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ON JEWS AND THE OLD TESTAMENT PRECEDENT FOR SACRED ART PRODUCTION: THE VIEWS OF SOME TWELFTH-CENTURY ABBOTS

Joan DelPlato

In the first half of the twelfth century French monastic leaders waged a major debate over the production of large-scale churches and their decoration. The ideal size and degree of ornateness for Christian churches were not simply aesthetic issues but also material ones, formulated by practical economics. Still church leaders used theological justifications in arguing for and against large-scale church building. The Old Testament temple of Solomon, a huge undertaking described in the first Book of Kings, was the main precedent recalled by medieval observers. My thesis is that the attitudes of early twelfth-century abbots—specifically Suger of St. Denis and Bernard of Clairvaux—toward this building project of the Old Testament Jews were formulated in part by the social and political position of contemporary Jews.

Proponents of lavish Church expenditure of money and manpower emphasized the finished product as a means to thank and honor God for his blessings. This attitude helped justify two main Benedictine projects which underwent massive rebuilding and extensive decoration in the twelfth century: the monastery at Cluny (Cluny III) and the royal abbey of St. Denis, located north of Paris. On the other hand, opponents of this outlay of monies cited the superfluity of such expense to the worship of God, who was best served not by wasting church money on elaborate art and architecture but by aiding the poor. This was the argument of the Cistercians, a rapidly-growing ascetic order founded in 1098 as an alternative to the extravagance of Cluny. Cistercian monasteries like Cîteaux, the order's mother abbey located near Dijon, in their austere architectural style and decoration, readily suggest this position.

Contemporary Jews were of concern to Christian leaders in at least three arenas. First, Jews had been a religious minority in Christian society for centuries, but by the twelfth century, their status as "blasphemous
heretics’ was aggravated by the zeal of the Crusaders. Religious intolerance overcame Christian charity and the missionary spirit. Jews were persecuted and even murdered in Western Europe in 1146 at the urging of the Cistercian monk and Crusader Raoul (Radulph) who preached their annihilation in France and the Rhineland in the period of religious intolerance culminating in the Second Crusade (1147). Secondly, longstanding antisemitism was exacerbated in the Anacletus controversy: in 1130 a schism occurred within the Church over the election of a new pope. Peter Pierleone, a former Cluniac monk of Jewish descent, had been elected Pope Anacletus II. In a separate election Innocent II (r.1130–43) had also been voted into the office.³ Anacletus’ Jewish heritage was an ideological factor in the campaign against him. Thirdly, monastic leaders’ antagonism towards Jews focused on Jewish moneylending and pawnbroking, two of the few occupations open to Jews.⁴ In the twelfth century Jews were often accused of stealing church goods, a chronic complaint against pawnbrokers caught with “hot” goods. In point of fact, local French priests, attempting to cope with their financial difficulties, were known to trade or sell sacred liturgical objects to Jews at this time, despite Christian and Jewish prohibitions against the practice.⁵ According to an unsubstantiated rumor, Anacletus had robbed churches with the aid of Jews.⁶

The writing of Suger, abbot of St. Denis (r.1122–51), offers ample evidence of his conscious awareness of Old Testament kings who sponsored the production of lavish sacred art. He was a principal advisor to King Louis VI (r.1108–37) and even served as regent for a short time under Louis VI’s son, Louis VII, continuing the close link between the French kings and the abbots of the royal abbey. Suger was thus able to finance the expansion of the abbey church, traditionally the burial place for the French kings, with funds from pilgrims traveling to St. Denis and, to some extent, the Capetian monarchs themselves. In his “De Administratone,” Suger defended lavish spending on art production, which he viewed, as testimony to God’s generosity.⁷ Suger used Solomon’s words of humility when he writes: “‘for who am I, or what is my father’s house’ that I should have presumed to begin so noble and pleasing an edifice.”⁸ He acknowledged that Old Testament religious leaders used golden vessels to hold the blood of animals they sacrificed, and thus he advocated that the Christian God be honored with objects made from materials no less precious—gold, jewels “and whatever is most valued among all created things.”⁹ Just as Solomon proposed to build a temple based on the promise God gave to his father David (1 Kings 5:5 and 2 Chronicles 3), so too did Suger, as a new Solomon, see Louis VII as the new David.¹⁰
Thus for Suger the Old Testament precedent, with which he consciously identified, served as justification for the artistic and architectural achievements he oversaw.

The economic status of Jews at St. Denis under Suger’s abbacy, where the economy was relatively advanced, was mutually beneficial. In the lands around St. Denis the Jews themselves led a comparatively comfortable life. Their stone houses were well-furnished. In 1111 Louis VI granted them the same privilege given the Christians of the time: they were placed under the direct jurisdiction of the abbey and subject to the ecclesiastical seigneur of St. Denis. In turn, the abbey profitted by about one thousand pounds in borrowing eighty silver marks from the Jewish moneylender Oursel (Ursellus) c.1100 and repaid c.1130. Suger probably relied on Jewish moneylenders to obtain some of the capital he needed to rebuild St. Denis. Jews also helped the abbey by spending their money at the Lendit fairs held near St. Denis, though there was an uninformed Church prohibition against allowing them to attend. Jews throughout Europe benefitted from the fairs, since they often sold their goods there; they also used the opportunity for social reunions and even rabbinic synods.

In his biography of Louis VI, Suger wrote a vivid account of the celebration over Innocent II’s (r.1130–3) visit to St. Denis on Easter morning in 1131. He mentions a delegation of Jews awaiting the arrival of the pope. When a Jewish representative presented Innocent with a copy of the Old Testament the pope responded: “May the omnipotent God remove the veil from your hearts” (cf. 2 Corinthians 3:15–16). The veil appears also in one of the stained glass windows at St. Denis, where Christ is located between the Church and the Synagogue. Christ crowns the former; in the latter he removes the veil from her eyes. A similar message appears in the Tree of Jesse stained glass window at St. Denis dating from c.1142–4, where the Synagogue is reintegrated into the Church. Thus “reintegration” seems to describe both Suger’s hopeful theological position and his social ideal for the Jews in his domain.

It seems Suger avoided direct involvement in polemics, at least in the controversy surrounding the Crusades, during his building program at St. Denis. This neutrality can be viewed as part of Suger’s role as mediator et pacis vinculum. Yet Suger seems to have harbored some anti-Jewish attitudes. In his description of Innocent’s visit, he refers to Jewish “blindness,” a common Christian theological view of Jews. More concretely, he suggested a connection between Jews and church robbers in the inscription on a panel of the main altar of the church of St. Denis where he named Judas, the archetypal Jew and traitor to Christ: “If any impious
person should despoil this excellent altar/May he perish, deservedly damned, associated with Judas." Nonetheless, Suger of St. Denis, like a good businessman, recognized the necessity of social harmony if his building plan were to be realized; he accepted the role of Jews in the area and in fact encouraged their integration into life around St. Denis. At the same time, he used the Jewish precedent of Solomon's temple to justify his enormous program of rebuilding St. Denis. Thus, Suger had ideological motives as well as economic ones in protecting the Jews, especially during the 1130s and early 1140s.

In 1125 the Cistercian and former nobleman Abbot Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153) wrote a letter to the monk William of St. Thierry in which he strongly criticized Benedictine monasticism, including Cluny and its art production. Here in his Apologia the reformer Bernard rejected the Old Testament justification of temple-building, which he found in Psalm 26:8, for constructing the Christian monastery. As an alternative Bernard twice reiterated the New Testament view that the state of the inner temple, the soul, is more important than the material edifice and that "the kingdom of God is within you" (Luke 17:21). One main reason he rejected elaborate church decoration was that it was a misplacement of Church funds: "the walls of the church are aglow, but the poor of the Church go hungry." Bernard also made several direct references to the Old Testament prototype for lavish spending. For example, he said that huge church dimensions and the "expensive" and "foolish" images decorating them distract the penitent; they seemed to him "like something out of the Old Testament."

Bernard also criticized elaborate church decoration because it resembles Old Testament idol-worship (Psalm 106:35–6). He claims "the very sight of such sumptuous and exquisite baubles is sufficient to inspire men to make offerings, though not to say their prayers." One example of "idolatry" is a candelabrum which Bernard describes in detail; he asks rhetorically whether such sacred objects are meant to inspire remorse for sins or to dazzle the viewer. Bernard was probably referring to the Old Testament candelabrum par excellence, which had seven branches for seven lamps and was wrought from a single piece of gold (Exodus 25:31–40).

When Bernard wrote the Apologia in 1125 the monastery at Clairvaux probably had no direct contact with Jews and very little interaction with other laity, as part of the Cistercian ideal of the monastery as a paradisus claustralis. Bernard's predecessor, Stephen Harding (r.1108–1133), had employed rabbis to work with Hebrew manuscripts at Cîteaux, an activity Bernard probably did not continue. What small communities of Jews
there were in France in the first half of the twelfth century were located instead in the larger cities of Paris, Dijon, Blois and Bray-sur-Seine, where there was a need for moneylenders. Bernard of Clairvaux was thus economically independent of Jews.

Bernard’s early position on the Jews was drawn from patristic writings. He voiced a common Christian stereotype of Jews in referring to them in his sermons as the cruel murderers of Christ. There he also condemned the Jewish practice of animal sacrifice, dating from the Old Testament and probably nonexistent by the twelfth century. In addition, Bernard criticized the Jewish usurer; he coined the verb judaizare, to lend at interest.

Five years after writing the Apologia Bernard spoke out on the Anacletus controversy, expressing “horror” at Pierleone’s nomination, and calling him a “fruitless growth,” a term he had previously used in reference to Jews. He in fact lead a campaign against Anacletus, though ostensibly for reasons other than his ancestry.

In the later 1140s, however, Bernard made conciliatory comments on Jews in another letter written to Henry, Archbishop of Mainz, in his capacity as official preacher of the Second Crusade (1146–7), to which he was appointed by Pope Eugenius II in 1146. In his letter Bernard denounced the extremism of his co-Cistercian Radulph against the Jews; Bernard called for the preservation of Jews so that they might be converted to Christianity and even traveled to Germany in an attempt to subdue Radulph. Bernard disagreed with the equating of Jews and Saracens in a letter he directed “To the English People” and circulated throughout western Europe. He cited Scripture (Psalm 59:12) calling for their protection from persecution—until the coming of Christ at the Last Judgment when they would receive their just punishment (Romans 11:26). Bernard was never an advocate of the Jews. He defended their lives, but by singling them out for criticism he also humiliated and isolated them. Apparently his earlier and more strident anti-Jewish sentiment stemmed from his strict reliance on Christian biblical injunctions against Jews and a lack of contact with them. From his stereotyped Christian criticism, at least in word, he moved to a relatively more tolerant policy in the 1140s. He had used Christian tradition to criticize but then to protect the Jews when the situation became critical. Still his early antisemitism was consistent with his unequivocal rejection of the Old Testament precedent for sacred art production in 1125.

When Bernard wrote his Apologia he undoubtedly had in mind the huge Cluny III, but three years earlier Peter the Venerable had begun an abbacy
(1122–53) at Cluny quite different from that of his predecessors. In the previous century, Cluny had undergone a great expansion under Abbot Hugh (1049–1109), increasing the numbers of both its resident monks and the monasteries under its jurisdiction. The church of the monastery itself was enlarged with rents from its daughterhouses and donations from some of the most prominent emperors and kings of the time, making it the largest Western European church.

Burdened with financial problems that developed under his overextended predecessors, Peter began an austerity program in 1132. He even found it necessary to close down the artistic workshops. He reputedly opposed Cluny’s practice of borrowing money from Jews living in Chalon-sur-Saône using religious art objects as collateral. Yet he himself was forced to pawn sacred objects from the sacristy of Cluny mainly to Jews living nearby.

His forced economic dealings with Jews probably contributed to his scathing theological critique of them. On the eve of the Second Crusade in 1146, Peter wrote to Louis VII, criticizing Jews for thievery and for buying stolen sacred objects, and likening Jewish people to the murderous Cain. In his advisory writings on the Crusades, Peter denounced both the “Saracen heresy” and the “Jewish heresy,” despite having helped translate the Koran into Latin and having studied the Talmud. He thought it inconsistent that the Crusaders

\[
\text{go forth to seek the enemies of Christendom in distant lands while the blasphemous Jews, who are worse than the Saracens, are permitted in our very midst to scoff with impunity at Christ.}
\]

He never stated that the Jews should be eradicated, but he proposed to Louis VII that they be punished for their rejection of Christ, usury and dealing in stolen church goods and that this take the form of a tax on all Jews to raise money for the Second Crusade. Two “evils” would thus be remedied: the infidel Saracens would be vanquished with money obtained from the blasphemous Jews. He also wrote the Tractatus adversus inveteratum duritiem iudaearum, c.1140, a book which survives in thirty-four copies, attesting to its popularity.

Peter the Venerable had no known aesthetic program of Cluniac art comparable to St. Bernard’s Apologia on the Cistercian ideal, probably because Peter’s austerity program precluded sponsoring art to the degree he would have liked. One example of Cluniac art, however, viewed in its context suggests that Peter saw an unfortunate continuity between Old
Testament and contemporary Jews. A lintel of the smaller door of the porch-narthex at a church at Charlieu (in the Loire region), under Cluniac jurisdiction c.1135, depicts the Old Testament blood sacrifice; a ram, goat and calf are led in for the kill. The sculpture’s ‘message’ is the common Christian view of the New superseding the Old Testament concept of sacrifice. This scene has been related to the content of Peter’s letter directed against the heretical Petrobrusians in which he claims that animals are sacrificed on the Jewish altar, but only the Lamb of God rests on the Christian altar. 

Peter the Venerable tended to see all non-Christians alike. He harbored ill-will toward the Jews, perhaps because his economic dealings with them were a bitter reminder of better days for Cluny. Still Peter came round to Bernard’s missionary spirit toward the Jews by 1146. Until Bernard objected, Peter linked the Jews with the Saracen heretics. Like Bernard, he seemed to have viewed contemporary Jews as a continuation of those from the Old Testament, though whether he considered the issue of heresy connected to the Old Testament concept of sacred art production is still an open question. In a 1147 letter where he in effect answered Bernard’s charges against the excesses of Cluniac life, no direct mention was made of Church spending on sacred objects.

Thus Abbots Suger of St. Denis and Bernard of Clairvaux entered into the controversy over sacred art production from a particular economic vantagepoint, of which their dealings with Jews were part. Though Peter the Venerable apparently did not directly participate in the debate over lavish church spending on art, he was a significant figure in its configuration by virtue of his position as the inheritor of Cluny’s administration and his economic and theological engagement with Jews. A major theological and aesthetic debate among French abbots in the first half of the twelfth century was thus rooted at least partially in economic realities that concerned Jews, a group whose very presence could not help but provoke strong ideological response and sharpen the dialectics of late medieval Christian culture.
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NOTES


2. It provides the actual measurements of this temple (60 by 20 by 30 cubits), its huge vestibule, sanctuary and inner shrine (1 Kings 6:2,3,17,20). For its decoration Solomon used bronze and especially gold in its altar, lampstands, flowers, snuffers and door panels. After he constructed the permanent furnishings, Solomon brought in the portable “sacred treasures” of his father David, which had also been worked in silver and gold (1 Kings 6:21–22, 28; 7:47–51).


5. Rabinowitz, Social Life of the Jews, 93ff.


that he sees the clerics of St. Denis as descendants of David in his discussion of
the Ark of the Covenant (Panofsky, trans., Abbot Suger, 123).
15. E. A. Bégin, “Recherches pour servir à l’histoire des juifs dans le Nord-Est
M. Bloch (Paris, 1897), 151.
256-69.
20. “Que le Dieu tout-puissant veuille bien ôter le voile de vos coeurs” (Suger,
La Vie, 265).
21. “But to this very day, every time the Law of Moses is read, a veil lied over
the minds of the hearers. However, as Scripture says of Moses, ‘whenever he turns
to the Lord the veil is removed.’”
22. L. Grodecki, “Les vitraux allégoriques de Saint-Denis,” L’Art de France:
(Garden City, New York, 1955), 132.
25. Suger, La Vie, 265.
27. Panofsky also implies this in comparing Suger to “a modern oil or steel magnate” (Abbot Suger, 110).
28. Clairvaux was one of the four daughter abbeys of Cîteaux.
29. “Lord, I love the beauty of your house, the place where your glory dwells.”
Before Bernard, his predecessor, St. Stephen Harding (1108-33), questioned the
necessity of material expense in the production of sacred art (O. K. Werckmeister,
Medieval Art History: A Short Survey [Los Angeles, 1980], 161).
30. St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Works: Treatises I (Spenser, Massachusetts, 1970),
66.
31. St. Bernard, Works: Treatises I, 47-8 and 61. See also I Corinthians 3:16:
“Surely you know that you are God’s temple, where the spirit of God dwells.”
34. “But they mingled with the nations, learning their ways; they worshipped
their idols and were ensnared by them.”
36. Bernard may have been referring to a specific object, the seven-branched
candelabrum located in the chevet at Cluny III in Abbot Hugh’s time, a gift from
Matilda, wife of Henry I of England. Made of gilt copper with crystals and beryls, its stem alone measured eighteen feet; it was exquisitiously cast and worked. See J. Evans, *Cluniac Art of the Romanesque Period* (Cambridge, 1950), 25. A. Dimier by contrast believes the candelabrum in question was located at the entrance to the sanctuary at St. Remy at Rheims (St. Bernard, *Works: Treatises I*, 65).


38. “Make a lamp-stand of pure gold. The lamp-stand, stem and branches, shall be of beaten work, its cups, both calyces and petals, shall be of one piece with it. There are to be six branches springing from its sides; three branches of the lamp stand shall spring from the one side and three branches from the other side. There shall be three cups shaped like almond blossoms, with calyx and petals, on the first branch . . .”


44. Berger claims that Jews no longer conducted animal sacrifice (“The Attitude of St. Bernard,” 103, footnote 64), while Rabinowitz implies that they did (*Social Life of the Jews*, 52).


48. Still the anti-pope controlled Rome until his death in 1138.


50. Friedman believes Bernard was more concerned with Radulph’s insubordination than the content of this common monk’s diatribe (“An Anatomy,” 90).

51. Copies of this were also sent “to the lords and very dear fathers the archbishops; and all the clergy and people of Eastern France and Bavaria” (St. Bernard, *Letters*, no. 391, 460–3.)


62. Berry, “Peter the Venerable,” 149. By 1146 Abbot Suger rejected Peter the Venerable’s proposed tax on Jews to finance the Crusades and called for a tax on churches of the realm instead (Grabois, “L’Abbaye,” 1195).

63. Berry, “Peter the Venerable,” 149.


65. Another issue this term raises is that of “blood libel,” the allegation that Jews murder non-Jews to get blood for Passover and other rituals. There were trials and massacres of Jews for this allegation throughout the Middle Ages; the first occurred in 1144. (See the *Encyclopedia Judaica*, IV, 1120ff.)


67. Mâle claims that although Burgundy was only mildly affected by heretics the Cluniac monks tried to forestall the threat of heresy through their art programs, to avoid problems experienced in Languedoc, specifically, at St. Gilles and St. Pons (L’Art religieux, 422).