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Almost sixty years ago, the role of the Jews in the Croxton Play of the Sacrament came into question as Cecilia Cutts suggested a metaphorical reading of the play's textual characterization;¹ she argued that the Croxton Jews, in rejecting Christianity, were portrayed in such a way as to represent a different group which deliberately excluded itself from orthodox Christianity—that is, the Lollards.² Alternatively, Steven Kruger has suggested that the Croxton Jews are representative of the specifically Jewish body, and his reassessment links corruptions of the Jewish body to Christian bodily miracles.³ In interrogating the role of Jewish identity, Elisa Narin van Court has posited a paradoxical “Jewish presence” in medieval English narratives as literary, theological, and visual representations of Jews continued long after their expulsion from England in 1290.⁴ Likewise, Sheila Delany has shown that the Jews continued to influence English writers with their “absent presence.”⁵

Critics reading the late-fourteenth-century poem The Siege of Jerusalem vary similarly in their assessment of Jewish identity.⁶ While Mary Hamel has suggested that the Jews portrayed in the Siege represent a homogenized group of Jews, Saracens, and heretics,⁷ Ralph Hanna III and Narin van Court have argued that the Jews portrayed in the Siege occupy a position particular to medieval Jewish people. Setting the Siege in its textual environment of Yorkshire, Hanna suggests a Lancastrian reception of it wherein the Jews represent those killed in the Yorkshire massacre in 1190.⁸ In light of her research on Augustinian historians, Narin van Court argues for parallels between first-century and medieval Jews, explaining that the Jew qua Jew must be considered when reading the Siege.⁹ In these critiques of the Siege, two strands of thought regarding Jewish identity emerge: that of the literal, historical reading suggested by Hanna and Narin van Court, and that of the nonliteral, typological reading put forward by Hamel and others.
The work of these scholars has done much to address the role of the Jews in the text. Curiously, however, comparatively little has been done to explore the role of the Romans, who are characterized in variable ways. My approach here will build upon the model provided by Suzanne Conklin Akbari, who argues that Jewish identity in the poet Josephus Conklin Akbari, who argues that Jewish identity in the poetic *Siege of Jerusalem* is variable, designating both *in bono* Christian identity and *in malo* Muslim identity. When one examines the behavior of the Romans against the ideas of medieval Christian exegetes, one finds that they are depicted as depraved persecutors of the faithful and as victorious warriors for Christ. While the *Siege* fits loosely within the genre of crusade literature, as Hamel has shown, the work becomes much more than a crusading poem when one acknowledges the portrayal of the Jews from the Augustinian tradition together with the depiction of the Romans from the exegetical tradition. In investigating the historical siege’s background in both traditions, I will examine the writings of Joachim of Fiore, Ralph of Coggeshall, and Ranulf Higden, in order to show how, in England, the dual idea of Rome—both as city and as personification of the Church—was shifting in its cultural valence.

Medieval exegetical interpretation of the historical siege of Jerusalem shows that biblical exegesis of the event influenced the reception of the poem and inspired medieval commentary on the moral state of western Christendom. Although literal and typological interpretations of the Romans of the poetic siege place them in the role of Christians who do battle for their faith, the exegetical applications demonstrate that the Romans also occupied an antagonistic role: that of the Antichrist. As medieval exegetes sought to place the historical siege within the context of biblical historiography and prophecy, they relied on the writings of Josephus, which comprised the central source of information regarding the historical siege of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. For medieval Christian exegetes, Josephus’s account of the Jewish war represented a history of the Roman siege that could be used to substantiate Christian doctrine. Josephus presents the first portrayal of the Roman involvement in Christian historiography outside of the biblical account. It is through examination of the various exegetical commentaries that use Josephus’s *Jewish War* that one finds a kind of culmination of Josephan biblical exegesis in *The Siege of Jerusalem*, as the poem takes its place in a tradition that relied on the commemoration of the sieges of that holy city. Before turning to Josephus, however, I will outline the depiction of the Romans in the poem and consider what a literal interpretation of their role reveals.

Certainly there is room for a literal reading of the Romans, although the cultural fiction of their Christianity makes it unlikely that they represent any Roman group before the time of Constantine. Moreover, the fictitious element introduced through the chivalric framework in which
they act removes the Romans of the poem one step further from actual Romans, for the courtly tropes enacted by the Romans of the poem did not exist until long after the fall of the Roman Empire. One is left, then, with a kind of Roman character composite derived from Christian narrative and medieval romance. In order to examine the Romans in the poem as specifically Roman, that is, not as a typological substitution for any other group, one must consider them as a group constructed by an English author to create a fictitious historical past. Thus, in the *Siege* Rome’s cultural identity is reassigned and Christianized over two hundred years prior to its actual recognition. According to the poem, Vespasian, along with his sons, converts to Christianity and vows to avenge the death of Christ by besieging Jerusalem:

```
Cytees vnder S[yo]ne, now is 3our sorow vppe:
Pe deþ of dereworþ Crist dere schal be 3olden.
```

(299–300; cp. 348)

Though the campaign is initially organized by Nero as a means to secure tribute from the holy city, Titus and Vespasian are said to lend their leadership to accomplish Christian ends. Along with Christianizing the ancient rulership of Rome, the poem asserts Rome’s place as a holy city—an assertion that would have interested English supporters of Urban VI. In this case, the audience sees the character Pope Peter in action, preaching to the Romans, interacting with the Emperor, and handling holy relics (205, 224–28). Although all of these events are fictitious, they add to the sense that the Roman papacy, not Avignon, was directly linked to the presence of Peter at the cultural height of the Roman Empire.¹²

Adding to the religious significance of Rome, the Veil of Veronica is established as an authentic Roman relic (235–64). At the time of the poem’s distribution, the Veil of Veronica was one of the most popular relics in Rome, for it was said to show the image of the face of Christ. Here in the poem, the Veil is described as having sacred healing powers:¹³

```
Per is no gome [o]n þis [grounde] þat is grym wounded,
Meselry ne meschef, ne man vpon erþe,
Þat kneleþ doun to þat cloþ and on Crist leueþ,
Bot alle hapneþ to hele in [an] handwhyle.
```

(169–72)

In the *Siege* the importance of Rome as the spiritual center of western Christendom is attached to the powers of the Veil. Clearly the Veil is of great importance: it is received in Rome with a noble procession just as if it were Christ himself; likewise, Peter kneels and weeps before it
monolithic, makes war miracles, Jerusalem Jerusalem Lancastrian England have had about its ramifications, not with hackneyed detail, which is purely anachronistic, the poet portrays the Romans as a monolithic, western Christian force, described using the rhetoric of crusade romances. Even Titus is portrayed in a chivalric fashion: he addresses God as “corteys Crist” and vows to avenge him according to the rules of courtly conduct (181). The Siege poet portrays his Romans with characteristics that would have had special resonance to an audience who had participated in campaigns in the Holy Land or France, or, by the same token, who were being actively recruited for that purpose. To this end, the poem shows a mix of chivalric and devotional images that would have been used both to entertain an audience and to urge it to support the campaigns. The poem’s links to Bolton Priory, a hotbed of Lancastrian activity, suggest the very practical nature of the poem as a recruitment piece.15 The strained political climate and financial difficulties that England experienced in defending its borders and waging war in France suggest that, if the poem was indeed commissioned for crusade recruitment, it needed to present incentives for expending money and men already in short supply.16 Pro-crusade propaganda poured into England from western Europe, including Philippe de Mézières’s Epistre of 1395 to Richard II, in which he encourages the English king toward crusading. Although he speaks on behalf of the French, he describes the
Holy Land as Richard’s *propre heritage*, purchased with Christ’s Passion.\(^1\)\(^7\) Significantly, de Mézières exhorts Richard to “remember Titus, son of Vespasian, Emperor of Rome” and take up crusading in the Holy Land.\(^1\)\(^8\) Thus the literary use of the historical siege of Jerusalem was a common metaphor for crusader activity, as it is here employed to encourage the fourteenth-century English and French on their foreign campaigns.\(^1\)\(^9\) Through the poem the English who supported the campaigns abroad could have viewed themselves like the Romans of the poem who, portrayed as valiant knights, slay thousands of Jews in the morning and go hunting and hawking in the afternoon.\(^1\)\(^0\)

Whether focused on English participation in the later crusades or, possibly, in France, interpretations of the historical siege of Jerusalem were changing in ways that must have affected late medieval English reception of the poem. Chivalric trappings and devotional images were made to function as military propaganda towards inspiring military recruitment. In the poem elaborate preparations are made for war as the Romans ready their horses and equipment, and then provision their ships for the sea journey:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Pan was rotlyng in Rome, robyng of brynnyis,} \\
\text{Schewyng of scharpe, scheldes ydressed} \\
\text{Per wer floynes aflot, farcostes many,} \\
\text{Cogges and crayers ycasteled ale;} \\
\text{Galees of grete streynghẽ with golden fanes [B]ra[y]d on ſe brod se aboute foure myle.}
\end{align*}
\]

(281–82, 289–92)

Likewise, siege warfare, popular both in the Holy Land and during the war in France, is explicitly described as Titus and Vespasian set a siege around Jerusalem and prepare for the next assault:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Byfor ſe foure ȝates he formes to lenge} \\
\text{Sixt[i] ȝousand by somme while ſe sege lasteþ;} \\
\text{Sette ward on ſe walles þat noȝt awey scaped,} \\
\text{Sixe ȝousand in sercle ſe cite alle aboute.} \\
\text{Was noȝt while ſe nyȝt laste bot nehyng of stedis,} \\
\text{Strogelyng in stele wede and stuffyng of helmes.}
\end{align*}
\]

(421–26)

Once the siege has been set around the holy city, the troops make several assaults on it and fail repeatedly. In light of these frustrations, Titus outlines to his generals a new and passive strategy of starvation:
“We scholde with [hunger] hem honte to hoke out of toun
[Without weme or wounde or any wo elles.]
For þer as fayleþ þe fode þer is feynt strengþe
And þer as hunger is hote hertes ben feble.”

(879–82)

Such experience with sieges would have been familiar to an audience who had recently fought in France, been on crusade, or had ancestors who had done so.

In the poet's depictions of Jewish and Roman skirmishes, the terrifying sounds of battle spring from the page with the repetition of hard consonants and lively detail:

Bemes blowen anon blonkes to neþe,
Stedis stampen in þe [st]ede st[uf][ed] steil vndere,
Stïþe men in stiropys striden alofte,
Knýþes croýsen hemself, cacchen here helmys.
With loude clarion cry and [with cormous] pypys,
Tymbris and tabourris tonelande loude,
Zeuen a sch[r]i[k]ande schout; schrynken þe Iewes.

(525–31)

Along with realistic descriptions of warfare, some fictitious elements are introduced with chivalric depictions of battle. The chivalric imagery in the poem presents a romanticized view of warfare, where God's favor rests on the side of the all-powerful Romans:

So Crist his knýþes gan kepe tille complyn tyme.
An hundred þousand helmes of þe heþen syde
Were fey fallen in þe felde.

(612–14)

Here Christ is said to offer his followers potency in battle against a "heathen" army. The poet's depictions of the siege also represent a glamorous portrayal of war where the Romans are depicted as knights of chivalric tales who spend much of their time in the noble pursuits of holding tournaments and resting in lavish pavilions. Indeed, they are shown to be so successful in battle that Vespasian gives them plenty of leisure time to pursue their own entertainments. After Vespasian sets a watch around the town, he encourages his knights to play:

“For we wol hunten at þe hart þis heþes aboute
And hure racches renne amonge þis rowe bonkes;
Ride to þe reuer and rere vp þe foules,  
Se faucouns fle, fele of þe beste—  
Ech segge to þe solas þat hymself lyke[þ]."
Princes out of pauenouns presen on stedes,  
Torn[ei]en, triflyyn, and on þe toun wayten.

(889–95)

Here, the scene seems to detach the depiction of the Christian army from its Roman identity only to connect it with a specifically western European literary mode.21 With their fantastic courtly adventures on the battlefield and their hauls of military praeda, the characterization of the Romans as crusading knights of medieval romance would have allowed late medieval Christian readers to experience a feeling of spiritual and temporal kinship with those responsible for the fall of the Temple, fulfilling scriptural prophecy as they themselves went out on crusade.

The poet’s use of religious tropes also encouraged such chivalric identification with the Romans. For instance, by placing a ten-line Passion sequence at the beginning of the poem, the poet uses the Passion as a lens through which the reader views the events that follow, for the suffering of the Jews is thus foreshadowed by the suffering of Christ. Likewise, when Vespasian encourages his troops before battle, he exhorts them to remember the Passion, urging his men to be merciless against their adversary and reminding them that the Jews took no mercy on Christ (497–504). These exhortations imply that the Roman troops, like their leaders, are motivated by their Christian faith to the same degree that their generals are. Vespasian’s motives are explicitly connected with his Christian faith; long before he is crowned Emperor, he is described as "þis comelich kyng þat for Crist wereþ" (954). Not only is Vespasian portrayed as serving under the commission of Christ in his “crusade” against Jerusalem, but he is shown to have taken up a crusader vow. Thus he is loath to leave Jerusalem to take up his post in Rome for fear of breaking this promise, saying:

“For Y haue heylych heyȝt here forto lenge  
Tille I þis toured [t]oun ha[ue] taken at [my] wille  
And me þe ȝates ben ȝet and ȝolden þe keyes.”

(977–79)

One of his generals, Sir Sabyn, suggests that, in order to fulfill this “promise” to heaven, Vespasian let Titus and Domitian complete the siege in Vespasian’s place. Sabyn’s advice is orthodox, for crusaders were allowed to perform the crusader vow on behalf of another. He says that whatever Vespasian’s army may accomplish, they do it in his name:
“So may h[e] couenaunt be kept þat þou to Crist made: 
Þyself dest þat þy soudiours by þyn assent worchen.”

(999–1000)

In following this choice, the future Emperor is thus shown to be an obedient Christian, a determination that is confirmed when, upon leaving Jerusalem to take his crown in Rome, he prays for God’s blessing (1023). Titus is also portrayed as a Christian prince, and the poet shows him desiring Christian baptism immediately after his conversion at the beginning of the poem:

“Telle me tit,” quoþ Titus, “what tokne he lafte
To hem þat knew hym for Crist and his crafte leued?”
“Nempne þe Trinyte by name,” quod Nathan, “at Þries
And þermyd baptemed be in blessed water.”
Forþ þey fetten a font and foullde hym þer,
Made hym Cristen kyng þat for Crist werred.

(189–94)

Significantly, Titus fights for the sake of Christ after he is baptized, and later he is shown to participate in yet another Christian institution: he takes up his father’s commuted crusader vow, and, after breaching the walls of Jerusalem, he thanks God for the victory (1213). The Romans’ militant Christianity creates a certain unity between medieval Christians and early Romans. By bringing ancient Rome into Christian brotherhood with the idealized crusading knights of the fourteenth century, western medieval Christians could, as it were, take part in the victories of the ancient Romans. Turning now to the typological interpretations of the poem, one finds that exegetical readings offer a stark contrast to the literal reading discussed above.

Typology and the Christian Assimilation of Josephus

The poetic *Siege of Jerusalem* offers a narrative which at once justifies and authenticates Rome’s position as a holy city, for as Jerusalem is destroyed, Rome is enriched through the acquisition of its relics. The idea that the fall of Jerusalem was the necessary precondition for the rise of Rome was explored exegetically by religious writers who saw the event as the pivotal moment in a perpetual cycle, with the role of Jerusalem’s adversaries taken up by different peoples each time. The background of this cycle is the lamentation over the fall of the Temple, a form stemming from Jewish
exegetical tradition. As seen in the Book of Lamentations, the laments came to be recited publicly on the Ninth of Ab, the Jewish day of mourning in remembrance of the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem and destruction of the Temple in 587 B.C.E. Although the Lamentations have often been attributed to the prophet Jeremiah, they were in fact written in a hand (or hands) other than Jeremiah’s. The poems lament the former glory of Jerusalem, comparing that city’s prior magnificence to the ruin after the invasion. Along with mourning for the city’s past, moral purification is lifted up as recompense for communal suffering. Scholars such as E. Ann Matter note that the lament over the fall of the Temple is not applied solely to the period of Babylonian captivity, but also to that of the fall of the second Temple in 70 C.E. Matter suggests the lament over the fall of the second Temple was perhaps in “response” to the Roman siege of Jerusalem, likewise remembered on the Ninth of Ab. It is significant that one lament can be temporally exchanged for another, for in the exchange, the fall becomes a typological trope in which the different adversaries of the Jews, be they Babylonian or Roman, are perceived as a force united against Jerusalem, operating across time. As the Jewish practice of mourning the fall of the Temple carries over into medieval liturgical tradition, we find selections from the five books of Lamentations in the lessons for the first nocturn of Matins on Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, and Holy Saturday. Thus both Jewish and Christian writers treat the fall of Jerusalem in a commemorative, typological sense.

The medieval Church’s fascination with the destruction of Jerusalem, along with the liturgical and homiletic traditions concerning the event, originate from the three synoptic gospels that contain Christ’s prophecy of the city’s downfall. According to Luke 19:43–44, Christ prophesied:

Quia venient dies in te et circumdabunt te inimici tui vallo et circumdabunt te et coangustabunt te undique ad terram prostantern te et filios qui in te sunt. Et non reliquent in te lapidem super lapidem eo quod non cognoveris tempus visitationis tuae.

For the days shall come upon you: and your enemies shall cast a trench about you and compass you round, and straiten you on every side, and beat you flat to the ground and your children who are in you. And they shall not leave in you a stone upon a stone: because you did not know that time of your visitation.

From these verses medieval Christian exegetes built the belief that the historical fall of Jerusalem was the fulfillment of scriptural prophecy. By the fourth century, this particular Lucan passage was included in the lectionary as the gospel reading for the tenth Sunday after Pentecost, establishing it as part of the medieval Christian homiletic tradition. While the
Lucan verse was becoming part of the medieval lectionary, Hegesippus’s fourth-century *De excidio urbis Hierosolimitanae*, an abridgement of Josephus’s *Jewish War*, introduced a Christian identity for the Romans. In turn, medieval sermon writers were inspired by the fictionalized theme of Christian Rome’s retribution and began to include excerpts from Hegesippus’s work.

Adding to typological interpretations of the fall of the Temple, direct assimilation of Josephus is seen in the portrayal of the first-century Roman army as soldiers of Christ. The development of this portrayal is seen in texts related to *The Jewish War*, such as Hegesippus’s *De excidio urbis Hierosolimitanae*, mentioned above, and the early sixth-century Latin prose *Cura Sanitatis Tiberii*.26 In the latter, the Roman Emperor Tiberius converts to Christianity after being healed by the image of the Veronica. Such fictional Christianization is also seen in the work of the anonymous Latin prose *Vindicta Salvatoris*, which appeared in the seventh or eighth centuries: in this work, Titus and Vespasian convert to Christianity and act out of revenge for Christ’s crucifixion, announcing that they would “do with the Jews as the Jews had done to Christ.”27 As Heinz Schreckenberg has shown,28 historians and biblical exegetes borrowed Josephus’s account of *The Jewish War* beginning in the second century C.E., and it influenced the works of many biblical historians, including Hegesippus, Jerome, Paschasius Radbertus, and Joachim of Fiore.29

Writings about Josephus from the later medieval period suggest that his work had become fully integrated into the fabric of western Christianity. For instance, Guy N. Deutsch has shown that Peter Comestor, author of the *Historia scholastica*, considered Josephus to be “on par with the highest religious authority.”30 Josephus contributed to the writing about the fall of Jerusalem in medieval biblical commentary by providing information not offered by the Bible, and which was received as the exegetical counterpart to the Old Testament: just as the New Testament was thought to complement the Old, the Josephan account was received as part of the new covenant in biblical history. As part of the tradition of the fall of Jerusalem, Josephus’s work represented an apocryphal fulfillment of the biblical prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and others who warned of Jerusalem’s impending doom. The Josephan exegetical tradition not only looks back to Jerusalem’s demise in the second Temple period, but also includes the first-century siege, portraying the Romans as the exegetical equivalent of the Babylonians. *The Siege of Jerusalem* participates in the tradition of the lamentations with the added element that Jerusalem’s antagonists are portrayed as Christians, further emphasizing the typological interchangeability of its adversaries.

Exegetical interpretation of Jerusalem’s adversaries, ranging from the foes of the Maccabees to the Babylonian and Roman forces, was also applied to the fall of Jerusalem in 1099 to the Frankish army. By the
twelfth century, crusade chroniclers employed the tradition of the fall of Jerusalem to show that the campaigns were the fulfillment of biblical prophecy. As Beryl Smalley has demonstrated, the First Crusade inspired a new type of interpretation of scriptural prophecy that included twelfth-century Franks in its plan:

The New Testament still fulfilled the promises of the Old; Jerusalem retained its four senses; but the psalmist and the prophets also foretold the Frankish conquest of the holy City. Promises stretched elastically from the past to the present. Isaiah’s prophecy: “That I may bring sons from afar” (lx,9) foretold the victory of the Franks, God’s new Israelites, over the Saracens, his enemies.31

An example of such elastic interpretation is seen in Robert the Monk’s account of the first crusade. Robert writes that the crusaders, whom he calls filii peregrinorum, give glory to God by invading Jerusalem; he lauds the invasion as the fulfillment of the biblical prophecies “to the praise and glory of Christ.”32 This ecclesiastically transmitted belief that God divinely ordained the twelfth-century fall of Jerusalem was strongly influenced by Josephus, and it echoes throughout the Siege.33

Shifting Cultural Identities: From Jerusalem to Rome

From a literal and historical point of view, then, the Romans depicted in the Siege are part of the exegetical tradition of the fall of Jerusalem. The Gospel of Luke predicts the fall of Jerusalem to a nameless enemy with unspoken incentives; however, the fourteenth-century poem transforms the image of Rome from that of an unintentional intermediary to that of a willing instrument working to fulfill the plans of God. No longer power-hungry hordes, the Romans are like medieval Christian crusaders who fight because God wills it. Titus is no longer a pagan general and the pawn of holy prophecy; he is a main actor in a Christian apocryphal narrative. It is for the sake of Christ, then, that the poetic Titus has the temple overturned and plowed under with salt. Moreover, medieval audiences would have perceived by these actions that Titus was fulfilling Christ’s prophecy of Jerusalem’s utter demise (“non relinquunt in te lapidem super lapidem”): the phrase “they did not leave one stone standing upon another” is repeated four times in the poem as if to reiterate the significance of the event as the fulfillment of prophecy.34 By portraying the Romans as the punishers of the Jews and the avengers of Christ, the poet locates Rome within salvation history from almost the first years of the Christian era. Moreover, though little of the poem actually takes place
in Rome, the short episodes that do happen there describe a city that is purging itself of pagan religion. Thus we witness the old emperors assassinating one another, pagan idols shattering upon exposition to the Sudarium, and Vespasian being crowned as the first Christian emperor. As the new champions of the Christian faith, the Christian Romans of the Siege sanctify the once-pagan history of Rome, making the city appear to be the rightful spiritual capital of Christendom, destined to be the seat of St. Peter.

The literal reading of Jews qua Jews, as Hanna and Narin van Court have established, and as Romans qua Romans, as I have shown, enables certain authenticating ideas about Rome to be expressed, as well as providing a narrative to explain ecclesiastical thinking about Jews and Christians in the Latin West. Turning now to an exegetical investigation, one sees that the roles of the Jews and the Romans were not stable and could take on morally interchangeable attributes, with either group acting as antagonists or representatives of Christianity. While the literal reading of the Romans of the Siege portrays Rome as the rightful place of the Church on earth, the exegetical readings of the siege interpret Rome as a source of religious dysfunction. Instead of acting as the champion of Christ, Rome becomes the adversary of God’s chosen Jewish people. In turn, medieval exegetes appropriated the literary images of the Jews and Jerusalem and reinterpreted them as medieval Christians and the Christian Church. For medieval ecclesiasts, Jerusalem and the Church were exegetically linked. As Matter has shown, John Cassian’s exegetical interpretation of Jerusalem in the Collationes was the locus classicus of later medieval scriptural interpretations of Jerusalem:

Cassian’s explanation of the four senses of scripture, the historical, allegorical, anagogical, and tropological, culminates in the famous example of Jerusalem, which can be understood historically as the city of the Jews, allegorically as the Church of Christ, anagogically as the celestial city, “the mother of all” (Gal.4:26), and tropologically or morally as the human soul.35

Gregory the Great, following Origen, expanded the allegorical and tropological understanding of the holy city, interpreting Jerusalem’s adversities as typological tribulations which have afflicted the Church.36 The development of these reinterpretations and shifting cultural identities can be seen through the exegesis of many historical and biblical writers of the medieval period. I have selected the writings of Joachim of Fiore, Ralph of Coggeshall, and Ranulf Higden to represent those writers who were widely known and drew substantially from Josephus to both portray and reinterpret the fall of Jerusalem. In these writers one finds literary
links made between Christian and Jewish identity, from the portrayal of Jerusalem as *ecclesia*, to explanations of God’s favor upon those men who attempt to invade the city. Such writings suggest that medieval interpretations of the *Siege* included, among other readings, the persecuted Jews of the poem as representatives of the suffering body of Christians.

England and Josephus: Joachim of Fiore and Ralph of Coggeshall

Although exegetical interpretation of the historical siege began long before the twelfth century, it was abbot Joachim of Fiore who voiced the connections between the fall of Jerusalem and the moral state of Rome most clearly. Moreover, and perhaps more significantly, he directly influenced the reception of the historical siege by biblical exegetes in England, where the fourteenth-century version of the poem was composed. Joachim, author of the *Liber de Concordia Noui ac Vetus Testamenti*, was born around 1135. He was affiliated with the Cistercians as a young man; however, he never officially joined the order. Joachim traveled to Palestine in 1167 where he began experiencing his spiritual revelations. Shortly thereafter, he began his career as an itinerant preacher and in 1181 undertook planning his *Liber de Concordia*. As E. Randolph Daniel and Marjorie Reeves have shown, Joachim develops the concept of *cordia*, his exegetical method, by using Old Testament biblical history as a kind of “key” to the New Testament, his own present time, and the apocalyptic future. He explains the method to his scriptural analysis:

> Concordiam proprie esse dicimus similitudinem eque proportionis noui ac ueteris testamenti . . . cum uidelicit persona et persona, ordo et ordo, bellum et bellum ex paritate quadam mutuis se uultibus intuentur.

Strictly speaking, we say that concordia is a likeness of equal proportion between the Old and New Testament . . . since, namely, character and character, order and order, war and war look upon each other from a certain similar standpoint.

Thus event prefigures event, character foreshadows character, and battles are set up as interconnected occurrences. This exegetical correspondence essentializes Joachim’s use of the word *cordia*, showing the relationship between patterns in Old Testament history that share similarities with the New Testament accounts. Using the Old Testament like a template, he seeks to show not only how understanding of the New
Testament can be gleaned from consideration of the Old, but that *spiritualis intellectus* results from considering both together. Joachim’s exegesis shows that events and people described in the Old Testament have multiple meanings, for they correspond to, and were seen to prophesy, in a sense, occurrences in the New Testament. Joachim writes that this correspondence between people and events makes historical patterns between past and present apparent, providing evidence of the divine. However, Joachim’s use of the Old Testament is not limited to interpretations of the New Testament; he also brings Old Testament knowledge to bear upon his own current events, such as the threat against the Byzantine Empire. In this case, Joachim links the Saracen threat against Byzantium to Hosea’s prophecy that Israel would be surrendered to the Assyrians. Joachim writes that, *secundum concordiam*, the biblical account of the Assyrians foreshadows the twelfth-century Saracen presence. Even beyond current events, Joachim’s exegesis includes predictions about the future, especially the Apocalypse; he writes that what is to come in the Last Days can be foretold by past events. To this end, many of Joachim’s contemporaries considered Joachim’s *Liber* to be prophetic, believing that his work predicted the fall of Jerusalem to the Muslims in 1187.

Many of Joachim’s prophecies center around the city of Jerusalem as the location where the Last Judgment will take place. His attention to the biblical and historical role of the city shows a complex relationship among the historical, new, and celestial Jerusalems. This relationship is further complicated by the strong exegetical links with which Joachim binds Jerusalem and Rome together. Between Jerusalem and Rome, Joachim finds *concordia* between both the personalities and events in the Old Testament and those in the early Christian and medieval Church. He suggests a natural progression of leadership, beginning with Moses and resulting in Peter’s Roman pontificate. Through his interpretation of biblical history, Joachim says that Jerusalem should be called *ecclesia*:

Concordat igitur cum Moyse Paulus; Petrus cum Caleb; Iohannes autem cum Isue. Caleb, iubente domino, data est in possessione Ebron; in quo processu temporis rex Daud possetit et tenuit sceptrum regni, priesquam regnaret in Iherusalem. Set et Petrus sedit Rome super conuentum fidelium, qui ibi erat congregatus Iudeorum et gentium; in quo post aliquot annos Romanus pontifex, qui successit pro tempore, sollemnem obtinuit principatum, prius scilicet quam perueniret ad istum statum in quo pro visione pacis sancta Iherusalem uocari meretur ecclesia.

Therefore Paul concords with Moses, Peter with Caleb, also John with Joshuá. Caleb, at God’s will, gained possession of Hebron, in which, in the passage of time, King David possessed and ruled over
the kingdom before he ruled in Jerusalem. But Peter also ruled in Rome over the gathering of the faithful, a gathering formed of Jews and Gentiles. [In Rome], after some years, the Roman Pope who followed [Peter] after some time, obtained this solemn principality—that is, before it actually came into that state in which, on account of a vision of peace, the Church deserves to be called holy Jerusalem.48

Here, Joachim compares King David’s rule over Hebron to Peter’s authority in the early Roman Church; he also implies that, in the same manner in which David came to rule the city Jerusalem, the Church gradually increased its spiritual dominion in Rome. Notably, Joachim writes that with the formal recognition of the Roman Pope, the Roman Church becomes the “New Jerusalem” on earth:

Quibus nimirum assimulata fore constat ingentia illa christianorum infideliumque certamina, que post primos Christi apostolorum et Iudeorum conflictus in populo gentili consumata leguntur; usque uidelicet ad tempora Constantini quando noua illa Iherusalem, ecclesia scilicet Petri, regali est coronata fastigio, quemadmodum et uetus illa Iherusalem in tribu Iuda in diebus Dauid.

To [those conflicts in the Old Testament], of course, it is agreed that those enormous struggles between the Christians and the infidels were assimilated; these [conflicts] are read to have been fulfilled among the Gentile people after the first conflicts of the Apostles of Christ and the Jews. That is, up until the time of Constantine when the new Jerusalem, that is, the Church of Peter, was crowned with queenly eminence, in the same way that ancient Jerusalem herself also was crowned by the tribe of Judah in the days of David.49

As the New Jerusalem, Rome becomes God’s favored city, moving the position of spiritual dominance to early medieval western Christian Europe. This sentiment is echoed in the Siege, as Jerusalem is stripped of its religious trappings and prestige, then replaced by Rome. Joachim makes this progression seem natural, and not only biblical, by calling Rome (ecclesia) the daughter of Sion; notably, synagoga is the mother of Sion.50 Joachim rationalizes the rise of the daughter over the mother, or the young over the old, as the predisposition of the Holy Spirit to look toward that which is new.

While Joachim establishes the Roman Church as the New Jerusalem, he builds up the strong spiritual presence of the Church only to bring it down again. Rome is not only the next spiritual capital of God’s dwelling
place on earth, but, according to Joachim, it too is doomed to the successive sieges encountered by the city of Jerusalem. The Church of Rome shares in Jerusalem’s might, but it also shares in that city’s sorrows. Joachim looks at the fallen Jerusalem of the Old Testament, drawing from the book of Jeremiah to depict the battle-torn city. E. Randolph Daniel has shown that Joachim’s early revelations in Palestine suggested to Joachim a concordia between the persecution of the Jews, Jerusalem, and the Church:

Igitur secundum hunc modum persone et persone duorum testamentorum mutuis se uultibus intuentur; et nichilominus urbs et urbs, populus et populus, ordo et ordo, bellum et bellum, et siqua esse possunt similia, que sibi affinitate similitudinum pari causa rationis conueniant. . . . Igitur non solum persona personam uerum etiam multitudo multitudinem respicit ut est Jerusalem Romanam ecclesiam, Samaria Constantinopolitanam, Babilon Romam, Egyptus imperium Constantinopolitanum, et hiis similia. (my emphasis)

Therefore, according to this method, [one set of] characters and [another set of] characters from the two testaments regard each other mutually; and not the less, city and city, people and people, order and order, war and war, and anything else which can be considered similar; which match each other by an affinity of similarities, by an equal argument of reason. . . . Therefore, not only one character is compared to another character, but also the multitude looks upon the multitude as Jerusalem looks at the Roman Church, Samaria looks at Constantinople, Babylon looks at Rome, Egypt looks at the Empire of Constantinople, and things similar to this.

Here, city prefigures city, people prefigure people, and so on, until Joachim places ancient cities in concordia with medieval empires and the Roman Church; what these entities have in common is their state of ruin from a former position of God’s favor. In similar fashion, Joachim warns that God has rejected the Church due to its sins, and he portrays the desolation of the Church as like the destruction of historical Jerusalem.

Along with the comparison between Rome and Jerusalem, the relationship between Babylon and Rome further complicates matters by placing the esteemed Roman Church in close proximity to desperate and depraved Babylon. As Reeves has shown, modern scholars, like medieval exegetes, continue to dispute the relationship that Joachim posited between Rome and Babylon. However, for Joachim, there was an important distinction between Roma ecclesia and Roma civitas. Indeed, in the
quotation cited above, Joachim links Roma, the city, with Babylon the oppressor of Jerusalem in II Kings 25:1–7; for him, Babylon is also the wicked city condemned by God in Isaiah 13:2–22. In spite of this distinction, however, Joachim is concerned with the crimes of both Roma ecclesia and Roma civitas, and, as we shall see, he raises an invective against his mother Church, warning that the wickedness of the Christians within could precipitate its downfall. As Joachim finds in the prophetic account of Isaiah and Jeremiah, God rejects the children of Israel for their sins—particularly their devotion to idols. He writes that the sins of the Jews, secundum concordiam, prefigure the crimina latinorum; he blames the “crimes” of the Church for what he perceives as God’s punishment and neglect of the Church. Comparing Old Testament Jerusalem and medieval ecclesiastical Rome, he writes:

Jeremias ad litteram deflet peccata iudeorum. Secundum concordiam crimina latinorum. Deflet ad litteram destructionem hierusalem. Secundum concordiam desolationem ecclesiae.

Literally, Jeremiah bewails the sins of the Jews; according to concordia, he bewails the crimes of the Latins. Literally, he mourns the destruction of Jerusalem; according to concordia, he mourns the desolation of the Church.55

By linking the desolation of the medieval Church and the repeated sieges of Jerusalem in the Old Testament, Joachim begins a new trend in medieval exegetical writing about Jerusalem. He holds that the biblical and historical persecution of the Jews and the city of Jerusalem are exegetically linked to what he perceives as God’s punishment of twelfth-century Christians and the Roman Church. This exegetical method reflects Joachim’s belief that God had rejected Jerusalem. His interpretation also links the Roman Church to Jerusalem and medieval western Christians to the Old Testament Jews besieged by Babylon.56 Thus in a Christian medieval exegetical sense, the tribulations of Jews and Christians alike are bound across time, so that events and individuals form part of a pattern set to repeat itself until the Last Judgment. As the typological representation of the moral and spiritual woes experienced by fourteenth-century Christendom, the Jews and the holy city of the poem participate in this cycle.

Concurrent with the problem of the sins of the Church was Joachim’s prophecy that Antichrist would rise from the Church of Rome, a claim that he makes not only in an account of his conversation with Richard I, but also in his Expositio in Apocalypsim.57 Long before the fourteenth-century break occurred, Joachim condemned the corruption he perceived in the office of the papacy by implying that Antichrist would appear in
the form of the Pope. This allegation appears in Roger of Hoveden’s account of the 1190 meeting at Messina, where Joachim warns Richard I of Antichrist’s presence in Rome:

Admirantibus autem cunctis super his quae ab illo audiebant, dixit ei rex, “Ubi est Antichristus natus? Et ubi regnaturus est?” Respondit ei Joachim . . . quod Antichristus ille in urbe Romana jam natus esse creditur, et in ea sedem apostolicam obtinebit.

But with everyone around him marveling over those things which they heard from him, the king said to him, “Where was the Antichrist born? And where will he reign?” Joachim answered him that it is believed that the Antichrist had already been born in the city, Rome, and will obtain the apostolic seat in that city.

Joachim perceives Antichrist to be a mortal threat to western Christianity arising from the spiritual heart of its empire. Along with Roger’s account of the meeting with the king, Joachim’s *Expositio* predicted a pseudo-Pope, appearing as a “quasi universalis pontifex.” Although Joachim never explicitly identifies the Roman Church with the city of Babylon, he does, as Reeves has shown, expect a “pseudo-Pope” as one of the manifestations of the Antichrist. After the Great Schism, many fourteenth-century audiences in western Europe and England eagerly adapted Joachim’s remarks about Rome and Babylon to suit the times. For instance, the French writer Jean de Roquetaillade, in his *Vade mecum in tribulatione*, interprets England in the role of Antichrist against the “true Pope,” and attributes the French disasters in the Hundred Years’ War to the work of this same foe. Like Roquetaillade, Telesphorus of Cosenza produced nationalist interpretations of Joachim’s texts, claiming that Joachim’s call to reform signaled the obliteration of the Roman Church through the Schism. As Reeves, Sandra Zimdars-Swartz, and Delno C. West have shown, English Wycliffites also used Joachim’s prophecies as an indictment of Rome, and this rallying point was employed by later Protestant Reformers.

Thematically, Joachim’s typologies made a strong impression on those English exegetical writers who were to follow after him; Reeves has noted that his work held special currency in fourteenth-century England as Joachim’s criticism of the Roman Church was employed by the English exegetes. Combined with the material from the Josephan tradition of the fall of Jerusalem, biblical exegesis in the hands of English ecclesiasts became a powerful tool for comment on the Great Schism. Joachim’s work was disseminated broadly across Europe and into England at an early stage, and, for a brief moment in the late twelfth century, was perceived to promote England as the last hope of winning the Holy Land.
Traditional scholarship holds that the pseudo-Joachite work, *Super Hieremiam*,66 introduced Joachim’s works to the Franciscan Order in the second half of the thirteenth century, but Morton W. Bloomfield and Reeves show that his work disseminated north of the Alps before 1240, and that Joachim’s first English audience included Anglo-Normans in the train of Richard I on the Third Crusade.67 At this meeting, Roger of Hoveden reports that Joachim tells Richard that God has left the restoration of the Holy Land for Richard alone to accomplish; he then predicts that Richard will kill Saladin and restore Jerusalem to Christian rule.68 Such a statement must have done much to elevate the urgency of the crusade in the eyes of the English crown and to raise the status of English participation in the campaigns. However, Daniel has shown that, after Richard’s failure to capture Jerusalem in the Third Crusade, Joachim considered the crusades to be a “futile enterprise,” becoming convinced that spiritual reform, and not valor, would win the day.69 Other English chroniclers besides Roger were intrigued by Joachim’s prophecies; for example, Ralph of Coggeshall offers an account based in part on an interview between Joachim and the abbot of the Cistercian house of Persigny.70 As we shall see, Ralph, an English priest who relied on Joachist exegesis, expands the exegetical relationship that Joachim believed Rome and Jerusalem to share; in this expansion, Ralph attributes western Europe’s losses in the Holy Land to the poor spiritual state of Europe, a theme preached especially in England during the time of the *Siege* poem’s production.

Ralph was abbot of the Cistercian abbey of Coggeshall in Essex, England, from 1206 until his death in 1218.71 Although scant historical evidence exists to provide details about Ralph’s life, it is believed that he began his *Chronicon Anglicanum* in 1198, almost ten years after Saladin took over Jerusalem.72 At this time, England had just begun its full-fledged participation in the eastern campaigns, with many English taking up the Cross for the Third Crusade under Richard I. For Ralph, the culmination of his *Chronicon* is his account of the relic of the true Cross. Constantinople is shown to be politically unstable after the fall; thus, he implies, it is fitting to move the relic to a safer place.73 Ralph’s use of Joachim of Fiore’s exegesis on the Babylonian siege of Jerusalem shows that Ralph was also interrogating the role of the Roman Church and the morality of western Christendom. Ralph makes special note of Joachim; not only does he offer an account of his life and works, but he also shows how Joachim, in his *Concordia*, compared the tribulations of the Old Testament Jews with those of western Christians. Likewise, Ralph reiterates how Joachim likened the seven tribulations of the Old Testament to the opening of the seven seals, which was to take place before the end of the world.74 Of the seven persecutions, six have been meted out to the Old
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66. *Super Hieremiam* is a thirteenth-century work that argues for the truth of Joachim’s prophecy.
68. Richard I’s failure to capture Jerusalem is a well-known event in the history of the Crusades.
69. Other chroniclers who were intrigued by Joachim’s prophecies include Roger of Hoveden.
70. Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon Anglicanum*.
71. Ralph of Coggeshall was a prominent English chronicler.
72. The fall of Constantinople is a significant historical event.
73. Ralph’s account of the relic of the true Cross is an important moment in his *Chronicon*.
74. Joachim of Fiore is a thirteenth-century theologian who influenced Ralph of Coggeshall.
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Testament Jews; these six Old Testament trials foreshadow the six being meted out to Christians, secundum concordiam. Ralph’s account of Joachim’s work pays particular attention to the fall of Jerusalem. Of the six persecutions he mentions, he takes special care to explain the fifth fully, for the fifth tribulation explains the Saracen expulsion of the Crusaders from the city:

Quintam vero persecutionem, quam sub quinta visione et quinti sigilli apertione distinxit, dicit agi temporibus nostris a Saláádio et ejus successoribus, qui terram Hierosolymitanam invaserunt, et matrem Syon a civitate sua Hierusalem transmigrame compulerunt, orbata sancta Cruce, civitate et regno, et Christianorum cerimoniis et omni gloria sua illis in locis spoliata.

Moreover, he says that the fifth persecution, which he distinguished by the fifth vision and the opening of the fifth seal, is enacted in our own times by Saladin and his successors who have invaded the land of Jerusalem, and they compelled mother Syon to move from her city Jerusalem—Jerusalem having been robbed of the Holy Cross, the city and kingdom, the ceremonies of the Christians, and her every glory in those places.75

Ralph uses Joachim’s exegetical method to explain that the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin shares concordiam with the Old Testament account of the Babylonian captivity. Ralph repeats Joachim’s biblical exegesis in order to justify the substitution of Rome for Jerusalem as God’s holy city. It is as if Jerusalem, without the Temple or its relics, is powerless; on these grounds he writes, “mother Syon is compelled to leave Jerusalem,” just as Jews of the sixth century B.C.E. had been compelled to do.

Moreover, like Joachim, who justifies the Roman Church as the New Jerusalem, Ralph also discusses the problems of his contemporary Rome. He writes that “New Jerusalem,” or the Roman Church, is under attack as well. To this end, Ralph expands on the theme of Christian malfeasance in his discussion of the sixth seal marking the coming of Antichrist, who has already begun to flourish in the city of Rome.76

Sed ut malignitas diabolicae adinventionis jam propagata, facilis per Antichristi saevissimam persecutionem possit in Christianis ubique dilatari, credibile est primitus Sarracenos Antichristi praecursores paulatim terras Christianorum invadere et suo dominio subjugare, sicut eos jam fecisse cernimus; ita ut nullus Christianus princeps, peccatis Christianorum exigentibus, adeo potens existat, qui Antichristi saevissimae persecutione et vesanae tyrannidi audeat, vel possit, rebellando resistere. (my emphasis)
But just so that the malignancy of diabolical devising which has already been propagated may be spread more easily through the savage persecution of Antichrist, everywhere against Christians, it is believable that the Saracens, precursors of Antichrist, bit by bit are invading Christian lands and subjugating them to their dominion, just as we have seen them to have done already, to the extent that, on account of the sins of the Christians, no Christian prince exists who is powerful enough to dare or be able to resist the most vicious persecution and frenzied tyranny of Antichrist by rebelling.\textsuperscript{77}

The Saracens, or “the precursors of Antichrist” as they are called above, are portrayed as pawns involved in a plan against Christendom. Joachim attributes their success in driving Christians from their land in the Crusader States to Antichrist himself. For Ralph, the reign of Babylon, the fall of the Crusader States, and the rise of Antichrist are interconnected.\textsuperscript{78} This interpretation is by no means exclusive to Ralph, for many medieval writers explored the connections between the reign of Antichrist and the rise of Muslim power in the Holy Land. The wide dispersal of this image, however, suggests that western Europe and England were both interested in explaining the rise of a non-Christian force through exegetical means. As seen in the quotation above, it is important to note that Ralph did not attribute the fall of the Crusader States solely to the rise of the Saracens, but also to the sins of western Christendom itself. By implicating western Europe and England in the fall, he makes a separate distinction that “Antichrist” is also seen apart from the Saracens. By showing Antichrist as a force associated with Christian immorality, Ralph posits a separate role for Antichrist, attributing western Europe’s loss of Jerusalem not just to Saladin’s power, but also to Christian sin. By attributing the loss of Christian territory in the Holy Land to their own corruption, Ralph likens western medieval Christians to the sixth-century B.C.E. Jews discussed in Isaiah and Jeremiah, for these prophets similarly attribute the Babylonian captivity to the sins of the Jews. He predicts that the fall of Rome will be similar to the fall of Babylon, a comparison made possible, he says, on account of the confusion of “manifold idolatry” in both.\textsuperscript{79} In turn, the Christians cannot resist Antichrist nor can they conquer the Saracens on account of their own prodigious sins. Uniting Christians and Jews through their shared moral weaknesses, Ralph explains that Christian sinfulness is a liability in the fight against Antichrist.\textsuperscript{80} According to medieval exegetes, sinfulness lost Jerusalem for Jews and Christians alike.\textsuperscript{81} \textit{The Siege of Jerusalem} may have participated in this tradition based on the very nature of its subject matter. As we have seen, the role of neither Roman, Jew, nor Christian occupied a fixed and immutable place in the exegetical frame-
work. Like Jerusalem the city, these peoples were made to play several roles in order to teach Christian doctrine. The popularity of the works of Joachim and Ralph of Coggeshall illustrates the wide dispersal of such interpretations of Jerusalem’s demise.

Ralph’s *Chronicon*, along with the additions accruing to it, remained popular in England over the next two centuries. Several chroniclers borrowed from it, among them Ranulf Higden, a Benedictine monk at the abbey of St. Werburgh in Chester, who used the works of Hegesippus, Ralph’s *Chronicon*, and the Latin version of Josephus in composing his *Polychronicon* in the 1320s. The *Polychronicon* was widely available in England, especially in the second half of the fourteenth century; the work disseminated among the ecclesiastical institutions in Latin and was translated into English at least twice, once by John Trevisa in the 1380s, and again in the fifteenth century. The popularity of Ralph’s work, both directly and as mediated by Higden, suggests that its message struck a chord with its medieval English audience. The topical nature of the *Chronicon* is borne out through the noted rise, after the western Christian loss of Jerusalem to Saladin, of English sermons against the sins of the laity in medieval England.

Just as Ralph’s *Chronicon* contributed to England’s perception that the loss of the Crusader States was in some way connected to the sinful ways of the west, so too later chroniclers correlated the role of Antichrist with the corruption of the Roman Church as seen in the Papal Schism. In order to examine such interpretations, one cannot look to Higden because his death in 1363 or 1364 antedates the split. However, further comment regarding the Papal Schism itself is available in the *Appendix* to Higden’s *Polychronicon*. Here, an anonymous author adds an account of the election of Bartholomew, archbishop of Bari, as Pope Urban VI, along with the cardinals’ attempt to depose him, and the election of the antipope. This account is biased in the favor of the English, though not obviously so; however, the chronicler does take care to mention the detail, unwelcome in English eyes, that this new pope is “consanguineum regis Franciae” (a relative of the King of France). In spite of his political leanings, the writer seems more concerned that the Schism occurred in the first place than he is about the political situation with France; thus he concludes, “ita horribile schisma in capite universalis ecclesiae est exortum” (thus the horrible Schism took place at the head of the Universal Church). Similarly, these events receive no comment from Trevisa in spite of the fact that his other translations, such as those of the *Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum* and archbishop FitzRalph’s antifraternal *Defensio Curatorum*, suggest that Trevisa made a pastime of commenting on the corruption he perceived within the Church. However, as Walter Ullmann has shown, although few English chroniclers comment at length
about the Papal Schism, those who do refer to it endow Urban with unquestioned authority and, in contrast, show utter contempt for Clement, the court at Avignon, and the French crown. 87

An extensive English account of the Schism was produced by Thomas Walsingham, a monk writing at St. Albans in 1377. Antonia Gransden has shown that Walsingham may have begun his career by writing the St. Albans continuation of Higden’s Polychronicon. 88 His primary work, a history of England, written as a continuation to Matthew Paris’s Chronica Majora, locates him within the tradition of historical writing founded at St. Albans by Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris. 89 In his Historia Anglicana and St. Albans Chronicle, he documents the beginning of the Schism, follows its course, and displays anti-French feelings. 90 Walsingham shows that in a letter sent to Pope Urban VI, his former cardinals attack him and his election to the papacy, referring to him as, “apostaticus, anathematizatus, Antichristus, et totius Christianitatis invasor ac destructor.” 91 Such invective suggests that the ecclesiastical writers like Ralph of Coggeshall had, through their criticism of the papacy and discussions of Antichrist, prepared England for the next step in exegetical interpretation: the antipope as Antichrist. Likewise, this association circulated widely across western Europe, appearing in the language of the French ecclesiastics, as seen in the example above and in later communications. 92 Almost twenty years after the outbreak of the Schism, the use of the term “Antichrist” in association with the papacy was employed by the Lollards in their Conclusiones against the Church, fixed upon the doors of Westminster Abbey and St. Paul’s Cathedral in 1395. 93

Related to the corruption attributed to the Church were the sins of Christendom in general; the perceived state of moral decline, which was correlated with the Great Schism, continued to be thought to foment the loss of the Crusader States. Both Higden and Trevisa take part in this tradition in their account of Richard I’s losses in the Holy Land. As if to justify Richard’s defeat, Higden writes that the failure is part of God’s plan to chasten Christendom:

   Sic igitur Christus Rex noster malis hominum bene utens, dum terrenam suam Jerusalem . . . in manus tradit hostium, coelestis suae Jerusalem uberiora lucra subtiliter conquisisit. Itaque propter nostrorum defectum et deducus temporum oportet civitatem sanctam conculcari a gentibus usque ad tempus quod solus Deus novit.

   And so Christ our king, using men’s evil well, while he gives over his land Jerusalem . . . into the hands of the enemy, he subtly conquers the fertile riches of his celestial Jerusalem. And thus on account of our defects and shameful times, it is right that the holy city be trampled by people until the time which God alone knows. 94
According to Higden, God himself planned the loss of Jerusalem; the Muslim occupation of Jerusalem was in fact a type of punishment or purification ritual for the Christians. This belief in the spiritually justified loss of Jerusalem continued to be perpetuated in England. Trevisa elaborates on this passage when he presents a translation clarifying that, although the earthly Jerusalem was lost, the celestial Jerusalem, or eternal salvation, could be gained by enduring punishment for sins. Thus, by enduring the Muslim conquest, western Christians pay a kind of penance and thus progress toward their own heavenly salvation. Trevisa's translation of the passage confirms a medieval view that the loss of Jerusalem is a just punishment meant to strengthen Christendom; by suffering defeat, they would win the celestial Jerusalem instead: "So Crist oure kyng useþ wel þe Evel dedes of mankynde, while he takeþ þe erþelich Jerusalem into þe hondes of enemies . . . and bringeþ þerynne forþ wysliche large wynnyng of hiþe Jerusalem in hevene." 95 It is as if the loss of the earthly Jerusalem is necessary to produce the celestial, more valuable one. Trevisa's translation suggests that although western Christians had lost hope of winning back their territories in the Holy Land, nevertheless, they felt they still owned Jerusalem, albeit in a more spiritual, sublimated fashion.

It is in light of this explanation or necessity, if you will, of losing the earthly Jerusalem that I consider the Siege. As English involvement in the Hundred Years' War upheld a split in the Church dictated by nationalistic loyalties united against France, the traditional exegesis that linked the suffering of Rome to that of Jerusalem likewise influenced the poem's reception in England. 96 In the poem the depiction of the Jews, like the depiction of the Romans, is elastic; not only do the Jews of the poem represent Jewish groups who come before and after them, but they also represent medieval Christians. In England's historical chronicles medieval Christians in the Holy Land, like the Jews in the poem, suffer death by the sword, and fall to sickness and starvation in their attempt to keep Jerusalem. 97 According to the exegetes, hope for attaining the physical Jerusalem is so far gone that an eternal ideal of the city is evoked instead; so, too, the actual city in the Siege is annihilated, with the Temple torn apart stone by stone. 98 This retribution for Christian sin is borne out in Higden and Trevisa's exegetical interpretation that Jerusalem would be trod under the feet of the enemy until Christendom earned God's forgiveness and deserved the city in a celestial sense. Thus they would have to earn their eternal reward in heaven: the celestial Jerusalem. In replacing the material with the spiritual goal, the physical city no longer matters, and its annihilation inaugurates a period of renewal for western Christendom. The text thus both explains Christian inability to keep the city and justifies the power of Rome. As far as the English were con-
cerned, Rome, like Jerusalem, was at the mercy of Antichrist, though this
time it struggled under the perceived threat of a corrupt papal govern-
ment at Avignon instead of Muslim armies. Rome, Joachim’s “New
Jerusalem,” would rise up and perform the offices of a sacred earthly city
just as Jerusalem had done.

The image of the fall of Jerusalem occupied the minds of medieval bib-
lical commentators for over fourteen centuries. The exegetical inter-
pretation of the siege held currency as an applied metaphor for the
moral state of the Church and the society of Christians as a whole. With
the advent of the crusades, the siege image acquired greater proportion,
as the fortunes of the crusaders rose and fell in the Holy Land and were
interpreted according to sacred Scripture. From the interchangeable
typological model of first-century Romans as early medieval Christians,
to the portrayal of Jerusalem and the Jews as the Church and the
Christian soul, the role of the besieger and besieged was interpreted vari-
ably, depending on the exegetical context. In Josephus one finds perhaps
the very first exegete of the Roman siege, for it was he who related the
events of the Jewish war in light of his knowledge of the prophetic works
and the Lamentations; as mentioned above, he “corrects” messianic
prophecy in favor of his Roman captors, only to be “emended” again by
Joachim of Fiore. Whatever the case, the predisposition of a society to
insert itself literally into its sacred texts, interpreting its current circum-
stances in their contexts, can be observed in the manipulation of the his-
torical siege of Jerusalem.

Significantly, not just the general historical fact of the city’s demise at
the hands of the Romans, but Josephus’s specific account of The Jewish
War influenced romance and religious genres alike. Josephus’s influence
is all the more remarkable not only because he was a Jewish writer bor-
rowed into the western canon by Christian writers, but also because one
can perceive the agenda of those Christian adapters as they shaped
Josephus’s account for their own ends. The city of Jerusalem, seen at once
as a metonym for the Jewish people, the Christian Church and soul, and
the city of heavenly salvation, occupies a multivalent place in the spec-
trum of symbolic religious language. Religious writers such as the anony-
mous Hegesippus, Jerome, Paschasius Radbertus, Joachim of Fiore, and
Ralph of Coggeshall represent a mere handful of authors using Josephus
to create biblical commentary based on typologies. As medieval ecclesi-
estical writers mined Josephus’s account of the Jewish war for exegetical
material, they found numerous parallels that suggested to them that the
Roman triumph over Jerusalem was another step in the divine pattern of
salvation history.

While the exegetes have shown how medieval audiences interpreted
the literal presence of the Romans in biblical history, this depiction also
reveals more information to the reader concerning the Jews. As Narin van Court has shown, the first-century Jews of the Siege may have been viewed as medieval Jews through the Augustinian tradition. Alternatively, as Hamel argues, they may have been perceived as the non-Christian adversary of the crusades, thus as part of a more generalized body of Saracens. To these readings I would add that, for an English audience, the role of the Jews would have also come to represent the plight of the English nation itself. Indeed, as the Jews of the Siege are made to represent Christendom under threat, they are portrayed as a people with whom to sympathize and from whom to gain inspiration in the face of adversity. As Narin van Court has demonstrated through her study on the Augustinian historians, the Siege poet’s treatment of his sources shows the influence of late twelfth-century Augustinian attitudes toward the Jews.99 Narin van Court’s work on Augustinian writers, such as William of Newburgh and Thomas Wykes, shows that they considered a Jewish presence necessary in order that Christians could remember Christ’s Passion. Newburgh cites Psalm 59:12, “Slay them not, lest my people forget,” in defense of the Jews.100 Indeed, not only do Newburgh and Wykes argue that the Jews are useful to Christians and therefore better left unharmed, they also show outrage at the inhumanity of the crimes against the Jews and condemn Christian barbarity against them. This moral response results in Newburg’s castigation of Christian violence and subsequent defense of the Jews. Noting that the Siege poet may have been influenced by Newburgh through other Augustinian historians such as Wykes, Narin van Court finds precedents for the poet’s sympathetic portrayal of the Jews. Like Wykes who condemns cruelty against the Jews, the Siege poet shows the influence of Jewish “toleration” in his revisions of his sources and humane descriptions of defeated Jews.101 While several scholars have addressed the issue of the poem’s sympathetic portrayal of a suffering Jewish people, I would add that the exegetical typologies of the actual siege offer valuable information regarding this portrayal. The influence of medieval exegetes like Joachim of Fiore, who like Gregory the Great compared the plight of Jerusalem and the Jews to that of the Christian Church and Christians, initiated just such a “sympathetic” interpretation of the Jews, for in the Jews medieval Christian exegetes saw themselves. Thus in investigating the role of the Romans, one can find further information regarding the role of the Jews, the sympathetic nature of their portrayal, and the English audience itself. Through exegetical interpretation, medieval Christian commentators found a way to explain western Europe’s tribulations in the Holy Land through a series of typologies, linking their own place in history to a cycle of suffering associated with Jerusalem since the Babylonian captivity. By placing the fall of Frankish Jerusalem to the Muslims alongside the long succession of historically
and biblically recorded falls of Jerusalem, western Christians both explained their loss in scriptural terms and brought themselves into a cycle of history associated with the Holy Land.

Considered together, the exegetical reading of the poem that interprets the Jews as a typological Christian people and views the Romans as the Antichrist seems contradictory to the literal reading of the poem where fictitious Romans are linked to the Christian crusading forces of western Europe. On the one hand, the typological interpretation necessitates a counter reading of the Siege wherein the Roman aggressors become the adversaries of Christendom, and the Jewish siege victims occupy a martyr-like role as Christians. On the other hand, the literal reading appears much more straightforward as it portrays a fictionalized Roman force whose Christian roots link the poem’s audience to past military grandeur and spiritual authenticity. While these exegetical and literal interpretations seem incompatible, taken together they offer an apt reflection of the time in which the poem was produced in England. In fact, upon closer inspection the results of both readings yield similar results: as a criticism of the Papal Schism, the exegetical reading of the poem would have been in circulation at the precise historical moment of the strife with Avignon. Likewise, the literal reading of the poem supports the Church of Rome by creating a history of Rome’s ties with the holy city Jerusalem. Through both readings, the position of Rome as spiritual capital is justified even as the Papal Schism is questioned. Moreover, both readings present a moral call to arms in the face of Muslim occupation of the Holy Land. The exegetical reading, however, expands into areas of interpretation where the literal reading cannot: it not only calls for its audience to participate in a campaign against the adversaries of Christendom, be they Antichrist or Saladin, but also urges Christian reform from within. The Siege shows the role of the Romans shifting in its cultural valence; it also shows the role of Jerusalem shifting from a material relic sought by the English, to that of a celestial city attained through moral reform of the soul.
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