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Introduction

My attraction towards medieval Rome grew out of my interest for antique Rome. This interest was sparked by the Belgian comic book series of “Asterix & Obelix.” As I chose to study history, I went in to the direction of ancient history. When the time came to choose a master, 'Eternal Rome' was an easy choice. While the so-called 'bad emperors' still have my preference, the quirks of historical personalities is what first drew me to medieval history, particularly in connection with the popes.

The Roman republic, as well as the Roman empire has received a lot of attention throughout the ages. This attention came from people such as scholars, politicians and artists and when economic prosperity made this possible, tourists. The history of the republic and later the empire, was intertwined with the history of the city for over 1000 years. This has left its mark on Rome, as multiple ancient monuments are still standing tall in the modern landscape of the Eternal City.

Over the years I have come to learn that, even though the Roman empire was taken out of the historical equation, the city of Rome remained an important player in European history. Especially in the context of church history, as Rome was the see of the pope, the ex officio leader of the catholic church. The church started to dominate the history of Rome, even when the empire was still intact. Moving the capital of the empire from Rome to Constantinople by the Romans, enabled this dominating position for the papal authority.

The other power that dominated medieval history was the Holy Roman Empire and its precursors, including Charlemagne. Even though the title of the Holy Roman Empire was not used until the 13th century, the idea that these emperors continued the Roman empire was coined with the coronation of Charlemagne. This so-called translatio imperii, or translation of the empire, consisted of this idea of continuation. Which was odd as the Byzantine empire claimed to be the direct continuation of the Roman empire, which it, in a way, was.

The plot thickens as the church made claims to be the continuation of the Roman empire with a document called Constitutum domini Constantini imperatoris or the Constitutum Constantini for short. In this document, which later proved to be a forgery, the emperor Constantine transferred the power over Rome and the rest of the western part of the Roman empire to the pope. It was also used in the reproduction of the ancient Roman empire, the so-called imitatio imperii.

In 1144, in the city of Rome, a commune was realised that consisted of Roman citizens troubled by the growing temporal power of the pope. This commune was inspired by
Republican Rome, even installing a senate. This, in short, shows how the legacy of the Roman empire was contested throughout the Middle Ages.

The uses of the Roman inheritance will be the main focus of this thesis, focusing on medieval Rome. The period I have chosen for this thesis starts at 1075 and ends at 1143, covering the period of the Investiture struggle, the Dictatus Papae and the run-up to the commune. The main actor within my research will be the papacy, and leave the other parties to an different scholar. In the remainder of this introduction I will try to convey the scientific basis of this thesis, with a status questionis and some significant concepts used in this thesis.

To investigate a significant part of ancient Rome's inheritance, I will investigate the following research question:

In what way was the use of the inheritance of ancient Rome, in the representation of medieval papal power, subject to change in the period 1075-1143?

For arriving at an answer to this question, I will investigate and answer the following sub-questions:

1. What was the influence of the Investiture Controversy on the inheritance of Rome?
2. In what way did the inheritance of ancient Rome contribute to the papacy’s power and the display of it?
3. How was liturgical ceremonial able to contribute to papal power?

These subquestions will be answered in their corresponding chapters, with the first chapter serving as an introduction to the Investiture Controversy and a further introduction to the historical background of our research period. The second chapter will elaborate on the way in which the papacy made use of the inheritance of ancient Rome at Rome. The last chapter will focus on a case-study of papal power, in this case a liturgical ceremony, and what this ceremony was able to do for the papacy, in regard to power and the representation thereof.

As a final notice I would like to acknowledge the focal point of my thesis, to be the papacy, I believe that either other side, the Holy Roman empire and the Roman commune, deserve their own research. If I were to acknowledge any changes in the representation of
either faction, in the same way as will be done for the papacy, this thesis will (and should) turn in to a book.
Methodological & conceptual framework

In this part of the introduction I intend to explain certain methodologies and concepts that are essential for this thesis. It should make for an easier read in the rest of the thesis. The first part of this explanatory section covers the state of the modern historiography, or status quaestionis. The last part will focus on some "umbrella" terms that, in my opinion, are more appropriately discussed in the introduction, as I deem them essential to the complete understanding of this thesis. Other terms will be, where deemed necessary, discussed in the footnotes.

While the so-called renaissance of the twelfth century, is not the theme of this thesis directly, it is referenced, direct or indirect, several times and acts as a dome for my entire research period. For this reason I feel obliged to review the status quaestionis of the renaissance of the twelfth century as well as that of medieval Rome. The general trend in writing the history of Rome, or any history for that matter, is the abolition of any sharp breaks to the past. Any revolution, uprise or upheaval or however one names it, there has been a turn towards the investigation of a larger preceding period. As Uta-Renate Blumenthal states in the preface of her work "The Investiture Controversy : Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century":

"As succinctly as possible this book describes the roots of a set of ideals that effected a radical transformation of eleventh-century European society that led to the confrontation between church and monarchy known as the investiture struggle or Gregorian reform. Ideas cannot be divorced from reality, especially not in the Middle Ages. I present them, therefore, in their contemporary political, social, and cultural context."

A rather amplified title as Charles Homer Haskins produced in 1927, “The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century,” should not make its way into modern historiography. The terminology used, in the research as well as the title, is too debatable, even though a period of revival of culture, among others, can be discerned. That his work did provide for a new approach to our research period is illuminated by Haskins’ own words:

The title of this book will appear to many to contain a flagrant contradiction. A renaissance in the twelfth century! Do not the Middle Ages, that epoch of ignorance, stagnation, and gloom, stand in the sharpest contrast to the light and progress and freedom of the Italian Renaissance which followed? How could there be a

---

1 Uta-Renate Blumenthal, The Investiture Controversy : Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century, (Philadelphia, 1995), preface.
renaissance in the Middle Ages, when men had no eye for the joy and beauty and knowledge of this passing world, their gaze ever fixed on the terrors of the world to come?²

He continues:

To the most important of these earlier revivals the present volume is devoted, the Renaissance of the Twelfth Century which is often called the Mediaeval Renaissance. This century, the very century of St. Bernard and his mule, was in many respects an age of fresh and vigorous life. The epoch of the Crusades, of the rise of towns, and of the earliest bureaucratic states of the West, it saw the culmination of Romanesque art and the beginnings of Gothic; the emergence of the vernacular literatures; the revival of the Latin classics and of Latin poetry and Roman law; the recovery of Greek science, with its Arabic additions, and of much of Greek philosophy; and the origin of the first European universities. The twelfth century left its signature on higher education, on the scholastic philosophy, on European systems of law, on architecture and sculpture, on the liturgical drama, on Latin and vernacular poetry. The theme is too broad for a single volume, or a single author.³

One could interpret Haskins as a visionary, even a prophet, as these subjects have found their way to either a collection, a monograph or a series.

Further research on the subject of the twelfth century renaissance was done by Richard W. Southern, who saw a civilisation emerge. Jean Leclerq focussed on the continuity of ancient heritage, thereby questioning the sharp break with the past in the twelfth century.⁴ Leidulf Melve saw in the the preceding conference, which led to the 1982 collection “Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century,” edited by Robert L. Benson, Giles Constable & Carol Lanham, the best reflection on the work of Haskins.⁵

The authors came up, according to Melve, with three distinct recommendations for further research. The first was a closer look at any possible connection between the 'renaissance' and the Investiture Conflict, next a further investigation into ecclesiastical reform and the wider cultural and social evolution. Finally a recommendation is pronounced to push the research further back into the eleventh century.⁶

These recommendations have been followed up, which have led to other research focussing on communicative framework, the origin of the Investiture Contest and a focus on non-Latin sides of the 'renaissance,' according to Melve. This had caused a refrain from

³ Haskins, Renaissance, 1955, preface.
periodisation and categorisation. All in all the new way for scholars on medieval history, on this particular subject, is to look back at Carolingian & Ottonian periods of bloom. Other new research should look into the emergence of ‘free intellectuals’ in the urban centres of around 1100 and finally a conceptualisation of the relationship of the three ‘results’ - focussing on communicative framework, the origin of the Investiture Contest and on non-Latins – should prove a new way in future research.7

Richard Krautheimer's 1980 book “Rome, profile of a city, 312-1318” synthesises the history of art, architecture and politics of Rome from the time of Constantine unto the departure of the papacy from Rome. He outlines the city as a living organism and its repeated revival, our research period is defined in the corresponding chapter “The New Rebirth of Rome: The Twelfth Century.” Krautheimer adheres as well to the image of renewal in Rome after (and during) the Investiture Contest, preceded by the Carolingian one. Due to the impact that it had, and still does, I consider Krautheimer's work a bridge, connecting both twelfth century 'renaissance' with the rise of the papal monarchy, by looking at art and architecture.8

An other subject that has seen a bit of a transformation is the investiture contest. Or rather a more objective approach, as in the past any subject that involved the church either attracted, often catholic historians, or protestant ones. The catholic narrative concerned the papacy and its reform, while the protestant view was that ideas of authority lay at the beginning of the conflict, in essence a struggle for right order in the world. The former narrative came from Augustin Flinche, the latter was the work of Gerd Tellenbach.

Further research into social and economic history at the time of the conflict, unearthed a surprising shift in the narrative: lay people. This caused a greater demarcation in who the church was, all christians, the faithful or the clerical hierarchy? While this question does not necessarily need an answer to be able to acknowledge the outcome of the reforms: the papal monarchy. While the church had tried to remain independent from secular rulers from the outset, the later twelfth century saw the rise of some of the more mightier popes of history, for example Innocent III.

In her essay on the narrative of the Investiture Conflict, Maureen C. Miller suggests two improvements in further research on the subject. The first is a shift away from merely describing the papacy as this does not help us in explaining. What the papal monarchy

consists of is rather clear, but what explains the position of the papacy at the end of the
twelfth century could do with more analysis. An other problem is the focus on the greatness
of the popes, according to Miller this “short circuits serious inquiry into how papal monarchy
was born.”

While Ian Stuart Robinson is reproached for his more descriptive work “The papacy
1073-1198, Continuity and Innovation,” Miller acknowledges that it has brought some new
insight to the subject. First the rise of a like-minded network of ecclesiastics, which she
describes as 'friendship circles.' A second innovation in the work of Robinson are the focus on 'emergency' administrative innovations of the Gregorian reform, challenging existing norms
of power. What those existing norms of power are, and how they where perceived warrants
more research. Miller also suggests even more inversion of the top-down narrative, looking at
how local communities were or were not able to influence the changes in Rome. As a way
forward she suggests careful re-reading of classical sources, as well as a new research of
archives.⁹

My own research focuses on the beginnings of the papacy's rise to power, and how the
heritage of ancient Rome was able to help the papacy in this amelioration of their position.
What I hope to find is a clear sign that the papacy, in response to the struggle with the
empire, starts to show, or rather intensifies, its growing power through symbolism based on
the ancient empire of Rome.

The next part of this introduction will consist of a brief elucidation on terminology. For the
terms that will be discussed in this section, are essential in view of the rest of the thesis. First
up is the so-called twelfth century renaissance. However the wording (see above), the gist of
this term is that during the long twelfth century, more or less from 1050 to 1215, a renewal of
the appreciation of ancient Rome took place, a revival of classical culture. Although the term
'renaissance' indicates a rather swift rupture from history, it rather grew slowly, hence the
starting point of around 1050, cf. Above to an even earlier starting point.

The renovatio or renewal did not start in Rome, but in Monte Cassino; crucial figures
in the infancy of the revival are Alfanus of Salerno (b.+/−1020 d.1085) and Desiderius of Monte
Cassino (b.1026-d. 1087, also known as the short-lived pope Victor III).¹⁰ Not only an
outstanding poet, pervaded with ancient Rome's eminence, Alfanus was close with the

1570-1580.
¹⁰ Herbert Bloch, “The new fascination with ancient Rome,” in Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth
reformists within the church, and with archdeacon Hildebrand, our pope Gregory VII. As both men spent quite some time at Monte Cassino, the veneration of ancient Rome was invigorated from this abbey. This veneration slowly propagated throughout Europe, effecting all forms of culture, the church and politics.¹¹

The second term to be discussed is that *translatio imperii*, or the transfer of control. This referred to the possibility to the transfer of authority from one people or a person to another. *Translatio* was already happening in ancient, for example the *translatio imperii* from Troy to Rome, as described by Virgil in his Aeneid. The *translatio imperii* was a part of, as stated by Jacques Le Goff, 'a transfer of knowledge and culture, or *translatio studii*.¹²

The last term that needs to be discussed is that of *imitatio imperii Romanii*, the imitation of the Roman empire. While this might refer to any of royal emulation or imitation of said empire, in this thesis it will relate mostly to the papacy that is able to obtain certain privileges in a echoing of the Roman empire. For example the installation of the *curia Romana* around 1100, can be viewed as an imitation of the administration of Roman empire.¹³

---

¹³ Wilfried Hartmann, *Der Investiturstreit*. (Munich, 2007), pp. 45, 97.
Chapter 1 – Historical setting

This chapter consists of an introduction of the historical setting of my designated research period, 1075-1143. This is by no means an extended research into this period, as I will focus predominantly on the relationship between empire and pope. The fate of, for example, the French and English crown and their relationship to the papacy will be interlaced into the story, but most likely it will be set aside if not necessary. With this historical introduction I will try to answer the following subquestion: What was the influence of the Investiture Controversy on the inheritance of Rome?

One of the more defining moments in European history would be the Investiture Controversy. In short this conflict comprised of Pope and emperor crossing swords about who had the right to appoint new clergymen. The core of the this controversy started out as a reform movement within the catholic church, focused on cleansing the church of corruption. Simony was such a form of corruption, which can be defined as a trade in ecclesiastical offices. While the then reigning emperor Henry III was, at first, supportive of the reformative work of the papacy, he later changed his mind.

After the schism between east and west in 1054, effectively creating the catholic church in the west, and the orthodox church in the east, the papacy continued to show their intentions. In 1059 an important change was made to the electoral process of the papacy. After the papal bull In nomine Domini, the nobility of Rome and the Holy Roman emperor were gradually forced out of the electoral process. Their place was meant to be taken by the College of Cardinals, however this change did not come into fruition until the election of Innocent II, in 1130.

The next important move in fuelling the conflict between the then still archdeacon Hildebrand and king Henry IV was the excommunication of a number of counsellors of Henry for simoniacal practices by a papal synod in march of 1073. As pope Alexander II was on his deathbed, it is very likely that Hildebrand played a fundamental role in this event. Newly acclaimed pope, Gregory VII had started to make plans to “liberate the church of Constantinople from the Saracens” and could use Henry’s help with such an undertaking; all seemed well.

It was not until king Henry, having just defeated an uprising in Saxony, invested his chaplain Tedald as archbishop of Milan, that the struggle between empire and papacy really gained momentum around 1075. Henry felt confident on his position and demanded the

14 Hartmann, Der Investiturstreit, pp. 66-72.
abdication of Gregory, whose position seemed to be on a slippery slope, after even being imprisoned, albeit for a short while, on Christmas day 1075. The main problem that Henry had with ‘the monk Hildebrand,’ was that the Gregorian reforms undermined his royal authority. The imperial coronation in Rome that Gregory had suggested in their correspondence was not worth the hassle to Henry.

In the Roman synod of 1076, ‘the monk Hildebrand’ retaliated by excommunicating Henry from the church, as well as deposing him as king, absolving all vassals from their fealty to him. Even though these actions were backed by the Dictatus papae, the deposing of Henry could not have been backed by canon law. The unprecedented actions of Gregory were of such a seriousness, that Henry had no choice but to either exonerate himself or perform a penance. As the German princes had invited the pope to Augsburg, Henry made sure to intercept Gregory at Canossa (modern day northern Italy) and ensure his absolution by performing penance.

While winning a strategic victory at Canossa, Henry had to publicly accept the unparalleled claims made by the pope. The alliance between the German princes and the pope however had been successfully ruptured. In 1077, the revolting princes chose Rudolf of Rheinfelden, the duke of Swabia, as their new king. However, Gregory did not give his approval to this new king, as the princes should have waited for his advice and consent. Gregory’s outright refusal to pick a side, coincided with his position as mediator and to maintain this position for as long as possible.

While Gregory remained neutral in the matter of the German kings, in 1078 he issued a decree against lay investiture. Perhaps a defensive measure if Henry overcame his rival king, but certainly important for the relationship between empire and papacy in following decades. In 1080 Gregory finally chose a side, that of the German princes and their leader Rudolf of Rheinfelden. Unfortunately for Gregory (and Rudolf), the latter succumbed, not much later, to his battlefield injuries which he contracted at the battle on the Elster (modern-day East Germany). This coincided with a second excommunication of king Henry, but the strategic advantage was with Henry, and not with the pope.

The majority of the German and Italian bishops chose Henry’s side, which culminated in Gregory’s disposal as pope. Subsequently Henry appointed the archbishop of Ravenna, Wibert of Parma, as the new pope, Clement III. With these changes Henry obviously felt

---

18 Robinson, pp. 403-406; Legend would have it that Henry stood bare-headed and dressed poorly in front of the castle at Canossa, for three days.
secure enough to march for Rome, which he did in 1081. A mere two years later Henry had occupied the majority of the city, with just the stronghold of Castel Sant'Angelo remaining as a safe haven for Gregory.\(^20\)

After Henry got what he came for, the title of emperor and the enthronement of Clement III as the new pope, he left the Eternal City. His leaving was timed with the arrival of the strongest of pope Gregory’s allies, Robert Guiscard, the duke of Apulia, Calabria & Sicily. While Gregory was rescued from Castel Sant'Angelo, the rest of the city had been devastated in the process. This forced Gregory to leave Rome and live out his days in Salerno, where he died on the 25\(^{th}\) of May 1085.

The official successor to Gregory was Abbot Desiderius of Monte Cassino, Victor III. Due to inner conflict and reluctance of Desiderius, it took about a year for Victor III to be enthroned as the new pope. As pope Victor III took a conciliatory approach to Henry, but still made sure to condemn lay investiture, as well as excommunicating pope Clement III. Unfortunately for Henry and Victor, the latter did not last for a long time, as he died the following year, in 1087. After another extended vacancy for the apostolic see, Odo of Ostia, a Cardinal bishop was elected as Urban II.

Urban II had declared himself a strict follower of Gregory VII in his elective letter to the German princes and bishops. As a way to act on these words, he corroborated the excommunication of Clement III, as well as the Holy Roman emperor, Henry IV in 1089. By means of protecting his see against Henry, Urban went out of his way to forge alliances with north Italian & south German associates. The Archbishopric of Milan, invested by Henry in 1086, was the pivot of Urban’s policies, due to its central position. Unfortunately for Henry, the real threat to his reign came from within.\(^21\)

Henry had, in the years 1090-92, made some serious progress on strengthening his position. Peace was made with the Saxon rebels and due to several victories in Italy, he had full control of the Eternal City. This allowed Clement III to take residence in Rome, while Urban II had to take shelter with, just as Gregory VII was forced to do, his Norman allies. Urban II’s fate seemed to go in the same direction as it went with Gregory, but fortunately for Urban, he seemed to have the Lord’s preference.

With an astonishing change of heart, the 20 year old son of Henry, Conrad, took up the fight against his father. Described not as just a opportunistic ally of the papacy, but as the ‘devout champion of the church.’ Conrad was crowned king of Italy in Milan, and after the

\(^{20}\) Robinson, pp. 411-12; Morris, pp. 113-121.
Italian allies gathered to him, Henry was stuck in Italy, cut off from the German kingdom. As if this was not troublesome enough, Urban managed to rehabilitate former churchmen who had associated with Henry, at the 1095 reform council of Piacenza. And he remained a keen diplomat, as Urban was able to negotiate a marriage between Conrad and the daughter of Count Roger I of Sicily, the brother of Robert Guiscard.  

The most renowned achievement of pope Urban II was his 1095 call to purge the Holy Land from non-christian elements. At a council in Clermont (Clermont-Ferrand, modern day France) he held a speech in which he calls all christians to arms. “To bring aid to fellow christians in the area and to destroy the vile race from the lands of our friends.” At the same council Urban managed to further develop and expand the investiture decree made by Gregory in 1078. This elaboration prohibited clergymen to pay obeisance, and therefore be free of profane power.

All in all, the papacy seemed to be on the way back to the top, as the lack of a long vacancy of the see when Urban II died in 1099, shows. In a mere 15 days pope Paschal II was elected, who took after his predecessors Gregory and Urban. Confirming the excommunication of the emperor in a synod at Rome, the first time he was able to hold one there, in 1102. The imperial party, however, was able to maintain the schism and kept electing their own popes. Urban’s alliances turned out to be short lived, but Henry IV tried to pacify himself with Paschal II, realising he could not maintain peace in his empire if he kept the dispute with the popes going.

By declaring himself willing to go to Holy Land he hoped to appease the papacy, but he was not willing to relinquish investiture, so his announcement was in vain. An additional problem for the emperor was a second sanguineous problem, his son Henry V. Conrad had died an mundane death in 1101, after being deposed by an imperial diet in 1098. His brother Henry also lived in discord with his father, especially when the former denounced him for being an excommunicate, around 1105/6. Henry rose in rebellion against the emperor, and both were seeking the backing of pope Paschal II.

The death of Henry IV ushered in a new epoch in the relationship between the papacy and the for the time being king of Germany, Henry V. While his father had many issues with the papacy, Henry V’s main interest was to gain the right of kingship, ius regni. The label of Investiture Contest would be more adequate for the relationship between Henry V and the

---

24 Robinson, pp. 417-9; Morris, pp. 121-126.
papacy. The outright refusal of Henry to renounce his claims to investiture would persist, in stark contrast with the papacy's relations with other royalty in Europe. The kings of France and England had reached an agreement with pope Paschalis II around 1107. In the case of the English crown, at that point held by Henry I, a dubious agreement was reached. The English crown was able to maintain the control over appointing men of the cloth, but the ceremony of investiture was abolished. Both men, Henry and Paschal, had compromised, as Paschal needed the friendship and finance of the English crown. Henry I could not afford to be excommunicated, as he was planning a invasion of Norman lands on the other side of the Channel. As both men had enough reason to dilute their claims, they were able to reach this agreement.

In France an agreement was reached as well, but unfortunately the sources are failing. They can't tell us if this was done in the English manner, or that the French king, Philip I (and his son Louis VI, who succeeded him in 1108) had completely lost control of over the appointment of clergymen. Encouraged by the ambiguous successes in London and Paris, Paschal was spurred on by the French to negotiate with Henry V. Unfortunately, these talks led nowhere and on the subject of investiture, Henry V and Paschal II remained at a stalemate.

In February of 1111, the stalemate was forcibly broken as Henry, and his 30,000 men strong army had reached Rome. Under this pressure Paschal was forced to meet Henry's demands and relinquished his own. All set to meet Henry's requirements and even crown him the new emperor, Paschal II was, along with several other cardinals, taken prisoner. Two conflicting accounts survive, one suggests a public outrage among those present, when the agreement was made public. An other account suggests the blame for the failed agreement was with Henry himself, refusing to ratify the agreement. Whatever the reason was for the failed attempt, Paschal and the other cardinals remained in custody for two months. Once set free by Henry, he was forced to agree his captor's demands. Henry V was crowned as the Holy Roman emperor and received a papal privilege, which granted him the right to invest the clergy. Henry returned to Germany a content man and pope Paschal was left to face his own party, who he had so unceremoniously betrayed. He was only able to appease his critics by revoking the pravilegium he had granted.

27 The misunderstanding between Henry and the papacy was most likely caused by the so-called regalia, or the secular activities of the clergy: for example tolls, markets and mints. Both parties explained these secular activities in a different way, causing Henry to nullify the agreement.
the emperor, but he refused to break his oath and did not excommunicate Henry.\textsuperscript{28}

In the remainder of his days, Paschal showed no intention to either comply with the demands of Henry, nor those made by his legates, who demanded the emperor be excommunicated. Henry faced recognisable internal unrest in Germany, but had the upper hand in Italian affairs. In 1117 he was able to visit Rome anew, but this time Paschal had retreated to Benevento. Whether this was due to the insurgence within Rome, or the impending return of the emperor to the Eternal City remains debatable, but sources favour the latter possibility. When Paschal passed away in 1118, the papacy and the empire were not closer to solving their conflict.\textsuperscript{29}

Even though the successor to Paschal, Gelasius II, held the pontificate for only year, the relationship between papacy and empire managed to deteriorate even further. One would not expect anything less from the chief advisor of the late pope; Gelasius II was one of the cardinals that shared the experiences with the pope in 1111. Compromise was not an option, not for Paschal II, nor for Gelasius II. Henry further aggravated the conflict by entering Rome by surprise in March 1118, but Gelasius was able to escape to Gaeta. This gave Henry the opportunity to install his own pope, Gregory VIII, but this pushed Gelasius over the edge: he excommunicated the emperor and Gregory VIII as well.\textsuperscript{30}

With the help of papal legates in Germany, pope Gelasius was able to return to Rome. These legates stirred up the rebellion against the emperor, and Henry saw himself compelled to return to Germany to deal with the princes. The luck of Gelasius was changing as he was forced to abandon Rome again after just two months. This second exile was provoked by the violence of the powerful families in Rome. He died in exile, at the beginning of 1119, which induced the election of Guido of Vienne, a Gregorian hard-liner while archbishop, as pope Calixtus II.\textsuperscript{31}

Calixtus was able to reach an agreement with emperor Henry in 1122, after three years of hefty debates.\textsuperscript{32} This agreement, more famously known as the concordat of Worms, was in fact a compromise. Henry was allowed to appoint clergymen, save that there should not be any investiture, conform the solution made in the case of the English crown. As neither party could claim a total victory, the concordat was a mere truce between empire and papacy. As

\textsuperscript{28} Morris, pp. 154-161.
\textsuperscript{29} Robinson, pp. 428-31.
\textsuperscript{30} Gregory VIII, or Archbishop Maurice of Braga, ruled for 3 years (1118-1121) but was only recognised in the rebellious parts of Rome and the rest of the papal patrimony.
\textsuperscript{31} Robinson, pp. 431-2.
\textsuperscript{32} The agreement seems to have been forced upon Henry, rebellious voices within the empire demanded peace from Henry, and they were rewarded. The crux of the agreement lies with it being a ‘temporary’ solution, as Calixtus was able to clarify to his Gregorian constituency. The deal was only effectual for Henry V himself, none of his successors were able to fall back on the concordat.
such, it would function for about 30 years, until the emergence of the renowned Frederick I Barbarossa.\textsuperscript{33}

While the peace was settled and delineated, there was still room for different interpretations. Especially in the field of the \textit{regalia} the papacy was willing and able to disregard rights conceded to the emperor. Further success for the papacy followed after emperor Henry V died childless in 1125. The papacy was able to safeguard the election of their ally Lothar III as the new German king, at the expense of Henry’s designated heir, Frederick II of Staufen. And the papacy got what they were looking for, as the royal control of episcopal elections diminished over the years.\textsuperscript{34}

As the papacy had achieved peace with the emperor, it was finally able to return to the Lateran in Rome. The palace was in need of a reconstruction, and Calixtus II started these operations. It is unlikely he was able to see the finished results, as Calixtus passed away and a new pope was elected. A shift from electing Roman/South-Italian cardinals to French/North-Italian cardinals was started by Calixtus, as the former group was critical of the concordat. The latter party was able to strengthen their position even further, as their candidate was enthroned as pope Honorius II in late 1124.\textsuperscript{35}

While a schism was avoided in the election of 1124, the bipartisan rift that had appeared was a foreshadowing of troublesome times. In 1130, after the death of Honorius II, a fissure emerged in the papacy as both parties elected their own candidate. The Roman/South-Italian cardinals, who were backed by Roger II of Sicily and the important Roman family of the Pierleoni, elected Peter Pierleoni as Anacletus II. The French/North-Italian cardinals elected Gregorio Papareschi as pope Innocent II. Both of the popes denounced each other and sought the support of the German king Lothar III.\textsuperscript{36}

While Rome was under the control of Anacletus II, Innocent II was forced to retreat, and was only able to return to the see when Anacletus died in 1138. Innocent was able to be recognised as pope by multiple highly respected men of the cloth, the most famous among them Bernard of Clairvaux. In 1131 Innocent received the backing of king Lothar as well, in return for the imperial crown, which he received from Innocent in 1133. Regrettably for the both of them, Anacletus’ allies were able to maintain their position in the Leonine City and remained in control of St. Peter’s as well. Lothar was therefore crowned as Holy Roman emperor at the Lateran palace, which was successfully captured by his forces, on the 4\textsuperscript{th} of

\textsuperscript{33} Robinson, pp. 436-39.
\textsuperscript{34} Morris, pp. 162-164.
\textsuperscript{35} Robinson, pp. 440-44; Morris, 169.
June 1133.\(^{37}\)

As the emperor had left for Germany after his coronation, Innocent was forced to flee Rome and once again took shelter in Pisa. Lothar III had to deal with rebellious spirit within Germany, Innocent with the other pope, Anacletus, and his ally Roger II of Sicily, who was advancing in the south of Italy. When in 1135 the rebels were reconciled with the emperor, Innocent seized the opportunity and send out legates to Lothar. These were to make sure Lothar did the just thing and was to march for Rome and end the schism. An other problem was that of the insurgence of Roger II, who was unlawfully crowned king by Anacletus according to Bernard of Clairvaux, and had to be halted and his land reclaimed by the empire.\(^{38}\)

After the defeat of Roger II in 1137, Lothar died on his way home to Germany. The papacy long remembered the late emperor as a model prince.\(^{39}\) Unfortunately his successor, Conrad III, was not as effective in helping the papacy. Roger II of Sicily was able to make Innocent recognise his reign, as well as his hold over Apulia and Calabria. If the approaching danger from the south was not enough, the final months of Innocent II’s reign a danger from within Rome reared its head.\(^{40}\)

In 1138 the schism within the Church was settled with the death of Anacletus II, and Innocent was able to return home. To celebrate this fact, Innocent convoked the clergy and held the Second Lateran Council. At this council the majority of canons, or church rules, were that of councils held during the schism. The papacy was overreaching its limits, as the legal and political obligations of the clergy were drawing criticism. In 1143, months prior to Innocent II’s death, the commune of Rome was established by distinguished families of Rome, in direct dissent with the clergy and derived from an ancient Roman model, the senate.\(^{41}\)

This concludes the historical setting of my research period (1075-1143). The main themes that should be distinguishable are the enduring struggle between papacy and empire over the right to appoint clergymen and later in our period, the empire as the champion of the papacy. Other important themes are the recurrent struggle within the papacy as well as the important fact that the popes were only able to reside in Rome on occasion.

---

37 Robinson, pp. 445-47; Morris, pp. 185-186.
38 Ibid., pp. 449-50.
39 A mural at the St. Nicholas chapel of the Lateran palace may be the cause of this veneration. The now lost work of art, known to us through sketches & descriptions, could have been interpreted as portraying Lothar as a papal liege. In reality the relationship between pope & emperor was much more equivocal, but relations with later emperors may have caused the favourable historiography.
40 Robinson, pp. 450-53.
At this point I would like to return to the question I posed at the beginning of this chapter: *What was the influence of the Investiture Controversy on the inheritance of Rome?* The biggest direct influence that the controversy had was that the papacy was not able to hold Rome, and its monuments, at all times. Besides the papacy being forced out of Rome at times, the city had seen some battles as well. Fortunately this was before the advent of gunpowder to Europe, so real damage was prevented, but still any conflict turning the streets of Rome into a battlefield would not have been advantageous to the monuments and therefore the inheritance of ancient Rome.

![Figure 1: Europe around 1100.](image-url)
The second chapter of my thesis will look into the subquestion: *In what way did the inheritance of ancient Rome contribute to the papacy’s power and the display of it?* This chapter will feature an extensive look into the inheritance of Rome, focusing on the city itself. It will entail a (short) description of the landscape of Rome, clarified and expounded with the help of several medieval sources. For this end I have selected the *Liber Pontificalis*, *Mirabilia Urbis Romae*, the *Liber Politicus*, Hildebert of Lavardin and William of Malmesbury. Next I will describe these sources shortly, providing some background information.

On the sources:
The main source concerning the history of Rome in the medieval period would be the *Liber Pontificalis*, or the book of the popes. A revival of interest in the biographies of the popes took place in our research period. As the original was cut short just before 900, during the time of the Investiture Contest new biographies were written. Not in the same style, or even in the same book, but whenever the need had arisen. Which had led to the critical edition of Louis Duschesne in the late 1800’s.\(^\text{42}\) Duschesne’s edition is the one used for any part of *Liber Pontificalis* that is used or referred to in my thesis. It encompasses all of the biographies of the popes of our research period, as well as an edited form from later times, the *Annales Romani*. The main problem with this source would be the bias towards the popes. In this case it should not matter as I intend to focus on the story of the papacy, concerning the display of power.\(^\text{43}\)

The main source I will use for chapter 2 will be the *Mirabilia Urbis Romae*. The *Mirabilia* is, the oldest version at least, dated somewhere between 1140 and 1143. For this dating, the *Mirabilia* is an appropriate source to use, as it should contain the antiquities known up to 1143. As my research period ends in 1143, the *Mirabilia* will provide a great source to look back at the delineated period.\(^\text{44}\)

The *Mirabilia* contains three major themes: places of interest, legendary descriptions and finally a overview that would be best described as a perambulation of Rome. It is, in itself, a remarkable revivification of the antique *descriptio urbis*.\(^\text{45}\) And especially when one is


\(^{44}\) *Mirabilia Urbis Romae: Die Wunderwerke Der Stadt Rom*. (Freiburg im Breisgau, 2014), p.11.

unfamiliar with Rome and its topography the third part comes across as unclear. However, the former two parts can be enjoyed, even without the knowledge of the topography of Rome. The survival of the Mirabilia can be accounted to its incorporation into the Liber Politicus of the canon Benedict, as well as the over 140 Latin manuscripts in which the text is handed down to us.46

The Liber Politicus can be considered best as an compilation, concerned with different documents. The ordo was the main part of the compilation, it was a script for papal liturgy.47 As explained above, it contained a version of the Mirabilia, as well as a list of patriarchal churches, a list of the crowned days and more.48 The main body encompasses a description of about 40 separate ceremonies, of which 33 were performed by the pope. It is commonly dated 1140-1143, corresponding with the Mirabilia, and compiled by the aforementioned canon Benedict. According to Wickham, the Liber Politicus should be connected to the victorious return of pope Innocent in 1138, and seen in the light of the restoration of (righteous) papal power.49

Born in 1065, near Lavardin, Hildebert was a man of the cloth. He was appointed bishop of Le Mans in 1096 and archbishop of Tours in 1125. In 1101 Hildebert went to Rome for the first time, many visits were to follow. Hildebert wrote on many subjects, our main text will be his poetry on Rome, which he had seen with his own eyes. This visit had made such an impact, that he needed to express himself in poetry. He can be described as one the main protagonists of the twelfth century revival.50

Born around 1095, after his education there, William became a monk in Malmesbury. William’s main interest seems to have been history, as he never moved up in ecclesiastical rank. His main works are the Gesta regum Anglorum (Deeds of the English Kings) and the Gesta pontificum Anglorum (Deeds of the English Bishops). It is in the former that we find a description of Rome around 1100, although this must be informed by others as William is not known for having visited the city himself. He died around 1143, leaving the sequel to the Gesta regum Anglorum, the Historia Novella, unfinished.51

46 Mirabilia Urbis Romae, 2014, pp. 11, 12.
On the physical state of medieval Rome:
Struggling for dominance, papal and imperial forces continued to fight for over 35 years, with only a recurring lack in finances on both sides, inducing a truce. The majority of battles, between papal and imperial factions, were fought in and around the four major strategic points in Rome: the Lateran, St. Peter’s and the Leonine City, Castel San Angelo and the Tiber island.\(^{52}\) This can be illustrated with a fragment of the life of Gregory VII in the *Liber Pontificalis*, in which the siege (and damaging) of the now lost Septizodium is described:

Dehinc Septem solia in quibus Rusticus nepos praedicti pontificis consedebat obsidere cum multis machinationibus attemptavit, de quibus quamplurimas columnas subvertit.\(^{53}\)

The destruction of other parts Rome in 1085 was also described in the biography of Gregory VII. It mentions the destruction of the region where the church of *Sancti Silvestri in Capite* and the *Basilica S. Laurentii in Lucina* stood. It also speaks of a big fire in the area between the Lateran complex and the Colosseum:

Immo ipse cum suis totam regionem illam in qua aecclesiae sancti Silvestri et sancti Laurentii in Lucina site sunt penitus destruxit et fere ad nichilum reedit; dehinc ivit ad castrum sancti Angeli, domnum papam de eo abstraxit secumque Lateranum deduxit, omnesque Romanos depredati coepit et expoliare, atque, quod injuriosum est nuntiare, mulieres dehonestare, regiones illas circa Lateranum et Coloseum positas igne comburere.\(^{54}\)

A third fragment, of the life of Paschalis II, sheds some more light upon ancient monuments still standing strong in our period. Among those mentioned are the temple of Romulus, again the Septizodium, the Circus Maximus and the arch of Constantine:

Et ipsi insecuti sunt eos per omnes vias, scilicet per viam maiorem que pergit ad Sanctum Clementem, dicto marchione cum suis et cum Romani pedites persecuti sunt eos usque prope templum Romuly ante domum iudicis Mattilde; Stephanus Normannus cum ceteris qui cum eo erant iusta ecclesiae sanctorum Marcellini et Petri persecuti sunt eos usque ad arcum Aure; et per viam que pergit ad sanctum Stephanum in Celio monte insecuti sunt eos usque ad Sedem Solis. Postea reversi ad eorum pontifice remearunt ad propria. Necnon et altera pugna inter eis commiserunt in Circolo maiore; et illi


\(^{53}\) Liber Pontificalis, Gregory VII, p. 290, r. 15-17; it was not lost after the described battle; it took another 500 years for the building to be completely gone.

\(^{54}\) Liber Pontificalis, Gregory VII, p. 290, r. 27-31.
On the papacy's revival of Rome:

The first church I will discuss will be *Santa Maria in Trastevere* (from trans Tiberim, i.e. across from the river Tiber). While this is one of the older churches in Rome, founded in the fourth century, it was rebuilt from the foundations during the final years of Innocent II’s reign. This church was, in its refurbishment period, adorned with ancient capitols. The origin of these capitols was the baths of Caracalla, moving them to another place would have been the prerogative of the papacy, in concordance with the *Constitutum Constantini*. The capitols, which represented Egyptian gods as Isis and Serapis, were not connected to a temple in this time, but rather to *Palatia*, a secular building with strong connections to the emperor.

The way the ancient pieces were used inside the church, alluded to any biblical pair, e.g. Adam & Eve, Jesus Christ and the Virgin Mary. As the following text will show, a connection could have been made with emperors and their wives:

> In Transtiberim that is to say, beyond Tiber, where is now Saint Mary, was the temple of the Ravennates, where oil flowed from the earth in the time of the emperor Octavian; and there was the *taberna meritoria* where the soldiers served for wages, that waited without pay in the senate.

The ambience of imperial privilege was the underlying thought of the transfer, the explicit meaning was bilateral; an imperial or a christian one.

The church of Sancti Clementi, near the Colosseum, was replaced between 1100 and 1130. Whatever caused this replication, sheer old age in combination with rising ground levels, the 1084 sack of Rome or a 1091 earthquake is still up for debate. The church had been in a good enough state to host the election of cardinal Rainerius as pope Paschalis II. Nonetheless, the church was revised in a way that it resembled early christian architecture, therefore it should be seen as particular monument to the revival of this building style. While the use of *spolia* is not as rich as with *S. Maria in Trastevere*, multiple ancient Corynthian-style capitals were used as well as medieval copies of this style. A very hypothetical reason for
the thorough renovation of S. Clementi, might have been the strong links that the church had with the anti-pope Clement III, that the church would have remained a focal point of pro-imperial supporters, even after Clement’s death. So as an act of forgetting, alike the ancient Damnatio Memoriae, the church was completely renovated, in order to remove any connotations to the anti-pope.\footnote{Krautheimer, Rome, 1980, p. 161; Joan Barclay Lloyd, “The Building History of the Medieval Church of S. Clemente in Rome.” Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 45-3 (1986), pp. 202-3, 213, 216; Lila Yawn, “Clement’s New Clothes. The Destruction of Old S. Clemente in Rome, the Eleventh-Century Frescoes, and the Cult of (Anti)Pope Clement III” Reti Medievali Rivista 13-1 (2012), p. 31.}

The third church to be discussed, Santi Quattro Coronati, or the Four Holy Crowned Ones, resides across the street from S. Clementi. Unlike the S. Clementi, it had suffered from the ravages in 1084.\footnote{Krautheimer, p. 164.} It was consecrated during the reign of Paschalis (20	extsuperscript{th} January 1110):

\begin{quote}
Qui beatissimus quamplures fecit ordinationes per diversos menses, presbyteros L, diaconos XXX, episcopos numero C. Consecravit ecclesias XX: Rome aecclesiam sancti Adriani in Tribus Fatis II\” anno sui pontificatus dedicavit, et aecclesiam sanctae Mariae positam in regione Areole in loco qui vocatur in Monticelli similiter consecravit; verum etiam ecclesiam sanctorum Quatuor Coronatorum quae tempore Roberti Guiscardi Salernitani principis destructa erat, a fundamentis refecit atque consecravit anno pontificatus sui X\”VII\”, mense ian., die XX\”.\footnote{Liber Pontificalis, Paschal II, p. 305, r. 31-5.}
\end{quote}

The church was not fully restored, a smaller church was put in its place.\footnote{Krautheimer, p.164.} The main proponent that would allude to imperial thought would have been the pavements of the church, specifically the quatrefoil in the centre of the church. The allusion was made with the construction of the quatrefoil out of porphyry (cf. The porphyritic sarcophagus of emperor Hadrian, appropriated by pope Innocent II).\footnote{Dorothy Glass, “Papal Patronage in the Early Twelfth Century: Notes on the Iconography of Cosmatesque Pavements.” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 32 (1969), p. 389-90.}

The final church to be described is the Sancti Crisogonii, located about 150 metres from S. Maria in Trastevere. The early christian building was demolished in 1121, the new complex was finished in 1129. The S. Crisogonii stood out for its extraordinary, best signified by the use of porphyry columns. The building of the church has been seen as a triumphal phase, said to be inspired by the end of the Investiture Contest in 1122. It was outfitted with a new mosaic pavement, marble choir and presbytery enclosures and a marble altar, as well as a marble throne.\footnote{Dale Kinney, “Rome in the Twelfth Century: Urbs Fracta and Renovatio.” Gesta 45-2 (2006), pp. 203, 211.}

\begin{footnotes}
62 Krautheimer, p. 164.
63 Liber Pontificalis, Paschal II, p. 305, r. 31-5.
64 Krautheimer, p.164.
\end{footnotes}
The main theme in church(re)building in our research period seems to be Constantine. Of the four churches that were either rebuilt or renovated; Sancti Clementi, Santa Maria in Trastevere, Santi Quattro Coronati and Sancti Crisogoni, all four of them referred to the early christian churches or basilicas.\(^{67}\) In combination with the Dictatus Papae and the donation of Constantine, the symbolic significance of the Constantinian models of these churches would have been noticeable, not only reviving them, but expanding them as well.\(^{68}\)

On the heritage of ancient Rome:
Rome has been, throughout its history, predominantly characterised by its ancient monuments. While they are hardly ever concretely described, there are some main protagonists in the description of Rome. The papal stronghold of the Septizodium is featured a lot, as is the Castel Sant'angelo. Other oft mentioned monuments are the Colosseum, the Capitolium and as a divide between pagan and christian the Pantheon. It was further described by its statues, for example the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius, which was long adhered as representing Constantine.\(^{69}\)

The other side of Rome, that was seemingly ignorant of historical value, as remains of statuary or architecture became fuel for the lime kilns. This was done mainly to repair the walls that protected Rome's borders. A less destructive, but still destructive, way of handling history were spolia; this practice had been exercised by ancient Romans alike. Parts of ancient buildings were used in contemporary buildings, e.g. capitals, inscriptions, column bases or just plain building blocks.\(^{70}\)

In the following excerpt of William of Malmesbury's Gesta Regum Anglorum (Deeds of the English Kings) Rome is described by referring to the ancient gateways, in relation to churches & martyrs:

---

70 Krautheimer, 1980, pp. 187-8; ; spolia refers to victory, cf. Spoils of war, but in this setting it refers more to claiming ancient pieces to incorporate in contemporary buildings, not a real victory or triumph, but it can be explained as victory of christian Rome over ancient Rome (cf. Hildebert's poem).
The fourth is the Salarian gate and way; now called St. Silvester’s. Here, near the road, lie St. Hermes, and St. Vasella, and Prothus, and Jacinctus, Maxilian, Herculan, Crispus; and, in another place, hard by, rest the holy martyrs Pamphilus and Quirinus, seventy steps beneath the surface. Next is the church of St. Felicity, where she rests, and Silanus her son; and not far distant, Boniface the martyr. In another church, there are Crisantus, and Daria, and Saturninus, and Maurus, and Jason, and their mother Hilaria, and others innumerable. And in another church, St. Alexander, Vitalis, Martiahs, sons of St. Felicity; and seven holy virgins, Saturnina, Hilarina, Duranda, Rogantina, Serotina, Paulina, Donata. Next the church of St. Silvester, where he lies under a marble tomb; and the martyrs, Celestinus, Philippus, and Felix; and there too, the Three Hundred and Sixty-five martyrs rest in one sepulchre; and near them lie Paulus and Crescentianus, Prisca and Semetrius, Praxides and Potentiana.71

The *Mirabilia*, in comparison, starts by listing of ancient buildings and places, after which the author mentions the first real christian places, in connection, again, to the martyrs, and also cemeteries, in the final sections of the first chapter.72 Even when the author takes us to around in tour of the city of Rome, he is able to this by recollecting the ancient monuments (in stead of by churches):

Of the Vatican and the Needle.

Within the Palace of Nero is the temple of Apollo, that is called Saint Parnel; before which is the basilica that is called Vatican, adorned with marvellous mosaic and ceiled with gold and glass. It is therefore called Vatican because in that place the Vates that is to say, the priests, sang their offices before Apollo’s temple, and therefore all that part of St. Peter’s church is called Vatican. There is also another temple, that was Nero’s Wardrobe, which is now called Saint Andrew; nigh whereunto is the memorial of Caesar, that is the Needle, where his ashes nobly rest in his sarcophagus to the intent that as in his lifetime the whole world lay subdued before him, even so in his death the fame may lie beneath him for ever.73

The reality of medieval Rome was that its ancient roots could not be separated from its contemporary branches: ancient Rome was ubiquitous. But at the same time the ancient remains had lost their value, popular imagination was able to reconstruct for example the Colosseum as a temple of the Sun. The story about the statues of the Dioscuri in the *Mirabilia* puts some further emphasis on the loss of antiquity:

...In the time of the emperor Tiberius there came to Rome two young men that were philosophers, named Praxiteles and Phidias, whom

72 Nichols, *Mirabilia Vrbis Romae*, 1889, pp. 1-26; see Appendix IV.
73 Nichols, 1889, pp. 70-2.
the emperor, observing them to be of so much wisdom, kept nigh unto himself in his palace; and he said to them, wherefore do ye go abroad naked? who answered and said: Because all things are naked and open to us, and we hold the world of no account, therefore we go naked and possess nothing; and they said: Whatsoever thou, most mighty emperor, shalt devise in thy chamber by day or night, albeit we be absent, we will tell it thee every word. If ye shall do that ye say, said the emperor, I will give you what thing soever ye shall desire. They answered and said. We ask no money, but only a memorial of us. And when the next day was come, they showed unto the emperor in order whatsoever he had thought of in that night. Therefore he made them the memorial that he had promised, to wit, the naked horses, which trample on the earth, that is upon the mighty princes of the world that rule over the men of this world; and there shall come a full mighty king, which shall mount the horses, that is, upon the might of the princes of this world. Meanwhile there be the two men half naked, which stand by the horses, and with arms raised on high and bent fingers tell the things that are to be; and as they be naked, so is all worldly knowledge naked and open to their minds...

A completely new origin story was associated with the statues of Castor & Pollux, the twin brothers from Greek mythology. The loss of ancient and pagan heritage was also a necessary one, according to Hildebert of Lavardin.

There should, however, be noted that erudition would have made an enormous difference. The learned men of the cloth would have been educated to a level that ancient motifs in paintings, decorations or mosaics were employed in a deliberate manner, not just for aesthetics. This was also made possible due to the death of paganism, the links to ancient mythology and gods alike were gone. <In line with the so-called twelfth-century renaissance (see methodologies)

After the end of the Investiture Contest, in 1122, the papacy was able to claim the leadership of western christianity, as well as the dominance over the secular leaders of the West. This point was further exacerbated by the Constanitutum Constantini, and the Dictatus Papae attributed to pope Gregory VII. The so-called imitatio imperii that was boosted by these documents, enabled the clergy responsible for decorating the churches to appropriate ancient art and give a new life as part of christian tradition. The related change from vicarius Petri to vicarius Christi was only written in stone during the papacy of Innocent III (r.1198-1216), but from Gregory onward, popes would use this alternate titulature on

---

74 Krautheimer, 1980, pp. 188-9; Nichols, 1889, pp. 39-41.
75 See Appendix III below: Hildebert first concentrates on the loss of the ancients, and in the second part celebrates the christian success.
76 Krautheimer, 1980, p. 189; not gone forever, as people in the Renaissance were eager to learn on these subjects.
78 Ibid., p. 189.
occasion. As the title *vicarius Christi* had been used by the kings of German empire, the assumption by the papacy, albeit not official, refers, again, to *imitatio imperii*.79

The revival of twelfth century Rome has been described as threefold; the first stage, *conservatio*, the second as *restauratio*, and the third as *renovatio triumphans*. The first starts 1050, well before our research period and ends around 1100, after a period that the legitimate popes were not able to hold Rome. The second period starts around 1100 unto the end of the Investiture Contest, and is signified by the changes to the churches of *S. Clementi* and *S. Quattro Coronati*. The third period, the *renovatio triumphans*, is signified by the rich adornment of *S. Maria in Trastevere* and *S. Crisogno*, and was driven by the Concordat of Worms.80

The trouble with effectuating this change was that, as we have seen in ch. 1, Rome was not under the influence of the reform popes, at all times. Control of Rome was only regained by Paschal II, around 1100, and still there were multiple periods of absence of a legitimate pope in Rome. When given the opportunity the popes, or their subordinates, would dedicate, rededicate, renovate and refurbish churches, in line with the *imitatio imperii*.81

An other important factor in the renewal of Rome, after the Investiture Contest, was the written word, i.e. inscriptions, not just through *spolia*, but newly carved ones as well. This was done to give ancient spaces and monuments a new meaning, in full coherence with one of our sources: the *Mirabilia*. A new Rome was created out of the old, not just in form, but also in meaning.82

In these concluding remarks on this chapter, I would like to return to the posed subquestion: *In what way did the inheritance of ancient Rome contribute to the papacy’s power and the display of it?* The first remark would be that throughout our defined research period Rome was not always in hands of the (legitimate) papacy. When this was not the case, the papacy was able to claim ancient Rome, mainly through the use of *spolia*, in a bifold manner: to show that christian Rome had risen, like a phoenix, from the ruins of ancient Rome. On the other hand the papacy was able to claim the connection to Constantine, the *imitatio imperii*, through the churches that were restored and renovated.

Figure 2: Map of medieval Rome

The plan is intended to illustrate the history of the city of Rome in the Middle Ages, but the names of a few buildings of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are also inserted. The names of the churches, from which Cardinal-Priests and Cardinal-Deacons derived their titles are given in their Italian or English forms. The list is not exhaustive.
Figure 3: Map of ancient Rome
Chapter 3 – Case study: Display of power? Papal adventus

The final chapter of my thesis will take a closer look at one of the ceremonies of the medieval papacy, the adventus. In this chapter I will try to find out if, and in which way the papacy was able to display its power through this ceremony. The subquestion that corresponds with the following chapter is: How was liturgical ceremonial able to contribute to papal power?

On adventus:

Adventus, which was integrally adopted from the ancient Roman emperors, was in effect a ritual reception of the ruler. The road to adoption of the ritual by the papacy was opened by the conversion of the Roman empire to Christianity. This change is attributed to the emperor Constantine, hence his suffix ‘The Great,’ but it was not until emperor Theodosius I and his edict of Thessalonica in 380 that the pagan religion was pushed back and even prohibited (around 390-3). The change to Christianity would lay the basis for the opportunity of the popes to strive for power, as they were representatives of God on earth and the emperors relation with the divine had diminished.83

The other public ritual that was performed by Roman emperors, and victorious generals of the Republic alike, was the triumphus. The connotation of the triumphus was victory, and somewhere in history, most likely Constantine’s victory over Maxentius at the Milvian bridge over the river Tiber (modern-day Rome), the two rituals merged. This would translate to the papal procession, on major liturgical days, passing beneath as much victory arches in Rome as possible. And as if this would not suffice as symbolism, on the coronation day of the pope, and the annual re-enactment of it on Easter Monday alike, temporary arches were set up, probably constructed out of plants and flowers, but more expensive materials were used as well. As noted by Twyman the evocation of the imperial past would not have been lost on the audience.84

83 Twyman, Papal Ceremonial, 2002, p. 6-7; the ancient Roman ritual had its roots with the rituals of the Hellenistic kings, hypantesis or apantesis, in which they were heralded as the representative of the gods. Which would condone the papacy adopting the ritual, as they were the representative of God on earth.
84 Ibid., pp. 8-9, 210-11.
This loosely translates in Udoalscalcus describing the pope's (Calixtus II) *adventus* in 1120 as a magnificent triumphant entry in to Rome, that would have impressed Caesar and Cicero alike. Claiming the *adventus* not as a secular ceremony, but as an ecclesiastical triumph (cf. Chapter 1).  

While the adoption of the *adventus* had a definite vibe of the *renovatio Romae* heralded by the papacy, the *adventus* had a definite christian energy as well. The *adventus* appealed to the imagery of the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem, on Palm Sunday:

12 The next day the great crowd that had come for the festival heard that Jesus was on his way to Jerusalem.
13 They took palm branches and went out to meet him, shouting, “Hosanna![a]” “Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord!”[b] “Blessed is the king of Israel!”
14 Jesus found a young donkey and sat on it, as it is written:
15 “Do not be afraid, Daughter Zion; see, your king is coming, seated on a donkey’s colt.”
16 At first his disciples did not understand all this. Only after Jesus was glorified did they realize that these things had been written about him and that these things had been done to him.
17 Now the crowd that was with him when he called Lazarus from the tomb and raised him from the dead continued to spread the word.
18 Many people, because they had heard that he had performed this sign, went out to meet him.
19 So the Pharisees said to one another, “See, this is getting us nowhere. Look how the whole world has gone after him!”

This christian theme had been picked up since late antiquity and had effect on art as well. The two themes were interacting with each other, as christian authors appropriated imperial titulature in their description of Christ and his following.  

The goal of this reciprocal influence, and the goal of any symbolism attached to the event of *adventus* was, according to Twyman, political propaganda. The comprehensiveness of the ritual was to cloak the sensitivity of the arrival of a new power, as it might induce questions of legitimacy. The focus of the *adventus* was not upon propagating leadership, but more upon laying down the laws of that leadership. So not a clarification of the rules, but more a statement that the rules were in affect once again. This is especially relevant

---

considering the existence, throughout our research period, of anti-popes, and due to the absence of the papacy, the rise of the Roman nobility.\(^\text{88}\)

**Extra-mural adventus:**
As there are no contemporary sources that give a detailed route for an extra-mural adventus, the following text refers to an intra-mural adventus. To be exact, the re-enactment of the coronation ritual, performed on Easter Monday. It is highly likely that we owe it to this repetitive character that this route is known to us today:\(^\text{89}\)

This having been finished, he is crowned before the basilica of Saint Peter in the place where he gets on a horse and, crowned, returns to the palace with a procession along the Via Sacra, through the portico and the aforementioned bridge, entering under the triumphal arch of the Emperors Theodosius, Valentinian and Gratian, and alongside the palace of Chromacius, where the Jews praise him.

Going up through the Parione between the Circus of Alexander and the theater of Pompey, he goes down through the gate of Agrippina and goes up through Pinea next to the Palatine, going up before Saint Mark and under the arch of the Golden Bread through the hill of the silversmiths between the island of the same name and the capitol, he goes down in front of the Mamertine Prison; he enters under the triumphal arch between the Temple of Fate and the Temple of Concord, going forth between Forum of Trajan and the Forum of Caesar.

He enters under the arch of Nerva between the temple of the same goddess and the temple of Janus, and he ascends in front of the granite sanctuary where Simon Magus died, next to the temple of Romulus.

He goes through the triumphal arch of Titus and Vespasian, which is called the ‘Arch of the Seven Lamps’, and goes down to the ‘Sweating Pyramid’ in front of the triumphal arch of Constantine, turning left in front of the amphitheatre and returning to the Lateran along the Via Sacra next to the Colosseum.

There, received with honour and the praises of the cardinals and judges, he goes up to the palace and gives the presbyterium and celebrates a feast in that same Leonine church. After the feast, he goes down to Vespers and performs the office as it is written.\(^\text{90}\)

The text, the *Liber Politicus*, describes the ceremonial route that the papal procession would follow. In comparison to the adventus the route would be shorter, as with an adventus the pope would be greeted outside the city, before either going on to St. Peter’s basilica or, in a later stage in time, on to the Lateran complex. However, as we have seen in chapter 2, Rome’s landscape was filled with monuments and monumental churches alike. By moving through

\(^\text{89}\) Ibid., p. 175.
\(^\text{90}\) *Liber Politicus*, c.51; translation provided by Ms. Kati Ihnat, reader for research seminar: Ceremonies as Invented Tradition (2017/8).
certain (ancient) areas, a connection with the political power represented by ancient monuments could be made as well, for example by passing under surviving triumphal arches.\footnote{Chris Wickham, \textit{Medieval Rome: Stability and Crisis of a City, 950-1150}, (Oxford, 2015), pp. 383-4.}

The extra-mural \textit{adventus} was performed, in the majority of instances known in our period, in connection to the election of a new bishop of Rome. In the decades leading up to 1075 popes had been nominated by the Holy Roman emperor, outside of Rome. If the new popes had been able to make their way to Rome fairly quick after their nomination there was no trouble to be foreseen. The trouble began when a pope was unable to enter Rome, an event that happened to occur several times in our period (cf. ch. 1). The most notable names that were not able to enter Rome right after their election were Calixtus II & Innocent II.\footnote{Twyman, 2002, pp. 89-91; Calixtus was elected at Cluny, Innocent had to compete with a strong antipope (Anacletus II).}

When a pope had not been able to enter Rome for a while, the connection between the \textit{adventus} and the assumption of the papal throne was harder to establish. To this end their was more emphasis on the rituals that were closely associated with Rome and the twofold leadership of the pope, both secular and spiritual. In the case of Calixtus there is actually a second \textit{adventus}, which referred to Calixtus' victory over the anti-pope Gregory VIII. This is shortly referenced in Falco of Benevento's \textit{Chronicum}:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

A later biography of Calixtus, written by Boso between 1159-1178, seems to mix the two events, giving Calixtus more credit (and power) then was due.\footnote{Twyman, 2002, p.97; \textit{Liber Pontificalis}, pp.376-7.}

As we have seen (ch. 1) Innocent's papacy was marked by a tenacious struggle with the anti-pope Anacletus II. After having fled Rome in 1130, Innocent was able to enter Rome, albeit briefly and with the help of emperor Lothar, in 1133.
Innocent was able to claim the Lateran palace and take his seat on the throne there. Other sources suggest that, even though popes were chosen and even sworn in at a different place, when they first returned to Rome, the ritual was performed as if the former events never happened. Unfortunately for my research, there is no clear route known, at least not for the designated period in time, for the extra-mural *adventus*. The changes in this ritual, however, can be discerned and will be tested to my hypothesis in the next section.96

On the eve of the Investiture Contest, in 1059, a precedent was set involving pope Nicholas II, who was elected outside of Rome, in a papal decree:

...Wenn aber die Verworfenseit der schändenden un ungerechten Menschen so stark geworden sein sollte, dass eine reine, echte und entgeltliche Wahl in der Stadt (Rom) nicht stattfinden kann, dan sollen die Kardinalbischöfe zusammen mit den gottesfürchtigen Klerikern und katholische Laien – auch wenn es nur wenige sein sollten – die rechtliche Vollmacht besitzen, den Bischof des apostolischen Sitzes dort zu wählen, wo es ihnen nach ihrer Meinung angemessener erscheint.

Wenn ein kriegerische Zeit oder irgendein Anschlag von Menschen nach dem vollständigen Ablauf der Wahl mit dem Eifer der Bosheit verhindert, dass derjenige, der gewählt wurde, entsprechend der Gepflogenheit auf dem apostolischen Stuhl inthronisiert werden kann, dann soll der Elekt dennoch wie ein Papst die Befugnis besitzen, die heilige römische Kirche zu leiten und über alle ihre Güter verfügen, denn wir wissen, dass der selige Gregor dies vor seiner Weihe getan hat...97

One year later a small edit was made to the decree, the difference was made between “as if he were already pope” and “as if he were already enthroned.”

95 Chronicon, Falco of Benevento.
In 1179, at the Third Lateran Council, it was ruled that the electoral process of a new pope was the only viable and lawful base of the papacy (see appendix V).

This process, described by Twyman as *Entsymbolisierung*, must be viewed in concordance with the papacy’s *renovatio Romae*. The papacy had been cut loose from the ties to the city of Rome, enabling the pope to be a pope from the moment of election. With the regional ties more or less severed, the international character of the papacy as the leader of the church was able to expand.\(^{99}\)

While the enthronement of the pope was no longer required, under normal circumstances it was still a viable part of the accession of the new pope. The changing nature of the enthronement led to the situation in which the *sedes Petri*\(^ {100}\) would not have to play a physical part in the enthronement, other thrones would suffice. This allowed for a change of scenery, again in agreement with the *renovatio Romae*. From the 12\(^{th}\) century onwards, the Lateran basilica was to be connected with the inauguration ritual. The reason for the shift in location, as with the *adventus* itself, was plural.\(^ {101}\)

Firstly, the Lateran basilica was deemed the 'proper' papal residence, as is reflected in the biography of Paschal II in the *Liber Pontificalis*:

\[
... \text{ab ipsis patribus honorifice est deportata in basilicam Salvatoris, in sede propria, in patriarchio, dextro latere templi, in mausoleo purissimi marmoris talapsico...}
\]

This position was further strengthened by the papacy choosing the Lateran basilica as their final resting place; 10 out of 12 12\(^{th}\) century popes who passed away in Rome, were buried there. A second reason for the preference of the Lateran basilica was its connotations with Constantine, following the revival of the *Constitutum Constantini*.

\[
... \text{In return for which, to those same holy apostles, my masters, St.}
\]

---

100 The chair of St. Peter, or the papal throne
Peter and St. Paul; and, through them, also to St. Sylvester, our father, — the chief pontiff and universal pope of the city of Rome, — and to all the pontiffs his successors, who until the end of the world shall be about to sit in the seat of St. Peter: we concede and, by this present, do confer, our imperial Lateran palace, which is preferred to, and ranks above, all the palaces in the whole world; then a diadem, that is, the crown of our head, and at the same time the tiara; and, also, the shoulder band, — that is, the collar that usually surrounds our imperial neck; and also the purple mantle, and crimson tunic, and all the imperial raiment; and the same rank as those presiding over the imperial cavalry; conferring also the imperial sceptres, and, at the same time, the spears and standards; also the banners and different imperial ornaments, and all the advantage of our high imperial position, and the glory of our power.

The third reasoning was that the Lateran basilica was strongly identified with the temple at Jerusalem, there were even claims of the Ark of the Covenant’s presence at the basilica, identifying the Lateran as the New Temple of Jerusalem.

The aforementioned changes to the adventus were in line with the renovatio Romae, and with the so-called imitatio imperii. Both ideas were stressed and underlined in the Investiture Contest, and the importance of Constantine’s donation was augmented with the Dictatus Papae ascribed to Gregory VII (1075) (see appendix II), especially for dictates 7-9, and 12:

“That for him alone is it lawful, according to the needs of the time, to make new laws, to assemble together new congregations, to make an abbey of a canonry; and, on the other hand, to divide a rich bishopric and unite the poor ones.”

“That he alone may use the imperial insignia.”

“That of the pope alone all princes shall kiss the feet.”

“That it may be permitted to him to depose emperors.”

One of the main corollary of the Dictatus Papae, was the possibility for the papacy to claim all imperial insignia (see the excerpt of the CC above). Which happened right away, especially considering papal attire; coronation became papal prerogative, not just the mitre, but an actual diadem which, in combination with enmantling, was a clear evocation of the ancient empire.

The biggest influence on the papacy was the election decree of 1059, as the election process of the pope was only to include cardinals. The people of Rome, mostly the nobility,

104 Henderson, Select Historical Documents, 1912, pp. 366-367.
who had been involved in the electoral process up to that point, were put out of play. The fact that the pope was the ruler from the moment he was elected, made the separation of the double role of the papacy possible. The pope as the head of the Western christian church was prioritised over the pope as a bishop and lord of Rome. This would lead to the rise and the power base of the anti-popes, in whose elections the populus and lower clergy did play a part.106

This antithesis is best outlined by the schism of 1130 (cf. ch. 1) in which the popes Innocent and Anacletus were reliant on those opposing roles of the papacy. Innocent was able to receive international backing from kings of France, England and Germany, as well as Bernard of Clairvaux. Anacletus had Rome itself as a base of conduct, supported by the Roman people and Roger II of Sicily. Pope Innocent II did come out on top, but only after the death of Anacletus II. There was a need for Innocent to show his Romanness.

That the imitatio imperii did not work in the end can be established by the rise of the commune. The trouble is that imitatio imperii was not aimed at the Romans primarily. As Twyman states, “the true theatre for the imitatio imperii were the episcopal cities and monastic centres of northern Europe. The increase of the use of adventus in the 12th century is evident, but it is highly ironic as the inability to control Rome increased as well. And yet, the symbolism of the pope entering and moving through Rome, along multiple ancient and medieval monuments would have a positive influence on the image of the pope, especially as a symbol of power.107

Through circumstances the city of Rome was subordinated in favour of Western christianity as a whole. The trouble with this disadvantageous position was that the people of Rome were used to be involved in the process of electing a pope. So for our period there was not a great change in the ritual, as the papacy could not do without the people of Rome, even if this meant that they had to negotiate the terms to enter Rome. The symbolism that was evoked with the ritual of the adventus was able to help the papacy demonstrate its power, it was the focus on Western christianity (and the Investiture Contest) as whole that caused the instability in Rome.108

Viewed in line with these big ideas, it is rather ironic that the papacy was able to enlarge its influence in medieval Europe, yet the control over its own see was becoming more unreliable. Ultimately ending, at the end of our research period, in the commune di Roma.109

107 Ibid., pp. 221-23.
108 Twyman, pp. 224-25.
As a conclusion to this chapter I will answer the subquestion I have posed at the beginning of the chapter: *How was liturgical ceremonial able to contribute to papal power?* The answer is twofold: symbolism and Rome's landscape. The symbolism of the *adventus* as imperial and christian meant that any time a pope performed an *adventus*, the ritual would (try to) invoke these symbolisms in the audience. This was strengthened by Rome's landscape on the one hand, that would emphasise the power of the church and the papacy due to the juxtaposition of the ancient ruins and its imposing churches, through which the pope went on his way to either St. Peter's or the Lateran basilica. And on the other hand amplified by the use of imperial insignia.

![Figure 4: Map of medieval Rome - Focus on the churches](image)
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Conclusion

As I have stated in the introduction of this thesis, I have attempted to investigate the following research question:

In what way was the use of the inheritance of ancient Rome, in the representation of medieval papal power, subject to change in the period 1075-1143?

In this conclusion I will look at each chapter and its conclusion, before arriving at a overall conclusion.

Chapter one revolved around the historical setting of the research period, and tried to answer the question: What was the influence of the Investiture Controversy on the inheritance of Rome? The Investiture Controversy did involve actual warfare, it was not a mere battle of words. Therefore the physical influence the conflict had, was actual damage to Rome, for example the disastrous year of 1084. The physical influence is further worked out in chapter 2. The immaterial, or spiritual influence of the Investiture Controversy was the intermittent absence of the (legitimate) papacy from Rome, in return for which the papacy was able to expand its power over the christian church. The former effect lead, eventually to the commune, at the end of our research period, while the latter effect provided a breeding ground for the association with ancient Rome, and of course, the start of the papal monarchy.

In chapter two I discussed the question: In what way did the inheritance of ancient Rome contribute to the papacy’s power and the display of it? The answer to this subquestion is twofold. The papacy was able to use the ancient past to contrast with the glorious christian present, as did Hildebert in his famous poem. The papacy was also able to ascertain ancient imperial imagery by building or rebuilding churches in an early christian manner. The effect of spolia used in the construction of early twelfth century churches is on the hand a further emphasis of the rise of christianity from the ruins of ancient Rome. On the other side, the use of spolia reinforced the imitatio imperii that was evoked by the early christian building style. The meaning of any ancient artefact, as I have tried to show, was not of importance, that there was an ancient artefact used in a church was more important. Which doesn't mean that those in charge did not now, perhaps not for every bit of spolia, all in all the people in charge of renovations or rebuilding would have known what they took. An important side note to all of the aforementioned is that the control over Rome had to be re-established by the papacy
on several occasions. And even anti-popes were, eventually, not a problem, as any building programme started by such a usurper, could be rededicated once the legitimate pope had taken control of Rome, provided he would be alive.

The last chapter of my thesis, concerning the case study of papal adventus, tried to answer the following subquestion: How was liturgical ceremonial able to contribute to papal power? The answer is, yet again, twofold. First the symbolism that the ritual of adventus would try to invoke in the audience, was part christian, as it referred the entry of Christ in Jerusalem. The other part of the symbolism alluded to imperial Rome, as the emperors of Rome had partaken in the same ritual. The actual remains of that former glory in Rome itself, were eagerly used in papal ritual, as they were able to give the pope more eminence. Again, in combination with the juxtaposition of ruins and 'new' churches, the glorious present would be heralded by any ritual that passed through the city. Papal use of imperial insignia, made possible through the Constitutum Constantini as well as the Dictatus Papae, further emphasised the imitatio imperii, emulated by the papacy.

Now to provide an answer to the main research question: In what way was the use of the inheritance of ancient Rome, in the representation of medieval papal power, subject to change in the period 1075-1143? The papacy would have used, on whatever scale, the inheritance of ancient Rome prior to our research period. The struggle for power of investiture and with imperial forces alike, seems to have put this use only into further acceleration. Propagated with the falsified Constitutum Constantini and emphasised with the Dictatus Papae, the papacy was able to equate themselves to the emperor. As they did not yield or concede in the years following our research period, the so-called papal monarchy was able to gain momentum, reaching its pinnacle at the end of the twelfth century. For our period, the equation with the empire could not avert the rise of the Roman commune. The spells of absence from Rome, left a power vacuum, seized upon by the noble families of Rome. The use of ancient Rome's inheritance was intensified in our period, in the areas of ritual and architecture, cast into legality by Gregory VII and brought forth by power struggles with the other emulator of ancient Rome.
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I: Constitutum Constantini

In the name of the holy and indivisible Trinity, the Father, namely, and the Son and the Holy Spirit. The emperor Caesar Flavius Constantine in Christ Jesus, the Lord I God our Saviour, one of that same holy Trinity, — faithful merciful, supreme, beneficent, Alamannic, Gothic, Sarmatic, Germanic, Britannic, Hunic, pious, fortunate, victor and triumph, always august: to the most holy and blessed father of fathers Sylvester, bishop of the city of and to all his successors the pontiffs, who are about to sit upon Rome and pope, the chair of St. Peter until the end of time — also to all the most reverend and of God beloved catholic bishops, subjected by this our imperial decree throughout the whole world to this same holy, Roman church, who have been established now and in all previous times — grace, peace, charity, rejoicing, long-suffering, mercy, be with you all from God the Father almighty and from Jesus Christ his Son and from the Holy Ghost. Our most gracious serenity desires, in clear discourse, through the page of this our imperial decree, to bring to the knowledge of all the people in the whole world what things our Saviour and Redeemer the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the most High Father, has most wonderfully seen fit to bring about through his holy apostles Peter and Paul and by the intervention of our father Sylvester, the highest pontiff and the universal pope. First, indeed, putting forth, with the inmost confession of our heart, for the purpose of instructing the mind of all of you, our creed which we have learned from the aforesaid most blessed father and our confessor, Sylvester the universal pontiff; and then at length announcing the mercy of God which has been poured upon us.

For we wish you to know, as we have signified through our former imperial decree, that we have gone away, from the worship of idols, from mute and deaf images made by hand, from devilish contrivances and from all the pomps of Satan; and have arrived at the pure faith of the christians, which is the true light and everlasting life. Believing, according to what he — that same one, our revered supreme father and teacher, the pontiff Sylvester — has taught us, in God the Father, the almighty maker of Heaven and earth, of all things visible and invisible; and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord God, through whom all things are created; and in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and vivifier of the whole creature. We confess these, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, in such way that, in the perfect Trinity, there shall also be a fullness of divinity and a unity of power. The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God; and these three are one in Jesus Christ.

There are therefore three forms but one power. For God, wise in all previous time, gave forth from himself the word through which all future ages were to be born; and when, by that sole word of His wisdom, He formed the whole creation from nothing, He was with it, arranging all things in His mysterious secret place.

Therefore, the virtues of the Heavens and all the material part of the earth having been perfected, by the wise nod of His wisdom first creating man of the clay of the earth in His own image and likeness, He placed him in a paradise of delight. Him the ancient serpent and envious enemy, the devil, through the most bitter taste of the forbidden tree, made an exile from these joys; and, being expelled, did not cease in many ways to cast his poisonous darts; in order that, turning the human race from the way of truth to the worship of idols, he might persuade it, namely to worship the creature and not the creator; so that,
through them (the idols), he might cause those whom he might be able to entrap in his snares to be burned with him in eternal punishment. But our Lord, pitying His creature, sending ahead His holy prophets, announcing through them the light of the future life — the coming, that is, of His Son our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ — sent that same only begotten Son and Word of wisdom: He descending from Heaven on account of our salvation, being born of the Holy Spirit and of the Virgin Mary, — the word was made flesh and dwelt among us. He did not cease to be what He had been, but began to be what He had not been, perfect God and perfect man: as God, performing miracles; as man, sustaining human sufferings. We so learned Him to be very man and very God by the preaching of our father Sylvester, the supreme pontiff, that we can in no wise doubt that He was very, God and very man. And, having chosen twelve apostles, He shone with miracles before them and an innumerable multitude of people. We confess that this same Lord Jesus Christ fulfilled the law and the prophets; that He suffered, was crucified, on the third day arose from the dead according to the Scriptures; was received into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father. Whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end. For this is our orthodox creed, placed before us by our most blessed father Sylvester, the supreme pontiff. We exhort, therefore, all people, and all the different nations, to hold, cherish and preach this faith; and, in the name of the Holy Trinity, to obtain the grace of baptism; and, with devout heart, to adore the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour, who with the Father and the Holy Spirit, lives and reigns through infinite ages; whom Sylvester our father, the universal pontiff, preaches. For He himself, our Lord God, having pit on me a sinner, sent His holy apostles to visit us, and caused the light of his splendour to shine upon us. And do ye rejoice that I, having been withdrawn from the shadow, have come to the true light and to the knowledge of truth. For, at a time when a mighty and filthy leprosy had invaded all the flesh of my body, and the care was administered of many physicians who came together, nor by that of any one of them did I achieve health: there came hither the priests of the Capitol, saving to me that a font should be made on the Capitol, and that I should fill this with the blood of innocent infants; and that, if I bathed in it while it was warm, I might be cleansed. And very many innocent infants having been brought together according to their words, when the sacrilegious priests of the pagans wished them to be slaughtered and the font to be filled with their blood: Our Serenity perceiving the tears of the mothers, I straight away abhorred the deed. And, pitying them, I ordered their own sons to be restored to them; and, giving them vehicles and gifts, sent them off rejoicing to their own. That day having passed therefore — the silence of night having come upon us — when the time of sleep had arrived, the apostles St. Peter and Paul appear, saying to me: “Since thou hast placed a term to thy vices, and hast abhorred the pouring forth of innocent blood, we are sent by, Christ the Lord our God, to give to thee a plan for recovering thy health. Hear, therefore, our warning, and do what we indicate to thee. Sylvester — the bishop of the city of Rome — on Mount Serapte, fleeing they persecutions, cherishes the darkness with his clergy in the caverns of the rocks. This one, when thou shalt have led him to thyself, will himself show thee a pool of piety; in which, when he shall have dipped thee for the third time, all that strength of the leprosy will desert thee. And, when this shall have been done, make this return to thy Saviour, that by thy order through the whole world the churches may be restored. Purify thyself, moreover, in this way, that, leaving all the superstition of idols, thou do adore and cherish the living and true God — who is alone and true — and that thou attain to
the doing of His will."

Rising, therefore, from sleep, straight away I did according to that which I had been advised to do by, the holy apostles; and, having summoned that excellent and benignant father and our enlightener — Sylvester the universal pope — I told him all the words that had been taught me by the holy apostles; and asked him who where those gods Peter and Paul. But he said that they where not really called gods, but apostles of our Saviour the Lord God Jesus Christ. And again we began to ask that same most blessed pope whether he had some express image of those apostles; so that, from their likeness, we might learn that they were those whom revelation bad shown to us. Then that same venerable father ordered the images of those same apostles to be shown by his deacon. And, when I had looked at them, and recognized, represented in those images, the countenances of those whom I had seen in my dream: with a great noise, before all my satraps, I confessed that they were those whom I had seen in my dream.

Hereupon that same most blessed Sylvester our father, bishop of the city of Rome, imposed upon us a time of penance — within our Lateran palace, in the chapel, in a hair garment, — so that I might obtain pardon from our Lord God Jesus Christ our Saviour by vigils, fasts, and tears and prayers, for all things that had been impiously done and unjustly ordered by me. Then through the imposition of the hands of the clergy, I came to the bishop himself; and there, renouncing the pomps of Satan and his works, and all idols made by hands, of my own will before all the people I confessed: that I believed in God the Father almighty, maker of Heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; and in Jesus Christ, His only Son our Lord, who was born of the Holy Spirit and of the Virgin Mary. And, the font having been blessed, the wave of salvation purified me there with a triple immersion. For there I, being placed at the bottom of the font, saw with my own eyes a band from Heaven touching me; whence rising, clean, know that I was cleansed from all the squalor of leprosy. And, I being raised from the venerable font — putting on white raiment, be administered to me the sign of the seven-fold holy Spirit, the unction of the holy oil; and he traced the sign of the holy cross on my brow, saying: God seals thee with the seal of His faith in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, to signalize thy faith. All the clergy replied: "Amen." The bishop added, "peace be with thee."

And so, on the first day after receiving the mystery of the holy baptism, and after the cure of my body from the squalor of the leprosy, I recognized that there was no other God save the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit; whom the most blessed Sylvester the pope doth preach; a trinity in one, a unity in three. For all the gods of the nations, whom I have worshipped up to this time, are proved to be demons; works made by the hand of men; inasmuch as that same venerable father told to us most clearly how much power in Heaven and on earth He, our Saviour, conferred on his apostle St. Peter, when finding him faithful after questioning him He said: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock (petrani) shall I build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Give heed ye powerful, and incline the ear of your hearts to that which the good Lord and Master added to His disciple, saying: "and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in Heaven, and whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed also in Heaven." This is very wonderful and glorious, to bind and loose on earth and to have it bound and loosed in Heaven.

And when, the blessed Sylvester preaching them, I perceived these things, and learned that by the
kindness of St. Peter himself I had been entirely restored to health: I — together with all our satraps and the whole senate and the nobles and all the Roman people, who are subject to the glory of our rule — considered it advisable that, as on earth he (Peter) is seen to have been constituted vicar of the Son of God, so the pontiffs, who are the representatives of that same chief of the apostles, should obtain from us and our empire the power of a supremacy greater than the earthly clemency of our imperial serenity is seen to have had conceded to it,—we choosing that same prince of the apostles, or his vicars, to be our constant intercessors with God. And, to the extent of our earthly imperial power, we decree that his holy Roman church shall be honoured with veneration; and that, more than our empire and earthly throne, the most sacred seat of St. Peter shall be gloriously exalted; we giving to it the imperial power, and dignity of glory, and vigour and honour.

And we ordain and decree that he shall have the supremacy as well over the four chief seats Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople and Jerusalem, as also over all the churches of God in the whole world. And he who for the time being shall be pontiff of that holy Roman church shall be more exalted than, and chief over, all the priests of the whole world; and, according to his judgement, everything which is to be provided for the service of God or the stability of the faith of the christians is to be administered. It is indeed just, that there the holy law should have the seat of its rule where the founder of holy laws, our Saviour, told St. Peter to take the chair of the apostleship; where also, sustaining the cross, he blissfully took the cup of death and appeared as imitator of his Lord and Master; and that there the people should bend their necks at the confession of Christ’s name, where their teacher, St. Paul the apostle, extending his neck for Christ, was crowned with martyrdom. There, until the end, let them seek a teacher, where the holy body of the teacher lies; and there, prone and humiliated, let them perform I the service of the heavenly king, God our Saviour Jesus Christ, where the proud were accustomed to serve under the rule of an earthly king.

Meanwhile we wish all the people, of all the races and nations throughout the whole world, to know: that we have constructed within our Lateran palace, to the same Saviour our Lord God Jesus Christ, a church with a baptistery from the foundations. And know that we have carried on our own shoulders from its foundations, twelve baskets weighted with earth, according to the number of the holy apostles. Which holy church we command to be spoken of, cherished, venerated and preached of, as the head and summit of all the churches in the whole world — as we have commanded through our other imperial decrees. We have also constructed the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, chiefs of the apostles, which we have enriched with gold and silver; where also, placing their most sacred bodies with great honour, we have constructed their caskets of electrum, against which no force of the elements prevails. And we have placed a cross of purest gold and precious gems on each of their caskets, and fastened them with golden keys. And on these churches for the endowing of divine services we have conferred estates, and have enriched them with different objects; and, through our sacred imperial decrees, we have granted them our gift of land in the East as well as in the West; and even on the northern and southern coast; — namely in Judea, Greece, Asia, Thrace, Africa and Italy and the various islands: under this condition indeed, that all shall be administered by the hand of our most blessed father the pontiff Sylvester and his successors.
For let all the people and the nations of the races in the whole world rejoice with us; we exhorting all of you to give unbounded thanks, together with us, to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. For He is God in Heaven above and on earth below, who, visiting us through His holy apostles, made us worthy to receive the holy sacrament of baptism and health of body. In return for which, to those same holy apostles, my masters, St. Peter and St. Paul; and, through them, also to St. Sylvester, our father, — the chief pontiff and universal pope of the city of Rome, — and to all the pontiffs his successors, who until the end of the world shall be about to sit in the seat of St. Peter: we concede and, by this present, do confer, our imperial Lateran palace, which is preferred to, and ranks above, all the palaces in the whole world; then a diadem, that is, the crown of our head, and at the same time the tiara; and, also, the shoulder band, — that is, the collar that usually surrounds our imperial neck; and also the purple mantle, and crimson tunic, and all the imperial raiment; and the same rank as those presiding over the imperial cavalry; conferring also the imperial sceptres, and, at the same time, the spears and standards; also the banners and different imperial ornaments, and all the advantage of our high imperial position, and the glory of our power.

And we decree, as to those most reverend men, the clergy who serve, in different orders, that same holy Roman church, that they shall have the same advantage, distinction, power and excellence by the glory of which our most illustrious senate is adorned; that is, that they shall be made patricians and consuls, — we commanding that they shall also be decorated with the other imperial dignities. And even as the imperial soldiery, so, we decree, shall the clergy of the holy Roman church be adorned. And I even as the imperial power is adorned by different offices — by the distinction, that is, of chamberlains, and door keepers, and all the guards, — so we wish the holy Roman church to be adorned. And, in order that the pontifical glory may shine forth more fully, we decree this also: that the clergy of this same holy Roman church may use saddle cloths of linen of the whitest colour; namely that their horses may be adorned and so be ridden, and that, as our senate uses shoes with goats' hair, so they may be distinguished by gleaming linen; in order that, as the celestial beings, so the terrestrial may be adorned to the glory of God. Above all things, moreover, we give permission to that same most holy one our father Sylvester, bishop of the city of Rome and pope, and to all the most blessed pontiffs who shall come after him and succeed him in all future times — for the honour and glory of Jesus Christ our Lord, — to receive into that great Catholic and apostolic church of God, even into the number of the monastic clergy, any one from our senate, who, in free choice, of his own accord, may wish to become a clerck; no one at all presuming thereby to act in a haughty manner.

We also decreed this, that this same venerable one our father Sylvester, the supreme pontiff, and all the pontiffs his successors, might use and bear upon their heads — to the Praise of God and for the honour of St. Peter — the diadem; that is, the crown which we have granted him from our own head, of purest gold and precious gems. But he, the most holy pope, did not at all allow that crown of gold to be used over the clerical crown which he wears to the glory of St. Peter; but we placed upon his most holy head, with our own hands, a tiara of gleaming splendour representing the glorious resurrection of our Lord. And, holding the bridle of his horse, out of reverence for St. Peter we performed for him the duty of groom; decreeing that all the pontiffs his successors, and they alone, may use that tiara in processions.

In imitation of our own power, in order that for that cause the supreme pontificate may not deteriorate,
but may rather be adorned with power and glory even more than is the dignity of an earthly rule: behold
we — giving over to the oft-mentioned most blessed pontiff, our father Sylvester the universal pope, as well
our palace, as has been said, as also the city of Rome and all the provinces, districts and cities of Italy or of
the western regions; and relinquishing them, by our inviolable gift, to the power and sway of himself or the
pontiffs his successors — do decree, by this our godlike charter and imperial constitution, that it shall be
(so) arranged; and do concede that they (the palaces, provinces etc.) shall lawfully remain with the holy
Roman church.

Wherefore we have perceived it to be fitting that our empire and the power of our kingdom should be
transferred and changed to the regions of the East; and that, in the province of Byzantium, in a most
fitting place, a city should be built in our name; and that our empire should there be established. For,
where the supremacy of priests and the head of the christian religion has been established by a heavenly
ruler, it is not just that there an earthly ruler should have jurisdiction.

We decree, moreover, that all these things which, through this our imperial charter and through other
godlike commands, we have established and confirmed, shall remain uninjured and unshaken until the
end of the world. Wherefore, before the living God, who commanded us to reign, and in the face of his
terrible judgement, we conjure, through this our imperial decree, all the emperors our successors, and all
our nobles, the satraps also and the most glorious senate, and all the people in the whole world now and in
all times previously subject to our rule: that no one of them, in any way allow himself to oppose or
disregard, or in any way seize, these things which, by our imperial sanction, have been conceded to the
holy Roman church and to all its pontiffs. If anyone, moreover, — which we do not believe — prove a
scorner or despiser in this matter, he shall be subject and bound over to eternal damnation; and shall feel
that the holy chiefs of the apostles of God, Peter and Paul, will be opposed to him in the present and in the
future life. And, being burned in the nethermost hell, he shall perish with the devil and all the impious.

The page, moreover, of this our imperial decree, we, confirming it with our own hands, did place above
the venerable body of St. Peter chief of the apostles; and there, promising to that same apostle of God that
we would preserve inviolably all its provisions, and would leave in our commands to all the emperors our
successors to preserve them, we did hand it over, to be enduringly and happily possessed, to our most
blessed father Sylvester the supreme pontiff and universal pope, and, through him, to all the pontiffs his
successors — God our Lord and our Saviour Jesus Christ consenting.

And the imperial subscription: May the Divinity preserve you for many years, oh most holy and blessed
fathers.

Given at Rome on the third day before the Kalends of April, our master the august Flavius Constantine,
for the fourth time, and Galligano, most illustrious men, being consuls. 110

110 Henderson, Select Historical Documents, 1912, pp. 319-329.
II: Dictatus Papae

1. That the Roman church was founded by God alone.
2. That the Roman pontiff alone can with right be called universal.
3. That he alone can depose or reinstate bishops.
4. That, in a council his legate, even if a lower grade, is above all bishops, and can pass sentence of deposition against them.
5. That the pope may depose the absent.
6. That, among other things, we ought not to remain in the same house with those excommunicated by him.
7. That for him alone is it lawful, according to the needs of the time, to make new laws, to assemble together new congregations, to make an abbey of a canonry; and, on the other hand, to divide a rich bishopric and unite the poor ones.
8. That he alone may use the imperial insignia.
9. That of the pope alone all princes shall kiss the feet.
10. That his name alone shall be spoken in the churches.
11. That this is the only name in the world.
12. That it may be permitted to him to depose emperors.
13. That he may be permitted to transfer bishops if need be.
14. That he has power to ordain a clerk of any church he may wish.
15. That he who is ordained by him may preside over another church, but may not hold a subordinate position; and that such a one may not receive a higher grade from any bishop.
16. That no synod shall be called a general one without his order.
17. That no chapter and no book shall be considered canonical without his authority.
18. That a sentence passed by him may be retracted by no one; and that he himself, alone of all, may retract it.
19. That he himself may be judged by no one.
20. That no one shall dare to condemn one who appeals to the apostolic chair.
21. That to the latter should be referred the more important cases of every church.
22. That the Roman church has never erred; nor will it err to all eternity, the Scripture bearing witness.
23. That the Roman pontiff, if he have been canonically
ordained, is undoubtedly made a saint by the merits of St.
Peter; St. Ennodius, bishop of Pavia, bearing witness, and
many holy fathers agreeing with him. As is contained in the
decrees of St. Symmachus the pope.

24. That, by his command and consent, it may be lawful for
subordinates to bring accusations.

25. That he may depose and reinstate bishops without
assembling a synod.

26. That he who is not at peace with the Roman church shall not
be considered catholic.

27. That he may absolve subjects from their fealty to wicked
men.\textsuperscript{111}

III: Hildebert of Lavardin

ROM

Der Dichter:

Nichts ist, Rom, dir gleich, obwohl du in Trümmern fast ganz liegst,
Lehrst zerstört, welchen Glanz unversehrt du besaßt.
Langes Alter zerbrach den Stolz dir; der Kaisers Paläste,
Die Tempel der Götter dazu liegen verkommen im Sumpf.
Jenes machtvolle Werk verfiel, das der grimmige Parther
Fürchtete, als er bestand, dessen Fall er beklagt'.
Durch der Könige Schwert, das hütende Recht des Senates,
Durch die Himmlischen auch ward es zum Haupt der Welt.
Cäsar wollt' lieber mit Schuld es ganz alleine besitzen,
as Bundesgenosse und treu Schwiegervater zu sein.
Wachsend bezwang's mit Gewalt die Feinde, Verbrecher und Freunde,
Hat durch Gesetz Sie getrennt, hat sie mit Reichtum gekauft.
Rom, solange es wuchs, umhegte die Obhut der Obern,
Ahnenverehrung half, nahes Wasser dem Ort.
Baustoffe, Handwerker, Geld entsandten Westen und Osten,
Und es bot sich der Platz für die Gebäude selbst dar.
Die Führenden spendeten dem ihre Mittel, das Schicksal den Segen,
Die Meister gaben den Fleiß, alle Welt den Besitz.

Gefallen ist die Stadt, von der, wenn ich Würdiges sagen
Wollte, das eine allein könnte: „Sie war einmal Rom'.
Freilich haben die Zahl der Jahre, das Schwert und die Flamme
Diese Herrlichkeit nicht völlig zu tilgen vermocht.
Vieles besteht, viel verging, so daß man, was steht, nicht erreichen,
Selbst das Zerstörte auch nicht wiederaufbauen kann.
Schaff' wieder Schätze herbei und Marmor, die Gunst auch der Götter,
Künstler laß ihre Hand neu sich regen zum Werk -
Nicht wird dennoch ihr Bau den stehenden Mauern je gleichen,
Auch wiederaufbauen nur lassen die Trümmer sich nicht,
Die Macht von Menschen vermocht' einst Rom so gewaltig zu bauen,
Daß es der Götter Macht nicht zu vernichten vermocht'.
Hier bestaunen sogar die Götter die Bilder der Götter,
Und der geformten Gestalt gleichen, das wollen sie gern.
Götter mit solchem Gesicht vermocht' die Natur nicht zu bilden,
Wie von ihnen der Mensch herrliche Zeichen erschuf.
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In diesen Gottheiten lebt der Blick, sie werden verehrt mehr wegen der Schaffenden Kunst als ihrer Göttlichkeit.

Glücklich wäre die Stadt, wenn sie nur der Herren entbehrte Oder es Schmach ihnen wär', ohne den Glauben zu sein.

Rom:

Als die Abbilder ich, die eitlen Gottheiten ehrte, Ragt' ich durch Kriege und Volk und durch die Mauern empor; Da ich aber gestürzt der Götter Bilder, Altäre Und dem alleinigen Gott meine Dienste geweiht, Schwanden die Burgen dahin, zerbarsten der Götter Paläste, Wurde das Volk versklavt, und der Ritter verkan.

Wahrt aber gut ihn, wenn er über die Sterne ihn legt.
Welcher Kaiser hat mir mit dem Schwert, welch Konsul mit Wirken,
Welche Redner mit seinem Mund, welcher Krieg mit Gewalt
Derart Großes verschafft? Mit deren Gesetzen und Mühen
Nahm ich die Welt, doch ein Kreuz hat mir den Himmel verschafft.

IV: Mirabilia Urbis Romae

Of the Town Wall

The wall of the city of Rome hath towers three hundred threescore and one, castles forty and nine, [chief arches seven,] battlements six thousand and nine hundred, gates twelve, posterns five; and in the compass thereof there are twenty and two miles, without reckoning the transtiberim and the Leonine city, [that is the fame as Saint Peter’s Porch.]

Of the Gates

The gates of the famous city be these. Porta Capena that is called Saint Paul’s Gate, by the Temple of Remus; porta Appia [where is the church, that is named Domine quo vadis that is to say, Lord whither goest thou, where are seen the footsteps of Jesus Christ]; porta Latina [because there the Latins and Apulians were wont to go into the city; there is the vessel that was filled with boiling oil and in the which the blessed John the Evangelist was set]; porta Metrovia; porta Asinaria that is called Lateran Gate; porta Lavicana that is called Greater; porta Taurina that is called Saint Laurence’s Gate, or the gate of Tivoli, [and it is called Taurina or the Bull Gate, because there be carved thereon two heads of bulls, the one lean and the other fat; the lean head, that is without, signifieth them that come with slender substance into the city, the fat and full head within signifieth them that go forth rich]; porta Numentana [that leadeth to the city of Nomentum]; porta Salaria [the which hath two Ways, to wit, the old Salarian Way that leadeth to the Milvian Bridge, and the new way that goeth forth to the Salarian Bridge]; porta Pinciana [because king Pincius his palace is there]; porta Flaminia [that is called Saint Valentine’s]; porta Collina at [the castle that is by Saint Peter’s bridge, the which is called the emperor Hadrian’s castle, who made Saint Peter’s bridge]. Beyond Tiber be three gates: porta Septimiana seven Naiads joined with Janus; porta Aurelia or aurea that is to say, Golden [the which is now called Saint Pancras his gate]; and porta Portuensis. [In Saint Peter’s Porch be two gates, whereof the one is called the gate of the Castle of the holy Angel, and the other porta Viridaria that is to say, the gate at the Garden].

Of Triumphal Arches.

Arches Triumphal be these that follow [the which were made for an Emperor returning from a triumph, and whereunder they were led with worship by the senators, and his victory was graven thereon for a remembrance to posterity]; Alexander’s Golden Arch at Saint Celsus, the arch of the emperors Theodosius and Valentinian and Gratian at Saint Ursus; the triumphal arch [of marble that the Senate decreed to be adorned with trophies in honour of Drusus, father of Claudius Caesar, on account of the Rhaetic and German wars by him nobly achieved; whereof the vestiges do barely appear] without the Appian Gate at the temple of Mars; in the Circus the arch of Titus and Vespasian; the arch of Constantine by the Amphitheatre; at New Saint Mary’s, between the Greater Palace and the temple of Romulus, the arch of the Seven Lamps of Titus and Vespasian; [where is Moses his candlestick having seven branches, with the Ark, at the foot of the Cartulary Tower]; the arch of Julius Caesar and the Senators between the Aedes Concordiae and the Fatal Temple, [before Saint Martina, where be now the Breeches Towers]; nigh unto Saint Laurence in Lucina, the triumphal arch of Octavian; Antoninus his arch, nigh to his pillar, [where is now the tower of the Tosetti]. Then there is an arch at Saint Mark’s that is called Hand of Flesh, for at the time when in this city of Rome, Lucy, an holy matron, was tormented for the faith of Christ by the emperor Diocletian, he commanded that she
should be laid down and be beaten to death; and behold, he that smote her was made stone, but his hand remained flesh, unto the seventh day; wherefore the name of that place is called Hand of Flesh to this day. In the Capitol is the arch of Gold Bread; [and in the Aventine the arch of Faustinus nigh to Saint Sabina.

There are moreover other arches, which are not triumphal but memorial arches, as is the arch of Piety before Round Saint Mary’s. In this place upon a time, when an emperor was ready in his chariot to go forth to war, a poor widow fell at his feet, weeping and crying: Oh my lord, before thou goest, let me have justice. And he promised her that on his return he would do her full right; but she said: Peradventure thou shalt die first. This considering, the emperor leapt from his chariot, and held his consistory on the spot. And the woman said, I had one only son, and a young man hath slain him. Upon this saying the emperor gave sentence. The murderer, said he, shall die, he shall not live. Thy son then, said she, shall die, for it is he that playing with my son hath slain him. But when he was led to death, the woman sighed aloud, and said. Let the young man that is to die be given unto me in the stead of my son; so shall I be recompensed, else shall I never confess that I have had full right. This therefore was done, and the woman departed with rich gifts from the emperor.]

Of the Hills.
Hills within the city be these: Janiculus [that is commonly called Janarian, where is the church of Saint Sabba]; Aventine, that is also called Quirinal [because the Quirites were there, where is the church of Saint Alexius]; Caelian [where is the church of Saint Stephen in monte Caelio]; Capitol [or Tarpeian hill, where is the Senator’s palace]; Pallanteum [where is the Greater Palace]; Exquiline [that is called above others, where is the basilica of Saint Mary the Greater]; Viminal [where is Saint Agatha’s church, and where Virgil, being taken by the Romans, escaped invisibly and went to Naples, whence it is said, vado ad Napulim.]

Of Thermae
There be called thermae great palaces, having full great crypts under ground, wherein in the wintertime a fire was kindled throughout, and in summer they were filled with fresh waters, so that the court dwelt in the upper chambers in much delight; as may be seen in the thermae of Diocletian, before Saint Susana]. Now there are the Antonian Thermae; the Domitian Thermae; the Maximian; those of Licinius; the Diocletian; the Tiberian [behind Saint Susana]; the Novatian; those of Olympias [at Saint Laurence in panisperna]; those of Agrippa [behind Round Saint Mary’s]; and the Alexandrine [where is the hospital of the Thermae].

Of Palaces.
Palaces in the city be these: the Greater Palace of the Monarchy of the Earth, wherein is the capital seat of the whole world, and the Caesarean palace, in the Pallantean hill; the palace of Romulus nigh unto the hut of Faustulus; the palace of Severus [by Saint Sixtus]; the palace of Claudius [between the Colosseum and Saint Peter in vincula]; the palace of Constantine [in the Lateran, where my lord Pope dwelleth]: this Lateran palace was Nero’s, and named from the side of the northern region wherein it standeth, or from the frog which Nero secretly produced; in the which palace there is now a great church; the Sufurrian palace where is now the church of Saint Cross; the Volusian palace; the palace of Romulus [between New Saint Mary and Saint Cosmas], where are the two temples of Piety and Concord, and where Romulus set his golden image, saying. It shall not fall till that a virgin bear a child; and as soon as the Virgin bore a son, the image fell down; the palace of Trajan and
Hadrian, where is the pillar [twenty paces of height]; Constantine's palace; Sallust his palace; Camillus his
palace; Antonine's palace, where is his pillar [twenty-seven paces high]; Nero's palace [where is Saint Peter's
Needle] and wherein rest the bodies of the Apostles Peter and Paul, Simon and Jude; Julius Caesar's palace,
where is the sepulchre of Julius Caesar; Chromatius his palace; Eufimianus his palace; the palace of Titus and
Vespasian without Rome at the catacombs; Domitian's palace beyond Tiber at the Golden Morsel; Octavian's
palace [at Saint Laurence in Lucina].

Of Theatres.
The theatres be these: the theatre of Titus and Vespasian at the catacombs; the theatre of Tarquin and the
Emperors at the Seven Floors; Pompey's theatre at Saint Laurence [in Damaso]; Antoninus his theatre by
Antoninus his bridge; Alexander's theatre nigh unto Round Saint Mary's; Nero's theatre nigh to Crescentius his
castle; and the Flaminian theatre.

Of Bridges.
Bridges be these: the Milvian bridge; the Hadrian bridge; the Neronian bridge [at Sassia]; the Antonine bridge in
arenula, the Fabrician bridge, which is called the Jews' bridge, [because Jews dwell there]; Gratian's bridge
between the island and the Transtiberim; the Senators' bridge of Saint Mary; the marble bridge of Theodosius at
the Riparmea, and the Valentinian bridge.

Of the Pillars of Antonine and of Trajan; and of the Images that were of old time in Rome.
The winding pillar of Antonine hath one hundred threescore and fifteen feet of height, steps in number two
hundred and three, windows forty and five. The winding pillar of Trajan hath in height one hundred thirty and
eight feet, steps in number one hundred fourscore and five, windows forty and five. The colossean Amphitheatre
hath one hundred and eight submissal feet of height.\footnote{Francis Morgan Nichols, (ed.) \textit{Mirabilia Vrbis Romae: The
Marvels of Rome, or a Picture of the Golden City}, (London, 1889), pp. 6-25.}
...Of Rome, formerly the mistress of the globe, but which now, in comparison of its ancient state, appears a small town; and of the Romans, once "sovereign over all and the gowned nation,"* who are now the most fickle of men, bartering justice for gold, and dispensing with the canons for money; of this city and its inhabitants, I say, whatever I might attempt to write, has been anticipated by the verses of Hildebert, first, bishop of Mans, and afterwards archbishop of Tours. Which I insert, not to assume the honour acquired by another man's labour, but rather as a proof of a liberal mind, while not envying his fame, I give testimony to his charming poetry.

Rome, still thy ruins grand beyond compare,
Thy former greatness mournfully declare,
Though time thy stately palaces around
Hath strewed, and cast thy temples to the ground.
Fall'n is the power, the power Araxes dire
Regrets now gone, and dreaded when entire;
Which arms and laws, and ev'n the gods on high
Bade o'er the world assume the mastery;
Which guilty Caesar rather had enjoyed
Alone, than e'er a fostering hand employed.
Which gave to foes, to vice, to friends its care,
Subdued, restrained, or bade its kindness share
This growing power the holy fathers reared.
Where near the stream the fav'ring spot appeared
From either pole, materials, artists meet,
And rising wails their proper station greet;
Kings gave their treasures, fav'ring too was fate.
And arts and riches on the structure wait.
Fall'n is that city, whose proud fame to reach,
I merely say, " Rome was," there fails my speech.
Still neither time's decay, nor sword, nor fire,
Shall cause its beauty wholly to expire.
Human exertions raised that splendid Rome,
Which gods in vain shall strive to overcome.
Bid wealth, bid marble, and bid fate attend,
And watchful artists o'er the labour bend.
Still shall the matchless ruin art defy
The old to rival, or its loss supply.

Here gods themselves their sculptur'd forms admire,
And only to reflect those forms aspire;  
Nature unable such like gods to form,  
Left them to man’s creative genius warm;  
Life breathes within them, and the suppliant falls.  
Not to the God, but statues in the walls.  
City thrice blessed! were tyrants but away.  
Or shame compelled them justice to obey.

Are not these sufficient to point out in such a city, both the dignity of its former advantages, and the majesty of its present ruin? But that nothing may be wanting to its honour, I will add the number of its gates, and the multitude of its sacred relics; and that no person may complain of his being deprived of any knowledge by the obscurity of the narrative, the description shall run in an easy and familiar style.

The first is the Cornelian gate, which is now called the gate of St. Peter, and the Cornelian way. Near it is situated the church of St. Peter, in which his body lies, decked with gold and silver, and precious stones: and no one knows the number of the holy martyrs who rest in that church. On the same way is another church, in which lie the holy virgins Rufina and Secunda. In a third church, are Marius and Martha, and Audifax and Abacuc, their sons.

The second is the Flaminian gate, which is now called the gate of St. Valentine, and the Flaminian way, and when it arrives at the Milvian bridge, it takes the name of the Ravennanian way, because it leads to Ravenna; and there, at the first stone without the gate, St. Valentine rests in his church.

The third is called the Porcinian gate, and the way the same; but where it joins the Salarian, it loses its name, and there, nearly in the spot which is called Cucumeris, lie the martyrs, Festus, Johannes, Liberalis, Diogenes, Blastus, Lucina, and in one sepulchre, the Two Hundred and Sixty, in another, the Thirty.

The fourth is the Salarian gate and way; now called St. Silvester’s. Here, near the road, lie St. Hermes, and St. Vasella, and Prothus, and Jacinctus, Maxilian, Herculan, Crispus; and, in another place, hard by, rest the holy martyrs Pamphilus and Quirinus, seventy steps beneath the surface. Next is the church of St. Felicity, where she rests, and Silanus her son; and not far distant, Boniface the martyr. In another church, there are Crisantus, and Daria, and Saturninus, and Maurus, and Jason, and their mother Hilaria, and others innumerable. And in another church, St. Alexander, Vitalis, Mariath, sons of St. Felicity; and seven holy virgins, Saturnina, Hilarina, Duranda, Rogantina, Serolina, Paulina, Donata. Next the church of St. Silvester, where he lies under a marble tomb; and the martyrs, Celestinus, Philippus, and Felix; and there too, the Three Hundred and Sixty-five martyrs rest in one sepulchre; and near them lie Paulus and Crescentianus, Prisca and Semetrius, Praxides and Potentiana.

The fifth is called the Numentan gate. There lies St. Nicomede, priest and martyr; the way too is called by
the same name. Near the road are the church and body of St. Agnes; in another church, St. Ermerenciana, and the martyrs, Alexander, Felix, Papias; at the seventh stone on this road rests the holy pope Alexander, with Euentius and Theodolus.

The sixth is the Tiburtine § gate and way, which is now called St. Lawrence's: near this way lies St. Lawrence in his church, and Habundius the martyr: and near this, in another church, rest these martyrs, Cirica, Romanus, Justinus, Crescentianus; and not far from hence the church of St. Hyppolitus, where he himself rests, and his family, eighteen in number; there too repose, St. Trifonia, the wife of Decius, and his daughter Cirilla, and her nurse Concordia. And in another part of this way is the church of Agapit the martyr.

The seventh is called, at present, the Greater gate, formerly the Seracusan, and the way the Lavicanian, which leads to St. Helena. Near this are Peter, Marcellinus, Tyburtius, Geminus, Gorgonius, and the Forty Soldiers, and others without number; and a little farther the Four Coronati.

The eighth is the gate of St. John, which by the ancients was called Assenarica. The ninth gate is called Metrosa; and in front of both these runs the Latin way. The tenth is called the Latin gate, and way. Near this, in one church, lie the martyr's, Gordianus and Epimachus, Sulpicius, Servilianus, Quintinus, Quartus, Sophia, Triphenus. Near this too, in another spot, Tertullinus, and not far distant, the church of St. Eugenia, in which she lies, and her mother Claudia, and pope Stephen, with nineteen of his clergy, and Nemesius the deacon.

The eleventh is called the Appian gate and way. There lie St. Sebastian, and Quirinus, and originally the bodies of the apostles rested there. A little nearer Rome, are the martyrs, Januarius, Urbanus, Xenon, Quirinus, Agapetus, Felicissimus; and in another church, Tyburtius, Valerianus, Maximus. Not far distant is the church of the martyr Cecilia; and there are buried Stephanus, Sixtus, Zeferinus, Eusebius, Melchiades, Marcellus, Eutychianus, Dionysius, Antheros, Pontianus, pope Lucius, Optacius, Julianus, Calocerus, Parthenius, Tharsicius, Politanus, martyrs: there too is the church and body of St. Cornelius: and in another church, St. Sotheris: and not far off, rest the martyrs, Hippolytus, Adrianus, Eusebius, Maria, Martha, Paulina, Valeria, Marcellus, and near, pope Marcus in his church. Between the Appian and Ostiensian way, is the Ardeatine way, where are St. Marcus, and Marcellianus. And there lies pope Damasus in his church; and near him St. Petronilla, and Nereus, and Achilleus, and many more.

The twelfth gate and way is called the Ostiensian, but, at present, St. Paul's, because he lies near it in his church. There too is the martyr Timotheus: and near, in the church of St. Tecla, are the martyrs Felix, Audactus, and Nemesius. At the Three Fountains is the head of the martyr St. Anastasius.

The thirteenth is called the Portuan gate and way; near which in a church are the martyrs, Felix, Alexander, Abdon and Sennes, Symeon, Anastasius, Polion, Vincentius, Milex, Candida, and Innocentia.
The fourteenth is the Aurelian gate and way, which now is called the gate of St. Pancras, because he lies near it in his church, and the other martyrs, Paulinus, Arthemius, St. Sapientia, with her three daughters. Faith, Hope, and Charity. In another church. Processus and Martinianus; and, in a third, two Felixes; in a fourth Calixtus, and Calepodius; in a fifth St. Basilides. At the twelfth milliary within the city, on Mount Celius, are the martyrs Johannes, and Paulus, in their dwelling, which was made a church after their martyrdom: and Crispin and Crispinianus, and St. Benedicta. On the same mount, is the church of St. Stephen, the first martyr; and there are buried the martyrs Primus, and Felicianus; on Mount Aventine St. Boniface; and on Mount Nola, St. Tatiana rests.

Such are the Roman sanctuaries; such the sacred pledges upon earth: and yet in the midst of this heavenly treasure, as it were, a people drunk with senseless fury, even at the very time the crusaders arrived, were disturbing everything with wild ambition, and, when unable to satisfy their lust of money, pouring out the blood of their fellow citizens over the very bodies of the saints..." 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pope</th>
<th>Pontificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Gregory VII</td>
<td>22 Apr. 1073 – 25 May 1085 (12 years, 33 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clement III (antipope)</strong></td>
<td>25 June 1080 – 8 Sept. 1100 (20 years, 75 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor III</td>
<td>24 May 1086 – 16 Sept. 1087 (1 year, 115 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban II</td>
<td>12 Mar. 1088 – 29 July 1099 (11 years, 139 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paschal II</td>
<td>13 Aug. 1099 – 21 Jan. 1118 (18 years, 161 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodoric</td>
<td>8 Sept. 1100 – Jan. 1101 (115 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adalbert</td>
<td>Jan 1101 – Feb 1102 (1 year, 31 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvester IV</td>
<td>08 Nov. 1105 – 11 Apr. 1111 (5 years, 154 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelasius II</td>
<td>24 Jan. 1118 – 29 Jan. 1119 (1 year, 5 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory VIII</td>
<td>10 Mar. 1118 – 20 Apr. 1121 (3 years, 41 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callixtus II</td>
<td>2 Feb. 1119 – 13 Dec. 1124 (5 years, 315 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celestine II</td>
<td>16 Dec. 1124 – 16 Dec. 1124 (0 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorius II</td>
<td>21 Dec. 1124 – 13 Feb. 1130 (5 years, 54 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent II</td>
<td>14 Feb. 1130 – 24 Sept. 1143 (13 years, 222 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anacletus II</td>
<td>14 Feb. 1130 – 25 Jan. 1138 (7 years, 345 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor IV</td>
<td>23 Mar. 1138 – 25 Mar. 1138 (2 days)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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