indicated that the Jews offered their acclamations and presented their laws also during the annual Easter Monday procession and indicates a location according to twelfth-century monuments in the city.¹⁶⁷ The *Liber Politicus* of Canon Benedict, composed c. 1140 and perhaps more relevant to the pontificate of Eugenius III, described the route that the procession followed on Easter Monday. While the pope and his cortege demonstrated the imperial nature of the papacy by passing through the ancient spaces of imperial Rome and

¹⁶³ Kenneth R. Stow, "The Good of the Church, the Good of the State: The Popes and Jewish Money," in *Christianity and Judaism*, Diana Wood, ed., *Studies in Church History* 29 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 242.

¹⁶⁴ Jordan, *The French Monarchy*, 29-30.

¹⁶⁵ This line of inquiry may yield an answer to the nature of the papal/Jewish contractual relationship and deserves future study.

¹⁶⁶ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 193.

¹⁶⁷ "In secunda feria post Pascha summo mane domnus pontifex congregatis omnibus palatinis ordinibus in palatium, et descendens per porticum, et inveniens equum non faleratum, sed sicut moris est, pergit ad sanctum Petrum; ibique celebrata missa de more et laudibus atque sollempnitatibus universis sicut esterna die peractis, coronatur ad gradus; et eo incipiente equitare, senescalus post eum vadens facit de denariis jactum unum, ut sic multitudo populi que impedimentum prestat domno pape removeri possit, denariis ipsis colligendis intendens. Postquam vero domnus papa pervenit ad turrin Stephani Serpetri, qui est in capite Parrione, . . ." *Lib. Cens.* [37-38], 299. Twyman suggests that it was at the "ancient palace of Chromatius, the republican city prefect." Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 188.

numerous triumphal arches, the pope also processed through the Arch of Titus. Canon Benedict described the procession in the *Liber Politicus* circa 1160:

. . . It continues under the triumphal Arch of Titus and Vespasian, which is called of the Seven Lamps, it descends to the Meta Sudens before the triumphal Arch of Constantine; . . .¹⁶⁸

Passing by the sculpted reliefs of the Temple Treasures physically confirmed the Church's possession of biblical Judaism and reminded all onlookers of the long-held association of the Lateran with the Temple and the Treasures of the ancient Hebrews. That action supports another purpose of the Torah presentation, which was to acknowledge the Jews' role in Christian eschatological expectations.¹⁶⁹ The Lateran, with its connotation as the New Temple and repository of the Temple Treasures and of Christ in the Eucharist, was the end point of this procession, during which the present-day Jews praised the pope, Christ's vicar on earth. I agree with Twyman, that the Lateran's declaration to be the repository of the Temple Treasures, as claimed in the *DLE* nearly a century earlier, gave added meaning to this adventus procession and to the Jews' presentation of the Torah. As the anonymous author of the *DLE* wrote circa 1073:

And so, in this most holy basilica of the Lateran Savior, which is consecrated by God for Jesus Christ, the head of the world, the patriarchate and the imperium, is the pontifical seat of the apostolic cathedrals, and in the principal altar of the same church is the ark of the law of the Lord . . . And there the staff of Aaron, which became leafy; and the tablets of the Testament; and the rod of Moses, with which he hit the rock twice, and water flowed.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁸ “. . . Pergit sub arcu triumphali Titi et Vespasiani qui vocatur Septem lucernarum, descendit ad Metam sudantem ante triumphalem arcum Constantini . . .” *Lib. pol.* [51], 154, in *Le Liber censuum*.

¹⁶⁹ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 206-208.

¹⁷⁰ “In hac itaque sacrosancta Lateranensi basilica Salvatori Ihesu Christo Deo dicata, quae caput est mundi, quae patriarchalis est et imperialis, sedis est apostolicae cathedrae pontificalis, et eiusdem ecclesiae ara principalis est arca foederis Domini . . . Et ibi virga Aaron, quae fronduerat; et tabulae Testamenti; et virga Moysi, qua percussit bis silicem, et fluxerunt aquae.” *DLE* 336.17-20, 337.9-11. De Blaauw, “The Solitary Celebration,” 122.

As the pope proceeded toward the Lateran, the repository of the great Treasures of the ancient Hebrews and of the “original Covenant,” he stopped to receive the law of the present-day Jews, and reinforce Christianity’s expectations of the Jews’ conversion in the end-time.¹⁷¹

The Role of Nicolaus Maniacutius, the *Historia Imaginis Salvatoris*,
and the *Descriptio Lateranensis ecclesiae*

At about the same time as the pope’s re-entry in December 1145, Nicolaus Maniacutius was composing his treatise, the *Historia imaginis Salvatoris*, about the renowned Lateran basilica and its collection of sacred relics. The initial motivation for Nicolaus to compile his text is not completely clear; Gerhard Wolf suggests that the *HIS* may have been composed to counter the competitive claims of Constantinople, which for centuries had been called the New Rome. Another more likely suggestion of Wolf’s is that the Lateran canons’ competition with the canons of St. Peter’s led Nicolaus to extol the greatness of the Lateran.¹⁷² The text claimed not only that the Lateran held the Temple Treasures, but also that a miraculously created image of Christ resided there, the *Acheropita*.

I suggested earlier that Nicholas’s *HIS* contained content and sections of text very similar to that in the *DLE*. If the *DLE* was created to encourage pilgrims to visit the sites of famous relics in the city, as asserted by Valentini and Zucchetti, then the *DLE* would have been well-known among clergy at the Lateran and probably also at St. Peter’s, the Vatican.¹⁷³ Another text supports the proposition that the canons of the Vatican were familiar with the *DLE*; the *Descriptio basilicae Vaticanae* [*DBV*], written c. 1159 by Petrus Mallius, a canon of

¹⁷¹ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 206-208.

¹⁷² Wolf, “Laetare filia sion,” 425. For the competition between the two basilica, see Maccarrone, “La cathedra Sancti Petri,” 349-447.

¹⁷³ *DLE*, 319.

the Vatican, was a polemical text intended to counter the Lateran canons' claims of the superior position of the Lateran over all other Churches in Rome.¹⁷⁴

Competition between the canons of the two churches could very likely have been a motivation for Nicolaus, but an even more likely scenario is that Nicolaus was determined to produce a text to honor his former abbot and to welcome him to his rightful throne. If so, he probably would have decided to compose the text very soon after Eugenius' election. Extolling the power, supremacy, and legitimate authority of the Christian Church, the *HIS* also indirectly supported the authority of the returning pope to a volatile and unstable Rome. It is true that Nicolaus could not have foreseen the years of struggle ahead for Eugenius to secure his rule in Rome; however, Nicolaus had resided in Rome since at least 1140, and had personally witnessed the rise of the Commune and the turbulent state of the city, and the new pope's flight from Rome only three days after his election. With his work in biblical exegesis, his knowledge of the sacred texts, and access to texts, legends, and traditions of the Lateran, Nicolaus was perfectly suited to compose such a piece, and could not have created a more appropriate instrument to assert the legitimate rule of his former abbot. Whether he was requested to produce a laudatory text for Eugenius or whether he initiated the work of his own volition is not known, but it is reasonable to propose that Nicolaus began to compose the piece after Eugenius was elected, and finished it before his own death late in 1145.

In the *HIS*, Nicolaus connected the legitimate power of the pope to that of the Old Testament Yahweh and the New Testament Jesus, using the Temple Treasures as the symbols of that power. According to Gerhard Wolf, Nicolaus also explained that what made the Roman emperor Titus determined "to fulfill the plans of his father Vespasian against

¹⁷⁴ Petrus Mallius, *Descriptio basilicae Vaticanae* in *Codice topografico della città di Roma* III, Roberto Valentini and Giuseppe Zucchetti, eds., (Roma: Tipografia del Senato, 1946), 375-381.

Jerusalem was his knowledge of the cruelty of the Jews towards Christ,” thus the Romans had been the agents of God.¹⁷⁵ In addition, Wolf claims that Nicolaus was the first to call the private papal chapel in the Lateran Palace the *Sancta Sanctorum*, the “Holy of Holies,” while he also compared the pope to the Jewish high priest. The promotion of the Lateran as the New Temple and the claim that the Temple Treasures resided in the Lateran paved the way for Nicolaus’s re-naming of the papal chapel. It is significant that the Hebrew Treasures were supposedly in or under the main altar of the Lateran basilica, while the *Sancta Sanctorum* in the Lateran Palace held relics of Christ and the Saints, the sacred image of Christ (the *Acheropita*), and physical relics from the Holy Land. Thus the new Holy of Holies, the *Sancta Sanctorum*, was completely Christianized.¹⁷⁶

The Ongoing Struggle to Rule Rome

The return of Eugenius to Rome and the composition of Nicolaus’ *Historia* both followed soon after Eugenius issued his call to the Second Crusade on December 1, 1145, in the letter to Louis VII known as *Quantum praedecessores nostri*.¹⁷⁷ When Muslim forces conquered Christian Edessa in December 1144, the fate of the Christian kingdoms in the Holy Land drew the attention and concern of all of Europe. The news brought a renewed awareness of the state of the Holy Land; Christians in Rome received perennial reminders of

¹⁷⁵ Wolf, “Laetare filia sion,” 422.

¹⁷⁶ Wolf, “Laetare filia sion,” 425.

¹⁷⁷ The letter is contained in Otto of Freising, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1953), 71-73, I.xxxvi. Historians have debated the exact timing of Eugenius’ letter to Louis VII, whether in December of 1145 or March of 1146. Nevertheless, Bernard of Clairvaux was intimately involved in preaching the call to Crusade from early in 1146, upon the urging of his close friend Eugenius. For further discussion of the dating controversy regarding *Quantum praedecessores nostri*, see John G. Rowe, “The Origins of the Second Crusade: Pope Eugenius III, Bernard of Clairvaux, and Louis VII of France,” and George Ferzoco, “The Origin of the Second Crusade,” both in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, Michael Gervers, ed. (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1992), 80-99.

the land of the ancient Hebrews and biblical Judaism in the Jews' presentation of the Torah during adventus, and the Holy Thursday rite at the Lateran.

Despite his triumphal entry into Rome in December 1145, Eugenius was not able to remain in the city. The new pope left the Lateran after only five weeks for Trastevere, where he stayed for two months. Horace Mann's claim that Trastevere was not a part of the Commune appears to have some merit, because Eugenius safely resided there for that short time.¹⁷⁸ At this point it is not known if the Jews played any role in providing Eugenius with safe passage through and residence in Trastevere.¹⁷⁹ From Trastevere Eugenius traveled to Sutri and Viterbo, where he stayed until January 1147, then turned north, arriving in Lyon in March 1147. He remained in France and Germany through June of 1148.¹⁸⁰ In France, Eugenius dealt with the results of the Second Crusade, served as guardian of France during Louis VII's absence, and worked to maintain the support of the kings of France, England, and Germany; while in Germany, Eugenius visited Trier and agreed to support Henry, the son of Holy Roman Emperor Conrad III, who was participating in the Second Crusade.¹⁸¹ While the pope was away from Rome, the Commune gained in power and loyal followers, undoubtedly encouraged by the preaching of Arnold of Brescia.

¹⁷⁸ *Regesta*, II:29-34. Jaffe records only the general location of Eugenius' residence, "Trans Tiberim," between January 28 and March 16, 1146. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes*, IX: 148.

¹⁷⁹ Since the late eleventh century, the Pierleoni had provided the popes, including Gregory VII and Urban II, with safe passage through Trastevere to escape opposing forces. By 1146, with Jordan Pierleoni as *patricius*, the pope could not count on the Pierleoni for protection, but perhaps did rely on Jewish contacts in Trastevere to provide safe passage.

¹⁸⁰ *Regesta*, II:32-58.

¹⁸¹ *Regesta* II:38-58. Abbot Suger of St. Denis acted as regent while Louis VII was away on Crusade. Mann, in *The Lives of the Popes*, IX:189, 191-192, claims that Eugenius promised to support Henry, Conrad's son, probably in his hereditary claim to the German throne, which was not the tradition in the German Empire at that time. Eugenius also presided over the Council of Rheims in March 1148. Further research is needed to determine if any interactions between Eugenius and Jewish communities are recorded in the accounts of his stay in France and Germany, and if any decrees of the Council of Rheims dealt with the Jews, as recorded by John of Salisbury and other chroniclers. The *Liber Pontificalis* records that the Council of Rheims was called and conducted by Eugenius, but includes no details.

In the summer of 1148 when Eugenius returned to Italy, he visited Brescia from July to September, where he was warmly received.¹⁸² In the years since Eugenius had left Rome, Arnold of Brescia had established himself firmly in the city and gained numerous disciples among the citizens of Rome, “because the lord pope was occupied in Gaul.”¹⁸³ In July of 1148 while Eugenius visited the people of Brescia, he excommunicated Arnold.¹⁸⁴ Unsuccessful in persuading the Commune leaders to turn away from Arnold’s influence, Eugenius enlisted Sicilian forces to aid forcefully his return to Rome; however their military force was not sufficient to restore his authority.¹⁸⁵ In the meantime, the Commune leaders contacted Conrad and attempted to enlist him as their ally. They did not receive the emperor’s support, and so decided to make peace with the pope.¹⁸⁶ Eugenius grandly re-entered the city in November 1149 though the brief accounts of this entrance do not indicate any participation by the Jews.¹⁸⁷ Even though the Jews’ participation may not have been recorded, according to tradition and papal precedent, a pope returning from exile would have staged an adventus procession and the Jewish *schola* would have participated.

¹⁸² *Regesta*, II: 58-59.

¹⁸³ John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*.XXXI.

¹⁸⁴ *Regesta*, II: 58, no. 9281.

¹⁸⁵ John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, XXVII.

¹⁸⁶ According to John of Salisbury, in *Historia Pontificalis*, XXIX, Louis VII and Queen Eleanor visited Pope Eugenius in Tusculum in late 1149, while he was exiled from Rome and they were returning home after the Second Crusade. Mann suggests that the visit of Louis VII to Eugenius enhanced Eugenius’s image and encouraged the Romans to rethink their strategy with Eugenius. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes*, IX:160-161.

¹⁸⁷ John of Salisbury wrote briefly of a triumphal adventus of Eugenius into Rome in 1149, in *Historia Pontificalis*, XXI but did not mention any participation by the Jews. Different modern historians have connected the one description of Eugenius’ adventus in the *LP* II:387 (cited above) with either the 1145 and 1149 occasions. Marjorie Chibnal, the translator of the *Historia Pontificalis* (51) attributed the *LP* account of adventus to March, 1149. The *Regesta* II:61-64, indicates that Eugenius was not in Rome that year until November 28. Mann, in *The Lives of the Popes*, IX:148, 161, used Boso’s account to explain both the 1145 and the 1149 processions. Twyman, in *Papal Ceremonial*, 101, prefers to date Boso’s account to December 1145. I agree with Twyman that the 1145 date is more likely because Boso’s description of Eugenius’ adventus in the *LP* follows directly after the story of his 1145 flight from Rome and the Commune’s anarchy, and just before the short account of Eugenius’ call to Crusade, travel to St. Denis, and presiding over the Council of Rheims. If taken in a chronological context, Boso’s description of Eugenius’s adventus can only be ascribed to the December 1145 entrance into Rome.

Eugenius anticipated assistance from Conrad III, but before the emperor could travel to Rome, Eugenius again was forced to leave the city in June of 1150, due to renewed opposition from the Commune.¹⁸⁸ The death of Conrad III in February 1152, and the election of Frederick I Barbarossa, the former Duke of Swabia, as emperor, dramatically changed the relationship between the pope and the German ruler. Upon Frederick's election, the new emperor contacted Eugenius and offered his support while requesting certain favors: that the pope would annul his marriage, agree to his control over all of Italy, and anoint him in Rome. After negotiations in Constance in December 1152 between imperial representatives and Eugenius' representative, Bernard of Clairvaux, an agreement was reached.¹⁸⁹ Bernard's efforts on the pope's behalf, traveling hundreds of miles to negotiate with imperial officials despite his failing health, demonstrated the continuing close relationship between the pope and the abbot of Clairvaux. Before any of the provisions could be carried out, however, Eugenius died on July 8, 1153. His close friend and mentor, Bernard of Clairvaux, followed in death just weeks later on August 20.

The Influence of Bernard of Clairvaux

The attitude of Bernard of Clairvaux toward the Jews may also give a sense of Eugenius' perspective toward the Roman Jews and biblical Judaism. The close relationship between Bernard and Eugenius is apparent from the first letter written to the new pope soon after his election, in which he calls Eugenius "my father" and explains further:

I do not dare to call you a son any longer. You were my son, but now you have become my father. I was your father, but now I have become your son.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁸ John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, XXXII.

¹⁸⁹ Pacaut, *Frederick Barbarossa*, 61-63; Mann, *The Lives of the Popes*, IX:173. Mann claims that two witnesses to the agreement were Cardinals Roland and Octavian, the future Pope Alexander III and the antipope Victor IV.

¹⁹⁰ Bernard *Letters* no. 205.

Soon after Eugenius' election, Bernard began to compose the *De consideratione ad Eugenium papam tertiam libri quinque*, a text to encourage and exhort the new pope to maintain his monastic ideals. Bernard supported Eugenius as a fellow Cistercian monk and as his pope. Even though Bernardo of Pisa had been elevated to the highest office in the Church, Bernard evidently still felt a special duty to advise his former protégé. Bernard's influence on Eugenius must also be weighed in the context of the abbot of Clairvaux's great power within Europe. In the 1130's, the eventual acceptance of Pope Innocent II as the legitimate pope by nearly all European rulers was largely due to Bernard's work, and in turn bolstered Bernard's stature in Europe. According to Elizabeth Kennan, Bernard considered his involvement in the politics of both the papacy and secular rulers as intrinsic to his role as monk and spiritual leader, rather than distinct from it.¹⁹¹ Kennan notes that through Bernard's efforts, popes from Innocent II through Eugenius III gained significant power in comparison to the German emperors.¹⁹² That would change with the accession of Frederick I Barbarossa in 1152 and the death of both Bernard and Eugenius in 1153.

Bernard's collection of advice for Eugenius, the *De consideratione*, composed between 1147 and 1153, was written in the spirit of a conversation to a son, and also encouragement to a man facing incredible challenges. Eugenius was called to lead a monastic life, and yet was forced as pope to deal with the massive burden of administrative decisions, diplomatic negotiations, and judicial rulings, as well as his primary responsibility for the care of Christian souls. In addition to all of those concerns, Eugenius was forced to contend with the Commune in control of Rome.

¹⁹¹ Elizabeth T. Kennan in the introduction to *Five Books on Consideration*, by Bernard of Clairvaux, *Cistercian Fathers Series 37, The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux* 13 (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976), 5.

¹⁹² Kennan, the introduction to *Five Books on Consideration*, 7.

In the five books of *De consideratione*, Bernard advised Eugenius to balance his duties and not allow himself to be so overburdened as to interfere with his monastic vocation. When comparing the enormous duties of the papal office to the “servitude” of the Jews, Bernard tells Eugenius to,

. . . wake up and not only beware, but abhor that evil yoke of servitude which threatens you at every moment, or, more accurately, which even now weighs heavily upon you. Are you less a slave because you serve not one but all? There is no servitude more repulsive or oppressive than that of the Jews which they drag after them wherever they go. They offend their masters everywhere. But you, like them, tell me where you can ever be free or safe or your own? Everywhere confusion and noise, the yoke of your servitude, bear down upon you.¹⁹³

In this simple comparison to the Jews, Bernard expressed a traditional view of Augustine, that the Jews had been condemned to live dispersed and restricted within Christian society, because of their crime against Christ.

Despite Bernard’s negative view of Jews, he still thought of their safety during his call to the Second Crusade. Given the commission to call the Crusade by Eugenius, Bernard’s persuasive rhetoric effectively stirred Europe to undertake the mission to the Holy Land. At the start of his call to the Crusade, Bernard wrote to the nobility and clergy in England, France, and Bavaria, and asked them to rally to recover the Holy Land. Toward the end of the letter, he mentioned the Jews and directed that they should not be harmed,

I have heard with great joy of the zeal for God’s glory which burns in your midst, but your zeal needs the timely restraint of knowledge. The Jews are not to be persecuted, killed or even put to flight. Ask anyone who knows the Sacred Scriptures what he finds foretold of the Jews in the psalm. “Not for their destruction do I pray”, it says. The Jews are for us the living words of Scripture, for they remind us always of what our Lord suffered. They are dispersed all over the world so that by expiating their crime they may be everywhere the living witnesses of our redemption. Hence the same psalm adds, “only let thy power disperse them”. And so it is: dispersed they are . . . If

¹⁹³ Bernard *On Consideration*, I. III.4.

the Jews are utterly wiped out, what will become of our hope for their promised salvation, their eventual conversion? . . . It is an act of Christian piety both “to vanquish the proud” and also “to spare the subjected”, especially those for whom we have a law and a promise, and whose flesh was shared by Christ whose name be for ever blessed.¹⁹⁴

The words that Bernard chose showed his knowledge of both traditional Christian doctrine and Patristic texts regarding the place of the Jews in Christendom. In this letter, his concern that the Jews not suffer violence is also clearly evident, although within the paradigm of a superior speaking about an inferior. The complexity of this passage also demonstrates the complexity of his attitudes toward the Jews at that time; Bernard writes of “their crime” of killing Jesus, yet also notes that Jesus was Jewish. Such a complex, conflicting, and multi-faceted perspective must be kept in mind when attempting to determine Eugenius’s attitude toward the Roman Jews.

Despite Bernard’s admonitions, in the gathering fervor of preparations for the Crusade a monk known as Rudolph began to encourage many people in Germany not only to undertake the Crusade, but to begin it by first eliminating the Jews among them.¹⁹⁵ Otto of Freising recorded that:

The seed of this doctrine took such firm root and so grew in numerous cities of Gaul and Germany that a large number of Jews were killed in this stormy uprising, while many took refuge under the wings of the prince of the Romans.¹⁹⁶

¹⁹⁴ Bernard *Letters*, no. 391.2,6.

¹⁹⁵ Otto of Freising *Deeds* I.xxxviii. Synan, in *The Popes and the Jews* (74) notes the special nature of the danger to Jews in 1146, in light of the massacres in 1096, and especially notes the contribution of Bernard of Clairvaux who stepped in and protected the Jews, one of “the personalities who roused and repressed the passions of the Crusaders.”

¹⁹⁶ Otto of Freising *Deeds* I.xxxviii.

In a letter to the Archbishop of Mainz, Bernard denounced Rudolph and demanded both protection and respect for the Jews:¹⁹⁷

The fellow you mention in your letter has received no authority from men or through men, nor has he been sent by God. . . . I find three things most reprehensible in him: unauthorized preaching, contempt for episcopal authority, and incitation to murder. . . . Is it not a far better triumph for the Church to convince and convert the Jews than to put them all to the sword? Has that prayer which the Church offers for the Jews, from the rising up of the sun to the going down thereof, that the veil may be taken from their hearts so that they may be led from the darkness of error into the light of truth, been instituted in vain? If she did not hope that they would believe and be converted, it would seem useless and vain for her to pray for them. But with the eye of mercy she considers how the Lord regards with favour him who renders good for evil and love for hatred. Otherwise where does that saying come in, “Not for their destruction I pray”, and “When the fulness of the Gentiles shall have come in, then all Israel will be saved”, and “The Lord is rebuilding Jerusalem, calling the banished sons of Israel home”?¹⁹⁸

Bernard first wrote as an abbot, used to the strict obedience of his monks, and his abhorrence of Rudolph’s reckless behavior is apparent. Bernard also wrote as the representative of Eugenius, for the pope had commissioned Bernard with calling the Crusade. Perhaps Bernard’s expression of his hope in the Jews’ eventual conversion reveals another facet of Eugenius’s perspective of the Jews. In this letter, Bernard again referred to Christian doctrine concerning the Jews, which accused the Jews of “blind[ness]” to the truth of the Scriptures, and indicated a commonly-held eschatological view of the Jews’ expected role at the end of the world. Despite Bernard’s earlier harsh rhetoric regarding the Jewish ancestry of the antipope Anacletus II, and the negative views of the Jews that he expressed at times, in this

¹⁹⁷ Grayzel notes that Eugenius did not intervene to prevent attacks on the Jews but did have Bernard of Clairvaux call for their protection. Perhaps the exiled pope’s lack of action to protect the Jews could be explained in part by his ongoing struggle for authority, a similar situation faced by Urban II during the First Crusade. Grayzel, “Popes, Jews, and the Inquisition,” 156 n. 23.

¹⁹⁸ Bernard *Letters* no. 393.

instance he did manage to stop Rudolph's incitement to murder. For his actions, Bernard was praised by a Jewish writer living in the late twelfth century, Ephraim of Bonn:

Then the Lord heard our sigh, turned to us, and pitied us with His great mercy and kindness. Thus He sent after the evil priest a decent priest, a great man and the mentor of all the priests, one who knows and understands their faith. His name was Abbot Bernard, from the city of Clairvaux in France . . . Then he said to them: "It is fitting that you go forth against the Muslims. However, anyone who attacks a Jew and tries to kill him is as though he attacks Jesus himself. My pupil Radulph who advised destroying them did not advise properly. For in the Book of Psalms it is written concerning the Jews: 'Kill them not, lest my people forget'." . . . Were it not for the mercies of our Creator, Who sent the aforesaid abbot and his letters, there would not have been a remnant or survivor among the Jews.¹⁹⁹

Ephraim notes that Christian attackers of Jews ironically persecuted Jesus's own people.

Bernard had noted that connection also in an earlier letter, when he urged protection for the Jews, "whose flesh was shared by Christ whose name be for ever blessed."²⁰⁰

During the Second Crusade, European Jews faced another crisis, the severe blow to their finances from being forced, by papal orders, to release Crusaders from their debts:

. . . all they that are burdened by debt and have, with pure heart, undertaken so holy a journey need not pay the interest past due, and if they themselves or others for them have been bound by oath and pledge, by reason of such interest, by apostolic authority we absolve them.²⁰¹

Louis VII enforced that directive in his kingdom in 1147.²⁰² Ephraim of Bonn recorded the effect that the enforced cancellation of Crusaders' debts had had on French Jews, stating:

But the Jews lost much of their wealth. For the king of France commanded: "All who volunteer to go to Jerusalem shall have their debts forgiven, if they are indebted to the Jews." Since most of the Jews' loans in France are by charter, they lost their monies.²⁰³

¹⁹⁹ Ephraim of Bonn, *The Report of Ephraim of Bonn*, from Habermann, *Sefer Gezerot*, 115-116, as quoted in Chazan, *Church, State, and Jew*, 108.

²⁰⁰ Bernard *Letters*, no. 391.2,6.

²⁰¹ Eugenius III, *Quantum praedecessores nostri*, as quoted in Otto of Freising, *Deeds*.I.36.

²⁰² Synan, *The Popes and the Jews*, 77.

²⁰³ Ephraim of Bonn, from Habermann, *Sefer Gezerot*, 121, as quoted by Chazan, *Church, State, and Jew*, 146.

The evidence suggests the complex nature of Eugenius's attitude toward the Jews. In light of the words of Eugenius's former abbot, Bernard, it appears that Bernard held a complex perspective regarding the Jews: attitudes of respect, protection, toleration, condescension, and restriction. Perhaps Bernard's perspective was mirrored in Eugenius's; while Eugenius decreed *Sicut* to protect the Jews, he also released Crusaders from debts to Jews, resulting in many Jews' financial ruin. The papal release of Crusaders' debts contradicts Eugenius's possible contractual relationship with Roman Jews to obtain their financial backing. The Roman Jews' probable support for Eugenius during the Commune uprising suggests a relationship of respect, but perhaps that relationship merely reflected the terms of an agreement between the pope and the Roman Jews. Eugenius's associates and fellow monks included Nicolaus Maniacutius, who claimed to have consulted with Jewish scholars, and Bernard of Clairvaux, who expressed very harsh attitudes toward the Jews. Even though Eugenius apparently harbored complex attitudes toward contemporary Jews, he continued to acknowledge and promote the Church's claim to possess biblical Judaism through his acceptance of the Torah during *adventus*, during the papal procession through the Arch of Titus and in his former monk Nicolaus's laudatory text.

CHAPTER V
CONTINUITY OF TRADITIONS AND ATTITUDES
THROUGH ALEXANDER III: THE CHURCH'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF
BIBLICAL JUDAISM

A continuity of papal traditions toward the Jews of Rome and biblical Judaism, which were first observed in the papal reign of Eugenius III (r. 1145-1153), persevered through the reign of Alexander III (r. 1159-1181). Alexander's ritual entrance into the city and intramural processions, conducted as a papal *adventus*, and the papal ritual at the high altar of the Lateran basilica during the Holy Thursday mass, both pointed to an enduring tradition of acknowledging the Church's claim of theological and physical inheritance of the Old Covenant of the ancient Hebrews. The Roman Jews' acclamation of Alexander in Hebrew, their presentation of the Torah to the pope, and the pope's decree of *Sicut Judaeis* to them indicated a continuation of the papal/Jewish relationship established between Eugenius III and the Roman Jews; however, Alexander's employment of the Roman Jew Jechiel as his *senescalcus*, his steward, suggests a closer association. Nevertheless, toward the end of Alexander III's reign in 1179, several decrees of the Third Lateran Council, presided over by Alexander, added further restrictions to the lives of the Jews in Christendom. All of these individual events suggest that Alexander, like his predecessor Eugenius III, held a multifaceted and complex mixture of attitudes toward the Jews. This evidence also points without doubt to the unique nature of the relationship between the papacy and the Jews from 1145 through 1181, and the special relationship of these two popes to the Roman Jews. During the same period, these popes repeatedly promulgated the Church's claim to possess the completeness of the Old and the New Covenants, including the incomparable relics of biblical Judaism, the Temple Treasures.

The same political forces that had buffeted the papal reign of Eugenius III, especially the Roman Commune and the Holy Roman Emperor, continued to confront the three popes who followed him: Anastasius IV (r. 1153-1154), Adrian IV (r. 1154-1159), and Alexander III. Anastasius IV remained in Rome throughout his brief papacy;¹ however, Adrian IV spent nearly half of his reign outside of the city because of the danger to him in Rome. Adrian devoted much of his papacy to negotiations with the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa (r. 1152-1190), William I, king of Sicily (r. 1154-1168), and the Roman Commune, in his struggle to maintain his authority in Rome, the Patrimony, and Christendom.² Adrian also authorized military actions against certain territories in the Patrimony to preserve his rule and counter powerful noblemen, following the precedent set by the reforming papacies since the mid-eleventh century.³ By the reign of Alexander, the papal relationship with the Roman

¹ According to the *Regesta* (II:89-102), Anastasius IV remained in Rome throughout his entire reign, from July 1153 to December 1154. Perhaps his Roman origins enabled him to gain the favor of the Commune and remain in Rome. Robinson states, in *The Papacy* (xi), that out of the sixteen popes elected between 1099 and 1198, only five were Romans, including Anastasius IV. In addition, Robinson notes (147) that during the papal schism of 1130-1138, Anastasius, as Conrad, cardinal bishop of Sabina, had acted as Innocent II's papal vicar in Rome while Innocent was in exile in France, perhaps indicating his ability to deal diplomatically with the Romans. Anastasius's familiarity with Roman politics and powerful families undoubtedly served him well, but events also suggest that as pope he acquiesced to certain demands that his predecessor had refused, thus enabling him to remain in office unmolested. Robinson, *The Papacy*, 462.

² At the start of his reign, Adrian faced opposition from the Roman Commune, which had been inflamed by the preaching of Arnold of Brescia. Adrian decisively used the special powers of the papacy to eliminate Arnold of Brescia from the Roman scene by imposing an Interdict on the city of Rome during Holy Week, 1155. That highly effective papal act would have withheld the sacraments from all Christians in the city, and drove the Commune to exile Arnold from Rome. Frederick's forces, then in Italy, arrested Arnold and placed him in the custody of the Prefect of Rome, who executed Arnold, burned the corpse, and dumped the ashes into the Tiber. Diplomatic negotiations with Frederick Barbarossa resulted in Adrian's coronation of the emperor at St. Peter's in June 1155, but the Commune refused to allow either the pope or the emperor to enter Rome afterward. For further details of Adrian IV's extensive diplomatic efforts to maintain his power and authority throughout his reign, see Robinson, *The Papacy*, 462-472 and *Adrian IV The English Pope (1154-1159)* ed. by Brenda Bolton and Anne J. Duggan, *Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003). Another antagonist in the multi-faceted and long-term conflict between the papacy and the German emperor was the Norman kingdom of Sicily. A full description of that situation will not be presented here, but the Norman kings' threatening presence in the papal Patrimony, and perceived threat to both Byzantine and German imperial claims in Italy, shows the complexity of the political milieu in Italy in the latter twelfth century.

³ Brenda Bolton, "Nova familia beati Petri. Adrian IV and the Patrimony," in *Adrian IV The English Pope (1154-1159)*, 157-158, 162. Bolton describes (159-160) the makeup of the "Patrimony of St. Peter" and

commune and Holy Roman Emperor had deteriorated to the point that Alexander was forced to spend most of his papacy outside of Rome. Although he ruled as pope for nearly twenty-three years, he only spent about thirty-two months in the city of Rome.⁴

Even though the three popes who ruled after Eugenius were of different origins and temperaments, a continuity between papal reigns characterized the papacies of Eugenius III, Anastasius IV, Adrian IV, and Alexander III. Just before his election, Anastasius served Eugenius III in the Curia as cardinal bishop of Sabina, and Adrian, Nicolas Breakspear, had served Eugenius as legate to Scandinavia and cardinal bishop of Albano. Eugenius brought Roland of Siena, the future pope Alexander III, to Rome probably in 1148, and elevated him to cardinal priest of S. Marco and *cancellarius* in May 1153.⁵ Cardinal Roland continued to serve Anastasius and Adrian as *cancellarius* until Roland's election to the papacy on September 7, 1159.⁶

Despite that continuity between papacies, apparently no record has been found of either Anastasius or Adrian re-issuing *Sicut Judaeis* to the Jews of Rome or initiating contact with that group. Still, Anastasius probably did process through the city in his coronation *adventus* and during the Easter Monday *adventus*, in which the Jews would have participated. Also, according to Susan Twyman, it is highly likely that Adrian participated in papal *adventus* more than once during his papacy, and most probably on Easter Monday 1155, and

Adrian's efforts to maintain the territories traditionally under papal rule since the late-eighth century Carolingian era.

⁴ Unlike Eugenius, who spent much of his exile in France, Alexander lived in exile in various friendly cities in Italy, particularly Ferentino, Anagni, and Benevento. *Regesta* II:145-418.

⁵ Colin Morris, *The Papal Monarchy, The Western church from 1050 to 1250* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 193. John T. Noonan, Jr., "Who was Rolandus?" in *Law, Church, and Society, Essays in Honor of Stephan Kuttner*, ed. by Kenneth Pennington and Robert Somerville (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977), 43. According to Robinson, the *cancellarius* "directed the work of the group of notaries and *scriptores* who formed the papal secretariat." Robinson, *The Papacy*, 93.

⁶ Robinson, *The Papacy*, 94.

in November 1156 when he returned to the city after a period of exile. At a certain point in the procession through Rome, the Roman Jews would have presented their Torah to the pope and acclaimed him in Hebrew.⁷

During Alexander's reign, his acknowledgements of biblical Judaism and his relationship with Roman Jews indicated not only a continuation of Eugenius III's attitudes, but also an increased emphasis on the papal-Jewish relationship and a heightened focus on biblical Judaism. At the mid-twelfth century, the papal Holy Thursday ritual conducted at the Lateran high altar indicated that the altar structure surrounded the ark of the covenant, the most powerful and venerable of the Temple Treasures. That ritual continued a Lateran tradition that apparently had originated in the late eleventh century.⁸ By the early thirteenth century, the identification of the high altar had changed to an association with the altar of St. Peter rather than the ark.⁹ Evidently a close connection between the main or high altar of the Lateran basilica and the ark persisted in the latter half of the twelfth century while other events focused attention in Rome on biblical Judaism. Alexander's papal *adventus* of 1165 and John the Deacon's revision of the *DLE* that he dedicated to Alexander, both point toward an accelerated papal focus on biblical Judaism and the Temple Treasures in the second half of the twelfth century.

Alexander's presentation of *Sicut Judaeis* to the Roman Jews continued papal tradition, but his employment of the Roman Jew Jechiel as his *senescalcus* indicated a closer bond with the Roman Jews than in previous papal reigns. That special bond would fracture as

⁷ Susan E. Twyman, "Summus Pontifex. The Ritual and Ceremonial of the Papal Court," in *Adrian IV The English Pope*, 70-73.

⁸ De Blaauw, "The Solitary Celebration," 121.

⁹ James M. Powell, "Honorius III's 'Sermo in dedicatione ecclesie Lateranensis' and the Historical-Liturgical Traditions of the Lateran," *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 21 (1938), 203.

the twelfth century turned into the thirteenth, restrictions on the Jews increased, and accusations against them spread. The relationship between Eugenius III and the Jews, and Alexander III and the Jews signified a brief and unique period of papal/Jewish relations.

The Holy Thursday Ritual and the Temple Treasures

During the Eucharistic liturgy of the mass on Holy Thursday, the commemoration of the Last Supper of Jesus, a special papal ritual called attention to the Jewish Temple Treasures in the Lateran high altar and reinforced the Lateran basilica's connection to biblical Judaism.¹⁰ From its establishment in the fourth century, the Lateran basilica had been associated with biblical Judaism, the Temple, and the Old Testament.¹¹ The first apparent mention of the special ritual at the high altar was mentioned by Bonizo of Sutri circa 1095, who described the removal of the top horizontal slab of the high altar, the *mensa*, during the Holy Thursday mass before the blessing of the chrism:

As for today, during the Lord's Supper, after celebrating the divine service of the commemoration of the Lord's body and blood, the *mensa* is hoisted by the priests and removed from the hollow altar itself, right up to when the oil of exorcism and chrism is blessed by the pope himself.¹²

¹⁰ De Blaauw, in "The Solitary Celebration" (121, 125) notes that this ritual was specific to the Holy Thursday papal mass when it was said at the Lateran, thus was directly dependent on the special nature of the Lateran high altar. In the absence of the pope from Rome, a cardinal bishop would conduct the ritual at the Lateran as the pope's representative. Since Eugenius and Alexander both spent long periods of their papacies outside of Rome, they would not have had many opportunities to perform this particular rite in Rome. Nevertheless, the evidence indicates that Eugenius was in Rome on Holy Thursday of 1150 and 1153, and Alexander may have been able to celebrate it in Rome only five times, in 1161, 1166, 1167, 1178, and 1179. *Regesta* II:20-89, 145-418

¹¹ Several historical accounts suggested that a continuous tradition existed, through at least the early seventeenth century, that associated the Lateran basilica with biblical Judaism: candelabra donated to the Lateran basilica by Constantine in the fourth century were decorated with images of Old Testament prophets; the tenth-century apse mosaic in the Lateran basilica compared the Church's rituals to Sinai; and fifteenth and sixteenth-century murals in the Lateran Palace compared the pope to the Old Testament patriarchs. See Chapter II n. 100-103. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the bronze columns of the Lateran high altar were believed to have come from Solomon's Temple. For the literature supporting that belief, see Jack Freiberg, *The Lateran and Clement VIII* (Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 1988), 454 n. 29.

¹² "Quod in cena Domini post dominici corporis et sanguinis celebratam comemorationem, a sacerdotibus violatur, mensaque sublata in ipso altaris concavo usque hodie oleum exorcizatum et crismale ab ipso papa benedicitur." Bonizo of Sutri, *Liber de vita Christiana* IV.98, page 165, lines 15-18, edited by Ernst Perels (Berlin:Weidmann, 1930), 165. De Blaauw in "The Solitary Celebration" (123-124) mentions a Roman *Ordo*

While the ritual may have begun at that time, the special nature of the Lateran high altar was noted perhaps two decades earlier in the *Descriptio Lateranensis ecclesiae* [*DLE*], circa 1073. The author of the *DLE* mentioned the presence of the ark and other relics within or under the high altar:

And so, in this most holy basilica of the Lateran Savior, which is consecrated by God for Jesus Christ, the head of the world, of the patriarchate and the imperium, of the pontifical seat of the apostolic cathedral, the ark of the law of the Lord is in the altar of his same principal Church, or, as they affirm, the ark is below, and according to the upper altar measurement of length, breadth, and height, the ark is concealed, between four columns of red porphyry, underneath a rich ciborium. In which in fact, the reliquary is immense, but they do not understand what it is, for they do not know its fame. Truly, it is in the altar, above which is wooden with a silver covering, and in the lower part below it, is the following relic: the seven lampstands, which were in the first Tabernacle. . . . also the clothes of purple of the same Savior and Redeemer; two ampules of blood and water from the side of the Lord. And the circumcision of the lord. . . . Today this same history is clearly understood in the triumphal arch, which is called the Arch of the Seven Lamps, which is shown to have been built next to the Church of S. Maria Nova, in memory of the predictions and the origin of all the Roman people, on which are the candelabra and the ark with its sticks, which were in the first tabernacle, and which have been in the next Temple within the altar cloth, and were understood by the evidence to have been fashioned with marvelous care.¹³

The production of the original text of the *DLE* circa 1073 and the late eleventh-century formation of the Holy Thursday ritual indicated a desire to focus attention on the Temple

for the Holy Thursday liturgy from the seventh century that noted the hollow character of the high altar; De Blaauw also suggests that a special ritual with the high altar may have been conducted since that era.

¹³ "In hac itaque sacrosancta Lateranensi basilica Salvatori Ihesu Christo Deo dicata, quae caput est mundi, quae patriarchalis est et imperialis, sedis est apostolicae cathedrae pontificalis, et eiusdem ecclesiae ara principalis est arca foederis Domini, vel, ut aiunt, arca est inferius, et altare ad mensuram longitudinis, latitudinis et altitudinis arcae conditum est superius, inter quattuor columnas de rubeo porfirio sub quodam pulchro ciborio. In quo quidem, ut asserunt, multum est sanctuarium, sed quale sit non agnoscunt, nam nomen eius nesciunt. In altari vero, quod superius est ligneum de argento coopertum, atque sub eo inferius, est tale sanctuarium: septem candelabra, quae fuerunt in priori tabernaculo. . . . Purpureum vestimentum eiusdem Salvatoris et Redemptoris; de sanguine et aqua lateris Domini ampullae duae. Et circumcisio Domini. . . . Hoc idem usque hodie liquido perpenditur in triumphali arcu, qui appellatur Septem Lucernarum, qui constructus fuisse probatur ad memoriam praedictorum principum totiusque Romani populi iuxta ecclesiam Sanctae Mariae Novae, in quo candelabra, quae fuerunt in priori tabernaculo, et arca cum vectibus suis, quae fuit in secundo intra velum, manifeste ac mirifico opere sculpta fuisse cernuntur" *DLE* 336.17 to 337.5, 337.17-19, 341.25 to 342.23.

Treasures in the Lateran high altar; that focus continued and expanded from the middle to the late twelfth century. Because of the unique papal nature of the ritual, and the Lateran origin of the *DLE*, both probably originated in papal directives, and may well have been an outgrowth of the popes' active conflict with the Holy Roman Emperor and struggle for authority in the late eleventh and early twelfth century.¹⁴

The text that Nicolaus Maniacutius wrote circa 1145, the *Historia Imaginis Salvatoris* [*HIS*], reiterated many of the same claims of the *DLE*. Nicolaus listed the Temple Treasures taken from Jerusalem and kept in the Lateran:

At that time, the ark and tablets, the candelabrum and trumpets, and other vessels of the Temple had been carried away to Rome, or at least those vessels that are read about in the Second book of Maccabees or those that had been concealed in another way by the Elders following the restoration of the Temple, and which obviously appear on the triumphal arch which was erected for the divine Titus, by the son of the divine Vespasian, by the Senate and People of Rome.¹⁵

Nicolaus linked the long past removal of the Temple Treasures from Jerusalem by the Romans to the depiction of the Treasures still evident on the Arch of Titus in the Forum. With the Roman Commune's focus on Roman antiquity in the mid 1140s, Nicolaus deliberately used the awesome power of ancient Rome to support the authority of the Lateran basilica. Near the same time as Nicolaus's text and through the end of the twelfth century, various Roman texts claimed that the Temple Treasures were in the Lateran high altar. Moreover, three different Lateran texts, produced from 1139 to 1189, described the elaborate Holy Thursday ritual at the high altar: the *Ordo officiorum ecclesiae Lateranensis* of Bernard,

¹⁴ De Blaauw, "The Solitary Celebration," 126, 142-143.

¹⁵ "Tunc arca, et tabulae, candelabrum, et tubae, atque alia vasa templi Romam delata sunt, seu illa utique, quae Jeremias occultasse in secundo Machabeorum libro legitur, seu alia post restaurationem templi a Patribus sequentibus condita, quod evidenter apparet in arcu triumphali, quem erexit Divo Tito Divi Vespasiani filio Senatus, Populusque Romanus." *HIS*, 322.

cardinal and prior of the Lateran canons, circa 1139-1145; the *Liber Politicus* of Benedict, canon of the Lateran, circa 1140; and the *Gesta pauperis scolaris* of Albinus, cardinal Bishop of Albano, circa 1189.¹⁶ The span of time covered by these texts coincided with other expressions of the Church's inheritance of biblical Judaism, particularly the papal decree of *Sicut Judaeis* and the Roman Jews' presentation of the Torah to the pope.

During this era of heightened acknowledgement of biblical Judaism, the Holy Thursday ritual added emphasis, through physical rituals and spatial demonstrations, to the Church's claim to have the Temple Treasures in the Lateran basilica. The ritual not only indicated that the wooden ark of the covenant was inside the high altar, but also included the display of a special relic of Jesus's blood that was kept within the altar cavity. Circa 1073, the *DLE* had first claimed that ampules containing blood and water from Jesus were stored within the high altar.¹⁷

According to the *Ordo* of Bernard, at a certain point before the offertory of the mass, the ritual began when the cardinal priests and deacons lifted the horizontal altar table or *mensa* off the wooden main altar and placed it in an adjacent chapel. The remainder of the Mass, including the Eucharist, was then said on top of the wooden surface of the inner structure of the altar, which was purported to be the ark. Bernard explained the sequence of the ritual:

It is also known that on this day, for the people who have come to this church from remote parts of the world, while the lord pope gives the sermon, the table

¹⁶ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 24; Twyman, "Summus Pontifex," 213; De Blaauw, "The Solitary Celebration," 122-125. While both Bernard and Benedict were closely associated with the Lateran basilica, Albinus, as the cardinal of Albano, held a prominent and influential position in the Curia in the late twelfth century, and also would have been knowledgeable of the particular rituals conducted at the Lateran basilica. The inclusion of these three texts in this dissertation is not meant to suggest that they are the only texts that mention the ritual; however, their accounts clearly demonstrate the elaboration and continuation of the ritual in the second half of the twelfth century.

¹⁷ While the *DLE* mentions relics of the blood and the water from Jesus, De Blaauw notes that by the early thirteenth century, the ritual involved only the blood relic. That evolution of the ritual was perhaps an outcome of a "cult of the holy blood in the Lateran around 1200." De Blaauw, "The Solitary Celebration," 124.

of the main altar with all its coverings must be carried away by all of the cardinal priests and curial deacons, and so the ark is to be prepared by the lord pope himself in the form of that highest priest, and by the power to celebrate the mass, he begins to speak after the command of the apostles: “Once during the year, the pope alone entered into the second tabernacle, not without the blood, which he brought forward on behalf of his sins and the sins of the people.” And the table of the altar is carried off by the same cardinals, with great reverence, to the Chapel of St. Pancras and is placed upon a wooden apparatus. At this service and deed it will remain right up to Holy Saturday. And so the altar is covered over properly after the dismissal celebration with a pall or altar-cloth. He assigns this to the papal chancellor and Curia so that it is properly sealed on the four corners about the opening, and thus it is left with the chapter of canons, safeguarding it by day and night so that the seal is not broken, because from the altar, which is kept clear, something important may be lost.¹⁸

The details of Bernard’s text show the importance of biblical Judaism to the papacy’s assertion of power and authority, and the popes’ obvious determination to use the Temple Treasures to support that power. At the annual celebration of the institution of the Eucharist and before a large crowd from throughout Christendom, the altar is opened and the ark within it is prepared by the pope for the Eucharistic liturgy. According to Sible de Blaauw, contrary to the usual custom, on Holy Thursday the pope himself distributed communion from the front of the altar to the people, reinforcing the special nature of that mass and the altar.¹⁹

Bernard’s account notes the Old Testament to New Testament analogy that was extended to the Jewish high priest and the pope, with the brief quote from a New Testament

¹⁸ “Sciendum quoque est, quod, dum dominus papa in hac die populo, qui ex diuersis mundi partibus in hanc ecclesiam conuenerit, sermonem facit, maioris altaris mensa cum omnibus suis uestibus a presbyteris cardinalibus et diaconis curie ex toto auferri debet ac ita archa preparari, ut ipse dominus papa in figura illius summi pontificis [manibus] ad sacrificandum] [ingrediatur secundum apostoli dictum: *In secundo tabernaculo semel in anno solus pontifex introibat non sine sanguine, quem offeret pro sua et populi ignorantia.* Que tabula deportatur ab eisdem cardinalibus cum magna reuerentia in ecclesiam sancti Pancratii ac ponitur super ligneum instrumentum ad hoc opus factum et usque in sabbatum sanctum sic permanebit. Altare uero post misse celebrationem cooperitur pallio uel gausape ad hoc proprie deputato et a cancellario curie in IIII^{or} angulis de foris sigillatur ac sic canonicis die noctuque relinquitur custodiendum, ne sigilla frangantur et de altari, quod absit, aliquid amittatur.” *Ordo* 50.30-51.7. The Chapel of St. Pancras was located adjacent to the Lateran basilica, close to the apsidal end of the church.

¹⁹ De Blaauw, “The Solitary Celebration,” 142-143.

text, the *Letter to the Hebrews*, which apparently was a part of the ritual. In the *Letter to the Hebrews*, its author had described the ancient Hebrews' priestly traditions concerning the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies:

Thus with these arrangements, in fact, the priests always entered in the first tabernacle, completing the duties of the offerings; in the second tabernacle went the high priest alone once during the year, not without blood, which he offers for himself and for the errors of the people.²⁰

In addition, Bernard related that while the cardinal priests and deacons removed the top of the altar, the pope alone prepared the surface of the ark for the Eucharistic liturgy and then celebrated the institution of the Eucharist. It was that solitary nature of this papal ritual, directly comparing the pope to the Jewish high priest, who alone entered the Holy of Holies once a year, that added special emphasis to the Church's claim to have inherited biblical Judaism.²¹

Canon Benedict, in the *Liber politicus* circa 1140, wrote of the ritual removal of the altar table and clearly indicated the solitary nature of the papal consecration of the bread and wine:

On that day while the lord pope preaches, the cardinals raise the mensa of the altar, and they take it from the altar and place it in an undisturbed place. After completing the preaching, he gives absolution to the people. He blesses them and descends to his seat, where he announces the Creed. The offertory anthem is not said, but the pope alone goes into the altar near the bread and wine, which he reserves for others on the day of Good Friday.²²

²⁰ “. . . his vero ita compositis in priori quidem tabernaculo semper introibant sacerdotes sacrificiorum officia consummantes in secundo autem semel in anno solus pontifex non sine sanguine quem offert pro sua et populi ignorantia . . .” Hbr 9:6-7.

²¹ De Blaauw, “The Solitary Celebration,” 138.

²² “Eo die dum dominus pontifex predicat, cardinales levant mensam de altari et denudant altare et ponunt eam in securo loco. Peracta predicatione facit remissionem populo, benedicit et descendit ad sedem, ubi nunciat *Credo in unum Deum*. Offerenda non dicitur, sed solus pontifex intrat ad altare ad sacrificium, de quo sacrificio servat pro alio die parasceve.” *Lib. pol.* 151.7-14.

Sible de Blaauw notes that during a papal liturgy, the pope and cardinals would normally take communion at the same time; however, in this special Holy Thursday liturgy, the pope ingested the consecrated bread and wine by himself.²³ Again, the solitary nature of the pope's communion at the altar related his role to that of the Jewish high priest.

Near the end of the twelfth century, circa 1189, another description of the ritual was written by Albinus, cardinal Bishop of Albano. He described it in more detail and emphasized again that the pope took communion alone at the altar. The extra detail in Albinus's account indicates the further development of the ritual in the four decades since Benedict and Bernard's texts:

After the preaching of the lord pope, the cardinal deacons raise the top of the altar and for the purpose of exposing the altar, they lay the top part aside in a secret place, and they cover over the wooden altar itself, and after the mass they seal the four angles of that altar. When the preface of the mass is begun, the cardinal deacons make their way in front with the ampules, leading the subdeacons and acolytes, to the blessing, leading the way with the cross, thuribles, and two candles. For the rest, before it is said: "Through which all things, with the Lord, . . ." etc., the pope blesses the oil for the sick, just as is contained in the Ordine. After he will have said, "May the peace of the Lord be with you always," the pope alone partakes of the Eucharist before the altar, and the deacons bestow him with the chalice, only on that day.²⁴

By withdrawing and displaying the ampules, which were believed to contain the blood and water of Jesus, the pope conveyed several messages to the clergy and congregation. In the act of consecrating the Eucharist on the surface of what was promoted to be the ark of the

²³ De Blaauw, "The Solitary Celebration," 141.

²⁴ "Post predicationem vero domni pape diaconi cardinales levant mensam de altari et nudato altari ponunt eam in secreto loco, cooperiuntque ipsum altare linteo et post missam per IIII angulos illud sigillant. Cum autem prefatio inchoatur, vadunt diaconi cardinales cum subdiaconis et acolitibus pro ampullis adducendis ad benedicendum, precedente cruce, thuribulo et duobus cereis. Ceterum antequam dicatur *Per quem hec omnia, Domine*, etc., pontifex benedicit oleum pro infirmis, sicut in Ordine continetur. Postquam vero dixerit *Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum*, communicat solus pontifex ante altare et diaconi confirmant eum cum calice, illa tantummodo die." *Gesta* 129, Chapter 24.

covenant, the pope not only took possession of the most powerful and meaningful object in biblical Judaism, but transformed it into a new Christian symbol of the New Covenant with Jesus. Thus on Holy Thursday, when the pope celebrated the institution of the Eucharist, he also reminded those present of the Church's physical and theological inheritance of biblical Judaism. This conflated manifestation of Old Testament and New Testament power and authority undoubtedly added prestige and supported the authority of the papacy and the entire Church, but especially the Lateran basilica.

The dates in which the different Lateran texts were composed suggests their authors' intentions. These texts about the Temple Treasures and the Holy Thursday liturgy all indirectly supported the special power and authority of the pope, especially at the Lateran basilica. The first version of the *DLE* and the *Vita* of Bonizo of Sutri probably were intended to support papal authority in the late eleventh century in the face of continued conflict with the Holy Roman Emperor. By the mid-twelfth century, with political unrest in Rome confronting the power of the pope and often driving him out of Rome, the texts of Nicolaus Maniacutius, Bernard, Benedict, Albinus, and John the Deacon, encouraged a special and powerful position for the pope and his own church, the Lateran. The Holy Thursday ritual, as recorded in these texts, demonstrated the papacy's attempts to raise the prestige of the pope in response to persistent challenges from secular powers.

After the twelfth century, various figures continued to promote the special associations of the Lateran and its high altar, but the traditional beliefs about the placement of the Temple Treasures changed. In a sermon for the dedication feast day of the Lateran basilica, probably delivered early in the thirteenth century before his pontificate, Pope Honorius III (r. 1216-1227) repeated and conflated the Lateran traditions expressed by John the Deacon and Bonizo

of Sutri, including the Holy Thursday ritual in which the pope stands at the open altar by himself.²⁵ Honorius repeated Bonizo's claim that the wooden altar was the altar of St. Peter, but indicated that the altar of wood also symbolized the altar upon which Abraham nearly sacrificed Isaac, the cross of Jesus's crucifixion, and the altar of incense in the Temple in Jerusalem, thereby promoting a continuum between the Old Covenant and the New.²⁶ While the twelfth-century texts had claimed that the ark of the covenant was actually in the altar, by 1223, Giraldus Cambrensis recorded that the crypt beneath the high altar was the location of the Old Testament relics and the *mensa Domini* or table of the Last Supper, was in the high altar.²⁷ The shift in the placement of the ark from the high altar to beneath it, while the wooden high altar was identified as the altar of St. Peter, occurred at the end of the twelfth century and beginning of the thirteenth century, as papal attitudes expressed about the Jews were becoming more harsh. The concurrent development of both traditions may indeed indicate a papal connection. In addition, the claim that the high altar of the Lateran basilica was actually the altar of St. Peter struck a blow for the superiority of the Lateran basilica over St. Peter's.

Giraldus's text apparently also indicated the development of more anti-Semitic attitudes against Jews in thirteenth-century Rome. The twelfth-century account of the ritual by Albinus indicated that the ampules containing the blood and water from Jesus were displayed during the procession on Holy Thursday. In Giraldus's account of 1223, he

²⁵ Powell, "Honorius III's *Sermo*," 197, 199.

²⁶ Powell, "Honorius III's *Sermo*," 202. Honorius III, before his election to the papacy, composed the *Liber Censuum* c. 1192 and in it identified the Lateran high altar as the altar of St. Peter. Powell indicates that the identification was meant to attract pilgrims to Rome and detract from St. Peter's during the bitter rivalry between the two churches.

²⁷ "Haec omnia inferius sub principali et patriarchali altari in cripta laminis aereis munita, cum ipso toto tabernaculo, quod [ad] baptismum beati Constantini beata Helena Romam devexit, recondita manent." Giraldus Cambrensis: *Speculum ecclesiae* IV iii, in J.S. Brewer: *Giraldi Cambrensis opera* 4 (London, 1873), 273.

attributed the blood relic to an image of Christ on the Lateran Palace, which had reportedly been struck by a Jew and bled:

There is another story about some Jews . . . when they saw an image of the Divine Majesty painted above the door through which one enters the sanctuary, one of them took a stone and threw it, striking the image on the forehead. Blood immediately poured out in such an abundant flow that it ran down onto part of the floor. The one who threw the stone was instantly struck with a terrible agony and died in a frenzy in front of everyone. . . . The Christians ran to the scene and began to glorify what had happened with fitting reverence. The blood was taken up with great faith and brought health to many without reserve.²⁸

De Blaauw attributed the first mention of the blood relic's attribution to Giraldus Cambrensis; however, it had been recorded three decades earlier by Censius in the *Liber Censuum* circa 1192 in the Lateran rites conducted for a newly-elected pope:

When he had come before the same basilica, over whose arch supported by two columns of porphyry is an image of the Savior that was once struck by a certain Jew on the forehead and discharged blood, it is understood today [that] the chosen sits to the right in the porphyry seat, where the prior from the basilica of S. Lawrence in the Palace gives him the staff, which is the sign of command and amending, and the keys to the basilica itself and the Holy Lateran Palace . . .²⁹

Whether first circulating in 1192 or in 1223, the story of Jewish desecration of an image of Christ indicates growing negative attitudes toward the Jews at the end of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth centuries.

The identification of the high altar with the Jewish Temple Treasures apparently continued through the twelfth century, but eventually those objects that were believed to be

²⁸ Gerald of Wales, *A Translation of Gemma Ecclesiastica by Giraldus Cambrensis*, translated by John J. Hagen (London: Brill, 1979), I.31. De Blaauw notes in "The Solitary Celebration," (141-142), that the blood relic in the Lateran was widely believed to have come from the bleeding image of Jesus.

²⁹ "Ubi vero ventum est ante basilicam ipsam, super cujus arcum, qui sustentatur de duabus columpnis porfireticis, est ymago quedam Salvatoris que a quodam Judeo percussa olim in fronte sanguinem emisit, sicut hodie cernitur, idem electus sedet ad dexteram in sede porfiretica, ubi prior basilice sancti Laurentii de palatio dat ei ferulam, que est signum regiminis et correctionis, et claves ipsius basilice et sacri Lateranensis palatii . . ." *Lib. Cens.*, 312. Perhaps Geraldus obtained the story of the desecration of the image of Jesus from the *Liber Censuum*.

Old Testament relics were moved to different locations.³⁰ The actual contents of the high altar were removed and catalogued after the Lateran fire of 1308. The only Temple Treasure identified among the contents of the altar was the ark of the covenant.³¹ After the Old Testament relics were removed from the high altar, the altar was thereafter definitively associated with the altar of St. Peter.³² After the 1308 fire, the *mensa Domini*, the ark of the covenant, and the rods of Moses and Aaron were placed in the sacristy of the Lateran basilica, known as the Chapel of St. Thomas, adjacent to the western entrance of the basilica, where they remained until 1647. At that time the ark and rods were moved to the ambulatory of the apse and kept on display until 1745, when they were removed from public view.³³

Alexander III: 1159-1181

The Roman Jews

During the same period in which the Church claimed that the ark of the covenant, an incomparable treasure of the ancient Hebrews, was in the Lateran basilica's high altar, Pope Alexander III maintained the traditional papal relationship with the Roman Jews that had been formed by Eugenius III in 1145, and apparently established even closer contact with the community. From the start of Alexander's reign in 1159 through at least 1177, the Roman Jews faced the same situation as at the beginning of Eugenius's reign in 1145, when the city

³⁰ After the twelfth century, various texts continued to mention the presence of the Old Testament relics in the Lateran, demonstrating the prestige and efficacy of such a claim to the papacy. The major sources for the Old Testament relics in the Lateran from the thirteenth through the fifteenth centuries are: the relic list of Pope Nicholas IV (1291), *Rationale divinarum officiorum* by William Durandus (before 1296), and a bull of Eugenius IV (1446). See Freiberg, *The Lateran and Clement VIII* (Ph.D. Diss., New York University, 1988), Appendix G, 542-546 ff. for a complete list of the relevant texts.

³¹ De Blaauw, "The Solitary Celebration," 131. The catalogue of the altar contents (129 n. 38) does not include any relics from the Temple in Jerusalem other than the ark of the covenant. De Blaauw points out (133-134) that the items visible in the Arch of Titus reliefs were not found in the Lateran altar, despite the claims of earlier medieval writers.

³² Powell, "Honorius III's *Sermo*," 203-204.

³³ Freiberg, *The Lateran and Clement VIII*, 231; De Blaauw, "The Solitary Celebration," 130-132.

was controlled by the Roman Commune and the pope lived in exile elsewhere. Alexander faced relentless political pressures during his reign, which resulted in the vast majority of his papacy spent in exile outside of Rome. While the pope tried to establish and maintain his authority in Christendom, he was challenged by three imperially-supported antipopes.³⁴ The Roman Commune continued to oppose Alexander through most of his reign; according to Robinson, the Roman Commune remained loyal to the Holy Roman Emperor through Alexander's reign until the Peace of Venice pact in 1177 between the emperor and the pope.³⁵ Therefore Alexander faced extraordinary pressures to establish his authority and regain his papal power in Rome, and used the available opportunities to assert his ownership of the power and authority of biblical Judaism.

The Disputed Election and Exile

The Holy Roman Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa was a major disputant to Alexander's election and a continued obstruction to papal power in Rome. Elected in 1152, Frederick struck a new, forceful tone for imperial power in his first official letter to Eugenius III after the election, and remained a persistent power in Europe throughout his imperial reign.³⁶ That imperial attitude influenced Frederick's interactions with Alexander from 1159

³⁴ The three antipopes were Victor IV (r. 1159-1164), Paschal III (r. 1164-1168), and Calixtus III (r. 1168-1178). Robinson, *The Papacy*, x. The political pressures and challenges that Alexander faced during his reign are not the primary focus of this dissertation, but will be explained sufficiently to demonstrate Alexander's motivation to claim the power and authority of biblical Judaism.

³⁵ Robinson, *The Papacy*, 15.

³⁶ Despite Frederick's imperial attitude, Eugenius III concluded the Treaty of Constance with the emperor in March 1153, but was unable to carry out all of the treaty's provisions because of his death in July of that year. His successor Anastasius IV, during his short reign, acquiesced to certain demands of Frederick's and maintained an untroubled relationship with the emperor. Early in Adrian IV's reign, after a difficult start to the papal-imperial relationship, Frederick escorted the pope into Rome and was crowned by Adrian in St. Peter's in June 1155. As soon as imperial forces left Rome, shortly after the coronation, Adrian was not able to maintain his authority there and forced back into exile. The imperial relationship with the pope then began to deteriorate in response to the concordat of Benevento (1156) between Adrian IV and the king of Sicily, and clearly became hostile from 1157. Pacaut, in *Frederick Barbarossa*, claims (52-56) that Frederick Barbarossa desired to rule all of Italy, and in that context clashed with the king of Sicily, the Italian nobility, and the pope.

until the Peace of Venice was ratified between pope and emperor in 1177. According to Colin Morris, at the start of his reign Frederick believed that his power as emperor came directly from God, not from the papacy in Rome. Morris interprets the new emperor's actions in Italy and interactions with the Church as evidence that Frederick was determined to rule over all areas that he believed were his as emperor, including lands in the papal Patrimony, and to collect taxes from those lands.³⁷ Pacaut claims, however, that after nearly twenty years opposing Alexander and trying to gain control of Italy, Frederick changed tactics, made peace with Alexander in 1177, and achieved his original imperial goals.³⁸

Imperial hostility toward Alexander was also rooted in events during the papacy of his predecessor, Adrian IV, which resulted in a division within the college of cardinals into pro-Sicilian and pro-imperial factions.³⁹ After Adrian's death in 1159, that division erupted in schism, and the dual election of Pope Alexander III and the antipope Victor IV.⁴⁰ Since Victor's supporters controlled Rome, Alexander was forced to leave the city.⁴¹ Apparently Alexander left Rome by way of Trastevere, which would support the contention that Trastevere still was not included in the Commune.⁴² According to Marcel Pacaut, Alexander and his electors escaped to a fortified tower in Trastevere; the Frangipani then helped him to

³⁷ Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, 188-189.

³⁸ Pacaut, *Frederick Barbarossa*, 56.

³⁹ Robinson, *The Papacy*, 462-473. The dispute erupted with a letter from Adrian to Frederick in 1157, which was perceived by the Germans as insulting and indicative of renewed papal motives of imperial domination. Cardinal Roland, the future Alexander III, was one of the two emissaries who delivered the letter to Frederick's court. Adrian was then accused of being controlled by the Sicilians.

⁴⁰ Robinson, *The Papacy*, 52-55, 78-83; Mann, *The Lives of the Popes X*: 14-22.

⁴¹ Morris, in *The Papal Monarchy* (193-194) explains how Frederick attempted to legitimize his choice of pope, Victor IV. Alexander had excommunicated Victor IV shortly after the double election of September 1159. Frederick then called and presided over the ecclesiastical Council of Pavia in 1160, which decided that Victor was the legitimate. At that point, Alexander excommunicated Frederick. These moves and counter-moves, which were characteristic of papal and imperial rulers since the period of the Gregorian reform in the late eleventh century, continued to characterize the relationship between Alexander III and Frederick.

⁴² To reiterate, in the first years of the Commune, Trastevere apparently was not included in the Commune. The original Roman Jewish settlement had been centered in Trastevere, and in the twelfth century, while most Roman Jews lived in the Pierleoni's neighborhood of the Ripa, Trastevere still contained many Jewish families.

flee to Ninfa, where he was consecrated and crowned.⁴³ This chronology of events may indicate Jewish support for Alexander, sheltering him in Trastevere, similar to the assistance they probably provided for Eugenius in 1145.

While Alexander spent the first years of his pontificate in exile, he also conducted traditional pontifical business. By July 1160 Alexander III had been recognized by the kings of France and England, Louis VII and Henry II.⁴⁴ He returned to Rome briefly in June 1161, but was unable to maintain control of the city and left after just three weeks.⁴⁵ Alexander resided in Italy for most of his exile, but did travel through France from 1162-1165, and presided over the council of Tours in 1163. Robert Sommerville notes that the council members renewed Alexander's excommunication of the antipope Victor IV, but it did not renew Alexander's excommunication of Frederick, perhaps because the pope hoped for a reconciliation with the emperor.⁴⁶ Those hopes were unrealized, for when Victor IV died in 1164, Frederick supported the election of the next antipope, Paschall III.⁴⁷

Return to Rome and Papal Adventus

After six years in exile, Alexander was able to return to Rome when a pro-Alexandrine Senate was elected and the Roman political milieu changed, and as imperial power in northern

⁴³ Marcel Pacaut, *Alexandre III* (Paris: Librairie philosophique, 1956), 102. Jaffé, *Regesta* II:147. Twyman indicates in *Papal Ceremonial* (98) that the tower belonged to the Frangipani, but Pacaut does not mention the Frangipani until after the pope and cardinals were safely in the tower in Trastevere. Further research may clear up this point, and definitively indicate whether the Roman Jews had sheltered Alexander or not in 1159.

⁴⁴ Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, 194.

⁴⁵ *Regesta* II:153-154. Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 98-99.

⁴⁶ Alexander excommunicated Victor IV (Octavian) in late September 1159; Frederick's excommunication followed in March 1160. *Regesta* II:147 no. 10587, 150 no. 10628.

⁴⁷ Robert Somerville, *Pope Alexander III and the Council of Tours (1163), A Study of Ecclesiastical Politics and Institutions in the Twelfth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), 64-65. Somerville characterized (67) Alexander III and Frederick I Barbarossa as "representatives of prideful traditions," both unwilling to back down from their positions.

Italy was challenged by the League of Verona.⁴⁸ During his triumphal return in November 1165,⁴⁹ Alexander renewed his relationship with the Roman Jews during his papal *adventus* and presentation of *Sicut Judaeis*. While Alexander had returned briefly to Rome in 1161, his reception by the Romans at that time appears to have been subdued and not a broad *adventus* as was traditional for a pope returning from exile.⁵⁰ On the contrary, the 1165 *adventus* of Alexander was recorded by Boso in the *Liber Pontificalis* and included the participation of huge crowds of Romans, including the Roman Jews:

And in the morning, a multitude of the people, the Senators with the nobility and a large crowd of clergy and in fact a multitude of people, hurried from the city to him, displaying to him with honor, just as to the shepherd of their souls, obedient duty and customary respect. And then, with olive branches they escorted him with honor all the way to the Lateran gate, with the joy and delight of all; and where the entire city clergy, solemnly putting on vestments according to custom, already longing for him for a long time, were waiting for the *adventus* of the same pope; then the Jews arrived, in accordance with custom, bringing down their law on their arms; then the banner-bearers rushed together with the banners, the grooms, the scribes, the judges, with the advocates and with a not small multitude of the same people.⁵¹

Several aspects of this account demonstrate the special nature of Alexander's *adventus* in 1165. Boso clearly noted the overwhelming welcome by both secular and ecclesiastical Romans to Alexander, and compared the pope to Jesus, "the shepherd of their souls," which emphasized Alexander's supreme authority over them. The participation of the Roman Jews was an important component of papal *adventus*, "in accordance with custom," as they

⁴⁸ Pacaut, *Frederick Barbarossa*, 120. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes X*:76-78. Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, 195.

⁴⁹ *Regesta* II:195.

⁵⁰ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 99.

⁵¹ "Mane autem facto senatores cum nobilibus et magna cleri ac populi multitudo ex Urbe sibi honorifice occurrerunt, exhibentes sibi tanquam animarum suarum pastori obedientiam debitam et consuetam reverentiam. Et exinde cum ramis olivarum usque ad portam Lateranensem ipsum honorifice cum omni gaudio et letitia conduxerunt; ibique totus Urbis clerus, de more sollempniter indutus, eiusdem pontificis iamdiu desideratum prestolabatur adventum; ibi advenerant Iudei, ex more legem suam deferentes in brachiis; ibi concurrerant signiferi cum bandis, stratores, scriniarii, iudices, cum advocatis et non modica eiusdem populi multitudine." *LP* 2:413.

presented their law, the Torah, to Alexander. Boso recorded that the Jews occupied a prominent place in the ritual procession, just after the clergy and before the banner-bearers, grooms, scribes, judges, advocates and the multitude of people. Just as in the *adventus* of Eugenius III twenty years before, the Roman Jews presented their law to the pope as he entered the city after a period of exile from Rome. While the *Liber Pontificalis* account does not mention the Jews' Hebrew acclamation of Alexander, the Hebrew *laudes* continued to be included in the Jews' ceremonial welcome of the pope during *adventus* through at least 1188, therefore they were probably performed for Alexander too.⁵²

Before the presentation of the Torah to Alexander, the only previous record of such a presentation to a pope in Rome was to Eugenius III in 1145. Several parallels exist between the circumstances of Eugenius III's and Alexander III's early reigns and their *adventus* celebrations in 1145 and 1165: both popes left Rome hurriedly after their elections because of unsafe conditions in Rome, both reigns began in periods in which the Roman Commune completely controlled the city, both re-entered the city in a grand papal *adventus* after a period in exile, and both exchanged ritual honors with the Roman Jews during their *adventus* processions. The *Liber Pontificalis* records the Jews' presentation of the Torah to both Eugenius and Alexander, and the Hebrew acclamations of Eugenius. There is no reason to doubt that the Hebrew *laudes* were also performed for Alexander III in 1165. In addition, if a contractual relationship had existed between the Roman Jews and Eugenius III, providing papal protection to the Jews in return for the Jews supplying financial support for the pope, then such a relationship may have continued to exist between Alexander III and the Roman Jews. Alexander's long absences from the city of Rome, and disruption of papal revenues

⁵² Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 204. The Hebrew *laudes* were performed for Eugenius III in 1145.

from the Patrimony may indeed have necessitated special arrangements to obtain the necessary financial support.

During his reign Alexander III re-issued the decree *Sicut Judaeis*, calling on Christians to protect the Jews living among them and prohibiting certain atrocities against the Jews:

. . . since they wish more to endure to the end in their hardness, than to recognize the secret language of the prophets, still, because they demand our defense and help, by the gentleness of Christians of love, clinging to the footsteps of our predecessors of happy memory, Callistus and Eugenius, popes of the Romans, we give access to the petitions of the same ones, and we grant to them our power of protection. . . . we establish that no Christian may compell those Jews reluctant or unwilling to come to Baptism . . . no Christian, without a judicial assembly of earthly authority, may presume to wound or kill any of theirs, or may presume to take away their money or property from them . . . In no way may anyone upset them at the celebration for their church festival, especially with clubs or stones, . . . no one may venture into the cemetery of Jews, meeting men of evil for depravity and worthlessness, to seize or to maim, or to dig up human bodies for the pretext of money.⁵³

The principal portions of the decree shown above indicated that Alexander was following papal tradition by issuing this decree, and also indirectly recorded the variety of crimes committed against the Jews at that time. While the date of the decree is not presently known, Alexander's presentation of the decree to the Roman Jews probably occurred during his *adventus* of 1165. If papal *adventus* had assumed the original meaning of ruler *adventus*, which was a vehicle for the citizens to welcome their ruler, acknowledge his authority, and petition his protection, then 1165 is the logical date for the papacy to extend its official protection to the Jews.⁵⁴ Alexander had left Rome very soon after his election in 1159, was unable to process through the city in his coronation *adventus*, and was consecrated outside of the city. He had returned to the city briefly in 1161 and was acclaimed by the citizens in an

⁵³ Mansi 22: cols. 355ff.

⁵⁴ While Susan Twyman in *Papal Ceremonial* (204-205) apparently does not suggest a date for Alexander III's presentation of *Sicut*, she convincingly connects the mid-twelfth-century presentation of the Torah and acclamation of the pope by the Jews during *adventus* with the pope's decree of *Sicut Judaeis*.

incomplete *adventus*.⁵⁵ Finally returning in triumph to Rome in November 1165, and enjoying the favor of the city during his *adventus*, Alexander could complete his contract with the citizens as their ruler, receive the law of the Jews, and extend his official protection to them. Twyman credits this mid-twelfth century development of papal *adventus* to the popes' need to assume authority in Rome when the traditional papal inauguration, consecration, and coronation rituals were not completed after election; the role of the Roman Commune as the political disruptor in the city is clearly evident. The vital necessity of the pope to be acclaimed by his people in the city of Rome drove the development of papal *adventus*.⁵⁶

Perhaps soon after Alexander's 1165 *adventus*, Benjamin of Tudela visited Rome and documented in his *Itinerary* that a Roman Jew, Jechiel, served Alexander III as the papal steward or *senescalcus*:

Great scholars reside here [Rome], at the head of them being R. Daniel, the chief rabbi, and R. Jechiel, an official of the pope. He is a handsome young man of intelligence and wisdom, and he has the entry of the pope's palace; for he is the steward of his house and of all that he has.⁵⁷

Benjamin's travels described in the *Itinerary* have been dated to sometime between 1169 and 1171.⁵⁸ Before 1165, Alexander and his Curia had resided outside of Rome for six years, and would have established a papal household in Rome upon setting up residence there in November 1165. Perhaps a result of the renewal of the relationship between the pope and the Jews during the *adventus* of 1165 was the employment of Jechiel, a Roman Jew from a well-known family and descendent of a respected scholar, Rabbi Nathan ben Jechiel. If Alexander had indeed been supported by the Jews of Rome during his first long period of exile, and

⁵⁵ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 103, 219.

⁵⁶ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 216-219.

⁵⁷ Benjamin of Tudela, *The Itinerary*, 63.

⁵⁸ Michael A. Signer, introduction to *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela* by Benjamin of Tudela, 20.

provided with financial assistance, then his employment of Jechiel may have been an indication of his gratitude to the Roman Jewish community.

Renewed Conflict, Exile, and the Final Settlement with Frederick I Barbarossa

Alexander's return to Rome in 1165 did not signal the end to his troubles with the emperor; he remained in the city only until July 1167. Frederick's forces seized control of St. Peter's in July 1167 and in that church held the papal coronation of Paschal III, the second antipope to rule during Alexander III's reign.⁵⁹ At that time the Roman Senators promised their loyalty to the emperor, and Alexander again fled Rome for friendlier towns in Italy.⁶⁰ He would not return to Rome for ten years, until a definitive peace was reached with the emperor Frederick. During those ten years, relations between Alexander and Frederick remained antagonistic, as Frederick conducted several campaigns in Lombardy in attempts to subdue the cities to his rule.⁶¹ In late 1167, several northern Italian cities formed the Lombard League to oppose Frederick's rule and united their forces against Frederick's imperial army, while Alexander allied himself with the League and against Frederick.⁶² Again Alexander was compelled by the circumstances to exert his authority over Christendom from outside of Rome.⁶³

⁵⁹ Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, 195.

⁶⁰ *Regesta* II:205.

⁶¹ One of Frederick's claims was that he was entitled to the lands of the Countess Matilda of Tuscany, a strong supporter of the reform popes, who had died in 1115 without heirs. In her will, she left her property to the papacy, but by Alexander's reign, papal and imperial claims on the Mathildine lands added tension to ongoing conflict between Alexander and Frederick. Pacaut, *Frederick Barbarossa*, 37. Robinson, *The Papacy*, 246-247.

⁶² Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, 197. Pacaut outlines the development of the northern cities' alliances against Frederick. The Lombard League formed from the union of the League of Verona and the League of Cremona. Pacaut, *Frederick Barbarossa*, 127.

⁶³ A major concern of Alexander's during that decade of 1167-1177 was the conflict between the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Becket and King Henry II of England. Robinson notes the careful diplomacy exerted by Alexander and several legates to England, to resolve the controversy without alienating Henry II, because the English king was a necessary ally of the papacy against the German emperor, and because the impoverished Alexander received an annual income, Peter's Pence, from England. Robinson, *The Papacy*, 167-168. The full

Frederick decided to seek peace with Alexander in 1176 after the Battle of Legnano in which the German army was routed, and negotiations were undertaken to form a lasting treaty.⁶⁴ Alexander and Frederick met at Venice in July 1177 and formally agreed to the terms of the Treaty of Venice.⁶⁵ Frederick pledged his allegiance to Alexander as pope and performed the stirrup service for the pope, while Alexander for his part rescinded Frederick's sentence of excommunication. Morris claims that neither Frederick nor Alexander secured the provisions of authority that each had sought over the years of their conflict. He suggests that Alexander agreed to concessions in order to secure the imperial support he needed to regain Rome, still under the control of the Commune.⁶⁶

After extensive negotiations with the Commune, Alexander returned to Rome in March 1178.⁶⁷ Boso recorded Alexander's second triumphal *adventus* procession into Rome, but the record does not indicate if the Roman Jews participated.⁶⁸ Still, Alexander had established the contract between the papacy and the Roman Jews during his first *adventus* entrance in 1165, receiving their Torah and decreeing *Sicut Judaeis* for the Jews' protection. Soon after his return to Rome, Alexander would have renewed the Church's focus on biblical Judaism by conducting the Holy Thursday ritual at the high altar of the Lateran, since Easter Sunday fell on April 9, 1178.⁶⁹

texts of letters exchanged between Alexander III and Thomas Becket may be found in Mansi, *Sacrorum cons.* 22.

⁶⁴ Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, 196.

⁶⁵ *MGH Const.* I: 360-373, no. 259-270.

⁶⁶ Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, 196-197.

⁶⁷ *Regesta* II: 320.

⁶⁸ *LP* 2:445-446.

⁶⁹ *Regesta* II: 321.

The Lateran Portico Mosaics

Upon his return to Rome, Alexander also called the Third Lateran Council for March 1179 and began to make preparations for the council. Those preparations may have included the construction of a new portico on the western entrance of the Lateran basilica, which was decorated with narrative scenes in mosaics, and detailed the story of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, and the history of the Lateran basilica and saints associated with it.⁷⁰ While Ingo Herklotz has recently proposed that the portico mosaics were created after the reign of Alexander III, the mosaic scenes have not been definitively dated.⁷¹

The mosaic scenes and accompanying inscription undeniably referenced the Lateran basilica's continued association with biblical Judaism and acknowledged Lateran superiority, papal authority, and imperial support of the papacy. An inscription that was placed directly underneath the narrative scenes and extended along the entire length of the architrave clearly conveyed papal intent:

It is granted by pontifical and similarly by imperial decree.
That I am the mother of all, head of the Church.
For this reason the Heavenly Crowns of the Savior,
In the name of the giver, decreed that all will have been completed:
And so, directed totally to us by the prayer of the suppliant,
I dedicate this, which is our glorious cathedral, to you, Christ.⁷²

⁷⁰ That portico was added onto the eastern entrance to the Lateran c. 1170-1180, in the tradition of porches added to Roman churches in that era. See Richard Krautheimer, *Rome, Profile of a City*, especially Chapter 7, 161-202. Nicolaus Angeli, a well-known architect and sculptor in late twelfth-century Rome, was responsible for the construction of the portico and also created the mosaic scenes. His workmanship was attested to by his inscribed proclamation, "NICOLAVS ANGELI FECIT HOC OPVS," "Nicolaus Angeli created this work," which he placed directly underneath the inscription. Ciampini, *De sacris aedificiis*, 13. Ingo Herklotz, *Gli eredi di Costantino: Il papato, il Laterano e la propaganda visiva nel XII secolo* (Roma: Viella, 2000), 161. Krautheimer, *Corpus V*, 12.

⁷¹ Herklotz, *Gli eredi*, 161.

⁷² "Dogmate Papali datur ac simul imperiali, Quod sim cunctarum mater, caput Ecclesiarum. Hinc Salvatoris Caelestia Regna datoris, Nomine sanxerunt cum cuncta peracta fuerunt: Sic sumus ex toto conversi supplice voto, Nostra quod haec aedes tibi Christe sit inclyta sedes," Ciampini, *De sacris aedificiis*, 13.

The Lateran clergy's claim, that their church was the mother and head of the churches in Rome, was re-iterated and proclaimed on the portico. The reference in the inscription to "imperial decree" shows that the pope and the Lateran enjoyed imperial support, therefore the portico must have been created after the Peace of Venice in 1177.

Although this portico was destroyed when the present façade of the Lateran was built by Galilei between 1730 and 1732, Giovanni Ciampini recorded the appearance of the portico and its mosaics in his book, *De sacris aedificiis a Constantino magno constructis*, printed in 1693,

. . . a continuous portico resting on six great columns, with three unadorned, and the same number smooth, with Doric capitals.⁷³

Perhaps a dozen mosaics scenes originally decorated the exterior façade of the portico at the architrave level, separated by porphyry roundels. When Ciampini recorded the appearance of the portico, only eight scenes remained. Undoubtedly due to the long-standing association of the Lateran to biblical Judaism, the first two mosaic scenes alluded to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish Temple.⁷⁴ The artist composed the first scene with four ships on the water, which Ciampini described as:

. . . in the first scene . . . four ships are seen, composed from traditional old Roman forms; they refer to the Roman fleet which General Vespasian and his son Titus the Legate, brought across for the destruction of Jerusalem . . .⁷⁵

⁷³ "Porticus contignatio sex magnis columnis innititur, tribus puris, totidem striates, cum capitulis Doricis." Ciampini, *De sacris aedificiis*, 10.

⁷⁴ The other mosaic scenes referred to the legendary establishment of the basilica by Constantine, and other legends about lives of Pope St. Sylvester, and Saints John the Evangelist and John the Baptist. The scenes of Constantine and Sylvester undoubtedly referenced that pope's imperially supported authority, thus reminding future emperors of the papacy's superiority.

⁷⁵ "In prima igitur eiusdem Tabulae II figura quatuor naves, veterum Romanorum more compactae, visuntur, easq; referent, quibus Romana classis ad Hierosolymae excidium transfretavit, Vespasiano Duce, ac Tito eius filio Legato." Ciampini, *De sacris aedificiis*, 11. It is important to note that Ciampini's description was composed in the late seventeenth century and reflects common perceptions of that era. Further research is needed to determine how the late twelfth-century Romans viewed the mosaic scenes and how the portico with its narrative mosaics functioned in papal ceremonies and processions.

The second scene includes two figures, one on the left standing and holding a spear, and one on the right seated. To the left of both men is the representation of a walled-city and a square tower rising from within it. Ciampini describes the second mosaic scene as:

The scene shows two men, one sitting and addressing, the other one armed with a spear and upright: Titus is possibly the first character, the Cohorts driving the assault on the tower of the Antonia . . . at this point, the Antonia Tower rises from the rear, the principal garrison of the men of Jerusalem, of which mention is not infrequently made among more political and more learned men . . .⁷⁶

Under the direction of his papal patron, the designer of the narrative scenes chose the particular scenes for the narrative mosaics. He selected scenes that were not only from Christian history intrinsically connected to the Lateran basilica. The scenes were not ordered in chronological order; first in the sequence of scenes were those that proclaimed the Roman destruction of Jerusalem and connected that destruction to the Lateran's reputation as the repository for the relics of the Temple. The motivation for choosing those scenes must have been to reinforce popular beliefs that the Treasures of the Temple in Jerusalem were still held at the Lateran. The Chapel of St. Thomas, in which the ark of the covenant, and rods of Moses and Aaron were placed after the 1308 Lateran fire, was to the left of the late-twelfth-century portico, and immediately adjacent to the two scenes referring to the destruction of Jerusalem.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ "Figura ostendit viros duos, alterum quidem sedentem, & alloquentem, alterum hastatum, & stantem: ac prior fortasse Titus est, ad Antoniae turris expugnationem cohorts impellens . . . hic a tergo Viri alte surgit Antonia turris, praecipuum Hierosolymorum praesidium; cuius cum apud Viros politioris eruditioris non infrequens mentio habeatur," Ciampini, *De sacris aedificiis*, 11.

⁷⁷ The circumstances of the creation of the portico and its mosaics, the purpose of both, and the use of the portico in papal ceremonial will be further investigated, but are beyond the scope of this dissertation at this point. See Herklotz, *Gli eredi di Costantino: Il papato, il Laterano, e la propaganda visiva nel XII secolo* (Roma: Viella, 2000), for the most recent study of the Lateran portico mosaics.

A Final Legacy: The Third Lateran Council, 1179

In the final years of his papacy and following the Peace of Venice, Alexander III was able to return to Rome and preside over the Third Lateran Council in March 1179; the council decrees had a long-lasting effect on many aspects of Church government, and also affected Jewish life. The decrees of the council increased the strength of the papal monarchy by strictly ordering papal elections, while several canons regulated the clergy.⁷⁸ Of the twenty-seven decrees, number twenty-six directly addressed the lives of Jews and Saracens, and the interactions of Christians with them:

Jews and Saracens are not to be allowed to have Christian servants in their houses, either under pretence of nourishing their children or for service or any other reason. Let those be excommunicated who presume to live with them. We declare that the evidence of Christians is to be accepted against Jews in every case, since Jews employ their own witnesses against Christians, and that those who prefer Jews to Christians in this matter are to lie under anathema, since Jews ought to be subject to Christians and to be supported by them on grounds of humanity alone. If any by the inspiration of God are converted to the Christian faith, they are in no way to be excluded from their possessions, since the condition of converts ought to be better than before their conversion. If this is not done, we enjoin on the princes and rulers of these places, under penalty of excommunication, the duty to restore fully to these converts the share of their inheritance and goods.⁷⁹

As in the case with the *Sicut* decree, the different stipulations of the above Lateran Council decree indicated what current situations were seen as problems in 1179. Christian servants

⁷⁸ Chodorow, *Christian Political Theory*, 19; Robinson, *The Papacy*, 57; Tanner, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils I*, Third Lateran Council, 211.1-24.

⁷⁹ "Iudaei sive Sarraceni nec sub alendorum puerorum obtentu nec pro servitio nec alia qualibet causa, christiana mancipia in domibus suis permittantur habere. Excommunicentur autem qui cum eis praesumpserint habitare. Testimonium quoque christianorum adversus Iudaeos in omnibus causis, cum illi adversus christianos testibus suis utantur, recipiendum esse censemus, et anathemate decernimus feriendos, quicumque Iudaeos christianis voluerint in hac parte praefere, cum eos subiacere christianis oporteat et ab eis pro sola humanitate foveri. Si qui praeterea Deo inspirante ad fidem se converterint christianam, a possessionibus suis nullatenus excludantur, cum melioris conditionis conversos ad fidem esse oporteat quam, antequam fidem acceperunt, habebantur. Si autem secus factum fuerit, principibus vel potestatibus eorumdem locorum sub poena excommunicationis iniungimus, ut portionem hereditatis et bonorum suorum ex integro eis faciant exhiberi." Tanner, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils I*, 223.30-224.12.

were not allowed to work for Jews, probably to prevent any danger of Christians converting to Judaism; the decree stipulated harsh penalties, “Let those be excommunicated who presume to live with them.” That pronouncement seems contrary to Alexander’s own actions in the previous decade, when the Roman Jew Jechiel was in papal employ; however, perhaps the employment of a Jewish man by a Christian and by the pope was not surprising, because the Christian employer and other Christians in the household would far outnumber the Jewish servant, and would be able to proselytize to him. The decree reiterated another restriction on Jews that had been proclaimed for centuries in Christian society, “the evidence of Christians is to be accepted against Jews in every case . . . Jews ought to be subject to Christians and to be supported by them on grounds of humanity alone.” This language did not indicate the closer relationship between Alexander III and the Roman Jews that other evidence from Alexander’s 1165 *adventus* has suggested. It is not possible to definitively say whether Alexander’s relationship with the Roman Jews was re-ordered by actions of this Council, or whether during the decade 1167-1177 and Alexander’s exile from Rome, his contact with those Roman Jews had deteriorated. Nevertheless, the decrees of the Third Lateran Council left a lasting influence on the Roman Church, continued the Church’s traditional restrictions on Jewish society, and served as Alexander’s final legacy.

Alexander III faced many obstacles to his rule over Rome and the Patrimony. Political pressures in Rome that had erupted in the early 1140s, particularly the Roman Commune, continued to plague Alexander’s rule. Relentless opposition from the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa, kept Alexander from Rome for most of his rule. Nevertheless, Alexander was able to return to Rome for short periods and eventually concluded a lasting peace with the Emperor. Throughout at least his early reign, Alexander apparently

maintained a relationship with the Roman Jews that probably resulted in his employment of the Jewish steward Jechiel. Despite that apparent association, Alexander nevertheless supported decrees from the Third Lateran Council in 1179 that reiterated and reinforced restrictions on Jews in Christian society. Alexander's actions indicate that even though he may have established close relationships with Roman Jews, he still carried out his leadership role in the Christian Church, and followed traditional doctrine and papal precedent regarding the place of the Jews in Christian society.

Conclusion

Papal attitudes in the twelfth century toward Judaism and the Jews functioned on several levels and originated from several sources. Judaism undeniably formed the basis for Christianity; Christians shared many sacred texts with Jews and revered the same prophets and patriarchs. On the other hand, papal attitudes toward the Jews differed between pre-Christian and post-Christian Jews. Augustine of Hippo had expressed the belief that only the Jews before the time of Christ had been faithful to their God. Those Jews since the time of Christ, who refused to believe that Jesus was the messiah, were perceived to be blind to the truth, especially the Christian truth contained in the Hebrew Scriptures. The dispersed Jews who lived among Christians functioned as witnesses to all Christians of the failure and invalidation of Judaism. Through the early Middle Ages, for the most part Jews lived safely within Christian society. Roman law and papal precedent both contributed to relatively safe conditions for Jews. Derogatory writings and sermons about the Jews, however, contributed to sporadic outbreaks of violence against Jews; that occasional violence erupted into massacres of Jews during the First Crusade and led into a period of official papal protection. The distinctly different Christian perceptions of pre-Christian Jews and contemporary Jews,

along with various precedents for papal actions, led to incredibly complex papal attitudes toward biblical Judaism and the Jews of twelfth-century Rome.

The stories of the twelfth-century popes, Eugenius III and Alexander III, and their multi-faceted attitudes toward biblical Judaism and contemporary Jews, are inextricably bound with those popes' struggles for authority, and with their support of the claim that the Temple Treasures were kept in the Lateran basilica. Taken from the Temple of Herod in the first century CE, those liturgical vessels and their history left enduring impressions on Christians and Jews alike. Believed by both groups to have been created under the actual direction of God, the Treasures embodied the Covenant between the ancient Hebrews and Yahweh, and served as a spiritual and physical conduit for the Hebrews to the presence of Yahweh in their midst. Used liturgically and defensively by the ancient Hebrews, the Treasures became theological tools of the twelfth-century popes' assertion of power and authority. From the 1140s, the papacy's claim to possess the Treasures equated to a claim to possess not only the authority of Moses and the majesty of the Hebrew kings David and Solomon, but also the power and authority of the Hebrew God, Yahweh. It was no accident that the papal title *vicarius Christi* was used in the second half of the twelfth century instead of the previously-used title, *vicarius Petri*.⁸⁰ The pope was not just the Bishop of Rome, but he was the new high priest; moreover, he was not merely St. Peter's representative on earth, but truly Christ's representative.

In their capacities as *vicarii Christi*, Eugenius III and Alexander III also ruled temporally over the Jews within the papal Patrimony and theologically over all Jews in Christendom, and maintained a special relationship with the Roman Jews. The Jews'

⁸⁰ Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial*, 219.

recollection of the last Temple in Jerusalem and the Temple Treasures persisted as sacred memories to Jews in the Diaspora. The destruction of that Temple and the definitive end of the Jewish state in Palestine remained an anniversary of collective mourning for Jews. Immortalized in the relief sculptures of the Arch of Titus, the symbol of the menorah was used by Roman Jews as a sign of their faith and inscribed on tombs, in catacombs, and in their synagogues. The relief sculptures on the Arch reinforced Roman Jews' awareness of the despoliation and desecration of the Temple by Roman forces. That remembrance of the Temple and its Treasures along with the possible presence of some Temple artifacts in Rome endured among twelfth-century Roman Jews and is demonstrated by the travel account of Benjamin of Tudela.

Although the Temple Treasures apparently were taken from Rome in the fifth century, different traditions developed to explain the eventual location of the Treasures. One tradition suggested that the menorah remained in Constantinople.

Another tradition, promulgated through Lateran texts, liturgical rituals, and papal *adventus* processions, claimed that the Temple Treasures were housed in the Lateran basilica. The authors of various Roman texts that mentioned the Temple Treasures followed different motivations: to lead Christian pilgrims to the important sights of Rome, to guide clergy through papal liturgical rituals, and to add honor, prestige, and authority to the Lateran basilica and the pope. The Lateran basilica had been associated with biblical Judaism and analogized to the Jewish Temple since the fourth century. That association continued and was promoted by Lateran clergy, especially during the twelfth century verbal conflict between Lateran and Vatican clergy concerning which church was the *mater et caput* in Rome. The rivalry between clerics led the Vatican cleric Petrus Mallius to denounce the Lateran basilica

as *synagoga*, and to sneer at Lateran clergy by calling them Jews. Exactly that which gave the Lateran basilica its special status, in the eyes of Vatican clergy detracted from it.

In the twelfth century, with the papal residence at the Lateran basilica, the Lateran remained the chief church in Rome. That situation would begin to change with the increased focus on St. Peter's basilica in the next century and eventually with the movement of the papacy to Avignon in 1308. When the popes returned to Rome in the late fourteenth century, they took up residence at St. Peter's and never again lived at the Lateran.

The claim that some of the Treasures were stored in the Lateran basilica, expressed in the *DLE* and other texts, can also be explained by the papacy's struggles for authority from the late eleventh century through 1177. Several popes during that period repeatedly voiced their independence from and superiority to secular authority. That drive for a papacy free from secular control intensified during the reign of Pope Gregory VII, the same approximate time as the original text of the *DLE*. Gregory's determination to gain supreme authority in Christendom led to enduring conflicts between the papacy and secular powers, especially the Holy Roman Emperor. The redaction and re-issue of the *DLE* during Pope Alexander III's protracted political struggle with Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa suggests a reuse of the text to again assert papal authority.

Assaulting or supporting papal power, Roman noble families wielded considerable influence on papal authority throughout the Middle Ages. These families, especially the Pierleoni and Frangipani, were intricately involved in the support of the popes from the mid-eleventh century. The origin of the Pierleoni in a Jewish convert in the 1040s did not deter the families from close association with the papacy, but did factor into widespread rejection of the Pierleoni pope, the antipope Anacletus II. By the second quarter of the twelfth century,

the two families had become bitter enemies; a Pierleoni led the 1145 Commune as *patricius*, while the Frangipani supported the popes against the Commune. Eugenius III and Alexander III were subject to the power of these nobles and the Commune, resulting in long periods of papal exile from Rome.

In their struggles with the Roman Commune and the emperor, Eugenius III and Alexander III used what tools were available to them to assert their authority, including excommunication and interdiction; however, both of these two popes also promoted collective memories of the incomparable majesty and power of the Temple Treasures among Christians while claiming to have some of the Treasures. Without a doubt, the political threats to Eugenius III and Alexander III from both the Roman Commune and the Holy Roman Emperor, led to the papacy's intensified claims to have the Temple Treasures in the Lateran basilica from 1145 to 1181.

Another text that extolled the Lateran's greatness, the *HIS*, by the Lateran cleric and Cistercian monk Nicolaus Maniacutius, claimed not only that the ark and other ancient Hebrew Treasures were in the Lateran basilica, but that the Romans had acted as God's agents in destroying Jerusalem and bringing the Temple Treasures and other relics to Rome. Nicolaus's loyalty to Pope Eugenius III, his former abbot, probably motivated him to produce the *HIS* when Eugenius was elected to the papacy in 1145. Nicolaus's text, in addition to praising the power and authority of the papacy, and extolling the special nature of the Lateran, elevated Christianity's inheritance of biblical Judaism to a higher level by calling the private papal chapel the *Sancta Sanctorum*. Though that term had been used before in other Christian contexts, Nicolaus drew parallels between the Temple and the new Christian *Sancta Sanctorum*, the pope's private chapel, thus characterizing the pope as the new high priest.

While the Temple Treasures were supposedly kept in the Lateran basilica, the *Sancta Sanctorum* housed relics from Christian history, thus Christianizing the “Holy of Holies.”

Nicolaus’s role at the Lateran in 1145 and his production of the *HIS* for Eugenius is remarkable for another reason. Before he joined the Cistercian order in Rome circa 1140, Nicolaus had worked extensively as a biblical exegete and Hebraist. In his own writing, Nicolaus claimed to have consulted rabbis about their interpretation of the Old Testament texts in Hebrew. His writings convey an attitude of respect for his fellow exegetes, even though they were Jews. While other scholars, including early Cistercian monks, had consulted Jewish scholars, questions remain as to exactly what prompted Nicolaus to work so closely with Jews, and what influences in his background led him to do so. Nicolaus’s training in biblical exegesis and the Hebrew language, and his contact with Jewish scholars give the *HIS* an air of authority; therefore, the claims that Nicolaus made in his text that some Temple Treasures were kept in the Lateran basilica were more believable to his fellow clerics. The affect on Eugenius of Nicolaus’s positive experiences with the Jews can only be surmised, but can be suggested by Eugenius’s apparently positive relationship with the Roman Jewish community in 1145.

Nicolaus’s text was produced during the same time that other Lateran texts described the Holy Thursday ritual at the Lateran high altar. From at least circa 1140 to 1192, a traditional ritual on Holy Thursday at the high altar of the Lateran basilica, promoted the belief that the ark of the covenant was enclosed within the altar. Deliberately associating the Old Testament Treasure of the ark with the New Testament re-enactment of the institution of the Eucharist, the popes reinforced both the Lateran basilica’s association with biblical Judaism, and the Church’s inheritance of the power and authority of the Old Covenant. The

intensification of that ritual in the second half of the twelfth century supports the claim of a special nature to papal relations with biblical Judaism in that half century. In the thirteenth century, a decreased focus on the Temple Treasures in the altar and the promotion that St. Peter's altar was in the Lateran high altar further support the claim that the latter half of the twelfth century was a unique period in papal attitudes toward biblical Judaism and contemporary Jews.

Another papal vehicle that focused interest on the Temple Treasures while relating to Roman Jews was papal *adventus*. A facet of papal imitation of imperial pomp and ceremony during the twelfth-century *renovatio*, *adventus* served the purposes of Eugenius III in 1145 and Alexander III in 1165 by providing a way for the popes to assume control of the city after political turmoil and exile. During *adventus*, the citizens' acknowledgement of the pope as their spiritual and temporal ruler also provided a vehicle for the Roman Jews and the pope to cement their contract with the Torah presentation, Hebrew *laudes*, and decree of *Sicut*. The processions, however, also focused attention on biblical Judaism by processing through the Arch of Titus and toward the endpoint, the Lateran basilica, the home of the Temple Treasures in the twelfth century.

The special role of the Roman Jews in papal *adventus* indicates a complex papal relationship with that community. Christians interpreted the Jews' presentation of the Torah to the pope as signaling the Jews' purpose within Christian society as witnesses to the failure of their belief. Presentation of their laws to the pope also signified acceptance of papal temporal rule, as did the Hebrew *laudes*. The contractual relationship between Eugenius III and the Jews, and Alexander III and the Jews, however, was fully evident in the popes' reciprocal decree of *Sicut Judaeis* to the Jews at that time. Perhaps the Jews' agreement to

provide financial backing to the exiled Eugenius III and Alexander III also formed part of the contractual arrangement.

Eugenius III and Alexander III's decree of *Sicut* to the Roman Jews, just the second and third such presentation since the original decree of Calixtus II circa 1123, signified much more than just a promise of protection. Eugenius was prompted to issue *Sicut* in 1145 for a reason; it had not been issued for over two decades. The reform popes' old ally and financial backer, the Pierleoni, had changed sides and in 1145 was allied with the Commune. Regardless of the probable patron-client relationship between the Pierleoni and the Roman Jews, the Roman Jews probably did support Eugenius. His bestowal of *Sicut* on the Roman Jews, while undated, logically falls during that pope's December 1145 *adventus*. Returning to Rome after months of exile, Eugenius would have demonstrated his position of authority during *adventus*, including toward the Roman Jews. By the thirteenth century, papal decree of *Sicut* accompanied the Roman Jews' presentation of the Torah during papal *adventus*. The tradition may indeed have begun much earlier in 1145 with Eugenius III.

Despite the evidence of Eugenius's close association with the Roman Jews, his association with Bernard of Clairvaux suggests that Eugenius's attitude toward Jews may have faced strong influences from Bernard, his monastic mentor. Bernard's harsh language about the Pierleoni antipope Anacletus II's Jewish ancestry, his urgings that German Jews be protected during the Second Crusade, and his acknowledgement that Jesus was a Jew, all indicated that he held varied attitudes toward the Jews. How those attitudes influenced Eugenius is not clear, but the complexity of Bernard's attitudes toward Jews may be reflected in Eugenius's actions toward the Jews, interactions with Roman Jews, and focus on biblical Judaism.

Events during the reign of Alexander III suggest a closer relationship with the Roman Jews. Alexander also bestowed *Sicut* and urged protection of the Jews, the first such action since Eugenius III's decree at least twenty years earlier.

Again, Alexander's decree is undated, but events suggest that it was decreed in 1165 when the pope returned to Rome after six years in exile, processed in papal *adventus* through the city, and received the Jews' Torah. At the time of his election in 1159, Alexander had faced similar circumstances to those Eugenius had faced and was forced to leave Rome soon after his contested election. After Alexander had returned safely to the city in 1165 and completed his presentation of *Sicut* to the Roman Jews, Benjamin of Tudela recorded that a Roman Jewish rabbi, Jechiel, the grandson of a well-known Jewish scholar, served the pope as his steward. While Jews did serve various popes at times in different capacities, the service of Jechiel at that particular time is noteworthy. Despite Christian attitudes toward Jews that varied from tolerance to forced conversions, and from protection to accusations of desecration of the host and ritual murder, and despite papal claims to have the incomparable Temple Treasures, Alexander maintained and even expanded a close and respected relationship with the Roman Jews, exhibited in the person of Jechiel.

All of the evidence presented indicates a unique period in papal-Jewish relations during the papacies of Eugenius III and Alexander III. Even without definitive first-person evidence of their attitudes toward the Jews and biblical Judaism, it is apparent that both popes harbored incredibly complicated attitudes toward the Jews. Ruling during a period in which multiple political forces repeatedly drove both popes from their papal see, Eugenius and Alexander both strove again and again to return to Rome and achieve authority over Rome,

the Patrimony and Christendom. How the Roman Jews and biblical Judaism fit into that complex equation is a fascinating story.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Albinus, Cardinal-Bishop of Albano. *Gesta pauperis scholaris*. In *Le Liber censuum de l'église Romaine*. Vol. 2. Edited by Paul Fabre and L. Duchesne. Paris: Fontemoing, 1910.
- Ambrose, Saint. *Letters*. Translated by Sr. M. Melchior Beyenka. *The Fathers of the Church* 26. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1954.
- Aronius, Julius. *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden, im Fränkischen und Deutschen Reiche bis zum Jahre 1273*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1970.
- Augustine, Saint. *The First Catechetical Instruction [De catechizandis Rudibus]*. Translated by Joseph P. Christopher. New York: Newman Press, 1946.
- _____. *The City of God*. Translated by Marcus Dods. New York: The Modern Library, 1950.
- Benedict. *The Marvels of Rome, Mirabilia urbis Romae*. Edited and translated by Francis Morgan Nichols. Introduction by Eileen Gardiner. 2nd edition. New York: Italica Press, 1986.
- Benedict, Canon of St. Peter's. *Liber Politicus*. In *Le Liber censuum de l'église Romaine*. Vol. 2. Edited by Paul Fabre and L. Duchesne. Paris: Fontemoing, 1910.
- Benjamin of Tudela. *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela, Travels in the Middle Ages*. Introduction by Michael A. Signer. Malibu: Joseph Simon, 1993.
- Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux. *The Letters of Bernard of Clairvaux*. Translated by Bruno Scott James. London: Burns Oates, 1953.
- _____. *Five Books on Consideration*. Introduction by Elizabeth T. Kennan. *Cistercian Fathers Series 37. The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux 13*. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976.
- Bernard, Cardinal and Prior of the Lateran Monastery. *Ordo officiorum ecclesiae Lateranensis*. Edited by Ludwig Fischer. *Bernhardi cardinalis et Lateranensis ecclesiae prioris Ordo officiorum ecclesiae Lateranensis*, Historische Forschungen und Quellen 2-3. München: F.P. Datterer, 1916.
- Biblia Sacra, iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1969.
- Bonizo of Sutri, *Liber de vita Christiana*. Edited by Ernst Perels. Berlin: Weidmann, 1930.

- Boso's Life of Alexander III*. Introduced by P. Munz. Translated by G.M. Ellis. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973.
- Census Camerarius. *Liber Censuum*. In *Le Liber censuum de l'église Romaine*. Vol. Edited by Paul Fabre and L. Duchesne. Paris: Fontemoing, 1910.
- Ciampini, Giovanni. *De sacra aedificiis a Constantino Magno constructis*. Roma: 1693.
- Davis, Raymond, editor and translator. *The Lives of the Eighth-Century Popes*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1992.
- _____. *The Book of Pontiffs (Liber Pontificalis), The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*. Revised edition. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000.
- Dio Cassius. *Dio's Roman History*. Loeb Classical Library. 1914-1927.
- Duchesne, L, ed. *Liber Pontificalis*. 2 vols. Paris: 1886-1892; vol. 3. Cyrille Vogel, ed. *Additions et Corrections de Mgr. L. Duchesne* Paris: E. de Boccard, 1955-1957.
- Epstein, I., ed.. *The Babylonian Talmud*. 35 vols. London: Soncino Press, 1935-1952.
- Eusebius Pamphilli. *Ecclesiastical History*. 2 vols. Translated by Roy J. Deferrari. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953.
- Faber, Paul and L. Duchesne, ed. *Le Liber Censuum de l'église Romaine*. 2 vols. Paris: Fontemoing, 1910.
- Flavio, Biondo. *Roma triumphans*. Venice: Philippo Pincio Mantuano, 1511.
- Gerald of Wales. *A Translation of Gemma Ecclesiastica by Giraldus Cambrensis*. Translated by John J. Hagen. London: Brill, 1979.
- Giraldus Cambrensius. *Speculum ecclesiae*. IV.iii. In J.S. Brewer: *Giraldi Cambrensis opera*. Vol. 4 (Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi scriptores [Rolls Series] 21, 4). London, 1873.
- Graphia aureae urbis Romae*. In *Codice topografico della città di Roma*. Vol. III. Edited by Roberto Valentini and Giuseppe Zucchetti. 67-110. Roma: tipografia del Senato, 1946.
- Gratian. *The Treatise on Laws, with the Ordinary Gloss*. In *Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Canon Law*. Vol. II. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1993.

- Gregory Magni, S. *Moralia in Iob, Libri XXIII-XXXV*. Adriaen Marci, cura et studio. *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* 143B. Turnholti: Brepols, 1985.
- Gregory VII, Pope. *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII, Selected Letters from the Registrum*. Edited and translated by Ephraim Emerton. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.
- Harding, Stephen. *The Admonition of Stephen Harding*. In *The Cistercian World: Monastic Writings of the Twelfth Century*. Translated and edited by Pauline Matarasso. London: Penguin Books, 1993.
- Herman-Judah. *Short Account of his own Conversion*. In *Conversion and Text, the Cases of Augustine of Hippo, Herman-Judah, and Constantine Tsatsos*. Edited by Karl F. Morrison. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992.
- Herodian. *Herodian*. Loeb Classical Library. 1952-1969.
- Jaffé, P., et al. *Regesta pontificum romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII*. 2 vols. Lipsiae: Veit, 1888.
- John Chrysostom, Saint. *Discourses against Judaizing Christians*. Translated by Paul W. Harkins. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1979.
- John of Salisbury. *Memoirs of the Papal Court, Historia pontificalis*. Translated by Marjorie Chibnal. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1956.
- John the Deacon. *Descriptio Lateranensis ecclesiae*. In *Codice topografico della città di Roma* III. Edited by Roberto Valentini and Giuseppe Zucchetti. 326-373. Roma: tipografia del Senato, 1946.
- Josephus. *Antiquities of the Jews*. Loeb Classical Library. 1978
- _____. *The Jewish War*. Loeb Classical Library. 1979.
- _____. *Against Apion*. In *The New Complete Works of Josephus*. Translated by William Whiston. Revised and expanded edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 1999.
- Julian. *The Works of the Emperor Julian*. Loeb Classical Library. 1913.
- Macrobius. *Saturnalia*. Translated by Percival Vaughan Davies. *Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies* 79. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.
- Mallius, Petrus. *Descriptio basilicae Vaticanae*. In *Codice topografico della città di Roma*. Vol. III. Edited by Roberto Valentini and Giuseppe Zucchetti. 375-442. Roma: tipografia del Senato, 1946.

- Maniacutius, Nicolaus. *Ad incorrupta pontificum nomina conservanda*. Lambeth MS 8. In Ralph de Diceto, *Abbreviationes chronicorum*. In *The Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto, Dean of London*. Vol. I. Edited by William Stubbs. 259-263. London: Longman & Co., 1876.
- _____. *Libellus de corruptione et correptione psalmorum et aliarum quarundam scripturarum*. In Peri, Vittorio. “‘Correctores immo corruptores’ un saggio di critica testuale nella Roma del XII secolo.” *Italia medioevale e umanistica XX* (1977): 19-125.
- _____. *Historia imaginis Salvatoris*. In Gerhard Wolf, *Salus Populi Romani*. 321-325. Weinheim: VCH, 1990.
- Mansi, Joannes Dominicus. *Sacrorum consiliorum nova, et amplissima collectio*. Vol. 22. Venetiis: Antonium Zatta, 1776.
- The Marvels of Rome, Mirabilia urbis Romae*. Edited and translated by Francis Morgan Nichols. 2nd ed. Introduction by Eileen Gardiner. New York: Italica Press, 1986.
- Master Gregorius, the Marvels of Rome*. Translated by John Osborne. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1987.
- Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (Hanover/Berlin/Munich, 1926–)
- Nathan ben Jehiel. *Arukh ha-shalem*. Israel, 1969.
- Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae*. Edited by Otto Seeck. Berlin: Weidmann, 1876.
- Otto of Freising. *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*. Translated by Charles Christopher Mierow. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953.
- _____. *The Two Cities: A Chronicle of Universal History to the Year 1146*. Edited by Austin P. Evans and Charles Knapp. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Panvinio, Onofrio Panvinio. *De praecipuis urbis Romae sanctioribusque basilicas quas septem ecclesias vulgo vocant liber*. Rome, 1570.
- Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai*. In *Constantinople in the Early Eighth Century*. Edited by Averil Cameron and Judith Herrin. Leiden: Brill, 1984.
- Patrologiae cursus completes. Series Latina*. Edited by J.-P. Migne, 221 vols. Paris, 1844-1864.
- Procopius. *History of the Wars*. Loeb Classical Library. 1979.

- Salomo aben Verga, Rabbi. *Shevet Jehudah*. Translated by M. Weiner. Neudruck, 1924.
- Sebaeus. *Histoire d'Heraclius*. Translated by F. Macler.
- Simonsohn, Shlomo. *The Apostolic See and the Jews, Documents: 492-1404*. Vol. 94, *Studies and Texts*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1991.
- Sophronius. *Patrologia cursus completes: Series Graeca*. Vol. 87. Edited by J.P. Migne. Paris, 1857-1866.
- Socrates Scholasticus. *Ecclesiastical History*. 7 Volumes. London: George Bell, 1892.
- Sozomen. *Ecclesiastical History*. In Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecclesiasticae historiae autores*. 1557.
- Suger, Abbot. *Vita Ludovici grossi Regis*. Edited by H. Waquet. In *Les Classiques de l'histoire de France au moyen-age*. Vol. 11. Paris, 1929.
- Tacitus. *The History*. In *Complete Works of Tacitus*. Edited by Moses Hadas. New York: the Modern Library, 1942.
- Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*. 2 Volumes. Edited by Norman P. Tanner. London: Sheed & Ward, 1990.
- Tertullian. *Apology*. In *The Fathers of the Church* 10. Translated by E.J. Daly. Washington, D.C., 1950.
- The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions*. Translated by Clyde Pharr. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1952.
- Theophanes, Confessor. *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284-813*. Translated by Cyril Mango. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Uodalscalcus de Eginone et Herimanno*. Edited by P. Jaffé. *MGH SS*. Vol. 12. 429-447. 1856.

Secondary Sources

- Alberty, Ranier. *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*. 2 Vols. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.
- Andrea, Alfred J. *Encyclopedia of the Crusades*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 2003.

- Andrews, Frances, et al. *Pope, Church and City, Essays in Honour of Brenda M. Bolton*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Auberger, Jean-Baptiste. *L'unanimité cistercienne primitive: mythe ou réalité? Vol. III, Cîteaux: studia et documenta*. Cîteaux: Achel, 1986.
- Avi-Yonah, M. *The Jews of Palestine*. New York: Schocken Books, 1976.
- _____. *The Jews under Byzantine and Roman Rule*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1984.
- Baldovin, John F. *The Urban Character of Christian Worship, the Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy*. Roma: Pont. institutum studiorum orientalium, 1987.
- Barnes, Timothy. *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- _____. "The Constantinian Settlement." *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge and Gohei Hata, 635-657. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.
- Baron, Salo Wittmayer. *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*. Vol. VI. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.
- _____. "Plenitude of Apostolic Power and Medieval Jewish Serfdom." In *Ancient and Medieval Jewish History*. 284-307. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1972.
- Bassler, Jouette M., ed. *Pauline Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Beck, Norman A. "The New Testament and the Teaching of Contempt." *Jewish-Christian Encounters over the Centuries: Symbiosis, Prejudice, Holocaust, Dialogue*. Edited by Marvin Perry and Frederick M. Schweitzer, 83-100. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.
- Belting, Hans. *Likeness and Presence, A History of the Image before the Era of Art*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Benson, Robert L. "Political *Renovatio*: Two Models from Roman Antiquity." In *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*. Edited by Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable, 339-386. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Benson, Robert L. and Giles Constable, eds. *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

- Berliner, Abraham. *Storia degli Ebrei di Roma*. Milano: R.C.S. Libri, 2000.
- Birch, Debra J. *Pilgrimage to Rome in the Middle Ages, Continuity and Change*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998.
- Bloch, H. "A New Fascination with Ancient Rome." In *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*. Edited by Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable, 615-636. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Bolton, Brenda and Anne J. Duggan, eds. *Adrian IV The English Pope (1154-1159). Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
- Bolton, Brenda. "Nova familia beati Petri. Adrian IV and the Patrimony." In *Adrian IV The English Pope (1154-1159)*. Edited by Brenda Bolton and Anne J. Duggan, 157-180. *Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
- Bowersock, G.W. *Julian the Apostate*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Brouette, Émile and Eugène Manning. *Dictionnaire des auteurs Cisterciens*. Vol. II. Belgium: Abbaye Notre-Dame de St-Remy, 1977.
- Canning, Joseph. *A History of Medieval Political Thought, 300-1450*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Capitani, Ovidio, et al., eds. *L'Italia dell'alto Medioevo*. In *Storia della Società Italiana*. Parte secunda. Vol.V. Milano: Nicola Teti, 1984.
- Cary, M. *A History of Rome Down to the Reign of Constantine*. 3rd ed. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975.
- Ceillier, R.P. *Histoire Generale des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques IV*. Paris: Louis Vives, 1863.
- Chazan, Robert, ed. *Church, State, and Jew in the Middle Ages*. New York: Behrman House, 1980
- _____. *In the Year 1096, The First Crusade and the Jew*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1996.
- Cheetham, Nicholas. *Keepers of the Keys, the Popes in History*. London: MacDonald, 1982.
- Chodorow, Stanley. *Christian Political Theory and Church Politics in the Mid-Twelfth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

- Cohen, Jeremy. *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Semitism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982.
- _____. "Scholarship and Intolerance in the Medieval Academy: The Study and Evaluation of Judaism in European Christendom," *The American Historical Review* 91, no. 3 (June, 1986): 592-613.
- _____. *Living Letters of the Law, Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Cohen, Shaye D. "Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew." *Harvard Theological Review* 82 (1989): 15-30.
- _____. "The Significance of Yavneh: Pharisees, Rabbis, and the End of Jewish Sectarianism." In *Origins of Judaism: Religion, History, and Literature in Late Antiquity*. Volume 2. Part 1 (1990): 101-127.
- Coulet, Noël. "De l'intégration à l'exclusion : La place des juifs dans les cérémonies d'entrée solennelle au Moyen Age." *Annales* 34. No. 4 (July-August, 1979): 672-683.
- Couret, A. *La prise de Jérusalem par les Perse*. Orleans, 1876.
- Cuomo, Luisa Ferretti. "Le Glosse Volgari nell'Aruk di R. Natan ben Yehi'el da Roma." *Medioevo Romano* XXII (Roma, 1998): 232-283.
- Dahan, Gilbert. *The Christian Polemic against the Jews in the Middle Ages*. Translated by Jody Gladding. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1998.
- Davies, Alan T. *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity*. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.
- De Blauuw, Sible. "The Solitary Celebration of the Supreme Pontiff. The Lateran Basilica as the New Temple in the Medieval Liturgy of Maundy Thursday." In *Omnes Circumstantes, Contributions towards a History of the Role of the People in the Liturgy*. Edited by Charles Caspers and Marc Schneiders, 120-143. Kampen: Kok, 1990.
- _____. *Cultus et Décor. Liturgia e Architettura nella Roma Tardoantica e Medievale*. 2 vols. Studi e Testi 335. Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1994.
- De Lange, Nicholas. *An Introduction to Judaism*. Cambridge: CUP, 2000.
- Denifle, Heinrich. "Die handschriften der Bibel-correctorien des 13. jahrhunderts." *Archiv für literature und kirchen geschichte des mittlealters*. Vierter Band. (1888): 263-483.

- Dessau, Hermann, ed. *Inscriptiones latinae selectae*. 2nd ed. 3 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1954-1955.
- Duffy, Eamon. *Saints and Sinners, A History of the Popes*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Eidelberg, Shlomo. *The Jews and the Crusaders, The Hebrew Chroniclers of the First Crusade*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1977.
- Erdmann, Carl. *The Origin of the Idea of Crusading*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Esposito, Anna. *Un'altra Roma, Minoranze nazionali e comunita ebraiche tra Medioevo e Rinascimento*. Roma: Il Calamo, 1995.
- Fedele, P. "Carete del monasterio dei SS. Cosma e Damiano in Mica Aurea." *Archivio della R. Società Romana* 22 (1899).
- _____. "Sull'origine dei Frangipane." *Archivio della R. Società Romana* 33 (1910).
- Ferzoco, George. "The Origin of the Second Crusade." In *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*. Edited by Michael Gervers, 91-99. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Frankel, Ellen and Betsy Platkin Teutsch. *The Encyclopedia of Jewish Symbols*. Northvale, N.J.: Jason Aronson, 1992.
- Freiberg, Jack. *The Lateran and Clement VIII*. Ph.D. Dissertation. New York University, 1988.
- _____. *The Lateran in 1600, Christian Concord in Counter-Reformation Rome*. Cambridge: CUP, 1995.
- Fuhrman, Horst. "Quis Teutonicos constituit iudices nationum? The Trouble with Henry." *Speculum* 69. No. 2 (April, 1994): 344-358.
- Dom Gabriel, Abbé d'Aiguebelle, *L'abbaye des Trois-Fontaines, située aux eaux-salviennes, près de Rome*. Landerneau: P.B. Desmoulins, 1882.
- Gager, John G. *The Origins of Anti-Semitism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Gervers, Michael, ed. *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Glaber, Helmut. *Papst Eugen III*. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1936.

- Gordon, R.P. *1 & 2 Samuel*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- Graetz, Heinrich. *History of the Jews*. Vol. III. Philadelphia: the Jewish Publication Society of America, 1945.
- Grayzel, Solomon. *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*. New York: Hermon Press, 1966.
- _____. "Popes, Jews, and the Inquisition from 'Sicut' to 'Turbato'." In *Essays on the Occasion of the Seventiety Anniversary of the Dropsie University 1909-1979*. 151-188. Philadelphia: Dropsie University, 1979.
- Greenaway, George William. *Arnold of Brescia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1931.
- Gregorovius, Ferdinand. *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages*. 13 Vols. Translated from the 4th German edition by Annie Hamilton. London: George Bell, 1896.
- Gruen, Erich S. *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Hadfield, Garry A. C. *Andrew of St. Victor, A Twelfth-Century Hebraist: An Investigation of his Works and Sources*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 1971.
- Hailperin, Herman. *Rashi and the Christian Scholars*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963.
- Halphen, Louis. *Etudes sur L'administration de Rome au Moyen Age (751-1252)*. Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1907.
- Harrington, Daniel. "The Jewishness of Jesus: Facing Some Problems." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987).
- _____. *Paul on the Mystery of Israel*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Haskins, Charles Homer. *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*. New York: Meridian Books, 1957.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Heers, Jacques. *Family Clans in the Middle Ages, A Study of Political and Social Structures in Urban Areas*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1977.

- _____. *Parties and Political Life in the Medieval West*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1977.
- Herklotz, Ingo. "Der Campus Lateranensis im Mittelalter." *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 22 (1985): 3-43.
- _____. *'Sepulcra' e 'Monumenta' del Medioevo : studi sull'arte sepolcrale in Italia*. Roma: R. Nantes, 1985.
- _____. "Der mittelalterliche Fassadenportikus der Lateranbasilika und seine Mosaiken." *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Herziana* 25 (1989): 25-95.
- _____. "Architecture and Liturgy in Late Antiquity and the Middle ages; Traditions and Trends in Modern Scholarship." *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 33 (1991) 1-34.
- _____. *Gli eredi di Constantino: Il papato, il Laterano, e la propaganda visiva nel XII secolo*. Roma: Viella, 2000.
- Holum, Kenneth G. *Theodosian Empresses, Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
- Horn, Michael. *Studien zur geschichte Papst Eugens III (1145-1153)*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1992.
- Hülsen, Christian. *Le chiese di Roma nel medio evo Cataloghi ed appunti*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1975.
- Humphrey, John H. *Roman Circuses, Arenas for Chariot Racing*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
- Ingoglia, Robert T. "'I have neither Silver nor Gold': An Explanation of a Medieval Papal Ritual." *The Catholic Historical Review* 85. No. 4 (October, 1999): 531-540.
- Isaac, Jules. *The Teaching of Contempt: Christian Roots of Anti-Semitism*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Jellinek, Adolph. *Bet ha-Midrash*. Jerusalem: Wahrman Books, 1967.
- Jones, Michael. "'The Place of the Jews': Anti-Judaism and Theatricality in Medieval Culture." *Exemplaria* 12. No. 2 (Fall, 2000): 327-357.
- Jordan, William C. *The French Monarchy and the Jews*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989.
- Kaufman, David. "Les Juifs et la bible de l'abbé Etienne Harding de Citeaux." *Revue des etudes juives* XVIII (1889): 131-133.

- Kazhdan, Alexander P., ed. *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*. 3 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Kessler, Herbert L. *Spiritual Seeing, Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.
- Kessler, Herbert L. and Johanna Zacharias. *Rome 1300, On the Path of the Pilgrim*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Kisch, G. *The Jews in Medieval Germany. A Study of their Legal and Social Status*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1949.
- Kitzinger, Ernst. "The Arts as Aspects of a Renaissance." In *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*. Edited by Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable, 637-670. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Klagsbald, Victor. "The Menorah as Symbol; its Meaning and Origin in Early Jewish Art." *Jewish Art* XII-XIII (1986-87): 126-134.
- Knight, William. *The Arch of Titus and The Spoils of the Temple*. London: Longmans, 1867.
- Krautheimer, Richard, et al. *Corpus basilicarum Christianarum Romae. The Early Christian Basilicas of Rome. IV-IX Centuries*. 5 vols. Città del Vaticano: Pontificio istituto di archeologia Christiana, 1937-1977.
- Krautheimer, Richard. *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.
- Krautheimer, Richard. *Rome, Profile of a City 312-1308*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Kuttner, Stephan. "The Revival of Jurisprudence." In *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*. Edited by Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable, 299-323. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Langmuir, Gavin. *History, Religion, and Antisemitism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- _____. "The Faith of Christians and Hostility to Jews." In *Christianity and Judaism*, edited by Diana Wood, 77-92. *Studies in Church History*. Vol. 29. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1992.
- Lauer, Philippe. *Le Palais de Latran, Étude historique et archéologique*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1911.

- Leon, Harry J. *The Jews of Ancient Rome*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1960.
- Leyser, K.J. *Medieval Germany and its Neighbours, 900-1200*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1982.
- Mabillon. *Acta sanctorum ordinis S. Benedicti*. Paris, 1668-1701.
- Maccarrone, Michele. "La cathedra Sancti Petri nel medioevo: da simbolo a reliquia." *Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia* 36 (1985): 349-447.
- Mango, Cyril, ed. *The Oxford History of Byzantium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Mann, Horace K. *The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages*. 16 Vols. London: Kegan Paul, 1925.
- Marcus, Jacob R., ed. *The Jew in the Medieval World, A Source Book 315-1791*. Cincinnati: The Sinai Press, 1938.
- Mattingly, Harold. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*. 5 vols. London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1966.
- Mattingly, Harold, and Edward A. Sydenham. *The Roman Imperial Coinage*. 9 vols. London: Spink & son, 1923-1981.
- McBrien, Richard P. *Lives of the Popes, The Pontiffs from St. Peter to John Paul II*. New York: Harper Collins, 1997.
- McLynn, Neil B. *Ambrose of Milan, Church and Court in a Christian Capital*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Mercati, Giovanni. "Maniacoria Nicola (Manjacoria, Manicoria, Mangiacoze, Maniecutius, Magnacucius)." *Opere Minori*. Vol. II. 48-51. Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1937.
- Michael, Robert. "Antisemitism and the Church Fathers." *Jewish-Christian Encounters over the Centuries: Symbiosis, Prejudice, Holocaust, Dialogue*, edited by Marvin Perry and Frederick M. Schweitze, 101-130. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.
- Moore, R.I. *The Formation of a Persecuting Society, Power and Deviance in Western Europe 950-1250*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.
- Morris, Colin. *The Papal Monarchy, The Western Church from 1050 to 1250*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

- Morrison, Karl F, ed. *Conversion and Text, the Cases of Augustine of Hippo, Herman-Judah, and Constantine Tsatsos*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992.
- Neusner, Jacob, ed.. *The Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds*. Vol. II of *The Study of Ancient Judaism*. New York: KTAV Pub. House, Inc., 1981.
- Newman, Martha G. *The Boundaries of Charity, Cistercian Culture and Ecclesiastical Reform, 1098-1180*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Niermeyer, J.F. *Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Noonan, John T., Jr. "Who was Rolandus?" In *Law, Church, and Society, Essays in Honor of Stephan Kuttner*. Edited by Kenneth Pennington and Robert Somerville, 21-48. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.
- Nussbaum, Otto. "Sancta Sanctorum," *Romische Quartalschrift* 54 (1959): 234-246.
- Pacaut, Marcel. *Alexandre III*. Paris: Librairie philosophique, 1956.
- _____. *Frederick Barbarossa*. London: Collins, 1970.
- Panvinio, Onofrio. *De praecipuis urbis Romae sanctioribusque basilicas quas septem ecclesias vulgo vocant liber*. Rome, 1570.
- Parkes, James. *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue. A Study in the Origins of Antisemitism*. Reprint of first edition. London: Soncino Press, 1934. New York: Atheneum, 1969.
- Perry, Marvin and Frederick M. Schweitzer, eds. *Jewish-Christian Encounters over the Centuries, Symbiosis, Prejudice, Holocaust, Dialogue*. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.
- Peri, Vittorio. "Nicola Maniacutia, autore ecclesiastico romanzo del XII secolo." *Aevum* 36 (1962): 534-588.
- _____. "Nicola Maniacutia: un testimone della filologia romana del XII secolo." *Aevum* 41 (1967): 67-90.
- _____. "'Correctores immo corruptores' un saggio di critica testuale nella Roma del XII secolo." *Italia medioevale e umanistica* XX (1977): 19-125.
- Peters, F.E. *Jerusalem, The Holy City in the Eyes of Chroniclers, Visitors, Pilgrims, and Prophets from the Days of Abraham to the Beginnings of Modern Times*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.

- Powell, James M. "Honorius III's 'Sermo in dedicatione ecclesie Lateranensis' and the Historical-Liturgical Traditions of the Lateran." *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 21 (1938): 195-209.
- Ramage, Andrew and Nancy H. Ramage. *Roman Art*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1996.
- Reuther, Rosemary Radford. *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism*. New York: Seabury, 1974.
- _____. "The *Adversus Judaeos* Tradition in the Church Fathers: The Exegesis of Christian Anti-Judaism." In *Aspects of Jewish Culture in the Middle Ages*, 27-50. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1979.
- Richardson, L., Jr. *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Riley-Smith, Jonathan. *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*. London: Athlone, 1986.
- _____. *The First Crusaders, 1095-1131*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Robinson, I.S. *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest*. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1978.
- _____. *The Papacy 1073-1198*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- _____. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Roth, Cecil. *The History of the Jews of Italy*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1946.
- Roth, Cecil, ed. *The World History of the Jewish People*. Second Series: Medieval Period. Vol. 2: The Dark Ages, Jews in Christian Europe 711-1096. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1966.
- Rowe, John G. "The Origins of the Second Crusade: Pope Eugenius III, Bernard of Clairvaux, and Louis VII of France." In *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*. Edited by Michael Gervers, 79-89. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Rutgers, Leonard Victor. "Archeological Evidence for the Interaction of Jews and Non-Jews in Late Antiquity." *American Journal of Archaeology* 96. No. 1 (January, 1992): 101-118.

- Seiferth, Wolfgang. *Synagogue and Church in the Middle Ages: Two Symbols in Art and Literature*. New York: Ungar, 1970.
- Sicker, Martin. *Between Rome and Jerusalem, 300 Years of Roman-Judean Relations*. Westport, CN: Praeger, 2001.
- Simon, Marcel. *Verus Israel Étude sur les relations entre chrétiens et juifs dans l'empire romain (135-425)*. Paris, 1964.
- Simonsohn, Shlomo. *The Apostolic See and the Jews, History*. Vol. 109, *Studies and Texts*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1991.
- _____. "The Jews in the papal States to the Ghetto." *Italia Judaica* (1998): 11-29.
- Smalley, Beryl. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952.
- Smallwood, Mary. *The Jews under Roman Rule*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976.
- Snyder, Graydon F. *Ante Pacem, Archaeological Evidence of Church Life before Constantine*. Mercer University Press, 1985.
- Solin, Heikki and Marja Itkonen-Kaila, eds. *Graffiti del Palatino*. Helsinki, 1966.
- Somerville, Robert. *Pope Alexander III and the Council of Tours (1163), A Study of Ecclesiastical Politics and Institutions in the Twelfth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.
- Speciale, Lucinia. "Una cellula e i suoi libri: I SS. Vincenzo ed Anastasio alle Tre Fontane e Casamari." *Arte medievale*. Serie II. Anno VIII. No. 2 (1994): 47-76.
- Spinabella, G. *Un grande Pontefice Riformatore, Eugenio III, pisano*. Pisa: Valenti, 1964.
- Stow, Kenneth. *The '1007 Anonymous' and Papal Sovereignty: Jewish Perceptions of the Papacy and Papal Policy in the High Middle Ages*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1984.
- _____. "Hatred of the Jews or Love of the Church: Papal Policy toward the Jews in the Middle Ages." In *Antisemitism Through the Ages*. Edited by Shmuel Almog, 71-89. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1988.
- _____. *Alienated Minority, the Jews of Medieval Latin Europe*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.

- _____. “The Good of the Church, the Good of the State: The Popes and Jewish Money.” In *Christianity and Judaism*. Edited by Diana Wood, 237-252. *Studies in Church History* 29. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.
- _____. “The Church and the Jews.” In *The New Cambridge Medieval History*. Vol. V. Edited by David Abulafia. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Strauss, H. “The Fate and Form of the Menorah of the Maccabees.” *Eretz Israel* 6 (1960): 35.
- Stroll, Mary. *The Jewish Pope, Ideology and Politics in the Papal Schism of 1130*. Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- Synan, Edward A. *The Popes and the Jews in the Middle Ages*. New York: Macmillan: 1965.
- Thunø, Erik. *Image and Relic, Mediating the Sacred in Early Medieval Rome*. Rome: L’erma di bretscheider, 2002.
- Tozzini, Sandra. “Legal Discrimination against Italian Jews: From the Romans to the Unification of Italy.” In *The Most Ancient of Minorities, The Jews of Italy*. Edited by Stanislao G. Pugliese, 13-34. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 2002.
- Twyman, Susan E. *Papal Ceremonial at Rome in the Twelfth Century*. Henry Bradshaw Society, *Subsidia* Vol. IV. London: St. Edmundsbury Press, 2002.
- Twyman, Susan E. “*Summus Pontifex*. The Ritual and Ceremonial of the Papal Court.” In *Adrian IV The English Pope (1154-1159)*. Edited by Brenda Bolton and Anne J. Duggan, 49-74. *Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
- Ullman, Walter. *The Growth of Papal Government*. London: Methuen, 1955.
- Van den Gheyn, P.J. “Nicolas Maniacoria correcteur de la Bible.” *Revue biblique* 8 (1899): 289-295.
- Vogel, C. “La *Descriptio Ecclesiae Lateranensis* du Diacre Jean, Histoire du texte manuscript.” *Melanges en l’honneur de Monseigneur Michel Andrieu*. 457-476. Strasbourg: Palais Universitaire, 1956.
- _____. *Medieval Liturgy. An Introduction to the Sources*. Revised edition. Translated by W. Storey and N.K. Rasmussen. Washington, D.C.: Pastoral Press, 1986.
- Vogel, C. *Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae saec. VII antiquiores II*. Roma: 1888.
- Vogelstein, Hermann. *Rome*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1940.

- Weber, Robert. "Deux préfaces au psautier dues à Nicolas Maniacoria." *Revue Bénédictine* 63 (1953), 3-17.
- _____. "Un nouveau manuscrit de la révision du psautier *Iuxta Hebraeos* due a Nicolas Maniacoria." *Revue Bénédictine* 85 (1975) : 402-404.
- Weitzmann, Kurt and Herbert L. Kessler. *The Frescoes of the Dura Synagogue and Christian Art*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1990.
- Westerholm, Stephen. *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreter*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Williams, A. Lukyn. *Adversus Judaeos*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935.
- Wilmart, A. "Nicolas Manjuacoria cistercien a Trois-Fontaines." *Revue bénédictine* 33, No. 3 (1921): 136-143.
- Wolf, Gerhard. *Salus Populi Romani, Die Geschichte römischer Kultbilder im Mittelalter*. Weinheim: VCH, 1990.
- _____. "'Laetare filia sion. Ecce ego venio et habitabo in medio tui': Images of Christ Transferred to Rome from Jerusalem." *Jewish Art* 23/24 (1997/1998): 419-429.
- Wood, Diana, ed. *Christianity and Judaism. Studies in Church History*. Vol. 29. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.
- Yarden, Leon. *The Tree of Light: A Study of the Menorah, the Seven-branched Lampstand*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1971.
- _____. *The Spoils of Jerusalem on the Arch of Titus, a Re-investigation*. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet I. Rom, 1991.
- Zema, Demetrius B. "The Houses of Tuscany and of Pierleone in the Crisis of Rome in the Eleventh Century." In *Traditio, Studies in Ancient and Medieval History, Thought, and Religion*. Vol. II. Edited by Johannes Quasten and Stephan Kuttner, 155-175. New York: Cosmopolitan Science and Art Service, 1944.
- Ziegler, Joseph. "Reflections on the Jewry Oath in the Middle Ages." In *Christianity and Judaism*, edited by Diana Wood, 209-220. *Studies in Church History*. Vol. 29. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1992.

APPENDIX

LIST OF POPES 1049-1216

(Antipopes in brackets)

Leo IX	1049-1054	Innocent II	1130-1143
Victor II	1054-1057	[Anaclete II]	1130-1138]
Stephen IX	1057-1058	[Victor IV]	1138]
[Benedict X]	1058-1059]	Celestine II	1143-1144
Nicholas II	1059-1061	Lucius II	1144-1145
Alexander II	1061-1073	Eugenius III	1145-1153
[Honorius II]	1061-1072]	Anastasius IV	1153-1154
Gregory VII	1073-1085	Adrian IV	1154-1159
[Clement III]	1080-1100]	Alexander III	1159-1181
Victor III	1086-1087	[Victor IV]	1159-1164]
Urban II	1088-1099	[Paschal III]	1164-1168]
Paschal II	1099-1118	[Calixtus III]	1168-1178]
[Theodoric]	1100]	[Innocent III]	1179-1180]
[Albert]	1102]	Lucius III	1181-1185
[Silvester IV]	1105-1111]	Urban III	1185-1187
Gelasius II	1118-1119	Gregory VIII	1187
[Gregory VIII]	1118-1121]	Clement III	1187-1191
Calixtus II	1119-1124	Celestine III	1191-1198
Honorius II	1124-1130	Innocent III	1198-1216
[Celestine II]	1124]		

VITA

Marie Therese Champagne is a native of south Louisiana and earned a bachelor of science degree in nursing from Southeastern Louisiana University in 1977. She returned to university studies in the graduate program at Louisiana State University in art history in the fall of 1996, and in 1999 earned a master of arts degree in art history, with an emphasis on the study of medieval art and architecture. She is currently a candidate for the degree of doctor of philosophy in history, specializing in the history of medieval Europe, to be awarded May 20, 2005.