

# Heritage or Heresy

Preservation and Destruction  
of Religious Art and  
Architecture in Europe



Brenda Deen Schildgen



## HERITAGE OR HERESY

*This page intentionally left blank*

# HERITAGE OR HERESY

PRESERVATION AND DESTRUCTION OF  
RELIGIOUS ART AND ARCHITECTURE IN EUROPE

Brenda Deen Schildgen

palgrave  
macmillan



HERITAGE OR HERESY

Copyright © Brenda Deen Schildgen, 2008.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles or reviews.

First published in 2008 by  
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN™  
175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010 and  
Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, England RG21 6XS.  
Companies and representatives throughout the world.

PALGRAVE MACMILLAN is the global academic imprint of the Palgrave Macmillan division of St. Martin's Press, LLC and of Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. Macmillan® is a registered trademark in the United States, United Kingdom and other countries. Palgrave is a registered trademark in the European Union and other countries.

ISBN-13: 978-0-230-60329-5

ISBN-10: 0-230-60329-7

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Schildgen, Brenda

Heritage or Heresy: Preservation and Destruction of Religious Art and Architecture in Europe

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-230-60329-7

Subject listing

X000.X00X000 0000

000.000'0000000000000—xx00

0000000000

A catalogue record of the book is available from the British Library.

Design by Scribe Inc.

First edition: June 2008

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America.

*“Everywhere pillage and destruction were the order of the day.”*

—Abbé Grégoire, “Rapport,” 1793

*This page intentionally left blank*

# CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ix
List of Figures	xi
Preface	xiii
Introduction: Destruction and Preservation: Continuities and Discontinuities	1
1 Destruction: Idolatry	21
2 Destruction: Iconoclasm and the Reformation in Northern Europe	39
3 In Defense of Images: Christian Church and Religious “Art”	57
4 From Local Culture to World Heritage: Córdoba’s Mosque/Cathedral	79
5 York Minster: From Local to National Preservation	99
6 Making the French Nation: Liberating France, Abbé Grégoire, and the Patrimony of the Middle Ages	121
7 Victor Hugo’s <i>Notre-Dame of Paris</i>	133
8 The Turn to National Heritage: Nineteenth-Century Europe and Restoration	145
Conclusion: Memory, Regret, and History: What Is Cultural Heritage and Why Does It Matter?	167
Notes	187
List of Terms	225
Bibliography	229
Index	253



*This page intentionally left blank*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

BECAUSE OF THE SCOPE OF THE SUBJECT OF THIS BOOK, SUPPORT FOR this project has been immense. First, without the Allen Clowes Fellowship, a year-long fellowship at the National Humanities Center (NHC), Research Triangle Park in North Carolina, I could not have finished this book for many years. The NHC must be counted among the nation's best places to do research. So thanks go to Professors Giuseppe Mazzotta, John Ganim, and Peter Hawkins, who wrote on my behalf and whose recommendations were heeded. At the NHC, the dedication of librarians Jean Houston, Betsy Dain, and head librarian Eliza Robertson helped overcome all research obstacles with their ability to locate worldwide library resources. These are the most diligent, persistent, and helpful research librarians that anyone wanting to do research might encounter in an elusive dream, and they made my research desires come true.

Other people have been essential for keeping this book on track intellectually: first, Professor Randolph Starn, without whom I could not have conceived this book as it has turned out. The mistakes are mine, but Professor Starn provided all the stimulating and essential articles to make this study avoid some simple binary reading of history: past and present, destruction and preservation, heritage and heresy. Also, at Duke Divinity School, Professor Joel Marcus deepened my knowledge of idolatry and its biblical context. Jeffrey Spier, world expert on late antique gemstones, provided me essential information and photographs of examples of early Christian gems.

At the NHC, several co-fellows deserve recognition, including Cara Robertson, who obtained for me all the international declarations, protocols, and agreements on cultural property in a matter of minutes, when it would have taken me a month. I would also like to thank Deborah Wong, who volunteered to take photographs; Maryanne Kowaleski, Gary Macy, and Alastair Minnis, medieval advisors; Kristen E. Brustad, source and guide for Arabic sources in English; Madeline Zilfi and Silvana Patriarca, challenging interlocutors; and Robert Gordon, who gave me the good advice to reduce the final chapter to a conclusion: all of these good companions helped me stay focused and sensible. Also, Catherine Gallagher and Martin Jay were always ready sources of necessary reading matter. The NHC administrators, including Director Geoffrey Harpham and co-director Kent Mullikin, and staff—Lois Whittington, Pat Schreiber, Karen Carroll, Phillip Barron, Joel

Elliott, Corbett Capps, Sue Boyd, and James Getkin—together kept the fellows entertained, intellectually stimulated, comfortable, and well fed. They made sure that the computers were functioning and even helped edit drafts. This was a superb team, without whom this project would not have been finished for years.

Also at Duke, Alice Kaplan from the French Department provided me with a home and lots of good conversations. A one-month residency at the Liguria Study Center, funded by the Bogliasco Foundation, was essential to the final editing stages of the book.

A few words are required about the home front, my own institution, the University of California, Davis, which has been very generous to me. For me to accept the fellowship at the NHC, the university replaced all salary loss; the Davis Humanities Institute, directed by Georges Van Den Abbeele, supported me as a fellow during 2003–4, when I really got started on this project; and the university's generous research-fund support over the last few years made it possible for me to visit cathedrals, archives, and libraries in Spain, France, and England. Former acting dean, Patricia Turner, and former director of my department, Gail Finney, made it possible for me to be absent from campus. Diane Marie Amman, professor of international law in the UC Davis Law School generously read the last chapter for egregious errors on my part. Rasmi Simhan and Jennifer La Fleur, two of the most assiduous research assistants one could possibly imagine, checked all the references in the final stages. Finally, without my husband, Bob Schildgen, whose vigilant editorial eyes spotted every sign of weak writing and ungraceful expression, I would be months behind.

## FIGURES

Front Cover. Pictorial Map of Jerusalem, 1486 (Record #2908, British Library).	
Figure 1. Afghanistan, Bamiyan Buddhas after destruction, 2001	2
Figure 2. Hungarian Revolution, Stalin Fallen, October 24, 1956	3
Figure 3. French Kings/Kings of Judah from Notre-Dame de Paris, from gallery on the western façade (1220–30)	5
Figure 4. World War II Coventry Cathedral, United Kingdom, ruins destroyed by German air raids in 1940, Friday, March 12, 1943	9
Figure 5. View of ruined Wenlock Priory	39
Figure 6. View of the Great Mosque, Córdoba, from David Roberts, <i>Sketches in Spain taken during ye yeares 1832 and 1833</i>	80
Figure 7. Tower of the Giralda, Seville, from David Roberts, <i>Sketches in Spain taken during ye yeares 1832 and 1833</i>	82
Figure 8. Mid-East Egypt Antiquities, March 3, 2007	170
Figure 9. The ovens at the crematories in which the bodies of European victims of the Nazis were burned at Auschwitz, Poland	175
Figure 10. Israeli police officers patrol the Dome of the Rock Mosque	184

*This page intentionally left blank*

## PREFACE

WHEN TALIBAN SOLDIERS DESTROYED THE BAMIYAM VALLEY BUDDHAS OF Afghanistan in 2001, Americans were shocked. Many were also appalled that cultural treasures were looted when the United States invaded Iraq. Some saw these actions as evidence of a “clash of civilizations,” as striking examples of the incompatibility of the tolerant Western world with the religious zealotry, inflexibility, and even barbarism of the Muslim East. However, in their outrage at these actions in the Middle East, Americans seem to have conveniently forgotten that some of the world’s most ruthless destruction of religious and cultural artifacts has been done in the very heart of the West—in England, France, and Northern Europe—and was also perpetrated when Europeans conquered the Americas. The values of protection and preservation of art and architecture now taken for granted in the West developed only after a long series of political and cultural changes dating back to medieval times.

This is not to say that the West ever had a monopoly on iconoclasm. Iconoclasm is a worldwide phenomenon that dates back at least three thousand years, but since it would be impossible in one volume to cover its global history, this study focuses primarily on European iconoclasm and the countervailing preservation of religious buildings and artifacts in Europe. I begin by examining movements that have ravaged images, artifacts, and structures. I then consider how state-promoted violence, whether fostered by ideologies, nationalism, industrialization, or today’s economic development, have been responsible for much of the destruction wrought on artistic and architectural “heritage.” But such destruction may not be prompted solely by religious, ideological, political, or economic differences. Some scholars have linked such destructive episodes to a kind of genocide, arguing that the purpose in attacking a people’s “lived or built environment” can be to destroy the people themselves, or at the very least their way of life.

Although much destruction has obviously resulted from warfare, the military causes of destruction are not the main interest here. Rather, this book explores iconoclastic and preservation movements in civic institutions and nations, and the emergence in the last quarter of the twentieth century of an international movement to support nations seeking to preserve their cultural “wealth” as part of a shared world patrimony. Thus the focus is how state-building motives that have channeled popular emotions to destroy images emerged later to rescue and protect them, and how the trauma of twentieth-century

nationalist bellicosity and postwar regret and anxiety about future wars have led to the idea of world patrimony, a heritage that not only belongs to individual nations, creeds, or ideologies, but to all people.

*Heritage* or *heresy*, also the title of this study, can of course be reversed. In recent years, heritage has come to designate preservation of historic patrimony. During outbreaks of image aversion, church, temple, synagogue, or mosque buildings; decorations; and illuminated books have come under severe attack as heretical. In the nineteenth century, ironically, the recovery of this scorned Christian heritage in Europe became central to reinforcing national identity. National ideologies emerged in which it became tantamount to heresy to denigrate this heritage, while medieval sites were restored to conditions that never existed and a neo-medieval architecture appeared that imitated the once scorned style. Indeed, overenthusiastic restoration itself became a kind of iconoclasm, as it could radically alter the lived environment with demolition and reconstruction of features of medieval buildings.<sup>1</sup>

Today, in the age of mechanical reproduction,<sup>2</sup> with the heritage industry thriving, many cultural critics are dubious about the mushrooming of heritage sites,<sup>3</sup> the marketing of heritage, the corporate economic exploitation of tourism to historic and other valued sites, and the proliferation of “imitation” heritage more akin to heresy than to heritage.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, perhaps the prestige of the established old monument provides some sort of consolation, as a token of imagined past securities that can never be retrieved;<sup>5</sup> or perhaps it just provides proof of past ages before the present time when “novelty” tends to be valued above all else.<sup>6</sup> However, the recently selected wonders of the world (July 2007) suggest that ancient edifices, including Stonehenge, the Taj Mahal, Easter Island, Parthenon, the Colosseum, and the Pyramids of Giza (among the choices of the online survey)<sup>7</sup> are valued more as visual and recognizable icons or as lone and dead testimonies to once living brilliant civilizations. Historic sites become like tombs of ancient cultures visited by tourists who collect photos of themselves with backgrounds of bygone civilizations.

Although the triumph of preservation over destruction may seem a history of progress from “medieval” to “modern” times, this study will emphasize that history is not so simple or linear as might be assumed. Empires, kingdoms, realms, nations, traditional societies, governments, religions, and, today, non-governmental organizations have promoted *both* destruction and preservation throughout this long history. Therefore, the story unfolds with many discontinuities, reversals, and dramatic changes in policy. The idea and practice of preservation is not a modern phenomenon but rather a continuous one that has been brutally punctuated by destructive episodes. The looting of the Baghdad Museum in Iraq provides sufficient evidence that international agreements are by no means extensive enough to provide permanent protection of cultural patrimony. But these destructive episodes possess a sadly

palliative aspect in that they provoke new questions, debates, commitments, understanding, and international accords about what it means to destroy or preserve a shared cultural heritage.

Usually distinguished from vandalism, strictly defined, iconoclasm is the deliberate destruction of religious artifacts regardless of size or location: sculpture, paintings, icons, buildings, and whole cities.<sup>8</sup> The major Western destructions during the eighth- and ninth-century Byzantine iconoclast controversy, in the European Reformation, and in the English Reformation (sixteenth century) and the Cromwell Revolution in England (seventeenth century) were justified on religious grounds and based on a rigid literal reading of the first or second commandment,<sup>9</sup> forbidding “graven images” or “idols,” as stated in Exodus (20:4)<sup>10</sup> and Deuteronomy (5:8)—commandments that would distinguish the ancient Hebrews and Jews from their idol-worshipping neighbors, whether Babylonian, Egyptian, Greek, or Roman. The term vandalism was coined in 1794 by Abbé Gregoire to characterize both the state-sponsored and individually inspired destruction unleashed by the revolution in France.<sup>11</sup> France has had three major outbreaks of iconoclasm, to be discussed in this book. The vandalism of the French Revolution was not restricted to religious artifacts and buildings because during that time, all symbols of feudalism and the monarchy became objects of revulsion.<sup>12</sup> Both vandalism and iconoclasm are particular varieties of violent expression that usually are preceded by intellectual, political, or personal justifications.

I approach this study primarily from the point of view of a medievalist with training in theology, examining how the medieval world view as represented in its symbol system of images and buildings was assaulted or destroyed in the early modern period in England, the Netherlands, and elsewhere in Europe, and then how the nineteenth century “discovered” the period and its “Gothic” past and awoke to what they considered a specifically European heritage. Giorgio Vasari (1511–74), the Renaissance Florentine artist, architect, and author of *Lives of the Painters*, used both “German” and “*stilo gotico*” (Gothic style) as terms of derision about medieval art and the Middle Ages in general, initiating the scorn for the medieval artistic legacy.<sup>13</sup> But the English word “gothic,” probably coming from French and used to describe the style of church architecture with pointed arches, ribbed vaulting, and flying buttresses that developed in Western Europe from the twelfth through the sixteenth centuries, was first used to describe this specific style of architecture only in the seventeenth century. For the French in the late eighteenth century, all monuments of this medieval past were rejected first as “heretical” legacies of feudalism; but making national heritage required restoring this same “monumental” architectural and artistic history.<sup>14</sup>

During iconoclastic outbreaks, images (as artifacts and buildings)<sup>15</sup> arouse awe and ire in people, and while I do not deal with the nature of individual psycho-religious responses to these devotional practices and items, I examine



concentrated communal efforts both to destroy and to restore them. This study argues that these state-sponsored violent assaults against symbolic artifacts prompted responses that proclaimed the values of tradition and continuity or heritage. From a historical perspective, then, we might see the end of the Middle Ages not as a descent into empty symbol without content, as has been argued,<sup>16</sup> but as a deliberate destruction of the forms of religious practice that regulated and enriched the calendrical life of the community. Whether “official” feasts of the Middle Ages or “unofficial” carnival celebrations, liturgical cycles of feast and fast days, with their appropriate images of biblical figures, saints, and theological symbols, deeply affected life in the medieval period,<sup>17</sup> and all became suspect during the Reformation in the north of Europe. From a postmodernist view of the plastic arts, the calendrical celebrations of the Middle Ages constitute a kind of living sculpture, a “commemorative representation” that spoke a symbolic language about the meaning or use of a particular place.<sup>18</sup> The Reformation shoved this living sculpture from the stage of history, to eventually replace its psychic benefits with the idea of citizenship of the sovereign nation.

## INTRODUCTION

# DESTRUCTION AND PRESERVATION: CONTINUITIES AND DISCONTINUITIES

We went to Peter-house, 1643, December 21, with officers and soldiers. . . .  
We pulled down two mighty great angells, with wings, and divers other  
angells, and the 4 Evangelists, and Peter, with his keies on the chappell door.

—*The Journal of William Dowsing*<sup>1</sup>

JUST AS GOLIATH FELLED BY DAVID, THE IMMENSE STATUE OF SADDAM HUSSEIN that had overlooked the city of Baghdad toppled to the ground, fallen among other debris of war, pieces of bombed buildings, shattered glass, bits of fuselage, and unexploded ordinance. His was not the first monumental decapitation—many other examples come to mind. What Parisian citizens believed to be the medieval kings of France that stood in a row above the west entrance to Notre Dame fell at the time of the French Revolution, just like the lopped heads of Mary, Jesus, and countless saints during the Reformation and the Cromwellian Revolution in England.

More recently, we can recall the statue of Reza Khan, the father of the Shah of Iran, toppled with his horse in 1979, of Mussolini pulled to the street, or of Hitler and Stalin finally deposed from their seeming secure public sites.

Symbolic destruction of this type possesses a long-standing tradition, with examples going back to ancient Egypt and Athens and to the well-known habit of ancient Romans destroying images of dead emperors or recarving statues to remind us that the power of rulers is replaceable and at the same time to demonstrate the final loss of power of the decapitated.<sup>2</sup>

As Saddam lost his footing, the Baghdad Library, a repository of Iraq's heritage that archived tens of thousands of manuscripts, books, and Iraqi newspapers, was likewise pillaged. When flames engulfed the library, they



Figure 1. Afghanistan, Bamiyan Buddhas after destruction, 2001.

An armed Afghan man stands guard at the location of the destroyed Buddha statues seen behind him in Bamiyan, central Afghanistan, Tuesday April 9, 2002. Carved into the cliffs over 1,500 years ago, they were destroyed by the Taliban in 2001. (AP Images: 0204090898.)

destroyed countless manuscripts. Likened to the Mongol sacking of Baghdad in 1258, the invasion, the burning of the library, and the looting of the Iraq Museum in Baghdad stand as among the most barbarous and tragic cultural destructions of modern times.<sup>3</sup> In the preface to *The Looting of the Iraq Museum*, the editors write, “Within a month of the American invasion of Iraq in March [*sic*] 2003, people around the globe and from all walks of life were stunned by the news of the systematic looting and wanton destruction of the Iraq Museum in Baghdad, one of the world’s great repositories of Western civilization. Within its vaults and display cases were artifacts chronicling more than 60,000 years of history; not just Iraqi history, but human history, our history.”<sup>4</sup> Yet, despite the fact that American and foreign archaeologists had repeatedly warned the Pentagon about the dangers to this cultural wealth, the military claimed it did not anticipate the widespread looting of antiquities.<sup>5</sup> About five thousand of the fifteen thousand estimated looted items as of April 2006 had been returned, and donations from the U.S. State Department, Packard Humanities Institute, and the Iraqi Culture Ministry have returned the museum to order, although it awaits a time of peace when it will reopen to the public.<sup>6</sup>

The Iraq case provides a textbook model of how heritage, that is, the natural and cultural wealth of a geographical region that links a group of



Figure 2. Hungarian Revolution, Stalin Fallen, October 24, 1956.

Hungarians witness the fallen statue of Josef Stalin in front of the National Theatre in Budapest on October 24, 1956. Demonstrators revolting against communist rule in Hungary pulled the statue to the ground; then it was smashed to pieces by the people. (AP Images: 561024021.)

people, however loosely, is destroyed and preserved. Iraq has an estimated ten thousand archaeological sites, and for a country its size, one of the largest collections of ancient artifacts in the world. Baghdad's National Library and National Museum were not only repositories of this cultural heritage but also sources for documenting the region's complex history and identity. Iraq's heritage is therefore a major global, historic, and scholarly resource, as well as a source of revenue from tourism and of intellectual and aesthetic pleasure for all those interested. The curious and student alike, along with researchers, collectors, and aesthetes both abroad and within Iraq, made use of this repository of the past, and its loss constitutes a major cultural disaster.<sup>7</sup>

What makes this human and cultural catastrophe especially saddening is that Ancient Mesopotamia (present-day Iraq) has sustained "literate cultures" for 3,500 years, with a series of different rulers (Sumerians, Assyrians, Babylonians, etc.) that prized "archives" and "private scribal collections" in palaces and temples from ancient times.<sup>8</sup> It was in Iraq some 1,200 years ago—not in the European Renaissance—that the great recovery of ancient Greek culture began. Harun-al Rashid (reigned 786–809 CE), the caliph who appears frequently in *1001 Nights*, was an avid collector of ancient Greek

texts. His son, Caliph al-Ma`mun (813–33), expanded his father's patronage of archival work, sponsoring the translation of Greek texts into Arabic and founding the *bait al-hikma* (Academy of Wisdom in Baghdad), which surpassed the Persian University of Jundaisapur as a major center of science. Scholars of all races and religions, committed to what today we label a "universal world heritage," neither specifically Islamic nor Arabic, came from all over the world to the academy, whose library was enriched by the many translations from Greek. Concerned with preserving a "universal" heritage, the scholars who worked at the academy translated Galen's medical texts as well as Aristotle's *Physics*, the Greek New Testament, and works of Plato, Ptolemy, Euclid, Pythagoras, and Hippocrates.

Of Iraq's ten thousand archaeological sites, the World Heritage Convention only protects two, Hatra and Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat), the first capital of the Assyrian empire and the religious center of Assyria, respectively. According to the World Heritage Convention, in 2000 the Iraqi government proposed a number of tentative places as world heritage sites including Numrud, situated on the Tigris River south of Mosul; Nineveh (ancient strata), the Ancient Mesopotamian city mentioned in the Bible; the Fortress of Al-Ukhaidar, built in 774–75 by Isa ibn Musa; Ur, the city of the Sumerian moon god Nanna, the traditional home of the biblical patriarch Abraham (Gen. 12:4–5) and one of Gilgamesh's cities; Wasit, founded in 701 by al-Hajjaj bin Yusuf Al Thaqafi, Islamic governor of Iraq; and one of the great cities of Assyria, Samarra, recognized as possibly the largest archaeological site in the world today. Sadly, not only have these heritage designations been forgotten because of the Iraq war, but violence in Iraq has also damaged Samarra's mosque shrine and its spiral minaret dating from the ninth century and reflecting the adopted style of the Ancient Mesopotamian ziggurat. Today, a U.S. military base has been built next to this testimony to the multilayered history of the people who have lived for millennia alongside the area's two great rivers.

The treatment of heritage follows a pattern among diverse peoples and times. Whether destroyed or preserved to build national unity or religious movements; as a result of conquest, war, or revolution; or simply to satisfy human greed, rage, or other impulses, a region's heritage often becomes the victim of political and social upheaval, warfare, or even of planned structural or economic changes.<sup>9</sup> The first Gulf War isolated Iraq culturally as well as politically, leading to the plunder and sale of artifacts stolen from its museums and archaeological sites. Loss of position and power on the world economic and diplomatic stage made plundering its cultural wealth both easy and silent, as has happened so frequently in the past and most infamously in recent times under the Nazi regime.<sup>10</sup> Although the UNESCO convention signed in Paris in 1970 forbids the illegal transfer of cultural artifacts, many of Iraq's objects found their way to Switzerland, the world's fourth-largest

art market, whose own government recognizes the country's reputation as a center for illegally transferring cultural goods.<sup>11</sup>

Many recent examples of state-sponsored or individual destruction of national patrimony or cultural symbols come to mind. For example, in the case of the Bamiyam Valley Buddhas of Afghanistan, according to newspaper reports in 2001, Afghanistan's supreme leader Mullah Mohammed Omar ordered the destruction of all statues, including two ancient and towering images of the Buddha, issuing the following edict: "In view of the fatwa of prominent Afghan scholars and the verdict of the Afghan Supreme Court, it has been decided to break down all statues/idols present in different parts of the country. This is because these idols have been gods of the infidels (unbelievers), who worshipped them, and these are respected even now and perhaps maybe [*sic*] turned into gods again. The real God is only Allah and all other false gods should be removed."<sup>12</sup> While the reason given appears to be religious, based on the court's interpretation of Islamic law, clearly other motives underlay the decision. The act of violence against cultural symbols of alternatives to Taliban Islam was not just a defiant act of resistance against external political and cultural criticism; it was also an effort to impose national unity and purpose against military and tribal challenges within Afghanistan. An act that deliberately contradicted the values upheld by modern Western museum



Figure 3. French Kings/Kings of Judah from Notre-Dame de Paris, from gallery on the western façade (1220–30), pulled down in 1789 and found in 1977 in a mass grave at the Hôtel Moreau. (Musée de Cluny, author's photo.)

culture, the destruction, it has been argued, was also a performance “designed for the Internet . . . an elaborately staged destruction” that was itself a purposeful communication.<sup>13</sup>

Going back in time, we can find other examples of such symbolic destruction. When Hindu fundamentalists destroyed the sixteenth-century Babri Masjid Mosque in 1990, built by the Mughal emperor Babur in Ayodhya, India, that stood, according to tradition, over the Hindu temple built where the god Rama was reputedly born, they hoped to replace it with a Hindu temple. This case is a specific example of how politicized local memories can replace a multilayered historical past and trump scholarly authority.<sup>14</sup> Stemming from politically promoted religious tensions between Moslems and Hindus in India, the attack directly strengthened the Hindu Nationalist Party, which came to power almost immediately after this event.<sup>15</sup>

The Cultural Revolution in China (1966–76) encouraged defacing or destroying any objects or artifacts that smacked of imperial domination. In the furor to “destroy the old world; establish the new,” in a classic example of early Cultural Revolution Red Guard art, a worker is pictured smashing a crucifix, a Buddha, and classical Chinese texts, all representing imperial domination.<sup>16</sup> It is now conceded that the Cultural Revolution that sponsored the devastating mob violence had more to do with the economic failures of Mao’s Great Leap Forward than with criticizing a return to bourgeois life style. In a sophisticated political ploy to conceal these problems, the government unleashed a youth movement to focus energies by attacking the symbolic remnants of the pre-Communist state.

Similarly, in the former Soviet Union, Stalin’s regime justified the massive destruction of many of Moscow’s churches ostensibly to build the metropolitan railroad, but today many observers contend that it was part of an effort to destroy the Russian Orthodox religion and break its hold on the Russian people. Icons central to Orthodox traditional practices were shunned, covered, or destroyed. Today, they are hunted for and restored.<sup>17</sup>

State- or ecclesiastically sponsored violence against cultural sites also occurred in Spain with the “crusade” against Iberia’s non-Christians (Islamic Spain), beginning with the Sacking of Toledo in 1085 and proceeding sporadically but insistently until the capture of Granada in 1492. At least until 1492, the Spanish victors did guarantee some sort of religious freedom, but their policy was to take over mosques and either destroy them or reconsecrate them with holy water and turn them into Christian churches.<sup>18</sup> Based on a program of conquest and eventually of “national unity” from 1492, the Catholic kings adopted a program to erase the legacy of Judaism and Islam in Spain.

This policy of intolerance sailed across the Atlantic where, to conquer Mesoamerica, according to both Nahuatl and Spanish accounts, the conquerors drained lakes, destroyed “idols,” and raided and burned sacred buildings.<sup>19</sup>



In Latin America, or New Spain, it is important to distinguish between the bellicose iconoclastic religiosity of the military and the activity of some early missionaries, such as the Franciscans, who adopted a policy of syncretism of Christian ritual with Aztec (*Nahua*) religion, even though Emperor Charles V had ordered the following: "In regards to temples and adoratories, His majesty mandates that you demolish the temples [but] without scandal, and with the necessary prudence, and that the stone be used to build churches and convents."<sup>20</sup> In fact, as recent scholarship has shown, the Franciscans actively sought to mix the native religious practices, buildings, and symbols with their own<sup>21</sup> in a tradition reaching back to Pope Gregory I (590–604), who had stipulated in his letters pertaining to the conversion of the English not to destroy the temples, only the idols.<sup>22</sup>

Indeed, much of our knowledge of that first century of contact between Europe and Mesoamerica comes from the work of Fray Bernadino de Sahagún, first "anthropologist" of the area, who, in what is today called the Florentine Codex, collected Nahuatl texts that he recorded in the original language and also translated into Spanish.<sup>23</sup> We get a rather different picture of the actions of the friars in Yucatán from Fray Diego de Landa who, as the "kind" face of the conquerors, nonetheless in setting out to convert the Mayans to Christianity, scorned idols and temples while contributing to the destruction of the indigenous way of life and enslaving its people.<sup>24</sup>

Islam, like Christianity, had also endured periodic outbreaks of iconoclasm centuries before the attacks on the Buddhas in Afghanistan, although there is little evidence of destroyed images during the medieval period.<sup>25</sup> A *hadith* of Muhammad, "verily the most unprofitable thing that eats up the wealth of a believer is building," and a strict reading of the Koran 5:92, "O believers, wine and arrow-shuffling, / idols and divining arrows are an abomination, some of Satan's work; then avoid it," seem to prohibit religious art and architecture.<sup>26</sup> For example, in Egypt, Islamic rigorism led a fanatical Sufi in 1378 to deface the Sphinx of Giza so that it lost part of its face.<sup>27</sup> While the rigorists of the Reformation were smashing the stone heads of religious figures, Moslem rigorists also rubbed out human heads depicted in miniature paintings in precious Persian manuscripts.<sup>28</sup>

As is apparent in China's Cultural Revolution, religious sectarianism is by no means the only cause of outbreaks of state-sponsored or individual iconoclasm/vandalism. The French Revolution, a secular movement, led to the destruction of religious buildings and artifacts in order to eliminate what revolutionaries had come to see as a corrupt and decadent ecclesiastical and feudal power in French society. In this case, like the Reformation in England, destruction or "vandalism" was deemed palliative. It was state-sponsored cleansing of the built environment.

Indeed, for the last two hundred years, as national consciousness and the secular idea of the nation-state have been formed politically, intellectually,



and culturally,<sup>29</sup> the destruction of cultural centers and artifacts continues to play a prominent role in various conflicts, such as recent and ongoing struggles over religious sites, as in Tibet, Kosovo, Bosnia, Jerusalem, and Iraq. Destroying the cult sites of others, as has been recently argued in the examples of war against buildings and libraries, is a deliberate attempt to disparage or erase cultural or collective memory and thus to eliminate a people's sense of who they are.<sup>30</sup> This is an example of what has been called "instrumental iconoclasm, in which a particular action is executed in order to achieve a greater goal."<sup>31</sup>

As recently explored in *The Rape of Europa*, the Nazi regime and Hitler in particular, infamous for his efforts to erase a people, also sought to root out "degenerate" art, purging more than sixteen thousand modern works. At the same time, he amassed a huge collection of stolen "old" European masters that were to be on display in a museum of European art in honor of his regime—in other words, to create a new collective memory. The effort failed, but many of the works remain missing. Indeed, inflicting purposeful destruction on architecture, art, and artifacts was commonplace in World War II.

In 1939, fearing accidental or deliberate damage to Chartres Cathedral as at other medieval cathedrals, like York Minster for example, the sacristans removed all stained-glass windows and stored them in basements to save them both from thieves and bombs as a precaution prior to the World War II. The town of Chartres unfortunately was not spared bombardment. The cathedral had already sustained pillage of its relic treasury and mutilation of many bas-reliefs, along with other deliberate damage during the French Revolution (1789) and its aftermath (although these actions were more characteristic of a kind of "expressive iconoclasm, in which the desire to express beliefs and give vent to feelings is achieved by the act itself").<sup>32</sup>

In 1940, during the infamous nine-hour blitz, the Germans bombed Coventry, one of the best-preserved medieval cities in England, although there were no military targets in Coventry. The attack was the most sustained assault of a city in war history. Its purpose was to demoralize the people of Britain. By the end, Coventry's medieval cathedral was a skeleton.

In a similar act of violence against artifacts in 1945, the Allies attacked Dresden, the German city that was richest in terms of cultural heritage, after the British had adopted a policy of firebombing cities and civilian centers.<sup>33</sup> Dresden as a cultural center was not thought to be a war target, and it had become a refuge for civilian populations fleeing the war-torn regions in Germany. An estimated one hundred thousand civilians also became victims of the firebombing of the city.<sup>34</sup>

As acts of instrumental and expressive iconoclasm, the assaults against the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon in 2001 provide contemporary examples of symbolic buildings that became objects of destructive zeal. As symbols of U.S. military and economic power (what some would call the *true* religion of the United States), both buildings



Figure 4. World War II Coventry Cathedral, United Kingdom, ruins destroyed by German air raids in 1940, Friday, March 12, 1943, clergymen form a procession. (AP Images 430312020.)

represented what “America” meant to the iconoclasts who attacked them. Destroying them was a symbolic decapitation of the United States on religious grounds because to these Islamic fundamentalists, the buildings represented a kind of apostasy.

In a discussion of iconoclasm, it is important to distinguish between isolated incidents (expressive iconoclasm); premeditated, planned destructions (instrumental iconoclasm); and a combination of both. The isolated incidents that occur regularly throughout history and in many different areas are performances, speech acts, individual acts of rage, acts of disappointed love, corrective efforts, or acts of hedonism directed against specific targets. They may be labeled deviant behavior, or they may be understood as having a cultural, social, or political purpose.<sup>35</sup> Individuals or groups act on their own impulses to destroy an offensive artifact or object, as in the case of tearing down icons, like statues of Mussolini, Stalin, or Saddam Hussein, or when José Bové, the French “eco-saboteur” farmer deliberately smashed into a half-built McDonald’s in Millau, France in 1999. Even the common habit of tearing up the photographs of former lovers or spouses, as if the destruction of the photo would erase the emotional power the person once exercised, is a similar gesture.

Complex sociopsychological motives as well as political or ecclesiological agendas often underlie the destructive action. Psychological reasons that motivate iconoclasts to perform their acts of destruction certainly include rage, which is sometimes justified; religious fanaticism that excludes any challenges to its unbending view of the world; and even artistic taste. The trait defining the act of destruction is not what is destroyed but who performs the act and what motivates that individual. For example, a person who, in an expressive iconoclastic act, throws blood on a painting is considered a vandal, like the person who smashed the second toe of the left foot of Michelangelo's *David* in 1991, whereas such an act would be considered legitimate when a state or ideology condones or sponsors destruction of artifacts. The word "reformation" itself, ideologically colored with notions of progress and renewal, puts a positive label on events that led to the mass destruction of the medieval symbol system and calendrical lifestyle.

Discussing individual acts of iconoclasm, usually called vandalism, in a brilliant little essay entitled "Iconoclasts and Their Motives" (1983), David Freedberg, an eminent expert on iconoclasm,<sup>36</sup> argued that among the many examples of iconoclastic actions against works of art in the second half of the twentieth century (Leonardo's *Mona Lisa*, Michelangelo's *Pietà*, Rembrandt's *The Nightwatch*, Rembrandt's *Self-Portrait*, Bryan Organ's *Princess of Wales*, etc.), three main impulses prompted the attackers: attention seeking; revolt against the hold an image had on the perpetrator; and primitive feelings of hatred like those that had impelled legitimated iconoclastic movements in the past.<sup>37</sup> When a legitimate institution (state, religion, nation, etc.) channels individual resentments against an entire class of artistic images, a combination of both instrumental and expressive iconoclasm can erupt.

Although religious conflict is often cited as the cause of iconoclasm, emphasis on religious motives actually conceals political and economic forces that are often more powerful factors in the destruction. Building a national or group identity and common purpose against perceived threats to national stability must also be recognized as a major factor. For example, destruction of the remnants of Roman(papal) art in England during the Reformation had as much to do with building the English nation as it did with liturgical reform<sup>38</sup> (as will be discussed in Chapter 2). Here, iconoclasm possessed the instrumental function of destroying "collective memory" in the form of art, architecture, and liturgical and devotional practices.

Also, economic forces and resentments play a role, as in Christian destruction of the cultural property of Jews and Moslems in *Reconquista* Spain; in Protestant attacks on the signs of the Roman Church in England, the Netherlands, and France during the Reformation; and again in France during the revolutionary period. These outbreaks of iconoclasm had as much to do with appropriating property and destroying traditional economic alliances as with religious intolerance of what were considered heretical practices.

Also, destroying artifacts and the “symbolic capital”<sup>39</sup> of others, whether artifacts that represent the group identity and social memory of a people or of the divinities they worship, is a cultural war-making mechanism. The Spanish destruction of buildings and religious artifacts in the Americas in the sixteenth century was a forceful way of eliminating resistance to Spanish political and economic domination. Leaders can use, foment, and direct the emotions of the populace or their own policing powers to disparage or erase a people’s symbol system and its objects in order to advance political, cultural, or economic programs that may actually have little connection to religious beliefs.

Clearly artworks, whether visual art or architecture, are not the deities, spirits, saints, or invisible forces they represent. They are signs of these beings and forces, but not the entities themselves. Nonetheless, art does have the ability to evoke such a powerful sense of the actual presence of these entities and a sense of connection to them and awe of them that the distinction between image and what it signifies may disappear to the viewer. Anxiety about excessive ornamentation in religious devotion and the tension between intent and reality explain the concerns expressed about visual aids to religious contemplation, as espoused by the Cistercian reform movement, especially under the rule of Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153) who warned against the dangers of too much visual stimulation in the emerging sculptural renaissance of the twelfth century.<sup>40</sup> Although he was only addressing himself to monastic environments, Bernard’s concerns were more about architectural flamboyance and sculptural fantasy—in other words, about the necessity of austerity in monasteries, which such artistic excess contradicted. The Cistercians were neither iconoclastic nor against visual art because they promoted their own austere style, even though after the death of Bernard, they too turned to the new artistic developments patronized by the Cluniac order.<sup>41</sup> Nonetheless, the representation of “idolatry” as a dangerous seductress in late medieval and the pre-Reformation illuminated manuscripts points to the ongoing tension about the power of images.<sup>42</sup> The 1325 Sienese discovery of a statue of Venus by the fourth-century BCE Greek sculptor Lyssipus offers an example of this fear of the power in works of art. The Sienese placed the statue on a communal fountain until they began to fear it would bring bad luck, so they dismantled it, broke it into pieces, and buried it in Florentine territory, hoping that its evil power would damage their Florentine enemies.<sup>43</sup>

Even defenders of images, like Pope Gregory the Great, worried about what constituted appropriate reverence for visual display.<sup>44</sup> As the Renaissance writer Leon Battista Alberti noted in *On Painting* (1435), “Painting possesses a truly divine power in that not only does it make the absent present (as they say of friendship), but it also represents the dead to the living.”<sup>45</sup> This special power to make the absent present, which Alberti labels “divine,” is precisely the element that consoles the sympathetic viewer and agitates the potential vandal or iconoclast.<sup>46</sup>

Cardinal Paleotti (1522–97) of Bologna, who wrote *Discorso intorno alle imagini sacre e profane* (*Discourse on sacred and profane images* [1582]) in the wake of the image crisis during the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, was aware that because neither the painter nor the viewer of the painting could be guaranteed to “see” and understand the painting in the same way, the sign and signified were indeed not unified, creating a further complexity in the power of the image itself.<sup>47</sup> As Freedberg argues, when “critical pressures are brought to bear on this tension” between the image and what it represents, “men and women break images, as if to make it clear that the image is” just an image, that it “is not living,” and that it possesses “no supernatural embodiment of something that is alive.” By attacking or destroying the image, “they disrupt the apparent unity of sign and signified,” to force the viewers’ recognition that the object is ordinary material.<sup>48</sup> The link between imagination and sense perception that traditionally justifies the use of visual art in meditative and liturgical religious practices does not guarantee a religious ascent, and indeed the pure pleasure derived from the artifact may sensually arrest the viewer in an aesthetic experience rather than advance religious growth.<sup>49</sup> Some iconoclastic viewers do not recognize this distinction; and fearing that viewers are venerating matter, they believe the difference between sign and signified must be dramatically demonstrated. This anxiety can erupt into “idol-breaking” iconoclasm. To emphasize the separation between the image and what it signified, the early Christians reached a compromise, what came to be labeled as the middle way that separated adoration (*latreia*) for God alone from veneration (*dulia*) reserved for images.

Confusion over adoration and veneration and a failure to distinguish between sign and what it signifies may lie at the basis of the desire to destroy. When there is this misunderstanding of symbolic value, the artifact takes a quasi-mystical hold on both destroyers and venerators. This “symbolic value” has multiple meanings because for religious venerators, it may evoke ecstasy and lead to deepened religious experience; for those who fear idolatry, it becomes corruption, falsity, and heresy; for collectors and social climbers, it conveys economic and cultural power beyond the obvious pleasure and delight in owning or having seen something of value; and as noted, for builders of nations it can either symbolize tradition to be rejected as invalid, or tradition to be upheld as national identity and historical patrimony.

In this study, we will see that defenders of religious art and iconoclasts repeatedly revert to discussions of images as “matter” or as prototypes of something else. Yet the dichotomy is ultimately false because images are always both and more. To the destroyer, smashing a statue, building, or image symbolizes an assault on its provenance as if its destruction ends the enemy it represents. Describing one such iconoclastic episode during the civil war between the Puritans and the Royalists in England, the *Mercurius Rusticus*, a pro-Royalist paper, says of the Puritan soldiers, “They strook off the heads

of all the Statues, on all Monuments in the Church, especially they deface the *Bishops Tombs*, leaving one without a *head*, another without a *Nose*, one without a *hand*, and another without an *Arme*. . . . they pluck down, and deface the *Statua* of an Ancient Queen, the wife of *Edward the confessor* . . . mistaking it for the *Statua* of the *blessed Virgin Mary*.”<sup>50</sup>

For iconoclasts, the distinction between a sign (or symbol) and what it represents does not exist. The sign possesses only a single significance, and to destroy it is to expose both the sign (image) and what the iconoclast makes or believes it to signify as powerless. Destroying images of kings and rulers, thus, has the emotional force of an assassination. No matter what intellectual and religious arguments are advanced to justify the iconoclastic outbreak, fundamentally the iconoclast seeks to destroy the power the image possesses, to erase it from memory, or to abolish the consolation it provides.

Closer examination of the emotional state of the perpetrator reveals another aspect of the iconoclastic mentality, a kind of narcissism. With an egoistic desire for attention, the perpetrator combines the hold the object has on his imagination with hatred of it, and failing to separate external reality from his psychosocial needs, he smashes the offending object. Like Narcissus who takes his image as reality, the iconoclast cannot discern the multiple meanings of images and gives a privileged position to his or her own emotional desires, passions, and compulsions over any others, whether of history, tradition, communal values, and so on. This is what some have called a “malignant narcissism” that very often afflicts celebrities or others in the public eye. Because the nature of their work makes them the center of attention, they really do start to take their internal or psychic situation as the exclusive reality. Gradually, they tend to discredit all the external evidence of the (harmful) impact of their narcissism. This becomes a malignant narcissism when the person afflicted simply discards external evidence as nonsense compared with his or her psychic reality.<sup>51</sup> Leaders of iconoclastic movements, like individual vandals, appear to share a similar kind of malignant narcissism. Some preservationists and theorists about restoration/conservation have been accused of a similar single-mindedness that may not be malicious but that nonetheless fails to countenance alternative views and leads to solutions that neglect the complexities, even irresolvable problems of conservation.<sup>52</sup>

In *Civilization and Its Discontents*, when Freud argues that a human aggressive death instinct impedes civilization, he confronts one dimension of the destructive impulse that compels iconoclastic movements and actions. Freud’s idea of the struggle between Eros and Death, love and aggression, between “the instinct of life and the instinct of destruction” that describes the human drama<sup>53</sup> also applies to the iconoclast and to the preservationist. Notwithstanding the many flaws in Freud’s psychology, his distinction between the destructive impulse and the love impulse (death/Eros) provides a credible explanation of the iconoclast’s literal-mindedness, narcissism, and inability to

tolerate complexity or to discern split intentions and meanings. For under the illusion that his or her radical attitude is absolutely correct, he or she mistakes the sign for the real and sees no alternative but to destroy it. The hatred of the symbol and what it represents develops into an uncontrollable passion to deface or erase it. The acts of violence and intolerance against artifacts, therefore, are often as much acts of desire as acts of destruction.

Destruction and desecration may have long and infamous histories, but the desire to preserve and acts of conservation are not new phenomena either. One could argue persuasively that “destruction,” whether perpetrated by individuals, groups, or states, is invariably done in the name of “progress” or reform, that is, the need to erase the past and start afresh. State-sponsored destruction is often violent political and social engineering, somewhat parallel to a pattern of modern economic engineering that occurs when states and corporations destroy urban environments or villages and traditional lifestyles to construct dams, roads, and airports or mine the earth for resources. Preservation, on the other hand, has been historically done in the name of memory, although it too possesses an ideology of progress, as will be discussed in this book.

Reverence for the dead, like the impulse to destroy, is almost as basic to human life as eating, sleeping, and creating communities. In contrast to the general view that the modern era as a consequence of Enlightenment science and disciplined interest in the past invented the concept of preservation, much evidence remains for considering “preservation” a continuous human activity. Already in prehistoric times, humans shared a common concern for their dead, and this commitment led to creating places of “reverence” that have been held and preserved as memorial sites.<sup>54</sup> While the place, form, and manner of these kinds of sites may have altered over time, the habit of commemoration endures.<sup>55</sup> Religious or ritual activity from the dawn of humans living in societies also has required not just sacred sites, but sacred symbols and ritual actions, which themselves were like moving sculpture. Similarly, almost since the advent of “civilization” (i.e., people living in cities), humans have created archives to store and preserve learning. Again, the kind of preservation or the material media of the learning or ritual item may have undergone radical changes, but the archiving and revering habits endure,<sup>56</sup> almost as if a biological imperative compels the safeguarding repetitive activity.<sup>57</sup>

Like the urgings of the destructive impulse, many different values compel preservation. As this study will discuss, preservation provides “symbolic capital” that is as important as destruction has been. The modern idea of preservation and the museum as institution emerged with academic specialties in antiquities, art history, and architecture.<sup>58</sup> However, to make these developments possible, aesthetic or historic values had to become independent measures of worth as had happened beginning in the eighteenth century.<sup>59</sup> This contribution in the wake of one of the worst outbreaks of destruction, the



French Revolution made preservation “progressive” and destruction retrograde, at least in reference to European heritage. With the emergence of economic forces to steer the market value of “heritage” items, preservation today has both a symbolic and economic value—adding social and cultural prestige and increased capital to the owners of legacy items, whether museums, libraries, or individuals. This kind of preservation that removes the art object from its original context, some argue, is itself a kind of iconoclasm, for it places the object in a wholly new setting where its meaning can be radically altered and the memories or feelings it was created to support erased to be replaced by a new set of meanings, memories, and emotional attachments.<sup>60</sup>

Religious practices foster the ongoing preservation of sites and artifacts that in some cases have witnessed little change, other than necessary repairs and adjustments to facilitate new liturgical practices or stylistic innovations, which some also consider iconoclastic in itself. Baroque overlays in Romanesque churches were responses to changes in spirituality and religious ideology, but their dramatic reworking of church interiors strikes many as destruction rather than artistic or spiritual renewal. Today, having cult sites function as both museums and sites of worship places further strain on these environments. In such religious settings, preservation is a way for a religious community to continue its linkages to the past—but to a dynamic living past that recalls through bodily liturgical actions.<sup>61</sup> Indeed, it has been argued that the Gothic cathedral was itself a “symbolic memory-place.”<sup>62</sup> Certainly the cult of relics, saints’ days, and memorial sites in Christianity created both times and spaces for performing remembrance and recollection of events and their actors.<sup>63</sup>

In the West, the first state-sponsored preservation/reconstruction movement began when the Emperor Constantine the Great admitted Christianity to the imperial court (313 CE). While a tradition of Christian images, image-making, buildings, and holy places already existed by the early fourth century (as will be discussed in Chapter 3), veneration of holy sites took on a central function after the so-called Edict of Milan,<sup>64</sup> which granted freedom of worship to Christians and returned confiscated property.<sup>65</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea (260–339)—contemporary of the Emperor Constantine and author of *Ecclesiastical History*, the first history of Christianity—wrote of Constantine’s pledge to adorn Jerusalem, for example, “that sacred place” with “beautiful buildings.”<sup>66</sup> From the first century, “holy” described virtuous Christian men and women, the *ekklesia* or Church, or the scriptures. With the changes of the fourth century—testified to most forcefully in Eusebius’s *Onomastikon*,<sup>67</sup> a guide to locations mentioned in the Bible—sites became “holy,” labeled with expressions like the “most blessed place,” “the saving cave,” the “holy cave,” “the most holy cave,” and the “most marvelous place in the world.”<sup>68</sup>

Constantine undertook many monumental building enterprises as he sought to ornament Rome and Constantinople, but he also brought to Christianity an imperial sanction for the pagan notion of the sacredness of places



and things. This change encouraged not only building on a massive scale but the idea that certain places deserved special reverence.<sup>69</sup> Constantine's mother Helena and his mother-in-law Eutropia were among the first to make pilgrimages to Palestine. By choosing sites that were associated with Christ, the patriarchs, and the matriarchs—including Bethlehem, the Mount of Olives, and Mamre/Terebinthus—they facilitated the emperor's grandiose building plans for the area.<sup>70</sup> Eusebius's *Onomastikon*, lost, like earlier geographical works describing ancient Judea, the Temple, and Jerusalem, is an early testament to the importance conferred on ancient sites associated with sacred Judeo-Christian history. Constantine's success in promoting the idea of the holy place was immediate and durable, marking the beginning of a long history of the veneration of holy places and relics and the practice of pilgrimage as a legitimate Christian practice.<sup>71</sup> Of course this program was as necessary to the emperor's political designs as it was to satisfying his proclaimed religious purposes.<sup>72</sup> Nonetheless, the significance of this development is clear: it initiated an ambitious Christian building program and officially installed the idea of reverence for historic remains.

The Constantinian revival of the sites of the "sacred events" of Christianity brought into the open Christian memory and connection to the dead, a tradition continued throughout the medieval period with the cult of the saints that was a central feature of the Christian liturgy.<sup>73</sup> Furthermore, after the definitive collapse of the Western Roman Empire (in 476), interest in the past did not decline. For example, one of the most important figures of the late antique period, Cassiodorus (ca. 485–585), the Calabrian Roman official-turned-monk, preferred "to preserve old buildings because in preserving them we shall win no less praise than from building anew."<sup>74</sup> Praising restorations of old buildings on the grounds that early inventiveness is brought to perfection, Cassiodorus argues that restorations make old buildings revive.<sup>75</sup>

Also, the case of Hadrian's Pantheon in Rome, built in the first half of the second century, demonstrates continuing concern for conservation and preservation. Turned into a Christian basilica in 609, it has experienced multiple restorations beginning with L. Septimius Severus' in the early third century and continuing to the present. As the nineteenth-century architect and restorer of French monuments, Eugène Emmanuel Viollet le Duc (1814–79) noted in his article on restoration, in ancient and medieval times buildings were restored when possible, and when not possible, became *spolia* (remains from older buildings) for new buildings.<sup>76</sup> As already mentioned, Gregory the Great and John of Damascus stand out as ardent defenders of buildings and artifacts used for traditional commemorative or meditative practices. In later centuries, we find Master Gregorius's *The Marvels of Rome*, written in the late twelfth or early thirteenth centuries,<sup>77</sup> providing an inventory and history of ancient Roman buildings that survived with descriptions of their size and statuary. Gregorius's work is not unique, for beginning in 1300, Pope Boniface

the VIII's Year of the Jubilee, works such as *Mirabilia Urbis Romae* (Marvels of the City of Rome), which encouraged pilgrimages to Rome, became more common. Later, Petrarch's letter written from Rome to Giovanni Colonna between 1337 and 1341 offers yet another example of medieval interest in the architectural legacy of the Romans. His letter both laments the passage of time and lauds the remnants of the ancient Roman past in an elegy presaging Renaissance fascination with the Greco-Roman heritage.<sup>78</sup>

Following the papal exile in Avignon (1305–77) and the Great Schism (1397–1417) when Pope Martin V returned to Rome, a devastated city of only seventeen thousand people in 1420, a new approach to preservation emerged. Papal bulls recommended the conservation of the city of Rome, not just its churches and holy sites, but also its ancient buildings. In the bull *Cum aliam nostram urbem* of 1462, Pope Pius II Piccolomini (sounding like the Romantic poets will more than three centuries later) promoted the ancient remains as beautiful for giving the city its charm, while reminding us that human works are fragile.

But this story is not so simple. Raphael (1483–1520)—named inspector general of arts by Pope Louis X in 1515, the first such position—lamented the collapsing ruins of ancient Rome in what amounts to a funeral oration. Yet he embraced the new, which led to tearing down old Saint Peter's (a fourth-century basilica) and reassigning the marble from the Forum, the Circus Maximus, and the Aventine to the building of the new Saint Peter's in the *rinascita* style,<sup>79</sup> the word later invented by the painter, architect, and writer Giorgio Vasari (1511–74) to describe the changes in artistic expression of what we now call the Renaissance. What was lost when the new Saint Peter's replaced the fourth-century basilica? The medieval strata of the church became the victim of the new style and the “modern” Roman Church, even though much of the *spolia* from the ancient world that had found a home in old Saint Peter's was redeployed to the new church.<sup>80</sup>

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries began to rediscover, appreciate, recover, and imitate this medieval strata of western Europe. Even the nineteenth-century writers without religious faith or even sympathy with religious adherents began to describe a transcendent feeling that this legacy of past ages evoked for them. Their responses to medieval cathedrals, architecture, and art celebrate a sense of grandeur, immensity, light, and transcendence. For example, Victor Hugo wrote of Notre Dame as a symphony in stone, whose statuary, sculpture, and carvings produce its silent grandeur.<sup>81</sup> Viollet le Duc, as if in erotic rapture, in a letter to Prosper Mérimée (1803–70) about the French bas-reliefs decorating medieval churches that had “nothing to do with antiquity,” described the exquisite purity, artistic satisfaction, and ravishing form of the medieval works.<sup>82</sup>

John Ruskin (1819–1900), in his accolade to architecture as a source of psychological consolation, writes, “Architecture is the art which so disposes

and adorns the edifices raised by man for whatsoever uses, that the sight of them contributes to his mental health, power, and pleasure.”<sup>83</sup> Praising Romanesque art, he likened its forms to nature: “The Romanesque arch is beautiful as an abstract line. Its type is always before us in that of the apparent vault of heaven, and horizon of the earth. The cylindrical pillar is always beautiful, for God has so moulded the stem of every tree that it is pleasant to the eyes. The pointed arch is beautiful; it is the termination of every leaf that shakes in the summer wind, and its most fortunate associations are directly borrowed from the trefoiled grass of the field, or from the stars of its flowers.”<sup>84</sup>

Auguste Rodin (1840–1917), another lover of the French medieval cathedral as the emblem of “national” character, wrote, “The cathedral is the synthesis of the country. I repeat: rocks, forests, gardens, the northern sun, all this is captured in its gigantic body, all France is in our cathedrals, just as all Greece is in its Parthenon.”<sup>85</sup> Americans were also seized by medieval forms, most famously, Henry Adams (1838–1918), who described Chartres’ twelfth-century windows as inspired, even divine: “These three twelfth-century windows, like their contemporary Portal outside, and the *flèche* that goes with them, are the ideals of enthusiasts of mediaeval art; they are above the level of all known art, in religious form; they are inspired; they are divine!”<sup>86</sup>

The proto-environmentalists in America, whose interests in the U.S. natural patrimony parallel the European turn to the historic past, even adopted this rapturous architectural language to laud and defend the natural beauty of the New World. Of the experience of the ponds at Walden, Henry David Thoreau (1817–62) recalled, “White Pond and Walden are great crystals on the surface of the earth, Lakes of Light . . . like precious stones . . . more beautiful than our lives.”<sup>87</sup> John Muir (1838–1914), in a similar vein, enthralled by Yosemite, likened the natural to sculptural forms: “Then I went above to the alphabet valleys of the summits, comparing cañon to cañon, with all their varieties of rock structure and cleavage. . . . [T]he grand congregation of rock creations were present to me, and I studied their forms and sculpture. . . . The grandeur of these forces and their glorious results overpower me, and inhabit my whole being.”<sup>88</sup> For Americans, it was the natural beauty of their adopted land that spurred their desire for preservation and conservation, leading in 1872 to the creation of Yellowstone, the first national park in the world. A number of U.S. presidents after the 1906 Antiquities Act, initially designed to protect prehistoric Native American ruins and artifacts, declared hundreds of thousands of acres “objects of scientific interest.” Teddy Roosevelt was the first to use the act, declaring Devils Tower, Wyoming, the Petrified Forest in Arizona, and the Grand Canyon national monuments between 1906 and 1908. Ironically, the government’s plan to flood the Grand Canyon in the 1970s to create hydroelectricity incited a massive publicity campaign by one of the greatest U.S. environmentalists of the twentieth century, David Brower (1912–2000). Like the earlier environmentalists Thoreau and Muir, Brower

linked natural and cultural “beauty.” He ran full-page ads in the *New York Times* to counter the government’s argument that flooding would allow tourists to get closer to the top of the canyon, asking, “Should we also flood the Sistine Chapel, so tourists can get nearer the ceiling?”<sup>89</sup>

Europe’s celebrated cultural wealth was falling into decay and desolation as a result of deliberate destruction or neglect due to religious wars, revolutions, industrialization, and shifting tastes from the sixteenth century on. According to Belgian art historian Roger H. Marijnissen, we cannot calculate the number of works of art “lost or destroyed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Works of the highest order were treated with casual contempt. Style and taste were changing, and old-fashioned works of art no longer held any interest. Numerous masterpieces underwent scandalous tribulations.”<sup>90</sup> The nineteenth-century’s interest in recovery and preservation was possible partly because, despite the civic unrest, war, and violence of the previous two centuries, some notion of secular and religious tolerance, no matter how flawed, had emerged in the Enlightenment, and with it an idea of aesthetics that separated abstract ideas of “beauty” from the particularities of the religion faith. In addition, a commitment to national history and patrimony in many European countries became central to the formation of the modern nation. Connection to the past came to be associated with the history of a nation, with its own nexus of problems, rather than with the narrative of the heroes and heroines of Christianity whose celebration in “historic buildings” had earlier linked living believers with the dead through the celebrations of the liturgical year, the cult of the saints, and the burial of the dead. Romantic writers and artists began the nineteenth century’s long nostalgic meditation on the architectural and artistic remains of the medieval period, but from an aesthetic rather than a religious point of view.

Ongoing preservation of cultural monuments (cult sites and artifacts that were in use) up to the nineteenth century reflected a tradition of continuity, that is, making the buildings and artifacts conform to standards of taste, beauty, use, ecclesiology, theology, and religious experience that suited the attitudes of the particular moment in time, unless the item was deemed too degraded to be salvaged. But in the nineteenth century, a radical shift took place because the focus became restoration under the influence of nineteenth-century ideas about scientific history and philology. Ruled by the neo-medievalism of the period, architects removed features that had been added to buildings over the centuries while they strove to make artistic decisions based on style, history, and what was deemed to be the syntax of the buildings.<sup>91</sup> What is continuous, as far as religious artifacts are concerned, is the idea of habitual use, adaptation, and preservation. But the scientific approach to restoring a “historical” past on secular grounds is a new development. Another radical change has taken place in the twentieth century because the notion of conservation has challenged the whole idea of “restoration,” which

has been deemed unfaithful to the original context and meaning of historic buildings, artifacts, and spaces.<sup>92</sup>

The twentieth century has produced a global approach to conservation of what is now called world heritage. Convened in 1972, the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, an agency of UNESCO, sought to redress increasing threats to world patrimony caused not just by neglect, decay, or warfare, but also by the rapid social and economic changes that are causing irremediable damage or destruction. The agency, whose interests are secularist and simultaneously global and local, was charged to oversee the protection of “architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science,” and also nature preserves.<sup>93</sup> To arrive at this point of preservation requires a wholly new commitment to a global project that includes all peoples, cultures, and religions. Of course, in removing these sites from the dangers of modern political and social strife, they also become sources of local revenue through tourism, another feature of the global economy, itself posing different sets of problems that are also the concern of world bodies like UNESCO.<sup>94</sup> Despite all the accompanying instruction that informs the sites, setting these world heritage places apart also contributes to decontextualizing them while, according to the ideology of UNESCO, nonetheless providing a “common heritage” for a universalized notion of humankind. In UNESCO’s ideology lies a commitment to an idea of civilization belonging to a universal family of humankind in which all local heritages are given equal respect. Modern notions of preservation, civilization, and universalism are applied here with all their potential exclusionary and limiting pitfalls. However, just as the Enlightenment’s notion of tolerance advanced a universalist ideology of culture,<sup>95</sup> this development aspires to make both natural and cultural wealth the shared patrimony of the people of the world rather than a focus of strife.

Today, in an amazing contrast with the past, organizational support for preservation has become so powerful that heritage advocates are nowadays even criticized for overzealous protection of buildings and artifacts. Now, when preservation has local, national, and global networks of support, there are growing complaints that “heritage professionals once seen as selfless are now targets of suspicion, often thought backward looking, deluded, self-seeking, or hypocritical.”<sup>96</sup> A look back to the circumstances that led to modern preservation movements shows, however, that preservation has a far longer history than is generally believed. Furthermore, the sense of urgency underlying the preservationist concerns of the last two hundred years directly emerges from the disorienting effects of rapid change combined with nostalgia for a simpler past,<sup>97</sup> and from deracination, dislocation, and destruction of natural and built environments, as a consequence of industrialization, urbanization, and now globalization.

## CHAPTER 1

# DESTRUCTION: IDOLATRY

Tear down their altars, smash their pillars, put their sacred posts to the fire,  
and cut down the images of their gods, obliterating their name from that site.

—Deuteronomy 12:3

WHEN KING JOSIAH (621 BCE) ORDERED THE CLEANSING OF THE JERUSALEM temple in ancient Judea and the eradication of idolatry, he deposed idolatrous priests; burned and defiled all other cult sites; and destroyed altars, pillars, and statuary (2 Kings 23:4–20), initiating the first major iconoclastic movement. Similar destruction occurred again during the Byzantine iconoclastic crisis. Witnesses during the first Byzantine episode watched icons burned, pillaged, and destroyed in city and countryside alike. Punishments for those who resisted included mutilated bodies, cut off noses, eyes poked out, hands and ears cut off, and flagellations. Soldiers destroyed icons and burned monasteries.<sup>1</sup>

One word echoes throughout the three major episodes of destruction of religious art and architecture in the Judeo-Christian tradition: idolatry. To attack cult practices and destroy cult environments and artifacts, all three cases of iconoclastic outbreaks discussed here—King Josiah’s Deuteronomic reform,<sup>2</sup> the Byzantine Iconoclast controversy (726–843 CE), and the western European Reformation—invoke the second commandment, “You shall not make a carved image for yourself nor the likeness of anything in the heavens above, or on the earth below, or in the waters under the earth” (Exod. 20:4). Many explanations exist for these outbursts, but among the numerous efforts to understand them, two facts are clear: (1) visual display (as icons, images, or other items used in religious practice) becomes suspect for religious reasons; and (2) the destruction becomes official policy.

Although tearing down the sanctuaries; desecrating the holy places; and destroying the books, artifacts, and visual symbols of *other* peoples has been widespread throughout history, destruction within the iconoclasts’ own tradition is less common. The three cases to be discussed here describe occasions when the iconoclasts took up hammers, chisels, and whitewash against their

own traditions; and reaching back into what they considered an earlier pristine practice of their religions, they accused their coreligionists of idolatry.

Three of these major iconoclastic episodes have similar features and common patterns of motives and results. What they share—besides the accusation of idolatry in their polemic against images, based on what appear to be sincere religious convictions—is that the religious function is assumed to state power while rulers attempt to restrict, change, or destroy cult sites; undermine cult practices and their practitioners; indoctrinate their people; and in doing so, to centralize political-religious power to themselves. In addition, the status of the artifact becomes suspect because confusion about the artifact itself and what it represents emerges. Devotional practices deriving from the sense that some spiritual, magical, or other special powers reside in the religious object are labeled superstition, and the devotional object therefore becomes the focus of derision and destruction.<sup>3</sup> Both iconoclasts and those who cherish religious artifacts agree that onlookers perceive some special significance in the “icon” or “image.” This fact is important because, in a sense, this “special” status implies that the visual object possesses an intrinsic value, thus laying the foundation for images to become artistic products that can be removed from particular cultural contexts.

In all three of these cases, outbreaks of iconoclastic actions occur when the political leader overrides the separate roles of ruler and priest to assume the role of both ruler and priest, while becoming upholder of law, both religious and secular. At the same time, these iconoclastic episodes promoted a polemical rereading of the Bible, one that restricted possible interpretations and narrowed the biblical canon but also produced a sophisticated defense of the function of images in religion, one that not only sustained an argument for preserving religious art but ultimately led to a case for preserving secular art as well.

### IDOLATRY

Two biblical texts appear to justify destruction of images. The first, Exodus 20:4 (and its restatement in Deuteronomy 5:7, 8), the *locus classicus* for Hebrew iconoclasm and later outbreaks, is the second commandment in the Decalogue. The second is Deuteronomy 12:3, based on the commandment, the divinely inscribed exhortation to destroy cult images: “Tear down their altars, dash in pieces their pillars, and burn their Ashe’rim with fire; and you shall hew down the graven images of their gods, and destroy their name out of that place.”

Contrary to the popular modern belief that the Decalogue is an absolute set of ethical norms, in fact, it actually is one of those biblical texts whose reception and interpretation differs profoundly according to the historically determined situation of the religious community receiving it. The authoritative

reception of the Decalogue, even within the biblical canon itself, has varied greatly. In certain periods it has had greater normative power, whereas in others, it has taken its place within an amplified ethical discussion involving numerous other biblical texts.<sup>4</sup>

Biblical scholars highlight the fact that the status of the commandment against idols, labeled the second commandment, although no numbers appear in the original, is subject to debate. Textual problems have not been resolved, and some argue that it reflects a later Deuteronomic addition.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, some biblical readers have taken the second commandment as an unchanging inflexible rule, treating it as a “monolithic concept” and therefore ignoring or overlooking the variety of attitudes toward images to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures themselves,<sup>6</sup> particularly those referring to the opulent decoration of Solomon’s temple (1 Kings 6:11–35), built with divine approval: “Concerning this house which you are building, if you will walk in my statutes and obey my ordinances and keep all my commandments and walk in them, then I will establish my word with you, which I spoke to David your father” (1 Kings 6:12). The temple was amply decorated with statues and with carvings of cherubim, palm trees, and open flowers (1 Kings 6:24–35; also Ezekiel 41:17–20).

Also, one needs to account for the fact that, whether deserved or not, the second commandment did acquire a canonical status. Regardless of changes in its normative status, it came to possess a timeless power, inscribing iconoclastic tendencies into Judeo-Christian tradition and appearing as a proof text to justify destructive episodes; although, as the Hebrew Bible attests, its prohibition was regularly ignored.<sup>7</sup>

Given the reception of the Decalogue as normative, it is not surprising to see it invoked during episodes when religious artworks become suspect. During both the Byzantine controversy and the Protestant Reformation, the Decalogue emerged as juridical. The eighth-century Byzantine emperors Leo III and Constantine V, and the sixteenth-century king of England and son of Henry VIII, Edward VI adopted the injunction attributed to Moses, intending to eliminate what they considered idolatry from their respective realms and restore the “pure” religion of the early Christian Church.

Since idolatry is the charge that prompted these episodes of destructive furor, let us begin with what it meant in the context of early Christianity (pre-third century CE when the first definitively dated Christian art appears). Because Jews and Christians more or less shared the First Testament (that is, the Hebrew Scripture or its Greek translation, the *Septuagint*) and it became the basis of New Testament “Christian” writing, Jewish and Christian history and ideas about idolatry are intertwined. We cannot speak of one without also speaking of the other. The translators of the *Septuagint*, produced in Egypt where the Jews were a minority among “idol worshippers,” adopted the term *eidolon* (Greek for “idol”),<sup>8</sup> which was used by Greek-speaking Jews



and Christians for cultic images. For Plato, this word meant “illusory phenomena” that come from the deceptive senses in contrast to “pure” ideas or forms that the soul apprehends.<sup>9</sup> Earlier, Herodotus had used the word simply to describe copies or figurative representations. The word *eidolon* is also sometimes used in non-Christian and non-Jewish Greek for cultic images.<sup>10</sup> The Hebrew Bible uses a large range of terms to designate idols, which are repeatedly decried (words associated with uncleanness and worthlessness are most common).

The *Septuagint's* frequent use of the word *eidolon* (ninety-six times) replaces no fewer than fifteen different terms used in the Hebrew Bible to denote heathen images and the gods they represent. *Eidolon* is the specific word used in the *Septuagint* version of the second commandment (Exod. 20:4; Deuteronomy 5:8), and it belongs to Jewish polemic directed against other gods and intended to protect Jews from those others in the ancient world who are identified with “idol worship.” The first and second commandments combined, therefore, function as a strategy to distinguish Jews from non-Jews, the first requiring Jews to be faithful to Yahweh and the second showing an absolute refusal to see anything other than idolatry in the non-Jewish or pagan cult of images.<sup>11</sup> Deuteronomy 4:15–18 elaborates on the prohibition against images: “Since you saw no shape when the Lord God spoke to you,” no one knows what God looks like, so he cannot be represented. An idol is an attempt to represent what is invisible, thus blurring the line between the invisible God and the animated “idol.”<sup>12</sup> Since images played a major role in cultic practices of the people surrounding the ancient Jews, the biblical injunctions against such idol worship constitute a warning to avoid contamination by local customs of others.<sup>13</sup>

“Idolatry,” with the sense of giving reverence to images as such, is never addressed in the New Testament gospels; but Paul, drawing from Jewish traditions, on several occasions decries worship of what he labels images (*eikon* [see Rom. 1:18–32; 1 Cor. 12:2; Acts 17:29]). Also, writing about “pagan” images, he specifically associates *eidola* with demons (1 Cor. 8:4; Gal. 4:8), which are not to be feared but avoided. Of course, the book of Revelations also criticizes idols, in this case, using the word *eidola*: “The people did not repent of the work of their hands or give up worshipping demons and idols” (Rev. 9:20).<sup>14</sup> As Joel Marcus highlights, idolatry is listed as a vice in the New Testament (Gal. 5:20; Col. 3:5; 1 Pet. 4:3; Rev. 21:8), and idolaters will not inherit the dominion of God, while Christians should avoid both idols and idolaters (1 Cor. 5:10–11, 6:9). Finally, idolatry in the New Testament acquires a specific moral valance because sexual immorality, desire for money, and participation in pagan food festivals are all identified with idolatry. This usage suggests that idolatry is linked to common pagan social customs that the new religionists are to avoid. We should not underestimate this sociological dimension because it was common to feast on meat in pagan festivals; for

the new religionists to avoid this tradition would be to miss out on a festive event that for many provided one of their few opportunities to eat meat.<sup>15</sup> (Gregory the Great also addresses this pagan habit in relationship to the conversion of the English in the sixth century CE. Following his “middle way” pastoral approach, he advised that the old habit of killing oxen to offer to the pagan gods be replaced with a religious feast in which the animals would still be killed (in huts outside the church), but God would be thanked for his generosity [Letter 11:56]).

In Romans 1:18–23, Paul offers a sharp critique of pagan icon (*eikon*) worship that clearly links icons with idols. This advice contrasts with 2 Corinthians 4:4, where he reconstructs the ancient idea of *eikon* or image into Christ as *eikon tou theou* (Christ as image of God), who as man can be rendered in person. Paul, in Jewish tradition, appears to deliberately interrogate the “lived space” of the Greco-Roman world, where ancient pagan divinities were visually represented everywhere (in and outside the temples, in household shrines, in the streets, in the hills, and in the cities) and to replace these “presences” with the *eikon* of God, Jesus, who could be visualized in the people of God and in the narrative history of the people of God.<sup>16</sup> Thus, following from this very provocative argument, we can perhaps fill the empty gap from the death of Jesus to the year 200, where so far we have found no examples of Christian art—when the first Christians might have imagined Christian theology and narrative in a uniquely symbolic form.<sup>17</sup>

### ANCIENT HEBREW ICONOCLASM

This story will begin in Jerusalem, “the center of the world,” as Saint Jerome, Church father and fourth-century Latin translator of the Bible, quoting Ezekiel, put it: “Thus says the Lord God, ‘This is Jerusalem, which I put among the nations, and surrounded by the lands’” (Ezek. 5:5–6).<sup>18</sup> Why Jerusalem? As the contested site today of the most revered monuments of three of the world’s major religions, how Jerusalem acquired its contemporary importance is not difficult to understand. According to biblical tradition, it became King David’s capital for the joined kingdoms of Judea and Israel (2 Sam. 5:1–25), and David planned a temple there to house the Ark of the Covenant (2 Sam. 7:1–29). His son Solomon built the temple in 957 BCE (1 Kings 6–8), which the Babylonians destroyed in 586 BCE as they drove the Hebrews into exile in an effort to erase the people and the God they worshipped. During the Jewish revolt against the Romans in 70 CE, the second temple, completed in 515 BCE, was destroyed by the Romans, again forcing the Jews into exile. Like the Babylonian assault, the Romans destroyed the temple as part of an effort to eliminate the people and their God.

The still-standing Western Wall, or Wailing Wall, of the erstwhile Jewish Temple, built between c.20–18 BCE to 26 CE was actually part of

the supporting structure for the Temple Mount (the mount itself believed to be the site of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac). Constructed during the period of Herod the Great (who ruled from 37 BCE through 4 CE) it remains the holiest site of Judaism. In addition to its Jewish history, the mount is also the site of at least two former Roman temples and the still-standing Umayyad Dome of the Rock (built ca. 687 and 691 CE), the supposed site of Mohammed's night journey (Sura 17:1 in the Koran).

Jerusalem also holds the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, presumed site of the resurrection of Jesus (finished ca. 335 CE). The ongoing tension over religious heritage sites has politicized these three sites in Jerusalem, placing them within the crossfire of simmering sectarian violence. They epitomize how buildings can dramatize or stage a continuous performance of collective memory, whether enshrined in sacred texts, reinforced by liturgical practices such as pilgrimage, or expressed by the triumphs, losses, and aspirations of the various religious faiths. (For example, for Christian fundamentalists prophesying about the impending end time and second coming after the Jews return to Israel and rebuild the temple, Jerusalem's "sacred sites" stand as battleground for the final conflict over contested religious and political claims).

As noted, the book of Deuteronomy, and the Deuteronomic strand of the Bible, represents a powerful censorship of images, cult sites, and altars for the ancient world. And when King Josiah of Judah (2 Kings 21:23–24, 22:10), who reigned from 640 to 609 BCE, put Deuteronomy's prohibitions into action, the Bible recorded the first documented case of iconoclasm.<sup>19</sup> Biblical scholars generally agree that an important rhetorical purpose of the "Deuteronomic history" was to highlight the Deuteronomic laws and to show the Hebrew people that they were suffering because they violated the laws. This rhetorical move links obeying these laws in particular as the means to avoid political catastrophe, while also explaining the exile on having failed to abide by these laws.<sup>20</sup>

Josiah, King Amon's eight-year-old son, came to the throne after his father was assassinated, and he reigned in Jerusalem for thirty-one years (2 Kings 21:23–24, 22:1). Of Josiah, the Deuteronomic author writes, "He did what was right in the eyes of the Lord; he followed closely in the footsteps of his forefather David, swerving neither right nor left" (2 Kings 22:2). The narrative in 2 Kings reflecting the primary interests of the Deuteronomic writer portrays the period of Israelite/Judean history preceding Josiah's reign as a betrayal of Yahweh, for both King Manasseh, Josiah's grandfather, and King Amon, Josiah's father, placed "graven images" in the house of the Lord (2 Kings 21:7–22). Accordingly, the biblical writer reports that the Lord communicated via the prophets, his servants, as follows: "Because Manasseh king of Judah has committed these abominations, and has done things more wicked than all that the Amorites did, who were before him, and has made

Judah also to sin with his idols; therefore thus says the Lord, the God of Israel, Behold, I am bringing upon Jerusalem and Judah such evil that the ears of every one who hears of it will tingle" (2 Kings 21:11–12).

Biblical scholars argue that another writer, the second Deuteronomist, editing the Deuteronomic history to provide a parallel with the Babylonian Exile, probably wrote this section (2 Kings 21:10–15) to attribute the fall of Jerusalem and Judah in 587–86 BCE to the apostasy of Manas'seh.<sup>21</sup> Thus the writers, like the prophet Ezekiel, writing from exile, seek to explain Judah's weakness before enemies as a betrayal of Yahweh because of the reinstatement of idol worship. In other words, the Hebrew prophet interprets the Babylonian destruction of the temple and the effort to eradicate the Jewish people and their religious practices as divine punishment for idolatry.

When Manas'seh died, his son Amon, as the biblical writer portrays him forsaking the Lord, "served the idols that his father served, and worshipped them" (2 Kings 21:21–22). A boy-king, Josiah came to the throne after his father's two-year reign, inheriting what the Deuteronomic writer clearly presents as a religious climate of apostasy. Thus began the "Deuteronomic Reformation," in which foreign priests and shrines (Canaanite) were destroyed and all cultic challenges to the centrality of Jerusalem and Yahweh worship were eliminated. Josiah, as hero of this history, emulated David and tried to restore the kingdom by centralizing the cultus at Jerusalem and restoring the annual feast of Passover.

When Hilkiah, the high priest, proclaimed he had found "the book of the law in the house of the Lord" (2 Kings 22:8), which he presented to the king, he was giving the king what is now called the book of Deuteronomy in the Bible. The discovery of the document, ostensibly found by workers restoring the Jerusalem temple under King Josiah's instructions (2 Kings 22:3–7), was the given reason for the Jerusalem convocation. Josiah publicly proclaimed this "book of the law" that Hilkiah found as the book of the covenant (Moses's laws), swearing to uphold it before the men of Judah and Jerusalem, the priests, prophets, and "all the people, both small and great" (2 Kings 23:1–3). As the king commanded the cleansing of the temple, he initiated the first major iconoclastic movement. Instituting Passover as if it were a reinstatement, "as it is written in this covenant" (2 Kings 23:21–23), Josiah established the feast that had not been kept, according to the Deuteronomic writer, "since the days of the judges who judged Israel" (2 Kings: 23:22). These actions made a public declaration of the priestly power of the king, of the centrality of Jerusalem, and finally of the defeat of any opposition to this centralized power.

The "Deuteronomic reforms" may indeed have had such concrete political purposes. First, they established Jerusalem as the capital of the kingdom; second, with the elimination of challenges to the monarchy, all taxes, tithes, and contributions would come to the capital; and third, Jerusalem became

the only true spiritual center of Yahweh worship. Thus this first recorded instance of a state-sponsored iconoclastic movement, while prompted by religious fervor and a return to imagined “roots,” had other political motives. The biblical narrative presents Josiah receiving the Ark of the Covenant with the Deuteronomic tablets as a new Moses and a king in the tradition of David. As a ruler with divine support, he set about destroying all the “idols.” But at the same time, he was able to garner the revenues that would have gone to alternate hill shrines and direct them to Jerusalem, where he could concentrate power while annexing parts of Israelite territory. With his increased revenues, he could strengthen the army, expand his territory, and begin a major program of political, economic, religious, and juridical reform centered in Jerusalem.<sup>22</sup>

Of course, if we look at 2 Kings 24, we discover that these reform moves did not protect Judea, which fell first to Egyptian and then to neo-Babylonian domination and to the reinstallation of “foreign” idols. Indeed, the prophet Ezekiel, writing from exile, makes more references to idols (*eidolon*) and idol worship as the cause of Israel’s failure than any other biblical text (twelve times). In his “warning oracles,” referring to the period prior to the fall of Jerusalem to Babylon, the prophet reports the words of the Lord to his listeners: “Hear the word of the Lord God. . . . I am bringing a sword against you and I will destroy your hill-shrines. Your altars will be made desolate, your incense-altars shattered, and I will fling down your slain before your idols. . . . Your altars will be waste and desolate and your idols shattered and useless, your incense-altars hewn down” (Ezek. 6:3–7). Ezekiel, thus, blames apostasy for his people’s suffering because when they chose multiple cult sites and multiple gods, they rejected Yahweh.

This begins the story, but it was hardly the end. These same biblical texts would be cited during the Byzantine iconoclast controversy and during the Protestant Reformation. This first recorded example from the Bible highlights several traits of such movements. These include consolidating political power to a particular place (such as Jerusalem, and later Constantinople) and person (King Josiah in Judah, the emperor in the Byzantine Empire, and the king in England). As the ruler controls the civic domain, he also assumes priestly power, thus combining the roles of priest and ruler and simultaneously undermining religious functionaries outside the hierarchical structures of the royal family, as, for example, local cult leaders in the Josiah case, monks or clergy who would not comply with the imperial edicts as in the Byzantine case, and in the English Reformation, monks or clergy loyal to powers outside England (i.e., Rome and the primacy of the pope). In these cases, the immediate result was to overcome opposition from political or religious challenges. Religion became an appendage of the state, subservient to the central power of the ruler and indeed an essential tool of the ruler. The intellectual foundation of the movement relies on a narrow reading of biblical texts that

assume a doctrinal role to uphold the position of the ruler as God's agent on earth. This is a strand in Christianity that began at the time of Constantine's conversion to Christianity.

Inspired by Constantine's victory at the Milvian Bridge (312 CE) and the end of Christian persecutions by the Roman Empire, Eusebius of Caesarea and Lactantius, the two most influential Christian intellectuals of the fourth century, developed a Christian theology of imperial rule—to explain and intellectually support Constantine's triumph.<sup>23</sup> Eusebius's narration of the Milvian Bridge event in his *Ecclesiastical History*—when Constantine supposedly saw a cross in the sky that presaged his victory (and the victory of Christianity)—restored the God of battles from the ancient Near East as developed in Hebraic historiography and simultaneously introduced to Christianity the idea of providential temporal history and the ruler as God's agent. The Hebrew Bible histories, whether the story of Moses's exodus from Egypt or Joshua's conquest of Jericho, show a war god busily intervening on behalf of his people, both to punish the oppressors, as in the flight from Egypt, and to award victory to his people, as in Joshua's victory, while the divinity intervenes to punish the chosen people as well as outsiders for idolatry, among other moral violations.<sup>24</sup> The Eastern Roman Empire (which came to be called the Byzantine Empire) renewed this tradition by merging the imperial and religious function. It has been persuasively argued that in the century that preceded the outbreak of iconoclasm in the Eastern Empire—from the death of Emperor Justinian (565) to the reign of Heraclius (610–41) who repelled the Arab surge in Jerusalem and recovered the “true cross”—this imperial-religious fusion evolved into an imperial cultus with its own liturgical formalism. Although they existed long before this time, icon use and icon veneration as imperially supported customs rose in this period.<sup>25</sup>

### BYZANTINE ICONOCLASM

The Byzantine Empire's iconoclasm furor created a major crisis lasting from the 720s to 843 CE, the latter date when orthodoxy was finally restored after a century of internal violence. To understand the circumstances that led to this civil and ecclesiastical turmoil, it is essential to recognize how vulnerable the Eastern Roman Empire found itself in the face of seventh-century Persian and then later Islamic expansionism. By 619, Persia had conquered Egypt, Jerusalem (614), Damascus (613), and Antioch (611). A brief look at the entry of the Byzantine chronicler Theophanes in his *Chronographia*, a history of Byzantium from 284–813, for 610 provides an overview of how weak the Empire had become: “In this year the Persians captured Caesarea in Capadocia and took therein many tens of thousands of captives. The Emperor Herakleios found the affairs of the Roman state undone, for the Avars had

devastated Europe, while the Persians had destroyed all of Asia and had captured the cities and annihilated in battle the Roman army."<sup>26</sup>

Because images were used to ward off enemies (*apotropaia*) and as safeguards for cities (*palladia*), in this climate of constant warfare, veneration of images became widespread in the Eastern Empire. In fact, the first account of a miracle tied to a religious image appears in Evagrius's *Ecclesiastical History* (late sixth century).<sup>27</sup> In this instance, Evagrius alleged that when the Persians laid siege to Edessa in 544 an icon of Christ saved the city.<sup>28</sup> Already in the sixth century, devotion to the Virgin Mother, the theotokos, was growing, having been officially promoted at the Council of Ephesus at the end of the fourth century. But her position as "mediator" gained particular resonance in the Eastern Empire because by the sixth century, as the emperor figure assumed greater religious and "theocratic" ceremonial power, the theotokos (Mary) emerged as the patroness of the city, the empire, and the imperial household. Icons and veneration of the Virgin were growing in popularity among the powerful and powerless at the same time.<sup>29</sup> By 626, the patriarch had images of the Virgin and Child painted on the west side of the city where the Persians were attacking: "On all the gates to the west of the city . . . the venerable patriarch had painted . . . images of the holy figures of the Virgin with the Lord her son."<sup>30</sup> George the Pisidian, writing a poem on the successful outcome of the Avar War in 626 (*Bellum Avaricum*) wrote, "If a painter wished to show the victorious outcome of the struggle, he would place in the foreground [as the conquering hero] the one who gave birth without seed and paint her image [*eikona*]."<sup>31</sup> When the Arabs again laid siege to Constantinople in 717/18, an image of the Virgin was carried around the walls with the relics of the "true cross."

Theophanes tells the story of the 717 Arab assault on the imperial city, to emphasize the role of the theotokos in saving the city. Beginning and ending the siege on August 15, the feast of the Koimesis, the chief feast day of the Virgin Mary, the savior of Constantinople, Theophanes has the assault last just one year and attributes the city's salvation to the "intercession of the all-pure Theotokos," that is, the mother of God (*CTC* 545–48). Primarily, this evidence highlights the fact that icons in the sixth century had become part of the imperial "propaganda" mechanism that linked the earthly emperor with the divine emperor and pantheon.<sup>32</sup>

Prior to the iconoclast movement, religious images were a major feature of Byzantine life, whether used by clergy, secular authorities, or ordinary people. There is little doubt among experts that without the active support and involvement of the emperors, iconoclasm could not have thrived. Indeed, it has even been argued that unlike other doctrinal heresies in the early Church spurred by religious debates among bishops and theologians, iconoclasm was an imperial heresy. From the late sixth and early seventh centuries, showing the increasingly theocratic character of the empire, the numismatic evidence

reveals that the emperors began to favor Christ icons over their own images. During the reign of Justinian II (685–95), new coins were minted for the first time with Christ’s image on the obverse accompanied by the words “king of kings,” and the emperor’s on the reverse of coins with the words, “servant of Christ.” The relationship between king and Christ was clear: the human ruler was the servant of the heavenly king. Prior to this time, the coins had been minted with the emperor’s portrait on the obverse.<sup>33</sup> In fact, the alleged Quinisext Council of 692 in Constantinople specifically promoted images of Christ. The Eighty-Second Canon prescribed that images of Christ as human replace images of Christ as lamb:

Since therefore it is the perfect that should be set down in coloured depictions before the eyes of all, we decree that the lamb that takes away the sin of the world, Christ our God, is henceforth to be set forth in icons in accordance with his human form, in place of the old lamb, through which, grasping the depth of the humility of God the Word, we may be led to the memory of his life in the flesh, of his passion and saving death, and the redemption that was thus brought about for the world.<sup>34</sup>

The iconoclast outbreak is generally divided into two periods, the first beginning around 726 with Leo III (717–41), first iconoclast emperor, who had to defend Constantinople against an Arab siege, and continued by his son Constantine V (741–75) under whom the furor reached its highest peak. In 787, after the death of Leo IV (775–80), when the Empress Irene was regent for her son, iconoclasm was officially condemned as a heresy at the Second Nicene Council, but then came the second outbreak in 814 when Leo V (813–20) reopened the attack against images. His son, Michael II (820–29), followed in his footsteps, but at the Council of 843, once more when another widow (Theodora) of an iconoclast emperor, Theophilus (829–42), became regent for her son, icons were finally restored to orthodoxy.

Scholars of the iconoclastic outbreak in the Byzantine Empire represent a multitude of explanations about what happened and why, but as one expert has expressed it, the scholarship represents multiple explanations with little evidence.<sup>35</sup> Since the iconoclasts destroyed much of the art of the previous periods, and the lovers of icons destroyed the arguments the iconoclasts had advanced for their actions so that none of their writings would survive in their original form, we cannot be certain of much except that an iconoclasm crisis occurred and that it was rebuked eventually as heretical.<sup>36</sup> But we can see the outline of the movement as mandating destruction and the restoration of “orthodoxy” as a return to continuity of traditions and to preservation.

The many explanations for what encouraged the outbreak include, for example, a secular reform movement spurred by Leo III (717–41) and Constantine V (741–75), whose reorganization of the military, law, and agriculture also included the Church.<sup>37</sup> A second explanation points to a genuine religious reform intended to rid the empire of idolatry.<sup>38</sup> Some see it as stemming from



an opposition between the Greco-Roman past and eastern Christianity, and a correction of a return to paganism.<sup>39</sup> Some, using Theophanes' *Chronographia*, claim that a man imbued with Arab doctrines gave Leo III the idea.<sup>40</sup> Along the same lines, others have ascribed the influence of aniconic positions from Arab or Jewish scholars on the emperors.<sup>41</sup> Even though a certain presbyter John, vicar of the oriental patriarchs, attributed the beginning of the iconoclast movement to a Jewish-Moslem conspiracy in his report to the Seventh Ecumenical Council held at Nicaea, modern scholarship has rejected the theory that Islamic or Jewish iconoclasm influenced the emperors.<sup>42</sup> It is generally agreed that the emperors were listening to the advice of their own bishops who were trying to appease God.<sup>43</sup>

For some scholars, theology is the most significant aspect of the controversy, bringing to the fore many apparently unsettled issues about the nature of Christ (fully human or fully divine, consubstantial with the Father), the Eucharist, and the status of the holy in society.<sup>44</sup> For some, the icon discussion was in fact a continuation of Christological debates that the Church council of Chalcedon (451), which had focused on disputes about the nature of "Christ," had supposedly finally settled.<sup>45</sup> Peter Brown's original argument suggested that the iconoclasts focused on a few central symbols of Christianity (sign of the cross, church building, and the Eucharist), with the intention of undermining the widespread regional piety or local patriotism that had produced a multiplicity of images that the emperor chose as a scapegoat for a demoralized Byzantine society.<sup>46</sup> Finally, as Averil Cameron sums it up, no single explanation reveals precisely what happened and why.<sup>47</sup> However, church historians, social historians, theologians, and art historians at least agree on one point: even though some ecclesiastical figures may have supported iconoclasm, the imperial household initiated and encouraged the crisis, and iconoclasm became a primary mechanism for supporting the imperial cult. Indeed, in the letter Pope Gregory II reputedly wrote to Leo III, Gregory accuses the emperor of having taken on the role of priest, and Leo is reputed to have written, "I am ruler and priest."<sup>48</sup>

Given the context of warfare and instability by the early eighth century, a time in which enemies were constantly harassing the borders of the Eastern Christian Empire, the Empire was near total collapse.<sup>49</sup> Leo III was not an educated man but a military leader who, after his field successes in the Caucasus (comprising present day Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan and parts of Russia) and when the Arabs were besieging Constantinople in 717/18, seized imperial power and was thus elevated to emperor. What happened around 726 to instigate the formal suppression of images? According to Theophanes, when a volcanic eruption of monumental magnitude occurred in the Aegean Sea in 726 and created a new island, Leo III concluded that God had caused it: "In the summer season of the same year [726], a vapour as from a fiery furnace boiled up for a few days from the depth of the sea. . . . In the midst

of so great a fire an island that had not previously existed was formed and joined to the Sacred Island. . . . Thinking that God's wrath was in his [Leo III] favour instead of being directed against him, he stirred up a more ruthless war on the holy and venerable icons" (*CTC*, 559).

In addition, despite the fact that they had been repulsed around 678, the Arabs in 726 were again threatening the Byzantine Empire. Attacking Nicaea, only sixty miles from Constantinople where they were defeated, they were nonetheless able to seize Caesarea in present-day Israel.

In the tradition of the Hebrew Scriptures, Leo came to hold idolatry responsible for these events, attributing them to divine wrath. His first act according to Theophanes, was to remove the Christ icon from above the Chalke, the bronze gate at the imperial palace (*CTC*, 559).<sup>50</sup> In this, he followed the tradition of "divine destiny" conferred on the monarch, as Eusebius initially had expounded it when Constantine became the first Christian Roman emperor. With this historical and political tradition in the foreground, the iconoclastic emperors sought to assert the imperial cult once more: emperor as ruler, warrior, and upholder of the laws of the true faith, although very specifically of the Ten Commandments, as *The Ecloga*, his laws, make clear.

Indeed, the fact that Leo saw himself as such a leader is no more evident than his undertaking in the early eighth century, again 726, to revise the code of Roman law compiled by Justinian in the sixth century. He begins *The Ecloga*, a synopsis of the laws compiled in Greek for his subjects, who by this time did not know Latin, with the following:

A selection of laws arranged in a brief and compendious form by Leo and Constantine the wise and pious Emperors taken from the Institutes the Digests the Code and the Novels of the Great Justinian and improved in the direction of humanity; edited in the month of March, 9th Indiction in the year of the world 6234 [726].

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, Leo and Constantine the Faithful Emperors of the Romans.<sup>51</sup>

As Emperor of the Romans, Leo takes on himself the role of a new Moses or a new Josiah, instituting laws that restore a pure form of Christianity but upheld by the imperial edict.<sup>52</sup> Although *The Ecloga* does not deal at all with iconoclasm, the emperors do assert their dependence on biblical standards of righteousness, taking on themselves the standard as rulers according to Christian law. The emperors emphasize that they also adhered to the divine sanction that awarded them their position when they conclude the introduction with the following plea for protection: "that we may not incur the wrath of God as transgressors of His commandments" (*Manual of Roman Law*, 70). Again, showing how the emperors attached themselves to model lawgivers, in addition to revising the Justinian code according to Judeo-Christian terms, one of the remarkable features of *The Ecloga* is that it also included

a synopsis of the Mosaic Law, culled from Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy (*Manual of Roman Law*, 142–44).

Without wishing to overstate the case, this dependence on the Deuteronomic canon suggests that the first iconoclast emperors' biblical canon, although not restricted to the Hebrew Bible, certainly accords the Torah, without Genesis, a privileged position. Indeed, when Leo sought to justify his iconoclastic actions, according to John of Damascus (b. latter half of the seventh century, d. ca. 750),<sup>53</sup> he appealed to the Hebrew texts that forbade images (Exod. 20:4; Deut. 5:7–8). John's three treatises on divine images (726 to early 740s) would confront the iconoclast charge that the "snare of idolatry" had seduced the Church.<sup>54</sup>

Leo III rejected the "middle way," the term John of Damascus used to represent the orthodox position<sup>55</sup> between adoration and veneration<sup>56</sup> that had been argued earlier by Pope Gregory I (590–604). In 730, Leo summoned a council of bishops and church functionaries in which he communicated his decree to abolish the cult of images. The Patriarch of Constantinople, Germanus, refused and was immediately sent into exile. The Roman pontiff's attempts to intervene and overturn the decree failed. Pope Gregory II (715–31), in fact, had protested against iconoclasm, and Gregory III (731–41) at the 731 council condemned iconoclasm as a heresy.

Emperor Leo used this edict as a rationale for seizing the papal provinces in Italy (Calabria, Sicily, and Illyria), and while keeping the tax revenues, he assigned their jurisdiction to the Patriarchate of Constantinople.<sup>57</sup> For Leo, the emperor was a sacred being: "I am king and priest," (*Basileus kai hierews eimi*) he wrote to Pope Gregory II, as he strove to eliminate any images that competed with his royal function.<sup>58</sup> Images of Mary or Christ as imperial figures would express rivalry with the emperor's position on earth. After 730, according to the correspondence between Germanus and three bishops from Bithynia (read into the record during the fourth session of the Council of Nicaea in 787 that restored icons), priests, monks, and lay people who did not comply with the iconoclastic edict were persecuted, while icons, murals, and ciboria were eliminated and saints' relics burnt.<sup>59</sup> The particular accusation according to the letters was idolatry based on a rigid reading of Exodus 20:4.<sup>60</sup> However, Leo's iconoclasm was temperate compared to his son's. Coming to the throne in 741, Constantine unleashed the iconoclastic furor to imprison monks, burn books, and destroy icons in an effort to root out what was deemed the most grievous sin, idolatry. The primary sources for precisely how iconoclasm was prosecuted during his reign are limited to the opposition, but nonetheless, we can get an alarming picture of what unfolded during those years.

Indeed, during the iconoclastic period, demonstrating that it was what was portrayed that was at issue and not images themselves, imperial art took the place of religious art in churches, on coins, and in public buildings. Although

the evidence is not bountiful and the destruction was probably not universal, the images of saints, Christ, Mary, and even New Testament narrative cycles came down, particularly in major churches in Constantinople—for example,<sup>61</sup> and they were replaced with plain crosses and nonrepresentational vegetal or avian imagery in churches and the emperor's image and a plain cross on coins. After civil war and other wars of conquest following the imperial tradition begun by Constantine the Great, in 754 Constantine V called an ecumenical council. All the bishops from the Eastern Empire appeared, but the Western Church and some Eastern patriarchs did not attend. Proving how much the iconoclastic outbreak was linked to the imperial assumption of religious power, this 754 council placed the Byzantine emperors in the apostolic succession:

For this reason, therefore, Jesus, the author and agent of our salvation, as in the past, he had sent forth his most wise disciples and apostles with the power of the most Holy Spirit in order to eliminate completely all such things (as idolatry), so also now he raised his devotees, our faithful kings—the ones comparable to the apostles, who have become wise by the power of the same Spirit—in order to equip and teach us, as well as to abolish the demonic fortifications which resist the knowledge of God, and to refute diabolic cunning and error.<sup>62</sup>

The Council concluded with several anathemas—including the prohibition against images based on biblical citations from the New Testament, particularly the Gospel of John (“God is spirit” [John 4:24]), and Exodus 20:4, Deuteronomy 5:8 (the prohibition of images), and Deuteronomy 4:12—that God spoke but had no form:

Let no man dare to pursue henceforth this impious and unholy practice. Anyone who presumes from now on to manufacture an icon, or to worship it, or to set it up in a church or in a private house, or to hide it, if he be a bishop or a presbyter or a deacon, he shall be deposed; if he be a monk or a layman, he shall be anathematized and deemed guilty under imperial law as a foe of God's commands and an enemy of the doctrines of the Fathers.<sup>63</sup>

Under “imperial law,” images could not be adored; made; or kept hidden in churches, monasteries, or homes. Defenders of images were to be condemned, and the state would prosecute offenders. All religious were to swear allegiance to this edict and to follow its prescriptions. At the same time, when Constantine encountered resistance from the monasteries, he attacked them, forcing monks to break their vows, wear lay clothes, and leave their monasteries that in the view of the iconoclasts had become houses of prostitution. Those who refused, he imprisoned in an effort to destroy monasticism itself. Terrorizing his people with his religious politics, Constantine's cleansing of

the churches meant the destruction of relics, pulling down of crosses, cleansing walls of frescoes, and elimination of all human images.<sup>64</sup>

Written probably forty-two years after the death of Saint Stephen around 765—in other words, during the hiatus between the first and second outbreaks of iconoclasm—Stephen the Deacon's *The Life of Saint Stephen the Younger (807)*<sup>65</sup> provides a cohesive narrative of what happened under the iconoclast rulers. During the first phase of iconoclasm Stephen was a hermit with a community of twelve monks at Mt. Auxentios in Bithynia. After the 754 Council outlawing icons and mandating their systematic destruction, monks flocked to Stephen, imploring his help. Stephen the Deacon's life of the saint provides a gripping description of what was happening during the most heated period of the persecution of icon lovers. The hagiographer records that following the Council of 754, the pious watched the impious burn, pillage, and destroy sacred icons both in the country and in the city (section 26). When Stephen was imprisoned because of his resistance, he met 342 persecuted monks from different regions (section 56) who recounted the various outrages, including their mutilated bodies (cut off noses, eyes poked out, hands and ears cut off, flagellations, shaved heads), all because they had supported icons (section 56). In addition to watching the icons burn, monks were asked publicly to repudiate them, and when they refused, they were punished (section 58). In the following section, a monk from the monastery of Peleketa recounts how on the night of Holy Thursday, on the order of the emperor, a crowd of soldiers entered the monastery and caged, whipped, burned beards, and cut off the noses of the monks, and then burned the monastery (section 59). Whether or not the account exaggerates the facts matters less than that it reveals the intensity of monastic outrage at forced iconoclasm.

This period of iconoclasm came to an end when the Empress Irene ruled as regent for her son beginning in 780. In 787 the Seventh Ecumenical Council at Nicaea, linking the orthodox Christian belief in the human incarnation of God as Jesus with the image crisis, sought to end this controversy with an unequivocal declaration that supported representational art in religious practice:

The production of representational art . . . is quite in harmony with the history of the spread of the gospel, as it provides confirmation that the becoming man of the Word of God was real and not just imaginary, and as it brings us a similar benefit . . . following as we are the God-spoken teaching of our holy Fathers and the tradition of the Catholic Church—for we recognize that this tradition comes from the holy Spirit who dwells in her—we decree with full precision and care that, like the figure of the honoured and life-giving cross, the revered and holy images, whether painted or made of mosaic or of other suitable material, are to be exposed in the holy churches of God, on sacred instruments and vestments, on walls and panels, in houses and by public ways. . . . The more frequently they are

seen in representational art, the more are those who see them drawn to remember and long for those who serve as models, and to pay these images the tribute of salutation and respectful veneration.<sup>66</sup>

But the Council did not put a stop to the polemics, and with a background of Slavic, Bulgarian, and Arab threats to the empire, a second round of iconoclasm began when Leo V (813–20) came to power. Looking back over the previous period of iconoclasm (according to contemporary sources), Leo associated long successful imperial reigns with iconoclasm and brief, weak reigns with the return of icons. Indeed, if we look at the period, long reigns did coincide with the first period of iconoclasm when Leo III and his son Constantine V together reigned from 717–75. What followed were four emperors between 775 and 813, and Leo was well aware of this fact. In the Definition (*Horos*) of the Council of 815, he blamed the restoration of icons on the frivolity of a woman, and he specifically recalled the period of peace after the Council of 754 declaring the iconoclastic doctrine: “The Council having confirmed and fortified the divine doctrine of the holy Fathers and followed the six holy Ecumenical Councils . . . wherefore the Church of God remained un-troubled for many years and guarded the people in peace; until it chanced that the imperial office passed from [the hands of] men into [those of] a woman and God’s Church was undone by female frivolity.”<sup>67</sup>

Nicephoros (758–828), imperial secretary during the reigns of Leo IV and Constantine VI, under whom iconoclasm was condemned at the Seventh Council of Nicaea in 787, provides one source of information about this second iconoclast outbreak. When the Empress Irene blinded her son (Constantine VI), Nicephoros withdrew from public life, only returning under Emperor Nicephoros I and becoming a monk, a priest, and rising to patriarch all in 806. When Leo V (813–20) began the second attack, Nicephoros organized the resistance, and as a consequence had to abdicate his post and retire to a monastery where he wrote several treatises against iconoclasm. In three discourses against the iconoclasts, Nicephoros set out to repudiate their arguments and their actions.<sup>68</sup> Citing Canon 82 of the Quinisext Council that had mandated the use of icons with Christ as human rather than as a lamb, Nicephoros accused Constantine V of heresy and apostasy. His arguments defended icons on the consistent and traditional grounds that they referred to their prototype, without being the prototype, and he garnered his support from the Bible (Old and New Testament), from the Fathers of the Church, and from Church tradition as recorded in the councils of the Church. For him, the iconoclasts were heretics because they repudiated Church tradition and the Fathers, and thus, they fractured the universal Church.<sup>69</sup>

In the Byzantine example of instrumental destruction, we again see some major similarities to the Deuteronomic history of King Josiah. First, this attack is state sponsored, and the ruler has assumed the roles of both king and priest (Moses and David *redivivus*). The ruler does indeed strengthen

his hold over his domains through this widespread attack that uses the Bible and religious powers to control his realm and subjects. Second, the argument for destruction is based on narrow readings of specifically selected biblical texts from Exodus and Deuteronomy (the second commandment). Third, challenges coming from alternative power structures (like local cult leaders in the biblical case or monks and those loyal to the Roman episcopacy in the Byzantine case) are condemned and persecuted when possible. Finally, both venerator and haters of images believe or fear the power ascribed to the artifact, while one side wishes to destroy it and the other to preserve it.<sup>70</sup> For icon venerator, the image itself has the power to evoke divine truth, but not in some simplistic idolatrous transfer. Rather, God could reveal himself through a multitude of signs including images, liturgical items, water, candles, and so on.<sup>71</sup> When the Second Council of Nicaea anathematized those who denied that Christ could be represented in his humanity, those who denied the gospel events and ideas could be represented visually, and those who refused to “salute such representations as standing for the Lord and his saints,”<sup>72</sup> it secured the future of Western religious art and ultimately the basis for preservation of all art that is widely accepted today.

## CHAPTER 2

# DESTRUCTION: ICONOCLASM AND THE REFORMATION IN NORTHERN EUROPE

May God will that our lords be like the pious secular kings and lords of the Jews whom the Holy Spirit praises. In sacred Scripture they have always had the power to take action in churches and abolish what offends and hinders the faithful.

—Andreas Karlstadt, “On the Removal of Images”<sup>1</sup>



Figure 5. View of ruined Wenlock Priory. (British Library 019153.)



UNFORTUNATELY SUCH EXAMPLES OF ICONOCLASTIC MAYHEM, BYZANTINE-style, did not quietly disappear into history. Europe experienced another outbreak of destructive religious zeal during the late medieval and early modern period. As Reformation ideas spread across Europe, one of the first outbreaks occurred in Basel in 1529 when angry mobs took over the town. The day after the destruction, the scene was like a battlefield after war: "The images lay everywhere in and about the churches, some with heads missing, others with hands, arms, or legs lopped off. There remained little that the authorities could do beyond attempting to legitimize and regularize what had already transpired. City workmen were dispatched to the cathedral and other churches, where they systematically removed and demolished all the remaining cult objects overlooked by the iconoclastic mob, and whitewashed the walls."<sup>2</sup>

Similar scenes were repeated in France, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and England before Reformation frenzy came to an end. In England, after Henry VIII ordered the dissolution of the monasteries in 1536–39, eight hundred abbeys were destroyed, literally overnight. Among the oldest buildings in England, the eight hundred included Saint Augustine's Abbey in Canterbury, dating to the conversion of England in 597; Lindisfarne Priory, founded on Holy Island by Saint Aiden in 635 as a center of early Anglo-Saxon Christianity and where Saint Cuthbert was prior; Pershore, dating to 681–89; and Shaftesbury, founded by Alfred the Great, whose sister was its abbess in 888. The abbeys had provided medical care, works of charity, craft patronage, education, and social services that would not be replaced for centuries.

What early modern iconoclasm shares with the ancient and medieval examples is how the ruler asserts civic, political, and religious power to police pious practices and to impose change, while applying harsh measures to overthrow any opposition to these revolutionary changes in religious practice. Ominous and dangerous were the simultaneous emergence of secular policing powers that invaded the privacy of the home and monitored personal devotional practices.

Cleansing the remains of other cultures or what were deemed corruptions of Christianity that challenged purity became common in the early modern period. Spain, where Arabs had invaded in 711 and eventually came to occupy and rule two thirds of the country, offers a good example. When the "*Reconquista*" of the peninsula began with the sack of Toledo in 1085, Castile advanced its gradual control of the peninsula and as Arab cities fell, mosques in conquered areas were cleansed or destroyed, and the cultural artifacts of non-Christians were destroyed or reused. After the final conquest of Granada in 1492 and the expulsion of Jews and Muslims, all remaining mosques and synagogues were appropriated and reused or destroyed. In Italy, the Dominican reformer Savonarola (1452–98), a Catholic zealot predating the northern Reformation, who built on calls for religious reform going back to Dante,

Petrarch, and Catherine of Siena, among others, was chiding Florentines to abandon their wanton ways in the 1490s. By the end of the decade, inspired by Savonarola's charismatic preaching power at two famous carnivals—Fat Tuesdays (*brucciamenti delle vanità* [burning of vanities]), one on February 7, 1497, and another the following year on February 27, 1498—Florentines seemed to go mad as they burned or mutilated books, artifacts, and art works. This new religious custom ended only when Savonarola himself was hanged and burned.<sup>3</sup> Similar outbursts of iconoclasm also occurred in the Netherlands, France, and Switzerland.<sup>4</sup>

Like the Byzantine crisis, England, where a major state-sponsored iconoclastic movement developed, also had two phases: the first during the reign of the Tudors (from the 1530s during Henry VIII's reign to the death of Elizabeth in 1603), and the second during the Puritan Revolution (1625–60). England's Reformation witnessed both state-sponsored (instrumental) and spontaneous (expressive) outbursts of "group solidarity" burnings and destructive rampages.<sup>5</sup> The focus here is the Tudor crisis and the political circumstances under which it became state policy to destroy artifacts and buildings. The Cromwellian Revolution will play a role in the discussion of how York Cathedral was spared during the Puritan Revolution.

Reformation iconoclasts actually looked back to the Byzantine world to support their assault on religious images. In reaction, no doubt, to what was perceived as widespread abuse of images, John Calvin (1509–64), one of Europe's most ardent iconoclasts, sharply attacked the defense of images advanced during the Byzantine crisis at the Second Council of Nicaea (787). In fact, Calvin turned back to another ancient document to support his case. He found the *Libri Carolini*, produced around 790 in France, to question the legitimacy of the 787 Nicene Council. The *Libri Carolini* argued against the orthodox Byzantine acceptance of images as settled at the Council on the following grounds: The Word is the guide to salvation, and images are ultimately just material objects made by human hands. They are merely for decoration or commemoration. (The Council had used the word *adoratio* for both veneration and adoration, which overlooked the distinction between veneration and adoration.) The *Libri Carolini's* argument permitted art for devotional practices, but rejected what it perceived as the excessive "veneration" adopted at the Byzantine Council.<sup>6</sup>

The *Libri Carolini* never had official ecclesiastical sanction, and in fact, in response to its reservations about images, Pope Hadrian (d. December 25, 795) had invoked Gregory the Great's middle way and supported the Second Nicene Council's settlement. The *Libri Carolini* disappeared from official view.<sup>7</sup> Calvin's interpretation of the image issue ignored the whole tradition defending images, while he resurrected anti-image sentiments from the Carolingian (i.e., Germanic) past as good ammunition for the iconoclasts.<sup>8</sup>

Iconoclasm in the European Reformation confronts us with a legacy of prejudices that stem from the triumph of Protestantism in Northern Europe, creating a still evident though muted religious rift between Catholic and Protestant Europe. In contrast to the Byzantine case, where the iconoclasts eventually lost, Protestant Europe prevailed in terms of its desired reforms and in forming the dominant viewpoint about the history of the period. This version of history extols a superior form of religion, the formation of the “modern” nation—and justifies the destruction of traditional forms of Christian religious practice, including the use of paintings, statues, and other religious artifacts—and adopts a polemic of the triumph of “true” religion over what it labels as superstition, magic, and paganism. This stance is expressed as strongly today as it was in Calvin’s era. For example, in a recently republished collection of three Reformation treatises on “sacred images,” the editors state in their introduction “That the widespread iconoclasm of the Reformation represented a necessary step for the development of modern Christianity, and one could say also of Western culture, is an unquestioned and unquestionable assumption.”<sup>9</sup>

This opening quote that embraces a division of Protestant versus Catholic Europe claims the northern European form of Reformation Christianity as the “modern Christianity.” It adopts a teleological view of Christian history linked with Western hegemony, a prejudice so widespread that it has become a tacitly accepted assumption, recited repeatedly in text books and school matriculation exams, taught in university history classes, used in scholarly books about the period, and regularly inserted into daily newspapers and television patter. With a nod to the unfortunate destruction of a symbol system developed over 1,500 years that sustained a communal life, many defenders of the Reformation argue that iconoclasm was historically necessary.<sup>10</sup>

This scorn for pre-Reformation Christianity (or the medieval period in general) is enshrined in *The Actes and Monuments of these Latter Perilous Days* (1563)<sup>11</sup> of John Foxe (1516–87). A major sixteenth-century Protestant historian of the events, Foxe may not always have his facts correct, but he nonetheless reveals the vitriolic anti-Roman (and anti-medieval) polemic of the times. The first edition of *Actes and Monuments* appeared in 1563, and its views represent an anti-Roman sentiment common until very recent times. It continues to inform popular belief and is taught by professors in elite institutions. Indeed, the popular vision of brutality and superstition about the Middle Ages carries prejudices as violent as those directed at the Orient or the Middle East that have been rightly attacked by Edward Said, who was the first to systematically show how scholars, artists, and writers have promoted and upheld such views.<sup>12</sup> Recently, however, efforts to redress this reigning historical prejudice have emerged as scholars are now recognizing how state-promoted violence led to the dismantling of the medieval world, its religious practices, and the artifacts it had created and patronized.<sup>13</sup>

Not all Protestantism was uniformly anti-iconic. Martin Luther (1483–1546) had rejected the iconoclastic doctrines being advanced by the radical reformers Andreas Karlstadt (1486–1541), Ulrich Zwingli (1484–1531), and Calvin, all leaders of the “removal” movement during the Reformation.<sup>14</sup> Showing a more traditional understanding of the role of images in a sermon in 1522, Luther spoke about the threat to images, saying, “[Misunderstanding of images] is no reason to remove all images. . . . We must permit them. . . . But you are to preach that images are nothing.”<sup>15</sup> Image-breaking created civic disorder, as was immediately shown by the rioters at Wittenberg who, while Luther was out of town, overturned statues and altars and burned images and paintings in a parish church. This first case led to a rift between Luther and Karlstadt.<sup>16</sup> Nürenberg, the imperial city, was able to preserve its altars and statues because of the adoption of Lutheran principles, whereas in Zurich, where Zwingli triumphed, a 1524 edict led to the destruction of all “material accessories” to worship. Many Southern German and Swiss towns that followed the Reformation adopted Zwinglian rather than Lutheran ideas about religious images, so churches were cleansed of paintings and statues.<sup>17</sup> But both reformers and traditionalists in Wittenberg in the 1520s had resisted the idea of removing images from churches despite the polemics of Karlstadt. Philipp Melanchthon (1497–1560), biblical theologian and Luther’s colleague, developed a doctrine that separated God’s law, which was unchanging, and human customs that were subject to change. Images and relics in this system were allowable because they supported religious practices, but they are supplementary and not essential.<sup>18</sup> Like the Catholics who argued against the radicals, Melanchthon shared the opinion of two traditionalists, Hieronymus Emser (1478–1527) and Johannes Eck (1486–1543), who argued that images are not idols, as will be discussed in the next chapter.

Iconoclastic ideas, on the other hand, circulated widely in Switzerland, and one of the worst episodes of art destruction took place in Basel in 1529 when angry mobs attacked the churches. The burning of the remains, like the bonfire of vanities under Savonarola in Florence, took place on Ash Wednesday, and the pyres smoldered for two days and nights, according to witnesses. Erasmus, who was living in Basel at the time, saw the destruction, but he certainly did not approve of it, as we know from several of his letters that refer to the riotous destruction.<sup>19</sup> He was appalled when he witnessed all the statues—whether in churches, vestibules, porticoes, or monasteries—thrown into fires if they could burn, and the rest broken. Neither value nor handicraft spared them, he wrote.<sup>20</sup> After witnessing the destruction in Basel, Erasmus left as quickly as possible for Catholic Freiberg, writing in a letter to a friend how soothing it was to arrive to this well-mannered city where he did not hear such destructive talk.<sup>21</sup> An inspirer of the reforming movement and a Christian humanist like his friend Thomas More, Erasmus was aware that images had limits as devotional aids (which is completely consistent with

Catholic tradition, as we will see in the next chapter), but he was no iconoclast.<sup>22</sup> Again, there is an obvious difference between criticizing the spiritual efficacy of devotional images or even questioning devotional practices themselves and actually destroying the images. A chasm separates these two possibilities.

Andreas Karlstadt's treatise, "On the Removal of Images," published in Wittenberg in January 1522, played an important role in this episode because it had circulated widely in Basel and had strong adherents among the city's Protestants. It represents the radical position against images espoused during the Reformation. Karlstadt begins with the following premises:

1. That we have images in churches and houses of God is wrong and contrary to the first commandment, Thou shalt not have other gods.
2. That to have carved and painted idols set up on the altars is even more injurious and diabolical.
3. Therefore, it is good, necessary, praiseworthy, and pious that we remove them and give Scripture its due and in so doing accept its judgment. (Karlstadt, 21)

Taking the Hebrew Scriptures literally, ignoring the nuances that allegory and other hermeneutical methods had allowed during the previous 1,500 years, or even Melanchthon's historical argument, Karlstadt uses a number of biblical proof-texts to justify the removal of images. Of course, Exodus 20:4–5, the Decalogue prohibition of idols, gains new importance, as does the King Josiah story of the model of righteous kings (2 Kings 23:4ff.). For Karlstadt, the significance of the Josiah story is simple; secular policing powers must trump religious authority, or more directly, the secular police should assume the religious function: "From this everyone should observe how in accord with divine justice priests should be subordinate to kings. For this reason our magistrates should not wait for the priests of Baal to begin to remove their vessels, wooden blocks, and impediments, because they will never begin. *The highest secular authority should command it and bring it about*" (Karlstadt, 41, italics mine).

Karlstadt pits the written word against images and undertakes to dismantle Pope Gregory I's defense of images by arguing that as a papist, Gregory "offers to a likeness the veneration which God has given to his Word" when he "says that pictures are the books of the laity" (Karlstadt, 26). In a rhetorical address, he asks Gregory to defend how people can learn from the image of the crucified Christ and concludes that this is impossible and therefore it cannot be true that images are the books of the laity.<sup>23</sup> In a further assault on Gregory, he insists that pictures cannot instruct—only books can (36–37). Even more provocative than his assault against long-held Western acceptance of religious imagery in churches, with his attack on Gregory, Karlstadt argues for the intervention of rulers, who by "divine right" may "force priests to expel deceitful and damaging things" (41). Taking as his models the iconoclast rulers

Hezekiah and Josiah, who crossed the line between ruler and priest, Karlstadt recalls how as a pious king, Josiah had ordered the priests to destroy all cult sites outside Jerusalem:

Had, however, our rulers accepted divine counsel and fulfilled its command and driven the knavish and seductive blocks of wood from the church under pain of appropriate punishment, we would have to praise them as the Holy Spirit praised Hezekiah, who ripped down images, hacked down groves and broke up the image which God had given, as is described in 2 Kings 18[:3ff.]. May God will that our lords be like the pious secular kings and lords of the Jews whom the Holy Spirit praises. In sacred Scripture they have always had the power to take action in churches and abolish what offends and hinders the faithful. (By divine right they may force and compel priests to expel deceitful and damaging things.) Anyone can see this in 2 Kings 23[:4ff.], where it is written that King Josiah ordered the high priest and the other priests to throw out all the vessels, pillars, and the like which were made for Baal; and he burnt them outside the city of Jerusalem. (40–41)

While Karlstadt's treatise may not have been the particular intellectual instrument that spurred the English movement, it testifies to the political-religious climate that had led to the iconoclastic outbreaks throughout Europe and to the situation in areas where reformation ideas had taken hold in the decade prior to England's Reformation. Reflecting the imminence of the crisis, Henry VIII's proclamation of 1530 or thereabouts, under Thomas More's guidance, banned a number of continental books, mostly by Luther and Zwingli, but also by Melancthon and Bugenhagen and English books written by the reformers (*Foxe*, 4.667–70).<sup>24</sup> Luther's lectures on Deuteronomy, Zwingli's *Commentary on True and False Religion*, and Bugenhagen's *Commentary on Kings*, all banned, all deal with religious imagery. Events on the continent and the iconoclastic ideas that had inspired them were now roaming the land in England.<sup>25</sup>

Thomas More had written *Responsio ad Lutherum* (*Response to Luther*) in 1523, and his *Dialogue Concerning Heresies* written in English with a lay audience in mind appeared in 1529.<sup>26</sup> He identifies his opposition in this dialogue specifically, naming Luther, Bugenhagen, Tyndale, and Karlstadt, among others. Karlstadt made a number of proposals that became essential to the unfolding political situation in England. These included his argument for the absolute authority of the monarch over the realm in all matters, including those of conscience, and also the narrowing of the biblical canon, both necessary preconditions for the religious reform in images in England. While it can be argued that tensions about religious images had been a recurrent concern in Western and Eastern Christianity from the patristic period through the Cistercian reform movement, and that these worries were current in pre-Reformation Europe in general as well as in England,<sup>27</sup> nonetheless, there

is a monumental difference between complaint and diatribe against idolatrous image making and image adoring and the periodic violent outbursts that characterize iconoclastic movements. The former represents a corrective stance, the latter an attempt to obliterate. In this moment of English history, a new importance given to the Decalogue and the absolute authority of the ruler over all matters within the realm, both religious and secular, combined to unleash the impulses that led to destroying England's "medieval" artistic heritage.

### THE TUDOR REFORMATION

Henry VIII (1491–1547), the second Tudor ruler of England (1509–47), had initially supported orthodoxy (i.e., traditional religion and loyalty to Rome) when the Reformation began to stir in Germany. Henry earned the title "Defender of the Faith" (*Fidei Defensor*) in 1521 from the pope, for a treatise against Martin Luther (*Assertio septem sacramentorum*) that was likely written by John Fisher (1459–1535), bishop of Rochester and chancellor of Cambridge University. In addition, Henry had added his personal voice to the academic, ecclesiastical, and secular authorities' polemic against Luther in the 1520s.<sup>28</sup> Indeed, as noted, as late as 1530, he had promulgated a royal proclamation that as sovereign lord in the "true Catholic faith of Christ's religion," he must preserve his people from the "sedition of Martin Luther and other heretics"; and to protect his realm from "pestiferous, cursed, and seditious errors," he ordered that no books or preaching should support these heresies in his realm. Among a number of books he cited as a danger to the realm, we find William Tyndale's (1494–1536) translation of Genesis and of Deuteronomy.<sup>29</sup>

However, this commitment to orthodoxy declined when Henry's pressing need for a divorce came to the forefront of English politics by the end of the decade.<sup>30</sup> Nonetheless, when attacks on traditional religion swept over England during the 1530s, Henry had a number of reasons for resisting the cleansing of images and ending established customs that had spread on the continent. Most prominent of these was the civil disorder prompted by efforts to eliminate feast days and other religious celebrations, which were, of course, linked to religious art. This reluctance to adopt wholesale the iconoclastic programs witnessed on the continent characterizes both his reign and that of his daughter Elizabeth. It explains the often-contradictory royal proclamations about the role of religious images that we see in both of their reigns.<sup>31</sup>

In 1532 Thomas Cromwell (1489–1540) became Henry's chief minister. Whether or not because of his religious convictions, he became the author of England's Reformation, with the very specific goal of strengthening the king as the supreme head of the church, leader of a sovereign realm, answering to no one.<sup>32</sup> Cromwell was the architect and engineer of the dissolution of the



monasteries, the appropriation of their wealth and possessions to the crown, and the simultaneous dismantling of shrines across the country.<sup>33</sup> Despite Henry's reservations, iconoclasm rose to prominence in 1533 when Hugh Latimer (1470–1555), a controversial and polemical preacher and early supporter of Henry's divorce from Katherine of Aragon (1485–1536), was invited to public debates in Bristol. Latimer gained notoriety and favor with Thomas Cromwell in 1533 to become the prime propagandist for the reformist policies after he began preaching against images, the veneration of saints, and the doctrine of purgatory.<sup>34</sup>

Purgatory, the middle space between heaven and hell, a place from whence the dead could escape if enough people prayed for their release, came to prominence—according to Jacques Le Goff, a major French historian of the Middle Ages—in the second half of the twelfth century. Dante's *Purgatory* is the most sustained literary-theological exploration of the meaning and function of this middle realm in the other world.<sup>35</sup> The potential for abuse because of the economic element became one of the chief concerns of the reformers because besides paying monks and priests to pray for the dead, people gave money to have churches built, decorated, and painted to facilitate the passage of the dead from purgatory to heaven.

Shakespeare's *Hamlet* shows that the belief was still vibrant even after the Reformation, if we can believe the ghost of Hamlet's father.<sup>36</sup> However, although the abuses were ostensibly the issue, as Eamon Duffy makes clear, "the most decisive outcome of the Bristol debates was the ominous association of traditional piety with disaffection to the Crown and loyalty to the Papacy,"<sup>37</sup> making loyalty to traditional practice tantamount to treason to the realm. With the passage of the Act of Supremacy in November 1534, the act that led to Thomas More's execution for treason the following year, Cromwell had legally assured Henry's position as head of both church and realm. Thus, as in the Byzantine case, the new orthodoxy was adherence to royal supremacy.<sup>38</sup> When Cromwell was executed as a traitor in 1540, some believed the reform would stall, but Latimer lived on to inspire the iconoclasm in the reign of Edward VI, Henry's son.

With the proclamation of 1534 establishing the king as supreme head of both church and realm, the traditional distinction between temporal and spiritual powers (a division often compromised but nonetheless an ideal) was officially overthrown: "Forasmuch as our said nobles and commons both spiritual and temporal, assembled in our said court of parliament, have upon good, lawful and virtuous grounds, and for the public weal of our realm, *by one whole assent granted, annexed, knit, and united to the crown imperial of the same the title, dignity, and style of supreme head in earth immediately under God of the Church of England, as we be and undoubtedly have hitherto been*" (Foxe, 5.69, italics mine). Installing the king as supreme religious authority was the beginning of England's revolution against papal authority and a



unified Western Christianity. Without a separation of powers (ecclesiastical and temporal), loyalty to the realm and loyalty to its religion superseded traditional separations of public, secular law, and cult practice. In fact, the authority that replaced the priest was the king. In 1535, a royal proclamation abolished papal authority in England and admonished all clergy and teachers to eradicate, abolish, and erase the pope's name and memory.<sup>39</sup> While this may appear to be strictly political, in fact, in unraveling a thousand years of tradition, it was simultaneously an assault against the "collective memory" of practicing Christians.<sup>40</sup>

John Foxe writes that two years later in 1536, with papal power overthrown, the king ordered the monasteries ruined and their artifacts destroyed or confiscated. Foxe's account emphasizes the role of divine providence, as he presents the dissolution as "true Reformation" of the church following the suppression of the pope's authority:

Shortly after the overthrow of the pope, consequently began by little and little to follow *the ruin of abbeys and religious houses in England, in a right order and method by God's divine providence*. For neither could the fall of monasteries have followed after, unless that suppression of the pope had gone before; neither could any true Reformation of the church have been attempted, unless the subversion of those superstitious houses had been joined withal.

Whereupon the same year, in the month of October, the king, having then Thomas Cromwell of his council, sent Dr. Lee to visit the abbeys, priories, and nunneries in all England, and to set at liberty all such religious persons as desired to be free . . . at which time also, from the said abbeys and monasteries were *taken their chief jewels and relics*. (Foxe, 5.102, italics mine)

Like the actions of Constantine V in the Byzantine crisis, a precursor to the order for the wholesale robbery and pillaging of monastic communities, was the emperor/ruler's assumption of spiritual power. To get a sense of this loss, we should recall that Benedictine abbeys and cathedral priories had the largest libraries in England at the time. Furthermore, the buildings, artifact holdings, and collections comprised immense wealth, accumulated over many hundreds of years sometimes. The government appropriated or destroyed buildings and lands. Manuscripts and books, once stripped of bindings (sometimes with gold, jewels, brass, or other metals) and sometimes sorted for written materials that could build an English history, also became victims of iconoclasm. Acquisition of the wealth of these holdings was clearly one of the goals of the government and is corroborated by the fact that besides the monastic collections, books in university and private libraries, including the king's were purged and their bindings sent to the king's Jewel-house.<sup>41</sup> Cromwell was specifically involved with Lewes Priory, a Cluniac monastery and one of the greatest Romanesque churches in Europe,

because he hired an Italian engineer, Giovanni Portinari, to dismantle it so his son could build a grand house in its place.<sup>42</sup> Because they leave no trace, the loss of books, manuscripts, artifacts, and statuary is irreversible. Ruined buildings often leave their skeletons behind thus reminding us of their former existence and their loss.

The destructive actions did not occur without reaction. In 1537 in Lincolnshire, twenty thousand people rebelled and in Yorkshire, forty thousand. Many monks, abbots, nobles, and local citizenry were executed as traitors for this insurrection. This, of course, does not address famous resisters, like John Fisher and Thomas More, and others less renowned, who were executed for treason because it was not clear where they stood on the Act of Supremacy that had made Henry the head of the English church.<sup>43</sup> By 1536, and after Anne Boleyn's demise, conservatives hoped that traditional religion might be restored, and when Parliament was called, Henry—through his mouthpiece, Cromwell—asked that the religious differences that were causing so much unrest be settled. This convocation produced the Ten Articles, “articles devised by the kinges highnes majestie, to stablyshe Christen quietnes and unities amonge us, and to avoyde contentious opinions, which articles be also approved by the consent and determinations of the hole clergie of this realme.”<sup>44</sup> The conciliation unveiled in the articles reveals just how powerful traditional religious practice remained.

The articles, the “Formularies of Faith,” covered baptism, penance, Eucharist (the sacrament of the altar), justification (or remission of sins), images, honoring the saints, praying to saints, rites and ceremonies, and purgatory. Although the sacraments were reduced to three, the last five articles appeared to reinforce traditional religious practice following the essential/nonessential distinction of Melancthon. With advice against the danger of idolatry, saints and saints’ days could be honored; images (as long as they were not worshiped) could stand in churches; and customs such as eating the Eucharistic bread, bearing candles, giving of ashes on Ash Wednesday, bearing of palms on Palm Sunday, creeping to the cross on Good Friday, and other “like exorcisms and benedictions . . . and all other like laudable customs, rites, and ceremonies be not to be contemned and cast away.”<sup>45</sup>

In another amazing reversal of policy, the approach to images adopted here in many respects is not radically different from the advice that Gregory I gave to Bishop Serenus or that of John of Damascus (as will be discussed in the next chapter). In fact it appears to adopt the conventional teachings on images, or as Margaret Aston puts it, the Sixth Article “‘Of Images’ allowed for doubts about their use.” It both argued for image-breaking and yet acknowledged the usefulness of images.<sup>46</sup>

Another radical change of the period was a new model of ecclesiastical Visitation (traditional annual visits to churches by church officials) that had been instituted in 1535. With the Visitations coming under royal jurisdiction, royal

authority replaced Episcopal responsibility.<sup>47</sup> A series of Royal Injunctions under the Visitation Articles further strengthened the king's supreme authority over all religious matters. Because Cromwell was functioning as the king's deputy in spiritual concerns, the Royal Injunctions of 1536 came under his decisive power. For example, in the first injunction in 1536, usurping the Pope's power, the ecclesiastical functionaries were enjoined to uphold the laws of the land and particularly the king's authority as supreme head of the church of England (*VAI*, 2.3). Moving quickly from this primary recognition, the fourth injunction required the dean, parsons, vicars, and so on to abolish superstition and hypocrisy, that is, all traditional forms of religion, including images: "That all superstition and hypocrisy, crept into divers men's hearts, may vanish away, they shall not set forth or extol any images, relics, or miracles for any superstition or lucre, nor allure the people by any enticements to the pilgrimage of any saint, otherwise than is permitted in the Articles lately put forth by the authority of the King's majesty" (*VAI*, 2.5–6).

The Second Royal Injunctions (1538) that later formed the basis for both Edward's and Elizabeth's injunctions seemed to accord a special privilege for reading the Bible, the Our Father, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments, all in English; and while extolling scripture, they abhorred candles, images, relics, and all items "tending to idolatry" and ordered them taken down (*VAI*, 2: 37, 36–38), thus overriding the earlier injunctions. Despite the ten articles with their apparent conciliatory attitude, the later injunctions initiated a wave of destruction with the order to raze the monasteries and abbeys, no doubt a ploy to enrich the king while eliminating a powerful opposition to the reform and to the king's authority.

The injunctions, the destruction, and a series of high-profile state-sanctioned murders rendered Henry's reign what some have called a "reign of terror."<sup>48</sup> One hundred years later, Peter Heylyn in *Ecclesia Restaurata*, a history of the Reformation, wrote ruefully of these years:

And being further doubtful in himself what course to steer, he [Henry] marries at the same time with the Lady Ann . . . whom not long after he divorceth; advanceth his great minister, Cromwell, (by whom he had made so much havoc of religious houses in all parts of the realm), to the Earldom of Essex, and sends him headless to his grave within three months . . . takes to his bed the Lady Katharine Howard . . . and in a short time found cause enough to cut off her head; not being either the richer in children by so many wives, nor much improved in his revenue by such horrible rapines. In the midst of which confusions he sets the wheel of Reformation once more going.<sup>49</sup>

But Henry's reign was comparatively benign in contrast to what was to follow. The iconoclastic movement found new opportunities in England when Edward VI (1547–53), Henry's nine-year old son, was crowned on February 20, 1547. At the coronation, the archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas

Cranmer (1489–1556), intent on destroying any remnants of the influence of Rome in England, spoke these now infamous words: “Your majesty is God’s vice-regent and Christ’s vicar within your own dominions, and to see, with your predecessor Josiah, God truly worshipped, and idolatry destroyed, the tyranny of the bishops of Rome banished from your subjects, and images removed. These acts be signs of a second Josiah, who reformed the Church of God in his days.”<sup>50</sup>

Henry had appointed Thomas Cranmer archbishop of Canterbury, and from this cathedra Cranmer had acquiesced and indeed lent religious support to Henry’s ruthless infidelities and personal desires. When Henry died, leaving the crown to his sickly son, Cranmer began to enact his reformist convictions. Thus, linking Edward with King Josiah, Cranmer invoked the second commandment that forbids “graven images.” As in the Byzantine crisis, Deuteronomy takes on greater importance, and the Decalogue becomes its central message.<sup>51</sup>

Making Edward Josiah *redivivus* appears to have been commonplace because John Foxe’s narrative for Edward’s reign also emphasizes the parallels with King Josiah:

If I should seek with whom to match this noble Edward, I find not with whom to make my match more aptly, than with good Josias: for, as one began his reign at eight years of his age, so the other began at nine. Neither were their acts and zealous proceedings in God’s cause much discrepant: for as mild Josias plucked down the hill altars, cut down the groves and destroyed all monuments of idolatry in the temple, the like corruptions, dross, and deformities of popish idolatry (crept into the church of Christ of long time), this evangelical Josias, King Edward, removed and purged out of the true temple of the Lord. Josias restored the true worship and service of God in Jerusalem, and destroyed the idolatrous priests! King Edward likewise in England abolishing idolatrous masses and false invocation, reduced again religion to right sincerity. (*Foxe*. 5.698)

For John Foxe, the iconoclastic monarch had restored the “true temple of the Lord.” Like Constantine V following in his father’s footsteps, Edward VI vigorously attacked the cult of images under the aegis of upholding God’s law. Among his 1547 proclamations, Edward announced his Injunctions for Religious Reform that, among other reforms, forbade images in churches while parishioners were enjoined to do the same in their own houses.<sup>52</sup>

The Visitation Articles based on the proclamation enjoin the visitors to check to see whether anyone obstinately was extolling the bishop of Rome or keeping holy days. To this, he added the following: “Whether there do remain not taken down in your churches, chapels, or elsewhere, any mis-used images, with pilgrimages, clothes, stones, shoes, offerings, kissings, candlesticks, trindles of wax, and such other like: and whether there do remain not delayed and destroyed any shrines, covering of shrines, or any

other monument of idolatry, superstition and hypocrisy" (*VAI*, 2.105). Again in 1547, reaffirming the king's supreme authority over religious matters and desire to eradicate the former practices, the Visitation Articles repeated the same injunctions (2.115–16).

To eliminate idolatry, visitors/inspectors were to "take away, utterly extinct and destroy all shrines, covering of shrines, all tables, candlesticks, trindles or rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition: so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glass-windows, or elsewhere within their churches or houses" (*VAI*, 2.126). Interestingly, under Henry, because replacing windows was costly, many remained, but here windows were also included. Many windows were finally smashed during Cromwell's Commonwealth (2.126n1). The lists of proscribed items had not included glass before, so its appearance on the list testifies to the rigor of this new cleansing.

Another feature to this proclamation includes an even more ominous suggestion. When the edict included "houses" in the list of places where devotional imagery was proscribed, the royal realm had invaded the household, legislating behavior within. In 1547, essentially initiating the tenor of Edward's reign, the King's Council sent a letter to the archbishop of Canterbury for the abolishing of images on the grounds that despite the abolition, some common people persisted in their idolatry and superstition (*Foxe*, 5.717–18). This amounted to a declaration of war against images anywhere within the realm.

Edward died in 1553, and when Mary (1553–56), the Roman Catholic daughter of Catherine of Aragon and Henry VIII, came to the throne while still maintaining (initially) supreme authority, she returned church practices (holy days, fast days, and all ceremonies) to what they had been under her father Henry in 1529. Her third royal proclamation, right after she became queen, offered freedom of conscience and forbade religious controversy. She reminded her realm that she could not "hide that religion which God and the world knoweth she hath ever professed from her infancy hitherto." Though she recommended her subjects follow her model, she would not "compel any her [*sic*] said subjects" to do so.<sup>53</sup> In 1553 she annulled Edward's 1550 statute for abolishing images and other aids to devotion, eventually repealing all nine Edwardine statutes. At the same time, she reinstated traditional religion, citing the disorder, hatred among people, and discord that had characterized the previous years.<sup>54</sup> In the Visitation Articles sent to the ordinary in 1554, she specifically recalled the practices of her father: "Put in execution all such canons and ecclesiastical laws, heretofore in the time of King Henry the Eighth used within this realm of England" (*VAI*, 2.324–25). By the time she married Philip of Spain, she had returned the English church to Roman authority.

But when Elizabeth came to the throne in 1558, she reinstated the Reform of Images and once again eliminated traditional practices of veneration. She also reinstated the Act of Supremacy that Mary had rescinded in 1554 after

her marriage to Philip of Spain. Interestingly, John Foxe's anti-Catholic narrative about Mary's demise and Elizabeth's rise invokes the same providential explanation deployed by the second wave of Byzantine iconoclast emperors. When the reign of Mary, "a vehement adversary and persecutor against the sincere professors of Christ Jesus and his gospel" came swiftly to an end, this demonstrated "God's great wrath and displeasure" (Foxe, 8.625). Thus, according to Foxe, God favors iconoclastic monarchs and punishes their opponents.

When Foxe turns to discussing the reign of Elizabeth, he links God's design, good kings (i.e., those who subvert the monuments of idolatry), and successful reigns. As with the Deuteronomic writer, good kings attack idolatry:

Of good kings we read in the Scripture, in showing mercy and pity, in seeking God's will in his word, and subverting the monuments of idolatry, how God blessed their ways, increased their honours, and mightily prospered all their proceedings; as we see in king David, Solomon, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, with such others. Manasseh made the streets of Jerusalem to swim with the blood of his subjects; but what came of it the text doth testify.

Of queen Elizabeth, who now reigneth among us . . . it is hard to say, whether the realm of England felt more of God's wrath in queen Mary's time, or of God's favour and mercy in these blessed and peaceable days of queen Elizabeth. (Foxe, 8.626)

Elizabeth's reign returned the authority over religious matters to the monarch. Her Royal Injunctions adopt the same kind of language and specific instructions that had characterized visitations during her brother's time, although she is clearly wary about the dangers of disorder.

In the Royal Injunctions of 1559, Queen Elizabeth states her absolute authority over her realms, by God's law:

1. And that the Queen's power within her realms and dominions is the highest power under God, to whom all men, within the same realms and dominions, by God's law, owe most loyalty and obedience afore and above all other powers and potentates on earth.
2. Besides this, to the intent that all superstition and hypocrisy crept into divers men's hearts may vanish away, they shall not set forth or extol *the dignity* of any images, relics, or miracles but *declaring the abuse of the same, they shall teach that all goodness, health and grace ought to be both asked and looked for only of God*, as of the very author and giver of the same, and of none other. (VAI 3.9, italics show Elizabeth's change of Edward's article)

But she did not go as far as her brother had to eliminate images. She reworked Edward's injunction, so as to discourage the destruction of images and to encourage preaching and teaching against them.<sup>55</sup> However, this subtlety eluded the agents charged with the Visitations in 1559 because they took it upon themselves to remove the remaining carved images from the churches.<sup>56</sup>

Furthermore, the 1559 proclamation included a provision that again reached into the privacy of the household: "Also, that they shall take away, utterly extinct, and destroy all shrines, covering of shrines, all tables, candlesticks, trindles, and rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition, so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glasses, window, or elsewhere within their churches and houses; preserving, nevertheless, or repairing, both the walls and glass windows. *And they shall exhort all their parishioners to do the like within their several houses*"<sup>57</sup> (italics mine).

The *Ecclesia Restaurata* reports that when Elizabeth came to the throne, the Protestants believed, as the Catholics had when Mary ascended, that she would definitively settle the religious conflicts in favor of the reformers. So, just as the Catholics had restored altars and returned to traditional religion under Mary, now "before they were required so to do by any public authority; so fared it now with many unadvised zealots amongst the Protestants, who, measuring the Queen's affections by their own, or else presuming that their errors would be taken for an honest zeal, employed themselves as busily in the demolishing of altars and defacing of images, as if they had been licensed and commanded to it by some legal warrant."<sup>58</sup>

One can have an idea about how serious this destruction was because the following year, 1560, the queen made a proclamation "[p]rohibiting [d]estruction of [c]hurch [m]onuments" because by "means of sundry people, partly ignorant, partly malicious, or covetous, there hath been of late years spoiled and broken certain ancient monuments, some of metal, some of stone, which were erected up as well in churches as in other public places." Thus, she mandates the arrest of the perpetrators and orders the clergy to arrange for the repairs.<sup>59</sup>

There is something even more insidious in these proclamations than just the legislation of religious images in public places, recalling that in pre-Reformation times, it was common for religious images of many different designs to be found on the exterior of churches, on church property, but also generally on streets, in public squares, in fields, and in homes. Elizabeth's edicts, as Edward's had earlier, required their destruction. The Tudors promulgated a host of other edicts to legislate how one was to practice religion, including topics like fasting, reading, appropriate behavior in and outside of churches, and suppressing rumors about religion, for example.<sup>60</sup> Furthermore, the middle of Elizabeth's reign witnessed an increase in municipal policing of moral behavior (including behavior at weddings, public drinking, dancing, and many other types of ritual-related conduct).<sup>61</sup> With a policing capacity of judges, sheriffs, justices of the peace, mayors, bailiffs, and other ministers, as well as most importantly the ecclesiastical courts, all under the monarch's ultimate authority, the realm now emerged to dominate both the public and private world of the household and to legislate family religious practices, and in so doing to encourage local spying. The royal proclamations and statutes



about religion had one central political purpose: to impose religious uniformity on the English people and to suppress differences. People who spoke against the sacrament of the mass could be hauled before a court on the witness of two others; those who failed to attend church could be fined.<sup>62</sup>

The overlap between public and private devotion came to the forefront when even the queen herself had her private chapel scrutinized and condemned. Foreign visitors attest to the fact that Elizabeth kept a crucifix in her private chapel. A queen's private chapel was in many ways both a public chapel and a model for her subjects and for foreign visitors.<sup>63</sup> Letters between the exiles in Switzerland, who had left England when Mary came to the throne, and people, mainly clergy who remained in England, testify to a heated controversy over both public and private crucifixes, occasioned by the queen's insistence on keeping hers. A letter from John Jewel to Peter Martyr in Switzerland in November 1559 reveals just how seriously the English clergy were taking the issue of private and public devotional images when he writes, "That little silver cross, of ill-omened origin, still maintains its place in the queen's chapel. Wretched me! This thing will soon be drawn into a precedent. There was at one time some hope of its being removed; and we all of us diligently exerted ourselves . . . [But] it is now a hopeless case."<sup>64</sup> Three months later, Jewel returns to the topic, telling Peter Martyr that "this controversy about the crucifix is now at its height" and that the judges will decide the future of all those "crosses of silver and tin, which we have every where broken in pieces" (*Zurich*, 67–68; Latin, 39).

The issue did not go away. Thomas Sampson wrote to Peter Martyr in January, 1560, "What can I hope for, when the ministry of the word is banished from the court? while the crucifix is allowed, with lights burning before it? The altars indeed are removed, and images also throughout the kingdom; the crucifix and candles are retained at court alone. And the wretched multitude are not only rejoicing at this, but will imitate it of their own accord" (*Zurich*, 63; Latin, 36). By April 1560, Bishop Sandy reported to Peter Martyr that "the queen's majesty considered it not contrary to the word of God, nay, rather for the advantage of the church, that the image of Christ crucified, together with [those of the Virgin] Mary and [Saint] John, should be placed, as heretofore, in some conspicuous part of the Church." Arguing vehemently against this development to the point of the queen's displeasure, he persuaded the queen to his position, especially since after all, at his last visitation he had removed and burned "all images of every kind" (*Zurich*, 73–74; Latin, 42–43).

Concern over Elizabeth's crucifix refused to evaporate, and indeed someone, or several persons, in 1562 entered her chapel, and as John Parkhurst, bishop of Norwich, reports it, "Good news was brought me, namely, that the crucifix and candlesticks in the queen's chapel are broken in pieces, and, as some one has brought word, reduced to ashes" (*Zurich*, 122; Latin, 73). A crucifix was back again by 1563, to Parkhurst's consternation: "The lukewarmness



of some persons very much retards the progress of the gospel," he wrote to Henry Bullinger the following April (*Zurich*, 129, Latin, 77).

This whole story of Elizabeth's crucifix highlights the unhealthy religious zeal of the times. Whatever her motives for having the crucifix, and some have argued it was her way of appeasing foreign Catholic realms while mollifying traditionalists at home,<sup>65</sup> it is entirely possible that she was sincerely attached to the image, even though we have no word from her to that effect. The furious opposition to the crucifix represents a radical invasion of private devotional space by church authorities. If these purists were willing to invade a queen's private chapel, one can only imagine the kind of spying on neighbors this climate of state-sanctioned religious zeal had unleashed.

### CONCLUSION

Starting with a divorce and a need for a male heir to ascend to the throne, the Tudor chapter in England's Reformation gives us a process of how iconoclastic movements flourish, particularly in the early modern period when the realm emerged as the policing instrument for religious matters. A flurry of government or royal proclamations, visitation articles, edicts, "legal warrants," destruction of religious buildings and artifacts, and book banning and burning all testify to a realm searching to control and direct the religious life of its population. The absolute authority of the ruler over all matters pertaining to the religious life of the people, even though Elizabeth rejected this role, drove a wedge between loyalty to conscience and tradition and loyalty to the realm, in which to choose conscience could endanger one's life. To choose tradition softly, as in the case of Elizabeth's crucifix, endangered the image itself.

One tantalizing aspect of these two European outbreaks of destructive zeal against cultural artifacts in the guise of reform evokes the old observation that history tells stories according to who wins and who loses. The iconoclasts in the Byzantine Empire lost out to the venerators of icons, and as orthodox religion prevailed and religious art continued to play a central role, iconoclasm came to be regarded as a nasty chapter in Byzantine history. In contrast, the adherents of traditional religious practice lost in the English Reformation, and its historians continue to tell the story of the triumph of "true religion" and the "modern state" over superstition and idolatry. In the triumphal history of England, the story of the Roman Catholic "Bloody Mary" obscures all the blood spilled, spying on private devotions, smashing buildings, and mutilating art works during the reigns of Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth in the cause of "true religion." One of the most shameful chapters in the history of both religion and art, the ruin of the monasteries and the stripping of the altars in England (along with all the martyrdoms that accompanied these radical actions) has yet to be acknowledged as a national crime. Ironically today even finding the fragments of religious art that evaded the destroying hands of the time remains an urgent task for English art historians and restorers.

## CHAPTER 3

# IN DEFENSE OF IMAGES: CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND RELIGIOUS “ART”

For a picture is provided in churches for the reason that those who are illiterate may at least read by looking at the walls what they cannot read in books.

—Gregory the Great<sup>1</sup>

EARLY CHRISTIANITY WAS HOSTILE TO IMAGES. SO GOES THE STANDARD argument. This presupposition provided another strong argument for the destruction in the sixteenth century. It assumes continuity with Jewish traditions based on the Decalogue that forbade sacred art, like the argument of the Byzantine iconoclasts. Pitting Jerusalem against Athens and Rome, while excluding artisan traditions from the ancient Middle East where Christianity also thrived (Syria, Egypt, Persia, Parthia, or Palestine, for example), this presupposition informed the outbreaks of destruction of religious images and buildings in Western Christianity. Thus, many scholars, like the reformers who wrote against “idolatry” during the Reformation period, at least since the nineteenth century, have argued that early Christians were aniconic. This assumption remains much alive.<sup>2</sup> In his 1990 magisterial book, *Likeness and Presence*, Hans Belting wrote, without any qualifications, as if it were a statement of fact, “We should always keep in mind that in the beginning, the Christian religion did not allow for any concession in its total rejection of the religious image, especially the image demanding veneration.”<sup>3</sup>

Archaeology, however, tells a very different story. As new artifacts are uncovered from the early Christian period, mounting artistic evidence has irrevocably challenged this prejudice.<sup>4</sup> When a group of Roman antiquarians, the *Accademia Romana degli Antiquari*, began to explore the early Christian catacombs in the fifteenth century (i.e., before the Reformation), they began to uncover a very different story about the use of images. Scientific

study of these sites began when Antonio Bosio (1575–1629), the “Christopher Columbus’ of Roman catacombs” and author of *Roma sotterranea*, which appeared in 1632, described the catacombs and their art known at his time.<sup>5</sup> Modern archaeological work on Christian sites began in the middle of the nineteenth century, when Giovanni Battista de Rossi (1822–94), who is considered the father and founder of Christian archaeology, started his work on the Saint Callixtus catacombs (the oldest dated from the middle of the second century) in Rome.<sup>6</sup> Together with twentieth-century studies, this accumulated archaeological work provides convincing evidence to contradict the long-held conviction that early Christians lacked images or artifacts with a distinct iconography. This aniconic theory now appears to be largely a construct of the Reformation and of nineteenth-century scholars who followed the reformers’ lead.

This chapter addresses two related arguments. First, it challenges the working assumption that early Christianity lacked images and suggests this is a carelessly repeated and unsubstantiated historical prejudice. Second, related to the first issue, I will suggest that the defenses of pictures, icons, and images after iconoclastic incidents constitute early arguments for preservation and cultural continuity, suggesting that the idea of “preservation” that is usually associated with nineteenth-century scholarship actually has much deeper roots. Taking strong positions against iconoclasm and factionalism, while upholding unity and tradition, these defenses of images confront the malicious elements of the destructive actions, while they forecast benign results from preservation and tradition. Although different from some modern arguments for preservation, these defenses that constitute a Christian theology of art nonetheless share similar convictions about tradition, reverence for the past, and shared “built environments.” A consideration of Gregory the Great’s two letters to the bishop of Marseilles, Serenus; John of Damascus’s three treatises on images; and the Reformation defenses of Hieronymus Emser (1477–1527) and Thomas More (1478–1535) will show that their arguments for a middle way recommend avoiding excess and controversy to find a place for images in religious practices. Against those who choose destruction to confront a perceived infraction of “correct” devotional practices, these arguments for traditional approaches to images also present the idea of local heritage, an essential aspect of today’s preservation movements.

### EARLY CHRISTIAN ART

We need to put the first few centuries of Christianity in the correct context of a fledgling religion growing in a pagan empire that was on occasion vehemently hostile to it. Again, looking back with Reformation and nineteenth-century eyes, we too easily see Christianity as dominant, with Christ on every lip. Although Christianity was widespread geographically by the second century, it remained

essentially a minor underground cult—to the Romans, a superstition and a recipient of intermittent pogroms and persecutions until the so-called Edict of Milan (edict of toleration [313 CE]). In fact, in the decade preceding the edict of toleration, according to Lactantius, Emperor Diocletian reinstated the old edicts of Emperor Valerian; and in an example of ancient iconoclasm, he mandated the destruction of Christian churches, forbade Christian assemblies, and ordered Christian scriptures burned.<sup>7</sup> This suggests that identifiable Christian churches were functioning above ground, and we can assume they included some sort of decoration: all of this was ordered destroyed.

When Constantine made Christianity legitimate after 313, only 10 percent of the population of the empire (about sixty million people) was Christian and in the preceding centuries would have been much lower.<sup>8</sup> With such a limited population, it is not surprising that there are not abundant examples of early Christian art. Nonetheless, both archaeological evidence and primary texts from the period reveal that Christianity had visual representation and decoration at least from the year 200 CE onwards. Moreover, this evidence, based on the study of an ancient synagogue, also suggests that ancient Judaism itself was not aniconic.<sup>9</sup> None of the examples of visual decoration can be considered sudden developments, but rather a natural outgrowth of people living in the Greco-Roman, North African, Syrian, or Persian worlds of which they were a part. Whether or not Christians had visual representation before 200 remains an argument from silence because so far persuasive archaeological evidence has not emerged. However, against traditional assumptions that Christianity was iconoclastic from the beginning, the material evidence (lamps, stamps, intaglio, gemstones, frescoes, sculpture, and funerary decorations) demonstrates that early Christians did develop a decorative iconography at least by 200.<sup>10</sup>

A number of examples of Paleo-Christian art make a persuasive case against the long-held view that early Christians shunned art. These include the Christian paintings in the Roman catacombs, the oldest dating to around 200, the sarcophagi with Christian subjects in Rome and Provence, dating from around 230, and the mural paintings in the baptistery of Dura-Europos in Syria, dated almost a century before the Christianization of the imperial household.<sup>11</sup>

The Saint Callixtus catacombs in Rome, the official cemetery of the Church of Rome in its earliest period, originates from about the middle of the second century. It is named after Deacon Callixtus who, at the beginning of the third century, was appointed by Pope Zephyrinus to administer the cemetery where many early Christian martyrs had been buried. Specifically in the “Cubicles of the Sacraments,” we find a number of examples of early Christian art. Among these are the depiction of the miracle of Moses striking the rock, the oldest representation of a Christian baptism with a priest placing his right hand on the head of the person being baptized who is standing

in a stream. Other representations of baptism are the fisherman, the Samaritan woman at the well, and the paralytic in the pool of Bethesda. There is a depiction of the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves and fishes (John. 6:1–15) and a picture of Jonah.<sup>12</sup>

Symbols abound in these frescoes. They include the Good Shepherd, either with a lamb around his shoulders or as a shepherd with surrounding sheep (of which there are eighty-eight examples in the Roman catacombs alone); this image symbolically represents Christ and the souls he saves, and appears in the frescoes, in the reliefs of the sarcophagi, and in the statues and on the tombs; and an *orante*, a praying figure with open arms symbolizing the soul accepting divine aid. X/P, the first two letters of the Greek word for Christ (*Christos*), is a monogram for Christ, often placed on a tomb to designate that a Christian is buried within. The Greek word for fish (a widespread symbol of Christ) *ichtus*, when placed vertically, forms an acrostic: *Iesus Christos Theou Uios Soter* (Jesus Christ, Son of God, Savior). Other symbols include the dove that evokes peace or the Holy Spirit; the Alpha and the Omega, as beginning and end in Christ; an anchor that conveys salvation; and the phoenix, a mythical bird, eternal life. Also, fresco techniques are used to represent biblical scenes from the Old and the New Testament, some of them with a precise symbolic meaning.<sup>13</sup>

In this regard, we should also note the recent study of gems engraved with Christian inscriptions and symbols that were based on pagan models. These gems, likely made by pagan gem cutters for Christian clients, include examples that can be dated to the early third century according to expert Jeffrey Spier. The most common symbols derive from pagan imagery and include, as in the Roman catacombs and on Christian sarcophagi, fish, doves, trees, anchors, ships, and the Good Shepherd. This repertoire is a far more restrictive set of images than found at the time, with the fish and Good Shepherd occurring most frequently, although examples of narrative, like Jonah and Daniel, appear very early also. The selection<sup>14</sup> seems to confirm that the advice of Clement of Alexandria (150–ca. 215), who wrote *The Teacher* (*Logos Paidagogos*, ca. 200), to choose symbols that could be harmonized with Christian teachings was indeed adopted.<sup>15</sup>

Neither is the Dura-Europos Synagogue, a major find for Christian and Jewish late antique archaeology, believed to represent a unique example of ancient Judeo-Christian religious decoration. In the synagogue—built in two stages, the first at the end of the second century and the second in 244–45<sup>16</sup>—and the Christian baptistery at Dura-Europos, we see biblical narrative painting that differs from the iconographic program developing in Rome and other Western sites.<sup>17</sup> During the siege in 256, the Persians destroyed the synagogue, but the citizens of Dura had built a fortification wall near the west wall of the city that buried the west wall of the synagogue, thus fortuitously saving that wall of the building. (Parts of the south and north walls also remain.)

Since the walls are frescoed, we have concrete examples of Jewish biblical narrative painting in the early third century.<sup>18</sup> These include a series of Jacob frescoes—his dream at Bethel, blessing his children, and so on—a series of Moses paintings, and prophets. In the Christian baptistery at Dura we find scenes from the New Testament, scenes of Adam and Eve, and scenes of David beheading Goliath. The frescoes in the Christian building at Dura follow a similar iconographical scheme to the Jewish building, leading experts to argue that the Christian frescoes functioned to evangelize to the Jews in their community by showing Christian continuity with Jewish history.<sup>19</sup> In fact, some argue that the similarity of the painting style in the two religious buildings suggests a shared prototype, one that later shows up in Byzantine art, but more importantly may emanate from illustrated versions of the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scripture, the *Septuagint*. While all scholars agree that the Torah roll was never illustrated, the *Septuagint*, along with other retellings of Hebrew Scripture could have been, especially since other ancient Greek books were illustrated.<sup>20</sup>

Besides the King Josiah story in the Bible, Jewish aniconism, in fact, may have been a much later development, coming roughly at the same time as the rise of icon veneration in the Byzantine world and in reaction to it and to the influence of Greek culture in Judaism. A specific case of Jewish iconoclasm in a synagogue at Na'aran, Palestine, uncovered in 1918 and excavated in 1921, provides evidence for this. Here specifically, “pagan” iconography (Helios, twelve signs of the zodiac) has been wrenched from a mosaic floor while the Jewish symbols (menorah and Hebrew writing) as well as decorative details (geometric designs and a bird in a cage, a basket of fruit, and two birds) remain. Experts argue that the Jewish community using this synagogue was responsible for the destruction as Judaism in the later sixth and early seventh centuries adopted aniconic positions to distinguish its identity from Byzantine Christianity with its visual images.<sup>21</sup>

Another remarkable example of early Christian art and architecture dating from as early as 140–55 is at Santa Pudenziana in Rome, originally a *domus ecclesia* (house church).<sup>22</sup> An elaborately frescoed third-century site was found in 1977 near Verona at S. Maria in Stelle in Val Pantena. The frescoes, like their cousins at Dura-Europos, include scenes from Daniel, the entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem, and a vision of the apostolic college with Christ among the apostles.<sup>23</sup> The large basilica at Aquileia, produced under the supervision of Bishop Theodore, a local Christian born and raised in Aquileia whose name is inscribed in the floor mosaics,<sup>24</sup> was dedicated between 315 and 320, right after the Edict of Milan (313). Its floor mosaics present a complex iconographical schema with biblical narratives like Jonah and the whale (symbolic of the resurrection of Jesus), fish (*ichthus*), and the Good Shepherd, as well as many traditional Roman design elements (like peacocks and pheasants) that have been adopted as Christian symbols. It is unlikely that

an artistic repertoire of this grandeur and symbolic articulation could have sprung up overnight.<sup>25</sup> Also, a number of sarcophagi remain from the third as well as the early fourth centuries,<sup>26</sup> besides the highly celebrated later fourth-century Junius Bassus, with a complex and highly developed iconographic narrative scheme.<sup>27</sup> The sculptured sarcophagus that forms the base of the ambo of Saint Ambrogio in Milan is one of the few testimonies remaining of the basilica in the time of Bishop Ambrose (late fourth century). Here too we have an ambitious cycle of Old and New Testament narrative sculptures, still very much in late Roman sculptural style and representing the theology of Bishop Ambrose of Milan.<sup>28</sup>

What is the situation in which this Christian art emerged? Of the ancient philosophies, as later adopted by Christian theologians, Stoicism and neo-Platonism had discouraged images if people prayed to them as though they were gods.<sup>29</sup> Plato (ca. 427–ca. 347 BCE), in his *Phaedo*, however, has Socrates explain in the dialogue that “pictures” or “images” function to remind onlookers of what they represent, but they can never equal what they recall visually. Thus in essence, Plato has Socrates separate the effigy from what it represents, yet allows the effigy to be a recollection of the original.<sup>30</sup>

Plotinus (ca. 204–70 CE), considered to be the founder of neo-Platonism, on the other hand, in “On the Intelligible Beauty,” features the beauty in a humanly created sculptured form to argue that this intrinsic quality is an imitation of nature, which itself is derived from an abstract principle. Thus he creates, in Platonic tradition, a hierarchy of abstract value, ascending from the material.<sup>31</sup> Origen (185–254 CE) writes in *Against Celsius* that according to the Greek historian Herodotus (ca. 484–425 BCE), the Scythians, Lybian nomads, and Persians had no statues, and that according to Heraclitus, it is nonsensical to pray to statues, insinuating that those who do so could not know the true nature of god.<sup>32</sup> Eusebius (b. ca. 260, d. before 341 CE) quotes Porphyry (ca. 234–ca. 305 CE), the influential neo-Platonic philosopher, as writing, “There’s nothing surprising if the most ignorant look at statues of wood or stone, just as those who do not know how to read see only stones in stele, writing tablets as pieces of wood or books as nothing more than papyrus woven together.” The Porphyry quote then continues to discuss divinity as light and as invisible to human senses. Eusebius uses this to condemn the “modern” tendency to make statues made of gold and other rich materials.<sup>33</sup>

Augustine (354–430 CE), writing against the pagan gods in *The City of God*, recalls that the pagan Roman philosopher Cicero (106–43 BCE), in *On the Nature of the Gods*, finds fault on stoical grounds with those who spent “whole days in praying and sacrificing . . . who set up images of the gods (a thing he [Cicero] condemns,) gods of different ages and differently dressed, with genealogies, marriages, and family relationships.”<sup>34</sup> Again, writing against making images of gods, Augustine cites another pagan, Marcus

Varro (116–27 BCE), to point out that the Romans originally worshipped without images:

For more than one hundred and seventy years the ancient Romans worshipped the gods without an image. “If this usage had continued to our own day,” he [Varro] says, “our worship of the gods would be more devout.” And in support of his opinion he adduces, among other things, the testimony of the Jewish race. And he ends with the forthright statement that those who first set up images of the gods for the people diminished reverence in their cities as they added to error, for he wisely judged that gods in the shape of senseless images might easily inspire contempt.<sup>35</sup>

But despite these concerns among pagan philosophers as cited by Christians, statues, images, and symbols of the gods were commonplace and necessary to official ancient Roman political and religious life. The pagans had justified statues on grounds that sound similar to those that Christians later adopted to defend them: that statues are not gods, but copies to remind the onlooker of the divinity; the god is made human because man is made in god’s image; statues can exhibit miraculous powers.

Clement of Alexandria (150–ca. 215 CE), in *The Teacher (Logos Paidagogos)*, who otherwise seems to follow a neo-Platonic scorn for visual art, testifies to early interest in appropriate visual decoration for Christians:

Let the seals be of a dove or fish or ship in full sail or of a musical lyre, such as Polycrates used, or of a ship’s anchor, like the one Seleucus had engraved in an intaglio; or, if anyone be a fisherman, let him make an image of the Apostles and of the children drawn out of the water. No representation of an idol may be impressed on the ring, for we are forbidden to possess such an image, nor may a sword or bow, for we cultivate peace, nor a drinking cup, for we practice temperance. Many of the more sensual have their loves or their mistresses engraved on their seal, as if, by this indelible memorial of their passion, they wish to be made unable to forget their erotic passion.<sup>36</sup>

The earliest material evidence of Christian art demonstrates a full use of the images Clement recommends; although it is clear that Clement did not recommend all the decorative traditions of the ancient Greco-Roman world. His advice has two principles: use already existing markets; and be selective.<sup>37</sup>

By the third century, as evidence now suggests, ancient Greco-Roman Christians had adopted pagan Greco-Roman narrative artistic traditions, portrait traditions, symbolic and iconographical elements, and design elements in a number of diverse media (painting, sculpture, mosaics, and intaglio, for example). When Clement specifically suggests an interpretative element in the selection and use of images adopted from the ancient Roman repertoire, he reveals that Christianity is developing its own repertoire of symbolic forms. Intaglio for stamps and decorations for lamps or funerary items show shepherds, doves, lyres, anchors, ships in full sail, fishermen, and fish, all of



which could be harmonized with Christian beliefs and narratives. We know from Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*<sup>38</sup> that a massive church building program began after Constantine ended the persecution of Christians to which the *Liber Pontificalis* (*Book of Pontiffs*) from Pope Silvester (314–35 CE) also testifies.<sup>39</sup>

Further evidence of Christian art is found in the very documents that attack it, because the Christian polemics against art are themselves proof of art's widespread use. Therefore, it is rather ironic that most arguments for an aniconic early Christianity were built on these polemics. The early arguments include some notable Christian writers, including the North Africans Tertullian (160–230 CE) and Origen (182–225 CE) and the eastern Mediterraneans Epiphanius (ca. 310–403 CE) and Eusebius. At the Council of Elvira (in Southern Spain), a local synod meeting circa 300 CE, the thirty-sixth canon reads, "There must be no pictures in church, lest what is depicted on walls be worshipped and adored."<sup>40</sup> While representative of situations elsewhere, this proves that visual display was widespread enough that it drew attention from local church authorities.<sup>41</sup> Many of these polemics against visual aids in religious practice seem to be primarily directed against pagan artifacts, but they clearly also show that a specifically Christian art had begun to flourish in the early Church.

Origen had argued against pagan statues, stating that the prohibition in the Hebrew Scriptures (Exod. 20:4; Deut. 5:7, 8) applied to the ancient Hebrews as well as to Christians.<sup>42</sup> He bluntly stated that it is stupid both to pray to statues and to pretend to do so. Christians should avoid it because they might fall into the trap of believing that the statues are gods.<sup>43</sup>

Tertullian was avidly against anything that suggested idolatry, returning to the topic on a number of occasions. Clearly focusing on pagan sculptural works but including "idols" (i.e., statues, engravings, and weavings) made of gypsum, stone, bronze, or silver, in *De idolatria*, he advises Christians to avoid all such items. He elaborates, as if it were an inappropriate profession for a Christian, that artists who make such things should be banned from the house of God.<sup>44</sup> In *Scorpiace*, citing Exodus 20:2, "Thou shalt have no gods before me," and numerous quotes from Deuteronomy, he argues that the Jews in the Bible were punished for their superstitious turn to idols.<sup>45</sup> Yet from Tertullian, in *De pudicitia*, we know that Carthaginian Christians were already putting religious images on Eucharistic vessels before 210–11. Writing about interpreting the story of the Good Shepherd (Luke 14:4ff.), Tertullian refers to the pictures on chalices, which show the true interpretation of lost sheep, the Good Shepherd, and the flock.<sup>46</sup>

One of the more famous arguments used in the Byzantine attack of images reputedly came from Epiphanius of Salamis in the late fourth century,<sup>47</sup> to whom the English Reformers also turned as an authority.<sup>48</sup> Referring to church walls plastered with the painted images of the apostles, Christ, the

patriarchs, and prophets, Epiphanius deplores this custom. However, the validity of this text was challenged during the Byzantine image crisis. In his treatises against the iconoclasts, John of Damascus (b. 676, d. between 754–87) sets out to argue that Epiphanius's text was forged: "If you say that the divine and wonderful Epiphanius clearly prohibited these images, then first the work in question is perhaps spurious and forged, being the work of one and bearing the name of another, which often happens." More importantly, John adds, "There is the witness of the divine Epiphanius's own church that his purpose was not to abolish images, for it has been decorated with images up to our own time."<sup>49</sup>

Furthermore, these arguments together reveal that although some disapproved of visual aids to the spiritual life, there is no evidence of iconoclastic movements. We have no records of iconoclastic outbreaks in the first four centuries of the Church, so despite the fact that some apologists like Tertullian, Eusebius, and Origen worried about visual display, none recommended wholesale destruction.<sup>50</sup> Despite the occasional complaints about popular decorative traditions and the philosophical arguments against images, the Christian West in the first millennium did not confront a major controversy over images as occurred later in the Eastern Church.

It is also important to note that some early texts offered justification for artistic support to devotion. In fact, ardent defenders of religious art in the early centuries of Christianity include Hilary of Poitiers (b. beginning of fourth century, d. 368), who discussed images and denied the equality between the image and what it represents<sup>51</sup>; Paulinus of Nola (354–431), in his poems;<sup>52</sup> Pope Gregory (540–604), in his argument for images as a "Bible for the unlettered," written in two letters to Serenus, the bishop of Marseilles; and John of Damascus, in the three treatises, *On the Divine Images*, for the instructional and devotional value of icons, written in direct response to Byzantine iconoclasm. These defenses that rely on the force of tradition provide a foundation, if not the argument, for the idea of "preservation" that today, in our museum and heritage site cultures, we take for granted.

Paulinus of Nola in one of his poems describes a sequence of biblical narrative paintings, going from Genesis to Judges, Ruth, and Kings in his church dedicated to Saint Felix at Nola. Most interesting is his justification for the paintings; "you may perhaps ask what motive implanted in us this decision to adorn the holy houses with representations of living persons, an unusual custom." He explains that great crowds of pilgrims were coming to the church because of Saint Felix, and unsophisticated, rowdy, and loud, they needed guidance, so "we thought it useful to enliven all the houses of Felix with paintings on sacred themes, in the hope that they would excite the interest of the rustics by their attractive appearance, for the sketches are painted in various colours."<sup>53</sup> Here, clearly the art works function to edify the pilgrims and redirect energies formerly dedicated to pagan festivities into Christian

devotion. Rather than an accommodation to pagan artistic traditions, this is an evangelistic program inspired by the most elite of the time to Christianize the flock.

The Cappadocian fathers—Gregory of Nyssa (ca. 335–85), Basil the Great (ca. 329–79), and Gregory Nazianzus (325–84)—all seem to have found a place for images. Recalling the affective power of visual art, Gregory of Nyssa describes paintings of the sacrifice of Isaac that brought tears to his eyes.<sup>54</sup> Elsewhere, he describes a martyrium decorated with images of various martyrs' deeds, torments, and death, and an image of Christ in human form. For painting, he writes, even when silent, speaks from the wall and benefits the onlooker.<sup>55</sup> Gregory Nazianzus praises the true-to-nature figures at the Church of Nazianzus and the superb work of the artisans.<sup>56</sup> We also find the neo-Platonic notion that an image represents its prototype in John Chrysostom (b. ca. 347–407) and in Basil the Great. Basil argued, in the context of discussing the link between the Father and the Son, that the “honor given the icon passes to the prototype,” a phrase based on Pauline presuppositions that would echo throughout the iconoclast controversy.<sup>57</sup> According to John of Damascus, citing *The Life of John Chrysostom*, Chrysostom possessed an icon of the apostle Paul that he gazed at and attended to in contemplation and devotion (“Treatise 1,” 55).

This evidence indicates that Christians began to develop artistic traditions very early in their history and that a unique symbol system intended to support the central teachings of the religion had appeared at least by 200, which we know from archaeological remains. Adapting preexistent visual decoration and imagery from the pagan worlds around them, both Jews and Christians in the early centuries of the first millennium were developing a system of iconographical and symbolic representation suitable to their ritual practices and unique narrative traditions, a transformation that would reflect the radical shift of meanings in symbolic communication in the late Roman Empire.<sup>58</sup> Also, it now appears evident that from early Christian times, a distinction between narrative representation and “portrait” (i.e., icon, image, and effigy) permitted the development of narrative art, not just for Christians but also for Jews, as suggested by the synagogue and baptistery at Dura-Europos.<sup>59</sup>

### PRESERVATION AND THE ARGUMENT AGAINST ICONOCLASM

Desire for novelty is a very modern phenomenon, driven by markets and commodification of culture.<sup>60</sup> In the ancient and medieval worlds, preservation was more typically the norm, so when we examine iconoclasm, we see that brushing aside the old as tradition, as past practice, as idolatrous or heretical, or as remnants of a dead or declining order occurs primarily when revolutionary structural changes overthrow the political, social, and economic status quo. Arguments against iconoclasm defend the status quo

and argue to preserve the buildings, art, and artifacts as part of a religious and social order that claims benefits for its members.

### *Gregory the Great*

In response to outbreaks of violence against religious images, arguments against iconoclasm confront religious or antireligious zealotry and the disruption it causes. Pope Gregory the Great (590–604) wrote two letters (one in July 599, and the other in October 600) to the bishop of Marseilles after the bishop had wantonly destroyed the visual artifacts in his church because, he claimed, parishioners were adoring them. Gregory's defense of images has proven almost juridical in the Western Church. His central idea is that visual art representing sacred subjects in churches functions as "letters" (*litteras*) for the unlettered: "For what writing provides for readers, this a picture provides for uneducated people looking at it, for in it the ignorant see what they should follow and the illiterate read the same from it. Thus a picture serves as a text, especially for pagans (*Letters of Gregory*, 11.10).<sup>61</sup>

This idea was coded into Canon Law,<sup>62</sup> elaborated by Pope Hadrian I in his synodal letter of 785 addressed to Irene and Constantine to support restoring images in the East, adapted during the High Middle Ages,<sup>63</sup> revisited at the Council of Trent,<sup>64</sup> and it appears important even today.<sup>65</sup> A quick look at the Vatican Web site and its explanation of the Saint Callixtus catacombs shows that Gregory's influence is still with us today: "The symbols and the frescoes form a miniature Gospel, a summary of the Christian faith."<sup>66</sup>

While art historians recognize that Gregory's justification for visual support in devotion became radically important for the history of Western art,<sup>67</sup> the attention here is on Gregory's concern with the dangers of iconoclasm. In Gregory's middle way between iconoclasm and adoration, I would argue, he was following an Augustinian path that sought a pastoral accommodation to "human things." Augustine's distinction between *uti* (useful) and *frui* (enjoyable)—developed in the *De Doctrina Christiana* (*On Christian Teaching* [1.2–5]),<sup>68</sup> which claims that everything can be useful while only God is enjoyable—espouses a position intended to guide the Christian flock. This position had considerable weight for Gregory's evangelistic times. Such a distinction translates all human things into utilities that require interpretation and therefore have a didactic purpose.

But that "didacticism" is very ample, for it embraces learning, remembering, and being moved, all of which facilitate the onlooker in his or her *accessus* (ascent) to the adoration of God. Thus, Gregory's defense of religious images needs to be understood as a theology of art that includes seeing, reasoning, and contemplating.<sup>69</sup> As Margaret Aston, eminent art historian of the late Middle Ages and Reformation periods, has written about Gregory and Augustine, "The ability to empty the mind of corporeal images marked

a critical stage in the meditative ascent," but this *via negativa* (negative way) did not deny the valid role of the senses (sight and hearing particularly) in earlier stages of the *accessus* to God.<sup>70</sup> This would also be true later for Saint Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153), who worried about the distractions of visual imagery for his Cistercian brothers.

That Gregory understood Christian art as necessarily didactic in this expanded understanding of teaching follows both from his own pastoral philosophy and from this Augustinian premise. Words are signs for Augustine, and in this sense the division between visual signs and written words might not be so far apart in this neo-Platonic scheme.<sup>71</sup> For Gregory, too, the image or sign as inscribed, spoken, or heard word (*vox carnis* versus *vox animae* [bodily voice versus spiritual voice]) is a means of acquiring knowledge, and since all human things pass through the senses, we may come to know the *Logos* (Word) through them. This is the heart of the meaning of the Incarnation and Christ as *eikon* of God. Images thus can also function as evangelizing messages, but in this broader view, they can lead upward beyond the immediate sensual apprehension to meditation and then to spiritual knowledge of God.<sup>72</sup>

In *De Catechizandis Rudibus*,<sup>73</sup> a preaching manual written for local priests, Augustine laid out a very practical version of the *De Doctrina Christiana*, aspects of which also appear in Gregory's *Regula Pastoralis* (*Rule for Pastors*).<sup>74</sup> Throughout this text, Gregory singles out humility and charity as essential for those who would become pastors, consistently reverting to the metaphor of the shepherd and his sheep. Both Augustine and Gregory focus on pastoral matters, but one issue has particular relevance to the role of imagery and Gregory's displeasure with the bishop of Marseilles' behavior: Augustine and Gregory equally insist that the pastor, while upholding the double law of charity (love God and love your neighbor), must adapt his teaching to the level of his disciples. To fail to do so is to fail the faithful. Mercy, humility, and love should regulate the pastor's actions, not a sense of superiority.<sup>75</sup>

Considering the opprobrium and harm the iconoclast Byzantine emperors and the Tudor rulers would one day inflict on pious practices and their practitioners, we can appreciate the wisdom of Gregory's middle way. The end of Gregory's *Regula Pastoralis* emphasizes this point about humility, when, in using a painting analogy, he writes in humility and with charity, "I have tried to show what a pastor must be, and I, a poor painter, have painted a beautiful picture of man; and I am directing others towards the shores of perfection, even while I am still beaten by the waves of sin."<sup>76</sup>

When the bishop ignored Gregory's letter requesting that he reverse his actions, Gregory followed with a second letter. The focus on this letter has traditionally been the issue of the bible of the unlettered and the justification of art on the grounds that people who cannot read may learn from the pictures, especially if a responsible preacher refers to the narratives in his

sermons and the laity learns to interpret the pictures through this guidance. Distinguishing between adoring pictures and learning from them, in the second letter, Gregory offers the following justification of religious images:

For the worship of a picture is one thing but learning what should be worshipped through the story on a picture is something else. For what writing provides for readers, this a picture provides for uneducated people looking at it, for in it the ignorant see what they should follow and the illiterate read the same from it. Thus a picture serves as a text, especially for pagans. . . .

. . . painted images had been made for the edification of ignorant people. (*Letters of Gregory*, 11.10)<sup>77</sup>

But the letter takes up several other important points. These include the consequences of iconoclasm, the priest's evangelistic role, the dangers of schism and a pastor's responsibility, and a theology of images:

- 1) Against iconoclasm: Referring several times to the bishop's uncontrolled zeal and the fact that he broke the statues, Gregory condemns him for his indiscretion:

Burning with uncontrolled zeal, you began breaking the statues of the saints. . . .

. . . we condemn you for having broken them. (*Letters of Gregory*, 11.10)<sup>78</sup>

- 2) Evangelism: According to the letter, the nature of the bishop's constituency, a mixture of Christian and non-Christian, makes his actions especially deplorable:

Thus a picture serves as a text, especially for *pagans*; . . . as you live among *pagans*; when might you bring *errant sheep* into the Lord's sheepfold, when you cannot retain those that you have? (*Letters of Gregory*, 11.10, italics mine)<sup>79</sup>

- 3) Pastoralism and the dangers of schism:

Gregory several times criticizes the bishop for creating schism in his parish and community because of his rash actions and exhorts him to behave like a true shepherd. While he applauds the bishop for condemning adoration of the pictures, he asks him if he has ever heard of any other priest breaking them. If the answer is never, that should have been a warning that to destroy them was to raise himself up as more holy and wise than his brethren. Gregory emphasizes that the correct course of action for a pastor is not to scatter the flock but to gather it. The bishop's recklessness has upset the brethren, and thus they have suspended themselves from the community, so Gregory exhorts him to rein in his zeal and presumptuousness and recall those who have separated themselves.

## 4) Theology:

Gregory emphatically repeats that to adore pictures is inadvisable, but nonetheless the pictures aid religious devotion: “Indeed, because you had banned their adoration, we fully applauded you . . .

“Worship of a picture,” he writes, “is one thing but learning what should be worshipped through the story on a picture is something else.” Why, because “. . . it is unlawful to worship anything made by human hand, since it has been written: ‘You shall adore the Lord God and him only shall you serve’ (Luke 4:8).” (*Letters of Gregory*, 11.10)<sup>80</sup>

Here, Gregory’s theology of images distinguishes between the picture, which has a devotional purpose and can therefore lead to adoration of God, and worshipping the picture, which should be avoided. This breakdown of the letter shows that Gregory had a number of concerns that resulted from the bishop’s actions. Gregory refers to the fact that the bishop was inflamed with an unwise and inconsiderate zeal, which had consequences: creating scandal and schism, which he refers to several times. He disciplines the bishop for scattering his flock, for recklessly following his own impulses, and for causing his flock to withdraw from communion. Gregory informs him that this is not the behavior of a Good Shepherd who should unite, not divide. Also, it is clear from the letter that the bishop works in a “mixed” community of Christians and gentiles and that his excessive force has scandalized both his own parishioners and outsiders.

A central feature of Gregory’s argument is a middle way between forbidding adoration of images and encouraging respect for them, because properly used they are instruments of instruction, meditation, and contemplation of the saints and the divinity. His dictum that pictures are books for the unlettered connects to teaching and pastoral care. It is the bishop’s responsibility to teach his parishioners to look beyond the sign to appreciate what is signified.<sup>81</sup> Nonetheless, Gregory also sensibly warned of the danger of overzealotry because destruction based on such rigid positions would cause more turmoil, and specifically it threatened to destroy community, creating divisions and conflicts. For Gregory, the priest’s role, as developed in the *Regula Pastoralis*, is to shepherd flock together, not to sow discord. The concerns about education, informing parishioners about the meaning of images and learning from them rather than adoring them, and the danger of zealotry because it creates schism and scandal emphasize the common sense of Gregory’s middle way. The example of destructive zeal in the cases discussed in Chapters 1 and 2 certainly prove Gregory’s point. Furthermore, for all the ostensible rejection of Gregory’s papist approach, the accommodations that both Henry VIII and Elizabeth sought over the image issue (though not the supreme authority issue) show them more in continuity with Gregory than with the discontinuity adopted on the continent by Karlstadt, Calvin, and Zwingli.

## *John of Damascus*

In the Eastern Church, John of Damascus developed a theological defense of images. But his justification of images is not as important here as the dangers he identifies with iconoclasm: (1) schism or divisiveness, (2) imperial involvement in ecclesiastical matters, (3) abandonment of tradition, (4) fear of matter (i.e., dualism). The concerns he raised, I would suggest, ultimately provided an argument for preservation of artifacts that forecasts our modern idea of cultural heritage.

Like Basil the Great, who he quotes, John argued that the honor given to the image is referred to its prototype (“Treatise 1,” 35).<sup>82</sup> A major figure in the history of Christian theology, John, the child of a prominent Christian family, was born in Damascus and lived his entire life in the Middle East. He was a civil servant in the Umayyad government (the first great Muslim Caliphate centered in Damascus (661–750 CE), but he resigned his position to become a monk in Palestine where he took the name John. John, identified as Mansur, his Arabic name, at the Synod of Hieria in 754, was anathematized because of his anti-iconoclastic writings. His life ended at his monastery in Jerusalem where he wrote many of his major theological works.<sup>83</sup> John’s three treatises on images—which are actually three different forms of the same treatise since he self-plagiarizes throughout, although he adds new material in the second and third treatises—became very popular in Europe during the Reformation. Eight Latin and one French edition appeared in the sixteenth century, and in later centuries, this work was translated into Church Slavonic, Russian, Serbian, German, Italian, and other modern languages.<sup>84</sup>

As with the discussion of Gregory, I am less interested here in John’s argument for the function and justification of visual aids to devotion as developed in *The Three Treatises on The Divine Images* than with his rejection of iconoclasm, his concern about its consequences, and the connection he makes among icon veneration, tradition, and preservation. In an argument that for a modern reader smacks of anti-Judaism, John does scrutinize the divinely inspired commandments against “idols” in the Hebrew Scriptures (Exodus and Deuteronomy) that were so important to the iconoclasts, leading him into an argument that pits the New Testament against certain strands of the Old Testament, making the New Testament the fulfillment of the Old Testament (“Treatise 2,” 62–65; “Treatise 3,” 83–91).<sup>85</sup> For John, “idols” are the former false gods worshipped by the ancient Hebrews against their own traditions, from which he carefully distinguishes “images,” for which he finds justification within the Hebrew tradition itself.

John’s treatises also provide an answer for those who have argued that the fight over images is really a struggle between the learned and unlearned. In the iconoclast outbreaks, as discussed in the last two chapters, the powerful (rulers and their ecclesiastical supporters) state mandate their own theological conditions on what they deem idolatrous habits of the “illiterate,” uneducated,



or just plain superstitious populace. While images were consistently defended for the “illiterate,” those who attacked them wanted to impose the practices of “educated” believers. However, John’s *florilegia* (list of citations that follows the treatises) cites many learned figures who testify to the value and purpose of visual artifacts in both public and private piety from the second through the seventh centuries. This is a potent argument against those who contend that the Church’s acceptance of visual art was an accommodation to pressure from below, that is, a recalcitrant Christian population that refused to give up its pagan habits. If we accept the argument that early Christianity continued artistic traditions from the pagan world, then John’s *florilegia* also show that these traditions were not restricted to the uneducated.

John’s first treatise takes on the issue of the danger of schism and divisiveness prompted by iconoclasm. Opening with a powerful description of the divisiveness that the iconoclastic attack has unleashed, he writes, “I see the Church . . . battered as by the surging sea overwhelming it with wave upon wave, tossed about and troubled by the grievous assault of wicked spirits, and Christ’s tunic, woven from top to bottom, rent, which the children of the ungodly have arrogantly sought to divide, and his body cut to pieces, which is the people of God and the tradition of the Church that has held sway from the beginning” (“Treatise 1,” 19). Right from the beginning, like Gregory, John seizes on the consequences of the destruction, choosing the strongest language at his disposal: the Church is “battered” and “tossed and troubled by the grievous assault,” and making this dissolution symbolically parallel to the dividing of Christ’s clothes at the crucifixion, he presents the attack against images as the rending of Christ’s body, that is, the Church.

This is forceful language that describes schism, which is pitted against the traditions of the people of God from the beginning. Citing David as his inspiration (Ps. 118:46), “I spoke before kings and was not ashamed” (“Treatise 1,” 19–20), John also recognizes imperial sponsorship as the culprit for the attack against artifacts, closing the first treatise with the damning announcement that the emperor has overstepped the boundary of his authority: “These things [efficacy of icons] are matters for synods, not emperors. . . . It was not to emperors that Christ gave the authority to bind and loose, but to apostles and to those who succeeded them as shepherds and teachers” (“Treatise 1,” 57).

The second treatise even more forcefully attacks the emperors for assuming the priestly role to override the division between the secular and religious domains: “It is not for emperors to legislate for the Church. For look what the divine apostle says: ‘And God has appointed in the Church first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly pastors and teachers, for the equipment of the saints’—he did not say emperors” (“Treatise 2,” 68). In the same section, he concludes, “We submit to you, O Emperor, in the matters of this life, taxes, revenues, commercial dues, in which our concerns are entrusted to you. For

the ecclesiastical constitution we have pastors who speak to us the word and represent the ecclesiastical ordinance. We do not remove the ancient boundaries, set in place by our fathers, but we hold fast to the traditions, as we have received them" ("Treatise 2," 69).

In "Treatise 2," even though he gives the emperors the right to legislate matters of this life, John condemns their intrusion into religious matters: "I do not accept an emperor who tyrannically snatches at the priesthood. Have emperors received the authority to bind and to loose? I know that Valens was called a Christian emperor and persecuted the Orthodox faith, as well as Zeno and Anastasius, Heraclius and Constantine who [died] in Sicily, and Bardanes Philippicus. I am not persuaded that the Church should be constituted by imperial canons, but rather by patristic traditions, both written and unwritten" ("Treatise 2," 73).

The third concern raised by John about iconoclasm, which is clearly related to the first two—the dangers of divisiveness and imperial intrusion into religious matters—addresses "tradition." For John, tradition is what he calls the "middle way," or following "orthodoxy" ("Treatise 2," 60–61; "Treatise 3," 81–82), that which has been established as "true" by scriptures, ecumenical councils, the authority of patristic teachings, and even unwritten traditions, like turning East to pray or venerating icons. John's respect for tradition to argue against destruction of sacred images offers a particularly interesting foundation for our modern secular idea of preservation. Let us look at how he addresses the role of tradition. Emphasizing its importance, the issue appears immediately after the opening to "Treatise 1," when he writes,

Therefore, holding firm in thought to the *preservation* of the ordinances of the Church, through which salvation has come to us, as a kind of *keel or foundation*, I have brought my discourse to the starting point, as it were urging on a well-bridled horse. For it seems to me a calamity, and more than a calamity, that the Church, adorned with such privileges and arrayed with *traditions received from above by the most godly men*, should return to the poor elements, afraid where no fear was, and, as if it did not know the true God, be suspicious of the snare of idolatry and therefore decline in the smallest degree from perfection, thus bearing a disfiguring mark in the midst of a face exceeding fair, *thus harming the whole by the slightest injury to its beauty*. For what is small is not small, if it produces something big, so the slightest disturbance of the *tradition* of the Church that has held sway from the beginning is no small matter, that *tradition made known to us by our forefathers*, whose conduct we should look to and whose faith we should imitate. ("Treatise 1," 20, italics mine)

John's context, of course, is the Christian Church and the traditions that he maintains have been upheld from the beginning and handed down by honorable men. I have italicized certain words purposefully, because in upholding traditions, John makes an argument against destruction and for *preservation*

and *tradition*, the first word he uses in this context. He is clearly also worried about the harm to the whole that comes when a minority imposes its will. He returns frequently to this defense from tradition, and in fact, his *florilegia* of authorities that conclude all three treatises represent a cornucopia of references to bolster the role of tradition—for traditions are the rocks, the foundation handed down. Their loss “will quickly bring ruin to [the] building” (“Treatise 1,” 58). Of course, his argument is very much in a theological context, but his defense translates easily into the secular domain: destruction undoes our connection to, our knowledge of, and our relationship to the past. In our modern language, as in any major disruption to the norm, whether in war or radical social, political, or economic change, this uprooting that wrenches us from our sense of continuity with the past can create psychosocial trauma.

John’s fourth concern about iconoclasm is the fear of “matter” that inspires iconoclasts. A theological issue, this fear is inspired by a failure to fully appreciate the idea of God as creator of matter or the meaning of the Incarnation—that God became human, that is, was embodied in matter. The theology of the Incarnation (that the historical visible Jesus was the Son of the invisible God) is at the heart of the iconoclast crisis. As many historians of the period have argued and John writes, “You abuse matter and call it worthless. . . . So do the Manichees, but the divine Scripture proclaims that it is good. For it says, ‘And God saw everything that he had made, and behold it was exceedingly good.’ I therefore confess that matter is something made by God and that it is good, you, however, if you say it is evil, either do not confess that it is from God, or make God the cause of evils” (“Treatise 2,” 69–70). For John, this is a return to an earlier schism that not only divides Christians from Christians but divides humans as matter from God, and in the Christian framework, mirrors the rift that had occurred in Eden.

John’s immediate concern is the theological and ecclesiastical implication in the iconoclastic fear of matter, but in fact, something else lingers in the margins of his discussion. For a modern reader, John’s linkage of the fear of matter and the hatred of visual art goes to the heart of iconoclastic and vandalistic activity. The visual artifact affects its viewers’ psyches, and it is this “matter” that the destroyers want to eradicate. In other words, for iconoclasts, the image is pure matter; it is that which it represents. This conviction incites an emotional reaction similar to the attachment found in contemporary vandalism that seeks to destroy the image as if it were what it represents, and at the same time to erase the cultural power it (the image or what it represents) possesses. On the other hand, veneratorators of visual artifacts share a similar attachment (whether the artifact is viewed as an end in itself or as a medium to rise to higher knowledge), for the work inspires an affective response.

**TWO REFORMATION DEFENSES:  
HIERONYMUS EMSER AND THOMAS MORE**

Three important defenses of images appeared in the 1520s to counter the assault of iconoclasts like Karlstadt. The German tract of Hieronymus Emser and the Latin of Johannes Eck (1486–1543) both specifically respond to Karlstadt, and both launched their arguments on grounds similar to those of John of Damascus. Thomas More's "A Dialogue Concerning Heresies" took up images as one of its concerns amidst the unraveling of many aspects of "Roman" Christianity as practiced in England. Eck and More knew each other because when Eck visited London in 1525, he met both John Fisher and Thomas More. Deploring the iconoclast attacks and rashness of schismatic preaching, Eck's argument against the destruction of images follows the logic of incarnation theology as developed by John of Damascus: "Through the incarnation of the Word, the invisible God was made visible and capable of being represented" (Eck, 99). All three treatises confront Martin Luther's ideological stance, "Sola Scriptura" ("Only Scripture") and, defending popular piety, base their arguments on one central premise: Scripture is not the only guide to religious practice. For guidance, besides the Bible, Christians have the Church, which preexisted scripture (Jesus taught orally, after all, and the gospel writers may not have known Jesus, they argue), plus Christian tradition, in its theologians and saints, the councils of the Church, and unwritten traditions.<sup>86</sup>

Emser's treatise, "That One Should Not Remove Images of the Saints from the Churches Nor Dishonour Them and That They are Not Forbidden by Scripture" (1522), declares its position in the title itself. Like Eck and More, Emser does not defend images under all conditions, for he is clearly against their abuse, but he recommends reform rather than overturning the tradition itself (Emser, 92–94). Addressing the Duke of Saxony as the shepherd of the faith for his people, Emser's little treatise answers Karlstadt's propositions with his own to insist on the legitimacy of images, which he distinguishes from "idols" on the following grounds:

1. That we have images in the churches and houses of God is just and in accord with the commandment, Thou shalt not worship others gods.
2. That to have carved and painted images on altars is both useful and Christian.
3. Therefore it is heretical and unchristian to remove them because Scripture (and the way we use them) gives no grounds to condemn or forbid them. (Emser, 47)

Emser's refutation of the reformers' argument, like the positions of John of Damascus and Johannes Eck, is based on the Bible, tradition, the Church Fathers, and the councils of the Church. Like Gregory, Emser highlights the potential danger of schism and mayhem if the iconoclast position is adopted

as state policy (Emser, 58–59, 80). For Emser, also an argument that both Eck and More raise, books are as problematic as images because “if God does not touch and attract our hearts, neither book nor image can help” (Emser, 85). Problems abound with reading, he suggests, because the Bible is not stuck in time, and it requires knowledge to decipher it, a position argued from the earliest periods of Christian reading (Emser, 90). In a direct confrontation with Karlstadt, in a very modern argument, Emser identified iconoclasm as a kind of idol worship itself. Because the iconoclast puts himself above all others, not just contemporaries, but against all the legacy of the past (Emser, 71), he makes an idol of the present moment, allowing it to take precedence over all previous ethical or traditional knowledge.

Like Emser, Thomas More also knew what was at stake in the image crisis. He also was fully aware of the possibly lethal consequences of his opposition to the reforms. He saw before him the pending dangers for England and Europe at his critical moment on the stage of history. William Roper, More’s son-in-law, recording a number of conversations he had about current events in his *Lyfe of Thomas Moore*,<sup>87</sup> reports More as saying three matters needed to be settled to achieve universal peace: that Christian princes at war needed to make peace, that the heresies afflicting the Church needed to be settled in uniformity, and finally that the question of the king’s marriage be settled to the glory of God and the peace of all parties.<sup>88</sup>

More had been battling the reformers both with the pen and through his position as chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster with fire, having confiscated, banned, and ordered burned clandestine reformation books smuggled from the continent that showed up at the London docks. William Tyndale’s English translation of the Bible was among these victims of More’s opposition (DCH, 456). Roper gives a compelling picture of More’s sense of the imminent danger to himself and of More’s own role in the religious controversies that enveloped him: “I pray God,” he said, “that some of us sitting as high as the mountains, treading heretics under our feet like ants live to the day that we wish when they will have their churches quietly to themselves and they will be content to let us have ours.”<sup>89</sup> Iconoclasm, in these desperate times, was only one aspect of More’s *Dialogue Concerning Heresies*, which deals with many issues related to the reforming activities and polemic on the continent and in England. Tyndale’s translation of the Bible is another focus as More argues against it and justifies burning it (DCH 1: 284–92).

By the time More wrote the *Dialogue Against Heresies* (1529), iconoclastic furor was raging on the continent. Signs were everywhere that England might be next; indeed, as it turned out, England was next. More’s arguments against iconoclasm are now familiar to us. He follows the line of thought developed over a thousand-year tradition, probing the biblical prohibitions against “idols” and not against images (DCH 1, 44–46), arguing that devotion to images that point to something else, that is, God, is not idolatry (DCH 1, 96–97), and revisiting the Byzantine councils that had debated the

image issue (DCH 1, 355). He also refers to Gregory's letters to the bishop of Marseilles that condemn the bishop for breaking images and distinguish between worship and veneration (DCH 1, 356). Here More repeats Gregory's position that images are the books of lay people where they read the life of Christ ("ymagys be the bokys of lay peple wherin they rede the lyfe of Cryste" [DCH 1, 359]). Using words like malice and hatred to characterize the iconoclasts' actions (DCH 1, 47–48), just as John of Damascus had done, More worried about the malicious motives of the proponents and the pernicious consequences of image destruction. William Tyndale set out to defend himself against More's *Dialogue* the following year after More had been promoted to lord high chancellor of England. On the image question, in *An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue*, Tyndale insisted that those who serve images are "idolaters," and purgatory is a "poet's fable."<sup>90</sup> The polemic continued, and as this sad chapter in history tells us, both men were dead within five years, both executed by the state.

Given this controversy, civil discord, and sectarian schism in which religious images had occupied a prominent place in polemical attacks, the Council of Trent, convened after the Reformation had definitively shattered Christian unity, also addressed both the veneration of saints and the honoring of images (1563). Resolutions of the council endorsed the veneration of relics, intercession of saints, and honor given to images. But what is more important than this restatement of the Church's traditional position is the argument for this continuity. First, as had Erasmus, Thomas More, and other Catholic reformers, the Council endorsed rooting out all abuses of religious practices connected to images, saints, and relics. Repeating Basil the Great, Gregory I, and John of Damascus, the resolution held that

the consensus of the holy Fathers and [to]the decrees of the sacred councils, [are] as follows: they are first of all to instruct the faithful carefully about the intercession of the saints, invocation of them, reverences for their relics and the legitimate use of images of them. . . . And they must also teach that images of Christ, the virgin mother of God and the other saints should be set up and kept, particularly in churches, and that due honour and reverence is owed to them, not because some divinity or power is believed to lie in them as reason for the cult, or because anything is to be expected from them, or because confidence should be placed in images as was done by the pagans of old; but because the honour showed to them is referred to the original which they represent.<sup>91</sup>

Why continue this tradition, knowing that abuses occur? Because the "images" do apparently have salutary power, can recall the articles of faith, can remind of God's gifts and blessings, and can demonstrate behavior by example, thus encouraging greater devotion and adoration of God.<sup>92</sup>

No position of compromise emerges here with the attacks against images launched by the reformers. Indeed, restating the anathema of the 787 Council of Nicaea, "If anyone teaches or holds what is contrary to these decrees: let him be anathema" (*Si quis autem his decretis contraria docuerit aut senserit*), the

decree defers to a long-established position that put images in the center of devotional practices. The council sought to root out abuses to this venerable tradition in devotional practices, but recommended instruction so that the faithful would understand the “correct” role of images.<sup>93</sup>

Twenty years later, Cardinal Gabriele Paleotti, archbishop of Bologna (1582), in a treatise entitled “Discorso intorno alle imagini sacre e profane” (“Discourse on Sacred and Profane Images”) further developed the views of the Council of Trent on images to take into account new developments in the arts in the Renaissance. Making essential distinctions between secular and religious art (spurred no doubt by the ongoing recovery of ancient pagan art and an emerging market for secular art products); public and private art; and painter, image, and beholder, Paleotti restated the Council’s concerns about abuses of religious paintings, sculpture, images, and other artifacts. He assigned the sacred image to a unique category, but recognized that because there is a distinction between what the viewer sees and the image itself, a beholder might view a sacred image as a profane one. He also introduced a radical new idea, stating that aesthetic pleasure might be an end in itself for some viewers of images. Here we have a Counter-Reformation Roman Catholic bishop vitally engaged in a discourse about art, who, recognizing its aesthetic power, examines its role in secular and religious life in the wake of the Reformation. Endorsing religious art in devotional practices, he offers an elaboration on the broad guidelines laid out by the Council.<sup>94</sup>

In the Josiah, Byzantine, and Tudor iconoclast outbreaks, the central governing realm was the prime mover for the prosecution of what the realm labeled image worship. But a radically different feature of the earlier modern image defenses was the willingness of the proponents of religious images to use the arm of the government to prosecute religious opponents. Writers like Emser, who addresses his defense to the Duke of Saxony, were fully conscious of the ruler’s power to direct policing actions against the populace, just as Karlstadt had asked that pious secular leaders support the image cleansing. More had used his police powers to ban books, and he recommended the list for the king’s proclamation covering prohibited books in 1530. In *A Dialogue* More writes, “The serious punishment of heretics is devised not by the clergy but by temporal princes and good lay people and not without great cause” (DCH 1, 430).<sup>95</sup> When reformers and traditionalists turn to secular powers to police religious matters, we are witnessing a significant social and political redirection. In England certainly this no doubt explains why so many on both sides lost their lives when they chose loyalty to conscience over loyalty to the realm. On the other hand, as national administrations become the dominant institutions debating and legislating this religious artistic heritage, we recognize the emerging power of government to determine whether to destroy or preserve this legacy. Much of England’s medieval art, artifacts, and architecture was destroyed or assaulted in this period. What remained was left for Oliver Cromwell and the English Civil War, in which the medieval legacy was once more the object of state-sponsored violence (see Chapter 5).

# FROM LOCAL CULTURE TO WORLD HERITAGE: CÓRDOBA'S MOSQUE/ CATHEDRAL

ALTHOUGH MANY ARTIFACTS AND BUILDINGS WERE DAMAGED OR LOST DURING the iconoclastic periods discussed previously, much did survive this Christian violence in the late medieval and early modern periods. In some cases, despite national politics; ethnic, civil, and religious conflicts; and other outside pressures, a local citizenry committed to its civic environment arose to preserve its city's signature buildings and artifacts. For example, the Cathedral of Córdoba in Spain, and York Minster, a medieval English cathedral, were, for the most part, spared iconoclastic outbreaks in their national settings. The Cathedral of Córdoba was originally a medieval Andalusian mosque, itself built over a Visigothic church. Although it has been used as a Christian church since the Christians recaptured the city in 1236 and reconsecrated it as a Christian church, it is to this day called the *Mezquita* (mosque). The survival of both York Minster and Córdoba's Mosque during tumultuous times suggests that an idea of "preservation" also existed in the Middle Ages.

Córdoba's *Mezquita* and the city where it resides became a UNESCO World Heritage Site in 1984. Roughly one hundred years earlier in 1882, it had been designated a national monument, a permanent and perennial testimony to Spanish-Muslim culture.<sup>2</sup> But its recent recognition by the arbiters of national and international culture cannot do justice to the extraordinary prestige the building held in the opinion of Córdoba citizens for the previous millennium, indeed from the time of its initial construction.

## CIVIC HUMANISM AND CÓRDOBA'S MOSQUE/CATHEDRAL

Scholars have argued for some time that the well-recognized sense of civic life of the fourteenth-century republics in the early Italian Renaissance<sup>3</sup> had





Figure 6. View of the Great Mosque, Córdoba, from David Roberts, *Sketches in Spain taken during ye yeares 1832 and 1833* (London: Hodgson & Graves, 1837) (author's photo).

deep pan-European roots that suggest continuity rather than radical change.<sup>4</sup> Indeed, Isidore of Seville (570–636), the Visigothic author of *Etymologies*, a foundational encyclopedic text for the Middle Ages, defined a city as “a number of men joined by a social bond. The name comes from the citizens who live in it.”<sup>5</sup> This suggests that for Isidore, civic humanism constituted citizens tied by a social bond to their urban environment. Isidore does not mention the religious or ethnic identity of the citizens, for the people themselves as a social unit define a city. It is the city that binds them. Indeed, we do not need to turn to the Italian *rinascita* (rebirth) to find examples of civic humanism, because the idea of people joined by the city in which they live appears in many medieval Latin written texts as well as in the Islamic tradition.<sup>6</sup>

A Latin work, identified as “*Descriptio Cordovbae*” (“Description of Córdoba”), written two centuries after King Ferdinando III’s 1236 Christian conquest of Córdoba,<sup>7</sup> with the name Jerónimo attached to it testifies to an enduring admiration for the city and to a profound sense of civic pride.<sup>8</sup> Belonging to a tradition of *laudes civitatum* (*praise of the city*), in which the author might praise a city for its unique qualities, including its ancient buildings, its climate, and its geographical environs; express utopian longings for an ideal city; or express nostalgia for a once great city, the tract expresses a melancholic affection for Córdoba’s legacy, while describing the city’s many features.

Jerónimo's *descriptio urbium* (*description of a city*) follows the ancient Roman *topos*, for example, Statius in his *Laudes Neapolis*,<sup>9</sup> or Cassiodorus (ca. 485–ca. 585) who provided the formulae for praising cities and citizens in his *Variarum*,<sup>10</sup> medieval Italian descriptions of cities<sup>11</sup> and Iberian traditions for praising cities.<sup>12</sup> In another example of Iberian civic praise, Alfonso de Palencia wrote a *laudes civitatum* that showed that a civic conscience also existed in Seville in this period. In a eulogy entitled *De laudibus Hispalis* (*In praise of Seville*), Alfonso, who has abandoned his hometown of Palencia for Seville, gives the city's mythological and historical background, the population, the natural surroundings, and the mercantile opportunities it provides.<sup>13</sup> Also extant is an encomium (*risala*) of Islamic Spain by Al-Saqundi (d. 1231), which includes, among the many Iberian cities it praises, Granada and Seville, although Córdoba earns the most attention.<sup>14</sup> Al-Saqundi's, Jerónimo's, and Alfonso de Palencia's descriptions follow a city-praising convention found in Iberia, to offer genuine accolades for living cities and for their environmental, economic, and cultural wealth, whether erstwhile or current.

The manuscript of Jerónimo's *descriptio urbium* was discovered just thirty years ago and is listed in the catalogue of pre-Trent Spanish manuscripts in the library of the University of Salamanca in Spain. The codex that includes the manuscript, also dated in the fifteenth century, is written on paper in cursive Gothic script with Arabic numerals. As to who the author was, Manuel Nieto Cumplido, the manuscript's editor, hypothesizes that he was the canon of the Royal College of San Hipólito of Córdoba, who had lived in the city during the reigns of Henry IV (1454–79) and the Catholic kings (Isabel and Ferdinand [1479–1516]).<sup>15</sup> The work begins with an introductory poem, in which the author tells us he was born in Córdoba, but that he became an adult in Italy. He also informs us that from youth, he traveled widely, going to the Aegean Sea, crossing the Bosphorus, and visiting the cities of the Byzantine Empire. He claims he had seen most of the cities of the Orthodox East. He indicates generally that he knew the famous kingdoms of the "moors," but he insists, "Who could omit Córdoba from among these? For this place, I propose to write in prose about its worthy beauty that shines with the brightness of a royal metropolis."<sup>16</sup>

What makes Jerónimo's text remarkable is that it expresses admiration for a city, its buildings, and its civic environment that had once been a major cultural center of the Umayyads, the continuation of the Islamic caliphate in Damascus (661–750 CE), founded by Abd-al-Rahman I (756–88) who fled Syria as an exile to reestablish the Muslim dynasty in Al-Andalus that lasted from 756 to 1031. Jerónimo considers Córdoba's preeminent building as one of the Seven Wonders of the World. After the Christian conquest, as archives make clear, both Christian rulers and citizens' support shielded not only the mosque, but also many other features of the city from harm during

the massive social, economic, and military changes in Iberia from 1236 to the restructuring of the mosque after 1521 by the architect Hernán Ruiz.

Of the three main political centers in reconquered Spain in the thirteenth century—Toledo, Córdoba, and Seville, where major mosques had stood—Córdoba's Mezquita remains comparatively intact despite major changes in politics and architectural styles. By contrast, Toledo's main mosque, itself founded on a sixth-century Visigothic church, was completely transformed after 1227 when King Ferdinand laid the first stone for Toledo's Gothic cathedral. Seville's cathedral, which also occupies the site of a mosque, pulled down in 1402, is a late Gothic building with little trace of any Arab origins aside from its decorated bell tower, La Giralda, and its patio of orange trees. Nonetheless, despite the erasure of the building, both the tower and the cathedral exhibit *mudéjar* elements (see List of Terms).

What were the circumstances that assured the survival of Córdoba's mosque after the Christian conversion of the city while the other two were completely transformed? Initially the mosque, as the central monument of the Islamic city, was a site for memorializing and naturalizing the claims of Umayyad supremacy and rebirth. The Arabic, Latin, and Castilian testimonies to the building from the time of its foundation to Jerónimo's fifteenth-century



Figure 7. Tower of the Giralda, Seville, from David Roberts, *Sketches in Spain taken during ye years 1832 and 1833*. (London: Hodgson & Graves, 1837) (author's photo).

text include descriptions of the city, the initial construction of the mosque, and its various additions and embellishments. In describing appropriated features and architectural innovations, these texts highlight how civic pride combined with political and aesthetic principles to govern the city's most important monument, despite the radical changes in who was ruling.<sup>17</sup> They also demonstrate how a major city monument can represent different cultural and political narratives with diverse ideologies while simultaneously expressing shifting civic loyalties.

Revealing both a sense of decline and pride in Córdoba's fortunes, Jerónimo concludes the encomium for his city with a plea for its recognition as a great city: "I have put these things together so that in the future this glorious city will not be unknown by its own inhabitants and so thus recognized, it will be consequently more esteemed."<sup>18</sup> He wanted his city to enjoy its due recognition. Thus, he offered a nostalgic retrospective view of Córdoba, the city; its region, its main buildings, particularly the "temple," (the word Jerónimo uses for Córdoba's Mezquita); and the city's reputation as a center of learning.

Jerónimo's work is not unique, for a number of Arabic descriptions of the city and its monuments also exist from the period. Although written after the caliphate had either declined or had begun to decline in power (from 1009–31, the Córdoba caliphate was in a civil war that broke the territory into taifa kingdoms), these descriptions may be memorials of the earlier "golden age" of Umayyad ascendance, just as the mosque itself was an expression of memory and revival. Among the Arab writers are Ibn Hayyan (b. Córdoba, ca. 986, d. 1076), considered the greatest historian of the Umayyad period, who tells of Abd-al-Rahman II's enlargement of the mosque<sup>19</sup>; Abu 'Ubayd Al-Bakri (1040–94), his disciple<sup>20</sup>; Al-Himyari (d. 1178), who describes the Mezquita in great detail, quoting from Al-Idrisi (1100–1166)<sup>21</sup>; and Ibn 'Idhari (d. 1295), who compiled Ibn Hayyan's work.<sup>22</sup> Also, Ibn Hazm (994–1064) refers to the building in *The Dove's Neck-Ring*.<sup>23</sup> Ibn Khaldûn (1332–1406), recording the rise and fall of dynasties in his renowned *Muqaddimah*, touches on architecture to compare the nave of the Umayyad Mosque of Córdoba with Roman aqueducts in Carthage, the Pyramids of Egypt, and other buildings as examples of strengths and weaknesses of various dynasties.<sup>24</sup> After the Christian conquest, Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada (1170–1247), the archbishop of Toledo, in *Historia de Rebus Hispanie* (*History of Spanish Concerns*) specifically refers to the beauty of the building, the best of the Arabs' architecture.<sup>25</sup> Also, the *Primera Crónica General de España* (*First General Chronicle of Spain*), attributed to Alfonso X el Sabio (1221–84), discusses the city and the mosque.<sup>26</sup> All of this written attention to the city and its major building suggests a kind of "collective memory" at work, in which the building itself refers to earlier architectural styles and decorative traditions, while the historians record its splendor and the city's past glory.<sup>27</sup>

Writing retrospectively, Ibn 'Idhari, who compiles most of the previous Arab chronicles about the Spanish Umayyad period beginning in 792, tells the history of the fleeing representatives of the overthrown Syrian dynasty and of the city they came to rule. In 756, when Abd al Rahman I, grandson of the Umayyad Caliph Hisham, abandoned Syria after the Abbasid<sup>28</sup> forces attacked, he fled across North Africa to enter Al-Andalus, and as leader of his army he managed to unify the region. Ibn 'Idhari explains that Abd al Rahman I made Córdoba the capital, which became a cultural mecca, believing, "When I [Abd al Rahman I] entered Spain, I remembered the prediction given to my grandfather that I would make the Umayyad dynasty revive after its fall."<sup>29</sup>

Nonetheless, this first emir, the émigré (*el Inmigrado*), never forgot his homeland in Syria, and these memories informed the architecture of his new home. Ibn 'Idhari recounts that in 766, the first emir restored the walls of the city and built numerous mosques,<sup>30</sup> attracting many immigrants from Syria. Again, according to the Arab historians, the first Spanish emir was an eloquent and rhetorically gifted speaker, who wrote poetry recalling his lost homeland: "My body, you know, is in one place, but my heart and its affections in another. Marked by destiny, a separation that had to happen, it chased the sleep from my eyelids. Divine will that decided this divorce, will decree perhaps a day of reunion."<sup>31</sup>

With an apparent commitment to placing Al-Andalus, and specifically Córdoba, in a cosmopolitan context, Ibn 'Idhari told his readers that when 'Abd al-Rahman I began to build the Mezquita, he wanted to invest in a mosque that would have a unique international reputation, reflecting the origins of the immigrants.<sup>32</sup> He tells us that Christians and Moslems had been sharing a Christian church, the Visigothic church of San Vicente that stood on the site of what would become the present building:<sup>33</sup>

Thus, the Moslems agreed with the barbarians of Córdoba to take half of their very large church, which is situated in the middle of the town; in this half they built a major mosque while leaving the other half to the Christians, but they destroyed all the other churches. However, when the number of Moslems grew in Spain and Córdoba . . . this mosque became insufficient: they had to add galleries . . . When Abd al-Rahman arrived in Spain and was installed in Córdoba, he examined the question of aggrandizement . . . He called together the barbarians of the town and asked them to sell their portion of the church that they still held, offering them a very good price given the terms of the treaty to which they had submitted themselves. Thus the Christians abandoned their half.<sup>34</sup>

The claims of the medieval Arab historians were proven when archaeological investigations in 1932–36 uncovered the Paleo-Christian Visigothic basilica of San Vicente, the mosaic floor, about ten feet below the present building, made available to public view in 2005. The discovery helped to place the provenance of the building's architectural details and provided further

evidence for the earlier strata of the building.<sup>35</sup> The findings included Ionic and Corinthian capitals,<sup>36</sup> Visigothic impost blocks (a heading placed on a capital, in this case looking like an inverted stone pyramid with a square rather than pointed base), the Visigothic church's presbytery screen dividers (some also reused as window lattice work in the mosque) and altar pedestals. All of the columns, in fact, in the first strata of the Abd al-Rahman I mosque had been taken from Roman and Visigothic buildings.<sup>37</sup> In a tradition of reuse and appropriation that has roots in the ancient and medieval Mediterranean, the Christian church on which the mosque was built had itself been on the site of an abandoned Roman temple.<sup>38</sup>

The Arab compiler Al-Himyari described the four extensions to the mosque carried out under the auspices of four rulers. The first, the construction of Abd al Rahman I, was completed in 785 and today is still the oldest building used in Spain. Ibn Hayyan's chronicle of the years 796 to 847 provides an expansive description of the additions to the mosque made during the reign of Abd al Rahman II (833). This second expansion added two naves to the original nine and a northern porch that was united with the western and eastern ones surrounding the patio. In an eloquent hyperbolic testimony both to the ruler and to the beauty of the building and to its comparability with other famous monuments, not unlike Jerónimo's later praise, Ibn Hayyan quotes various poets from Abd al Raman's court to record that the emir had "built a mosque that no-one other than God could make," except of course Mecca's mosque, built by the prophet. Further hyperbole on the special status of the building comes from another poet that Ibn Hayyan quotes, who praises it as the best building, saying that all the mosques of Mesopotamia and Syria cannot equal its beauty.<sup>39</sup>

However, it was under Al-Hakam II's rule that the chef d'oeuvre, the mosaic *mihrab* (prayer niche), was built (961). According to both the Christian *Primera Crónica General de España* and the Arab historian Ibn Hayyan, who praise him for his piety, Al-Hakam had initiated an age of peaceful coexistence with his Christian neighbors.<sup>40</sup> The Christian King Alfonso X praised him as a "a man who defends God . . . and kept the entire land in peace . . . and had no need to make wars."<sup>41</sup> According to Ibn 'Idhari, from the moment that Al-Hakam ascended to the caliphate, he occupied himself with enlarging the mosque. That Byzantine artistry was ascendant, we discover, as Ibn 'Idhari tells us that Al-Hakam wrote to the Byzantine rulers seeking an expert worker in mosaic who would come with materials to build and decorate the mihrab in the style of the Damascus mosque, built by his Umayyad ancestors, which also featured the work of Byzantine craftsmen. At the same time, the artisan was to train local workers (Mamluk slaves) to do mosaic tiling.<sup>42</sup>

In fact, Al-Hakam's notable additions, the mihrab and the *maqsura* (entrance to the mihrab area), introduced new elements to the building in an exuberant artistic celebration of the triumph of the reborn Umayyad caliphate. When

he had the luxurious mihrab built in 961, he had its inscriptions assert the victory of Islam over Judaism and Christianity, just as in the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem, another Umayyad masterpiece:<sup>43</sup> “In the name of God, the clement, the merciful, there is no God except him—all that lives and persists. God has made descend on you—the prophet of the book of truth, testifying to what preceded him. He made the Pentateuch, the Gospel, formerly as guide to men. He has made the Koran descend.”<sup>44</sup> The inscription defers to Islamic triumph in which Judaism and Christianity (the Torah and the Gospels) are replaced by the “book of truth,” the Koran. It demonstrates that the mihrab had much more than the single function of orienting the faithful toward Mecca, especially given the opulence of its decoration.<sup>45</sup> The creation of Byzantine artisans with local Moslem and Christian helpers, this “ornament” of specifically Córdoba artistic expression with Syrian and Byzantine craftsmanship, was completed between 965 and 970, remaining to this day a unique example of mihrab art. Liturgical practices unique to Córdoba Islam were enacted in front of the mihrab, and it has been argued that these innovations were a reaction to the presence of Christians in the community. (The muezzins prayed in front of it before the call to prayer; the Koran was carried around the mosque with a candle in front of it before the actual reading, suggesting some syncretism with contemporary Christian practice).<sup>46</sup> The maqsura was intended only for the royal family. Its polylobed arches, a spectacular architectural innovation, signal the entrance to the mihrab, an octagon-shaped room decorated with white marble with a shell-shaped cupola, the first in the history of Islam. Its mosaic detail is conspicuously rich, but not purely for decoration because its nonrepresentational symbolism invokes the numinous, while simultaneously displaying some of the most refined Byzantine mosaic skill.<sup>47</sup>

Al-Hakam’s addition highlights how the building was to echo the Great Mosque of Damascus, a kind of dialogue with his Umayyad ancestors<sup>48</sup> and demonstration of the caliphate’s cultural triumph over political adversity. Both the building and its features made clear references to the imperial mosque, the Great Mosque of Damascus, on the grounds of which the ancestors of the Umayyads had also once shared space with the Christian Damascenes. Córdoba’s mosque, too, with its appropriation of late antique and Byzantine styles, was a “dialogic adaptation” that made a statement both to its own parent mosque and to its late antique architectural and stylistic ancestors. As a monument to the restored power of the Umayyads, its images as messages made a statement about the political power of the Córdoba caliphate.<sup>49</sup>

Thus, together with Al-Hakam’s decorative additions, the mosque combined the remains, artistic traditions, and reminiscences of other buildings and cultures to stand as an encyclopedia of ancient and medieval Mediterranean art and architecture. These echoes of the past include appropriated features like the horseshoe arch, based on Visigothic models (as still stands



at San Juan de Baños), and Roman building techniques such as the red brick and white stone striping in the arches combined with superposed arches as in the Roman aqueduct in Mérida, a style like that used at the Great Mosque of Damascus, likewise based on ancient models.<sup>50</sup> Such appropriation was a covert continuation of earlier traditions, but at the same time it created something completely new. This reception was not borrowing, copying, or translating, but maintaining a dialogue with former cultural models and connections.<sup>51</sup> Furthermore, the reappropriated *spolia* from the ancient Romans and Christian Visigothic times (with crosses scraped out), Byzantine mosaics, Syrian-style arches, and hints of Jerusalem's Dome of the Rock, which the Umayyads had also built, further contributed to the building's memorial function as public art, political memory,<sup>52</sup> and confirmation of Umayyad revival. In a display of *cultural syncretism* that incorporates earlier contributions, while at the same time assimilating them and still dramatically stating something new, the maqsura and the mihrab, with their inscription and artistic repertoire of styles were also the settings for an ongoing liturgical performance of the Córdoba caliphate's triumph over adversaries, a memorial gesture that expressed victory over the past but also connection to it, whether in the religious or political domain.<sup>53</sup>

Standing as a beacon of the political power and visual imagination of the caliphate, the mosque has also left traces of its actual builders. The numerous signatures in Arabic script or with Christian images (the anchor, thau signs, the morning star, and the fishing ship made like an arrow)—primarily on capitals, columns, and imposts, but also on arches and bases dated to Al Hakam II's and Almanzor's amplifications—are in many ways the most powerful testimonies to how both Moslems and Mozarabs (Christians living an Arab lifestyle) contributed to the building and maintenance of the Mezquita.<sup>54</sup>

By the end of the tenth century, the mosque had followed the expanding needs of the Islamic faithful with the final and fourth addition completed under Al Mansur (called Almanzor in Castilian historiography) in 987, according to the Arab historian Ibn 'Idhari.<sup>55</sup> All the additions to the building adopted the 785 original style and arrangement of arches and columns to maintain the stylistic unity evident to this day in the building.<sup>56</sup> When Al-Himyari introduced his history of the building's construction, he described it in terms of its uniqueness, aesthetic perfection, and "universal" reputation: "In Córdoba stands the celebrated mosque, of universal renown; its vast area, its perfect design, its wealth of decoration and its solid construction make it one of the most beautiful monuments in the world. The Marwani Caliphs were careful to preserve the building, and carried out successive extensions . . . until it became an almost perfect monument, whose intricate detail could not be appreciated at first sight, and whose beauty almost defied description . . . This mosque does not have an equal for ornamentation, width or length among the Moslems."<sup>57</sup> Al-Himyari, writing after the Umayyad decline (ca. 1031),



nonetheless heralds the mosque as a monumental testimony to Umayyad brilliance, uniqueness in the Islamic world, and thriving continuity.

Commitment to the city, its buildings, and the civic achievements of the Arabs continued after the Christian conquest in 1236. As Arab cities fell to the Spanish conquerors, mosques that were not destroyed were consistently blessed with holy water and reconsecrated as Christian churches. Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada reports that once the city had been captured, the Mezquita was washed with holy water and turned into a church of the Blessed Virgin.<sup>58</sup> In fact, at the time of the conquest, although estimates vary, Córdoba had at least five mosques, all of which, including the Mezquita, were converted to Christian churches.<sup>59</sup>

### CHRISTIAN REUSE OF BUILDINGS

The continued use of buildings that had served other cults was customary for both early Christianity and early Islam. The official sanction for such uses was established for Christianity in 601 when Pope Gregory I, in a letter to Mellitus, abbot among the Franks, outlined an approach for Christian missionaries to deal with the buildings and “idols” of their new converts. The letter represents an important statement about buildings that would prove to be as important as Gregory’s two letters to the bishop of Marseilles condemning iconoclasm. Thinking about the situation in England, where Augustine’s mission was thriving, Gregory wrote,

The temples of the idols among that people [the English] ought not to be destroyed at all, but the idols themselves, which are inside them, should be destroyed. Let water be blessed and sprinkled in the same temples, and let altars be constructed and relics placed there. For if those temples have been well constructed, it is necessary that they should be changed from the cult of the demons to the worship of the true God, so that, while that race sees itself that its temples are not being destroyed, it may remove error from its people’s hearts, and by knowing and adoring the true God, they may come together in their customary places in a more friendly manner.<sup>60</sup>

Gregory’s letter provides corroboration for what archaeological evidence has also demonstrated about the reuse of pagan buildings in the Paleo-Christian period. Such reuse includes baths, thermal tanks, temples, and other buildings. Numerous examples remain, including Santa Pudenziana, Santa Maria Antiqua, Santa Maria in Cosmedin, and San Teodoro (all in Rome), and Santa Giustina at Ravenna and Santa Maria della Rotonda at Albano.<sup>61</sup>

Gregory’s letter seems to reflect his own pastoral and evangelist approach, for he recognizes the “customary” role of the “well-constructed” extant building in the life of the people. Not wishing to disrupt this relationship, he recommends changing its iconography by removing “idols” or representation of “other gods” while letting the building stand. His letter provides corroboration for a

tradition that Saint Pancras, in Canterbury, had been a “heathen” temple, containing an image of Aethelberht, king of Kent (560 CE), which was converted to a Christian church after the king also converted.<sup>62</sup> This dynamic synergistic process adapts the earlier historical building to a new cultural form, while keeping the original alive. As mentioned in the introduction, this pattern of reuse or adaptation continued in later evangelist periods, as in *Reconquista* Spain and in Latin America, for example.

When Gregory was pope, one of the most prized buildings of the Romans, the Pantheon—the temple to all the gods built during the reign of the great patron of architecture, Emperor Hadrian (117–38), who was born in Spain—stood deserted, its colossal statues of Augustus and Agrippa under the portico and the neglected replicas of dead caesars in their shrines beneath the gilded dome. The last decades of the sixth century were nasty times for Rome: in 589 massive floods caused the Tiber to break its banks, inundating Rome and destroying the papal granaries and a number of churches. A plague ravaged the city, while the Lombards renewed their attacks. The Pantheon watched silently. Its great bronze doors were closed, while the rain from the floods must have covered its floor, and the rising waters of the Tiber rushed toward it. The citizens of Rome believed it was haunted.<sup>63</sup>

Gregory’s letter recommending the conversion of pagan temples to Christian churches no doubt contributed to the restoration of the Pantheon, because Boniface IV who succeeded to the papal mantle in 608, according to the *Liber Pontificalis*, asked “the emperor Phocas for the temple called the Pantheon, and in it he made the church of the ever-virgin Saint Mary and all the martyrs.” According to the papal records, the emperor then conferred many gifts on the church.<sup>64</sup> However, half a century later, the Pantheon, along with several other bronze decorated buildings, was pillaged when the emperor Constantine (Constans II) came to Rome and stayed twelve days during Vitalian’s tenure as pope (657–72). Constantine dismantled all the city’s bronze decorations, removed the bronze tiles from the roof of the church of Saint Mary ad martyres (Pantheon), and had them sent to Constantinople, the imperial city, where they never arrived because they were seized by Arabs in Sicily and ended up in Alexandria.<sup>65</sup> Such was often the fate of the wealth of churches and other religious buildings, but the Pantheon itself survived to become one of the most admired and imitated buildings in the world, despite its temporary neglect and violation. Gregory’s letter provides corroboration for what archaeological evidence has also demonstrated about the reuse of pagan buildings in the Paleo-Christian period.

This pattern of reuse and transformation of a building does not hide its past; rather, new cultural, political, and social meanings are laid over its old state, creating the new building yet still reminding its viewer of former times,<sup>66</sup> as, for example, the Visigothic impostes and capitals used in the Córdoba mosque that just barely conceal the scraped out crosses that once decorated

them. Thus, the capture of the city of Córdoba and its wealth, “the first of all the [Andalusian] cities,”<sup>67</sup> had greater political and cultural meaning if the memory of its Islamic past was not erased because, among other reasons, it stood as a constant reminder of the triumph of the Christian Spanish forces over its former Arab inhabitants, just as the references to Syrian Umayyad buildings in the Córdoba mosque had previously functioned for the revived caliphate.

Alfonso X's *Primero Crónica General* demonstrates the prestige the city and the Mezquita in particular held for the Christian conquerors. Like Al-Saundi who writes of Córdoba, “It was in olden times, the seat of the empire, center of science, beacon of religiosity, seat of nobility and of the primacy,”<sup>68</sup> Alfonso, in similar terms, praises the city as “the city that history names the first of all cities, the patron and example for all the other cities of Andalusia.”<sup>69</sup> Turning to the building, he records that his father returned the bells of Santiago de Compostella to Galicia from whence they had been captured by Almanzor in 972 and hung in the Mezquita.<sup>70</sup> Al-Saundi also tells us that the bells had been lamps in the mosque and that the expansion had been built on the backs of Christians with materials from destroyed churches in Almanzor's regions, “touching on the great mosque, already you have heard that the lamps were made with the bells of the Christians, and that the enlargement that Almanzor made was built with earth that the Christians carried on their shoulders from churches that he destroyed in his regions.”<sup>71</sup> Singling out Córdoba's Mezquita as unique among the Arab mosques, Alfonso writes, “The mosque of Córdoba, the most beautiful [most moving] and largest of all the other mosques built by the Arabs.” He then records the Christian conquest of it when his father made it a church dedicated to the Virgin Mother, and when the bishop, in the long-established pattern endorsed by Pope Gregory I, blessed it with holy water. Then the king allotted income for its upkeep.<sup>72</sup>

Besides functioning to perpetually recall the triumphal Christian capture of the city and its cultural wealth, the mosque perhaps also inspired memory of the local builders and the Christian bodies that had hauled the stones to build Almanzor's enlargement. The city and citizenry's commitment to the building, as the historical record confirms, was both consistent and fierce. In 1261, the council and good men of the town, alarmed about the state of conservation of the ancient Mezquita, wrote to King Alfonso X, the Wise, “The church of Saint Mary has much damage in its woodwork and it is necessary to repair it in many ways and the king has to be attentive so that there not be discredit in losing this noble church.”<sup>73</sup>

In fact, under Alfonso X, according to archival evidence, several royal decrees reveal that the conservation of the ancient Mezquita, the Aljama of Córdoba, worried the king deeply, as it also did several popes including Alexander IV, Clement IV, and Nicholas III, who were preoccupied with organizing the diocese.<sup>74</sup> For example, according to Córdoba civic archives, on February 5, 1260, Alfonso gave money for works of repair, gave his revenue shares

to the bishop and the town council for repairs, forgave the church its dues to be used for repairs, and asked the preaching friars for money to repair the building. Córdoba's civic archives for the thirteenth through the fifteenth centuries testify to various aspects of public maintenance, with money given for upkeep of the water supply that the Arab city had developed so effectively, and rents from shops adjacent to the cathedral and annual "taxes" deliberately set aside for the upkeep of the Mezquita.<sup>75</sup> Decrees exist from Ferdinando's time through the time of Isabel and Ferdinand (dated from 1254 to 1480) for giving funds or demanding pay to the local mudéjar craftsmen for their work on the cathedral.<sup>76</sup>

Jerónimo's text reveals the position that the Mezquita and its city held for a Córdoba two centuries after the Castilian conquest and re-Christianization of the city. It also vividly demonstrates appreciation of the aesthetic aspects of the building, itself an exemplar of the city's proud heritage: "Let us turn then to the celebrated city which lacks prior praise of narrators but has left something in it worthy of praise."<sup>77</sup> Like Al-Saqundi's earlier praise, Jerónimo's encomium of the city describes it in hyperbolic terms, including its geographical region, with the Guadalquivir River, the fertile countryside, the climate, the sierra (which he likens to named biblical mountains), and its *templum* (temple). With parallel interests in the region's agricultural prosperity, Jerónimo, as Al-Saqundi, refers to its wealth in fruit; plentiful grain, enough to feed all of Spain; and rich viticulture, the latter a feature that the imams, according to Al-Saqundi, had tried to eradicate, but because of Al-Hakam's refusal to obey them, they failed.<sup>78</sup> Jerónimo adds that the area also is generous with fish and every kind of bird, a place where nobles can liberate themselves from worry and find solace in the recreational activity of hunting.<sup>79</sup> In addition, he praises the city's brilliance and the great philosophers who once lived and worked there. Although he refers to the city's recent calamities and suffering, which might mean the loss of population due to the ethnic violence of 1391, plague, civic unrest, or the silting up of the Guadalquivir River, all of which contributed to the reversal of the city's fortunes, for Jerónimo, it remains a city like the earthly paradise with a unique heritage (*peculiaris hereditas*):

This generous city must be counted among the most significant and populous cities of all the latitudes and its fame makes clear that this ancient capital of kingdoms, the famous throne of ancient kings must declare itself according to its own dignity and unique heritage. Its excellence deserves praise of such celebrated privilege that once like a diadem crowned all "the kings of Spain." Once with the influence of the higher stars, it was accustomed to engender men of great genius who, with a natural predilection, were dedicated to philosophy.<sup>80</sup>

Here Jerónimo mentions neither names of kings or philosophers, but he extols the past history that pertains to the dignity and honor of his city and its unique heritage. This is not an encomium for Jews, Christians, or Arabs, but a eulogy for a city, and its past glories.

Jerónimo's section on the famed building—"the temple worthy of every class of praise," the Mezquita, which primarily concerns us here—while glorifying Spain, still is a sign for him of the unique honor of Córdoba. Here, he exhibits a specific Córdoba civic humanism and aesthetic sensitivity, as values unique to a particular city identity: "It has a 'temple' worthy of every kind of praise whose most palpable beauty reanimates the spirit of whomever contemplates it. It is the glory of Spain and a distinct sign of the honor of Córdoba."<sup>81</sup>

With a refined sense of architectural aesthetics, even before an articulated theory of aesthetics has yet to emerge, Jerónimo describes the orderliness and symmetry of the columns and the artful construction of the building as having the power to move onlookers to admiration. He writes of the waves of arches and columns flowing incandescently through the building, "Not without cause does the artistic construction of such a great building move the men who contemplate the number and height of the marble columns to admiration. The talent of the architects determined the most orderly structure so that from any part that one looks the view flows majestically."<sup>82</sup>

Describing the minaret—a distinctly Islamic construction that was considered an architectural marvel, which he calls a tower, showing he does not identify it with its Islamic past—Jerónimo details its decorations and how one ascended from within: "There stands a famous tower [the minaret] constructed with blocks of stone, marked with geometric carvings and decorated with lattice-work of marble, whose crowning finishes with a pinnacle covered with bronze. One ascends it from the interior via two sets of steps."<sup>83</sup>

With an appreciation for the memorial function of the monument that ignores political, religious, and ethnic differences, Jerónimo also tells of a gilded chapel (*capella* [built in mudéjar style after the reconsecration of the building]), in which, he informs us, the bodies of the kings [Fernando IV and Alfonso XI] are buried. In a separated room, he tells his readers, kept for perpetual memory of the living, resides a throne decorated with marble of a certain king Almanzor, elegantly realized with an artistic cover. While noting stylistic variety and at the same time ignoring the religious and political distinctions between the later chapel and the mihrab, he describes another marble chapel (*capella*) whose roof finishes with a stone shell shape, decorated with two columns of jasper in its entrance, with its facade composed of mosaics of artful marquetry [the mihrab]. Then he informs us that one enters the temple by twelve doors protected by brass, revealing that in the fifteenth century, Christians continued the Islamic custom of entering the complex via one of the twelve doors.

Rhapsodically, he rhetorically compares the "temple" of "our [his] city" to the Seven Wonders of the World, all "pagan" monuments: "What remains to be said of this famous temple? Historians refer to just Seven Wonders of the World,"<sup>84</sup> and he lists the temple in Ephesus; the sepulcher of King Mausolo; the bronzed statue called the Colossus; the marble and gold statue of Jupiter

Olimpico that Phidias made; the king of the Medes, Cyrus's palace; the walls of Babylon that Queen Semiramis built; and the Pyramids of Egypt. But in a final hyperbolic flourish, he asks about his own temple wonder: "But, do these monuments stand out from the rest when one contemplates the temple in our city?"<sup>85</sup>

Much is remarkable in this encomium, verging on eulogy for Córdoba's environs and its temple. First is the memorial celebration for the city of the author's birth. Second, the author expresses an admiration that stems from appreciation for the unique aesthetic qualities of the style of the building and its special features, including the waves of arches, the prayer niche, and the minaret, which he singles out for attention. This expression of a sense of beauty, itself unusual for the time, seems to ignore the issue of how the architectural structure of the building supported its cult status. Indeed, since Jerónimo calls the mihrab a chapel, he seems to assume that it functioned just like other chapels in the "temple." Córdoba, he writes, is a city that houses a building equal to all the ancient pagan buildings and sculptures called the Seven Wonders of the World, his admiration stemming from appreciation for skilled workmanship and design.

This praise of a monument so profoundly colored with the work of other societies in an age when Anglo-, Franco-, and Italo-Gothic had emerged as a thriving pan-European style—not just in the rest of Europe, but in Burgos, León, and Seville—offers a startling example of appreciation for a monumental icon recognized as a local jewel. This is not the result of provincialism because Córdoba manuscripts also feature the Hispano-Flemish Gothic style, so the city was not cut off from the influences of the new artistic developments.<sup>86</sup> In Italy, from whence Jerónimo writes, and particularly in Florence, radical new developments in architecture based on a renewed interest in the Roman past challenged medieval architectural styles, while a scramble to retrieve the Greco-Roman legacy was in full swing. Yet, records show that this author and the citizens of Córdoba treasured their own unique building (and the city and environs where it stood), although it lacked all the architectural and design traits being adopted elsewhere in Europe.

Following the expansive description of the temple, Jerónimo turns to other distinct features of the living city-center. First, he gives a brief description of the Alcázar, built by Alfonso XI on the site of the Arab building and in Jerónimo's time used as a city palace for the kings of Spain. But rather than describing the building in detail as he had the temple, he expresses admiration for its gardens and patios, whose engineering, he claims, denies nature. Also, although already mentioned earlier when he discussed the Guadalquivir River, Jerónimo turns to the water system (a legacy of the Umayyads), supplied by subterranean channels from the river, which powered artificial fountains and sustained a garden. In addition, he remarks that the palace possessed patios specifically designed to take advantage of agreeable breezes.

Jerónimo also stops briefly to inform his readers about the city's ongoing civil life, for its "theatrum" or civic building is where judges met to resolve legal disputes, an aspect of civic life to which Al-Saundi's praise of Córdoba devotes considerable attention.<sup>87</sup>

When Ferdinando III conquered Córdoba, he had adopted a policy of tolerance toward the citizenry, not unlike that of the Umayyad rulers, an approach that his son Alfonso X continued. Prior to the conquest, in Arab Córdoba, Christians and Jews could practice their religion within existing buildings, although they were not allowed to build new ones.<sup>88</sup> The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) had sought to limit contacts between Christians and Moslems to economic transactions, thus banning marriages and social contacts between the two groups. The chronicles suggest these intermarriages had been occurring regularly among the kingdoms within Spain, as most notably the case of Al-Hakam II, child of the Christian slave named Maryan, according to Ibn Hayyan, and the Caliph Abd-al-Rahman.<sup>89</sup> Alfonso's *Siete Partidas* had restated the Fourth Lateran decrees on relationships between Moslems, Jews, and Christians, barring Jews and Moslems from having sexual relations with Christian women, forbidding oppression of Christians or the holding of Christian slaves, but allowing synagogues the "right to freedom of religion," to use a modern phrase, while clearly encouraging conversion to Christianity.<sup>90</sup> The mosques, on the other hand, had already been converted to Christian churches.

Despite increasing legal tension between minorities and the Christian majority, the city still admired the legacy of the Arabs, especially the workmanship in the Mezquita, many stylistic aspects of the Islamic building having developed into the mudéjar style. The mudéjar-style chapels built within the Mezquita in the fourteenth century (Capilla Real or Chapel of San Pedro) and a mudéjar-style synagogue built in Córdoba in the fourteenth century (1315) provide evidence for this stylistic preference. In Toledo, the opulent Sinagoga del Tránsito, built in the fourteenth century and patronized by Samuel Levi, treasurer to King Pedro the Cruel of Castille, also in mudéjar style, is further evidence of continuation of the artistic traditions of the Arabs, absorbed into reconquered Iberia and transformed into the unique Iberian mudéjar forms. As Gualis Borrás puts it, the source of mudéjar art can be found in the Christian acceptance of the art of Islam, an acceptance stimulated by their attraction to the art of the vanquished.<sup>91</sup>

The military, political, and religious reconquest that pitted Christian against Moslem Spain beginning in 1085 does conceal the rich mixture of civilizations that characterized the seven centuries in which Moslem, Jews, and Christians lived together first in Islamic and then in Christian-ruled Spain. Nowhere is this interlacing, hybridity, or syncretism more evident than in the art and architecture produced even as the *Reconquista* moved south.<sup>92</sup> But despite this affection for Islamic art and architecture, the repopulation of Andalusia by



Christians from the north led eventually to an official “anti-Judaism,”<sup>93</sup> while the situation of the *mudéjar* population of Córdoba (what remained of what was once one of the most vital cultures in the Arab world) had radically declined by the time of the Catholic kings, Isabel and Ferdinand.<sup>94</sup>

During the time of the *Reconquista*, the kings had attempted to maintain a social culture of *convivencia*, that is, living together,<sup>95</sup> a term that has invited some controversy since Américo Castro first used it, among the diverse groups in Andalusia. This was a type of legal and social coexistence after areas were taken over by Christians, but records show that friction was developing, particularly because the Jews were refusing to wear signs to distinguish themselves from Christians, and both Jews and Moslems (and Christians who were threatened with excommunication) resisted the “taxes” (tithing a tenth to the Church) required of all citizens, as decreed by the Fourth Lateran Council and restated by the Castilian kings.<sup>96</sup> Beginning in the thirteenth century, as Islamic cities fell to the Christians, Andalusia witnessed an intermittently violent and systematic eradication of the Islamic population with a substitution of Christian colonists from the north of Spain under the monarchical policy of *fueros*. This policy encouraged Christians from the north (nonlanded peasants and “knights” [*caballeros*] who were often nobles) to move to the newly conquered territories in the south. In a method to repopulate going back to the Christian conquest of Toledo in 1085, the system gave those who moved enough land to survive, in return for which they had to provide military service for the continuing campaigns further south.

By the end of the thirteenth century, ethnic and religious distinctions had become increasingly rigid with new sumptuary regulations to distinguish non-Christians from Christians. In 1312, the Council of Zamora, in a tradition going back to the Theodosian code (438 CE), banned the sharing of meals and sexual relations between Christians and Jews.<sup>97</sup> In Córdoba in the fourteenth century, the municipal functionaries failed to address many outbreaks of delinquency and ethnic violence and then resisted their responsibility to be just, further exacerbating the social tensions.<sup>98</sup> Several royal decrees in this period make it clear that the kings discouraged undermining Jewish financial activities in the region.<sup>99</sup> For example, when Christian townspeople viciously attacked the Jewish population of Córdoba in 1391, inspired by the fiery preaching of Ferrand Martínez of Seville, the king (Don Enrique) decreed that the guilty be punished; in 1404, the king again demanded that the citizens compensate the Jewish population.<sup>100</sup>

Despite this climate of ethnic tension, the fact that Córdoba’s Mosque/Cathedral experienced few major changes from the time of its conversion to a Christian church suggests that it possessed a special status in the city’s civic culture. In contrast to other religious buildings from the Arab period that were razed and replaced, as noted in the case of Toledo or Seville, it is comparatively unchanged. The Arab historians’ claims that it was built as a



monument that would have universal prestige suggest that the mosque had possessed a powerful place in local and international esteem, as Jerónimo's text also attempts to uphold. Not only the citizens of Córdoba but the Christian rulers who conquered the city were fully aware of its reputation. Loyalty to its aesthetic form continued. Indeed, when the building came under pressure in the late fifteenth century to adapt to new ecclesiastical styles along the lines of contemporary church architecture, as established in Toledo, Burgos, and León, the local Christian citizenry reacted forcefully to prevent the changes.

Bishop Alonso Manrique (1516–23), who was born in Toledo, had been the chaplain to Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor, who appointed him bishop of Córdoba. Alonso Manrique's experience of cathedral building had been formed in Toledo, so for him the Gothic model in which the presbytery, the altar, and the choir occupied the principal foci of the building provided the ideal setting for the celebration of the mass. For Manrique, the ideal cathedral followed the Gothic as model, just as in Seville that was built on the site where the main mosque once stood. Thus he arrived to Córdoba with a preconceived idea of how a cathedral ought to be built and arranged. The idea was to create a cruciform church within the existing building, with the beginning of the reconstruction of the cathedral in 1521.

But skeptical about the proposed project, the town council resisted. In the meantime, searching for building materials, those charged with the work settled on the ruins of the Medina Azahara, the spectacular palace, built by Abd-al-Rahman III (978–80) to celebrate the rebirth of the Umayyad caliphate and sacked by North African invaders in the early eleventh century. But three days after the contract for the building materials was signed, the city council raised a clamor, charging that the mayor and head of the church planned to knock down the major work (the church) of this city. The members of the city council registered their annoyance with the proposed remodeling, claiming it was an affront to the city, especially for those who had chapels in the cathedral. The bishop reacted forcefully, threatening excommunication to the dissenters, and the king was consulted to adjudicate. The Hernán Ruiz–designed cruciform building within the extant building did go forward, contributing the Renaissance strata to the Mezquita, with less damage to the Islamic footprint than originally conceived.<sup>101</sup> The record shows that local support for maintaining the integrity of the building was enormous, even though this appreciation went against reigning styles of ecclesiastical architecture in European Christendom. Jerónimo's text, written a century before these events, taken together with these reports in the city's archives, provide powerful witnesses to Córdoba's citizens' commitment to their city, its cathedral, and its *peculiaris hereditas* during the time of the massive social, political, and economic restructuring to create the Spanish nation.

This unique case of Córdoba's mosque/cathedral demonstrates the multiple functions of single monuments and their memorial functions in a city's

self-understanding: First the Umayyads' desire to restore their glory and establish their links with their Syrian past is commemorated stylistically in the building itself and by the historians who wrote about it. Afterwards, because of the city's international reputation, the additions to the building made a triumphal statement about the revived Umayyad caliphate, as recorded by the Arab chroniclers. Even though by the time they were writing, Medina Azahara had been sacked and the caliphate had declined, the Mezquita still stood. After the Spanish conquest, the *Primera Crónica General* and Jiménez de Rada recorded how the Mezquita became a captured political and aesthetic icon that erased the Islamic building's cult function although not the Islamic character of the building itself. Finally, two centuries after the Christian capture of the city, Jerónimo's *laudes civitatum* celebrates it as the jewel of Córdoba, the eighth wonder of the world, preserving the memory of the city's past glories.<sup>102</sup>

### CONCLUSION

While we might lament the Renaissance/Baroque addition to the building, it does reflect its continued use, while also respecting the changing liturgical practices adopted by people of faith in this town at different times. The locals were and remain committed to preservation of the beauty and integrity of the site. Like France and England's Gothic revival, Spain also experienced a revival of mudéjar-style architecture in the late nineteenth century when the Mezquita became a national monument, and in the early twentieth centuries as an active political *regionalismo* (culture of regionalism) surged. This period saw the building of Toledo's railway station, Seville's Estación de Córdoba, Seville's Hotel Alfonso XIII, and Seville's Museo de Artes y Costumbres Populares, all in "Moorish" revival style. Rafael Romero Barros (1832–95) and son Rafael Romero de Torres (1865–98) promoted the idea of local history and local culture, while also drawing attention to the artistic traditions that Córdoba's monumental buildings featured.<sup>103</sup> They argued, while presenting their portrait of Córdoba, that because national history suppresses "local" history and culture, its places, themes, authors, and buildings remain unknown and sometimes even ignored in their own city. Their goal, as they wrote, was to bring local history to the forefront.

Ironically, it was not Córdoba's international reputation in the Middle Ages but the city's local resistance that rose to preserve it in later times. Córdoba's Mezquita became a model case for ICOMOS (International Commission on Monuments and Sites), an organization responsible for nominating sites to UNESCO for the World Heritage List,<sup>104</sup> when the group met in Córdoba in 1973. The recommendations for restorations and protection of monuments pertinent to distinct cultures were based on the 1964 Venice Charter that had adopted the position that historic monuments are living witnesses of their

age-old traditions. Highlighting a commitment to conservation or historic preservation and the historical integrity of the building and its artifacts—not unlike the argument made by Gregory the Great, when he ruled that the former buildings of the newly converted ought to be preserved—Articles 4 through 13 of the ICOMOS conclusion feature the contribution made by the Mezquita because of its complex cultural history. Rejecting the idea of restoration as had been practiced in the nineteenth century (to be discussed in Chapter 8), Article 4 links conservation to permanence; Article 5 recognizes that conservation needs to favor what is useful for society; Article 6 makes recommendations about maintenance of the traditional colors, size, and effects of the built environment; Article 7 links the monument to its history from which it cannot be separated; Article 8 deals with decorations that are an integral part of the building, stating that sculpture, painting, and other decoration ought not to be removed (having the mihrab and a crucifix in the same building exemplifies this recommendation); rejecting restoration in favor of conservation, Article 9 emphasizes that the building should be allowed to feature its aesthetic and historic value (the Mezquita's mixture of Byzantine, Syrian, Visigothic, Islamic, and Renaissance and Baroque strata exemplifies this); Article 10 recommends the use of modern techniques to achieve these conservation goals; and Article 11 again reiterates that all strata of the building's history should be respected and maintained, and in the case of missing elements (Article 12), new ones must harmonize and all additions must respect the building's integrity (Article 13).<sup>105</sup>

Now forty years old, these recommendations almost seem intended for Córdoba's mosque, which offers a model of how the multilayered cultural history of a building simultaneously records the connection of people through their shared cultural patrimony. Recent bellicose outbreaks that have led to the destruction of buildings with similar histories suggests that the Córdoba population of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries had greater appreciation for cultural legacy than many have in our own times. The burning of the sixteenth-century Babri Masjid Mosque in 1990 that the Mughal emperor Babur built in Ayodhya displays the opposite impulse.<sup>106</sup> Similarly, the Chinese invasion of Tibet in 1949 that led to the massive destruction of temples (more than six thousand), like the destruction of Bosnian patrimony and Sarajevo's library just fifteen years ago, and the recent assault on Iraq's heritage together present a shattering picture of recent assaults on the cultural legacy of "others" in spite of an ideology of world patrimony, which makes Córdoba's medieval compromise seem comparatively enlightened.

## CHAPTER 5

# YORK MINSTER: FROM LOCAL TO NATIONAL PRESERVATION

This discouragement from the publick does not in the least abate in me a value for local histories.

—Francis Drake, *Eboracum*

WHEN HENRY VIII ORDERED THE RUIN OF THE ABBEYS AND RELIGIOUS HOUSES in England in 1536, York had more than a dozen abbeys and monasteries and several religious-order run hospitals and poor houses.<sup>1</sup> In 1537, serious rioting broke out in Lincolnshire to protest the revolution in religious practices, and it eventually spread to Yorkshire. John Foxe blamed the seditious preaching of monks and priests for the people's objection to these forced changes to their customary religious behavior: "A new insurrection in Yorkshire [followed] . . . through the instigation and lying tales of seditious persons, especially monks and priests; making them believe, that their silver chalices, crosses, jewels, and other ornaments, should be taken out of their churches. . . . The number of these rebels was nearly forty thousand. . . . This their devilish rebellion they termed by the name of a 'Holy Pilgrimage.'"<sup>2</sup>

Even if Foxe exaggerated the numbers, his account reveals a seething rage among the people still very much attached to their religious customs and ready to rebel at any new provocation. England was just half a century away from one civil war (and in fact only a century before another would erupt), and Henry's ordered disruption of traditional religion had spurred this civil unrest that would remain just barely below the surface for the entire reign of the Tudors.

The county of York suffered the results of yet another Henrician edict when he ordered the seizing of church property and overturning of the cults connected to death and the afterlife in 1546: "[As] Defender of the Faythe and of the Church of Englonde and also of Irelande, in erthe, the supreme hedd . . . Where by one acte in our Parliament . . . there is gyven and graunted to us full power and auctoritie to assume and take into our hands . . . all chauntries, hospitalls, colleges, free chappells, fraternyties, brotherhedds,

guylds, and sallaries of stipendarie priests, within this realme of England and Wales.”<sup>3</sup> Ostensibly intended to restore “true religion,” in fact, the act states clearly that the revenues from the sales would be used to support the wars against the French and the Scottish.<sup>4</sup> Most importantly, this action allowed the king to appropriate all local Church wealth to the crown, while ending the services it provided (education, medical care, aid to the poor, etc.), thus centralizing revenue and power.<sup>5</sup>

These events seem to be a fitting preamble to a discussion of how York Minster escaped the devastating results first of the Tudors’ and later of Oliver Cromwell’s iconoclasm when the city once again faced an attack on its “fabric.” While the monasteries had been destroyed during Henry VIII’s reign, and statuary, stained glass, and altar screens further attacked under Edward’s brief reign, many churches still preserved much. During the English Civil War (1642–1651) and its aftermath (1649–1653), these again became the focus of iconoclasts. The journal of William Dowsing, an agent of the Earl of Manchester, provides a vivid document of the 1644 attack on church decorations, including stained glass, statuary, roof bosses, elevated and railed-off altars, organs, brasses, and stone crosses.<sup>6</sup>

What happened in many other cathedrals during the Civil War and Cromwell’s reign contrasts with York’s adamant local resistance. For example, Durham Cathedral was closed in 1650 to incarcerate three thousand Scottish prisoners. At Exeter Cathedral, as in so many others, stone altars had been dismantled and wall frescoes whitewashed away under Edward VI. But when Sir Fairfax and Cromwell captured Exeter in 1646, the cloisters were also destroyed. Lichfield Cathedral was under siege three times during the period to experience serious damage, and at Wells Cathedral, puritan zealots attacked windows, stonework, and other furnishings, while thieves stole whatever was moveable.

Bruno Ryves collected accounts of the spoliation of English churches during the Puritan Revolution in *Mercurius Rusticus*, a complaint of the recent ravages to the countryside, recording plundering, sacrilege, and other profanations. On Canterbury’s desecration, it records, “The soldiers, entering the Church, and Quire, Giant-like, began a fight with God himselfe, overthrew the communion table, toare the velvet cloth from before it, defaced the goodly screen, or tabernacle work, violated the monuments of the dead, spoyled the organs, brake down the ancient railles, and seats, with the brazen [bronze] eagle which did support the Bible, forced open the cupboards of the singing-men, rent some of their surplices, gownes, and bibles,” and it concludes, “But what our forefathers thought Religion to build up, we their degenerate posterity think Piety to pull down.”<sup>7</sup>

What makes the history of the “reception” of York Minster remarkable is that despite this sectarian violence; state-sponsored destruction; radical shifts in taste, style, and religious practices; as well as political upheavals

and economic restructuring, the cathedral's windows, sculptures, and other images managed to remain comparatively unscathed.<sup>8</sup> York Minster being spared from iconoclasm is partly fortuitous, but its survival also has concrete links to local history, imagination, and civic pride. The attachment to local places, traditions, and shared civic spaces that played the critical role in the fate of the city of York and its cultural wealth during the Cromwellian siege of the city in 1644 gives an idea of what attachments and affections could be excited to spur future preservation movements, whether local or national. In this seventeenth-century case, pride of place based on local heritage and civic humanism came forward to preserve the building and its artifacts. The celebration of the minster as a national monument became the project of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when, as noted, medieval cathedrals as a group began to enjoy renewed interest and admiration as part of the "national" history of Great Britain.

#### **YORK MINSTER FROM THE FOURTH TO THE SIXTEENTH CENTURIES**

The minster tells a story reaching back to ancient Christendom in England with a building history lasting more than three hundred years. Recording the dedication and commitment of gifts and financial resources of clergy, nobility, merchants, guildsmen, craftspeople, and peasantry during that period, it also has left traces of the political fissures that led to deposing kings and civil war.<sup>9</sup> Yet York's cathedral exemplifies the highest point of medieval architectural achievement, the city and the cathedral possessing much of the stained glass that survives from the medieval period in England,<sup>10</sup> while it remains the largest church in northern Europe to this day.

York possessed a venerable position in the history of Christianity because Constantine the Great, who would become the first Christian Roman emperor, was proclaimed emperor in 306 while in the city. Six years later, Constantine ended persecutions of Christians and made the religion one of those permitted in the empire. The reputed Bishop Eborius from Eboracum (York) was among three bishops who went to the Church Council of Arles in 314, thus providing evidence for the presence of Christians in York even before the official conversion of Constantine to Christianity on his deathbed in 337.

Christianity more or less disappeared from the region, along with the Romans, when they withdrew to help defend Rome from invasions in the fifth century. An effort to introduce Christianity to the island occurred again when Pope Gregory the Great sent missionaries to convert the English in 597. Led by Saint Augustine, accompanied by forty monks, the mission in the south proved successful, and after a Kentish Christian princess, Ethelburga, married King Edwin in York, Christianity was reestablished in the

north of England when the king converted on Easter day in 627. Certainly, the original church buildings, including a baptistery, whether or not on the precise space of the present minster, can be dated to this time. Bishop Paulinus, who had accompanied Ethelburga from the south, baptized the king in a small wooden church, and it is generally accepted that soon after, Edwin built a stone church dedicated to Saint Peter that enclosed the baptistery in deference to the role of Rome in York's conversion history, a dedication that endures to today.<sup>11</sup>

When Bishop Ecgbert was consecrated in 732, the see of York officially became an archbishopric. Gregory the Great had earlier designated that the two Christian seats—York and Canterbury—should share the primacy, with each taking a turn as leader,<sup>12</sup> and although this was honored more in the breach than in reality, York held this primary position in British Christianity. In addition, a number of notable scholars and saints were intertwined with York's history. These include figures like Saint John of Beverley, archbishop of York from 705–17 (d. 721) and founder of a school for priests in his home town of Beverley, and Ecgbert (732/4–66), archbishop, friend of the great medieval scholar Venerable Bede (672–735), and the founder of the cathedral school with its transcontinental reputation. Bede was the teacher of Alcuin, who became master of the cathedral school in 766–81 and later master of Charlemagne's palace school. Another important figure for the cathedral was Saint William Fitzherbert, archbishop of York (1143–47; 1153–54), whose shrine would be destroyed during the Tudor iconoclastic period.

The importance of this specifically Yorkan Christian history to the city can hardly be underestimated. A series of stained glass windows in the cathedral, finished in the fourteenth century, celebrate the triumph of Christianity in the north of England. Echoing a theme already highlighted in the west window of the nave, where York's archbishops as "the apostles of Christianity in the north" stand beneath "the apostles of the New Testament," the easternmost window on the south side of the clerestory presents thirty-eight stained-glass figures and many others in the tracery-light openings, all drawn from the early seventh to late eighth century Northumbrian conversions and based on Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (731).

Bede (673–735) was himself a northerner, although his history, as the title itself declares, sets out to feature the history of the English, linking south to north through a story of conversion that Pope Gregory the Great, whose letters to the English missionaries he highlights in his history, had initiated. Among the figures on the stained glass are Pope Eleutherius (reigned 174–89), the fourteenth Roman bishop; King Aelle of Deira (560–605), the last pagan king of Northumbria; King Edwin of Deira, the first Christian king of the north and builder of the first church; Bishop Paulinus, who accompanied Edwin's Christian wife to the north; and Pope Gregory I himself. The stained glass narrative is clearly intended as a celebration of York's ancient

and revered role in the history of Britain's Christianity, and more specifically of York itself.<sup>13</sup>

This early history of Christian York, commemorated in the cathedral's glass, is the beginning of the story of how the city and its minster celebrated its Christian origins. As the stained glass windows recording this history and the patrons who had their names or coats of arms inscribed on them emphasize, York's early conversion history and Christian legacy still possessed considerable civic power in the fourteenth century. The minster, as we know it, was under constant construction from the period of Archbishop Thomas of Bayeux (1070–1100), who began the new building on the site of the old Roman fortress. It was continued by a series of bishops, including Archbishop Roger Pont l'Evêque (1154), who extended the main transepts to the width they have in the present building, and Walter Gray (appointed archbishop in 1215), who began the rebuilding in the Gothic style of French cathedrals, to the rededication of the cathedral in 1472. From 1215 on, the most spectacular features of the cathedral architecture and artifacts were completed, including the south transept (1220–44), the north transept (completed in 1253), the five-sisters window, the chapter house (begun ca. 1260), the new nave (begun in 1291), the great west window (completed in 1338), the Lady Chapel (begun in 1361), and the east window (finally glazed in 1405–8).<sup>14</sup>

Royal interest in York is less evident, although during the wars between Scotland and England (most intense from the 1290s through the 1330s), under the first three Edwards (Edward I [reigned 1272–1307], Edward II [reigned 1307–27], and Edward III [reigned 1327–77]), York intermittently was the seat of government so that it earned the title of second city of the realm. Edward III had married Philippa of Hainault in the minster (1328),<sup>15</sup> and during the reign of his grandson, Richard II (1377–99), York received a royal charter (1396), elevating the city to county status and giving it the right to govern itself and elect its own mayor.<sup>16</sup>

The minster had attained its present-day size by its completion in 1500. Its grandeur testifies to the generosity and commitment of the people of Yorkshire, a patronage celebrated and remembered in the artifacts within the building. When Henry VIII came to the throne, the medieval city stood as a splendid testimony to its citizens' generosity, "with its guildhalls, alms-houses, and forty parish churches, its minster completed within living memory, its conventual buildings—pre-eminent among them the magnificent Abbey of Saint Mary—as yet unthreatened by secular hands. The chief architectural change to befall Tudor York was the virtual obliteration of the monastic group, which speedily became stone-quarries."<sup>17</sup>

Visitation records from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries suggest that a certain degree of carelessness characterized liturgical practices at York Minster. Nonetheless, in contrast to other sees (Canterbury, Wells, and Durham, for example), the city remained lukewarm or rebellious toward the changes



underway during the Reformation.<sup>18</sup> Indeed, support for the rebels during the pilgrimage of grace came even from the cathedral, as John Foxe claims. Of course, the fact that the kings (Henry VIII and Edward VI) seized the church's treasures and much of its income could hardly have endeared them or the auspices under which they were acting to either the resident secular clergy or the local community.<sup>19</sup>

Besides its obvious imposing presence, whereby the minster as the central building of the city generated a sense of civic life, other features no doubt contributed to its civic role. First, local education was promoted due to two Lateran decrees (i.e., from the papacy), one in 1179 and the second in 1215, that had stipulated that metropolitan cathedrals had to provide free education to local citizens. At least from the twelfth century on, a cathedral school in York, "one of the largest and most important schools in the country," did offer education in grammar to the poor of the community with the intention of making education possible for the entire city.<sup>20</sup> Also, York's school, although not a national center like Oxford or Cambridge, offered higher studies as a local institution.<sup>21</sup> Secondly, Richard II's 1396 royal charter that essentially put the mayor in charge of the city had provided civic liberties and had no doubt increased citizen self-awareness. Third, the stained glass that celebrates York's Christian history provides good evidence that already by the fifteenth century, York had developed a strategy for promoting itself as a historical city, showing that the city's self-awareness as a unique civic environment was a feature to be promoted and advertised.<sup>22</sup> Fourth, the veneration of Saint William Fitzherbert, archbishop, was a lively and vigorous local cult, uniting the community in a shared celebration and memory unique to the city. And there were other cults of particular importance to the city, including Saint Blaise, Saint Christopher, the Holy Trinity, Corpus Christi, and Saint Anne, together contributing to the celebration of the local. Also, when Richard Scrope (1350–1405), chancellor of England under Richard II and archbishop of York from 1398, stood up to Henry IV, who had deposed Richard from the throne, he became a local cult hero. When he insinuated that Henry had usurped the throne after he threw his cousin Richard in prison in 1399, Scrope was beheaded outside of York in 1405, and from the early fifteenth century, Scrope was venerated as a martyr.<sup>23</sup> Fifth, heraldic family images, dating back centuries, that decorated the minster testify to local "cultural" investment in the site. From an economic point of view, the fact that the minster was in a constant state of "being built" and decorated for almost four hundred years must be recognized as having provided work for masons, sculptors, glaziers, glass designers, carpenters, weavers, and a host of other "fabric" makers. Building the cathedral functioned as a long-term public works project, a proto-Keynesian redistribution of income, that contributed to the economic well-being of the city.

Furthermore, and perhaps more importantly for York's civic life during the late Middle Ages, the city itself supported over a hundred different crafts, indicating its economic health. In a show of civic enthusiasm, fifty-four craft guilds jointly sponsored and performed the annual Corpus Christi dramas and pageants (on the Thursday after Trinity Sunday, sometime in June, a feast day established in 1263), a larger group than in any other cycle in England.<sup>24</sup> Despite constant complaints about the cost, the entertainment brought the entire region together in a day of common celebration, pleasure, relaxation, and rowdiness on the streets of the city.<sup>25</sup> In fact, the religious guilds exerted a strong influence on the city, Corpus Christi alone having enrolled 16,850 members in the century and a half before the Reformation.<sup>26</sup> The Corpus Christi pageant and plays, of course, were both casualties of the Reformation.<sup>27</sup> As an expert on the minster in the late Middle Ages concludes in his survey of the history of the governing body of the minster "the voluminous records of the fifteenth century" suggest that what changes happened in the governing body of the church did not seem to affect the role of the cathedral in popular opinion. The cathedral clock summoned the aldermen to council meetings; the prelates and lords met in the chapter house; and the minster held the largest repository of chivalric heraldry to demonstrate its link to noble patronage. Residents of the city visited the church as members of the city's various guilds and visitors came to admire the marvelous building.<sup>28</sup> In many ways, it functioned like the civic center in modern cities, even though after the Reformation urban authorities gained power that the cathedral formerly held.<sup>29</sup>

#### YORK MINSTER: SURVIVAL IN AN AGE OF ICONOCLASM

The building survived the outbreak of violence against buildings and religious artifacts that began during the English Reformation and did not definitively end until the Restoration in 1660.<sup>30</sup> Local advocacy, informed by a sense of civic commitment, took on a prominent role in this struggle against the destructive pressures.<sup>31</sup> Also, partly because many monuments to local citizens replaced those formerly occupied by saints in the wake of the Reformation, local lay persons had a considerable investment in the cathedral's well-being.<sup>32</sup>

Two early works by York citizens James Torre (1649–99) and Francis Drake (1696–1771) recount the story of how York was spared major iconoclastic destruction in the Tudor and Cromwell periods.<sup>33</sup> Torre, who dedicated his life to York's antiquities, published a little treatise called *The Antiquities of York City*, collected from the papers of Christopher Hildyard (1615–94), who had written and had published the first history of York in 1664 within living memory of the Civil War. Drake, "of the City of York, Gent.," as declared on the frontispiece of his book, wrote the most important history and description of the city in the century, which appeared in 1736.<sup>34</sup>

He had read the manuscript on the city written by Sir Thomas Widdrington (d. 1664) and used Torre's notes, beginning his monumental encyclopedic project in 1729.<sup>35</sup>

Because the Royalists (i.e., those loyal to the king) held York when the Civil War broke out (the first war in 1642–46, and the second in 1648–49), the city became a major battleground. When the Parliamentarians (i.e., those loyal to Oliver Cromwell) laid siege to the city in 1644, the minster faced yet another crisis of survival. An enemy army was about to capture and overthrow the city, the citizens, and its signature buildings. In addition to the threat from outside the city, the civil wars had already forced citizens to build defensive earthworks, leading to the violation of gardens, orchards, and enclosed pastures as well as suburbs, which were often spoiled to create defenses around cities.<sup>36</sup> During the Civil War, according to Thomas Widdrington, the Parliamentarians attacked York's suburbs, resulting in the burning and razing of up to four hundred houses.<sup>37</sup> Under close siege, the Royalist leaders congregated in the minster, which further threatened the building. At risk, as in so many wars to this day, were the building's integrity, the fate of all its artifacts, and its library.

The earl of Manchester, major-general of the Eastern Association of Cromwell's army and the same person who led the assault on York, had appointed the Puritan iconoclast, a civilian official William Dowsing on December 19, 1643, to implement the Parliamentary Ordinance of August 28, 1643, and to take down remaining objects of superstition. Most Puritan iconoclasm, in fact, was the work of civilian officials rather than of Parliamentary soldiers, although they, too, did their share of looting.<sup>38</sup> Dowsing was busy at work inspecting and destroying "idols" all over East Anglia in 1643–44, as he records in his *Journal*, writing in a typical entry, for example, "Madlin Colledge, Dec. 30. We brake downe about 40 superstitious pictures, Joseph and Mary stood to be espoused in the windowe."<sup>39</sup> The same fate could have been awaiting the York Minster, so far not a severe victim of iconoclastic zeal. In fact, when the Parliamentary generals asked the city to surrender in the summer of 1644, the Royalists holding the city responded with their own stipulations, highlighting their concern for the minster and its artifacts. Numbers three and four of their specific propositions for rendering the city spelled out several items that were germane to the survival of the Cathedral:

That the gentry have liberty to go to their own houses, and be protected from violence, and not questioned for what they have done. And that the townsmen may enjoy all privileges as before. . . . That the garrison placed here be only Yorkshire men.

That all the churches be kept from profanation: That the divine service be performed therein, as formerly: That the revenues belong to the officers as it has done. (*Eboracum*, 165)<sup>40</sup>

Several features of this particular set of stipulations are curious, but the Parliamentarians, who believed that after victory they could determine their own rules for the city, rejected these along with the others. First, the citizens demanded that the victorious army garrison be only Yorkshire men. This suggests that they believed citizens would follow allegiances to family, friends, and local traditions, and civic over national loyalty. Second, they hoped the churches would be spared any damage, showing their allegiance to long-standing tradition. They wanted services to continue in the Laudian liturgy,<sup>41</sup> then in practice. Laudianism was a liturgical practice and theological position associated with William Laud, bishop of London (1628) and archbishop of Canterbury (1633), and with Richard Neile, bishop of Durham (1617), bishop of Winchester (1627), and archbishop of York (1632). They promoted the tradition of divinely instituted order of bishops and the clear authority for the Church and its ordained ministers. They wanted the restitution of the wealth and jurisdiction to the Church of what had been confiscated during the Reformation; they desired a return to the rich decorations of the pre-Reformation, an emphasis on the sacraments rather than preaching as a means to grace; they also rejected strict Calvinist doctrines of predestination. Finally, they wanted to protect the Church revenues from confiscation. The Parliamentarians rejected these stipulations two days later, and the siege continued. But, what is fascinating about this story is that when the city yielded a month later, the Parliamentary generals together conceded precisely what the citizens had earlier requested. For our purposes, it was Article XII that saved the churches: "That neither churches nor other buildings shall be defaced, nor any plunderings, nor taking of any man's person, nor any part of his estate suffered; and that justice shall be administered within the city by the magistrates according to law, who shall be assisted, therein, if need require, by the garrison" (*Eboracum*, 170).

The earl of Manchester, the head of the army in the north, and Ferdinando Fairfax, a Yorkshire gentleman, along with several other Parliamentary army leaders, signed the agreement. After the capitulation and the declaration of peace, Fairfax remained governor of York with his son; and, according to legend, he threatened to shoot anyone who attempted to harm the city's monuments, particularly the minster.

Torre's *The Antiquities of York City* specifically applauds the role of this same Ferdinando Fairfax in saving York from destruction. The book's dedication to Sir William Robinson, member of parliament for the city of York, written by Francis Hildyard, reflects an ideology of civic humanism and local pride. He claims he writes for "the Honour or Advantage of the city of York" that had allowed York to thrive in the past and which he desires for its future, so that it retrieve, "its ancient Splendour and Glory, from which it is most unhappily fallen."<sup>42</sup> Introducing the story of York's antiquities with an accolade of

the city, to its ancient splendor, to the loyalty of its citizens, and with a plea for retrieval of its past glory, Torre's work is heraldic publicity for the city.

The second dedication to the book, written by Francis Hildyard, is to Robert Fairfax, alderman of the City of York. It singles out how Lord Fairfax's commitment to York saved the city and its minster from destruction during the Cromwellian siege:

To publish the Antiquities of the City of York, without some acknowledgement how Propitious Your Name and Family has been to this Ancient City, would be injurious and ungrateful to its benefactors: That generous and tender Regard of the then Lord Fairfax (altho' at that time in a detestable Rebellion against his Sovereign) to the Preservation of that Ancient and most Magnificent Structure the Cathedral of this City, when he Commanded the Parliament Army at the Siege of it, by making it Death to level a Gun against it, notwithstanding it was then a refuge and shelter to the Loyal Citizens who defended it against Him, and his saving the City, as well as its Cathedral, from being made an Heap of Rubbish, ought always to be remembered with a due Respect.<sup>43</sup>

Whether the facts are true or false, Hildyard credits a Yorkshire citizen with the "preservation" of the city and its cathedral against iconoclastic threats, even though Fairfax was politically and militarily allied with the Parliamentarians and therefore in opposition to the so-called rebels within the city. In doing so, Hildyard essentially pays homage to an idea of loyalty to the local environment that trumps national politics in favor of civic virtue. In essence, the cathedral stood against political opposition, as it upheld citizen unity and civic loyalty reaching back more than a thousand years. The minster, as building and as repository of the city's Christian history and communal support, and even (or perhaps especially) as playground (if the records of recreational activities within the building are to be trusted),<sup>44</sup> could unify despite national political oppositions.

Indeed, the status of the building in the citizens' cultural practice and imagination may have played a decisive role in saving York's cultural wealth. The number of books about the city's antiquities appearing in the post-Civil War period present a convincing case for a strong sense of civic loyalty and for an emerging tourist industry. For example, an Irishman named Thomas Gent (1693–1778), who had emigrated to York, became a major Yorkshire publisher. The Preface to his little book published in 1730 and titled, *The antient and modern history of the famous city of York; and in particular manner of its magnificent cathedral, commonly call'd York Minster* explains his intention.<sup>45</sup> Espousing civic loyalty, he colors his beginning with a sense of nostalgia for what has been lost to the city and its citizens, while extolling its remaining legacy. He will treat "the sublime Subjects of this antient Church and City" (Gent, iii). "And [referring to his book] if this little Piece be a Means of promoting a nobler Design, and furthering a more diligent Enquiry; if in the

meantime it calls from Oblivion some things that might have been longer forgotten, or entirely lost; I hope my Zeal for the Honour of this city will be acceptable to the Publick, (at least not offensive) to the most generous and Splendid ornaments of it" (Gent, iv). The occasion for the book, Gent explains, was its usefulness, its means to inform visitors who come to see the building: "Walking one evening with some Friends towards Heslington, near York, and our discourse being of the Minster, etc., I happen'd to say, 'Twas a pity, that when so many Gentlemen and Ladies came to view so fair a Fabric, these should be wanting a little Book, describing as much as possible the inimitable beauties thereof; that by taking such a Memorial along with them, they might at a distance discourse the better of what they had seen" (Gent, vii–viii).

Several issues come to the surface in this preface, and they are all informed by a sense of civic commitment: (1) Gent applauds the intrinsic beauty of the building, the fabric he chooses to describe zealously for York's citizens; (2) he is writing a tour guide for visitors to the cathedral; and (3) he recognizes that tourists might need such a guide to understand what they are seeing. His deference to the needs of tourists and the connection between what the city offers and the potential interests of visitors to it also reflects a pending economic change, for the book seeks to inform a consuming clientele, ready to patronize the city and its artifacts in a radical new way, replacing pilgrimage to saints' relics with tourist visits for historic knowledge or aesthetic pleasure.

The most famous history of York from this period is the *Eboracum*, by Francis Drake of the City of York, Gentleman., which declares on its title page where the author's commitments lie. Using York's ancient name, which emphasizes that the book is a history of the city and its antiquities, from "its original to the present times," making full use of authentic manuscripts, public records, ancient chronicles, and modern historians, Drake also provides a history of the cathedral church and the lives of its archbishops. This is an ambitious encyclopedic project, intended to celebrate York as an ancient city with its unique secular and religious history, both of which Drake links to its central building, the cathedral. Drake is less interesting for the accuracy of his account and his hypotheses about the history than for his explanation of how York survived threats to its artistic fabric and what that reveals about local and civic pride.

In the preface, Drake proclaims that his goal in writing the book is "to revive the memory of a decayed city, at present the second in Britain, but of old the first, and in antiquity, the glory of the whole Island" (*Eboracum*, preface). He knows that York's history is unlike any other English city, and he is completely aware that as a consequence, he is writing a different kind of history, a "local history" as he calls it, one that does not meet with such honor or encouragement from the world as general historians receive. Further, he writes, referring to the growing interest in the history of England as a nation,

“we have an instance before our eyes of an history of England taking a prodigious run; and making its way, at no small expense to the buyers, almost, into every family in the kingdom. And, will in time be as much engrafted there, made familiar, and had in as great regard as the old family Bible” (*Eboracum*, preface). In making this contrast between local and national history, Drake testifies to a growing national sentiment being grafted via reading onto the psychic (and civic) imagination of every English person, as English history alongside the Bible as reading matter takes its preeminent place in every English person’s home. Lamenting the difficulties in writing the kind of “local” history he is undertaking, he will not be deterred: “This discouragement from the publick does not in the least abate in me a value for local histories” (*Eboracum*, “preface.”)

Drake’s local history applauds York’s ancient origins and its native geographical wealth, for it resides in “the richest, pleasantest, and most extensive valley in Britain, if not in all Europe” (*Eboracum*, 1). In terms of national or royal history, 1625, when Charles I came to the throne, to the Restoration in 1660 appears to be the period that interests him most, for he spends more space here, although he does cover the history from the departure of the Romans to the beginning of the Stuart reign in 1603. But the part of York’s recent history most important to Drake is the start of Charles’s reign, when York would become the last stop in the Cromwellian triumph: “We now enter upon a busy reign indeed, unfortunate . . . both to prince and people. The prince’s prerogative and the people’s rights here clashed so furiously, that in the end they were both lost in anarchy and confusion. Tyranny and aiming at absolute power, the topicks the malecontents threw against king Charles’s government, was by the just judgment of God, in the person of Cromwell, sufficiently retorted” (*Eboracum*, 134).

Drake seems far more invested in the people who had lived, worked, and died in the city. Certainly, he lists the kings of England, beginning with those of Deira before the north was united with the south, but he is equally interested in providing lists of archbishops, vicars, and rectors of various parishes in the see of York, all the viscounts and high sheriffs going back to 1069, representatives in parliament, mayors, and bailiffs, along with their professions, for example (*Eboracum*, 350–70). The cathedral’s history is as much a history of those who lived; donated gifts of candles, plate, vestments, and so on; died; and were buried in its confines, as it is of the building’s intrinsic artistic merit. He lists the gifts and their donors, as if reminding of profanations that might be avoided in the future, “lest the altar should again be robbed of its present ornaments” (*Eboracum*, 524). In other words, for Drake, York’s history is about the city’s people, buildings, religious customs and practices, and natural environment more than about its place in a national history. When his city became the last front of a war within the nation, he lamented, “What share our city bore, in these home-bred divisions, is very considerable; and

since not handed down, so distinctly as it ought, by any historian, I have taken pains to collect from manuscripts, records, and histories . . . The reader will find that our city's loyalty was, in an especial manner, exemplified to its injured sovereign" (*Eboracum*, 134). Writing after the restoration of the monarchy, Drake seeks to set the record straight, singling out the story of the "injured sovereign" and the particular suffering and loyalty of his city, which he points out other historians overlook.

Dedicated to the "History and Antiquities of the Church of York," book II begins with the ancient origins of York's Christianity, which Drake presents as predating the Augustine conversion of the south. Deferring to the tradition that King Lucius requested Christian missionaries from Pope Eleutherius, he writes, "It is plain that the Christian religion had footing in Britain, long before the days of Constantine the Great [306 CE]" (*Eboracum*, 400). Thus Drake, following the tradition grandly represented in the Great East Window (fifteenth century), asserts York's ancient Christian roots and separates the city's Christian past from the rest of England's. Drake calls this east window "the wonder of the world, both for masonry and glazing . . . very near the breadth and height of the middle choir" (*Eboracum*, 527).

The glass panels of the Great East Window comprise a pictorial Bible in the tradition of Pope Gregory's defense of visual art as "bible for the unlettered." However, the bottom row of nine windows, incidentally those that in many ways are more visible to viewers from below, celebrate York's political and religious history. On the left are kings and on the right side, religious figures central to the Christian history of York. The kings—Ebrauk, Lucius, Edwin, and Edgar all belonging to York's ancient past are followed by William I, Edward the Confessor, and Edward III (English kings). Exactly in the middle, between the kings and religious figures, is the donor Bishop Skirlaw of York, followed by Saint William; Saint John of Beverly; Saint Egbert; Pope Gregory the Great of the second conversion; Saint Paulinus, first archbishop of York; Saint Wilfrid; and Saint Eleutherius, the pope believed to have originally converted York, among others. With the entire biblical narrative from creation to apocalypse depicted in the glass, this iconographical representation testifies to the long-standing idea of York's status as a Christian city with a unique ancient history. The bottom row of the Great East Window with York's Christian heroes links them to the sacred history that precedes them in the glass above. Drake's history in many ways follows this tradition.

The description of York's cathedral continues with a careful inventory of its many features. Drake singles out the chapter-house as unique: "To begin with the out-buildings, I must first enter upon a description of the chapter-house; which disdains to allow an equal, in Gothick architecture, in the universe" (*Eboracum*, 476). He is a partisan of his city, revealing both his politics and his commitments unabashedly. "After all," he writes, "this noble structure had like to have met its fate, in the late days of rapine and sacrilege [the



Cromwellian revolution]; for we have a tradition very much credited, that a certain person in this city had obtained a grant, from the pious legislature, of those days to pull down the chapter-house as a useless part of the church. We are further told, that the man had certainly effected it, and had designed to have built stables out of the materials, had not death surprised him a week before the intended execution of his wicked project" (*Eboracum*, 478). This serendipitous death preserved not just a Yorkshire treasure, but one of the few remaining chapter-houses because those that had not been razed under Henry VIII were ordered destroyed by Oliver Cromwell on grounds that they had lost their communal purposes under the new political order.

Providing many engravings of the cathedral so readers can see rather than simply read, Drake nonetheless writes under the picture of the chapter-house: "John Drake, . . . Prebendary of the Metropolitan Church of York, lest Time, or other accident should either destroy or deface this magnificent structure, presents this view of it to posterity. 1736" (*Eboracum*, 476–77). His antiquarian sense of pending disaster reminds his readers that only a few years have passed since the time when all of York's antiquities might have been shattered and its buildings turned to stone quarries, as so many were.

Of the cathedral, he says,

To conclude this low account of our magnificent fabrick, but which indeed no words can illustrate as it ought to be, I shall only say, that it is a building of that magnitude and extent, that, even in those ages which affected the erecting of religious structures, it took near two centuries to compleat. Since which it has stood above three more, and hitherto escaped the teeth of corroding time by wind and weather; or, what is much more destructive than either of them, party zeal. . . . That this fabrick may stand firm and transmit to late posterity the virtues of its founders; and continue, what it has long been, not only a singular ornament to the city and these northern parts, but to the whole kingdom. (*Eboracum*, 533–34)

While recognizing the dangers of organic decay and deliberate destruction that remained threats, Drake's encomium lauds those citizens who dedicated their resources and energy to the city's well-being, synthesized in the city's ornaments, particularly in its cathedral, which he recognizes as a decoration for the entire kingdom, thus connecting local to national history.

These eighteenth-century works record a history of civic loyalty and suggest how it surfaced to save the cathedral from the iconoclastic furor in the previous century.<sup>46</sup> Even though the writers praise the building's beauty, a value that they promote, in fact, in the century and a half when Christopher Hildyard, James Torre, and Drake were writing, Gothic as a style was competing with the ascendance of classical and neoclassical models. This was the period in which Christopher Wren (1632–1723) built Saint Paul's Cathedral in London (1675–1710) and Greenwich Hospital (1696–1715), not to mention the numerous replicas of the Roman Pantheon that appeared in the

eighteenth century—Lord Burlington’s in 1717, the Bagno at Chiswick, and the Pantheon at Stourhead of 1753–54, for example. By the late eighteenth century, neoclassical style was dominant, as William Chambers’ Somerset House (1776–86) or the Panthéon in Paris (1780) testify. New buildings were following the classical ideal adopted from the Renaissance on, especially on the continent and in the fledgling United States of America, where the classical ideal became the adopted style for civic buildings.<sup>47</sup> By the 1740s in England, however, fake medieval castles were also the rage, giving way by the end of the century to Gothic revival, which would play a central role in the Protestant revival in the middle of the next century.

### GOthic AS STYLE AND THE SHIFT TO NATIONAL PATRIMONY

England passed an Act of Toleration that allowed free practice of religion in 1689, forty-five years after parliament, at the height of Cromwell’s Civil War, had passed the ordinance to demolish “monuments of idolatry,” that is, all the religious artifacts (paintings, sculpture, stained glass, etc.) not destroyed during the reign of the Tudors. The act was a culmination of a number of events besides England’s tumultuous civil war. On the continent, Louis XIV of France assumed absolute power in 1661 and attempted to make France an all-Catholic country by revoking the Edict of Nantes that in 1598 had sought to end religious violence, thus creating the climate for more civic unrest. John Locke (1632–1704) and Pierre Bayle (1647–1706), who were living as exiles in Holland at the time, emerged to challenge the policies of persecution of dissenters that had dominated both religion and politics in Europe for the previous several centuries.<sup>48</sup>

Adopting an argument that the business of government and the practice of religion should not overlap, Locke’s letters concerning toleration published in 1689 and 1692 were in fact not arguments for tolerance as an ideal but against persecution as a policy. His letters were translated into French in 1710 and provided the foundation for Voltaire’s *Treatise on Tolerance*, published in 1764 with the French translation of Locke’s *A Letter Concerning Toleration*. While exposing the grim history of Christian intolerance and still arguing that tolerance had indeed been long valued as an ideal, Voltaire argued for “universal tolerance” and for natural law that guarantees all humans certain universal rights.<sup>49</sup> Expressing a profound discontinuity with the past, these intellectual projects of the Enlightenment laid the groundwork for the architectural and artistic preservation movements of the nineteenth century.

Persuasive evidence for this shift toward appreciation of this legacy appears in *A Tour Through England and Wales*, written by Daniel Defoe (1660–1731) in 1724–26.<sup>50</sup> Defoe’s guidebook celebrates Britain—ruled by a Hanoverian king, true; but together with a landed aristocracy, a burgeoning economy, and a stable government, he presents an England preparing itself for change.<sup>51</sup>

Primarily focusing on economic issues, in two volumes, Defoe takes us all over Britain, beginning in the south and southwest and wending his way north. His description of York, “indeed a pleasant and beautiful city” (*TEW*, 2.228), is what concerns us here. Admitting his book is a general overview, he still manages to recall York’s Roman past, its modern bridge (as large as the Rialto in Venice, he boasts), and its “modern” cathedral, begun around 1313 (*TEW*, 2.229). He writes, commending the minster’s modernity, “It is a Gothick building, but with all the most modern addenda that order of building can admit. . . . I see nothing indeed of that kind of structure in England go beyond it.” (*TEW*, 2.229). He goes further in his praise: “As then this church was so compleatly finished, and that so lately that it is not yet four hundred years old, it is the less to be wondered that the work continues so firm and fine, that it is now the beautifullest church of the old building that is in Britain” (*TEW*, 2.230).

Defoe’s description turns around four central points: (1) labeling a building Gothic and then claiming it possesses modern amenities, (2) calling it “beautiful,” (3) establishing heritage as a value, and (4) identifying that heritage as British. Secular values dominate his observations, and indeed if we compare what he says of Canterbury—where he details how it was founded under a good bishop of Rome (Pope Gregory the Great) in contrast to those popes “that usurp’d honour of Universal Bishop” and the Canterbury bishops who had once “plagued, insulted, and tyranniz’d over the Kings of England” (*TEW*, 1.116), a reference primarily to the martyr Thomas Beckett, Archbishop of Canterbury who was murdered by agents of Henry II in the twelfth century—we recognize his commitment to national monarchy as the unifier of a nation. As for York Minster, Defoe mingles a strong appreciation of the beauty of this religious structure with the building of modern Britain, a secular nation with a history to be found in its many regions ripe for economic development (in this case, Yorkshire) and in its architectural heritage. Between Daniel Defoe’s *Tour-Guide* and the late nineteenth century, dozens of books and articles appeared on the city of York and its minster, testifying to the turn to the idea of legacy and history that discovering the medieval period provided England as it developed national consciousness.

When Joseph Halfpenny (1748–1811) published *Gothic Ornaments in the Cathedral Church of York, Drawn and Etched by Joseph Halfpenny* in York, he signaled the shift in taste that would lead once again to architectural prestige for Gothic as a style. Now separated in most ways from its cultural and ritual matrix that had vivified it in the medieval period, Gothic as style emerged to support the national history of Britain as the country moved into the height of its imperial and industrial power. Because of what Halfpenny selects to draw from the minster, his book offers us an insight about this pending change in style. High Gothic mesmerizes him as he gives four general views (of the church and the chapter-house) to feature its spaciousness, lightness,

and expansive reach. But what clearly fascinates him are the “specimens of Gothic ornaments,” of which he gives us 175. Although he includes vegetal, animal, and human ornaments, overall he produces an exaggerated view of the grotesques in the building, the very details that would most shock the neoclassical affections of his own times. Then quoting from the *Treatise on the Decorative Parts of Civil Architecture*, Halfpenny opposes the classical revival in the architectural model that emerged in the Italian Renaissance to promote Gothic as a neglected but extraordinary style of which England has many examples that in turn demonstrate the nation’s own ancient history. He wishes the style were better understood, more carefully studied, and saved from neglect and even worse, loss. His drawings seem to dwell on everything that is a challenge to the mathematical crispness, geometric precision, and simplicity of classical and neoclassical design. Gothic detail, grotesques, lace, filigree, and intricacy, which he renders in exaggerated form, fascinate him, as he indeed presages the change in taste about to dominate the next century, when the tracery, grotesques, and narratives of medieval times reappear in literature and architecture. Halfpenny pleads that “the remembrance “of these “extraordinary” buildings be preserved, while he laments the neglect they now experience.<sup>52</sup> His pleas were not without result because York’s prestige would now emerge based on new criteria of taste (English Gothic) as a source for antiquarian interests and as a foundation for establishing England’s national heritage, a feature of Gothic he also emphasizes.

On the cusp of rediscovery as a national treasure, York Minster faced its worst disasters in the nineteenth century. Two devastating fires overtook the minster, one in 1829, started by a fanatical iconoclast who believed he was following God’s design by setting the building on fire,<sup>53</sup> and the second in 1840. Nineteenth-century Britain, one could argue, was obsessed with its own history, even while it was expanding its empire all over the world. In 1857, under the auspices of Her Majesty’s Treasury, *The Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages* appeared, collecting together materials on the history of England from the invasion of the Romans to the reign of Henry VIII. The preface to the three volumes on York lays out the presuppositions that hold the collected documents together: “The history of the church of York is more or less connected with that of the city itself, and a sketch of the fortunes of the place will be an appropriate introduction to the records of its civil as well as ecclesiastical government.”<sup>54</sup> Volumes 1 and 2 include edited medieval versions of the lives of bishops and archbishops of York, including several of the life of Saint Wilfred, Bishop of York; of the life and miracles of Saint John, Bishop of York; of works attributed to Alcuin; and of the life of Oswald, Bishop of York. Volume 3 prints letters from and to the See of York concerning rights and privileges. By the nineteenth century, the history of pre-Reformation Christian England had emerged as central to the national history as Britain rapidly urbanized (with 50 percent of the

population in urban areas by the 1851 census) to become the first industrialized nation in Europe. A disoriented and dislocated population, finding itself in urban squalor and producing nostalgia for the past, was to find solace in medieval revivalism.<sup>55</sup>

Besides the medieval revival, the century also saw the republication of John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* in 1841 and Henry VIII's edicts as part of the Surtees Society publications at the end of the century. Indeed, this work of archivists and historians demonstrates how the period discovered, recovered, and romanticized the English Middle Ages, while at the same time rendering it exotic, remote, and brutal.<sup>56</sup> The turn back, especially in the republication of works that featured the birth of Protestantism against a sadistic Catholicism, as emphasized in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* (protestants killed by the Catholic Tudor monarch Mary I), promoted Britain as a Protestant nation, beneficiary of God's providential care.<sup>57</sup> While the iconoclasts had set about destroying the medieval symbol system and its artifacts that had regulated daily life for a millennium more or less, the English in the nineteenth century engaged in a systematic recovery of that same symbol system with the buildings and artifacts that supported it. Now divorced from their original cultural matrix and decontextualized, medieval form was separated from its content and image from prototype, to focus on the "image" (monument) as an end in itself that could be used to bolster a national ideology and Protestant identity and raise citizen consciousness and civic responsibility. Beginning in the eighteenth century and flourishing in the nineteenth, "objective" historical inquiry, aesthetic and consumer pleasure, and national culture building that embraced England's Christian heritage (now transformed into the Church of England) held the key to the new position of these "stately buildings."

What had happened from Henry's dissolutions and the Puritan Revolution to nineteenth-century Britain that might explain how one period could disparage and discard its patrimony and then another could decide to save, catalogue, restore, and revere that same heritage? The Oxford (or Tractarian) Movement or the Catholic Revival in the Church of England, which began at Oriel College, Oxford in the 1830s, was a reaction to the increasingly secular Church of England, and this certainly contributed to a renewed interest in ecclesiology and the sacramental and liturgical practices of the Roman Catholic Church. The movement, called Tractarian because its proponents published "tracts"—included figures such as John Keble, John Henry Newman, and Edward Bouverie Pusey, among others—and eventually led to the Catholic Revival in the Church of England.<sup>58</sup> Among the most famous converts during this Roman Catholic revival in the first half of the century was the architect Augustus Welby Pugin, who embraced Gothic as the most appropriate style for church architecture.<sup>59</sup> The Church of England readopted Roman Catholic sacramental and ritual practices that were either banned by

the Reformation or neglected, while Gothic became the preferred style for church architecture.

As for York, the authors of the 1850 *An Historical and Descriptive Guide to York Cathedral and Its Antiquities* indicate yet another reason for this changed attitude toward the past:

The history of York Minster, since the first movements of the Reformation, is comparatively devoid of interest; we may add, happily so: for where much is to be related of our sacred edifices during this interval, the interest is too often a painful one, centered as it is in the spoliation which took place at the Reformation; in the still more wanton, and infinitely more destructive mischief of the Puritans; and in the intolerable perversions of all propriety in recent additions or repairs. At the Reformation, the Cathedral of York suffered little that can be said to have robbed the fabric of any portions of its true glory.<sup>60</sup>

The book illustrates various aspects of the minster, including its Gothic monuments, glasswork, architectural treasures (the nave and chapter-house, for example), and famous screen that “narrowly escaped removal from its proper place, during the repairs after the fire of 1829. All competent judges were, of course, against this innovation, and the zeal of many of them prompted them to a very strong expression of their feelings on the subject. We trust that, for the future, it is safe.”<sup>61</sup>

In the prologue, the authors explain their rationale and sources. Gone is the scorn for the Middle Ages. Replacing it is reverence for sources left by the clergy who kept such good records. They provide the information for a comprehensive history of York’s minster.<sup>62</sup> To this is added, as the above quote makes clear, disdain for the destruction of the Reformation, anxiety about any later damage that might occur, and concern about the kinds of repairs that could be made. These authors were determined to feature the great achievements of the medieval era, and they scorned destructions of any kind, whether conventional iconoclasm, additions to the building, or poor quality of repairs. They adhered to the idea of an “authentic” condition of the building.

What happened? The change can be summed up under four major shifts: (1) A change in the preferred style for church architecture and in sacramental and liturgical practices led to a new appreciation of medieval Gothic architecture and sculpture; with this also came concern about preservation and anxiety about poor restorations. (2) Although anxiety about a re-ritualization of liturgical practices was still current in Church circles, making the British nation in the nineteenth century did not have the same anti-Roman Church imperative as occurred in the sixteenth century. Rather, as Linda Colley puts it so succinctly, by the nineteenth century, “an uncompromising Protestantism was the foundation on which their state [the Britons] was explicitly and unapologetically based.”<sup>63</sup> (3) By the middle of the century, changing liturgical

practices in segments of the Church of England, due in large part to the spur of the Oxford Movement, encouraged a new appreciation for the legacy of the Middle Ages, as Gothic style became adopted for new churches. (4) The archival interests of the nineteenth century provided a powerful companion for building a nation and for celebration of the high points in its uniquely British culture.

Witnessing this revised status of England's medieval cathedrals, in a backward glance at national history, the Dean of Canterbury wrote in his introduction to a book of descriptions of England's cathedrals published in 1893,

All the monuments of our national history that have survived the ravages of time and the violence of human passions, our ministers and cathedral churches are the most beautiful, the most interesting, the most eloquent of old-world men, strange faces, other minds. They are at once poems and chronicles, epitomes in stone of the character, the aspirations, the faith, the achievements and failures of our forefathers. To write the story of the great churches of England would practically amount to writing English history from before the Norman Conquest to the Reformation; it would mean a history of religion in these islands from the early Saxon foundations to the iconoclastic days of the Puritans; it would involve a survey of the development and progress of architecture from an antiquity almost mythical down to the close of the fifteenth century.<sup>64</sup>

These fin-de-siècle remarks are a fitting summary to the story of York Minster. Recognizing the zeal and violence of human passions that had threatened medieval church architecture and artifacts, the author lauds the medieval cathedrals' beauty, genius, and human spirit, all values that typify the nineteenth-century national sensibility. The building belongs now not so much to any city as to British history, as it stands as a unique testimony to British national energy and genius. Equating the buildings with "prayer itself," the Dean of Canterbury links British history to its Christian buildings, as the most ancient buildings still standing, and thus they become the means to establish Britain as a Christian nation with an ancient history, a move that typifies how culture and nation-building were linked in the period.

On the chapter titled "York Minster," the Dean writes, "York Minster is a 'thing of beauty' in spite of ruthless improvements and fanatical zeal and Puritan Philistinism and indiscriminating utilitarianism and ignorant restorations."<sup>65</sup> In a fanciful mode, the author wonders whether the building stands on an original "British" church, having grown in biblical fashion like the mustard seed,<sup>66</sup> but he rejects regrets for the ruthless destructions and loss of "things of beauty," whether due to the fires or the wildness of reckless looters.<sup>67</sup> In his retrospective nostalgia, he does however signal a new kind of danger, "ignorant restorations," already observed in these buildings, an issue that will become central to restoration and preservation discourse from this point forward.

The story of York Minster tells both a local and a national history. In the face of national calamity, forced religious reform, and attendant iconoclasm—first during the Tudor period and then during the Civil War—the city and the citizens resisted efforts to destroy at least York’s signature building and its artifacts, even if they failed to save the monasteries and other functioning civic buildings. What explains this civic commitment? The stained glass history of York’s Christianity provides strong evidence of a local civic humanism, a characteristic that endured into the nineteenth century as shown by Francis Drake’s eighteenth-century *Eboracum* and the controversy over the removal of the rood screen in the nineteenth century when local citizens rose to protect its historic position in the minster.<sup>68</sup> The ancient history of the city, the over four hundred years in which the cathedral was in the process of being built; the patrons, whether guilds, craftspeople, nobles, and clergy; the civic activities connected to the cathedral (shared governance, annual festivals, care of the poor and indigent, burial of the dead, and education); as well as the circulation of financial resources these activities ensured must all have influenced the commitment of York’s population. The building constituted the “lived environment” of the citizenry of York, but in the nineteenth century when Britain appropriated its medieval past to bolster an ideology of Christian nationalism, the focus on the city and its cultural artifacts emerged as part of Britain’s national history, a shift Francis Drake’s *Eboracum* had already noted was beginning to occur in the eighteenth century.



*This page intentionally left blank*

# MAKING THE FRENCH NATION: LIBERATING FRANCE, ABBÉ GRÉGOIRE, AND THE PATRIMONY OF THE MIDDLE AGES

Les longs souvenirs font les grands peuples.  
(Long memories make great people.)

—M. de Montalembert

AT THE TIME OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION (BEGINNING 1789), FRANCE destroyed buildings, sculpture, paintings, artifacts, and books as well as manuscripts, which, if not trashed or burned, were stolen and sold on the international market—much of this ending up eventually in the British Library or the Cloisters of the Metropolitan Museum in New York. As a vivid example, the largest medieval church in Europe, the Abbey of Cluny, which had been attacked by the Huguenots during the French religious wars in 1562, was sacked and destroyed in 1790 by revolutionary mobs. The library at Cluny remained one of the most important in Europe, with a large collection of valuable medieval manuscripts. Besides the attack of the buildings, the 1562 sacking was the first assault on these prized legacies of the medieval period, leading to their destruction or dispersal. But during the 1790 riot, even more burned. Fortunately, the Cluny town hall safely hid some of these valued possessions.

The French Archives of the Commission of Historical Monuments provide many other vivid examples of iconoclastic furor. During the sixteenth-century religious wars, the Protestants sacked the church and monastery of the Madeleine in Vézelay, leaving it as a threshing floor and stable. By the

mid-eighteenth century, the monastery lay in ruins, and the king ordered it razed.<sup>2</sup> The Cistercian monasteries were also wrecked, the first, Citeaux (founded 1098), hammered during the religious wars in the late fifteen hundreds and then again during the Revolution when a wrecker bought it in 1791 for quarry. Clairvaux, founded 1115, the best known of the abbeys because of the twelfth-century saint Bernard of Clairvaux, was only saved from wreckers because Napoleon turned it into a prison. All that remains of Morimond (founded 1115) is a ruined arch. In 1791, Chartres itself was pillaged, its lead roofing stripped to make bullets, causing the timber to rot and seepage in the vaults. The wooden statue of Notre-Dame de Sous-Terre, the palladium of the cathedral, was decapitated and burned.<sup>3</sup> These are just a few vivid examples of the deliberate destruction of medieval art and architecture that France experienced in these major iconoclastic periods.<sup>4</sup>

The Revolution sought to curtail the power of the Church in the political domain, and seeking to contain the evident rage against the Church, Church property was nationalized in 1789 while religious orders were suppressed in 1790. A French ecclesiastical figure, but a devotee of the Enlightenment and great supporter of the Revolution who rose to prominence in these intense political times, was Abbé Grégoire (1750–1831). While defending the Revolution and its republican principles, he decried the extent of the destruction in emotional furor.<sup>5</sup>

Who was Grégoire? He was born in a poor family, a tailor's son, a serious intellectual who was recognized as a poet in 1779; became a priest; opposed slavery; was ardently against anti-Semitism although in favor of Jewish assimilation, in favor of "people of color"<sup>6</sup>; and rose to prominence when he was elected to the Estates General in 1789, always taking the most democratic positions despite his clerical garb that he never removed even during the difficult times under Robespierre. He was elected bishop of Blois in 1791, remaining simultaneously an ardent Christian and political revolutionary his entire life.<sup>7</sup> From his position on the Committee of Public Instruction, Grégoire was the first to describe the reigning iconoclasm against French churches, monasteries, and secular buildings as well as manuscripts, paintings, and statuary as "vandalisme."<sup>8</sup>

In the nineteenth century, figures like Grégoire—writers; activists in the government and the press; archivists who produced scientific inventories of medieval buildings; architects who restored buildings and who promoted the Gothic revival as style; and the new specialists, art historians—studied the remnants of the medieval period and began to look back as much of its legacy lay in ruins. As the last chapter concluded, by the end of the eighteenth century, a full-fledged Gothic revival, spurred in part by nation building and interest in Europe's past, represented a shift in taste against classicism and neoclassicism. The following three chapters will examine the roles of writers, activists, architects, and art historians in creating this medieval revival and

preservation movement and how their various intellectual and cultural convictions shaped the movement to restore the medieval legacy.

The historic record shows that in 1793 in France, revolutionary decrees had ordered the destruction of all the signs and symbols of the Christian religion and the feudal order. However, in the wake of this destruction in France during the Revolution and its aftermath, national ideology coupled with artistic and archival interests, regret about what was destroyed, and scientific interest rose to recover the legacy of the medieval past. Indeed, the French Revolution unleashed some of the worst violence against religious buildings and artifacts that had occurred since the Reformation, again, notwithstanding the eighteenth-century intellectual discourse of tolerance. But the Revolution also produced the idea of the historic national monument perhaps because of the number of buildings destroyed during that tumultuous time. It was the Revolution that gave birth to the idea of public, collective interest and to the radical idea that French monuments with either an artistic or historical value belong to the nation and provide pleasure and education for the citizens of France.

### VANDALISM

France witnessed its medieval art and architecture attacked or destroyed during the three massive outbreaks of *vandalisme*: the religious wars from 1562 to the eighteenth century; in 1793 during the Revolution; and finally by the *bande noire*, when building companies purchased ruins to literally use them as stone quarries in the early nineteenth century following the Revolution. Émile Mâle, the nineteenth-century medieval scholar of French religious art, looking back over this history of iconoclasm, pointed out in 1898 that a major contribution to medieval history would be to provide an inventory of the great works destroyed during these outbreaks.<sup>9</sup> But it was not until 1959 that Louis Réau published such an inventory under the title *Histoire du Vandalisme: Les Monuments Détruits de l'Art Français (History of Vandalism: The Destroyed Monuments of French Art)*. His inventory, accompanied by photos, includes all the destructive episodes. In the religious wars, because it was the Catholics that had produced millions of works of art, and the Huguenots condemned them, iconoclasm was rampant. Quoting contemporary observers, Réau wrote, "Where the Huguenot is master, he destroys all the images, demolishes all the sepulchers, takes all the sacred valuables from the churches," and "The innovators have destroyed the temples, and other holy buildings in such great numbers that the Crown will need ten years of revenues to replace them."<sup>10</sup> Indeed, the descriptions of what was destroyed certainly rival Henry's dissolution of the monasteries. Singling out the worst from this encyclopedic review of the monumental ravaging—Orléans in the Loire, ironically the city where Joan of Arc rooted out the English, witnessed

almost all of its churches, abbeys, and cathedral (one of the most beautiful in France) sacked. The monument to Joan of Arc was likewise a victim of Huguenot iconoclasm.<sup>11</sup>

Motives for these various outbreaks were legion. They include instrumental destruction sponsored by the state, royalty, or nobility as in war; during religious reform movements directed against the Catholic Church in general; for rebuilding on a more lavish scale; or to erase buildings symbolic of the past, as during the Revolution, all buildings that reminded of the feudal, monarchic, or ecclesiastical past were slated to be demolished. Also, intolerance of the Catholic Church and rage against the political, social, or religious status quo fueled expressive mob violence directed against buildings and artifacts. Réau includes five categories of causes for vandalism: (1) religious bigotry and religious prudery (which led to smashing buildings and statues and destroying paintings and books, both in the religious wars and during the Revolution); (2) sentimental vandalism (based on a sense of outrage that led to tearing down buildings, like the Bastille, as symbolic of royal abuses during the Revolution); (3) aesthetic vandalism (which is based on taste); (4) restoration as a type of vandalism, as Viollet le Duc's restorations (to be discussed in chapter 8); (5) and Elginism (removal of art works from their original site, the word invented from the 1801 spoliation of the Parthenon by Lord Elgin of the British army). Certainly all of these became commonplace in France from the beginning of the Revolution in 1789 to the eventual creation of the Ministry for Historic Monuments and through the various restoration projects of the nineteenth century. In the immediate period following the Revolution, committees examined cases and decided the fate of a building based on whether it had links with feudalism, the monarchy, or the Church.<sup>12</sup> Revolutionary legislation had confiscated the wealth of the Roman Church, and then, all art, artifacts, and architecture associated with the king and his rule, with the Church, and with any cultural-political links to both came under consistent and widespread attack.<sup>13</sup> Thus the past became the object of scorn, ripe for destruction under the rule of the new France. Legislative efforts attempted to rein in the rampant destruction, but it proved easier to unleash revolutionary impulses than to control them once they were at work.<sup>14</sup>

### *Abbé Grégoire (1750–1831)*

An early figure to confront this destructive and bigoted consequence of the Revolution was Abbé Grégoire, Bishop of Blois. Grégoire argued against the monarchy, church corruption and power in the secular domain, slavery, racism, anti-Semitism, and capital punishment, but even as an ardent supporter of the Revolution, he nonetheless decried what was happening as a consequence of the radical political and social changes: "One must once more be frightened by the rapidity with which, at the moment when all is to be

regenerated, the conspirators demoralize the nation and lead us by barbarism to slavery. In the space of a year, they have managed to destroy the product of many centuries of civilization”<sup>15</sup> For Grégoire, as this quotation makes evident, such destruction constitutes an attack on the nation itself and a re-enslavement.

Grégoire took a position on the Comité d’instruction publique (Committee on Public Education) on the grounds that it might be the only remaining place where good sense remained in the climate of brigandage, blasphemy, and frenzy that characterized those years immediately following the Revolution. In his *Mémoires*, describing the outbreak of violence, he recalls his report to the Convention against *vandalisme*, a word he says he created to kill the crisis:

One recalls that the angry mob proposed to burn all the public libraries. Everywhere they put a heavy hand on books, paintings, monuments that carried the imprint of religion, feudalism, royalty; it is incalculable the damage to objects of religion, science, and literature. When I proposed to stop these devastations the first time, I was gratified with the epithet fanatic; it was argued that under the pretext of love of the arts, I wanted to save the trophies of superstition. However, such was their excess that finally it was possible to hear my voice and it was consented that I present to the committee a report against vandalism. I created the word to kill the thing.<sup>16</sup>

In his *Mémoires*, he records his struggle to preserve monuments and books on the grounds of freedom of religion, even while hammers were destroying these *superbes basiliques* (superb basilicas). “Everywhere, pillage and destruction were the order of the day,”<sup>17</sup> he laments in his “Rapport”<sup>18</sup> to the national convention on the destruction wrought by *vandalisme*. As representative of the ministry of education, Grégoire’s 1793 “Rapport presented a means to redress the crisis. This report resulted in the first decree covering the ongoing pillage. Promulgated by order of the government after the meeting, it remains a fascinating document and a first for Europe because it appropriated all monuments of art and science to the nation, promised severe punishment to those who committed vandalism against this property, and charged citizens themselves with responsibility for denouncing miscreant behavior against it:

The national convention, after having heard the report of the committee of public instruction decrees that which follows:

1. Libraries and all other monuments of science and art belonging to the nation are assigned to the surveillance of all good citizens; they are invited to denounce to the authorities the provocateurs and authors of vandalisms and degradations to the libraries and monuments.
2. Those who maliciously destroy or degrade any monuments of science or arts will receive two years punishment of detention conforming to the decree of April 13, 1793.

3. The present decree will be printed in the list of laws.
4. It will be posted in local administrative offices, in the meeting places for public societies, and in all places that possess monuments of science and art.
5. Every individual who has in his or her possession manuscripts, titles, charters, medals, antiquities belonging to houses of national interest must return them within a month after the promulgation of this decree to the administrator of his or her local district or be treated and punished as a suspect.
6. The Convention decrees that copies of this report be sent to local administrations and public societies.<sup>19</sup>

Grégoire's purpose was both to stop the pillage and propose a means to rebuild the "nation" with respect for the legacy of the past. As had occurred earlier in other European iconoclastic outbreaks, new positions were adopted to defend the value of traditional arts and architecture associated with religion. Grégoire had to defend the arts against their former patrons—the royalty and the Church. As he put it, the brigands have emigrated, but the arts remain behind. Like us, he wrote, they are the children of liberty; like us they have a country; and we will transmit this double heritage to our posterity.<sup>20</sup> Grégoire wanted the artistic legacy of feudalism liberated just as he believed France itself had been. In proposing to save this heritage, he set out to create a new type of collective memory, a historical memory that would inform and educate new citizens of the republic. Despite the promulgation of the decree, however, the second report in the third year of the revolution decried the continuing vandalism, as did the third report.

Grégoire represents a radical new departure for the uses of the past, in this case, rescuing France's medieval patrimony (*patrimoine*)—a word used for the first time with its new meaning of what one receives as a citizen as inheritance from the previous age. Salvaging the arts for Grégoire possesses the same imperative as the project of making the French language uniform;<sup>21</sup> advancing the study of science; reorganizing education for the public benefit of all French citizens; creating national museums to house manuscripts and artifacts from the feudal past, important not only for the beauty of their workmanship but for their historical value, the history of machinery, and knowledge of plant life;<sup>22</sup> creating dual language editions (French and Latin or Greek, side by side)<sup>23</sup>; and storing all the materials of the monarchs that reveal their infamies—these form the national history that should be archived and studied to enrich the republic.

Grégoire does not propose the death penalty for those who commit crimes against this heritage, which he considers "worthy of being kept" (*dignes d'être conservé*).<sup>24</sup> In identifying places and things worthy of saving, he is establishing what Pierre Bourdieu more recently has called places worthy to be frequented, which once part of a national educational program would soon become institutionalized as what Bourdieu labels the "interiorization of cultural rules" (*l'intériorisation de l'arbitraire culturel*).<sup>25</sup> Thus the dead legacy of

feudalism, the monarchy, and medieval Christianity would build the new national consciousness. As “symbolic capital,” this legacy possesses a wholly new meaning that is decontextualized from its former significance—it belongs to the past, but it represents national character and prestige in the present.<sup>26</sup> Grégoire, indeed, hopes that like the Italians, perhaps the French will come to respect the monuments as public and national objects that are everyone’s property. In Italy, he writes, people are used to respecting not only their monuments but also those who design them. He wants the French citizen to develop the same deference, to respect these items as national objects that are everyone’s property.<sup>27</sup>

Grégoire argues for a new relationship to the artifacts and books of the past, which would make them the property of the state and of the people. And as testimonies to history, they would form the basis for educating a citizenry about its past. Here is an argument for patrimony that does not belong to individuals but to the national good, now redefined as all citizens of the French republic. The “republic” and its citizens, as patrons, have replaced the Church, the nobility, and the feudal system, and as the institutions of the modern nation, the museum and the national library replace the Church, palace, and monastery. As Donald Preziosi writes of the Enlightenment museum, “Since its invention in late eighteenth-century Europe as one of the premier epistemological technologies of the Enlightenment, the museum has been central to the social, ethical, and political formation of the citizenry of modernizing nation-states.”<sup>28</sup> Grégoire understood this function of the past once archived as he wrote, “Legislators, that you prescribe the national interest, it is to use to the maximum your immense and precious collections and make them serve the instruction of all citizens.”<sup>29</sup> Arguing that such public education is the most infallible means to avoid the monopoly of talents that the feudal system had upheld, he held that barbarians and slaves hated the sciences and destroyed monuments, but free men love and conserve them.<sup>30</sup>

While the Revolution did not create “France” as nation, it did create the idea of the “citizen,” the national interest, the national language, national education, patrimony, or heritage as the property of all citizens. It transformed religious collective memory into national cultural memory<sup>31</sup> when art and artifacts were wrenched from their erstwhile places in churches, castles, and private collections to find a new home in the national museum—the institution also arising from the rupture with the past that the Revolution achieved.<sup>32</sup> The Revolution made the museum a top priority, with the Louvre already slated to become a museum under the monarchy, officially designated a national museum in 1791 and opened in 1793, exactly one year after the overthrow of the monarchy.<sup>33</sup> The Museum of French Monuments followed in 1795. As renowned French medieval historian Jacques Le Goff has written, the nineteenth-century scientific movement accelerates “national collective memories” with the consequence of creating a modern citizen of a nation.<sup>34</sup>



National museums, or repositories of national memory, held a critical role in this development. In addition, a September 7, 1790, decree inaugurated the French National Archives, whereby archival activities, which began in the late eighteenth century under noble family patronage, became public by national decree in 1794.<sup>35</sup> In addition to this national liberation of archives and collections from their former proprietors, because of the Revolution, France became the first country in Europe to create a governmental administration for the conservation of ancient buildings to protect its national patrimony.<sup>36</sup> The radical political engineering that followed the Revolution created both the Republic and also the modern nation invested in its historic past that it had just attempted to obliterate. This case for historical legacy as cultural value that would form a national agenda, described by Antonio Gramsci in *Intellectuals and the Organization of Culture*, led post-revolutionary France—which had produced new social classes that did not compromise with the old empowered classes (whether the Church or the aristocracy)—to national unity, but it also made France more international and cosmopolitan (and as a consequence also imperialist).<sup>37</sup>

Furthermore, the psychosocial consequences of national trauma because of the mass destruction spurred people like Abbé Grégoire to rethink what relationship the new “nation” of France should establish with the past from which it was permanently ruptured. His answer was what has come to be identified as modern education (history [or collective national memory], literature, art, science) with schools and museums as the institutions that supported this education.

With its cry for liberty, equality, and fraternity, the Revolution came to fruition ironically in the civil administration of Emperor Napoleon, one of whose greatest achievements was the revision of French laws and codes. The seven new law codes finally enforced what the Revolution had sought to achieve. Among these new laws was one addressing religious toleration and another abolishing serfdom. At the same time, Napoleon centralized France’s government, and this too contributed to laying the foundation for a movement for preservation of a nationally defined French cultural heritage. Even though Napoleon was no great lover of medieval ecclesiastical buildings, Article 257 of his Penal Code promised severe punishments to anyone who damaged public buildings: “Whoever destroys, knocks down, mutilates, or degrades monuments, statues and other objects for public use or decoration and raised by public authority or with public authorization will be punished with imprisonment of one month to two years and fined one hundred to five hundred francs.”<sup>38</sup>

However, it was the restored monarchy, the July Monarchy, that actually *institutionalized* the conservation of monuments, when in 1830 the post of Inspector General of Historic Monuments, part of the Department of the Interior, was created, the first of its kind in the world.<sup>39</sup> Although Victor Hugo’s

novel *Notre-Dame of Paris* (to be discussed in the next chapter) assumed a pivotal role in this redirection of interest in medieval monuments, the monarchy's interest in erasing the immediate memory of the sacking of the archbishopric and the profanations of 1830 also was critical.<sup>40</sup> In the wake of the destructions under the restored monarchy, not only were places radically changed or reduced to rubble through vandalism, but more importantly, continuity with the past was shattered as a population faced a new world that was bereft of local memories in the form of buildings, festivals, and other traditional markers.<sup>41</sup>

The French Revolution and aftermath represents a dramatic example of how the people's will as a powerful political force can sweep away the reigning political, social, and cultural forms, but England's rapid urbanization spurred by the Industrial Revolution in the nineteenth century had a similar impact. The Reformation in northern Europe under the auspices of temporal rulers had achieved a similar disruption of communal practices earlier. These three cases of massive social, political, and economic reorganization arose out of radically different sectors of the society, yet all had a similar dramatic consequence for art, artifacts, and architecture in their respective environments and to the collective memories the people shared through them. France's case is especially interesting because although its major experiences of iconoclasm occurred due to religious wars, revolutionary political changes, and economic opportunism, it was the first country in Europe to create national laws and a national office for its patrimony and the only country to enforce expropriation of private property to protect and restore its patrimony.

But what makes the French contribution a forecasting of future developments in relationship to the past (and specifically to the medieval past) is that although preservation became a national agenda, under the influence of Enlightenment and revolutionary or republican values, the argument for saving religious artifacts and buildings as national monuments emerged in a secular framework. While similar archival and aesthetic convictions appeared in many countries in Europe at this moment in history, ironically, despite the ruin unleashed by the revolutionaries, it was the French Revolution that first dreamed of conserving national buildings under the auspices of the national government, partially because the goods of the crown and the Church were nationalized in 1789–90.<sup>42</sup> In fact, the concept of the "historic monument" arrived on the stage of history exactly at this moment, with L. A. Millin using the term in 1790 with this meaning for the first time,<sup>43</sup> while François Guizot institutionalized it when he created the post of Inspector of Historic Monuments in 1840.<sup>44</sup>

Across Europe, many different interests spurred the recovery of medieval buildings and monuments. Several English, French, and German writers, including Jane Austen, Thomas Gray, Goethe, Chateaubriand, Friedrich Schlegel, Madame de Staël, Victor Hugo, Charles Nodier, and Prosper Mérimée,<sup>45</sup>

played a critical role in featuring the medieval past and in turn prompting interest in preservation, conservation, restoration, and imitation of the medieval legacy. When Goethe as a young man in 1772 wrote an essay titled "On German Architecture," in which he criticized neoclassical buildings, he heralded a shift in taste about to sweep Europe. Scorning Italian classicism of the Renaissance, he wrote, "Did not the genius of the ancients rise from the grave and fetter your own, Italian? . . . You were struck by the magnificent effect of columns, so you wanted to put them to use and embedded them in walls. You wanted colonnades too, so you encircled St. Peter's Square with marble walks which lead nowhere."<sup>46</sup> Following Vasari's lead, he had earlier shared, indeed encouraged, the neoclassical scorn for Gothic, as he admits, "Under the heading 'Gothic,' as an entry in the dictionary, I listed all the synonymous misconceptions that I had ever encountered, such as indefinite, disorganized, unnatural, patched-together, tacked-on, overladen. No wiser than a nation which calls the world it does not know barbaric, I called everything which did not fit into my system Gothic."<sup>47</sup> But experiencing Strasbourg Cathedral, which he describes in this essay as German rather than as Gothic, he proclaimed, "This is German architecture! Our architecture!"<sup>48</sup> radically altering his opinion. He signals the stylistic changes about to dominate the nineteenth century: "But what unexpected emotions seized me when I finally stood before the edifice! My soul was suffused with a feeling of immense grandeur which, because it consisted of thousands of harmonizing details, I was able to savor and enjoy. . . . How often I returned to view its dignity and magnificence from all sides, from every distance."<sup>49</sup>

In an essay titled "Gothic Architecture," written over fifty years later in 1823, Goethe remembers his earlier rapture over Strasbourg Cathedral and how seeing the nineteenth-century interventions to Milan Cathedral had dulled his enthusiasm for Gothic as style. When confronted with the project for the restoration of Cologne Cathedral, he presciently expresses some of the central problems of restoration, preservation, and memory that will haunt the nineteenth century and continue to perplex cultural conservationists to this day: "I must admit that seeing the exterior of the Cologne Cathedral aroused a certain apprehension in me which I could not explain. A significant ruin has a venerable quality, and we sense and actually see in it the conflict between a noble work of man, and time that with silent force spares nothing. Here, on the other hand, we are confronted with an edifice which is unfinished and prodigious, and precisely its incompleteness reminds us of man's insufficiency when he attempts the colossal."<sup>50</sup> Like Pope Pius II Piccolomini in his 1462 bull, *Cum almam nostram urbem*, who praised ancient Roman remains for their memorial power, for Goethe, the fact that the building decays or that it is unfinished represents its special status. No modern building can possess such memorial power or declare its own fragility or humankind's weakness.

The revived interest in the medieval past that Goethe had heralded excited both popular and scholarly interest. It translated into preservation movements, archival activity, and stylistic imitations in buildings, furniture, household and ecclesiastical artifacts, literature, and art. But Goethe's opposition between his initial affection for "Gothic architecture" and his horror at the restorations under way fifty years later sums up the controversies of the period.

In England, the Society for the Antiquaries of London had been founded in 1707 with a Royal Charter in 1751 to become one of the oldest learned societies in Britain whose mission was to encourage, advance, and further the study and knowledge of antiquities.<sup>51</sup> Richard Gough (1735–1809), director of the society, proposed a committee to oversee ancient monuments in order to preserve them. Although Gough's idea was not implemented, he did initiate a discussion about the status of the medieval monuments in England and the standards to apply when preserving or restoring them, demonstrating that scholarly controversies about preservation issues go back at least to the eighteenth century, when unlike the earlier restorations, an idea of "historical truth" came to influence the approach to medieval structures. James Wyatt (1746–1813), with a reputation for neoclassical designs, became one of the first English architects to build in the Gothic style, and as a consequence he was commissioned to restore a number of cathedrals including Salisbury, Lichfield, Hereford, and Durham, about which many disputes swirled.<sup>52</sup>

The emergence of an impulse to recover, revere, and restore the artifacts and buildings of individual nations in the nineteenth century reflects a new cultural reverence for the legacy of the Middle Ages. But in France, it also signals the beginning of a movement to save national monuments with funding from the government in the service of the national good.<sup>53</sup> Thus the museum and legacy sites emerge as repositories of "heritage." As partial replacements for the Church's spiritual benefits, these new cultural forms did not just store what had been lost, but they provided the basis for founding a new sensibility whereby the nation became the primary entity for formation of consciousness with citizenship as the primary identity.<sup>54</sup> This national consciousness depended on knowledge of the past as a discipline based on scientific study, and in the case of Abbé Grégoire, was linked to an abhorrence of the political imbalances identified with the feudal past. Grégoire sought to redeem the past for contemporary purposes: historical knowledge about all aspects of the past, whether against liberty or supporting it; aesthetic education; and shared cultural values that constitute the national consciousness.

Now the nation became the patron of the arts and the people the heir to the nation's patrimony. Central words for Grégoire are heritage, patrimony, patriot (the name given in 1789 to partisans of the new ideas), republic (September 21, 1791, the Convention abolished the monarchy and created the first Republic in France), and citizen, all of which replaced erstwhile categories

determined by the feudal estate system, which required loyalty to Church and feudal lord. The citizen formation Abbé Grégoire imagined would emerge from national institutions like public education and national museums, making the legacy of the Middle Ages the foundation for national consciousness. Today, as Pierre Nora reminds us, *patrimoine* in France has shifted from inherited property (Grégoire argued that the French people owned their past, had a right to liberate it from feudalism, and that the museums would house its legacy) to “the possessions that make us who we are.” Nora writes that three words, “identity,” “memory,” and “patrimony” have become circular, almost synonymous with “identity.”<sup>55</sup> The nineteenth century in France, in the wake of the Revolution, spurred citizen and national consciousness, while building a nation on exclusive racial ideas about a land, its history, and the people who were to identify with it. Abbé Grégoire, a supporter of the Revolution, arguing to free medieval art and artifacts from its former proprietors, had proposed building the new France on the artistic and literary patrimony of the Middle Ages.

# VICTOR HUGO'S *NOTRE-DAME OF PARIS*

Je pense cela, qu'il ne faut pas démolir la France.

(I think the following, that one must not demolish France.)

—Victor Hugo, “Guerre aux Démolisseurs,” 1825

VICTOR HUGO, PROSPER MÉRIMÉE, AND EUGÈNE EMMANUEL VIOLLET-LE-DUC not only inspired the medieval architectural “renaissance” in France (this word used first by M. de Montalembert in a review of Hugo’s *Notre-Dame of Paris*, published in *L’Avenir* on April 11, 1831),<sup>2</sup> but they were actively involved in both bureaucratic and fieldwork to sustain the recovery movement. In the context of the vandalism preceding the July Monarchy (1830–48) that brought Louis-Philippe to power as king of the French, and with the deliberate devastation of the Revolution in the background, together, these three figures did much to foster a modern post-revolutionary French nation that combined secularism with the archival interests of the time. In doing so they promoted an ideology of French cultural pride, an essential element in the preservation movement in the period.

## VICTOR HUGO, “GUERRE AUX DÉMOLISSEURS”

Hugo published his first essay declaring *Guerre aux Démolisseurs* (War on Demolishers) in 1825,<sup>3</sup> an impassioned plea to save the remains of the past as French national monuments. He laments that if things keep going the way they are, France will not have a single national monument that remains. It is not the time for silence because all kinds of profanation, degradation, and ruin threaten the little that still exists in France of the beautiful monuments of the Middle Ages, where he emphasizes, are imprinted the old national glory and where both the memory of the kings and of the tradition of the people are enthroned. He writes of both secular and religious buildings, cathedrals, castles, and towers, all at risk of disappearing. A Romantic who saw modern

industry replacing an irreplaceable art, he concluded the essay, “I think the following, that one must not demolish France” (*Je pense cela, et qu’il ne faut pas démolir la France*).<sup>4</sup> For Hugo, this devastation of the medieval legacy is a question of national urgency. Like Grégoire, for Hugo, the legacy and France are the same. To demolish the one is to demolish the other. An 1832 essay, written a year after the publication of *Notre-Dame of Paris*, his novel that is better known to English readers as *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*, returns to the subject, still deploring the barbarism and the brutality of the demolition of “old France” and lamenting the fact that whether prompted by local or national authorities, not a single area of France was free from these destructions of the medieval legacy.<sup>5</sup>

Hugo was still fomenting in 1834, arguing that since the July Revolution, the profanations were expanding. National, liberal, patriotic, philosophical, and Voltaire-type arguments, he writes, have overtaken (i.e., during the Reformation and religious wars) erstwhile religious reform pretexts for vandalism. He pleads for laws, for money, for commitment, repeating what he had said in 1825, “We must stop the hammer that mutilates the face of the country. One law would suffice; let it be made. Whatever the rights of property, the destruction of a historic monument must not be permitted.”<sup>6</sup> Finally, he makes the argument that bears similarity to the Venice Charter of 1964: “There are two things about a building: its use and its beauty. Its use belongs to its owner, its beauty to the whole world, to you, to me, to all of us. Therefore to destroy it is to overtake its right.”<sup>8</sup> Hugo’s polemic is emotionally wrought, almost as though he knows that he stands at a critical moment in history. His *outrage* is in fact a lament over the passage of time never to be retrieved, even if the building still remains. His novel, *Notre-Dame of Paris* is in many ways a dirge for this past time and a plea for a modern France that respects its architectural legacy as national monuments.

### VICTOR HUGO, *Notre-Dame of Paris*

Published in 1831, Victor Hugo’s *Notre-Dame of Paris* named a specific monument as its title to place the medieval cathedral at the novel’s ideological center.<sup>9</sup> The chapter “Ceci Tuera Cela” (“This Will Kill That” [bk. 5, chap. 2]) pits book against cathedral, individual against community, and knowledge against tradition<sup>10</sup> in a binary reading of history that makes the printing press the deciding force in a radical historical shift. These facts alone testify to the importance that the idea of the monument and the monumental occupy in the novel. Hugo’s novel attempted to highlight the devastation to the cathedral wrought as much by time as by humans. He singled out the fashions of the eighteenth century and the ravages of the Revolution as well as the neglect of time as causes for the demise of the central monument of the city of Paris.<sup>11</sup> But Hugo’s argument that the book would kill the building and

that the printing press would bring to an end the culture that produced the Gothic cathedral presents the central paradox in his advocacy for restoring the church: his book as monument would replace the monument as book.<sup>12</sup>

Following the revolutionary decrees to rid the country of all signs of the former rulers of France (as discussed in the last chapter), the Revolutionary Committee of the City of Paris had ordered the exterior sculptures of Notre-Dame removed. Particularly, raging mobs lashed out against the stone kings. By order of the city administration, the gallery of kings on the second tier of the western façade of Notre-Dame was removed, and these were not fully restored until the twentieth century. Everyone from the thirteenth century on, in fact, had believed they were meant to represent the kings of France. A thirteenth-century fabliau quotes, "*Vois ci Pépin, vois là Charlemagne*" (See here Pepin, there see Charlemagne), testifying to the assumption that the twenty-eight kings dressed in contemporary royal attire represented thirteen Merovingians, eight Carolingians, and seven Capetians, ending with Philip-Augustus. This traditional sentiment led to their destruction in 1793. In the novel in an elegiac *ubi sunt*, Hugo also links the sculptures with the kings of France: "Three important things are missing from that façade today. First, the flight of eleven steps which formerly raised it above the ground; then, the bottom row of statues which occupied the niches in the three portals; and the upper row of the twenty-eight earliest kings of France, which filled the first-floor gallery, from Childebert up until Philip-Augustus, holding the 'apple of empire' in their hands."<sup>13</sup>

Furthermore, not only the exterior of the building suffered, for in 1793, the interior had also been plundered and then used for storage of food and grain. In the climate of the atheistic rationalism of the Revolution, the church was rededicated to a cult of reason. Today, the kings have been restored to their original places, and what remains of the stone heads of the kings, discovered in a mass grave in Paris in 1977, can now be found in the Cluny Museum, Paris.

Clearly the cathedral has experienced radical changes over its eight-hundred-year history. First, as a center of Christian cultic practice in the Middle Ages, it also served monarchical ambitions, for sitting on the Île de France in the Seine River, it was a beacon of the alliance between the French kings and the religion that united the Christian kings with the emerging Christian French realm.<sup>14</sup> This role was cemented from the thirteenth to the eighteenth century when the Revolution brought the alliance to an end. As Hugo points out, as an exemplar of Gothic architecture, the cathedral had been shunned in the eighteenth century because it lacked the neoclassical refinements of style applauded by the age, which had adopted Vasari's disdain expressed two centuries earlier.<sup>15</sup> Then, following the damage during the Revolution, its brief stint as a granary, and a flurry of activity to clean it some ten years after the destruction, by 1804, the cathedral bore witness as Napoleon and his



consort Josephine were crowned. Thus, the building maintained the cultural role of conferring legitimacy on the French ruler that the Revolution had intended to eliminate. The cathedral still possessed this ambivalent cultural status when Victor Hugo began to write his novel.

Hugo was a secularist, an archivist, an aesthete, and a nineteenth-century medievalist, who also was partially responsible for creating “grotesque” and distorted views of the period, as the novel highlights. Quasimodo, Hugo’s ugly hunchbacked hero, brings alive the grotesques of Gothic sculpture; Frolo, the corrupt priest, keeps alive the anticlericalism typical of the medieval (and revolutionary) period; while Hugo romanticizes Esmeralda, a French girl who believes she is a gypsy, as a new Beatrice, Dante’s savior. But the cathedral itself, with its dark labyrinthine passageways, hidden closets, ominous heights, and Gothic sculptural detail becomes the main character of the novel. Almost all the editions of the novel in the nineteenth century were illustrated, and the engraved drawings invariably emphasize this exaggerated view of the period: picturesque, grotesque, dark, and labyrinthine.<sup>16</sup>

Nonetheless, Hugo represents the emergence of a new phenomenon in the relationship to cultural artifacts: “Beside each wrinkle on the face of this old queen of our cathedrals,” he wrote of Notre-Dame, “you will find a scar” (*NDP*, 123).<sup>17</sup> For Hugo introduces a radical new element, the aesthetic, to the relationship between the observer and the religious artifact, one that differs from cultic participants. He writes in the note added to the eighth edition (1832) that his novel may have “opened up a few true perspectives on the art of the Middle Ages, that marvelous art hitherto unknown to some, and, what is worse, misunderstood by others” (*NDP*, 28).<sup>18</sup> For Hugo, to discuss the cathedral is to talk about art, beauty, and the aesthetic pleasure provided by artifacts.

This was of course part of the new understanding of art, which conferred an intrinsic value on it regardless of the cultic or political intent of its makers or patrons. The eighteenth-century German philosopher Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten (1714–62) produced a treatise on beauty and the sublime that instituted the term “aesthetics” in an intellectual swerve away from the Platonic tradition in which art was believed to arouse sensual bodily responses.<sup>19</sup> Because art became subject to market values, especially during the eighteenth century with the rise of the bourgeoisie, questions arose about how to judge its merits. Baumgarten’s theory posited a sense of beauty whereby good art could be distinguished from bad and good taste raised above poor based on principles of artistic values or a science of aesthetics.

Emmanuel Kant (1724–1804), on the other hand, rejected Baumgarten’s idea that art could be based on objective rules and principles of beauty. He would cut it away from “the aesthetic faculty” and ground it in “the sublime,” arguing in *Critique of Judgment* that aesthetic judgment stems from subjective responses and feelings of pleasure or displeasure that cannot be held to objective standards.

These discussions about what makes viewers respond to art, however, indicate how aesthetic studies were becoming autonomous in this period, as did historical studies, and supposedly subject to reason.<sup>20</sup>

Summing up the results of these Enlightenment developments, Jürgen Habermas, contemporary German philosopher, argues in his recent book, *Religion and Rationality*, “aesthetic experience has become an integral component of the modern world in that it has become independent as a cultural sphere of value.”<sup>21</sup> Hugo’s novel highlights this movement toward the autonomy of art when he writes that the cathedral had been assaulted not just by time and political revolutions, but above all by “the ever more foolish and grotesque fashions which, since the anarchic but magnificent aberrations of the Renaissance, have succeeded one another in the necessary decadence of architecture. Fashions have done more harm than revolutions.”<sup>22</sup> Thus, for Hugo, aesthetics and standards of taste have ruled the fate of monuments that remain legacies of the past.

Testimony to this cultural transformation at the heart of Hugo’s literary purposes in the novel comes from the first reviews of the novel by M. de Montalembert, another ardent supporter of preservation, written just after its publication:

We solemnly thank Mr. Victor Hugo . . . for the lively and shining light he has thrown on the long neglected *beauties*, and for his work that contributes, more than anything else, to popularizing them. All *French* interested in this title and that *France* not be stripped of its *beautiful* ornaments, owes to the author of this strong defense of the *masterpieces of our fathers*, the witness to their recognition. Those who have so courageously stigmatized the dark devastations of the gang of terrorists have refunded all the poetic energy to stigmatize the atrocious taste that has today gone defacing, mutilating, destroying and replastering throughout the surface of *France*. . . . It is through public opinion that one must attack and beat this degenerate influence of the eighteenth century on the most noble and popular of the arts. We do not know a *work of art* more appropriate to begin this attack than *Notre-Dame de Paris*. Mr. Victor Hugo will have the glory of having given the revolutionary signal that must infallibly work on architecture; his admirable chapter titles “*Notre-Dame*” and “*Bird’s Eye View of Paris*” are the first manifestations of a new taste, of a second *renaissance*, to which we anticipate a better destiny than the first.<sup>23</sup> (*italics mine*)

I have quoted this at length because it raises several major points about shifts in attitudes that Hugo’s novel represents. First, with the emphasis on “beauty long-neglected,” the author sets the tone. The novel has drawn attention to two aspects of the cathedral—that it is beautiful in some abstract and pure way and that it has been neglected for a long time. We have here aesthetic justification and a sense of time, both of the past and of the future,<sup>24</sup> for the novel is playing a role in a “renaissance” of the old for modern disinterested pleasure. Furthermore, the author credits Hugo with giving the signal for a

revolution, an ironic word choice given the historic context, considering that this revolution is a spur to restore something from the past. In fact, the author refers to beauty, taste, or art at least six times in his review, to the Renaissance that had given birth to the “degenerate” influence of the eighteenth century, to a second renaissance and its new taste, and finally, he refers to France and the French three times. Together, these aspects of the review highlight a revised notion of how to see the monument: it has become an aesthetic object to be experienced as art in a revolutionary shift in taste, and particularly it is to be cherished by the French, who as a nation share this common heritage. Nowhere does Montalembert mention that the building houses a religious cult, even though he was a Roman Catholic and supported religious revival. Rather, just as Hugo does in the novel, he views the church as a beautiful monument that is an artistic expression of its times to be enjoyed in the present as a cultural legacy.

In the chapter dedicated to Notre-Dame, Hugo reveals his adherence to an aesthetic that ties beauty to the sublime, writing, “The church of Notre-Dame of Paris is without doubt, even today, a sublime and majestic building . . . a vast symphony in stone . . . the colossal handiwork of a man and a people” (*NDP*, 123).<sup>25</sup> As noted, “the sublime” was not a new topic to eighteenth-century aesthetics, but Hugo’s link between beauty and the sublime suggests the Kantian notion of the “universal subjective validity in the experience of the sublime as well as in that of beauty.”<sup>26</sup> For Kant, both the sublime and the beautiful require a judgment of reflection, but whereas “the beautiful in nature concerns the form of the object, which consists in limitation; the sublime, by contrast, is to be found in a formless object insofar as limitlessness is represented in it.”<sup>27</sup> This notion of limitlessness underlies the “universality” of the feeling inspired by the object in the Kantian aesthetic. Hugo, too, attests to this sense of sublime limitlessness, for he finds Notre-Dame an imitation of divine creation, this “colossal handiwork . . . a sort of human creation, in short, as powerful and fecund as that divine creation whose twin characteristics of variety and eternity it seems to have purloined.”<sup>28</sup> Also, like Montalembert, Hugo connects the building to the people who had built it, and in doing so makes an argument for a national culture based in its historical past. Indeed, it can be argued that in this approach to the medieval legacy, history and art overlap in the experience of viewing the medieval building or artifact.<sup>29</sup>

Other authors of the period also bear witness to this cultural turn to aesthetics, national heritage, or cultural tradition as values, as discussed in the last chapter. Charles Augustin Sainte-Beuve (1804–69), for example, wrote in the 1832 prospectus for the novel, “In Notre-Dame, the first vital idea, the generating inspiration of the work is unquestionably art, architecture, love of this cathedral and of its architecture.”<sup>30</sup> Théophile Gautier wrote of Hugo, “He has saved the art of the Middle Ages in France and given to archaeology a

lyrical impetus."<sup>31</sup> The novel's impact was enormous, and it can be credited with creating the climate for the restoration of medieval monuments in France and the creation of a national office and inspector general for the historical monuments of France.<sup>32</sup>

The nationalist element in this cultural development should not be underestimated: explicit was the commitment to reviving the national past, as Grégoire had earlier argued. By 1835, François Guizot, minister of the interior, had created a committee charged with recovering and publishing all unedited documents from the French medieval period. This was eventually divided into two committees, one of which was charged with arts. By 1840, this had evolved to include a Committee of Arts and Monuments, of which Hugo was a member until 1848. This committee was organized to conserve historical buildings, take an inventory of all French monuments, and disperse archaeological information and instruction to the provinces.<sup>33</sup> Hugo's novel had laid out the artistic and historical rationale for this enterprise.

Almost forty years after the novel's first appearance, Edmond Biré wrote that Hugo's novel was "defective in more than one way,"<sup>34</sup> yet referring to the scorn visited on medieval art and architecture from Descartes to the philosophers of the eighteenth century, he noted that the novel had contributed to the rehabilitation of medieval art so outrageously ignored for more than two centuries. More importantly, Biré attests to the secularization of religious art, referring to Hugo as having pleaded the cause of "our national architecture," "our gothic monuments," and "our old cathedrals."<sup>35</sup> Here he clearly espouses the notion of shared national culture: this is an aesthetic, historic, and political revolution in which the idea of preservation of monuments on the basis of aesthetic value and historic relevance has political meaning, for the churches come to represent French national heritage.

However, a profound paradox lies at the heart of Hugo's interest in the preservation of medieval monuments and in his invention or reconstruction of the Middle Ages; the chapter "This Will Kill That" ("Ceci Tuera Cela") declares the contradiction at the center of Hugo's project.<sup>36</sup> On the one hand, his book becomes the monument that endeavors to preserve the cathedral from the ravages of time and man. On the other, "this" (the novel) will kill "that" (the cathedral), as his monumental novel becomes the capital punishment, a major theme of the novel, of the architectural monument as a center of religious experience. Humankind, Hugo writes, "has two books, two registers, and two testaments: masonry and printing, the bible of stone and the bible of paper." In the age of masonry, even books were monuments (*NDP*, 200).<sup>37</sup> "This will kill that" signified that "one art was going to dethrone another art. It meant: printing will kill architecture" (*NDP*, 189).<sup>38</sup> The alphabet in colonnades, obelisks, and towers, the pages of marble of the past would give way to "the grandeur of the edifice which printing has erected in its turn" (*NDP*, 201).<sup>39</sup> Up to and including the fifteenth century of the Christian era, Hugo

writes, "Architecture was the great book of mankind" (*NDP*, 189).<sup>40</sup> This was one of the features of Christian practice that the Protestant Reformation had sought to overthrow, as discussed in earlier chapters.

Furthermore, Hugo also insists that the Church was always primarily art, and its cultic status was merely a pretext for its art: "In this way, on the pretext of building churches to God, that art grew to a magnificent stature" (*NDP*, 193). This artistic status of the building for Hugo means the church was ultimately estranged from its cultic function: "An entire church would display a symbolic meaning utterly alien to the cult, or even hostile to the Church."<sup>41</sup> But this book in stone was doomed to be dethroned: "Architecture was dethroned. The lead characters of Gutenberg succeeded the stone characters of Orpheus" (*NDP*, 196).<sup>42</sup> From decline followed death, according to Hugo, "let there be no mistake, architecture is dead, dead beyond recall, killed by the printed book" (*NDP*, 199).<sup>43</sup> Hugo sees this tragic end to architecture, killed by books and the printing press, replaced by another monument, a mythological symbol of confusion: the Tower of Babel. The proliferation of books and writers whom he describes with architectural terms—Dante was the last Romanesque church, Shakespeare the last Gothic cathedral—becomes a colossal building. The press incessantly vomits new material, in a confusion of languages, untiring labor, and endless activity (*NDP*, 200).<sup>44</sup> But this construction that grows without end, he argues, "this is the human race's second Tower of Babel" (*NDP*, 202).<sup>45</sup>

Many interpretations emerge for what exactly Hugo means by likening the explosion of publications to the Tower of Babel. Doubtless, the modern writer does build Babel in the sense of the myth of transgression, challenge, and overreaching. But also Hugo implies that the advent of the printing press made possible a new version of the Babel myth of excess and confusion.<sup>46</sup> Herein lies the paradox at the heart of the novel, for Hugo admires the unity represented by the building, "the social, the collective, the dominant art" (*NDP*, 200),<sup>47</sup> and seeks to restore it, yet his own literary work kills it. While celebrating the church, Hugo circumscribes it to its aesthetic, archival dimensions—the book replaces the building. The preservation of the cathedral would make it, like Hugo's novel, an object of aesthetic pleasure: "The press will kill the church" (*NDP*, 189).<sup>48</sup>

In arguing to preserve the cathedral, Hugo, like Goethe and other Romantic poets, shows how intellectuals and artists do not merely reflect cultural developments but in fact can and do play an active role in promoting them. Hugo's novel shows that although he recognizes that taste shifts perhaps arbitrarily over time—he finds the eighteenth century almost barbarian in its artistic positions—he promotes the idea of the beautiful as that sublime entity that pleases independently of time and perspective. In other words, he does not only praise French medieval architecture. Just the contrary, from an aesthetic position, he sees architecture, whether the pyramids of Egypt, the

gigantic Hindu pagodas, or Gothic churches, as hybrid constructions, interesting for the artist, the antiquary, and the historian.<sup>49</sup> But here, too, we must recognize a paradox, for in praising the Gothic cathedral, Hugo singles out certain places as having greater cultural value than others.<sup>50</sup>

This is a fascinating journey to consider because certainly the Church in the Middle Ages was worthy to be frequented but for a completely different arbitrary reason. In the Middle Ages, churches were visible symbols of communal order, a “universal form of writing,” as Hugo remarks in the novel (*NDP*, 194),<sup>51</sup> and they represented the power of the Roman Church (as well as the alliance of monarchy and church in France). Again, Hugo’s novel assumes the role of promoting the cathedral as a monument to history and artistic brilliance paradoxically constructing a new rationale for making the building culturally worthy, though divorced from its primary and original function.

Understanding the complexity of medieval society’s attachment to its artifacts is daunting, especially if we try to know what ordinary people thought about their local buildings, paintings, sculptures, and stained glass, for example. Depending on the location (Italy’s city states are different from the French, Iberian, and English kingdoms, for example), patronage came from cities, religious orders, royalty and nobles, merchants, and craftspeople, suggesting widespread support for decorating cities, houses, monasteries, and churches. Redesigning and redecorating religious architectural spaces may have been prompted by liturgical needs, like an increase in the number of pilgrims, as Abbot Suger’s St. Denis in Paris,<sup>52</sup> the Madeleine in Vézelay, or San Francesco in Assisi, for example. Simple material explanations for frescoes or sculpture within monastic communities seen primarily by the community can hardly explain their style and significance. Such works, at the time of their composition, had functional value for commemoration and meditation certainly. They had liturgical purposes; they may have been a visual display of a patron’s generosity or a visible proof of civic virtue; but at the same time, they demonstrate an appreciation for decorative value and the value of art in meditative practices. It would be hard to characterize such work as catering to the economic, archival, scholarly, or pure aesthetic values that have emerged to dominate the modern art world, although civic values may still pertain. The viewing of them must have had an aesthetic component even if it was not articulated.

In the medieval period, patronizing such “arts” was a means to demonstrate wealth and piety, sometimes as a visual symbol of contrition, as the Arena Chapel (*Capella degli Scrovegni*) in Padua, decorated by Giotto and built by Enrico Scrovegni as pious recompense for his banker father’s life of usury (1303), or Cosimo de’ Medici’s rebuilding of San Marco in Florence to atone for his shady financial dealings (rededicated in 1443). Or patronage might demonstrate civic virtue and civic pride as the decoration of Orsanmichele in Florence, which features the donations of the various guilds active

in Florence, just as many of the stained glass windows in the Chartres cathedral provide the signature of the various guilds who paid for them.<sup>53</sup> People's appreciation for these decorations may indeed have been aesthetic, but a philosophy of "the aesthetic" was neither articulated nor widely disseminated in the period.<sup>54</sup> Despite the Second Council of Nicaea's support for images in devotional practices, Abbot Suger's famed descriptions of the building of St.-Denis—"the parent monument of all Gothic cathedrals,"<sup>55</sup> which indeed showed that Suger, at least, was very aware of the connection between the building and a "living theology"<sup>56</sup>—and Gervase of Canterbury's description of the construction and reconstruction of Canterbury Cathedral, details of which reveal a clear appreciation for the qualities of the building, very little remains from the period that tells us individual subjective experiences of what was thought about the great building and artistic enterprises of the time.<sup>57</sup>

Bourdieu's conviction that social and economic forces rather than the Kantian innate sense of beauty regulate taste and consumption of "art" in bourgeois societies<sup>58</sup> could not apply to the medieval *participation* in architectural or visual culture, which was, despite the rigid social stratification of medieval society, communitarian. Bourdieu is correct to distinguish the medieval from the post-Enlightenment consumption of art, for as he points out, in the modern era, that is, after the French Revolution, a dualistic structure emerged in which use value or function has separated from "pure art," that is, form value. In other words, as Hugo's novel highlights, in a major city, the cathedral in fact served a political function, besides a liturgical and social function, in the medieval period, whereas from the eighteenth century onwards and in France after the Revolution, the building as entity acquired a "form value" or independent artistic and historic value, which ironically was then made to perform the political function of nation making.

In the Middle Ages, again in a very ample understanding, "use value" dominates because the use of the "art product" is precisely its power to enhance sensual, imaginative, and intellectual experience that leads to religious knowledge and experience. Or its "use value" conveys the civic generosity of its patron and confers fame on the donor while decorating a city, church, monastery, or public space. In the modern environment, as Hugo's novel well understood, due to the autonomy of the client and of the artwork itself, and because the art work is often detached from its original context, the art critic or historian confers value on it, and thus measures what constitutes a great work of art.<sup>59</sup> Although "official" culture<sup>60</sup> was the primary patron of the visual arts in the Middle Ages, the entire devout population (i.e., those who went to church and even those who did not) could participate in, enjoy, and appreciate public visual culture as a living and organic experience.<sup>61</sup> What we call "visual art" (art, architecture, paintings, sculpture, and artifacts, today mostly lodged in or even as museums), in the Middle Ages, except for monastic communities, occupied public space as a constant visual presence.

As is well known, Christian art, though existing at least from the early third century (as discussed in chapter three), was given papal sanction when Pope Gregory in the sixth century recommended art as the Bible for the unlearned, which would appear as pictures and ornaments in churches as lessons for the laity. Hugo shows how deeply he understood this popular aspect of medieval visual art when he pitted the cathedral/monument as book against the book as monument. Also, with the bias of early nineteenth-century French Romantic and individualist notions about liberty and the artist, he argues that after the crusades, the cathedral—formerly the epitome of dogmatism—was invaded by the bourgeoisie, by the people, and by liberty; and escaping the priest came under the power of the artist: “The book of architecture no longer belonged to the priesthood, to religion and to Rome; it belonged to the imagination, to poetry and to the people” (*NDP*, 192).<sup>62</sup> This utopian binary misreading of history ignores vast contradictory evidence (priests and monks as artists, such as Fra Angelico, or Michelangelo and Raphael working under papal patronage), but it does capture the spirit of how the modern secular imagination came to appreciate and indeed venerate its medieval Christian legacy.



*This page intentionally left blank*

## CHAPTER 8<sup>1</sup>

# THE TURN TO NATIONAL HERITAGE: NINETEENTH- CENTURY EUROPE AND RESTORATION

La construction est une science; c'est aussi un art.  
(Construction is a science; it is also an art.)

—Viollet le Duc, “Construction”<sup>2</sup>

WHILE AESTHETIC AND HISTORICAL INTERESTS AS WELL AS A NATIONALIST ideology spurred the French nineteenth-century interest in the Middle Ages, in England, as explored in Chapter 5, already in the eighteenth century, scholars and writers were examining English medieval architecture as an aspect of the local and national history of England. Indeed, during this period, whether German, French, or English, one of the remarkable aspects of the discussion of Gothic architecture is how often writers identify the style as unique to a particular national culture.

### PROSPER MÉRIMÉE, EMMANUELLE VIOLLET LE DUC, AND FRENCH HISTORICAL MONUMENTS

In France, the Commission des Monuments Historiques (Commission of Historical Monuments) was created in 1837 to protect antiquities, medieval religious buildings, and a few castles. Aesthetes, secularists, and nationalists Mérimée (1803–70), as inspector of historical monuments, and Viollet le Duc (1814–79), *inspecteur général des édifices diocésains* (inspector general of diocesan buildings [1848–74]) and an architect charged with restorations of the national monuments,<sup>3</sup> worked together to help reverse the destruction and degradation that had become the fate of medieval artifacts for the

previous three hundred years in France. The French preservation movement can be attributed to four factors: it was a culture of tolerance that upheld (1) secular values, (2) aesthetic standards (by which the medieval legacy became prized), (3) scientific history (with art history emerging as an academic discipline by the middle of the century), and (4) national cultural heritage as categories of value in the building of a citizenry educated about its past.<sup>4</sup> This contrasts with England's recovery of Gothic art and architecture, in which both religious and Gothic revival overlapped as central to national culture.

Defining "restoration" as returning a building to its original condition—which could entail remedying a false earlier restoration or repairing mutilated features of the building<sup>5</sup>—early in the nineteenth century, A. L. Millin, in the *Dictionnaire des Beaux-Arts*,<sup>6</sup> established the guidelines for French medieval restorations. This earlier approach encouraged the kinds of radical architectural interventions deplored later in the century. Today, restoration has come to describe any of the following architectural interventions that may have occurred during a building's history: (1) to make a historic monument adequate for contemporary use, that is, redesign it to fit current needs or tastes (the most common intervention before the nineteenth century); (2) to return a work to its imagined original condition (the mode of the nineteenth century), based on a historical hypothesis; (3) today, to conserve the work, that is, to respect its historic origins (even eliminating accretions due to stylistic and need adjustments over a long time span).<sup>7</sup>

The creation of the post of inspector general of historical monuments institutionalized under the July Monarchy, the year before Hugo's novel appeared, attests to the originality of the French approach to the conservation of national monuments. From the revolutionary period onward, both the polemic for and action against the medieval legacy drove the national commitment to its restoration. The first to occupy the inspector's post, Ludovic Vitet, was well acquainted with the Romantic radical Étienne-Jean Delécluze, maternal uncle of Viollet le Duc, who would be charged with several restorations. A male coterie of artists, intellectuals, and writers like Stendhal, Prosper Mérimée, Sainte-Beuve, and others, including Vitet, were regular guests at Delécluze's Sunday salons in Paris. Delécluze, as maternal uncle, became responsible for Viollet le Duc's education, and it was through him that Mérimée and the young future architect became acquainted. When he became inspector general, Vitet immediately recognized how difficult imposing his state authority over local claims would become. Thus, the Commission was created so that decisions would hold the weight of more than a sole opinion against the local authorities often dealing with more pressing problems posed by the new urbanism.<sup>8</sup> The Commission was responsible for defining its objectives, making an inventory of the problems with the monuments, and suggesting remedies.<sup>9</sup> A historian, Vitet had little academic knowledge of architecture or of building techniques.<sup>10</sup> When Prosper Mérimée, who was

likewise lacking in the required expertise, became the second inspector of historical monuments (1834–68), he engaged the young architect Viollet le Duc for many restoration projects. Here is a radical reversal from how local commitments had saved Córdoba's Mezquita and York's Minster from destructive national hands, for in the French monument approach, the national government converges on the local environment to intervene and save the "national" heritage.

### *Prosper Mérimée and the Commission of Historical Monuments*

Although best known as the author of the novella *Carmen*, which was made into Bizet's opera of the same name, Prosper Mérimée's stature in cultural history owes more to the fact that he had primary responsibility for overseeing French historic monuments in the important post-revolutionary period. Both Mérimée and Viollet le Duc, in contrast to John Ruskin (the art historian responsible for much of England's interest in its medieval architecture) were nonbelievers who appreciated medieval art for its aesthetic qualities.<sup>11</sup> In fact, Mérimée, a lifetime intimate of the empress Eugénie (the wife of Napoleon III), identified himself as a "heretic and a pagan" in a letter to Viollet le Duc.<sup>12</sup>

Mérimée's function was to inspect monuments, but his task, as the title of the Commission makes clear, was primarily historical and archaeological in contrast to Viollet le Duc's architectural work. Applying himself with fervor, tenacity, and urgency, as revealed in his letters,<sup>13</sup> Mérimée, whose job was to decide what was worthy to be preserved, also reveals that the essential element in determining the procedure for restoration of a building was its date.<sup>14</sup> Such a major undertaking also demanded answers to abstract questions like what constituted historical value in the political, social, and aesthetic realms. In contrast, although many factors, including patronage or political, economic, social, and ecclesiological needs informed the building of cathedrals and churches in the medieval period, theology was central to the conception and realization of the buildings: the art of Gothic Europe represented a radical new way of seeing, and this reflected a theological vision of reality.<sup>15</sup>

Called a man of the eighteenth century, Mérimée, in fact, preferred the architectural style of the ancient Greco-Roman world, and he has even been accused of possessing little affection for medieval buildings. Revealing his bureaucratic relationship to the buildings, he wrote, "When I was viewing these historic monuments, I was their colonel. I regret having studied them so officially; I was inspecting their architectural characteristics, the additions, ancient repairs, and the poetic ensemble escaped me."<sup>16</sup> Writing to Viollet le Duc from Italy in 1858, Mérimée reveals his focus on historic interest and his personal aesthetic preferences as well as his snobbery. He writes, "How can you admire the architecture of the Venetian Palace? . . . Always the same plan, always the same neglect of details: as for the construction, it's diabolical. Everything is

mediocre, dirty, ruined.”<sup>17</sup> In contrast, Viollet le Duc, who had spent thirty months in Italy studying as a very young man (1835–37), revealed very different aesthetic standards, writing to his father, “Venice is a town that pleases me completely: . . . The Ducal Palace is the Parthenon of the Middle Ages. The fact is that I have never seen a monument that joins such a grand simplicity with so much beauty.”<sup>18</sup> Here, before he became immersed in French Romanesque and Gothic buildings—although the letters frequently compare French Gothic buildings to Italy’s Roman and Romanesque legacy—Viollet le Duc’s standard for judgment is the ancient world, but he admires the medieval building for its parallel simplicity and beauty.

The records of the meetings of the Commission of Historic Monuments in its first decade reveal how buildings were selected for conservation and how funds were allocated for the task. Structures worthy of historic recognition became national property, and any sale would be considered illegal. The government could then provide funds for preservation and restoration. For example, the Commission minutes of the February 19, 1838, meeting with Vatout, Taylor, Caristie, Duban, Vitet, and Mérimée present an exemplary entry:

The Commission decides after discussion that a note will be sent officially to the President of the Commission of the Budget and to some of the members to establish that the maintenance of the diocesan buildings depends on the Minister of the Interior and not on the Cults (Church).

M. Vitet sets forth that after having consulted several experts in the law, *it must be recognized that the law of July 7, 1833 permits expropriations in all cases where the interests of the arts would demand this measure.* The general terms of this law can be applied not only to clearing or acquiring historic monuments, but also to excavations under the ground of ancient edifices.

*A royal ordinance will first declare a building or a fragment of a building a public monument, the prefect conforming with the law of July 7, 1833 will institute an inquiry on the necessity or utility of the conservation of the monument.*<sup>19</sup> (italics mine)

This entry has a number of interesting features. First, Vitet, basing his argument on a law passed just five years previously, argues that buildings can be expropriated from their owners (in this case the Church), not only if they are historical monuments but also if they are considered artistically or historically important. Second, a royal ordinance would declare a building a public monument after an inquiry into the necessity or utility of conserving it. Again, just as in Hugo’s novel, the church building has become a national monument, and for historic and artistic reasons deemed worthy of restoration. But since Hugo’s novel, a state bureaucracy has developed to oversee the process, and this permits the confiscation of church property for archival preservation. Issues of religious sentiments or church ownership are trumped in favor of a secular value: historic and artistic merit.

As many have remarked, the aesthetic and historic grounds for restorations fluctuated, not just among the members of the Commission, but also the architects charged with the responsibilities differed radically. Set principles did not seem to rule the members of the Commission, and not only did it apply different standards to different buildings, but individual members also adopted different attitudes for different buildings. In addition, the many architects working in the field had radically different approaches to preservation projects.<sup>20</sup> In this regard, the minutes of the meeting of March 30, 1839, with Vatout, Taylor, Duban, and Mérimée present are especially interesting:

The President calls to the attention of the Commission how the aid provided by the Minister is being carried out in the provinces. In many localities, the repairs executed through this help do not receive intelligent oversight, and the architects often execute their charge in a manner contrary to good taste and contrary to the intentions of the government. The President [Mérimée] cites on this occasion, the works recently executed in several places on the Côte-d'Or. To place restrictions on these traits of vandalism, the Commission should examine if it would not be more suitable to remove the architects in the provinces from the direction of these projects and install Parisian architects whose talent is known.

M. Baron Taylor observes that the study of the arts of the Middle Ages in France is too recent for it to have spread to the provinces, always a little behind relative to the capital . . .

. . . The Commission is of the unanimous opinion that when the government goes to a lot of expense for a large restoration it must nominate the architect who would direct the work and when this task is in the provinces, the administration must make a *sine qua non* condition that they have the right to name the architect.<sup>21</sup>

This entry reveals much about how the Commission worked and what standards it applied. First, one sees that the president has a good deal of autonomy and independence, clearly wielding the greatest power in deciding the fate of buildings. Second, the members of the Commission, though working throughout the “provinces,” have a sense not just of centralized government and governance in Paris, but they also have a scornful attitude toward the provinces, even though most of the buildings are located outside of Paris. Third, the members of the Commission are fully aware of their historic function: the rediscovery of the French Middle Ages, which, they remark, has only recently come to consciousness. Fourth, they are aware that the work of the architects demands standards of taste; that poor restorations are themselves a kind of vandalism, the same word formerly used to describe the assault on buildings; and that Parisian architects who had studied the medieval period were more likely to uphold these standards.

Historical and archaeological issues that make it possible to date buildings also become essential in deciding what course to adopt in preserving them. Here disputes over conservation versus restoration, issues that still plague art

historians and restorers (and environmentalists engaged in nature restoration), come to the surface. The basilica at Vézelay, Viollet le Duc's most ambitious project, remains to this day a source of contention over how much architects should intervene in the preservation of a building. Viollet le Duc was so preoccupied with this issue that it became one of the longest entries in his dictionary. The question posed is, When does conservation become restoration, and how much damage to the original actually results from such imaginative restoration projects?<sup>22</sup> Also underlying the question is a privileged position accorded the original, or the earliest strata of the building or artwork, as if it were the "classical" form. This is what Alois Riegl (1858–1905), writing at the end of the century about the status of "monumental architecture," called a "deliberate commemorative value," or assigning a privileged moment of history to the monument.<sup>23</sup> Reconstructing to this imagined "original" creates a contradiction because the architect's work can actually place a very new form (in imitation of one strata of the old) onto the existing building, in essence restructuring it.<sup>24</sup>

In a meeting that expressed anxiety about the degradation of Sainte-Chapelle in Paris, the Commission's concerns about this conflict become evident:

Mr. Duban asks the advice of the Commission on the restoration of the turrets on the façade of Sainte-Chapelle; they were reconstructed at the end of the fifteenth century and belong to the worst phase of the ogival style in decadence, and replace those of the thirteenth century of which the beginnings are conserved and stand at the two sides of the remaining gable of the thirteenth century as all the other outstanding parts of the building. It is necessary to reconstruct them up to the height of the ancient constructions, and the other must be set again by inlaying which always has an ugly effect, on the inclined plane; this would not be the case if it were redone in the thirteenth-century style. . . . M. Duban calls for the support of the Commission to obtain workers who could execute the work he is ordering in a satisfactory manner, and also the painting, gilding, sculpture, and restoration of the glass.<sup>25</sup> (*italics mine*)

Here, Duban's request for help from the Commission lays out his rationale for the restoration project: standards of beauty and taste are equated with the original strata of the building, and reconstructions even within the medieval period are linked with the decadence, what he calls "bad form" of the ogival element. He assigns the word "beautiful" to the original strata of the building, thus either equating historical origins with aesthetic standards or possibly even allowing this standard to determine the character of the restoration. These examples provide a good sample of how the Commission operated when it first came into functioning order. Although aesthetics clearly played a role, aesthetic standards were not an articulated discourse. Instead, commitment to the oldest strata of the building became the standard of taste to rule

decisions. While the Commission's task was primarily bureaucratic, the minutes also emphasize the development of a secularized central government's effort to restore and prize its own national monuments, representing a wholly new approach to the preservation of the buildings of the past.

### *Viollet le Duc: Architect, Historian, and Archaeologist*

Viollet le Duc became the most respected on-site supervisor of this heritage project, as he oversaw work on more than forty medieval French buildings. Among these, Saint-Denis, the Madeleine in Vézeley, and Notre-Dame de Paris are the most celebrated. He shared Notre-Dame with Jean-Baptiste Lassus, a friend of Montalembert who, along with Montalembert, remained a practicing Catholic and therefore differed fundamentally from the agnostic rationalism of Viollet le Duc. These attitudes were central to Lassus's and Montalembert's approaches to restoration; for Lassus, restoration was to serve the cult or God's glory; for Viollet le Duc, the architect's vision of a medieval building. Viollet le Duc's position gave greater freedom to fulfill personal aspirations, while Lassus sought to restore what Auguste Rodin later identified as the very core of the buildings that gave them their former life—religious faith.

Three aspects of Viollet le Duc's work require elaboration. First, he was enamored of Gothic architecture, bringing a rationalist's aesthetic standards to bear on medieval buildings.<sup>26</sup> What he had to say in lectures he delivered on architecture in 1860 remain typical of his convictions. Captivated by the beauty of Notre-Dame de Paris, he wrote, "Every one knows the front of Notre-Dame de Paris; few perhaps realise the amount of knowledge, taste, study, care, resolution, and experience implied by the erection of that colossal pile within the space of at most ten or twelve years. . . . Here we have indeed Art, and Art of the noblest order."<sup>27</sup> Second, he identified this Gothic architectural innovation with an original flowering of French culture: "The front of Notre-Dame also renders conspicuous an excellence belonging exclusively to French architects at the time when France possessed an architecture of its own; that of variety in unity."<sup>28</sup> Finally, he was an agnostic, so his appreciation of the architectural brilliance of the medieval period was not the result of mystical reverence. If anything, he dismissed religion as a factor, arguing that great art could be produced in any age, no matter how "barbarous."<sup>29</sup> In his entry titled "Construction" in the *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XIe au XVIe siècle*—the title alone declaring his fundamental understanding that architecture was first and foremost a rational system—he wrote that customs could be odious and oppressive and that the abbots and feudal lords were dissipated and exercised an insupportable despotism in the medieval period, but, nonetheless, their monasteries and castles were built with wisdom, economy, and great freedom. A building is good or bad, judicious or deprived



of reason, he wrote. A building is not fanatical, oppressive, or tyrannical; such epithets cannot be applied to an assemblage of stones and wood and iron.<sup>30</sup>

A son of the superintendent of royal palaces and a skilled artist from childhood, Viollet le Duc enjoyed a privileged youth. When he decided on his chosen profession of architect, true to the revolutionary and intellectual iconoclasm of his age, he shunned the Académie des Beaux Arts because he thought it was too invested in classical and neoclassical models. At twenty he married, had a son the following year, and in 1836 took what was a life-transforming artistic hiatus in Italy, examining ancient and medieval monuments, many of which he drew. He spent time in Sicily, Naples, Rome, Florence, Pisa, Siena, and Venice.<sup>31</sup>

When he returned home, he began his lifelong commitment to the medieval architecture of France. In addition to his monumental *Dictionnaire raisonné*, he wrote more than twenty-five monographs on subjects ranging from French architecture to Russian art and geology. He was responsible for more than forty restorations including cathedrals, churches, palaces, hôtels de ville, châteaux, abbeys, and missions. He even found time to do the structural study for the Statue of Liberty and competed as one of the architects for the Paris Opera House.

Although committed to a rationalist architectural theory, Viollet le Duc recognized, nonetheless, that the great architecture of the medieval period was a product of a particular theology. Rhapsodizing the visionary element of medieval architecture, he wrote,

To raise a temple to God—as conceived by Christians—is a much more difficult task; for in Himself He unites all things, He presides over all; He is the Beginning and the End; He is Immensity. How then can a dwelling be made for Him who is omnipresent? How can this abstract idea of the Divinity be interpreted in stone? and how can men be led to conceive of a building as the dwelling-place of the God of the Christians? Yet the artists of the Middle Ages attempted this, and not without success. How did they set to work? They made their Christian church an epitome as it were of the Creation—an assemblage of all created things, visible and invisible—a sort of universal Epic in stone.<sup>32</sup>

Yet, when he came to discuss the Cluniac achievement, he showed that what he admired was the order's logical consistency. The Cluniac order had had a profound impact on architectural innovations in western Europe from the tenth through the twelfth centuries. The twelfth-century monastery at Cluny had stood as the largest building in Europe before the new Saint Peter's was erected in Rome in the sixteenth century. In another example of iconoclasm, the abbey, sacked in 1562, was finally burned by a revolutionary mob in 1790. For Viollet le Duc, who looked back on this history of pillage with despair, the artistic world of Cluny epitomized his rational principles: "In the literary productions, instructions, and constitutions that issued from Cluny

there is a logical consistency—a clear and practical intelligence which strikes an attentive reader; in perusing these documents, we recognise the work of lettered men, accustomed to a rational exercise of authority.”<sup>33</sup> Since classical and neoclassical style had become the measure of aesthetic value, particularly in standards set by the *École des Beaux Arts*, when Viollet le Duc uses the term *renaissance*, he is deliberately provocative. However, for Viollet le Duc, the Cluniac movement of the twelfth century was indeed a *renaissance*, but he saw it as a *renaissance* of unprecedented originality: “In these Clunisian buildings (but especially in such as were produced during the period called Romanesque), we already see the genius of the architect abandoning worn-out traditions and inventing new forms.”<sup>34</sup> His heroes are the Cluniacs, Peter the Venerable and the Abbot Suger, under whose guidance Saint-Denis was built, a building he undertook to restore.<sup>35</sup>

In contrast to the imitation of old forms (both artistic and architectural) that Viollet le Duc lamented had been installed in the sixteenth century and endlessly reproduced,<sup>36</sup> he applauded this “French” originality in the medieval period: “The arts developed in France, in the twelfth century, differ in all respects from those of Classical Antiquity. . . . In this art was manifested the special genius of the French nation—a genius foreign to the civilisations of antiquity, as it is to those of Italy and Germany in modern times.” What he calls the secular school of the late twelfth century abandoned the relics of classical antiquity and installed new principles of rational architecture based on reflection, which he identified as follows: “Equilibrium in the constructive system by opposing active resistance to active pressure, the outward form resulting only from the structure and the requirements; ornamentation derived solely from the local flora; statuary tending to the naturalistic, and seeking dramatic expression.”<sup>37</sup>

These passages from his *Entretiens* on architecture highlight Viollet le Duc’s views on the originality of the specifically French architectural and artistic imagination of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, revealing his own nationalist pride. Based on his intellectual idea of taste, which he identified as an “involuntary process of reasoning whose steps elude our observation,” he praises the works as “beautiful,” grounded in criteria that a Cartesian process of analysis and freedom from “prejudices” could discover.<sup>38</sup> He admired fidelity to nature, the use of local stone, decoration that reflected the local natural world, and statuary that was closer to natural reality. He was a nineteenth-century version of a structuralist who possessed a logical theory of the art of construction, for his dictionary refers to “functions, systems, logic, and structural equilibrium.”<sup>39</sup> He opposed plagiarism of classical models and advanced his aesthetic conviction based on the rational principle that Gothic was supreme over all other architectural systems.

Reading the records of the *Archives de la Commission des Monuments Historiques*, which describe the basilica of the Madeleine at Vézelay, one of

Viollet le Duc's most ambitious projects, one immediately perceives the way in which the architect approached his work. First, the entry describes the geographical setting of the site, and then turning to its history, it goes to its Roman origins. It is interested in the scientific, factual basis for the church, even dating the first mention of the relics of Mary Magdalene. The entry faithfully records the history of the building, begun toward the middle of the eleventh century and dedicated in 1104. Recalling that Saint Bernard preached the Second Crusade at Vézeley in 1146, the section then turns to the successive events that damaged the church. First came the fire of 1165 that destroyed the choir, not restored until the early years of the thirteenth century. Then Viollet le Duc graphically highlights the devastation of the religious wars in the sixteenth century: When the Protestants defeated the Catholics in the battle to possess Vézeley, they sacked the church with all the furor of fanaticism, mutilated the statues, burned the relics, and made the nave a stable and a threshing floor. By 1601 all the roofs were burned or destroyed by artillery. Around 1760 the monastery, now mostly abandoned, was destroyed under the order of the king. Finally, in the last paragraph, we get a precise description of the present state of the building at the point when Viollet le Duc undertook the restoration:

The *vandalism* of 1793 continued, without equaling, the *devastation* exercised by the Protestants in the sixteenth century in France. When tranquility was restored, the church of the abbey had become a parish, but it was deprived of means of maintenance. It remained without repairs, or at least without *intelligent repairs* until 1839. In the interval a new fire had aggravated the situation. In 1819, a thunderbolt hit the bell tower and destroyed the entire framework. The vaults of the nave and the choir were completely penetrated by rainwater. Most of the double arches were broken, all completely deformed. The walls leaned in all directions. Such was the ruinous condition of the church, that many times the general council of the Yonne department discussed whether it would be better in the interest of public safety to demolish the church. Finally the administration of *historic monuments*, which was then under the ministry of interior, resolved to make the greatest efforts to assure the *conservation* of this *admirable building*. M. Viollet le Duc was charged to study the project for restoration and to direct the execution of the work. (italics mine)<sup>40</sup>

The words used in this description highlight the radical shift in values over earlier times. For the Commission, ruled by secularism and an appreciation for the "historic" value of this "admirable building," the acts of the Protestants were "fanatical," and the final devastation by the revolution was *vandalism*. Instead, the work of the government office charged with a rational approach to preserving "historic monuments" elects "conservation" over "demolition" and "intelligent" reconstruction over repairs lacking *intelligence*.

The entries on "construction" and "architecture" in the *Dictionnaire raisonné* describe what Viollet le Duc identified as the unique aspects of medieval

building, but they also reveal his own commitments in architecture. He praised the Cluniac movement that led to the creation of a powerful school of lay builders and of groups of workers with a commitment to a shared project,<sup>41</sup> the individual creativity that was exhibited in the variation of forms from the single unity without tyranny in the Gothic style,<sup>42</sup> and the architecture's originality and departure from what was inherited from the ancient Romans.<sup>43</sup> Even though he believed much could be learned from medieval architecture, Viollet le Duc deplored neo-Gothic, the passion of the English, just as he deplored the unchanging forms imposed by the "modern academies" of arts that he held responsible for promoting endless neoclassical imitations.<sup>44</sup>

### *Viollet le Duc's Theory of Restoration*

In his entry titled "Restoration" in the *Dictionnaire raisonné*, Viollet le Duc reveals just how aware he was of the innovative nature of his work. "Restoration," he begins, "the word and the thing are modern. To restore a building is not to maintain it, to repair it or to remake it; it is to reestablish it in a complete state which might never have existed at a given moment."<sup>45</sup> He continues that this idea of restoring buildings of another age belongs only to the second part of his century. No civilization and no people in all of history have understood restorations in the way we do today, he wrote.<sup>46</sup> Viollet le Duc's moment in history gives birth to a movement that does not merely value buildings of the past but that also believes they should be restored to their "original" condition, which may never have existed.

In the remainder of the entry, Viollet le Duc elaborates precisely what he means by restoration. For example, to build a triumphal arch like that of Constantine in Rome with the fragments of the Arch of Trajan is not a restoration or a reconstruction. It is an act of vandalism, the plundering of barbarians. Nor is covering the remains of the Temple of Fortune in Rome a restoration; it is a mutilation. Only at the end of a civilization can one speak of restoring, or in the case of the ancient Greek monuments, of repairing. Thus, one can see that Viollet le Duc is not just thinking about repairs in a conventional sense, in the way, for example, churches might have always been repaired when a roof leaked or a column cracked. Rather for him, a rupture between the ages has occurred, a civilization has ended, thus forcing the architect to consider a whole new strategy with which to approach buildings belonging to the earlier era.

Again, recognizing his own time as having taken a rarely used approach to the historic past, Viollet le Duc speaks of philologists and their search for the origins of European languages; ethnographical work on the characteristics of races; and archaeologists who compare, discuss, and separate the origins of art in the whole world through an analytical method that follows certain

laws of inquiry. His discussion of racial traits shows he concurs with the racial theories emerging in his time. But, he also shows his prejudice in favor of the medieval period here: the twelfth century in the West was a true political, social, philosophical, artistic, and literary Renaissance (Renaissance is his word)<sup>47</sup>; and he attacks the “fanatics” who have monopolized certain historic periods exclusively. (No doubt use of the word Renaissance to describe the rediscovery of the medieval period is an oblique means of criticizing the *École des Beaux Arts* that upheld classical antiquity as the apogee of intellectual and artistic achievement.)

Why refer to this architectural quarrel about ancient and medieval ideals of architecture in an article on restoration? he asks. Well, already in the beginning of the nineteenth century, study of the literature of the Middle Ages was taken seriously, yet its architecture was still held as “bad.” The medieval churches had been devastated during the Revolution, abandoned, blackened by the weather, rotten from humidity, while the interiors could only inspire sadness. Viollet le Duc knew the scorn his contemporaries held towards the medieval period, yet with M. Vitet, first general inspector of historic monuments, he praised the originality of the beautiful and original school of sculpture born in the era. “Our imagination,” he wrote, “due to Protestantism, pedantry, and other causes, became each day less alive, less natural,”<sup>48</sup> leading to the degradation of medieval monuments. Nowadays, he continued, the work of M. Vitet and M. Mérimée, some of the most distinguished figures of his age, has led to the formation of a nucleus of young artists, desirous of possessing an intimate knowledge of these forgotten arts. Here, Viollet le Duc espouses one of his central tenets of restoration: it is the work of artists, but they are learned followers of the forgotten arts—a nostalgic reference to the destruction of the medieval guild system that had produced so many skilled artisans, a phenomenon that he lamented had died with the age.

Viollet le Duc singles out Saint-Denis, Suger’s pride, where the kings of France had been buried from the thirteenth century to the Revolution, which, because of the decision of Napoleon I was destined to become again the burial place of dynastic rulers, but more importantly, a museum of styles from the thirteenth through the sixteenth century. England, Germany, Italy, and Spain had already advanced their theories of conservation of ancient monuments when France, under Napoleon I, recognized the importance of restorations. But what precisely were the principles on which such work would be based?

Able to separate his feelings about the religious cult from his feelings about the building that housed it, Viollet le Duc argued for restoring the building to its original style, not only in appearance but also in structure. But most medieval buildings had experienced many modifications over the centuries. Here, Viollet le Duc applies standards of taste, arguing in favor of the oldest (or earliest) high Gothic period, suppressing, for example, if rationally required, a twelfth-century strata that was amended in the

thirteenth century. Any additions after this period were to be replaced with the earlier style, maintaining the overall unity of the building. Using words and expressions like “anachronism in stone,” “mutilations,” and “deformity” to characterize restorations that did not follow his rationalized historical approach, he praises the work of the Commission of Historical Monuments for having saved from ruin these works of unquestionable value. Speaking in secular terms of the original construction and the restoration projects, of the buildings’ beauty, and of their role in French national pride, he wrote, “These buildings, one of the glories of our country, preserved from ruin, will remain as a witness throughout the centuries of the commitment of men more attached to perpetuating their [the buildings’] glory than to their own particular interests.”<sup>49</sup>

Prompted by archival convictions and a positivist aesthetic, Viollet le Duc both rebuilt the churches and reimagined the medieval period. His *Projet de restauration de Notre-Dame de Paris* seems to adopt Hugo’s ideas, even though his restoration is regarded as quite radical. Patronized by Emperor Napoleon III and Empress Eugénie, his work did much to foster a modern post-revolutionary France in which secularism combined with the archival interests of the time, even while he offended specialists in antiquities who found his historical suppositions wrong.<sup>50</sup> But Viollet le Duc promoted a sense of French cultural pride, an essential element for the preservation of the buildings and creation of a patriotic and public spirit. Despite the controversial aspects of the restorations, the architect was busy repairing French monuments according to what he considered objective, rational aesthetic standards.<sup>51</sup>

Like the foundation of national museums and national archives in the period that identified, objectified, catalogued, shelved, and preserved items, following the same process as placing books in a library, the interest in the restoration of the discarded French Middle Ages was central to the emergence of modern France. Thus, Hugo’s project to save Notre-Dame de Paris, while recognizing an intrinsic artistic value in the cathedral, also contributed to monumentalizing it as an object for historical and cultural investigation. Hugo’s novel analyzed the process whereby the church as experiential cult center would become a museum, where the collected remnants of a dead past could be appreciated, observed, and contemplated, and where the consolation of religion was replaced by curiosity, nostalgia for the past, aesthetic pleasure, or archival work. Hugo’s, Mérimée’s, and Viollet le Duc’s interest in medieval monuments that had endured radical neglect was not only aesthetic. The restoration of the monuments (and its accompanying archival work that renewed interest in the history of the period when they were built) was certainly linked to building the French nation as a culture with an “indigenous” (or homegrown), aesthetically innovative, and ancient past.

### RESTORATION, ART HISTORY, AND CONTRASTS IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY EUROPE

Studies of medieval architecture had multiple purposes in the nineteenth century: historical education for the general public to bolster national ideology in France, or, as in England, to support religious renewal; specific information for architects engaged in restorations and stylistic imitations; and scholarly investigations, as art history emerged as a discipline.<sup>52</sup> The turn to national heritage in European countries as a cultural project also reflects the monumental psychic losses of the period. England's massive urbanization that began in the eighteenth century, by the 1850s, had dislocated half the population who were cut off from village and traditional lifestyle, and the displaced found themselves in unstable, often wretched city conditions. As they adjusted to urban life, the poor became the victims of this new economic and social world. When urban environments rapidly changed and signs of the old built environment disappeared, not only the poor, but England's entire population was affected. The fashion of medieval fairs; the taste in Gothic literature; the paintings, drawings, and posters of ruined abbeys; and the poetic meditation on ruins or empty villages can all be partly attributed to the psychic loss occasioned by this economic and social revolution.

England's revived interest in its Gothic heritage emerged in this context of rapid and ineluctable change when all that was familiar was disappearing.<sup>53</sup> On the continent, the ruins created by the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars were a visible sign of an absolute historic break from the past.<sup>54</sup> By 1835, unlike France, England paid architectural homage to Gothic and blessed it as the official national style by selecting it to build the new Houses of Parliament. Spurred by the Oxford Movement, the *Ecclesiologist*, first published in 1841, espoused Augustus Welby Pugin's architectural commitment to Gothic as the most appropriate style for church buildings,<sup>55</sup> while Protestant archivists, whose forefathers had vandalized the original Gothic churches, adopted Gothic as the most appropriate idiom for English churches.<sup>56</sup> As Kenneth Clark describes the English architectural situation in the eighteenth century, interest in Gothic was a symptom of change, but by the early nineteenth century, it emerged to characterize the taste of an age.<sup>57</sup> As England rediscovered its medieval past, Gothic emerged as the symbol of that time. Countless buildings expressing nostalgia for a simpler time went up imitating its style.

This turn is demonstrated in the number of books that architects, antiquarians, and architectural historians produced on Gothic architecture. In 1817, Thomas Rickman wrote *An Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of English Architecture from the Conquest to the Reformation*.<sup>58</sup> Augustus Charles Pugin's (1762–1832) *Specimens of Gothic Architecture* was first published in London in 1821.<sup>59</sup> Beginning in 1807, John Britton published an inexpensive series titled *Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain*, in which he laid out a terminology for

arranging the stylistic phases of English architecture (Anglo-Saxon, 597–1066; Anglo-Norman, 1066–1189; English 1189–1272; Decorated English, 1272–1461; and Highly Decorated English 1461–1509).<sup>60</sup> From 1814 to 1835, he put out another illustrated series titled *Cathedral Antiquities* in which he attempted to inform his readers about “our national antiquities in general, and more especially that of architecture.”<sup>61</sup> Britton’s illustrated work did much to inform the nonspecialist public about Gothic as a style.<sup>62</sup> Rickman, on the other hand, made a survey of English architecture from the “conquest to the reformation,” intended as a support for those attempting “accurate” restorations or to assist those planning new buildings in the same style.<sup>63</sup> Rickman, while identifying certain regional differences, however, situated English architecture within European traditions, arguing that the “national” styles (French, English, or German, etc.) are actually not contradictions but show that the buildings belong to the same families, a study of which contributes to understanding “the progress of architecture in Europe.”<sup>64</sup>

But it was Augustus Welby Pugin, the son of Augustus Charles Pugin,<sup>65</sup> who transformed English architecture and arts in the nineteenth century. His book, *The True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture*, published in 1841, is considered one of the most influential works on architecture in the century.<sup>66</sup> Essential to the early nineteenth-century reinterpretation of medieval art and architecture and the “architect” of Gothic revival, Pugin built, designed, or influenced the creation of monumental architecture, furniture, and artifacts in England, Ireland, the United States, and the European continent all in Gothic revival and following the syntax (mathematical and aesthetic principles) of the original style.<sup>67</sup> Of French origin (his father had left France at the time of the Revolution) and a convert to Catholicism, Pugin’s religion and aesthetic appreciation for Gothic architecture were intertwined. Baptized in 1835, in 1850, he wrote of how he came to know the Catholic faith: “I gained my knowledge of the ancient faith beneath the vaults of a Lincoln or a Westminster and I found it indelibly marked in the venerable piles which cover the face of this land.”<sup>68</sup> Pugin’s nostalgia was for both the style of medieval art and architecture and for its religious content. In many ways his work epitomizes how longing for the past in the face of the radical contemporary losses, whether due to the Revolution in France or the massive urbanization and industrialization in England, spurred the architectural renaissance of the medieval world in the nineteenth century.<sup>69</sup> As Pugin laments, “How many glorious churches have been destroyed during the last few years . . . for the occasional exercise of the national guard!” and at the same time, “factory chimneys disfigure our most beautiful vales.”<sup>70</sup>

Pugin’s role in transforming the architectural landscape of Britain was unprecedented, because it was under his influence that the major neo-Gothic monuments, including countless Gothic revival churches, castles, and the Big Ben clock tower were built.<sup>71</sup> Although disputes still linger about his



precise role in the Houses of Parliament, and Charles Barry was definitely the architect, Pugin's ideas permeated the designs.<sup>72</sup> Pugin's *The True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture* distinguishes English Gothic for its "severity" from the majesty of the successions of arches of the French churches, both peculiar to each country even though he argues, medieval "Christian architecture" was the same everywhere.<sup>73</sup> Still, believing in a nineteenth-century idea of nationalism as somehow inborn, he asserts national identity and patriotism as the reason to avoid foreign influence in English architecture. "Another objection to Italian architecture is this—we are not Italians we are Englishmen. God in his wisdom has implanted a love of nation and country in every man, and we should always cultivate the feeling; we ought to view the habits and manners of other nations without prejudice," he writes, and he emphasizes that architects and city planners should avoid cultivating "sameness," a trait he sees emerging everywhere and threatening to make everyplace in Europe garbed in a "nondescript modern style."<sup>74</sup>

By mid century, however, the more pressing concern emerged as the method, rationale, and circumstances that would direct restoration projects came to the attention of antiquarians and a new kind of specialist, the art historian. Here restored heritage potentially became heresy, and the natural course of destruction and ruin became preferable to the falsity of restoration. Goethe, as early as 1827, as pointed out in Chapter 6, had complained about how restoration projects turned into a travesty of medieval architecture. Among many who raised the banner protesting the crisis, lies, falsity, and profanation about the restoration projects undertaken in the nineteenth century, four figures stand out: the Englishmen John Ruskin (1819–1900) and William Morris (1834–96), the Austrian Alois Riegl (1858–1905), and the Italian Camillo Boito (1836–1914). The "picturesque," a word used by Horace Walpole (1717–97) to label Gothic, expanded by Uvedale Price (1747–1829) to describe the consequences of age patina,<sup>75</sup> and also used by Britton,<sup>76</sup> was one of the qualities of buildings worth saving according to a category of historic-artistic value adopted in William Morris's *Manifesto*.<sup>77</sup> "Picturesque" itself was a nostalgic glance to a simpler world that made certain remnants of the past a landscape painting. Recreating the past as something that had probably never existed, at the same time this imaginary past became the source of historical reflection. In the case of Ruskin and Morris, nostalgia seems the dominant emotion in their arguments about medieval architecture and artifacts. They dwell on the dichotomy between "authentic" art value and "historic" value and which should take precedence in efforts to save a monument, assuming of course that "authenticity" is actually possible, or that "historic truth" in a building or artwork can be reconstituted.

As this book has shown, at the time of the Reformation, the schism clearly had implications for artistic patrimony, for one party decided to destroy much of it. Simultaneously another kind of division described the differences

between the two groups in reference to religious art in particular that would resonate in the debate about the efficacy of restorations. For the Protestants, origins (that is, an idea of early Christianity before Constantine's conversion and the contamination of the religion by pagan Rome) had juridical power. So, under the assumption that early Christianity had no religious art, they labeled all church ornaments as "idolatry," which they chose to destroy. Conversely, restorations, under an equally "purist" ideology, were to be true to origins, no matter how hypothetical or historically flawed, and all intervening developments constituted a kind of heresy for the secular restorationists. For the Roman Church, on the other hand (as discussed in Chapter 3), tradition and continuity were the guidelines for religious practice, and this itself had implications for protecting or restoring religious art and architecture. This division between an idea of accurate historic reconstruction and continuing tradition dramatizes another problem in trying to understand the past, and more importantly the difficulty in developing a conservation policy.<sup>78</sup> As extreme positions, on the one hand, are the "purists" who prefer the least amount of intervention in buildings and artifacts, allowing them to decay naturally; on the other hand are "purists" of a different type, for whom preservation means whatever interventions are necessary to restore the building to an imagined "historical truth." Although this is not within the bounds of the discussion in this book, as an aside, to distinguish "built" origins in the case of medieval churches is virtually impossible because in addition to making extensive use of *spolia*, most churches were in a constant state of "being built" or being adapted to new liturgical and ecclesiastical needs or shifts in style. The changes from Romanesque to Gothic, or Gothic to *rinascita* styles are stunning examples of this pattern.<sup>79</sup> Under such hybrid circumstances, ideas of purity are entirely anachronistic. While it could be argued that this is a casual rejection of the past in contrast to the nineteenth century's scientific fascination with it, in fact, it reflects both a pragmatic and aesthetic appreciation of what could be carried over from the past and a commitment to the building itself, which invariably housed relics specifically maintained to link the faithful to the past in a continuous spiritual tradition.

Ruskin's "Christian romanticism" led him to revere the spiritual beauty of medieval church architecture, identifying the "greatest glory of a building" as "its Age, and in that deep sense of voicefulness, of stern watching, of mysterious sympathy."<sup>80</sup> In other words, he belongs to one extreme of the "purist" tradition. Thus, when he contemplates recovery of the architectural past, particularly as applied to the preservations under way, in "Lamp of Memory," he laments that because the dead cannot be raised, restoration was the most grievous destruction a building could suffer.<sup>81</sup> Restorations, in other words, like imitations, are similar to iconoclasm, a deliberate destruction of an authentic original. But Ruskin also adopted a nationalist idea about architecture, in "Lamp of Obedience," claiming "every form of noble architecture

is in some sort the embodiment of the Polity, Life, History, and Religious Faith of nations."<sup>82</sup> In the preface to the 1874 edition of *The Stones of Venice*, competing with Pugin's as the most influential book on architecture written in the century, Ruskin lamented how his own book had promoted so many imitations of medieval Venetian art and architecture completely unsuited to England.<sup>83</sup>

William Morris, Ruskin's famous student, founded the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings in England in 1877 to confront the destructive approaches to restoring medieval buildings current in his time. Funded by private donations, the organization is today the "largest, oldest and most technically expert national pressure group fighting to save old buildings from decay, demolition and damage."<sup>84</sup> It provides experts on restoration issues, acts as an advocacy group to save old buildings from demolition, and campaigns to maintain historic environments. The society's 1877 *Manifesto* directed a charge against the false and barbarous restoration activities that both Goethe and Ruskin had decried. Morris's categories for valuing an old building included buildings deemed "artistic, picturesque, historical, antique, or substantial, [and] any work that educated, artistic people would think it worthwhile to argue [about] at all."<sup>85</sup> Noting the lack of imagination in the architecture of the period, the *Manifesto* highlighted the conundrum of restoration projects: to what stage of the building does the restoration retreat; what is the aesthetic basis for such a historical reconstruction? Morris complained that unfortunately too many of these medieval buildings had been recklessly stripped of some of their most interesting material features. The final plea of the *Manifesto* of the society asks for the status quo as the "authentic building," thus seeking protection, not restoration.<sup>86</sup>

Camillo Boito, an Italian architect and author, in a quasi-manifesto of 1884, had even harsher objections about restorations. He covered sculpture, painting, and architecture, insisting about sculptural restorations, "No restorations; and throw out immediately without remission all those that have been done up to now, whether recent or old."<sup>87</sup> About painting, Boito was more tentative, but concluded, "Stop yourself in time; here is the wisdom: content yourselves with the minimum [intervention]."<sup>88</sup> With regards to architecture, he returned to Viollet le Duc's definition of restoration: to restore a building means reestablishing it in a complete state that may never have existed at a specific time. Boito called this a lie, a falsification of the past, and a trap for the future, stating unequivocally, "The first and inflexible principle is this: do not innovate even if there exists a praiseworthy purpose for doing so. Better to leave incomplete and imperfect that which you find incomplete and imperfect."<sup>89</sup> In his specific guideline for architecture, he recognized that conservation requires miraculous intervention: "It is necessary to do the impossible, it is necessary to perform miracles to conserve a monument in its artistic and *picturesque* old aspect" (italics mine).<sup>90</sup> On the other hand, if adjustments

are indispensable, and it is not possible to remove additions, restored works actually become contemporary artifacts.<sup>91</sup> Boito linked restoration to a kind of iconoclasm, a heresy that masks itself as heritage.

The positions Boito adopted seem echoed more recently by Paul Philippot, a Belgian art historian who was director of ICCROM (International Centre for Conservation, Rome) from 1971–77, who writes, “It is an illusion to believe that an object can be brought back to its original state by stripping it of all later additions,” mostly because ultimately the “original state is a mythical, unhistorical idea, apt to sacrifice works of art to an abstract concept and present them in a state that never existed.”<sup>92</sup>

By the turn of the twentieth century, Alois Riegl, the Austrian art historian, curator of the Museum of Decorative Arts in Vienna (1883–97), and president of the Commission of Historical Monuments, in his *The Modern Cult of Monuments* proposed that other values exist in an “old work of art besides historical interest.”<sup>93</sup> Arguing that concepts of time differ in pre-Christian, medieval, and modern understanding, Riegl’s conviction that time is subjective<sup>94</sup> directly impacted approaches to preservation, especially in the nineteenth-century context of restoring monuments to their imagined historic truth. For Riegl, besides their art history value, monuments had many other values depending on the temporal context in which they are situated. This would challenge the whole notion of preservation of monuments because if the value of the work is not strictly historical but artistic, then contemporary standards and tastes would dominate discussions about preservation. Clearly this is what had happened in the nineteenth century when restorations followed scientific methods to reestablish buildings as they were in some *ideal* and partly imagined historical form, the reigning aesthetic premise in the French reconstruction approach. In other words, the nineteenth-century French approach had blurred the difference between aesthetic and historic value.

“Age value,” Riegl held, was based solely on decay, as revealed in imperfection, and it appealed to the general population. In other words, the past was valued for its own sake, and the building showing its disintegrating tendency comprised part of its aesthetic appeal. Thus, in contemporary art terms, the building itself became an installation. This approach to preservation would require, as Ruskin had suggested, that the building decay as it would organically from the effects of nature’s forces.<sup>95</sup> Riegl viewed the desire to maintain the monument in its *unique* time period with all age signs removed as ruled by historical value, merely one among many others. “Use” or the practical aspects of historic buildings constituted another value, for buildings in use where people can get hurt have to be repaired. It would be ridiculous to leave such buildings to decay naturally, he wrote. Finally, for Riegl, “newness” value was cause for yet another alarm in the whole history of destruction and preservation, for the modern fascination with the new absolutely contradicts age

value.<sup>96</sup> Desire for the new would create the circumstances for another wave of iconoclasm, he presciently foresaw.

Inventors of an academic discipline, these art historians and art curators, observant as they may be, with the exception of Riegl, do seem conquered by a kind of Romantic image of the “authentic” and “pure” condition of the objects of their interest. Their repeated emphasis on allowing monuments to follow their organic course belongs partly to nineteenth-century nostalgia for preindustrial Europe and partly to “pure art” values adopted by art history elites. Both separate the medieval building or artifact from the context that had originally given it meaning. Pugin’s famous contrast, “Look upon this picture and on this,” differentiating a 1440s English town from an 1840s town, provides vivid proof of his sense of the decline of the “built environment,” with the prominence of smokestacks and the prison in his time.<sup>97</sup> Similarly, Ruskin, speaking on the study of architecture at a lecture for the Institute of British Architects in 1865, insisted that “all lovely architecture was designed for cities in cloudless air . . . But our cities, built in black air, which, by its accumulated foulness, first renders all ornament invisible in distance, and then chokes its interstices with soot; cities which are mere crowded masses of store, and warehouse, and counter, and are therefore to the rest of the world what the larder and cellar are to the private house . . . for a city, or cities, such as this, no architecture is possible.”<sup>98</sup> And at the dawn of the twentieth century, in a wistful look backwards, Rodin, meditating on French medieval cathedrals, also pled for continuity and for saving what remained intact. And no doubt with Viollet le Duc in mind, he lamented the folly of restoration, the idea that rules could reestablish what he called the glory of the medieval cathedral or its vital, “exotic” beauty.<sup>99</sup>

Also, in this context, we should recall the fascination with ruins that had begun in the eighteenth and thrived in the nineteenth century, prompted primarily by poetic and fictional works and antiquarian studies. In Italy, classical Roman ruins inspired the drawings of Giovanni Paolo Pannini (1691–1765) and Giovanni Battista Piranesi (1720–78), who combined architectural and archivist interests with marketing their art works for tourists because poignant scenes of ruins (demonstrating Riegl’s idea of “age value”) had seeped into the popular imagination. Northern taste (German and English) focused on medieval or Gothic ruins as the subject of drawings and paintings, as picturesque environments became the rage in the nineteenth century.<sup>100</sup> Tintern and Fountains Abbeys, both ruined by Henry VIII, remain stunning examples of this affection for the ruin in England. The admiration spilled over into advertising when at the end of the century at least three separate cigarette companies (Ogden’s, Wills’s, and Churchman’s) produced cigarette cards with etchings of English cathedrals and ruined abbeys, thus wedding the old to the new. The same impulse spawned the spate of artificial ruins that came to populate England in the nineteenth century.<sup>101</sup> After the Revolution

in France, the ruins that remained became vivid evidence of fissures in history, and as such, they emphasized that history did not follow any teleological imperatives: quite the contrary, history could be and had been radically altered through violence.<sup>102</sup>

*This page intentionally left blank*

## CONCLUSION

# MEMORY, REGRET, AND HISTORY: WHAT IS CULTURAL HERITAGE AND WHY DOES IT MATTER?

WHEN GOETHE CALLED GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE GERMAN ARCHITECTURE IN the last quarter of the eighteenth century (1772, before a nation called Germany existed and before the American and the French revolutions gave birth to modern nations), he could not have known that by the 1830s, both the English and the French would also be claiming Gothic as uniquely national styles, appropriating a trans-European idiom to a national heritage. Ironically, in Europe in the nineteenth century, recovering the medieval heritage became one of the cultural means to build nationalism,<sup>1</sup> even though the European Middle Ages had no political entity parallel to the modern nation. Nationalist sentiments demanded allegiance to the abstract notion of the “nation,” replacing erstwhile connections to place, vernacular environments, local saints and their relics, and a pan-European Christendom. The commitment of financial resources to building national cultures, coupled with European interest in preservation and restoration, did, however, lay the foundation for protecting heritage as a value in itself. Thus, even though restricted to national monuments, the preservation movements of the nineteenth century initiated the discussion that would lead to making national artistic legacy a world patrimony.

The developments of the twentieth century have introduced new challenges to the whole enterprise of preservation while raising questions about what defines “heritage,” or more especially “culture”; what should be preserved; who owns it; and where it should be housed. Those charged with preservation look with postcolonial eyes at what constitutes “cultural heritage” as a worldwide concern. UNESCO, since April 20, 2006, has adopted a



new convention that expands the definition of culture to include “intangible cultural heritage” in addition to the “tangible heritage” of buildings, cities, complexes, and the natural environment, already covered by the World Heritage Convention. Recognizing the massive changes under way due to globalization, this convention seeks to protect masterpieces of oral and intangible heritage, endangered languages and music, and living human treasures or traditional knowledge, skills, and performances.<sup>2</sup> This new perspective attempts to protect the rights of traditional peoples, that is, those who remain living according to age-old traditions. In tandem, the convention works to protect the rights of national provenance and the rights of people and places with immense cultural wealth but little financial support for it. Both have emerged as matters of intense concern as historic and archaeological sites are raided and pillaged while people are driven from their lands to urban squalor.

### LEGISLATING HISTORIC PRESERVATION

With the birth of a wholly new idea of “national history” in the nineteenth century, interest in patrimony in the United States had turned to the natural environment, a first for the world. Yosemite was created as a state park in 1864 when the land was donated by the federal government to California for conservation, but it was eventually turned over to federal management and ownership. In 1872, the U. S. Congress created Yellowstone, which set apart three thousand square miles in Montana and Wyoming “as a public park or pleasuring-ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people.”<sup>3</sup> An international agreement that reserved the land on either side of the Niagara River at the falls between Canada and the United States soon followed. The creation of Yellowstone as the first national park in the world began an international park movement, so that today some 1,200 national parks or wildlife preserves exist in one hundred nations.<sup>4</sup> In the United States, a special federal agency to oversee the national parks was created in 1916, when the National Park Service (within the Department of the Interior) began to oversee the 35 national parks. Its purpose was to “promote and regulate the use of the Federal areas known as national parks, monuments and reservations . . . by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.”<sup>5</sup>

In paralleling approaches to European historic and artistic patrimony, the United States made the natural environment into an important national patrimony for the pleasure and education of anyone who visits the parks, as stated in the law creating them. In contrast to the European design and to its own innovative approach to the natural environment, the United States was very

slow to protect its built environment. For example, the only U.S. home on the World Heritage List,<sup>6</sup> Thomas Jefferson's Monticello, was offered to the U.S. Congress—once in 1858 when Uriah Phillips Levy, an admirer of Jefferson who had acquired the property in 1836, left it to Congress, and finally in 1923 when the federal government waived its opportunity to acquire Monticello for the nation. The Thomas Jefferson Foundation (formerly the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation) purchased the house and land from the Levy family. This private, nonprofit organization, dedicated to U.S. preservation of the buildings and lands, receives no regular subsidies from the federal or state budgets.<sup>7</sup> Most U.S. architectural preservation in the nineteenth century was indebted to local heritage or national nonprofit preservation groups (as in the case of Mount Vernon). Although Harry Truman signed the National Trust into law in 1949, today it is a private nonprofit foundation, receiving no funding from the federal government and dedicated to helping local communities protect irreplaceable cultural property.<sup>8</sup>

Individual European nations were already confronting threats to their cultural patrimony earlier in the nineteenth century because of inner European colonialism and pillage (whether due to warfare, as in the case of the Napoleonic Wars, or the result of collecting mania and speculation). Concern about national patrimony in Europe led to probing the bellicose circumstances in which the antiquities of Greece, Italy, Egypt, and other ancient Mediterranean and Middle Eastern civilizations had been plundered in order to build museums and private collections in the European centers of economic and colonial power—the case of the Elgin marbles, acquired by the British Museum in 1816, being the most infamous.<sup>9</sup> Such theft was justified on the grounds that the “rightful inheritors of Hellenic legacy, in [Virginia] Woolf’s words, were in London, Paris, and Berlin,”<sup>10</sup> or as the noted American historian Garry Wills recently put it, “We are all Romans now.”<sup>11</sup> Greece’s 1834 law to protect its patrimony was a direct result of the 1801 spoliation of the Parthenon. The resistance to pillaging in the name of preservation has a long history. In 1892, writing the history of Italian legislation regulating artistic patrimony from Julius Caesar to the nineteenth century, Filippo Mariotti’s view was similar to that of Kwame Anthony Appiah’s remarks in a 2006 article on the pillaging of Africa in more recent times. Mariotti wrote, “Thus it is worth considering how each civil society approaches conservation of objects precious for artistic and historic reasons. America, most powerful in money, seeks to adorn itself with the spoils of Europe, and other places in Asia and Africa, where brilliant civilizations flourished. On the other hand, in Europe and elsewhere, there is a constant movement against destruction and spoliation of monuments and artistic objects.”<sup>12</sup>

In attacking “Elginism” as one branch of vandalism or iconoclasm, Réau in the 1950s had singled out the Metropolitan Museum’s “Cloisters,” dedicated to the art of the European Middle Ages, which possesses a number of

precious pieces removed from European sites, as typifying this kind of spoliation.<sup>13</sup> Such plundering continues and remains of great concern, especially in the case of countries that have rich deposits of ancient and medieval art and artifacts, like Egypt, India, Italy, Iraq, Peru, or Mexico, for example.<sup>14</sup>

Conflicts over provenance today are tainted with a similar bellicosity to that which fueled wars in the past. Just how widespread this theft remains is corroborated in the case of the recent recovery of an *entire* Byzantine chapel and more than 142 artifacts found in two private villas in Greece (2006). The thefts were linked to the high-profile trial of Marion True, former curator of the J. Paul Getty Museum, charged with conspiracy to traffic in stolen antiquities.<sup>15</sup> The example of Peruvian artifacts disappearing into private homes, never to appear again, is yet another case of egregious violation of international laws.<sup>16</sup> Even assuming some acquisitions are legal, the question of removing artifacts from their original sites still poses problems with diverse opinions on



Figure 8. Mid-East Egypt Antiquities, March 3, 2007, AP Images, Sphinx of Giza in the background, defaced in fourteenth century by iconoclast. Zahi Hawass, general secretary of the Superior Council of Antiquities of the Egyptian government, who poses in front of Sphinx in Giza, Egypt, March 3, 2007. Hawass told the Associated Press in an interview that if persuasion doesn't work, he will fight for a bust of Nefertiti, now in a Berlin museum, that Germany says is too fragile to travel. Hawass rattled the world's museums last week with requests to hand over masterpieces of ancient Egypt, including the Rosetta Stone, some for loans, others permanently. (AP Photo/Amr Nabil, File, AP Images 070510013777.)

the rights of provenance. Appiah—in confronting the links among nationalism, museum building, and historic pillaging, but also recognizing how “foreign” artifacts fertilize the arts outside their local domains—proposes a more cosmopolitan transnational view for housing cultural patrimony that would allow art works to flow from their source of origin, in other words, out of their “local” context and back again, much in the same way as literary works cross boundaries of time and space through translation.<sup>17</sup>

Garry Wills, in a recent review of a book on the Metropolitan Museum’s collection of classical art, adopts a similar argument. Referring to the Metropolitan Museum’s agreement to return “twenty-one objects to Italy, including the famous Euphronius krater, Wills undertakes to discuss the issue of provenance and opposes the return of objects to their place of origin on the grounds that this idea follows from a postcolonial ethic that values ethnic place of origin over a universal claim that “we are all Greeks; we are all Romans.”<sup>18</sup> But the claim that we are all Romans overlooks concrete economic differences and contradictions in approaches to patrimony between cultures that are patrimony-rich and those that have financial resources to collect, a concern taken up more recently by the historian of Italian art, Salvatore Settis, who argues that the United States collects at will, whereas Italy’s civic art collections are both historically situated and regional and the result of long-standing commitment to local values.<sup>19</sup> If we accept a universal ethic in regard to cultural property, following UNESCO’s premises, and if we truly are all Romans, all Greeks (why not all Iraqis, Indians, Chinese, Yoruban, Egyptian, Mayan, and Incan, for example), then perhaps cultural wealth and heritage is universal—but we do name it; we do identify its place and time. It does have origins. Both in the case of “intangible heritage” and “tangible heritage,” their existence stems from the places of their birth and continued performance, although with enough money, whole cities and temples, of course, could be moved to the Arizona desert (as was London Bridge). The removal of heritage items to new sites not only impoverishes their place of origin; it also undermines archaeological and art history research and knowledge in situ that has the potential to enrich everyone no matter where they live.

Also, worried about destruction, plunder, and neglect under the auspices of the nationalist ideology of the nineteenth century, many European countries had produced legislative and local measures to protect monuments and artifacts, natural patrimony, and historic city centers.<sup>20</sup> Strongly protectionist, major differences characterize the various national legislative measures, with France opting for expropriation of private property to safeguard heritage items and sites, as discussed in the last three chapters. The French Monument Act of 1887 made it legal to expropriate private property deemed of historical or artistic significance because the 1841 act, allowing expropriation of “enrolled monuments” under the auspices of the Minister of Public

Instruction and Fine Arts, had not proven effective in protecting patrimony in private hands.<sup>21</sup>

Britain resisted any such laws, so that at the end of the nineteenth century, Stonehenge was still in private hands. Anxiety about the effects of industrialization on the natural environment led to founding the National Trust in 1895, sponsored by three Victorian philanthropists, Miss Octavia Hill, Sir Robert Hunter, and Canon Hardwicke Rawnsley. Using the inspiration of the national parks movement in the United States, although it was a private organization, the idea of the trust was to act as a guardian for the nation and to oversee both natural and architectural heritage sites, with Sayes Court, the garden of the seventeenth century diarist John Evelyn, becoming its first project.

Italy is an especially interesting case because it did not become a nation until the last third of the nineteenth century, yet it has had a longstanding commitment to its artistic and cultural heritage on the local level, as many have observed. And outside of the voluntary *brucciamenti delle vanità* (burning of vanities) of Savanarola, Italy has never experienced the zeal of religious iconoclasm. We might recall that Abbé Grégoire wished that the French had a similar attachment to the preservation of its artistic patrimony.<sup>22</sup> Enamored with Italy's medieval and ancient legacy, Viollet Le Duc, during his long sojourn in Italy, wrote to his father in Paris in 1836, lamenting that the French are far from equaling the Italians in their respect for their historic monuments.<sup>23</sup> In Italy, he learned to prefer the medieval architectural and sculptural legacy that had never been damaged by hammers, fire, or vandals, as in France, to the classical remains.<sup>24</sup>

Italy is indeed an exception to the general pattern of destruction and mayhem of artistic and architectural wealth that occurred during the various religious wars in Europe.<sup>25</sup> Perhaps because the Italian peninsula inherited Roman building laws since Julius Caesar passed a *Lex municipalis* governing the circumstances under which a building could be razed or built, Italy continued a habit of ongoing preservation and use. From the end of the fourth century, a number of emperors promulgated edicts to provide tax rebates for anyone who contributed to the conservation of public buildings.<sup>26</sup> Casiodorus and Gregory the Great reiterated this investment in the "old" that could be maintained or reused. As Salvatore Settis, former director of the Getty Research Institute and now director of the Scuola Normale Superiore of Pisa where he teaches art history and archaeology, writes,

In fact, as in no other country in the world and first of all countries in the world, Italy has been conscious of the profound connection between its own cultural history and its own future. I said "Italy," and I should have said, the Italies, the Italian states before unification, in many of which, from the Pontifical States and the Pacca edict (1820) to the Bourbon states in the south, to the Emilian ducal states, to the Medici-Lorena family that

gave Florence its artistic wealth forever (1737), today the Uffizi collection and all the Medici palaces and libraries, the knowledge that cultural patrimony must be understood as a totality and thus defended has been most ahead of the times and acute.<sup>27</sup>

In support of Settis's argument, we could turn to the Papal States, which had a program of ongoing preservation. Indeed, it would be an egregious oversight not to point out that despite occasional serious ruptures with the past (as the destruction of old Saint Peter's to make way for today's basilica), the long-term commitment of the Church was preservation of buildings, including pagan ones, and spurred by humanist interest in the ancient past from the early Renaissance on, of sacred as well as pagan art.<sup>28</sup> This safeguarding activity also included ancient and medieval pagan and religious books and led the humanist popes, Nicholas V (1447–55) and Sixtus IV (1471–84) to establish the Vatican Library.<sup>29</sup> Beginning in the late medieval / early Renaissance period, from Pope Pius II (*Cum Almam Nostram Urbem*, 1462) and Sixtus IV (*Quam provida*, 1474), through the nineteenth century, the Papal States' mandates for the protection of secular and religious monuments from the ancient through the "modern" era became the model for the Italian state.

The papal decrees show that the popes were worried about more than natural degradation of the monumental patrimony of pagan Roman and Christian Italy; they feared intentional damage, theft, and illegal excavations. Declaring monument conservation and concern for the arts one of the most meritorious of the Church's duties for centuries, edict after edict prohibits the extraction of figures (statues, medals, inscriptions, intaglio, etc.) of any material and expresses concern that pictures, mosaics, manuscripts, and other writings not be removed from their sites. In 1802, the Doria Pamphili Edict, under the auspices of Pope Pius VII and resulting in his 1820 edict signed by Cardinal Pacca, listed seventeen articles regulating "conservation of monuments and the production of art."<sup>30</sup> This was completely consistent with the commitment to the arts that had fueled the defenders of religious art and artifacts from Gregory the Great and John of Damascus through Thomas More and that led to the Council of Trent's decrees covering religious art.<sup>31</sup> Despite the fact that the French assault on religious arts is in the background, the nineteenth-century edicts interestingly do not give priority to religious works, but cover Roman, Greek, and Etruscan as well as Renaissance arts and architecture and thus can be considered a papal monument policy.

These edicts remain the strictest set promulgated in the Western world up to that point. Italy modeled its 1902 monument law on the Church's edicts that went back five hundred years to prohibit spoliation and independent unsupervised archaeology and mandate protection of the country's cultural wealth from the ancient periods through the Renaissance.<sup>32</sup> The act was updated in 2004, stipulating that "any ancient artifact from a dig belongs

to the state and can only travel on loan," and no doubt added to the impetus for the return of the sixth century BCE Euphronius krater, taken from Sicily illegally, which had found a home in the Metropolitan Museum of New York.<sup>33</sup>

Europe as a whole did not follow the French expropriation system, the Greek monument protection law, or the Italian states' policies. In Germany, although each member state had developed formal monument acts by the end of the nineteenth century, no single law prevailed. Bavaria had an inspector of monuments installed as early as 1835, and strenuous efforts were underway to protect the natural environment by the end of the century. Prussia resisted the French centralizing approach, although it did have regulations about local antiquities as early as 1830, and antiquarians believed preserving and studying the national past was central to formation of national citizenship.<sup>34</sup> In 1902, clearly worried about yet another kind of iconoclasm, public billboards, Prussia had passed a law forbidding advertisements that disfigure the landscape. Indeed, in keeping with local concern for the immediate habitat, many of the smaller states within Germany represented model examples of care of the monumental legacy.<sup>35</sup> The Austrian Empire, Belgium, Holland, Spain, Switzerland, Russia, and the Scandinavian countries had no monument acts similar to the French model, but all had various royal decrees to protect artistic and historic wealth as well as local regulations. Sweden had a royal expropriation decree, dating to 1666 that put all ancient monuments under royal protection, meaning they could be confiscated from private hands.<sup>36</sup> Thus, turning what once was deemed heresy into heritage, in the decades preceding the First World War, as part of a nationalist ideology, many European countries had moved to legislate the protection of their individual national patrimony. This movement toward legislating national preservation occurred in the context of loss of former ways of life due to revolution, war, urbanization, and industrialization. It represents a legal effort to control the eroding link to the past; but because such preservation activities entail archiving and sealing off from the practices of daily modern life, such approaches to preservation also contribute to the rupture with the past, for they remake the artifacts, buildings, and even whole cities as objects of inquiry or museum property and site.<sup>37</sup> Thus both preservation and destruction are Janus sides of the same alienation from the past.

#### **INTERNATIONALIZING HERITAGE:**

#### **INTERNATIONAL LAW, CONVENTIONS, AND PRIORITIES**

The twentieth century, with its major wars, genocides, natural and cultural ruin, and a host of crimes against humanity, has shifted this focus on the nation to give birth to international agreements and treaties intended to combat human impulses to destroy or expropriate cultural patrimony. Although



efforts in this direction had followed the First World War, the agreements of the twentieth century resulted from the traumatic experience of the Second World War and the resulting anxiety about future wars. Although I have stated that war-time destruction is not my primary focus, it is impossible to discuss twentieth-century developments without including the foundational narrative of our times, the Second World War, which delivered a new world order and the potential for destruction on a global scale.

Hans Erich Nossack's *The End Hamburg 1943*<sup>38</sup> or Sebald's "Air War and Literature: Zurich Letters"<sup>39</sup> provide a sense of the horror and loss experienced by the victors and defeated alike as they gazed on their ruined cities and buildings. But it is not nostalgia for a lost simpler time that is most evident in the major memorial sites and monuments in the aftermath of the war. Rather, the unprecedented destruction of people and places has inspired memorial sites that record regret and express guilt and induce a sense of shame and horror, while simultaneously reminding us of monumental human failure and standing as testimony to the defeat of monstrously inhumane forces. Germany's monuments to the victims of its national crimes constitute a radical departure from the usual pattern of war memorials.<sup>40</sup> The Memorial Death Camp at Auschwitz, Poland, a World Heritage Site to symbolize "humanity's cruelty to its fellow human beings" and the more recent creation of South



Figure 9. The ovens at the crematories in which the bodies of European victims of the Nazis were burned at Auschwitz, Poland. Fresh flowers are kept in memory of the victims. (AP Images: 070417018598.)



Africa's Robben Island as a World Heritage Site, "witness the triumph of democracy and freedom over oppression and racism."<sup>41</sup> Both represent an entirely new approach to legacy. Despite the triumphal language in the World Heritage Committee's descriptions of these examples of contemporary approaches to a monumental legacy, in fact, the sites do record the brutality and destructiveness that humans have willfully inflicted on their victims, and at the same time they remain as traumatic reminders of human cruelty. Leaving the bomb-destroyed buildings as a grim reminder of the consequences of war, as Coventry Cathedral, for example, is another example of this historic turn. The recent restoration of the stained glass in the Lady Chapel windows at Wells Cathedral in England, destroyed by Puritan zealots in 1642, reassembles the broken pieces as fragments. In a modern example of using *spolia*, remaking the windows with the shattered pieces declares the fissures in history, thus leaving a record of what was broken while constructing something wholly new. Unfortunately, on the same occasion the painting of the Virgin Mary stuck on a pike to be paraded in a scornful procession is lost forever.<sup>42</sup> All of these preservation projects point to a radically new development in the use of historical monuments, one that remembers human moral collapse and dramatizes human tragedies on a massive scale. Indeed, they invite a comparison with crucifixion art, with the difference being that they recall entire peoples being tortured or put to death in the cruelest manner. There is little consolation here, and unlike the nineteenth-century approach to uncovering the past that was tinged with utopian expectations of building new nations and citizens, these memorials record the failure of nations.

Although the postwar conventions concerning preservation, written under the shadow of the cold war and the arms race, convey a fear of the inevitability of a future war, they all addressed destruction of cultural property as a pressing international issue. Already in a 1907 Hague Convention respecting Laws and Customs of War on Land, Articles 27, 28, 47, 55, and 56 prohibited pillage (Articles 28 and 47) and specifically required besieged states to identify the buildings dedicated to religion, art, science, and historical monuments deserving protection by occupying states.<sup>43</sup> Article 53 of the 1949 Geneva Convention prohibited "any destruction by the Occupying Power of real or personal property belonging individually or collectively to private persons, or to the State, or to other public authorities, or to social or cooperative organizations [is prohibited] except where such destruction is rendered absolutely necessary by military operations."<sup>44</sup> A 1977 supplementary treaty to the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, which became customary international law relating to the protection of victims of noninternational armed conflicts, also prohibited acts of hostility against cultural and spiritual heritage, including using such acts in support of an armed conflict.<sup>45</sup>

The Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (August 7, 1956) adopted the phrase "cultural

property” as a conceptual framework for identifying what to preserve, which it understood as both unique to particular cultures but also worthy of being part of a world patrimony. Articles 1 through 18 lay out how cultural property is to be protected in the case of armed conflict. As in the 1907 provision, responsibility for cultural property belonged both to the country or countries under siege (Articles 3, 8, 10, 15) and to those on the offensive, or to victors (Articles 4, 5, 8–10, 15).<sup>46</sup>

Thus, the Hague conventions, the Fourth Geneva Convention (August 12, 1949),<sup>47</sup> and the charters of the United Nations (UN), of UNESCO, and of the World Heritage Convention together represent an effort to prevent harm to civilians and to cultural property, while promoting international cooperation. The idea of creating an international body to protect world heritage emerged after World War I,<sup>48</sup> but it was 1972 before the Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage, under UNESCO, appeared. The charter for the World Heritage Convention considers any deterioration or disappearance of items of any nation’s cultural or natural heritage a harmful impoverishment of the heritage of *all the nations of the world*.<sup>49</sup> The convention emerged as a direct response to the 1959 threat to the Abu Simbel temples in the Nile Valley, called the Nubian Monuments and now a World Heritage Site. Carved in the thirteenth century BCE, during the reign of Ramesses II as a monument to himself and his queen Nefertiti, the complex was moved in the 1960s to make way for the Aswan Dam.<sup>50</sup> The convention of 1972, which emerged in the context of this threat to the Nubian Monuments, was dedicated to the preservation of both the world’s cultural and natural heritage. The 1972 convention built on other twentieth-century international conservation charters that testify to a movement toward understanding artistic and archaeological wealth as world patrimony. The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments (1931), taking as its presupposition that “the question of the conservation of the artistic and archaeological property of mankind is one that interests the community of the States, which are wardens of civilization,” expressed hope that “the League of Nations will collaborate with each other on an ever-increasing scale and in a more concrete manner with a view to furthering the preservation of artistic and historic monuments.”<sup>51</sup> The Athens Charter laid out recommendations for the protocols that could regulate preservation and conservation on a global scale, at the same time endorsing the maintenance of the local lived environment or context where the monuments had been created and revered throughout their history as their rightful domicile.

The Venice Charter of 1964, written to set out standards for preservation, was adopted in 1965 by ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites), an organization that would become an advisor to the World Heritage Convention. Called a “prose poem in celebration of heritage values,”<sup>52</sup> the Venice Charter asserted its global mission as follows: “Imbued with a message from the

past, the historic monuments of generations of people remain to the present day as living witnesses of their age-old traditions. People are becoming more and more conscious of the unity of human values and regard ancient monuments as a common heritage. The common responsibility to safeguard them for future generations is recognized. It is our duty to hand them on in the full richness of their authenticity." Referring to the principles of preservation and restoration laid out by the 1931 Athens Charter, the Venice version sought scholarly consensus for conservation that would establish international standards.<sup>53</sup> But we should be quick to note the charter's deference to "monuments," "age-old traditions," and "authenticity," all words laden with specifically European context-defined meaning that do not seem to recognize "cultural diversity," all problematic in their implications and all open to multiple interpretations. These criteria could not apply in all cultural situations, and indeed the writers of the charter recognized that different countries and cultures could use the document as a guideline to frame their own charters. Furthermore, in many ways the appreciation of this monumental heritage is profoundly tied to the fact that the very process of valuing it as art or as history can separate it from its origins, making it an object of "universal" cultural importance to anyone anywhere and thus undermining the idea that an "authentic" context actually exists. As heritage, many of these monuments have ceased to possess their religious, devotional power or ethnic and cultural authority, thus also losing their affective "authenticity" to become objects of interest and sources of knowledge and delight to a viewing public, who again, might be anywhere in the world.<sup>54</sup>

The World Heritage Convention (WHC) adopted the recommendations of the Venice Charter in November 1972 and undertook to protect World Heritage Sites precisely because of the limitations on national efforts. The WHC aspires to educate, recommend, and make available economic, scientific, and technological resources when possible for conservation of heritage sites, no matter to whom such sites belong because they are "part of the world heritage of mankind as a whole." Confronting "the magnitude and gravity of the new dangers threatening [world heritage sites]," the convention holds that "it is incumbent on the international community as a whole to participate in the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, by the granting of collective assistance which, although not taking the place of action by the State concerned, will serve as an efficient complement thereto."<sup>55</sup> Thus, from the national restoration movements of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, we have moved to a global network intended to conserve selected items of the world's artistic and natural heritage. Important as this development is, we should note that designating a place of world cultural significance removes it, in a sense, from dynamic change, while making it a static repository of the past, an object of interest, a museum, a site of pleasure, or a destination of consuming tourists, which introduces new

challenges to the heritage site. Thus, in this ideal status of removal from sites of violence or radical alteration, the heritage site can produce new tensions between past and present and between value as history or art and value in the economic marketplace, whereby heritage becomes a means of global commercial exchange. On the other hand, designating World Heritage Sites as those that possess “outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science” (Article 1: Definition of Cultural and Natural Heritage) defines heritage too narrowly, an issue that has emerged in the forefront of discussions of the concept of heritage and its connection to human rights. Upholding “heritage,” for example, as cultural identity may have the unexpected consequence of undermining minorities, as happened with the Babri Masjid Mosque, destroyed in India in 1990 by Hindu fundamentalists.

Clearly aware of this unintended consequence of apotheosizing “heritage,” the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a UN document produced in the years immediately after World War II, states, “Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits” (Article 27).<sup>56</sup> In 1998, in what is called the Stockholm Declaration, at the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, ICOMOS restated the premise that everyone has a right to partake freely in the cultural life of the community.<sup>57</sup> While affirming the duty of member states to protect this “cultural” heritage, which is constantly under threat, ICOMOS restated its conviction that cultural heritage is integral to human rights. Defining heritage as the right to cultural identity, self-understanding, wise and appropriate use, and decision making about the heritage, ICOMOS identified these rights with the preservation and enrichment of the world’s cultural diversity, an individual and collective responsibility for all peoples and nations.

Although the initial declaration clearly stemmed from the racial and cultural genocides of World War II, the elaboration of the fifty-year anniversary can be seen as the world body’s response to the great tragedy of the rapid disappearance of traditional peoples and societies, along with their “intangible heritage,” predicted by Claude Lévi-Strauss in *Tristes Tropiques*<sup>58</sup> as one of the legacies of the twentieth century. In fact, by UNESCO’s estimate, 50 percent of the world’s six to seven thousand languages are endangered. As local groups are absorbed by larger social and economic entities where other languages and cultures dominate, one language disappears every two weeks along with much or all of its poetry, history, and traditional knowledge. The loss of up to sixty percent of the world’s plant and animal species predicted by some biologists will also directly affect if not obliterate local cultural groups and the intangible cultural heritage of the learning, art, and memory they carry.

What is cultural property in this context, then? By the end of the nineteenth century, as a feature of the nation-building ideology in European countries, a culture of tolerance had emerged to support the preservation of

the heritage of individual nations, which came to be designated “cultural property,” the term used by the 1956 Hague Convention, which defined it as,

- (a) Movable or immovable property of great importance to the cultural heritage of every people, such as monuments of architecture, art or history, whether religious or secular; archaeological sites; groups of buildings which, as a whole, are of historical or artistic interest; works of art; manuscripts, books and other objects of artistic, historical or archaeological interest; as well as scientific collections and important collections of books or archives or of reproductions of the property defined above;
- (b) buildings whose main and effective purpose is to preserve or exhibit the movable cultural property defined in sub-paragraph (a) such as museums, large libraries and depositories of archives, and refuges intended to shelter, in the event of armed conflict, the movable cultural property defined in subparagraph (a);
- (c) centres containing a large amount of cultural property as defined in subparagraphs (a) and (b), to be known as “centres containing monuments.”<sup>59</sup>

This definition of “cultural property,” which upheld national “cultural identity” in Europe, applies more specifically to “tangible heritage” and specifically to the European understanding of antiquities and to civilizations that produce fixed architecture and fixed artifacts intended to be permanent.

Now more than fifty years old, this definition has undergone repeated expansion in response to ongoing ethical debates about what cultural “values” are, the effects of rapid economic change, and documentation of the rapid disappearance of traditional people and their cultural habitats. A more global perspective has therefore required a more ample definition of what constitutes “cultural property.”<sup>60</sup> Today, World Heritage Sites are located on all continents, while “cultural property” has been expanded to include “intangible heritage” or “traditional cultural knowledge” of groups of people not defined by national borders; and that includes “art, music, dance forms, images, performances, oral literature, handicrafts and other expressions of distinct and distinctive societies.”<sup>61</sup> At the same time, some have asked questions about what is actually excluded from “cultural property” with such a broad definition.<sup>62</sup> Furthermore, “cultural rights” can and do clash with “human rights” because “universal rights” and “local rights” often contradict one another. Because of diverse definitions of what constitutes culture, a concept that warrants a distinct understanding dependent on context, culture can include cultural capital (accumulated material / social heritage of humankind), creativity (a more individualist approach that distinguishes “high” [historic/museum] from “low” [popular or traditional] forms of culture), or the anthropological approach which would mean a “total way of life.”<sup>63</sup> If culture is the latter, universal human rights conceivably could and do collide with local customs,

just as local agricultural economies and local control conflict with global economies, the World Trade Organization, and other global entities like the International Monetary Fund.

Commitment to a “built” environment, this study has argued, is not new because we have seen examples throughout history of a similar concern for buildings, artifacts, and environments that both local communities and large institutions like the Roman Church have designated “sacred,” “historic,” or exemplary in some special way. Framing this conviction in global, secular terms that recognize the uniqueness of local particularities but claim respect for them on grounds of shared human “universal” values represents a dramatic new development. This is based on an idea of preservation that “modernism” discovered, in its narrowly defined national model, and that the second half of the twentieth century expanded into a universal model of respect for local cultures.

Today, the battle line has been drawn between those endeavoring to defend traditional resources versus larger national and international interests who would prefer to brush them aside. Like the Reformation’s assault on the medieval ritual life, today traditional cultures are violently banished from the stage of history. Famous cases, like the 1995 execution of the writer Ken Saro-Wiwa for leading the resistance of the Ogoni people against the Nigerian government, and the multinational oil companies’ destruction of Ogoni indigenous lands and culture, are examples of this contemporary phenomenon. In the introduction to Saro-Wiwa’s collection of tales, *The Singing Anthill: Ogoni Folk Tales*, published in 1991, he wrote, “The pre-literate society which these tales indicate is certainly gone; the Ogoni still fish and farm but their lives are ringed around today, not by spirits but by oil wells and gas flares, and the harsh crudity of Nigerian politics which threatens their very survival as a people.”<sup>64</sup> Another example comes from Arundhati Roy (author of *The God of Small Things*), who opposed the Narmada Dam project in India. She contended that India’s 3,600 big dams have “devoured 50 million people,” but the promised benefits have yet to arrive. Distressed over the destruction, she wrote of the Narmada Valley that its “civilization older than Hinduism, [was] slated—sanctioned (by the highest court in the land)—to be drowned this monsoon when the waters of the Sardar Sarovar reservoir will rise to submerge it.”<sup>65</sup>

In yet another case of similar resistance, Mount Graham in the Pinaleno Mountains, Arizona, sacred to the San Carlos Apache, was the proposed site for an international observatory. Untouched by “modern civilization” and isolated from one another for thousands of years, the plants and animals in the region represented “a treasure chest of biological diversity.”<sup>66</sup> *Dzil nchaa si an* (Big Seated Mountain) is considered a sacred site where the supernatural Ga’an dwell. The San Carlos Apache, with the support of many national and international groups, resisted the efforts to disturb their sacred mountain by arguing that the planned site threatened freedom of religion, a heritage preservation

strategy of Native Americans who claim natural areas and features as their shrines. Even though the courts ruled against the University of Arizona's observatory,<sup>67</sup> in 1996 Congress passed a law making it possible to continue the planned project.

Thus before concluding, we should not forget that although international agreements exist and international bodies like ICOMOS and the World Heritage Convention provide the expertise and mechanism to at least support places and monuments of "outstanding" cultural and natural value, these organizations remain only as forceful as the national signatories allow them to be. As German philosopher Jürgen Habermas writes in *The Inclusion of the Other*, where he wrestles with how a world government might emerge from our fractured political times, because the UN Charter both "restrict[s] and guarantee[s] the sovereignty of individual states," it remains in many ways a response to a transitional situation, because it depends on the "voluntary cooperation of its members."<sup>68</sup> Indeed, international, national, and local economic and political forces often willfully violate the UN, Geneva, and Hague Conventions on human rights and commit genocide and other war crimes, mistreat prisoners of war, and leave cultural property unprotected. Today protection of "cultural heritage" often becomes the charge of local communities and activists who must struggle against powerful transnational corporations or large national entities.

Furthermore, while the "globalization" of cultural values has led to the idea of transcultural appreciation and protection of a diverse world patrimony, globalization itself threatens to engulf cultures and local economies into a uniform, faceless, corporate homogeneity. In other words, it invites an entirely new kind of iconoclastic destruction, as the case of the Ogoni people highlights. As Paul Ricoeur wrote prophetically in the 1960s in *History and Truth*, "the phenomenon of universalization, while being an advancement of mankind, at the same time constitutes a sort of subtle destruction, not only of traditional cultures . . . but also of what I shall call for the time being the creative nucleus of great civilizations and great cultures [*sic*]. . . . Everywhere throughout the world, one finds the same bad movie, the same slot machines, the same plastic or aluminum atrocities, the same twisting of language by propaganda."<sup>69</sup> He could have added, in every urban area, we experience the same congestion, the same shopping malls and franchise chains, a similar skyline, the same advertisements, and the same graffiti, all new versions of iconoclasm and destruction of "cultural heritage."

Just as the mechanical clock finally rang an end to the calendrical life-style of earlier times, today climate control through air conditioning sidelines nature, and global access to materials and techniques makes it possible to separate architecture and city planning from local materials and climate, irrevocably undermining the role of the local bioregion and climate in determining the city and building designs. Simultaneously, to sustain economic

growth, the ideological interests of modern liberal economics and the material goals of large corporations dismiss both the older buildings and tastes in the developed world and the lifestyles of traditional peoples. In this situation, a return to the nineteenth-century idea of preservation as model emerges as elusive, and resistance seems beyond our reach. Furthermore, doubts about what constitutes worthy “patrimony,” even, or perhaps especially, in France, which contributed so much to national preservation, can paralyze efforts to restrain ill-considered growth and incoherent architectural innovations, shadowing the future with grim possibilities.<sup>70</sup>

In the monumental seven-volume *Les Lieux de Mémoire* (*The Places of Memory*), reminiscent of similar nineteenth-century laments, Pierre Nora makes an inventory of the places where collective national memory (French) is “incarnated” (*incarnée*) but is rapidly disappearing. This includes the loss of local, regional, and national celebrations; emblems; monuments and commemorations, besides dictionaries; archives; and museums. Viewing the acceleration of history, Nora, in a sense archiving loss itself, recognizes a rupture of balance as places of memory replace memory itself.<sup>71</sup> Debating “cultural heritage,” patrimony, and “intangible heritage” in this context of rapid and irremediable change contains an element of futility, yet it remains imperative to be observant, vigilant, meditative, and resistant to thoughtless assumptions about what constitutes economic and social improvement and change. Constant vigilance is required in addressing the issues at stake in contemporary approaches to cultural preservation.

Those who set out to deliberately exploit historic or natural resources, without respect to sustainability, context, age interest, or artistic value, are perhaps driven by the same compulsions that inspired iconoclasts in the past.<sup>72</sup> Politicians and economists and business interests in the United States and elsewhere have consistently questioned or blatantly ignored historic and nature preservation on grounds that it stunts economic growth. A kind of destructive impulse lingers in the background, disguised (and marketed) in utopian rhetoric like the “global and local economy,” “development,” bringing freedom of choice, “democracy,” “women’s rights,” and fighting poverty. To achieve their economic and political ambitions, like the iconoclasts before them, these social and economic engineers deride the notion of historic landscapes, vernacular or traditional architecture, and the need for nature preserves, as, for example, in the case of the Alaska Wildlife Refuge. Exporting the new iconographical symbol system of skyscrapers, the McDonald’s Arch, or Nike and Coca-Cola signs as emblems of progress can desecrate historic environments as effectively as a hammer-wielding zealot of the English Reformation or a vandal of the French Revolution. Such threats to built environments that invade even the sky remind us how nineteenth-century European industrialism redesigned the cityscape.



The 2005 World Heritage Convention meeting in Vienna addressed the crisis of the skyscraper that threatens to change every skyline of large and small city alike and on a global scale. Even the medieval Gothic Cologne Cathedral (begun in 1248 and finished in 1880, exemplifying six hundred years of architectural and religious history) made the World Heritage At-Risk List in 2004 because of the visual impact of the new iconoclasm, the high-rise buildings that dwarf, overshadow, or occlude, raising the issue of “who owns the sky.” Indeed, perhaps it is time to consider putting the sky itself on the World Heritage At-Risk List.

Economic, social, or ideological arguments legitimate the scorn for both tangible and intangible culture, imposing this new world of “images,” just as theological ideas justified the hatred of traditional religious artifacts and practices that iconoclastic movements sponsored in the past. Indeed, those who pressure for corporate takeover possess the same tendency of earlier iconoclasts, for they have a single view of the economic and social future that impels them to deliberately attack values that stand in their way. As with the iconoclasts, economic and political justifications clothed in palliative rhetoric direct their actions.



Figure 10. Israeli police officers patrol the Dome of the Rock Mosque (background), securing the disputed area of the Al Aqsa Mosque compound in east Jerusalem's Old City, Friday, April 20, 2001. Israeli riot police secured the area after Palestinians started throwing stones following Friday noon prayers. The compound, known to Muslims as Haram al-Sharif, or Noble Sanctuary, and to Jews as the Temple Mount, site of their biblical temples, is the most sensitive spot in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. (AP Images; Photo/Leteris Pitarakis, AP 01042002964.)

As Paul Philippot highlights in the conclusion to his essay on “Historic Preservation,” long-term conservation must fight the causes of deterioration of cultural and, I would add, natural patrimony.<sup>73</sup> Humans cause this damage, whether due to ignorance, neglect, or deliberate destruction, as in the case of the Bamiyam Buddhas or the redesign of historic centers because of economic and transportation needs (as in the case of contemporary Beijing, where the vernacular architecture has become the victim of modernization—just as Florence lost its medieval core in the nineteenth century to make way for the modern city).<sup>74</sup> Furthermore, because of warfare and sectarian conflict, even when designated World Heritage, historically significant sites remain vulnerable. For example, Kosovo’s medieval monastery at Decani, since 2006 part of the World Heritage Complex of Kosovo’s medieval monuments, was bombed April 4, 2007, which now puts it on the World Heritage At-Risk List. The most obvious example, although not on the World Heritage List, but clearly in the crossfire of risk, is the Dome of the Rock in Old Jerusalem, built between 687–91.

In another threatened undesignated World Heritage location, Babylon, Iraq, American contractors paved over a four-thousand-year-old archaeological site to make a helicopter pad while Polish troops dug trenches through an ancient temple. As victim of such spoliation, the country awaits a time when fighting has ceased and when its ancient treasures might be restored to something resembling prewar conditions.<sup>75</sup> Until these conflicts are resolved, Old Jerusalem, Kosov, and Iraq’s rich heritage—world patrimony, on any terms—remain poised to become victims of contemporary iconoclasm.

*This page intentionally left blank*

# NOTES

## PREFACE

1. See Wim Denslagen, *Architectural Restoration in Western Europe: Controversy and Continuity* (Amsterdam: Architectura and Natura, 1994), for an overview of this development in England, France, German-speaking countries, and the Netherlands. See also Randolph Starn, "Architectural Imitations," *Future Anterior* 2, no. 2 (Winter 2005): 75–82.
2. Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in *Illuminations*, ed. and intro. by Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968), 219–53.
3. See Robert Hewison, *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a Climate of Decline* (London: Methuen, 1987); Françoise Choay, *The Invention of the Historic Monument*, trans. Lauren M. O'Connell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 154–78, first published in French as *L'Allégorie du Patrimoine* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1992). David Lowenthal, *Possessed by the Past: The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History* (New York: Free Press, 1996), 1–30.
4. See "Epilogue" to Dean MacCannell, *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*, with a new foreword by Lucy Lippard and a new epilogue by the author (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999; orig. Schocken, 1976), 189–203; Randolph Starn, "Authenticity and Historic Preservation: Towards an Authentic History," *History of the Human Sciences* 15, no. 1 (2002), 1–16, for a discussion of these issues.
5. This idea of nostalgia in relationship to the past in the modern era is developed by Peter Fritzsche, *Stranded in the Present: Modern Time and the Melancholy of History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004).
6. For the fascination with novelty, see Alois Riegl, "The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Essence and Its Development," trans. Karin Bruckner with Karen Williams, in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, ed. Nicholas Stanley Price, M. Kirby Talley Jr., and Alessandra Melucco Vaccaro (Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute, 1996), originally published as Alois Riegl, *Der Moderne Denkmalkultus: Sein Wesen und seine Entstehung* (Vienna: W. Braumüller, 1903), 81.
7. "The New 7 Wonders of the World," online survey, <http://www.new7wonders.com>.
8. Paul C. Finney, "Antecedents of Byzantine Iconoclasm: Christian Evidence before Constantine," in *The Image and the Word: Confrontations in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, ed. Joseph Gutmann (Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1977), 27.
9. It was the first commandment for Catholics and Lutherans, who followed Augustine, and the second commandment for Eastern Orthodox, Calvinists, and Anglicans, who followed Josephus and Philo.
10. *The New English Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, 1970).
11. Abbé Grégoire, *Mémoires de Grégoire*, preface by Jean-Noël Jeanneney, intro. by Jean-Michel Leniaud (Paris: Éditions de Santé, 1989), 59–60; see also Dario Gamboni, *The Destruction of Art: Iconoclasm and Vandalism since the French Revolution* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997), 17–20.
12. Pierre-Yves Balut, "La double inconstance: patrimoine et conservation, vandalisme et destruction," in *Révolution française et "Vandalisme Révolutionnaire"*, ed. Simone Bernard-Griffiths, Marie-Claude Chemin, and Jean Ehrard (Paris: Universitas, 1992), 7–13.
13. Giorgio Vasari, *Le Opere di Giorgio Vasari*, ed. Gaetano Milanesi (Florence: Sansoni, 1973), vol. 1, 137–38.
14. A. L. Millin is considered the first to use the word "monument" in the specifically modern sense. See A. L. Millin, *Antiquités nationales ou recueil de monumens* (Paris: Chez Drouhin, 1790–99); see also Choay,

*Invention of the Historic Monument*, who attributes the term with this meaning to Millin (14); *L'Allégorie du Patrimoine*, 64. Later in the nineteenth century, Alois Riegl, "The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Essence and Its Development," in *Historical and Philosophical Issues*; also Gamboni, *The Destruction of Art*.

15. For a compendious discussion of the history of the image, see Hans Belting, *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image before the Era of Art*, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); also see *L'Image: Fonctions et usages des images dans l'Occident médiéval*, ed. Jérôme Baschet and Jean-Claude Schmitt (Paris: Le Léopard d'Or, 1996).
16. Johan Huizinga, *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*, trans. Rodney J. Payton and Ulrich Mammitzsch (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996; orig. *Herfstij der Middeleeuwen*, 1921).
17. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. Hélène Iswolsky (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1968; orig. *Tvorchestvo Fransua Rable*, Moscow, 1965).
18. See Rosalind Krauss, "Sculpture in an Expanded Field," in *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture*, ed. Hal Foster (Seattle: Bay, 1983), 33.

## INTRODUCTION

1. Trevor Cooper, ed., *The Journal of William Dowling: Iconoclasm in East Anglia during the English Civil War* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 2001), 155.
2. See Jaś Elsner, "Iconoclasm and the Preservation of Memory," in *Monuments and Memory, Made and Unmade*, ed. Robert S. Nelson and Margaret Olin (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 209–31; Dieter Metzler, "Bilderstürme und Bilderfeindlichkeit in der Antike," in *Bildersturm: Die Zerstörung des Kunstwerks*, ed. Martin Warnke (Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1973), 15–16.
3. See James Raven, "Introduction," in *Lost Libraries: The Destruction of Great Book Collections Since Antiquity*, ed. James Raven (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 1–40, for a review of libraries lost from Ancient Mesopotamia to the English Reformation, French Revolution, and China's destruction in Tibet.
4. Milbry Polk and Angela M. H. Schusster, eds., *The Looting of the Iraq Museum, Baghdad: The Lost Legacy of Ancient Mesopotamia* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2005), xii.
5. Oliver Burkeman, "Ancient Archive Lost in Baghdad Library Blaze," *Guardian*, April 15, 2003.
6. Roger Cohen, "The Ghost in the Baghdad Museum," *New York Times*, April 2, 2006, sec. 2, p. 1, col. 3.
7. Mounir Bouchenaki, the deputy director-general of the UN cultural body UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization), in "Grim Warnings," *Al-Ahram Weekly On-Line* 873 (29 November–5 December, 2007), at <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2007/873/cu1.htm>
8. Jeremy Black, "Lost Libraries of Ancient Mesopotamia," in Raven, *Lost Libraries*, 41–57.
9. See Robert Bevan, *The Destruction of Memory: Architecture at War* (London: Reaktion Books, 2005).
10. See Lynn H. Nicholas, *The Rape of Europa: The Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War* (New York: Vintage Books, 1995).
11. For the UNESCO documents, see the UNESCO main page, <http://portal.unesco.org/>; for Illicit Trafficking and Restitution of Cultural Property, see <http://portal.unesco.org/culture>.
12. "Religious Intolerance in Afghanistan," [www.religioustolerance.org/rt\\_afgha.htm](http://www.religioustolerance.org/rt_afgha.htm).
13. See Finbarr Barry Flood, "Between Cult and Culture: Bamiyan, Islamic Iconoclasm, and the Museum," *Art Bulletin* 84, no. 4 (December 2002): 651.
14. See Tapati Guha-Thakurta, "Archaeology and the Monument: An Embattled Site of History and Memory in Contemporary India," in *Monuments and Memory*, 233–57.
15. See Stanley Wolpert, *A New History of India* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 407–51.
16. Caption Cultural Revolution Poster, Unknown Artist, Beijing, 1967 at <http://kaladarshan.arts.ohio-state.edu/exhib/poster/pages/pages1/C14019.html>
17. Seth Mydans, "Russia Peels the Veils from Antiquity and Gazes, Awed," *New York Times*, Sunday, October 16, 2005, sec. 1, p. 10, col. 1.
18. See Joseph F. O' Callaghan, *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 204–6.
19. For the Nahuatl accounts, see James Lockhart, ed. and trans., *We People Here: Nahuatl Accounts of the Conquest of Mexico* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 122, 192, 212, and 224. This is

from book 12 of the *Florentine Codex of Fray Bernardino de Sahagún* and includes the original Nahuatl with an English translation, Sahagún's Spanish version with an English translation. For the Spanish "conquistador" version, see Bernal Díaz del Castillo, *Historia Verdadera de la Conquista de la Nueva España*, 2 vols., ed. Ramon Iglesia (Mexico City: Editorial Nuevo Mundo, 1943), especially 1:43, 284–88, 2:140, for descriptions of the "idols," towns, and sacred buildings, and 2:12–13, 121–28, 148–56, and 161–63, for the military tactics, destruction of idols, draining of canals, and so on.

20. Quoted in Robert Ricard, *The Spiritual Conquest of Mexico: An Essay on the Apostolate and the Evangelizing Methods of the Mendicant Orders in New Spain, 1523–1572*, trans. Lesley Byrd Simpson (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), 107, originally published as *La "Conquête Spirituelle" du Mexique* (Paris: University of Paris, 1933).
21. Clarification and a revision that presents a more subtle picture than earlier assumptions (cf. Ricard) about the conversion of Mesoamerica have been persuasively demonstrated by James Lockhart, *The Nahuas after the Conquest: A Social and Cultural History of the Indians of Central Mexico, Sixteenth through Eighteenth Centuries* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992); see also Jaime Lara, *City, Temple, Stage: Eschatological Architecture and Liturgical Theatrics in New Spain* (Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 2004).
22. For the English, see Gregory the Great, *The Letters of Gregory the Great*, 3 vols., trans. and intro. by John R. C. Martyn (Toronto: PIMS, 2004); for the Latin, see San Gregorii Magni, *Registrum epistolarum*, in *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina (CCSL)140–140A*, 2 vols., ed. Dag Norberg (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1982), Letter 11.56.
23. Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, *Florentine Codex: General History of the Things of New Spain*, 13 parts, trans. Arthur J. O. Anderson and Charles E. Dibble (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1970–82); Miguel León-Portilla, *Bernardino de Sahagún: First Anthropologist*, trans. Mauricio J. Mixco (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002).
24. See Diego de Landa, *Relación de las Cosas de Yucatán*, intro. and notes by Héctor Pérez Martínez (Mexico: Pedro Robredo, 1938).
25. See Flood, "Between Cult and Culture," especially 646–47.
26. *The Koran*, with parallel Arabic text, translated with notes by N.J. Dawood (London: Penguin Books, 1990).
27. See Robert Irwin, *Islamic Art in Context: Art, Architecture, and the Literary World* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1997), 89.
28. *Ibid.*, 81–83.
29. Arguments are overstated and complexities are sidestepped; nonetheless, classic statements on this topic are Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1991); for the medieval situation see Patrick J. Geary, *The Myth of Nations: The Medieval Origins of Europe* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002).
30. See Bevan, *Destruction of Memory*. The idea of "collective memory" ("*mémoire collective*") was developed first by Maurice Halbwachs in *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1952), published originally in 1925, and published in English as *On Collective Memory*, ed., trans., and intro. by Lewis A. Coser (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992). Also, for the role of libraries in creating or destroying collective memory, see "Introduction," in *Lost Libraries*, 1–40, for the fate of libraries in some of these cities.
31. See Flood, 646.
32. *Ibid.*
33. See W. G. Sebald, *On the Natural History of Destruction*, trans. Anthea Bell (New York: Modern Library, 2004).
34. Emmy Werner, *Through the Eyes of Innocents: Children Witness World War II* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 2000).
35. See Claude Lévy-Leboyer, ed. *Vandalism: Behaviour and Motivations* (New York: Elsevier Science, 1984); also Gamboni, *Destruction of Art*.
36. Published in David Freedberg, *Iconoclasts and Their Motives* (Maarssen: Gary Schwartz, 1985); see also David Freedberg, *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).
37. Freedberg, *Iconoclasts and their motives*, 25.

38. See Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992); and Olivier Christin, *Une révolution symbolique: l'iconoclisme huguenot et la reconstruction catholique* (Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1991).
39. For the term “symbolic capital,” see Pierre Bourdieu and Alain Darbel, *L'Amour de l'art: Les musées d'art européens et leur public* (Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1969).
40. See Bernard of Clairvaux, *Liber de diligendo Deo*, in *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, ed. J. Leclercq, C. H. Talbot, and H. M. Rochais, 8 vols. (Rome: Cistercienses, 1957–77), 3:109–54. For Bernard's views, see Conrad Rudolph, *The “Things of Greater Importance”: Bernard of Clairvaux's “Apologia” and the Medieval Attitude toward Art* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990); James France, *The Cistercians in Medieval Art* (London: Sutton, 1998).
41. Louis Réau, *Histoire du Vandalisme: Les Monuments Détruits de l'Art Français: Du haut Moyen Age au XIXe siècle*; vol. 2, *Histoire du Vandalisme: Les Monuments Détruits de l'Art Français: XIXe siècle et XXe siècle*, vol. 1 of *Histoire du Vandalisme: Les Monuments Détruits de l'Art Français*, 2 vols. (Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1959), . 43–45.
42. See James Simpson, “The Rule of the Medieval Imagination,” in *Images, Idolatry, and Iconoclasm in Late Medieval England: Textuality and the Visual Image*, ed. Jeremy Dimmick, James Simpson, and Nicolette Zeeman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 4–24; Michael Camille, “The Iconoclast's Desire: Deguileville's Idolatry in France and England,” in *Images, Idolatry, and Iconoclasm*, 151–71; Kathleen Kamerick, *Popular Piety and Art in the Late Middle Ages: Image Worship and Idolatry in England 1350–1500* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).
43. A. Richard Turner, *Renaissance Florence: The Invention of a New Art* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1997), 51. This incident, according to Turner, is recorded in Siense documents and mentioned by the Florentine sculptor Lorenzo Ghiberti.
44. See letters 9.209 and 11.10 in Gregory to Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, *Letters of Gregory the Great*, 2:674 and 3:744–46; for the Latin, *Registrum epistolarum*, 768 (for the first letter) and 873–76 (for the second letter).
45. Leon Battista Alberti, *On Painting*, trans. Cecil Grayson (London: Penguin Books, 1991), book 2, p. 60. The Latin is “habet in se vim admodum divinam non modo ut quod de amicitia dicunt, absentes pictura praesentes esse faciat, verum etiam defunctus longa post saecula viventibus exhibeat” (Rocco Sinisgalli, ed., *De Pictura* (Rome: Edizioni Kappa, 2006).
46. For an elaboration on this “admodum divinam” or divine power, see Louis Marin, *Des pouvoirs de l'image* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1993), 9–22.
47. Gabriele Paleotti, *Discorso intorno alle imagini sacre e profane*, Bologna 1582, with preface by Paolo Prodi (Bologna: Arnaldo Forni Editore, 1990), 98.
48. Freedberg, *Iconoclasts and Their Motives*, 33–35.
49. See Freedberg, “*Invisibilia per visibilia*: Meditation and the Uses of Theory,” in *The Power of Images*, 161–91, for a thorough discussion of the complex topic of the relationship between the image and meditation.
50. Bruno Ryves, *Mercurius Rusticus: Or The countries complaint of the barbarous out-rages committed by the sectaries of this late flourishing kingdome. Together with a brief chronologie of the battails, sieges, conflicts, and other most remarkable passages from the beginning of this unnaturall warre to the 25. of March, 1646* (Oxford, 1646), 220.
51. I am grateful to Professor Elizabeth Constable, at the University of California Davis, for this insight.
52. See Rem Koolhaas, “Preservation is Overtaking Us,” *Future Anterior: Journal of Historic Preservation History, Theory and Criticism* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2004): 1–3, for hints of this problem; and David Lowenthal, “Why Sanctions Seldom Work: Reflections on Cultural Property Internationalism,” *International Journal of Cultural Property* 12 (2005): 393–423.
53. Sigmund Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, trans. James Strachey (New York: Norton, 1961), 69.
54. See James E. Young, “Memory/Monument,” in *Critical Terms for Art History*, ed. Robert S. Nelson and Richard Shiff (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996; repr., 2003), 234–47.
55. See Robert Pogue Harrison, *The Dominion of the Dead* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003).
56. See *Lost Libraries*.

57. See Lowenthal, "Why Sanctions Seldom Work," who writes, "The impulse to collect is in any case well-nigh universal" (402); "toddlers pile up pebbles and shells" (402); for likening humans to animals, like birds and mammals who "save" "bedding and foodstuffs" (402).
58. See Bourdieu and Darbel, *L'Amour de l'art*.
59. Jürgen Habermas, *Religion and Rationality: Essays on Reason, God, and Modernity*, ed. and intro. by Eduardo Mendietta (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002), 84.
60. See, for example, Finbarr Barry Flood, "Between Cult and Culture"; and Nelson and Olin, "Destruction/Reconstruction," in *Monuments and Memory*, 205–7.
61. See Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989; repr., 2007), 4–5.
62. See Frances A. Yates, *The Art of Memory* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974).
63. See Jacques Le Goff, "Memory in the Middle Ages—Western Europe," in *History and Memory*, trans. Steven Rendall and Elizabeth Claman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), 68–80.
64. The term "Edict of Milan," based on Lactantius, *De Mortibus persecutorum* in *Sources Chrétiennes* (SC) 39, 2 vols., ed. J. Moreau (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1954), 48.1ff.; and Eusebius, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, 4 vols., Greek text and trans. by Gustave Bardy (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952–60), SC 55 (10.5.4ff.) refers to the meeting of emperors at Milan to rescind the persecution of Christians. But, in fact, numerous measures had already been taken to end the persecutions prior to the date of this supposed edict (313 CE). See Norman H. Baynes, *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church* (London: Proceedings of the British Academy, Humphrey Milford, 1929), 351–57; also see Elizabeth DePalma Digeser, *The Making of a Christian Empire: Lactantius and Rome* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000), 122–23.
65. Noel Lenski, "The Reign of Constantine," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, ed. Noel Lenski (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 72.
66. *De Vita Constantini*, in PG 20, 3.30, cols. 1089–92; translations are from *Eusebius: Life of Constantine*, intro., trans., and comm. by Averil Cameron and Stuart G. Hall (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 134.
67. Eusebius, *Das Onomastikon der Biblischen Ortsnamen*, ed. Erich Klostermann, *Das Onomastikon in Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig, 1904; repr., Hildesheim: G. Olm, 1966).
68. Robert L. Wilken, *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), 88–89.
69. See Mark J. Johnson, "Architecture of Empire," in *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, 278–97; John R. Curran, *Pagan City and Christian Capital: Rome in the Fourth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 70–157.
70. See Joan E. Taylor, *Christians and the Holy Places: The Myth of Jewish-Christian Origins* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 306–8; see also Timothy D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981), 221, 248.
71. Pierre Maraval, *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient: Histoire et géographie des origines à la conquête arabe* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1985), 245–46.
72. Jonathan Z. Smith, *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987); see also Maraval, *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient*.
73. See Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).
74. See Cassiodorus, *Variarum Libri XII* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1973), 3.9.
75. Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 1.25. See also Chiara Frugoni, *A Distant City: Images of Urban Experience in the Medieval World*, trans. William McCuaig (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), originally published as *Una lontana città, Sentimenti e immagini nel Medioevo* (Turin: Einaudi, 1983), 30–53, for an extended discussion of this topic.
76. Eugène Emmanuel Viollet le Duc, *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XIe au XVIe siècle*, 10 vols. (Paris: B. Bance, 1858–68), 8:14–34.
77. Master Gregorius, *The Marvels of Rome*, trans. John Osborne (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1987).
78. Francesco Petrarca, *Le Familiari*, 4 vols., ed. Vittorio Rossi (Florence: G. C. Sansoni, 1942), vol. 2, bk. 6.2, pp. 55–60; English version is in *Rerum familiarium libri I–VIII*, trans. Aldo S. Bernardo (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1975), vol. 2, bk.6, 2, pp. 290–95.



79. See Filippo Mariotti, *La Legislazione delle Belle Arti* (Rome: Unione Cooperative Editrice, 1892), xxxi–xxxvii, which quotes Rafael’s moving “funeral oration for ancient art”; Choay, *Invention of the Historic Monument*, 35–39.
80. See Giacomo Grimaldi, *Descrizione della basilica antica di S. Pietro in Vaticano*, Codice Barberini Latino 2733, ed. Reto Niggli, *Codices e Vaticanis Selecti* 32 (Vatican City: BAV, 1972) for notes and pictures produced between 1608 and 1619. The manuscript was formalized in 1620. A brilliant discussion of the history of recycled materials in Old St. Peter’s can be found in Dale Kinney, “Spolia,” in *St. Peter’s in the Vatican*, ed. William Tronzo (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 16–47, which demonstrates how much the “built” legacies of earlier eras were valued throughout the medieval period and in the new building; also, William Tronzo, “The Prestige of Saint Peter’s: Observations on the Function of Monumental Narrative Cycles in Italy,” in *Pictorial Narrative in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, in *Studies in the History of Art* 16 (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1985), 93–112.
81. Victor Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris 1482*, ed. Jacques Seebacher and Yves Gohin (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 107, author’s translation.
82. Emmanuelle Viollet le Duc “Réponses de Viollet le Duc à Mérimée, 23 April, 1843,” in *La Correspondance Mérimée—Viollet le Duc*, ed. and pref. Françoise Bercé (Paris: Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques, 2001), 279–80.
83. John Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture, the Study of Architecture* (Boston: Dana Estes, 1900), 15.
84. Ruskin, *Seven Lamps of Architecture*, 101.
85. Auguste Rodin, *Les Cathédrales de France*, intro. by Charles Morice (Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1914), 8, author’s translation.
86. Henry Adams, *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres*, with a new intro. by Francis Henry Taylor (1905; rept., New York: Heritage, 1957), 131.
87. Henry David Thoreau, *Walden*, intro. and annotations by Bill McKibben (Boston: Beacon, 1997), 188.
88. John Muir, *To Yosemite and Beyond: Writings from the Years 1863–1875*, ed. Robert Engberg and Donald Wesling (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1980), 70.
89. Glen Canyon Institute, David Brower (1912–2000) at <http://www.glencanyon.org/brower/browerhome.php>.
90. R. H. Marijnissen, “Degradation, Conservation, and Restoration of Works of Art: Historical Overview,” in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, 278.
91. For thorough and scholarly discussions of these developments, see Maria Piera Sette, *Il Restauro in Architettura*, intro. by Gaetano Miarelli Mariani (Turin: UTET, 2001); and Françoise Bercé, *Des Monuments Historiques au Patrimoine du XVIIIe siècle à nos jours, ou, Les “égarements du Coeur et de l’esprit”* (Paris: Flammarion, 2000).
92. For a precise overview of this problem, see Paul Philippot, “Restoration from the Perspective of the Humanities,” in *Historical and Philosophical Issues*.
93. Sec. 1, article 1, UNESCO World heritage Convention at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext>.
94. See “Epilogue” to Dean MacCannell, *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*, 189–203; Randolph Starn, “Authenticity and historic preservation: towards an authentic history,” *History of the Human Sciences* 15, no. 1 (2002), 1–16, for a discussion of these issues.
95. For the Enlightenment idea, specifically Kant’s, on universalism and proposals for how it can be made applicable to the present global, political, economic, and cultural situation, see Jürgen Habermas, *The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory*, ed. Ciaran Cronin and Pablo De Greiff (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998).
96. Lowenthal, “Why Sanctions Seldom Work,” 393.
97. For a discussion of nostalgia, see Peter Fritzsche, “Specters of History: On Nostalgia, Exile, and Modernity,” *The American Historical Review* 106, no. 5 (2001), 1–31.

## CHAPTER 1

1. Marie-France Auzépy, intro., ed., and trans. from Greek, *La Vie d’Etienne le Jeune par Etienne le Diacre* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Variorum, 1997), secs. 26 and 59.

2. For the generally accepted scholarly position on the Deuteronomic texts, see Martin Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, trans. and intro. by Bernhard W. Anderson (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1972); Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973).
3. Despite its position that icon-lovers were idolaters, for a path-breaking earlier discussion of this topic that argued that the sixth-century political crises in the Byzantine Empire produced a new view about the function of images, see Ernst Kitzinger, "The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm," in *The Art of Byzantium and the Medieval West: Selected Studies*, ed. W. Eugene Kleinbauer (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976), 90–156, first published in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 8 (1954), 83–150. Also central is Margaret Aston, *England's Iconoclasts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1988).
4. For essays on the reception of the Decalogue in Hebrew Scripture to the thirteenth century, see Ben-Zion Segal, ed., *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*, English ed. Gershon Levi (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, Magnes, 1985; English ed., 1990); Aston's discussion of the role of the Decalogue in the first phase of England's Reformation, in *England's Iconoclasts*, 343–445, when the Decalogue assumed greater importance than it had in previous centuries. Also, Robert M. Grant, "The Decalogue in Early Christianity," *Harvard Theological Review* 40, no. 1 (January 1947), 1–17, assesses the position of the Decalogue versus the double law.
5. For a recent overview of the arguments, see Knut Holter, *Deuteronomy 4 and the Second Commandment* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003).
6. See Joseph Gutmann, "Prolegomenon," in *No Graven Images: Studies in Art and the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Joseph Gutmann (New York: KTAV, 1971), xv.
7. For a discussion of the biblical prohibition and its historic application in iconoclastic outbreaks, see Alain Besançon, "The Biblical Prohibition," in *The Forbidden Image: An Intellectual History of Iconoclasm*, trans. from French by Jane Marie Todd (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 63–108.
8. This section of my discussion is entirely indebted to the work of Terry Griffith, *Keep Yourself from Idols: A New Look at 1 John*, in *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 233 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), specifically his chap. 3, "The Meaning and Background of the Term *Eidolon*," 28–57. Several other studies have been similarly useful, including Joel Marcus, "Idolatry in the New Testament," *Interpretation* 60, no. 2 (2006), 152–64; Moshe Halbertal and Avishai Margalit, *Idolatry*, trans. Naomi Goldblum (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992); C. Kavin Rowe, "New Testament Iconography? Situating Paul in the Absence of Material Evidence," in *Picturing the New Testament: Studies in Ancient Visual Images*, ed. Annette Weissenrieder, Friederike Wendt, and Petra Von Gemünden (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 289–312.
9. See Plato, *Republic*, 2 vols., ed. T. E. Page, E. Capps and W. H. D. Rouse (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1930 and 1935), vol. 1, bk. 4, pp. 412–13, vol. 1, bk. 5, pp. 532–33 (n.6), vol. 2, bk. 7, pp. 196–97.
10. See Terry Griffith, "Eidolon as 'Idol' in Non-Jewish and Non-Christian Greek," *JTS* 53 (2002), 95–101.
11. Again, this is all derived from Griffith, *Keep Yourself from Idols*, 32–35.
12. See Moshe Greenberg, "The Decalogue Tradition Critically Examined," in *The Ten Commandments in Recent Research*, ed. by J. J. Stamm and trans. by M. E. Andrew, 83–119 (Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, 1967), 101–102.
13. Marcus, "Idolatry in the New Testament."
14. Griffith, *Keep Yourself from Idols*, 50–52.
15. See Marcus, "Idolatry in the New Testament."
16. These ideas are derived from Rowe, "New Testament Iconography?" in *Picturing the New Testament*.
17. "It is in this sense that room exists within Pauline iconic theology for artistic depictions. Paul of course never addressed this matter directly, but his conviction that the stories of human life can be or become the *eikon* of God moves to reconstruct space in terms that tell the story that is God's *eikon*" (Rowe, "New Testament Iconography?" in *Picturing the New Testament*, 311).
18. Jerome, *Commentarii in Hiezechielem*, Libri XIV, in *CCSL* 75 (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1964): "Haec dicit Dominus Deus: Ista est Hierusalem, in medio gentium posui eam, et in circuito eius terras"; Jerome's Commentary on Ezekiel's text has "Hierusalem in medio mundi sitam, hic idem propheta testatur, umbilicum terrae eam esse demonstrans; et psalmista nativitatem exprimens Domini: Veritas, inquit, de terra orta est" (55–56).

19. Joseph Gutmann, "Deuteronomy: Religious Reformation or Iconoclastic Revolution?" in *The Image and the Word: Confrontations in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1977), 5–25.
20. For the bibliography on Deuteronomy and its vexed commentary tradition and its dating, see Noth, *History*; Cross, *Canaanite Myth*; E. Rivkin, *The Shaping of Jewish History: A Radical New Interpretation* (New York: Scribner, 1971), 18–19; H. M. Orlinsky, *Understanding the Bible through History and Archaeology* (New York: KTAV, 1972), 192–96.
21. See Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 285–86.
22. Gutmann, "Deuteronomy: Religious Reformation or Iconoclastic Revolution," in *The Image and the Word*, 14.
23. See Eusebius, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, in *SC* 55, bk. 10, pp. 76–120; Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum*. See Baynes, *Constantine the Great*.
24. For this notion of the god of battles, see the first two chapters of Peter Partner, *God of Battles: Holy Wars of Christianity and Islam* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), which lay out the biblical and ancient Near Eastern foundations for divine intervention into the temporal domain (1–30).
25. For a brilliant and persuasive discussion of how and why icons and the imperial cult became linked in the century preceding the crisis, see Averil Cameron, "Images of Authority: Elites and Icons in Late Sixth-Century Byzantium," *Past and Present* 84 (August 1979), 3–35; also, see Averil Cameron, "The Language of Images: The Rise of Icons and Christian Representation," in *The Church and the Arts*, ed. Diana Wood, published for the Ecclesiastical History Society (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 1–42.
26. For the English, see C. Mango and R. Scott, trans. and intro., *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284–813* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 555 (hereafter cited in text as *CTC*); for the original, see Theophanes, *Chronographia*, 2 vols., ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1883–85; repr., Hildersheim, 1963), 429.
27. Evagrius, *Historia ecclesiastica* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2007).
28. Kitzinger, "The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm," 103–4.
29. See Averil Cameron, "The Theotokos in Sixth-Century Constantinople: A City Finds its Symbol," *Journal of Theological Studies* 29 (1978), 79–108.
30. For a translation of the sermon of Theodore Synkellos on the siege of the city in 626 CE, see Belting, *Likeness and Presence*, 495–96 (496).
31. See Belting, *Likeness and Presence*, 497, for the translation.
32. Again, for an elaboration of this discussion, see Kitzinger, "The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm," 110–21; see also Cameron, "Images of Authority."
33. For the role of the emperor in Byzantine art, see André Grabar, *L'empereur dans l'art byzantin* (London: Variorum, 1971; orig. 1936), especially 123–243; see Robin Cormack, *Writing in Gold: Byzantine Society and Its Icons* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 96–98.
34. Quoted in Andrew Louth, *St John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 196. See also Barber, *Figure and Likeness*, 41–42; Kitzinger, "Cult of Images," 121.
35. Stephen Gero, "Notes on Byzantine Iconoclasm in the Eighth Century," *Byzantion* 44 (1974), 42.
36. For a recent annotated survey of the material evidence including architecture, art works, manuscripts, textiles, coins, metalwork, and written documents, see Leslie Brubaker and John Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (ca. 680–850): The Sources* (Aldershot Hampshire, UK: Ashgate, 2001); Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine 2. The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600–1700)* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), 91–93; George Ostrogorsky, "The Early Byzantine State: Its Developments and Characteristics," *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. Joan Hussey (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956), 324–610.
37. Judith Herrin, "The Context of Iconoclast Reform," in *Iconoclasm*, ed. Anthony Bryer and Judith Herrin (Birmingham, England: University of Birmingham Centre for Byzantine Studies, 1977), 15–20.
38. See, for example, Milton V. Anastos, "The Ethical Theory of Images Formulated by the Iconoclasts in 754 and 815," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 8 (1954), 151–60; Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, 160ff.
39. For a thorough review of all the possible influences, see L. W. Barnard, *The Graeco-Roman and Oriental Background of the Iconoclastic Controversy* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974); Stephen Gero, "Notes on Byzantine Iconoclasm in the Eighth Century," 23–42.
40. See Barnard, *The Graeco-Roman and Oriental Background*, 10–33.

41. For a modern argument that supports this view, see André Grabar, *L'Iconoclisme Byzantin: Le Dossier Archéologique* (Paris: Flammarion, 1984), 116–20.
42. For the texts of the Second Council of Nicaea, see *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2 vols., ed. Norman P. Tanner, S. J., with original text established by G. Alberigo, J. A. Dossetti, P. P. Joannou, C. Leonardi, and P. Prodi (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1990), 1:133–56; for attributing the crisis to a Jewish-Moslem conspiracy, see “Acts of Seventh Ecumenical Council (787),” in Cyril Mango, *The Art of the Byzantine Empire, 312–1453*, in *Sources and Documents in the History of Art* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1972), 150–51. For a contrary view, see Gero, “Notes on Byzantine Iconoclasm in the Eighth Century,” 36; Peter Brown, “A Dark-Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy,” *English Historical Review* 346 (January 1973), 1; Ambrosios Giakalis, *Images of the Divine: The Theology of Icons at the Seventh Ecumenical Council* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 6.
43. See Brown, “A Dark-Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy,” 1; Charles Barber, *Figure and Likeness: On the Limits of Representation in Byzantine Iconoclasm* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002), 39–81.
44. See, for example, Patrick Henry, “What was the Iconoclastic Controversy About?” *Church History* 45 (1976): 16–31; Brown, “A Dark-Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy,” 1–34; Barber, *Figure and Likeness*, 7–37. See also, Giakalis, *Images of the Divine*, 1–21.
45. See Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition* 2, who labels this dispute a new version of the christological debates (91); Giakalis, *Images of the Divine*, 93–113.
46. Brown, “A Dark-Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy,” 19–21.
47. Cameron, “The Language of Images: The Rise of Icons and Christian Representation,” in *Church and the Arts*.
48. For selected pieces from the letters ascribed to Gregory II, see *Textus Byzantinos ad iconomachiam pertinentes*, ed. Herman Hennepf (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), 34–35; see also Giakalis, *Images of the Divine*, 1–21; Gero, “Notes on Byzantine Iconoclasm in the Eighth Century,” 23–42; Brown, “A Dark-Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy”; Henry, “What was the Iconoclastic Controversy About?”
49. For the political and military context of the period, for primary information, see Theophanes, *Chronographia*, who reports on all the wars and assaults that were regular occurrences in the Eastern empire; also see Herrin, “The Context of Iconoclast Reform,” 15–20.
50. For aspects of this story, see Mango, “Historical Introduction,” in *Iconoclasm*, 1–6; John A. McGuckin, “The Theology of Images and the Legitimation of Power in Eighth Century Byzantium,” *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 37 (1993), 39–58; Louth, *St. John Damascene*, 193–95. For a recent challenge to the truth of the story, see Marie-France Auzépy, “La destruction de l’icône du Christ de la Chalché par Léon III: propagande ou réalité?” *Byzantion* 60 (1990), 445–92.
51. Edwin Hanson Freshfield, trans., *A Manual of Roman Law: The Ecloga* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926), 66 (hereafter cited in text as *Manual of Roman Law*).
52. Gero, “Notes on Byzantine Iconoclasm,” 42.
53. Louth, *St. John Damascene*, 5.
54. Quoted from “Treatise 1,” in *Three Treatises On the Divine Images*, trans. and intro. by Andrew Louth (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2003), 20; for the original, see *PG* 94, col. 1232A–1420B; or Hennepf, *Textus Byzantinos*, 85–86; for an earlier translation, see Saint John of Damascus, *On the Divine Images: Three Apologies Against Those Who Attack the Divine Images*, trans. David Anderson (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1980). For discussion, see McGuckin, “The Theology of Images,” 42–43; Gero, “Notes on Byzantine Iconoclasm in the Eighth Century,” 42; Louth, *St. John Damascene*, 193–222.
55. *Three Treatises On the Divine Images*, 60.
56. For a brilliant discussion of these concepts in the Byzantine conflict, see Louth, *St. John Damascene*, 193–222.
57. Giakalis, *Images of the Divine*, 8.
58. See Hennepf, *Textus Byzantinos*, 35, sec. 82; and *PG* 98, col. 148–56, for the primary texts; see *Chronicle of Theophanes* for his version of this history and what can be proven in its allegations (563–66). For the status of the argument about the authenticity of the letters, see Brubaker and Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era*, 277.
59. See *PG* 98, col. 80; Mango, “Historical Introduction,” *Iconoclasm*, 3.
60. Hennepf, *Textus Byzantinos*, 34, sec. 77.

61. Mango, "Historical Introduction," in *Iconoclasm*, 4; Cormack, *Writing in Gold*.
62. As quoted in Mango, *Art of the Byzantine Empire*, 167–68; for the Greek text, see Hennephof, *Textus Byzantinos*, 63, sec. 208.
63. For the anathemas, see Hennephof, *Textus Byzantinos*, 74–78, secs. 249–64. For the specific quote above, see Mango, *Art of the Byzantine Empire*, 167–68; for the Greek text, see Hennephof, *Textus Byzantinos*, 76, sec. 262.
64. Francesco Cognasso, *Bisanzio: Storia di una Civiltà* (Varese: dall' Oglgio, 1976), 156–63.
65. *La Vie d'Étienne le Jeune par Étienne le Diacre*. Section references appear in parenthesis after each citation to this work.
66. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 1:135–36.
67. For the original, see Hennephof, *Textus*, 79–80, sec. 265; English as quoted in *Iconoclasm*, 184.
68. See Nicéphore, *Discours contre les Iconoclastes*, trans. and notes by Marie-José Mondzain-Baudinet (Paris: Éditions Klincksieck, 1989).
69. See Nicéphore, "Troisième Antirrhétique," *Discours contre les Iconoclastes*, 183–296.
70. See David Freedberg, "The Structure of Byzantine and European Iconoclasm," in *Iconoclasm*, 165–77.
71. Cameron, "The Language of Images," 29–42.
72. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 1:137.

## CHAPTER 2

1. Andreas Karlstadt, "On the Removal of Images," in *A Reformation Debate: Karlstadt, Emser, and Eck on Sacred Images. Three Treatises in Translation*, 2nd ed., trans. and intro. by Bryan D. Mangrum and Giuseppe Scavizzi (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 1998), 40–41. Karlstadt's original is "Von Abtuhung der Bylder"; Hieronymus Emser, "Das Man der heyligen Bilder in der Kirchen nit Abthon, noch unehren soll und das sie in der Schrifft nyndert verbotten seyn"; and Johannes Eck, "De non tollendis Christi et sanctorum imaginibus" (hereafter cited in text as Karlstadt, Emser, or Eck).
2. See Christensen, "Patterns of Iconoclasm," in *Image and the Word*, 127; for the primary text, see *Basler Chroniken herausgegeben von der historischen gesellschaft in Basel* (Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel, 1872), 1:88.
3. See John C. Olin, *The Catholic Reformation: Savonarola to Ignatius Loyola. Reform in the Church 1495–1540* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 1–15; for a series of essays on various aspects of Savonarola's reform movement, see A. Fontes, J.-L. Fournel, and M. Plaisance, ed. *Savonarole: Enjeux, Débats, Questions. Actes du Colloque International* (Paris: Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1997).
4. See Freedberg, "Structure of Byzantine and European Iconoclasm"; Carl C. Christensen, *Art and the Reformation in Germany* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1979); Carl C. Christensen, "Patterns of Iconoclasm in the Early Reformation: Strasbourg and Basel," in *The Image and the Word*, 107–47; Carlos M. N. Eire, *War Against the Idols: The Reformation of Worship from Erasmus to Calvin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); John Phillips, *The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England, 1535–1660* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973); Lee Palmer Wandel, *Voracious Idols and Violent Hands: Iconoclasm in Reformation Zurich, Strasbourg, and Basel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
5. See the brilliant work of Margaret Aston, *Faith and Fire: Popular and Unpopular Religion, 1350–1600* (London: Hambledon, 1993), 261–89; Margaret Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*.
6. This is a very complex topic outside the boundaries of this study, but see Ann Freeman, "Scripture and Images in the *Libri Carolini*," in *Testo e Immagine nell'Alto Medioevo 1* (Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1994), 163–88; for the text, see Ann Freeman, ed. *Opus Caroli Regis Contra Synodum (Libri Carolini)* (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1998), especially books 1, 2, and 4. Also see Herbert L. Kessler, "'Facies Bibliothecae Revelata': Carolingian Art as Spiritual Seeing," in *Testo e Immagine nell'Alto Medioevo 2*, 533–84; Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 47–61. Belting, *Likeness and Presence*, provides a synopsis of the pertinent parts (533–34).
7. Freeman, "Scripture and Images in the *Libri Carolini*."
8. For Calvin's iconoclasm and the tradition he turns to, see Besançon, *Forbidden Image*, 185–90.
9. "Introduction," *A Reformation Debate*, 1.
10. "Introduction," *A Reformation Debate*, 4.

11. John Foxe, *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, 8 vols., ed. Rev. George Townsend and Rev. Stephen Reed Cattle (London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1837–41) (hereafter cited in text as *Foxe*, followed by volume number, then page number).
12. For the creation of an exotic and dangerous Middle East in the Western imagination, see Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1979); see also John M. Ganim, *Medievalism and Orientalism: Three Essays on Literature, Architecture and Cultural Identity* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005) for an elaboration of the mystification of the Middle Ages along parallel lines with “orientalism” in the nineteenth century.
13. Among whom are Margaret Aston, Patrick Collinson, Eamon Duffy, Ronald Hutton, Peter Lake, John Morrill, John Phillips, Tessa Watt, and more recently Julie Spraggon.
14. See Christensen, *Art and the Reformation in Germany*, specifically chap. 2; Christensen, “Patterns of Iconoclasm in the Early Reformation: Strasbourg and Basel,” in *The Image and the Word*, 107; Eire, *War Against the Idols*, 66–73; Phillips, *The Reformation of Images*, 108; Wandel, *Voracious Idols and Violent Hands*, 7–8.
15. See Belting, *Likeness and Presence* for a version of the sermon (546).
16. Christensen, *Art and the Reformation*, 35, 40–41.
17. Christensen, “Patterns of Iconoclasm,” in *Image and the Word*, 108.
18. See Phillips, *Reformation of Images*, 48–49, 52 *passim*.
19. Desiderius Erasmus, *Opus Epistolarum Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*, ed. P. S. Allen and H. M. Allen (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992, repr., 1934), vol. 8, no. 2175, no. 2176, pp. 190–92, and no. 2158, pp. 161–64.
20. *Epistolarum Desiderii Erasmi*, vol. 8, no. 2158, pp. 162 (161–65).
21. “Utinam contingat rerum tranquillitas! Placet hec civitas bene morata; non audio quemquam de quocumque male loqui,” from letter no. 2151 to Boniface Amerbach, written from Freiberg (1529) in *Epistolarum Desiderii Erasmi*, 8:139.
22. See *Epistolarum Desiderii Erasmi*, vol. 5, letter no. 1293, p. 77, and no. 1274, pp. 44–47; E. Panofsky, “Erasmus and the Visual Arts,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 32 (1969), 207.
23. Images of the “crucified Christ” were uncommon in Gregory’s time, and they were definitely not a central icon on or over the altar as they became from the twelfth century onwards. In Gregory’s time the Good Shepherd or the Risen Christ were more common images of Jesus. See Robin Margaret Jensen, *Understanding Early Christian Art* (London: Routledge, 2000), 130–55.
24. See Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin, eds. *Tudor Royal Proclamations: The Early Tudors (1485–1553)* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1964), 1:193–97.
25. See Aston, *England’s Iconoclasts*, 201, 210–19.
26. Thomas More, *A Dialogue Concerning Heresies*, in *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, vol. 6, pt. 1 and 2, ed. Thomas M. C. Lawler, Germain Marc’Hadour, and Richard C. Marius (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981) (hereafter cited as *DCH*).
27. For example, see Simpson, “The Rule of the Medieval Imagination,” in *Images, Idolatry, and Iconoclasm*; Sarah Stanbury, “The Vivacity of Images: St Katherine, Knighton’s Lollards, and the Breaking of Idols,” in *Images, Idolatry, and Iconoclasm*, 131–50; and Camille, “The Iconoclast’s Desire: Deguileville’s Idolatry in France and England,” in *Images, Idolatry, and Iconoclasm*, 151–71.
28. See Richard Rex, “The English Campaign Against Luther in the 1520s,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 39 (1989), 85–106.
29. “Enforcing Statutes Against Heresy; Prohibiting Unlicensed Preaching, Heretical Books,” in *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 1:181–86.
30. See Rex, “The English Campaign Against Luther in the 1520s,” 85–106.
31. Again, I defer to Aston, *England’s Iconoclasts*, 220–46, 294–342.
32. For an elaboration of this, see G. R. Elton, *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government: Papers and Reviews 1946–1972*, vol. 1 of *Tudor Politics/Tudor Government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 173–88; see also G. R. Elton, *Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972). For Cromwell’s career, see Robert Hutchinson, *Thomas Cromwell: The Rise and Fall of Henry VIII’s most Notorious Minister* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2007).
33. Hutchinson, *Thomas Cromwell*, 3, 159–85.
34. See Elton, *Policy and Police*, 112–20.

35. See Jacques Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984) for the origins, development, and economic implications of this middle space.
36. See Stephen Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001) for an extended discussion of purgatory in *Hamlet*.
37. Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 380.
38. *Ibid.*, 381.
39. "Enforcing Statutes Abolishing Papal Authority in England," in *Tudor Royal Proclamations: The Early Tudors (1485–1553)* vol. 1, 229–32.
40. Again, for "collective memory" and religion, see Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 84–119.
41. See Nigel Ramsay, "The Manuscripts flew about like Butterflies': The Break-Up of English Libraries in the Sixteenth Century," in *Lost Libraries*, 125, 135.
42. Hutchinson, *Thomas Cromwell*, 171.
43. See Elton, *Policy and Police*, for many examples of the unpopularity of Henry's actions, but nonetheless he offers a defense of Cromwell's measures under Henry's rule. As he writes at the end, "Cromwell had of necessity also to practise much destruction; where he infused life, he also, and without qualms, bestowed much death. When his own fate reached him he died, as he knew, too soon; but he could also know that of all those that died he alone was both victim and victor" (425).
44. Printed in Gilbert Burnet, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, new ed. carefully revised and the records collated with the originals by Nicholas Pocock (Oxford: Clarendon, 1865), 4:272–85, 284n1.
45. *Ibid.*
46. Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 222–23.
47. "Introduction," *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*, 3 vols., ed. Walter Howard Frere (London: Longmans, Green, 1910), 1:119–20 (hereafter cited in text as *VAI*, followed by volume number, then page number).
48. Roger Bigelow Merriman, *Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1902).
49. Peter Heylyn, *Ecclesia Restaurata; or, The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1849), 1:21.
50. "The Archbishop's Speech at the Coronation of Edward VI, Feb. 20, 1547," reprinted in *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1566*, ed. John Edmund Cox, Parker Society (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1846), 127.
51. See Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 346; Lewis W. Spitz, "Further Lines of Inquiry for the Study of 'Reformation and Pedagogy,'" in *The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion: Papers from the University of Michigan Conference*, ed. Charles Trinkaus and Heiko A. Oberman (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 294–306.
52. "Injunctions for Religious Reform; Ordering Homilies to be Read from the Pulpit," pp. 393–403 in *Tudor Royal Proclamations: The Early Tudors (1485–1553)* vol. 1, 401.
53. "Offering Freedom of Conscience; Prohibiting Religious Controversy, Unlicensed Plays, and Printing," in *Tudor Royal Proclamations: The Later Tudors (1553–1587)* vol. 2, ed. Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1969), 5–8.
54. "Announcing Injunctions for Religion," in *Tudor Royal Proclamations* vol. 2, 35–38.
55. *Ibid.*, vol. 2, 118.
56. Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 302.
57. "Announcing Injunctions for Religion," in *Tudor Royal Proclamations* vol. 2, 123.
58. Heylyn, *Ecclesia Restaurata*, 2:270.
59. "Prohibiting Destruction of Church Monuments," in *Tudor Royal Proclamations* vol. 2, 146–48.
60. See, for selected examples, Henry's proclamations 129, 168, 177; and Edward's proclamations 281, 297, and 299 in *Tudor Royal Proclamations* vol.1; for Elizabeth's proclamations, see 466, 477, 489 (all on meat abstinence), 561, 688, 699 in *Tudor Royal Proclamations* vol. 2. For the legislation of faith at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, see Norman L. Jones, *Faith by Statute: Parliament and the Settlement of Religion 1559* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1982).
61. See A. G. Dickens, "Tudor York," in *A History of Yorkshire: The City of York*, ed. P. M. Tillott in *The Victoria History of the Counties of England*, ed. R. P. Hugh (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 152.



62. Ralph Houlbrooke, *Church Courts and the People During the English Reformation, 1520–1570* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 214–60.
63. See Margaret Aston, *The King's Bedpost: Reformation and Iconography in a Tudor Group Portrait* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 97–107.
64. Rev. Hastings Robinson, trans. and ed., *The Zurich Letters, Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others* in Latin and English (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1842), 1:55; for the original Latin, 31–32 (hereafter cited in text as *Zurich*).
65. J. T. Tomlinson, *Queen Elizabeth's Crucifix: Its Secret History* (London: Church Association, 1887).

### CHAPTER 3

1. For the English version, see Gregory the Great, *The Letters of Gregory the Great*, vol. 2, letter 9.209, p. 674 (hereafter cited in text as *Letters of Gregory*, followed by volume number, then page number.). Quoted in Latin as “Idcirco enim pictura in ecclesiis adhibetur, ut hi qui litteras nesciunt saltem in parietibus videndo legant, quae legere in codicibus non valent” in *CCSL* 140A, 9.209, p. 768.
2. For the argument for deeply anti-image foundations of early Christianity, see Hugo Koch, *Die altchristliche Bilderfrage nach den literarischen Quellen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917); for the Jewish matrix as the foundation for this anti-image position, see Ernest Renan, *Histoire des Origines du Christianisme 7: Marc-Aurèle et la fin du monde antique* (Paris: Michel Lévy, 1863), 539ff. Also, E. Kitzinger, “The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm,” reviews a number of Christian attacks against images in the first five centuries of Christianity; R. A. Markus, “The Cult of Icons in Sixth-Century Gaul,” repr. from *Journal of Theological Studies* 29 (1978), pp. 151–57 in *From Augustine to Gregory the Great: History and Christianity in Late Antiquity* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1983), XII; John Beckwith, *Early Christian and Byzantine Art* (New York: Penguin, 1979); Barnard, *Graeco-Roman and Oriental Background of the Iconoclastic Controversy*, 51–64, 89–91; Norman H. Baynes, “Idolatry and the Early Church,” in *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* (London: Athlone, 1955), 116–43.
3. Belting, *Likeness and Presence*, 144.
4. See, for example, Jensen, “The Character of Early Christian Iconography,” in *Understanding Early Christian Art*, 8–31; Freedberg, “The Myth of Aniconism,” in *The Power of Images*, 54–81; André Grabar, *Christian Iconography: A Study of Its Origins* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968) for the Greco-Roman origins of Paleo-Christian art; also see Paul Corby Finney, *The Invisible God: The Earliest Christians on Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994); Mary Charles Murray, “Art and the Early Church,” in *JTS*, n.s., 28, pt. 2, October, 1977, pp. 303–45; see also Louth, *St. John Damascene*, 195–96.
5. See Vincenzo Ficocchi Nicolai, Fabrizio Bisconti, and Danilo Mazzoleni, *The Christian Catacombs of Rome: History, Decoration, Inscriptions* (Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 1999), 9–13; L. V. Rutgers, *Subterranean Rome: In Search of the Roots of Christianity in the Catacombs of the Eternal City* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000).
6. See [www.catacombe.roma.it/](http://www.catacombe.roma.it/) for the main page for the catacombs. For “history of the catacombs,” see [www.catacombe.roma.it/en/storia.html](http://www.catacombe.roma.it/en/storia.html).
7. Lactantius, *De Mortibus persecutorum*, 1:11–13, pp.89–92; see also Curran, *Pagan City and Christian Capital*, 35–69; Robert M. Grant, *Augustus to Constantine: The Rise and Triumph of Christianity in the Roman World* (London: Westminster John Knox, 2004), 226–32.
8. See Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, who argues that Christianity was a “respectable institution” at the time of Constantine’s conversion pp. 21, 49–54, and 144–45). H. A. Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops: the Politics of Intolerance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000) estimates the population of Christians at six million, about 10 percent of the entire population of the empire (pp. 73, 109–10).
9. See Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000); Freedberg, “The Myth of Aniconism.” Also, Moshe Dothan, *Hammath Tiberias, Vol. 1 Early Synagogues* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983); Steven Fine, *Art and Judaism in the Greco-Roman World: Toward a New Jewish Archaeology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
10. Grabar, *Christian Iconography*; Finney, *Invisible God*; Finney, “Antecedents of Byzantine Iconoclasm: Christian Evidence Before Constantine,” in *Image and the Word*, 38–39; Charles Murray, “Art and the



- Early Church"; Jeffrey Spier, *Picturing the Bible: The Earliest Christian Art* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007); Jeffrey Spier, *Late Antique and Early Christian Gems* (Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2007).
11. See Grabar, *Christian Iconography*, 7–30; Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 584, 588; Jensen, *Understanding Early Christian Art*.
  12. See "Cubicles of the Sacraments," [www.catacombe.roma.it/en/cubicoli.html](http://www.catacombe.roma.it/en/cubicoli.html); see also Jensen, *Understanding Early Christian Art*, 32–93; Robert Milburn, *Early Christian Art and Architecture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 1–43; Fabrizio Bisconti, "The Decoration of Roman Catacombs," in *The Christian Catacombs of Rome: History*, 71–145.
  13. See [www.catacombe.roma.it/en/symb.html](http://www.catacombe.roma.it/en/symb.html).
  14. See Spier, *Late Antique and Early Christian Gems* for Christian inscriptions and monograms (30–39); for a discussion of fish, dove, anchor, and ship (41–52); and for the good shepherd (53–62).
  15. Clement of Alexandria, *Christ the Educator*, trans. Simon P. Wood in *Fathers of the Church* 23 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1954), bk. 3, chap. 11, p. 246; G. W. Butterworth, "Clement of Alexandria and Art," *JTS* 17 (1916): 68–76.
  16. Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 234–40.
  17. See Grabar, *Christian Iconography*, 20–26, and illustrations 40–43; Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 236–37; C. Hopkins, "The Christian Church"; and P. V. C. Baur, "The Paintings in the Christian Chapel," in *Christian Church at Dura-Europos* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1934).
  18. See Kurt Weitzmann and Herbert L. Kessler, *The Frescoes of the Dura Synagogue and Christian Art* (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1990), 15–84.
  19. Kessler, *The Frescoes of the Dura Synagogue and Christian Art*, 181.
  20. See Weitzmann, *The Frescoes of the Dura Synagogue and Christian Art*, 143–50.
  21. For a brilliant and persuasive essay on this topic, see Charles Barber, "The Truth in Painting: Iconoclasm and Identity in Early-Medieval Art," *Speculum* 72 (1997): 1019–36.
  22. Rév. Père Basile Vanmaele, *L'église Pudentienne de Rome (Santa Pudenziana)* (Louvain: E. Warny, 1965).
  23. See Dina dalla Barba Brusin, "Una probabile 'aedes catechizandorum' nell' ipogeo di S. Maria in Stelle in Val Pantena," *Aquileia Nostra* 48 (1978), 257–72.
  24. For Theodore as the organizer (site manager) in this period for Aquileia's cult sites, see Giuseppe Cuscito, "Vescovo e Cattedrale nella Documentazione Epigrafica in Occidente," in *Actes du XIe Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne* (Rome: Vatican City, 1989), vol.1:737–41.
  25. For Aquileia's development from the fourth through fifth centuries, see Sergio Tavano, "Patriarchi: Titoli e Segni," and Luisa Bertacchi, "Le fasi architettoniche del complesso episcopale di Aquileia nelle variazioni dei mosaici," both in *Aquileia e il Suo Patriarcato: Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studio* (Udine: Arti Grafiche Friulane, 2000), 11–32, 67–74; for an analysis of the animal iconography, see Antonio Quacquarelli, "Note Esetetiche sui Pavimenti Musivi delle Basiliche Teodoriane di Aquileia: 'Il Bestiarius,'" in *Aquileia nel IV Secolo*, vol. II, 429–62 (Udine: Arti Grafiche Friulane, 1982).
  26. See Jaś Elsner, "Perspectives in Art," in *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, ed. Noel Lenski 269–71.
  27. See Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, *The Iconography of the Sarcophagus of Junius Bassus* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990) for a complete discussion of the iconographical schema of the sarcophagus and other contemporary examples.
  28. See Carlo Capponi, ed., *L'Ambone di Sant'Ambrogio* (Milan: Silvana, 2000), 29–34.
  29. For an overview, see Butterworth, "Clement of Alexandria and Art." See also Besançon, *Forbidden Image*, 13–62.
  30. Plato, "Phaedo," in *Plato I*, with English trans. by Harold North Fowler (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), 252–69.
  31. See Plotinus, "On the Intelligible Beauty," in *Ennead V*, ed. G. P. Gould, trans. A. H. Armstrong (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), 233–81.
  32. Origen, *Contre Celse*, in *SC* vols. 132, 136, 147, 150, 227, Greek ed., intro., and French trans. by Marcel Borret (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1967–76), vol. 4 [150], 7.62, pp. 158–60.
  33. Eusebius of Caesarea, *La Préparation évangélique*, in *SC* 228, intro., Greek text, and French trans. by Édouard des Places (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1976–87), vol. 2 [228], bk. 3.7, pp.180–85.

34. Augustine, *The City of God Against the Pagans*, vol. 2, trans. William M. Green (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963), 4.30, pp. 114–15.
35. Augustine, *The City of God Against the Pagans*, vol. 2, bk. 4.30, pp. 118–21.
36. Clement of Alexandria, *Christ the Educator*, bk. 3, chap. 11, p. 246.
37. Finney, *Invisible God*, 111.
38. Eusebius, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, vol. 41, 10:3.
39. See L'Abbé L. Duchesne, ed. intro. and comm., *Liber Pontificalis*, 3 vols. (Paris: E. De Boccard, 1955), vol. 1:170–201; for the English, see Raymond Davis, trans. and intro., *The Book of Pontiffs (Liber Pontificalis): The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989), 14–26; Richard Krautheimer, *Three Christian Capitals: Topography and Politics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983); W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984); Robin Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987); Robert David Sack, *Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
40. “Placuit picturas in ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur,” José Vives, *Concilios Visigóticos e Hispano-Romanos I* (Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1963), 8.
41. See Charles Murray, “Art and the Early Church,” 317–18.
42. Origen, *Contre Celse*, vol. 4, 7.64, pp. 162–65.
43. *Ibid.*, vol. 4, 7.66, pp. 166–69.
44. Tertullian, *De Idololatria*, critical text, trans., and comm. by J. H. Waszink and J. C. M. Van Winden (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1987), 3:1–4, pp. 26–27.
45. Tertullian, *Scorpisce*, ed. Giovanna Azzali Bernardelli (Florence: Nardini, 1990), secs. 2–3, pp. 66–84. See Timothy David Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 96–102, 172–73.
46. Tertullian, *De Pudicitia*, in *SC* vols. 394–95, intro. by Claudio Micaelli, Latin text and French trans. by Charles Munier (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993), vol. 1:394 7:1ff., 10–12ff., pp. 174–78.
47. Epiphanius’ reputed comments are printed in Georg Ostrogorsky, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites* (Amsterdam: A. M. Hakkert, 1964), 67, 68–69, 71–72. They are translated in Mango, *Art of the Byzantine Empire*, 41–43. Whether the texts are authentic still remains a matter of dispute. See Brubaker and Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era*, 253, 253n38.
48. See Aston, *England’s Iconoclasts*, 249n310–311, 249n393.
49. John of Damascus, *On Divine Images*, “Treatise 1,” 38 (hereafter cited in text as “Treatise 1”).
50. See Finney, *Invisible God*, 39 and for an elaboration, 15–68; also, see Finney, “Antecedents of Byzantine Iconoclasm: Christian Evidence Before Constantine,” 27.
51. Hilary of Poitiers, *De Trinitate Liber VII*, in *PL* 10, 7, chap. 37, col. 230.
52. See Saint Paulinus of Nola, *The Poems of St. Paulinus of Nola*, in *Ancient Christian Writers* 40, trans. and annotated by P. G. Walsh (New York: Newman, 1975), “Poem 27,” cols.289–92; Paulinus of Nola “Carmen 27,” in *Paulinus’ Churches at Nola*, ed. R. C. Goldschmidt (Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche, 1940).
53. *Paulinus of Nola*, 290–91.
54. Gregory of Nyssa, “Oratio de Deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti,” in *PG* 46, 571–72 C.
55. Gregory of Nyssa, “Sancti ac Magni Martyris Theodori,” in *PG* 46, col. 737–40; cols. 735–48.
56. Gregory Nazianzus, “Oratio XIII: Funebris oratio in patrem, presente Basilio,” in *PG* 35, cols. 1036–37.
57. Basil of Caesarea, *Sur le Saint-Esprit*, in *SC* 17, Greek ed., intro., and French trans. by Benoît Pruche (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1968), 18:45, pp. 406–7; for John Chrysostom, see *In dictum Pauli, Nolo vos ignorare*, in *PG* 51, cols. 247–48; *Ad illuminandos catechesis* in *PG* 49, col. 233.
58. For the transformation of art from pagan images to Christian symbols, see Jaś Elsner, *Art and the Roman Viewer: The Transformation of Art from the Pagan World to Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 190–245.
59. Herbert L. Kessler, *Spiritual Seeing: Picturing God’s Invisibility in Medieval Art* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 1–28.
60. See Pierre Manent, *The City of Man*, trans. Marc A. LePain (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998) for how the Enlightenment installed this idea of the “tradition of novelty” (5–49).

61. *Letters of Gregory*, vol. 3, 11:10, p. 745. "Nam quod legentibus scriptura, hoc idiotis praestat pictura cernentibus, quia in ipsa ignorantes vident quod sequi debeant, in ipsa legunt qui litteras nesciunt; unde praecipue gentibus pro lectione pictura est."
62. Gratian, "Decreti tertia pars De Consecratione," Dist. 3, 27 in *PL* 187.
63. See Jeffrey F. Hamburger, "The Place of Theology in Medieval Art History: Problems, Positions, Possibilities," in *The Mind's Eye: Art and Theological Argument in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jeffrey F. Hamburger and Anne-Marie Bouché (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), 14–15.
64. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2:774–76.
65. For an article that reviews the use and misuse of Gregory's argument over the last fourteen hundred years, see Lawrence G. Duggan, "Was Art Really the 'Book of the Illiterate?'" *Word and Image* 5, no. 3 (July–September 1989), 227–51; also see R. A. Markus, *Gregory the Great and His World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 175–77.
66. "The Symbols," [www.catacombe.roma.it/en/symb.html](http://www.catacombe.roma.it/en/symb.html).
67. References to this idea are too numerous to list, but see Kitzinger, "The Cult of Images"; Grabar, *Christian Iconography*; Kenneth Clark, *Moments of Vision and Other Essays* (New York: Harper & Row, 1981), 41. For excellent articles on the whole question of pictures as books for the illiterate, to which I am profoundly indebted, see Michael Camille, "Seeing and Reading: Some Visual Implications of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy," *Art History* 8, no. 1 (1985), 26–49; Michael Camille, "The Gregorian Definition Revisited: Writing and the Medieval Image," in *L'Image*, 89–107; Celia M. Chazelle, "Pictures, books, and the illiterate: Pope Gregory I's letters to Serenus of Marseilles," *Word and Image* 6, no. 2 (April–June 1990), 138–53; Duggan, "Was Art Really the 'Book of the Illiterate?'" 227–51; Herbert L. Kessler, "Diction in the 'Bibles of the Illiterate,'" in *World Art: Themes of Unity in Diversity*, 3 vols, ed. Irving Lavin (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989), 2:297–308.
68. Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. Joseph Martin, in *CCSL* 32 (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1962), 7–9, pp. 1–167.
69. See Jérôme Baschet, "Introduction: L'Image-Objet," in *L'Image*, 7–26; see also Hamburger, "The Place of Theology," in *Mind's Eye*.
70. See Margaret Aston, "Imageless devotion: what kind of an ideal?" in *Pragmatic Utopias: Ideals and Communities 1200–1630*, ed. Rosemary Horrox and Sarah Rees Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 189.
71. For discussions of Augustine's theory of signs and his rhetorical training, see Brian Stock, *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge, and the Ethics of Interpretation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996); John M. Rist, *Augustine: Ancient Thought Baptized* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 23–40; Erich Auerbach, *Literary Language & its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages*, trans. Ralph Manheim (New York: Pantheon Books, 1965); George A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980); Mark D. Jordan, "Words and Word: Incarnation and Signification in Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*," *Augustinian Studies* 11 (1980): 177–96; Brenda Schildgen, "Augustine's Answer to Jacques Derrida in the *De Doctrina Christiana*," *New Literary History* 25, no. 2 (Spring, 1994), 383–97; Marcia L. Colish, *The Mirror of Language: A Study in the Medieval Theory of Knowledge* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1968), 8–81.
72. For a very brilliant essay on this subject, see P. A. Mariaux, "L'Image selon Grégoire le Grand et la question de l'art missionnaire," *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 14 (1993): 1–12; see also Hamburger, "The Place of Theology," in *Mind's Eye*; Camille, "The Gregorian Definition Revisited," 92–93; Carole Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 42. Also, I agree with Chazelle when she links Gregory's thinking with Augustine's on interpreting signs in the *De Doctrina Christiana*, in "Pictures, Books, and the Illiterate," in *Word and Image*, 145–47.
73. Augustine, *De Catechizandis Rudibus*, in *CCSL* 46 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969).
74. Grégoire le Grand, *Règle Pastorale*, Latin text ed. Floribert Rommel, trans. into French by Charles Morel, and intro. and notes by Bruno Judic, in *SC* 381–82 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992), 79–84. For the influence of Augustine on Gregory, and particularly of the *De Catechizandis rudibus* and the *De Doctrina Christiana* on Gregory's *Rule for Pastors*, see Judic, "Introduction Grégoire le Grand, *Règle Pastorale*, 39–56.
75. For a discussion of the Augustinian elements in the *Regula*, see Vera Paronetto, "Une présence augustinienne chez Grégoire le Grand: le *De Catechizandis rudibus* dans la *Regula pastoralis*," in *Grégoire le*

- Grand*, ed. Jacques Fontaine, Robert Gillet, and Stan Pellistrandi (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1986), 511–19.
76. “Dum monstrare qualis esse debeat pastor inuigilo, pulchrum depinxi hominem pictor foedus aliosque ad perfectionis litus dirigo, qui adhuc in delictorum fluctibus uersor” (Grégoire, *Règle Pastorale*, 2:540 [author’s translation]).
  77. “Aliud est enim picturam adorare, aliud per picturae historiam quid sit adorandum addiscere. Nam quod legentibus scriptura, hoc idiotis praestat pictura cernentibus, quia in ipsa ignorantes vident quod sequi debeant, in ipsa legunt qui litteras nesciunt; unde praecipue gentibus pro lectione pictura est. . . . Quia picturas imaginum, quae ad aedificationem imperiti populi factae fuerant.” Gregory, *Registrum epistolarum*, CCSL 140–140A, Letter 11:10.
  78. “Perlatum siquidem ad nos fuerat quod inconsiderato zelo succensus sanctorum imagines . . . fregisse vero reprehendimus.” Gregory, *Registrum epistolarum*, CCSL 140–140A, Letter 11:10.
  79. “Unde praecipue gentibus pro lectione pictura est . . . inter gentes habitas. . . . Quando ergo ad ovile dominicum errantes oves adducas, qui quas habes retinere non praeuales.” Gregory, *Registrum epistolarum*, CCSL 140–140A, Letter 11:10. For evangelization and the situation in which the letters were written, see Herbert L. Kessler, “Pictorial Narrative and Church Mission in Sixth-Century Gaul,” in *Pictorial Narrative in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. Herbert L. Kessler and Marianna Shreve Simpson, in *Studies in the History of Art* 16 (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1985), 75–91.
  80. “Et quidem quia eas adorari vetuisses omnino laudavimus”; “Aliud est enim picturam adorare, aliud per picturae historiam quid sit adorandum addiscere”; “Quia omne manufactum adorare non liceat, quoniam scriptum est: ‘Dominum Deum tuum adorabis et illi soli servies.’” Gregory, *Registrum epistolarum*, CCSL 140–140A, Letter 11:10.
  81. For more on this idea in Gregory’s approach to scripture and its relationship to reading signs, see R. A. Markus, “World and Text in Ancient Christianity II: Gregory the Great,” in *Signs and Meanings: World and Text in Ancient Christianity* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1996), 45–70.
  82. Basil the Great, *Sur le Saint-Esprit*, in SC 17, 18.45, p. 406.
  83. See Louth, *St. John Damascene*, 3–14; Louth’s book on John Damascene has been essential to this discussion. See also Thomas F. X. Noble, “John Damascene and the History of the Iconoclastic Controversy,” in *Religion, Culture, and Society in the Early Middle Ages, Studies in Honor of Richard E. Sullivan*, ed. Thomas F. X. Noble and John J. Contreni (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications, 1987), 95–116.
  84. Again, see Louth, *St. John Damascene*, 198–200.
  85. *Ibid.*, 203–4.
  86. Thomas More, *A Dialogue Concerning Heresies*, 537–43. Hereafter in text as DCH.
  87. William Roper, *Lyfe of Sir Thomas Moore, knyghte*, ed. E. V. Hitchcock, in *Early English Texts Society, Original Series* 197 (London: Oxford University Press, 1935).
  88. “The first is that where the [most] parte of Christen princes be at mortall warre, they were [all] at an universall peace. The second, that where the Church of Christe is [at this present] sore afflicted with many errors and heresies, it were settled in a perfecte uniformity [of] religion. The third, that where the kings matter of his marriage is nowe come in question, it were to the glory of god and quietnes of all partes brought to a good conclusion” (Roper, 24–25).
  89. “That some of us, as highe as we seeme to sitt upon the mountaynes, treading heretikes under our feete like antes, live not the day that we gladly wold wishe . . . to let them have their churches quietly to themselves, so that they wold be contente to let us have ours quietly to our selves” (Roper, 35).
  90. William Tyndale, *An Answer to Sir Thomas More’s Dialogue* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1850), 62, 125, 143. For an elaboration on this idea of purgatory as a “poet’s fable,” see Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory*.
  91. “Sanctorumque patrum consensionem et sacrorum conciliorum decreta: in primis de sanctorum intercessionem, invocationem, reliquiarum honore, et legitimo imaginum usu fideles diligenter instrument. . . . Imagines porro Christi, deiparae Virginis et aliorum sanctorum, in templis praesertim habendas et retinendas, eisque verbum honorem et venerationem impertiendam, non quod credatur inesse aliqua in iis divinitas vel virtus, propter quam sint colendae, vel quod ab eis sit aliquid petendum, vel quod fiducia in imaginibus sit figenda, veluti olim fiebat a gentibus, quae in idolis spem suam collocabant: sed quoniam honos, qui eis exhibetur, refertur ad prototypa, quae illae repraesentant” (*Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2:774–75).

92. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2:775.
93. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2:775–76.
94. Gabriele Paleotti, “Discorso intorno alle imagini sacre e profane,” in *Trattati d’Arte del Cinquecento fra Manierismo e Controriforma*, 3 vols., ed. Paola Barocchi (Bari: Giuseppe Laterza e Figli, 1960–62), 2:69–71, 117–509, especially Libro 2.
95. “The sore punyishment of heretykes is devysed not by the clergye but by temporall prynces and good ley people and not without grete cause” DCH 1, 430.

## CHAPTER 4

1. I wish to thank Manuel Nieto Cumplido, canon and archivist of Córdoba’s cathedral, for help with the archives and other historical records of the monument and Córdoba. Also, my colleague at UC Davis, Heghnar Zeitlin Watenpaugh provided expert advice on medieval Islamic architecture. Unless otherwise noted, all translations from French, Spanish, or Latin are the author’s.
2. Manuel Nieto Cumplido, *La Mezquita-Catedral de Córdoba y El ICOMOS* (Córdoba, Spain: Servicio de Publicaciones de Excmo, 1976), 13.
3. Hans Baron, *Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966).
4. See Frugoni, *A Distant City*, 3–29, for her view of medieval cities as “a state of mind, a matter of consciousness” (3).
5. “Civitas est hominum multitudo societatus vinculo adunata, dicta a civibus, id est ab ipsis incolis urbis” (San Isidoro de Sevilla, *Etimologías*, Edición Bilingüe, vol. I (Libros I–X) and vol. II (Libros XI–XX), ed. and trans. into Spanish José Oroz Reta and Manuel A. Marcus Casquero (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1983), 15. 2. 1
6. See R. Sellheim, “Fada’il,” in *The Encyclopedia of Islam*, new ed., vol. II C–G (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), 728–29, particularly 729. Fada’il is a category of praise literature and its topics include cities, places, and persons, among others. Praise of cities was more common in the Islamic West.
7. For a description of the capture of the city, see Alfonso X, *Primera Crónica General de España*, 2 vols., ed. Ramón Menéndez Pidal (Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1977), 2:729–33.
8. For a description and edition of the text with a photocopy of the manuscript, transcribed also in Latin and translated into Spanish with commentary, see Manuel Nieto Cumplido, *Córdoba en el Siglo XV* (Mezquita: Tip. Católica, 1973). The editor of the work, Nieto Cumplido, uses evidence in the work to date it: First, Jerónimo mentions that the royal chapel in the cathedral has the buried bodies of Fernando IV and Alfonso XI, who was moved there from Seville in 1371. Thus the text cannot be dated prior to 1371, almost 150 years after the conquest. Second, Jerónimo claims he visited the cities of the Orthodox, which would date the text before 1453 when Constantinople fell to the Turks. See Nieto Cumplido, *Córdoba en el Siglo XV*, 9–10.
9. Statius, *Stattius*, 2 vols., with English trans. by J. H. Mozley (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982; orig. 1928), “Silvae,” vol. 1, III.5, ll. 81–108, pp.198–201. See E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1967), 157–58.
10. See “Formula ad Praefectum Urbis de Architecto Faciendo in Urbe Roma,” VII:15, “Formula curatoris civitatis,” VII:12, “Formula defensoris cuiuslibet civitatis,” VII:11 in Cassiodorus, *Variarum Libri XII*, 271–72, 274–76.
11. For an expansive discussion of medieval descriptions and a list of the extant works, although dated, see J. K. Hyde, “Medieval Descriptions of Cities,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 48 (1966): 308–40; see also Daniel Waley, *The Italian City-Republics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969), 141–46. Descriptions of Milan go back to ca. 738: see G. B. Pighi, ed. and comm., *Laudes Mediolanensis Civitatis, Versus de Verona, Versum de Mediolano civitate* (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1960); and Benzo d’Alessandria, *De Mediolano Florentissima Civitate* (1316). There are descriptions of Padua: Giovanni da Nono, *Visio Egidii Regis Patavii* (1318); and Opicino de Canistris’s description of Pavia in 1330. Florence has several accolades that appear in chronicles such as Dino Compagni’s (1260–1324), describing Florence’s beautiful buildings, adornments, talented craftspeople, and model citizens (Dino Compagni, *Cronica*, ed. Davida Cappi [Rome: Nella Sede dell’ Istituto Palazzo Borromini, 2000]); Giovanni Villani’s 1336–38 description of Florence (Giovanni Villani, *Croniche*, ed. Giulio Cura Curà, intro. Giuseppe Edoardo Sansone

- [Rome: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 2002]). For the purposes of these Italian praises, see Gina Fasoli, "La coscienza nelle *'Laudes civitatum'*," in *La coscienza cittadina nei comuni italiani del Duecento. Atti dell' XI Convegno del Centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale* (Todi: Accademia Tudertina, 1972), 9–44; and Frugoni, *Distant City*, 54–81.
12. See María Rosa Lida de Malkiel, "La ciudad, tema poético de tono juglaresco en el Cancionero de Baena," in *Estudios sobre la literatura española del siglo XV* (Madrid: J. Porrúa Turanzas, 1978), 333–37.
  13. See Robert B. Tate, "The Civic Humanism of Alfonso de Palencia," *Renaissance and Modern Studies* 23 (1979): 25–44.
  14. See Al-Saqundi (abu-L-Walid Ismail Ibn Muhammad), *Elogio del Islam Español*, trans. into Spanish by Emilio García Gómez (Madrid: Estanislao Maestre, 1934). For Córdoba, see 100–106; for Seville, 95–99; for Granada, 108–10.
  15. *Córdoba en el Siglo XV*, 8–9.
  16. "Quis inter tanta Cordubam omitere valet? / Ut clarent regie metropole prerrogativa / Prosayce dignum duxi propalare decorum" (*Córdoba en el Siglo XV*, 43).
  17. For a discussion of contingency and monuments, see Young, "Memory/Monument," in *Critical Terms for Art History*, 237.
  18. "Hec siquidem omnia congesci ut urbs gloriosa a suis deinceps non ignoretur habitatoribus ut demum per consequens agita carior habeator" (*Córdoba en el Siglo XV*, 52).
  19. See Ibn Hayyan de Córdoba, *Crónica de los emires Alhakam I y Abdarrahan II entre los años 796 y 847*, trans. and notes by Mahmud Ali Makki and Federico Corriente (Zaragoza: La Aljafería, 2001), 173–78; Ibn Hayyan de Córdoba, *Crónica del Califá 'Abdarrahan III An-Nasir entre los años 912 y 942 (al-Muqtabis V)*, trans. into Spanish from Arabic by M. Jesús Viguera and Federico Corriente (Zaragoza: Anubar Ediciones, 1981).
  20. Abu 'Ubayd Al-Bakri, *Geografía de España (Kitab Al-Masalik Wa-L-Mamalik)*, *Textos Medievales*, intro., trans., and notes by Eliseo Vidal Beltran (Zaragoza: Facsímil, 1982), 29–31.
  21. E. Lévi Provençal, trans., *La Péninsule Ibérique au Moyen-âge d'après le Kitab Ar-Rawd Al-Mitar Fi Habar Al-Aktar d'Idn 'Abd Al-Muncim Al-Himyari* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1938), 182–90.
  22. See Al-Bayano'l-Mogrib, *Histoire de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne*, 2 vols., ed. and trans. into French by E. Fagnan (Alger: Pierre Fontana, 1904), which is a thirteenth-century compilation attributed to Ibn 'Idhari. See especially vol. 2, pp. 62–63, 57–73, for Ibn 'Idhari's version of the building of the mosque and the role of the various emirs and caliphs.
  23. Abu Muhammad Ali Ibn Hazm Al-Andalusi, *The Dove's Neck-Ring*, trans. A. R. Nykl (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1931), 63, 101, 189, 195–96.
  24. Ibn Khaldún, *The Muqaddimah*, 3 vols. trans. from Arabic by Franz Rosenthal (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1958), 1:357.
  25. Roderici Ximenii de Rada, *Historia de Rebus Hispania sive Historia Gothica*, ed. Juan Fernández Valverde, in *CCSM* 72 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1987), 165, 229, 299–300.
  26. *Primera Crónica General de España*, 733–34. See pp. 448–49, for Almanzor's capture of Santiago's bells that were hung in the Mezquita.
  27. For Córdoba's mosque and this idea of "collective memory," see Oleg Grabar, "Two Paradoxes in the Islamic Art of the Spanish Peninsula," in *Early Islamic Art, 650–1100: Constructing the Study of Islamic Art*, vol. 1 (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005), 269.
  28. The Abbasids were the second great Sunni dynasty, rising in 750 and making their capital in Baghdad, while chasing the Umayyads from power.
  29. "A mon entrée en Espagne, j'étais tout pénétré de la prédiction faite . . . [je suis] celui qui fera revivre cette dynastie [Omeyyades] après sa chute" (Al-Bayano'l-Mogrib, *Histoire de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne*, especially 2:62, 57–73, for Ibn 'Idhari's version of the events). See also, Alfonso X, *Primera Crónica General de España*, 2:338–40, for the coming of Abd al Rahman and the background of the divisions among the Arabs as the author understood them.
  30. Al-Bayano'l Mogrib, *Histoire de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne*, 2:73–96 tells this story.
  31. "Mon corps, tu le sais, est dans un lieu, mais mon coeur et ses affections sont dans un autre. Marquée qu'elle était par le destin, la separation a dû s'accomplir, mais elle a chassé le sommeil de mes paupières. La volonté divine, qui a décidé ce divorce, décrètera peut-être un jour notre réunion" (Al-Bayano'l-Mogrib, *Histoire de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne*, 2:96).

32. There are both Arabic and Christian texts that provide a date for the beginning of the building. These include the anonymous historian, Faht al-Andalus (composed around 1087–1106), who writes, “At the beginning of the lunar cycle of rabi al-awwal in 170, Abd al-Rahman ibn Mu’awiya ordered the foundation of the mosque of Córdoba”; Ibn ‘Idhari; the *Diker bilad al-Andalus*; and Ahmad al-Razi. The Archbishop of Toledo, Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, relied on these sources to set the date. For the Christian conquest of the city and the Christianization of the Mezquita, see Ximenii de Rada, *Historia de Rebus Hispania*, 299–300; Nieto Cumplido, *La Mezquita-Catedral de Córdoba y El ICOMOS*, 27–28.
33. Al-Bayano’l-Mogrib, *Histoire de l’Afrique et de l’Espagne*, 2:92.
34. “En conséquence, les musulmans s’entendirent avec les barbares de Cordove pour prendre la moitié de leur plus grande église, qui était située dans l’intérieur de la ville; dans cette moitié ils élevèrent une mosquée principale, tandis qu’ils laissèrent l’autre moitié aux chrétiens, mais en détruisant toutes les autres églises . . . . cette mosquée devint insuffisante: on dut y ajouter des galeries . . . Quand ‘Abd er-Rahmân ben Mo’âwiya fut arrivé en Espagne et se fut installé à Cordove, il examina la question de l’agrandissement . . . Il fit appeler les barbares de la ville pour leur demander de lui vendre la portion de l’église qu’ils détenaient encore, leur en offrant d’ailleurs in prix très élevé pour respecter les termes de traité conclu lors de leur soumission . . . Ce fut ainsi que les chrétiens abandonnèrent la moitié qui leur avait appartenu jusqu’alors” (Al-Bayano’l-Mogrib, *Histoire de l’Afrique et de l’Espagne*, 2:378–79).
35. See Luis Recio Mateo, *La Mezquita Catedral de Córdoba: Patrimonio de la Humanidad* (Granada: Ediciones Edilux, 2005), 192–200.
36. For a discussion of the recycled Roman capitals in the mosque, see Carlos Marquez, *Capiteles Romanos de Córdoba: Colonia Patricia* (Córdoba: Monte de Piedad y Caja de Ahorros, 1993).
37. See Gonzalo M. Borrás Gualis, “Arte Mudéjar,” in *El Islam: De Córdoba al Mudéjar* (Madrid: Silex, 1990), 191–219.
38. See O’ Callaghan, *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain*, 204–6.
39. *Crónica de los emires Albakam I y Abdarrahman II entre los años 796 y 847*, 173–74, 176–77.
40. See Emilio Garcia Gomez, ed. and trans. from Arabic, *Anales Palatinos del Califato de Córdoba Al-Hakam II, por ‘Isa Ibn Ahmad Al-Razi* (Madrid: Sociedad de Estudios y Publicaciones, 1967), 244–45 passim.
41. “Omne que se defendie con Dios. . . et toda la tierra assessegada et muy en paz . . . et nin ovo mester de fazer batallas” (Alfonso X, *Primera Crónica General de España*, 2:425).
42. Al-Bayano’l-Mogrib, *Histoire de l’Afrique et de l’Espagne*, 2:392–93. For the connection between early Islamic art and architecture and Byzantine artistic traditions, see Oleg Grabar, “Islamic Art and Byzantium,” in Grabar, *Early Islamic Art, 650–1100*, 3–41.
43. Oleg Grabar, “Umayyad Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem,” *Ars Orientalis* 3 (1959): 52–55.
44. Translated from the inscription over the mihrab as quoted in Manuel Nieto Cumplido, *La Catedral de Córdoba* (Córdoba: Publicaciones de la Obra Social y Cultural de Cajasur, 1998), 35.
45. There is considerable controversy over the status of the function of “mihrabs.” See, Alexandre Papadopoulos, Directeur du Centre de Recherche sur l’Esthétique et l’Art musulman at the University of Paris, *Le Mihrab dans l’Architecture et la Religion Musulmanes* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988), 10.
46. See Grabar, “Two Paradoxes in Islamic Art,” 268–69; Joaquin Yarza, *Arte y Arquitectura en España 500–1250* (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 1979), 69–79.
47. See Nicole Britz Leplaideur, “Analyse Esthétique et Symbolique du Mihrâb de Cordove,” in *Le Mihrab dans l’Architecture*, 129–35; also see Oleg Grabar, “Notes sur le Mihrâb de la Grande Mosquée de Cordove,” in *Le Mihrâb dans l’Architecture*, 115–220; “Débats a la Suite de la Communication du Prof. Grabar,” in *Le Mihrab dans l’Architecture*, 118–22.
48. Jerrilynn D. Dodds, “The Great Mosque of Córdoba,” in *Al-Andalus: The Art of Islamic Spain*, ed. Jerrilynn D. Dodds (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992), 22.
49. For a discussion of this dialogic element of Umayyad art and the political implications of the use of Byzantine and classical styles and materials, see Nasser Rabbat, “The Dialogic Dimension of Umayyad Art,” *Res* 43 (Spring 2003): especially 81.
50. Again, see Rabbat, “The Dialogic Dimension of Umayyad Art,” 79–94; Dodds, “The Great Mosque of Córdoba,” in *Al-Andalus: The Art of Islamic Spain*, 12–13.
51. See Rabbat, “The Dialogic Dimension of Umayyad Art,” 79–94. For a discussion of appropriation, influence, and borrowing, see Robert S. Nelson, “Appropriation,” in *Critical Terms for Art History*, 160–73.



52. For memory and monuments, see Young, "Memory/Monument," in *Critical Terms for Art History*, 234.
53. Again, see Rabbat, "The Dialogic Dimension of Umayyad Art"; Grabar, "Two Paradoxes in Islamic Art"; for the inspiration to these approaches to memorial monuments, see Young, "Memory/Monument," 237; and Connerton, "Commemorative ceremonies," in *How Societies Remember*, 41–71; see also Yates, *The Art of Memory*.
54. See Manuel Ocaña Jimenez, "Arquitectos y mano de obra en la construcción de la gran mezquita de Occidente," *Boletín de la Real Academia de Córdoba, de Ciencias, Bellas Letras y Nobles Artes* 102 (1981): 123–34, with a list of the names.
55. For descriptions of these additions, see Al-Bayano'l-Mogrib, *Histoire de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne*, 377–79, 386–93, 477–78. Also, for the cultural and political environments, see S. M. Imamuddin, *Muslim Spain: 711–1492 A.D.* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981).
56. See Oleg Grabar, *The Formation of Islamic Art* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987; orig. 1973), 108.
57. From *Abd Al-Muncim Al-Himyari*, in E. Lévi Provençal, *La Péninsule Ibérique*, 183. According to Lévi-Provençal, this description is borrowed from Al-Idrisi.
58. Ximenii de Rada, *Historia*, 229.
59. See José Manuel Escobar Camacho, *Córdoba en la Baja Edad Media (Evolución urbana de la ciudad)* (Córdoba: Caja Provincial de Ahorros de Córdoba, 1989), 35.
60. "Videlicet quia fana idolorum destrui in eadem gente minime debeant, sed ipsa, quae in eis sunt, idola destruantur. Aqua benedicta fiat, in eisdem fanis aspartatur, altaria construuntur, reliquiae ponantur, quia, si fana eadem bene constructa sunt, necesse est ut a cultu daemonum in obsequio veri Dei debeant commutati, ut, dum gens ipsa eadem fana sua non videt destrui, de corde errorem deponat et Deum verum cognoscens ac adorans ad loca quae consuevit familiaris concurrat" (for the Latin, Gregory I, *Registrum epistularum*, vol. 140A, 11.56, 961).
61. See Jan Vaes, "Nova Construere sed Amplius Vetusta Servare': La Réutilisation Chrétienne d'Édifices Antique en Italie," in *Actes du XIe Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne* (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1989), 1:299–321, especially 172–74.
62. For reuse in Britain, see Charles Thomas, *Christianity in Roman Britain to AD 500* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 155–201, especially 172–74. For the context of Gregory's missionary strategy, see R. A. Markus, "Gregory the Great and a Papal Missionary Strategy," in *The Mission of the Church and the Propagation of the Faith*, ed. G. J. Cuming (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 29–38.
63. See "Huius temporibus famis, pestilentiae et inundationes aquarum gravissime fuerunt," *Liber Pontificalis*, 1:317; *Book of the Pontiffs*, 62; Venerable Bede, *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. with intro. by Judith McClure and Roger Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), bk. 2, chap. 5; F. Homes Dudden, *Gregory the Great: His Place in History and Thought*, 2 vols. (New York: Russell & Russell, 1905), 1: 49–50.
64. "Eodem tempore petiit a Focate principe templum qui appellatur Pantheum, in quo fecit ecclesiam beatae Mariae semper virginis et omnium martyrum" (*Liber Pontificalis*, 1:317; *The Book of Pontiffs*, 62).
65. For this event, see *The Book of Pontiffs*, 72; *Liber Pontificalis*, 1:343–44.
66. See Elsner, "Iconoclasm and the Preservation of Memory," in *Monuments and Memory, Made and Unmade*, 209–31.
67. "La patriçia de las otras çipdades," *Primera Crónica General de España*, 2:733.
68. "Fué en lo antiguo sede del imperio, centro de la ciencia, faro del la religiosidad, asiento de la nobleza y de la primacia" (Al-Saqundi, *Elogio del Islam Español*, 100).
69. "A que la estoria llama patriçia de las otras çipdades, esto es padrona et enxemplo de las otras pueblas del Andalozia" (*Primera Crónica General de España*, 2:733).
70. *Primera Crónica General de España*, 2:448–49, 733.
71. "Tocante a la Mezquita mayor, ya habrás oído que las lámparas han sido fundidos con las campanas de los cristianos, y que la ampliación que hizo en su fábrica Ibn Abi Amir [Almanzor] fué construido con tierra que trasportaron los cristianos sobre sus hombros, de las iglesias que aquél destruyó en sus regions" (Al-Saqundi, *Elogio del Islam Español*, 105).



72. "La mezquita de Cordova, que sobrava et vençie de afeyto et de grandez a todas las otras mezzquitas de los alaraves" (*Primera Crónica General de España*, 2:734).
73. "Que en la Iglesia de Sancta Maria avie y mucho dañado en la Madera e que era de adobar en muchas guisas e que el rey avie de poner y algun recabdo en guisa que se non perdiese ca si non sería mengua en se perder tan noble Iglesia" (as quoted in Nieto Cumplido, *La Mezquita-Catedral*, 27).
74. *Corpus Mediaevale Cordubense II (1256–1277)*, intro. by Manuel Riu Riu (Córdoba: Publicaciones del Monte de Piedad y Caja de Ahorros de Córdoba, 1980), 16–17.
75. *Corpus Mediaevale Cordubense II (1256–1277)*, #678 (1263), 134–35; #617 (1261), #50 (1260); #54 (1285).
76. *Antiguos Inventarios del Archivo Municipal de Córdoba* (Córdoba: Tip. Artística, 1978), see decrees #10, (1254); #31 (1254); #1 (1386); #52 (1407); #63 (1425); #6 (1480).
77. "Revertamur igitur ad celebrem urbem de qua certe citius deficeret theorematum laudantis facundia quam in ea quid laudantum deesset" (*Córdoba en el Siglo XV*, 50).
78. Al-Saundi, *Elogio del Islam Español*, 100.
79. *Córdoba en el Siglo XV*, 45–50.
80. "Prothelatur inter insigniores ac numerosas climatum urbes civitas generosa, divulguetur fama preclare sedis antique regnorum que quondam specialis tronus priscorum regum prout suam exitit dignitatem eorumque peculiaris hereditas. Cuius promeruit excellentia tam celleberimo perfrui privilegio ut omnes olim Hispaniarum reges diademate infingeret. Cuius influenciarum superiorum siderum inspectione homines per plurimum ingenio consuevit gignere solertes et naturali philosophandi speculatione munitos" (*Córdoba en el Siglo XV*, 44).
81. "Habet enim tenplum omni laude dignissimum in cuius speciosissima pulcritudine spiritus reficitur contemplantis. Est enim deude Hispanie et Cordube honoris signalaculum" (*Córdoba en el Siglo XV*, 50).
82. "Nunquid tan grandis fabricae artificiosa compago sine causa hominibus movebit admirationem inventibus marmoream colupnarum ultitudinem et proceritatem? Quarum situm ordinatissimum taliter stabilivit architectorum solercia ut ad quamcumque partem quas inspexerit videbit incendentes" (*Córdoba en el Siglo XV*, 50).
83. "Ibi turris egregia consistit lapideis tabulis constructa, opere exclusorio tota rubricata cancelisque marmoreis insignita. Cuius fastigium pignaculo eneo galeato terminatur. Duabus scalis ab intro ascenditur . . ." (*Córdoba en el Siglo XV*, 50). Unfortunately the original minaret no longer exists because when it was converted to a Christian bell tower after 1236, it suffered from the elevation, which compromised its stability. Further damage came from the hurricane and earthquake of 1589, which finished weakening it. To consolidate it from 1593–1653, the ruined upper part was demolished, and the lower was surrounded and the outside completed and reestablished with neoclassical forms. The interior stairs remained, thus concealing the Muslim strata in the interior of the edifice. See Ramón Menéndez Pidal, ed., *Historia de España*, vol. 5 in *España Musulmana Hasta la Caída del Califato de Córdoba (711–1031)*, E. Lévi-Provençal, Instituciones y Vida Social e Intelectual, trans. from Arabic Emilio García Gómez (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1957), 465.
84. "Quid amplius de hoc inclito templo restat loqui? Ferunt preteriti seculi narratores fabricarum septem tantum terris attributa miracula" (*Córdoba en el Siglo XV*, 51).
85. "Set quis illa ulterius precipua reputabat cum in nostra civitate tale tenplum conspexerit?" (*Córdoba en el Siglo XV*, 51).
86. See Manuel Nieto Cumplido, *La Miniatura en la Catedral de Córdoba* (Córdoba: Monte de Piedad and Caja de Ahorros, 1973).
87. *Córdoba en el Siglo XV*, 51–52; Al-Saundi, 100–104.
88. María del Rosario Castro Castillo, "El Entorno de la Sinagoga y Judería de Córdoba," in *El Patrimonio Hebreo en la España Medieval*, ed. Alberto Villar Movellán and María del Rosario Castro Castillo (Córdoba: Universidad de Córdoba, 1999), 105–32.
89. See, for example, "De como Aurelio dio las cristianas por mugerías a los moros," vol. 2 in *Primera Crónica General*, 343. For Al-Hakam's parentage, see Ibn Hayyan, *Cronica del Califa Abdarrabman III An-Nasir entre los años 912 y 942 (al-Muqtabis V)*, 87.
90. See Robert I. Burns, S. J., ed., *Las Siete Partidas*, 5 vols., trans. Samuel Parsons Scott (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), vol. 5, Partida 6 and 7, Title XXIV, Laws 1–11, Title XXV, Laws 1–X, 1433–42.

91. Borrás Gualis, *El Islam*, 200.
92. A major point of Borrás Gualis, *El Islam*, 9–21.
93. For the situation in Seville, for example, see Isabel Montes Romero-Camacho, “La Aljama Judía de Sevilla en la Baja Edad Media,” in *El Patrimonio Hebreo en la España Medieval*, 25–52.
94. Edwards, *Christian Córdoba*, 177–81.
95. Américo Castro, *España en su historia: cristianos, moros, y judíos* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada, 1948). For discussions of how this “living together” actually worked, see T. Glick, *Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages: Comparative Perspectives on Social and Cultural Formation* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979), 6–13. Although seriously challenged, for a generous view of the ethnic-religious relationships in Islamic Spain, see María Rosa Menocal, *The Ornament of the World: How Muslims, Jews, and Christians Created a Culture of Tolerance in Medieval Spain* (New York: Little, Brown, 2002); also of special importance, David Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 8–9 argues that in medieval Iberia “violence was a central and systematic aspect of the coexistence of majority and minorities. *Convivencia* was predicated upon violence; it was not its peaceful antithesis” (245).
96. For the taxes, see *Corpus Medievale Cordubense II*: #586 (1260); Rosario Castro Castillo, “El Entorno de la Sinagoga,” 105–6.
97. See Joseph Pérez, *The Spanish Inquisition: A History*, trans. Janet Lloyd (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005), 1–25.
98. See Emilio Cabrera, “Violencia Urbana y Crisis Política en Andalucía durante el Siglo XV,” in *Aragón en La Edad Media: Sesiones de Trabajo*, IV Seminario de Historia Medieval (Zaragoza: Universidad de Zaragoza, 1995), 5–25.
99. Again, according to Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence*, interreligious violence tended to involve Christians and Moslems more frequently than Jews “because Jews belonged to the crown” (34).
100. #155 “Provisión de sr. rey don Enrique en que manda executar los culpados sobre la Judería Año de 1401 (1401),” (28); #182 (1396) (32); #127 (1404), “Provision del sr. rey don Enrique sobre 12000 doblas que robaron de la Judería de Córdoba para quenta de las 24,000 doblas que Córdoba hubo de dar por la muerte, robo, y destrucción de la Judería, año 1404, para que se repartan y cobren” (in Manuel Nieto Cumplido, *Antiguos Inventarios del Archivo Municipal de Córdoba* [Córdoba: Tip. Artística, 1978]). See also, John Edwards, *Christian Córdoba: The City and Its Region in the Late Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 181–88.
101. See Nieto Cumplido, *La Catedral de Córdoba*, 501–65, for this research. See also Antón Capitel, “La Catedral de Córdoba: Transformación cristiana de la Mezquita,” *Arquitectura* 256 (1985): 37–46, for precise details of how Hernán Díaz achieved his compromise with the extant building.
102. See Elsner, “Iconoclasm and Preservation of Memory,” 211, for these ideas about monuments and memory.
103. Rafael Romero y Barros, *Córdoba Monumental y Artística*, facsimile ed. (Córdoba: Consejería de Cultura y Medio Ambiente de la Junta Andalucía Caja Provincial de Ahorros de Córdoba, 1991) with introductory chapters. Mercedes Mudarra Barrero, 13–63.
104. For information and documents relating to ICOMOS, see <http://www.international.icomos.org/>.
105. Nieto Cumplido, *La Mezquita-Catedral de Córdoba y El ICOMOS*.
106. See Wolpert, *New History of India*, 436, 444, 446.

## CHAPTER 5

1. See P. M. Tillott, ed., “The Sites and Remains of the Religious Houses,” in *A History of Yorkshire: The City of York*, in *The Victoria History of the Counties of England*, ed. R. P. Hugh (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 357–65.
2. John Foxe, *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, 8 vols., ed. Rev. George Townsend and Rev. Stephen Reed Cattley (London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1837–41) (hereafter cited in text as *Foxe*, followed by volume number, then page number), vol. 5, 146–47.
3. *The Publications of the Surtees Society XCI (1892)*, 1.
4. *Publications of the Surtees Society*, xi.

5. For Thomas Cromwell's role as the architect of this "audacious legal pillage that remains the greatest single act of privatization in the history of Britain's governance," see Hutchinson, *Thomas Cromwell*, 3 passim.
6. *Journal of William Dowsing*, 12–13. For information about the Earl of Manchester, see "Appendix 6," 345–48; Julie Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm during the English Civil War. Studies in Modern British Religious History Series* (Woodbridge, England: Boydell, 2003).
7. *Mercurius Rusticus Or, The Countries Complaint of the Sacriledges, Prophanations, and Plunderings, Committed by Schismatiques on the Cathedrall Churches of this Kingdome*, collected by Bruno Ryves Oxford, 1647), 185, 183. For more on the Civil War destruction, see Stanford E. Lehmborg, *Cathedrals Under Siege: Cathedrals and English Society, 1600–1700* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996), 25–56.
8. For York's experience in the Civil War, see Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm*, 114–15, and 190–93, for the Minster.
9. See Christopher Norton, "Richard II and York Minster," in *The Government of Medieval York: Essays in commemoration of the 1396 Royal Charter*, ed. Sarah Rees Jones, *Borthwick Studies in History* 3 (1997): 56–87.
10. See David E. O'Connor and Jeremy Haselock, "The Stained and Painted Glass," in *A History of York Minster*, ed. G. E. Aylmer and Reginald Cant (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), 313–93.
11. See Sarah Brown, "Our Magnificent Fabrick," *York Minster: An Architectural History c.1220–1500* (Swindon, England: English Heritage, 2003), 1.
12. For the English, see *The Letters of Gregory the Great*; for the Latin, see *Registrum epistolarum*, Letter, 11.34.
13. See Brown, "Our Magnificent Fabrick," 224–26 for details of this stained-glass pictorial cycle; for the story of the conversion, see bk. 1, chap. 23–34; for the conversion of the north, see bk. 2, chap. 9–20 in Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*.
14. Brown, "Our Magnificent Fabrick," 11–220; Ann Willey, *York Minster* (London: Scala Books, 1998), 6 passim; John H. Harvey, "Architectural History from 1291–1558," in *History of York Minster*, 149–92; see Thomas French and David O'Connor, *York Minster, A Catalogue of Medieval Stained Glass: The West Windows of the Nave*, in *Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi*, Great Britain Fasc. 1 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); Thomas French, *York Minster: The Great East Window*, in *Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).
15. Mark Ormrod, "York and the Crown Under the First Three Edwards," in *Government of Medieval York*, 14–33.
16. See Nigel Saul, "Richard II and the City of York," in *Government of Medieval York*, 1–13.
17. A. G. Dickens, "Tudor York," in *History of Yorkshire*, 117.
18. For a complete picture of the state of ecclesiastical practices and services, see Barrie Dobson, "The Later Middle Ages: 1215–1500," in *History of York Minster*, 44–109; also, Rev. L. W. Cowie, "Worship in the Minster," in *History of Yorkshire*, 348.
19. See Claire Cross, "From the Reformation to the Restoration," in *History of York Minster*, 196–97, 200.
20. See Dobson, "Later Middle Ages," in *History of York Minster*, 71, 69–72.
21. See Nicholas Orme, *English Schools in the Middle Ages* (London: Methuen, 1973), 79–83.
22. Barrie Dobson, "The Crown, the Charter and the City, 1396–1461," in *Government of Medieval York*, 45–46.
23. For the story of his martyrdom, see James Raine, ed., "Miscellanea Relating to Archbishop Scrope," in *The Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops*, Rolls Series 71 (London: Longmans, 1886), II:304–11. See also Sarah Rees Jones, "York's Civic Administration, 1354–1464," in *Government of Medieval York*, 108–40.
24. See Jeremy Goldberg, "Craft Guilds, the Corpus Christi Play and Civic Government," in *Government of Medieval York*, 141–63.
25. E. Miller, "Medieval York," in *History of Yorkshire*, 96–97.
26. See Dickens, "Tudor York," 147.
27. Dickens, "Tudor York," 152–53.
28. Dobson, "Later Middle Ages," *History of York Minster*, 106–08.
29. Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm*, 178.

30. For an overview of the iconoclastic siege in the Civil War period, see Jacqueline Eales, "Iconoclasm, Iconography, and the Altar in the English Civil War," in *Church and the Arts*, 313–27.
31. Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm*, 254.
32. Lehmborg, *Cathedrals Under Siege*, 215–57.
33. Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm*, 191–93.
34. Francis Drake, *Eboracum: Or the History and Antiquities of the City of York, from Its Original to the Present Times Together with the History of the Cathedral Church* (London: William Bowyer, 1736) (hereafter cited in text as *Eboracum*).
35. See K. J. Allison and P. M. Tillott, "York in the 18th Century," in *History of Yorkshire*, 249.
36. See Stephen Porter, *Destruction in the English Civil Wars* (Dover, NH: Alan Sutton, 1994), 15–40.
37. Sir Thomas Widdrington, *Analecta Eboracensia: Or, some Remaynes of the Ancient City of York*, ed. Caesar Caine (London: C. J. Clark, 1897), 120, 128; Porter, *Destruction in the English Civil Wars*, 85.
38. See Porter, *Destruction in the English Civil Wars*, 130–32.
39. See *Journal of William Dowling*, 188.
40. All the documents from the negotiations are printed in Drake, *Eboracum*; for a modern version of the whole story of the siege with documents, see Peter Wenham, *The Great and Close Siege of York, 1644* (Kington, England Roundwood, 1970).
41. See definition in *Journal of William Dowling*, 421. For a more ample treatment, see Eales, "Iconoclasm, Iconography, and the Altar."
42. "Dedication," Christopher Hildyard, *The Antiquities of York City and the Civil Government Thereof With a List of all the Mayors and Bayliffs, Lord Mayors and Sheriffs, from the Time of King Edward the First, to this present Year, 1719*, collected by James Torr, from the papers of Christopher Hildyard (York: G. White Printed for F. Hildyard, 1719).
43. Hildyard, *The Antiquities of York*.
44. See Cowie, "Worship in the Minster," in *History of Yorkshire*, 351.
45. Thomas Gent, *The Antient and Modern History of the Famous City of York; and in a Particular Manner of its Magnificent Cathedral, Commonly Call'd York-Minster* (London: Thomas Hammond, 1730) (hereafter cited in text as Gent).
46. See for a sampling, Gent, *The Antient and Modern History of the Famous City of York*; Thomas Gent, *The Most Delectable, Scriptural and Pious History of the Famous and Magnificent Great Eastern Window (According to Beautiful Portraitsures) in St. Peter's Cathedral, York* (York, 1762); Browne Willis, *Survey of the Cathedral of York* (York, 1727); Drake, *Eboracum*; Joseph Halfpenny, *Gothic Ornaments in the Cathedral Church of York* (York, 1795); William Hargrove, *History and Description of the Ancient City of York* (York, 1818); J. Hildyard, *An Accurate Description and History of the Metropolitan and Cathedral Churches of Canterbury and York, From their first Foundation to the present Year* (York, 1755); C. Wild, *Twelve Perspective Views of the Metropolitan Church at York* (London, 1809).
47. For a history of the reaction against Gothic from the "Renaissance" on, see Paul Frankl, "The Period of Reaction against Gothic," *The Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations Through Eight Centuries* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1960), 235–414.
48. See Perez Zagorin, *How the Idea of Religious Toleration Came to the West* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003), 240–88.
49. See Voltaire, *Treatise on Tolerance*, ed. Simon Harvey, trans. from French by Brian Masters (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
50. Daniel Defoe, *A Tour Through England and Wales*, 2 vols. (London: J. M. Dent, 1928) (hereafter cited in text as *TEW*).
51. See Tristram Hunt, *Building Jerusalem: The Rise and Fall of the Victorian City* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2004), 4.
52. "To those usually called Gothic Architects we are indebted for the first considerable Improvements in construction; there is a lightness in their works, an art and boldness of execution, to which the antients never arrived, and which the moderns comprehend and imitate with difficulty. England contains many magnificent examples of this Species of Architecture, equally admirable for the art with which they are built, the taste and ingenuity with which they are composed. One cannot refrain from wishing that the Gothic Structures were more considered, were better understood, and in higher estimation than they hitherto seem to have been. Would our Dilettanti instead of importing the gleanings of Greece, or our Antiquaries, instead of publishing loose incoherent prints, encourage persons duly qualified to

- undertake a correct elegant publication of our Cathedrals, and other Buildings called Gothic, before they totally fall to ruin, it would be of real service to the Arts of Design; preserve the remembrance of an extraordinary Style of Building, now sinking fast into Oblivion; and at the same time publish to the World the riches of Britain in the Splendor of her Ancient Structures" (Halfpenny, "Introduction," in *Gothic Ornaments*).
53. John Browne, *The History of the Metropolitan Church of St. Peter, York* (London: Longman, 1847), 320–21.
  54. *The Historians of the Church of York and Its Archbishops*, 3 vols., ed. James Raine in *The Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages* (London: Longman, 1879–94), ix.
  55. For a brilliant discussion of how these intersected in the period, see Hunt, *Building Jerusalem*, especially 3–7, 57–95.
  56. For the link between this fascination and fear of both the Middle Ages and the "Orient," see Ganim, *Medievalism and Orientalism*, especially chap. 1, which deals with Gothic architecture.
  57. See Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005; rept. 1992), 25–29.
  58. S. A. Skinner, *Tractarians and the "Condition of England": The Social and Political Thought of the Oxford Movement* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2004).
  59. A. W. N. Pugin, *The True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture* (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853); Augustus Welby Pugin, *Some Remarks on the Articles which have recently appeared in the Rambler relative to Ecclesiastical Architecture and Decoration* (London: Charles Dolman, 1850).
  60. George Ayliffe Poole and J. W. Hugall, *An Historical and Descriptive Guide to York Cathedral and Its Antiquities* (York: R. Sunter, 1850), 169.
  61. Ayliffe Poole and Hugall, *Historical and Descriptive Guide to York Cathedral*, 119.
  62. Ayliffe Poole and Hugall, *Historical and Descriptive Guide to York Cathedral*, iv, v, vi.
  63. Colley, *Britons*, 18.
  64. Rev. F. W. Farrar, *Our English Minsters* (London: Isbister, 1893), ser. 1, pp. 13–14.
  65. *Ibid.*, 2:65.
  66. *Ibid.*, 2:66.
  67. *Ibid.*, 2:111.
  68. As a sidenote, the case of the rood screen presents another chapter in the city's commitment to its signature building and its artifacts because one of the canons of the cathedral chapter had proposed moving the "pulpitum" after the fire in 1829 to where he asserted it had originally stood, based partially, no doubt, on discoveries due to the fire. His strongest argument was that the rood screen obstructed the view of the architecture of the building, and thus interfered with the aesthetic experience of the Gothic amplitude. The *Yorkshire Gazette*, representing opinions of local citizens, was in an uproar over the proposal, and as a consequence the bishop ordered the dean and chapter to abort the plan. Moving furnishings in this way was occurring in many cathedrals at the time in order to feature the architectural splendor of the Gothic design, but in York, its citizens argued for the status quo. One citizen wrote to the *Gazette*, making the argument that the church, with all its accoutrements dating from various periods, revealed the historical record: "I look on the architecture of all great public edifices as historical; and those edifices themselves as the most authentic records and interesting monuments of the state of the arts at the periods in which they were erected; and this, I apprehend, constitutes their principal claim to be preserved with care and fidelity." See *Yorkshire Gazette*, November 6, 1830, City Library of York for a more developed discussion of this controversy and its implications for preservation/restoration discussions; see Denslagen, "The 'Pulpitum' in York Minster," in *Architectural Restoration*, 57–59.

## CHAPTER 6

1. All translations, unless otherwise noted, are the author's.
2. "Église de la Madeleine à Vézelay," in *Archives de la Commission des Monuments Historiques*, 4 vols., publ. Achille Fould (Paris: Gide et J. Baudry, 1855–72), 2:1–8.
3. Réau, *Les Monuments détruits de l'art français*, 1:309.
4. For a complete inventory of the massive destruction, see Réau, *Les Monuments détruits de l'art français*, especially 1:284–370.

5. Abbé Grégoire, "Rapport sur les destructions opérées par le vandalisme, et sur les moyens de le réprimer," suivi du Décret de la *Convention nationale, Comité d'instruction publique*, 1793 (Paris: De l'imprimerie nationale, 1794), 1–28.
6. For the text of "Motion en faveur des Juifs" (1789), see Josiane Boulad-Ayoub, *L'Abbé Grégoire: Apologète de la République* (Paris: Honoré Champion éditeur, 2005), 138–57; for the "Mémoire en faveur des gens de couleur" (1789), see Boulad-Ayoub, *L'Abbé Grégoire*, 159–80.
7. For analysis of Grégoire's life and career, see Rita Hermon-Belot, *L'Abbé Grégoire: La Politique et la Vérité* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 2000); Alyssa Goldstein Sepinwall, *The Abbé Grégoire and the French Revolution: The Making of Modern Universalism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).
8. Abbé Grégoire, *Mémoires de Grégoire, Ancien évêque de Blois*, preface by Jean-Noël Jeanneney, intro. by Jean-Michel Leniaud (Paris: Éditions de Santé, 1989), 346.
9. Émile Mâle, *L'Art religieux du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle en France: étude sur l'iconographie du moyen âge et sur ses sources d'inspiration* (Paris: A. Colin, 1902).
10. As quoted in Réau, *Les Monuments détruits de l'art français*, 1:68.
11. Réau, *Les Monuments détruits de l'art français*, 1:77.
12. See Réau, *Les Monuments détruits de l'art français*, 1:19–25.
13. See Gamboni, 31–39.
14. For a list of the legislation passed in the 1790s, see Réau, *Les Monuments détruits de l'art français*, 1:380–84.
15. "On doit être encore effrayé de la rapidité avec laquelle, au moment de tout régénérer, les conspirateurs démoralisaient la nation et nous ramenaient par la barbarie à l'esclavage. Dans l'espace d'un an, ils ont failli détruire le produit de plusieurs siècles de civilisation" (Abbé Grégoire, "Troisième rapport sur le vandalisme," *Convention Nationale, instruction publique* [Paris: L'Imprimerie Nationale Des Lois, 1794], 2).
16. "On se rappelle que des furieux avaient proposé d'incendier les bibliothèques publiques. De toutes parts on faisait main basse sur les livres, les tableaux, les monuments qui portaient l'empreinte de la religion, de la féodalité, de la royauté; elle est incalculable la perte d'objets religieux, scientifiques et littéraires. Quand la première fois je proposai d'arrêter ces dévastations, on me gratifia de nouveau de l'épithète de *fanatique*; on assura que, sous prétexte d'amour pour les arts, je voulais sauver les *trophées de la superstition*. Cependant tels furent les excès auxquels on se porta, qu'enfin il fut possible de faire utilement entendre ma voix, et l'on *consentit* au comité à ce que je présentasse à la Convention un rapport contre le *vandalisme*. Je créai le mot pour tuer la chose" (*Mémoires de Grégoire*, 345–46).
17. "De toutes parts le pillage et la destruction étoient à l'ordre du jour" (Abbé Grégoire, "Rapport" [1793], 7).
18. See footnote 5.
19. This is my translation from "Le Décret" (the Decree) that follows Grégoire's 1793 "Rapport," 27–28.
20. "Une horde de brigands ont émigré; mais les arts n'émigreront pas. Comme nous, les arts sont enfans de la liberté; comme nous, ils ont une patrie, et nous transmettrons ce double héritage à la posterité" (*Ibid.*, 15).
21. "Le projet d'uniformer l'idiôme" (*Ibid.*, 16).
22. *Ibid.*, 20.
23. "Réimprimons tous les bons auteurs grecs et latins, avec les variantes et la traduction française à côté: c'est un nouveau moyen d'enrichir la République et de répandre la langue nationale" (*Ibid.*, 18).
24. *Ibid.*, 26.
25. Bourdieu and Darbel, *L'Amour de l'art*, 162.
26. "Symbolic capital" is Pierre Bourdieu's term for the power (cultural, social, economic, or political) that comes from the possession, performance, or display of symbolic value, as for example, a cultural heritage that is claimed by a particular people, wearing certain brand named clothes, having attended an ivy league school, or having visited certain places. See Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, trans. and intro. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984), 72–76.
27. Grégoire, "Rapport" (1793), 26.
28. Donald Preziosi, "Collecting/Museums," in *Critical Terms for Art History*, 407.
29. "Législateurs, que vous prescript l'intérêt national c'est d'utiliser au plutôt vos immenses et précieuses collections en les faisant servir à l'instruction de tous les citoyens" (Grégoire, *Rapport* [1793], 23).

30. Ibid, 27.
31. See Jean-Pierre Babelon and A. Chastel, "La Notion de patrimoine," *Revue de l'art* 49 (Paris, CNRS, 1980; repr. Liana Levi, 1994), 5–32; for collective memory, again, see Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*.
32. Gamboni, *Destruction of Art*, 35–39; Flood, "Between Cult and Culture," *Art Bulletin*, 652; Réau, *Monuments Détruits de l'Art Français*, 1:384–95; Pierre Bourdieu, *Les règles de l'art. Genèse et structure du champ littéraire* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1992).
33. Jean-Pierre Babelon, "The Louvre: Royal Residence and Temple of the Arts," in *Realms of Memory: The Construction of the French Past*, 3 vols., ed. Pierre Nora, English ed. Lawrence D. Krizman, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 3:278; Yveline Cantarel-Besson, *La naissance du musée du Louvre: La politique muséologique sous la Révolution d'après les archives des musées nationaux*, 2 vols. (Paris: Ministère de la Culture, éditions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 1981).
34. Jacques Le Goff, *History and Memory*, trans. Steven Rendall and Elizabeth Claman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), 87–88.
35. Jacques Le Goff, *History and Memory*, 88.
36. See Jean Hubert, "Préface," in *Les premiers travaux de la commission des Monuments historiques 1837–1848: Procès-verbaux et relevés d'architectes*, by Françoise Berçé (Paris: A. and J. Picard, 1979), ix.
37. Antonio Gramsci, *Gli Intellettuali e l'Organizzazione della Cultura* (Turin: Einaudi, 1949), 3:8–9, 14.
38. "Quiconque aura détruit, abattu, mutilé ou dégradé des monuments, statues et autres objets destinés à l'utilité ou à la décoration publique, et élevés par l'autorité publique ou avec son autorisation, sera puni d'un emprisonnement d'un mois à deux ans, et d'une amende de cent francs à cinq cents francs" (quoted in Jean Mallion, *Victor Hugo et l'art architectural* [Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1962], 418).
39. For the history of historical monuments in the nineteenth century in France, see Berçé, *Des Monuments Historiques au Patrimoine du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle à nos jours*, 11–50; for the idea of national patrimony in the revolutionary ideology, see Frédéric Rücker, *Les Origines de la Conservation des Monuments historiques en France (1790–1830)* (Paris: Jouve & Cie, 1913).
40. See Réau, *Les Monuments Détruits de l'Art Français*, 2:87.
41. See Peter Fritzsche, "How Nostalgia Narrates Modernity," in *The Work of Memory: New Directions in the Study of German Society and Culture*, ed. Alon Confino and Peter Fritzsche (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 62–85; Fritzsche, "Specters of History: On Nostalgia, Exile, and Modernity," in *The American Historical Review*; Peter Fritzsche, "Chateaubriand's Ruins: Loss and Memory after the French Revolution," *History and Memory: Studies in Representation of the Past* 10, no. 2 (Fall 1998): 102–17; and Fritzsche, *Stranded in the Present*.
42. See Rücker, *Les Origines de la Conservation des Monuments historiques en France*; Jean Mallion, *Victor Hugo et l'art architectural*, 408.
43. See Millin, *Antiquités nationales ou recueil de monuments*; also, Choay, *Invention of the Historic Monument*, 14; Riegl, *Le Culte Moderne des Monuments*.
44. Choay, *Invention of the Historic Monument*, 14.
45. For the role of Thomas Gray and other English poets, see Kenneth Clark, *The Gothic Revival: An Essay in the History of Taste* (1928; repr., London: John Murray, 1962), 28–45; also for French writers, see Elizabeth Emery, *Romancing the Cathedral: Gothic Architecture in Fin-de-Siècle French Culture* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001), 11–43.
46. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, "On German Architecture," in *Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. John Gearey, trans. Ellen von Nardroff and Ernest H. von Nardroff (New York: Suhrkamp, 1986), 4.
47. Goethe, "On German Architecture," 5.
48. Ibid., 8.
49. Ibid., 6.
50. Goethe, "On Gothic Architecture," in *Essays on Art and Literature*, 12.
51. See <http://www.sal.org.uk>.
52. See Denslagen, *Architectural Restoration*, 34–55.
53. As shown by Berçé, *Des Monuments Historiques au Patrimoine*.
54. Bourdieu and Darbel, *L'Amour de l'art*; also, Anderson, in the chapter "Census, Map, Museum," in his *Imagined Communities*, makes this argument about the nationalistic function of museums (163–85).
55. Nora, "The Era of Commemoration," in *Realms of Memory*, 3:635–36.



## CHAPTER 7

1. A version of this chapter appeared in *Variations*, the journal of comparative literature of the University of Zurich, in 2003. All translations from French, except where noted, are the author's.
2. See Edmond Biré, *Victor Hugo et la restauration: étude historique et littéraire* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1869), 7–8.
3. Victor Hugo, "1825, Guerre aux Démolisseurs," in *Oeuvres Complètes*, vol. 5, ed. Jean Massin (Paris: Le Club Française du Livre, 1967), 160–62.
4. *Ibid.*, 162.
5. *Ibid.*, 163.
6. Hugo, "1834, Guerre aux Démolisseurs," 171–72.
7. The 1964 Venice Charter was adopted in 1965 by ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) as an advisory to the World Heritage Convention. See [http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/venice\\_e.htm](http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.htm).
8. Hugo, "1834, Guerre aux Démolisseurs," 171–72.
9. See Jacques Seebacher, "Introduction," in Victor Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris 1482*, ed. Jacques Seebacher and Yves Gohin (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 1059–61. All references to the text in French come from this edition.
10. *Ibid.*, 1047, 1067.
11. Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, 109–10.
12. This is a point made in José Manuel Losada Goya, "Victor Hugo ou les paradoxes de l'architecture: du livre de pierre au livre de papier," *Travaux de Littérature: Architectes et Architecture dans la Littérature Française* 12 (1999): 163–71.
13. English translations are from Victor Hugo, *Notre-Dame of Paris*, trans. John Sturrock (London: Penguin Books, 1978), 124 (hereafter cited in text as *NDP*); "Trois choses importantes manquent aujourd'hui à cette façade. D'abord le degré de onze marches qui l'exhaussait jadis au-dessus du sol; ensuite la série inférieure de statues qui occupait les niches des trois portails, et la série supérieure des vingt-huit plus anciens rois de France, qui garnissait la galerie du premier étage, à partir de Childebert jusqu'à Philippe Auguste, tenant en main 'la pomme impériale'" (Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, 107).
14. See, for example, Jacques Le Goff, *Saint Louis* (Paris: Gallimard, 1996); Jacques Le Goff, "La genèse de l'état français au Moyen Age," in *L'état et les pouvoirs*, vol. 2 of *Histoire de la France*, ed. André Burguière and Jacques Revel (Paris: Seuil, 1989), 21–180; Marie-Thérèse Lorcin, *La France au XIIIe siècle: économie et société* (Paris: Nathan, 1975); Jean Richard, *Saint Louis: Crusader King of France*, ed. and abridged by Simon Lloyd, trans. Jean Birrell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), chap. 11.
15. Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, 110; Victor Hugo, *Notre-Dame of Paris*, trans. John Sturrock, 125–30.
16. For example, see Victor Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, édition illustrée d'après les dessins de MM. E de Beaumont, L. Boulanger, Daubigny, T. Johannot, de Lemud, Meissonnier, G. Roqueplan, de Rudder, Steinbeil (Paris: Perrotin, éditeur, 1844); Victor Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, with illustrations by Brion (Paris: J. Hetzel, 1865).
17. "Sur la face de cette vieille reine de nos cathédrales à côté d'une ride on trouve toujours une cicatrice" (Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, 106).
18. "Ouvert quelques perspectives vraies sur l'art du moyen âge, sur cet art merveilleux jusqu'à présent inconnu des uns, ou, ce qui est pire encore, méconnu des autres" (*Ibid.*, 7).
19. See "Editor's Introduction," in *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, by Immanuel Kant, ed. Paul Guyer, trans. Paul Guyer and Eric Matthews (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), xiv.
20. See Hayden White, "The Politics of Historical Representation: Discipline and De-Sublimation," in *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 70–71.
21. Habermas, *Religion and Rationality*, 84; see also Kant, *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, 89–230 for Habermas' philosophical foundation.
22. Hugo, *Notre-Dame of Paris*, 126; "Les modes, de plus en plus grotesques et sottes, qui depuis les anarchiques et splendides déviations de la renaissance, se sont succédé dans la décadence nécessaire de l'architecture. Les modes ont fait plus de mal que les révolutions" (Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, 109).



23. Author's translation. The original follows: "Remercions solennellement M. Victor Hugo . . . de la vive et éclatante lumière qu'il a jetée sur des beautés depuis longtemps négligées, et que son ouvrage contribuera, plus que toute autre chose, à populariser. Tous les Français, intéressés à ce titre à ce que la France ne soit pas dépouillée de ses plus beaux ornements, doivent à l'auteur de cette énergique défense des chefs-d'oeuvre de nos pères le témoignage de leur reconnaissance. Celui qui a si courageusement flétri les ténébreuses dévastations de la *bande noire* a retrouvé toute sa poétique énergie pour flétrir le goût atroce qui s'en va aujourd'hui effaçant, mutilant, détruisant et replaçant sur toute la surface de la France . . . C'est par l'opinion publique qu'il faut attaquer et battre en brèche cette dégradante influence du XVIIIe siècle sur le plus noble et le plus populaire des arts. Nous ne connaissons pas d'ouvrage plus propre à commencer cette attaque que Notre-Dame de Paris. M. Victor Hugo aura la gloire d'avoir donné le signal de la révolution qui doit infailliblement s'opérer dans l'architecture; ses admirables chapitres intitulés *Notre-Dame* et *Paris vu à vol d'oiseau*, sont les premiers manifestes d'un goût nouveau, d'une seconde *renaissance*, à qui certes il faut souhaiter de meilleures destinées qu'à la première" (quoted in Biré, *Victor Hugo et la restauration*, 7–8).
24. This point is also made by Goya, "Victor Hugo ou les paradoxes de l'architecture," 163.
25. "Sans doute c'est encore aujourd'hui un majestueux et sublime édifice que l'église de Notre-Dame de Paris," this "vaste symphonie en pierre . . . oeuvre colossale d'un homme et d'un peuple" (Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, 106–7).
26. Paul Guyer, "Editor's Introduction," in *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, xxxii.
27. Kant, *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, 128.
28. Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, 124; "Oeuvre colossale . . . sorte de création humaine, en un mot, puissante et féconde comme la création divine dont elle semble avoir dérobé le double caractère: variété, éternité" (Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, 107).
29. For an elaboration of this idea, see Susan A. Crane, *Collecting and Historical Consciousness in Early Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000), 1–37.
30. ". . . Dans *Notre-Dame*, l'idée première, vitale, l'inspiration génératrice de l'oeuvre est sans contredit l'art, l'architecture, l'amour de cette cathédrale et de son architecture" (Charles Augustin Sainte-Beuve, "Notes de l'éditeur," in *Prospectus pour l'édition de 1832*, in Victor Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris 1482* [Paris: La Librairie Ollendorff, 1904], 455.)
31. "Il a sauvé l'art du Moyen âge en France et donné à l'archéologie une impulsion lyrique" (Théophile Gautier, *Dessins de Victor Hugo* [Paris: Castel, 1863], 10).
32. For a major study of this architectural interest of Hugo's and the impact of his work, see Mallion, *Victor Hugo et l'art architectural*, 445–79.
33. Mallion, *Victor Hugo et l'art architectural*, 446–48.
34. "Défectueux par plus d'un côté" (Biré, *Victor Hugo et la restauration*, 7 [author's translation]).
35. "*Notre* architecture nationale," "*nos* monuments gothiques," and "*nos* vieilles cathédrales" (Biré, *Victor Hugo et la restauration*, 7 [my translation and emphasis]).
36. For a study of Hugo's medievalism, see Patricia A. Ward, *The Medievalism of Victor Hugo* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1975).
37. "Il est certain que dans l'époque architecturale les poèmes, rares, il est vrai, ressemblent aux monuments" (Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, 187).
38. "Signifiait qu'un . . . art allait détrôner un autre art. Elle voulait dire: L'imprimerie tuera l'architecture" (Ibid., 175).
39. "La grandeur de l'édifice qu'il élève à son tour l'imprimerie" (Ibid., 187).
40. "L'architecture est le grand livre de l'humanité" (Ibid., 175).
41. "De cette manière, sous prétexte de bâtir des églises à Dieu, l'art se développait dans des proportions magnifiques. . . une église tout entière présente un sens symbolique absolument étranger au culte, ou même hostile à l'église" (Ibid., 179).
42. "L'architecture est détrônée. Aux lettres de pierre d'Orphée vont succéder les lettres de plomb de Gutenberg" (Ibid., 182).
43. "Qu'on ne s'y trompe pas, l'architecture est morte, morte sans retour, tuée par le livre imprimé" (Ibid., 186).
44. "Dante . . . c'est la dernière église romane, Shakespeare . . . la dernière cathédrale gothique" (Ibid., 187).
45. "C'est la seconde tour de Babel du genre humain" (Ibid., 188).

46. See Joan C. Kessler, "Cette Babel du monde": Visionary Architecture in the Poetry of Victor Hugo," *Nineteenth-century French Studies* 19, no. 3 (1991): 417–31.
47. "L'art social," "l'art collectif" (Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, 187).
48. "La presse tuera l'église" (Ibid., 174).
49. Ibid., 112.
50. Bourdieu and Darbel, *L'Amour de l'art: les musées d'art européens et leur public*.
51. "L'écriture universelle" (Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, 180).
52. See Andreas Speer, "Is There a Theology of the Gothic Cathedral? A Re-reading of Abbot Suger's Writings on the Abbey Church of St.-Denis," in *Mind's Eye*, 65–83.
53. Jeanine Sauvanon, *Les métiers au Moyen-Âge: leurs "signatures" dans les vitraux: Cathédrale de Chartres* (Chartres: Éditions Houvet, 1993).
54. Thomas Aquinas did in fact write on aesthetics as Umberto Eco has shown in *The Aesthetics of Thomas Aquinas*, trans. Hugh Bredin (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988). I would agree with Eco that Benedetto Croce's dismissive remark that Thomas's notions about aesthetics are overly general and dull was ill informed (Eco, *Aesthetics of Thomas Aquinas*, 1–19), but nonetheless, it would be difficult to maintain that the period exhibits a widespread and self-conscious "aesthetic sensibility" of the sort that has emerged since the eighteenth century. See also, Hamburger, "The Place of Theology," in *Mind's Eye*.
55. Abbot Suger, *Abbot Suger on the Abbey Church of St.-Denis and Its Art Treasures*, ed., trans., and annotated by Erwin Panofsky (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979; orig. 1946), xi.
56. For Abbot Suger, see Speer, "Is There a Theology of the Gothic Cathedral?" in *Mind's Eye*; also see Frankl, *The Gothic*, 3–24, and for primary texts, Appendix 1a–1c, pp. 839–41, and Appendix 2, p. 841; for Suger, "De Administratione," in *Abbot Suger*, ed. Panofsky, 42–81.
57. For Gervase, see Frankl, *Gothic*, 24–35, Appendix 3a–3b, pp. 842–44.
58. Bourdieu and Darbel, *L'Amour de l'art*, 162.
59. For an extended discussion of this topic, see Bourdieu, *Les règles de l'art*, especially "La genèse historique de l'esthétique pure" (393–430) and "La genèse sociale de l'oeil" (431–41).
60. See introduction to Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, where he draws this distinction between "official" and "unofficial" culture in the Middle Ages (1–58).
61. Speer identifies this with the "living theology": a combination of schooling, of liturgy-rooted, monastic piety, of the personal literary interest of a learned monk," lying behind Suger's "gothic" innovations at St. Denis and that came to inspire the architectural, stained glass, and sculptural changes of the thirteenth century. See "Is There a Theology of the Gothic Cathedral?" 75.
62. "Le livre architectural n'appartient plus au sacerdoce, à la religion, à Rome; il est à l'imagination, à la poésie, au peuple" (Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, 178).

## CHAPTER 8

1. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are mine.
2. Eugène Emmanuelle Viollet le Duc, "Construction," in *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XI<sup>e</sup> au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 4:1.
3. See Denslagen, "The prestige of Viollet le Duc: Sens and Roermond," 118–25; and "Viollet le Duc: Rationality and Restoration," in *Architectural restoration*, 126–39, for an overview of Viollet le Duc's general principles of restoration and Gothic architecture.
4. Bercé, *Des Monuments Historiques*, 7–50. For a thorough introduction to the people involved in the French recovery movement and their diverse attitudes in this period, see Alain Erlande-Brandenburg, *La Cathédrale* (Paris: Fayard, 1989), 13–39; also see Kevin D. Murphy, *Memory and Modernity: Viollet le Duc at Vézelay* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 2000).
5. As detailed in Bercé, *Des Monuments Historiques*, 20–21.
6. A. L. Millin, *Dictionnaire des Beaux-Arts* (Paris: J. N. Barba, 1838).
7. Sette, *Il Restauro in Architettura*, ix.
8. Again, see Bercé, *Des Monuments Historiques*, 24.
9. Bercé, *Les premiers travaux de la commission des monuments historiques*, 2–3.
10. Sir John Summerson, "Viollet le Duc and the Rational Point of View," *Architectural Design* 3, no. 4 (1980): 7–8.

11. See Sylvia Lyon, *The Life and Times of Prosper Mérimée* (New York: Dial, 1948), vii; Sir Nikolaus Pevsner, "Ruskin and Viollet le Duc: Englishness and Frenchness in the Appreciation of Gothic Architecture," *Architectural Design* 3, no. 4 (1980): 48.
12. Prosper Mérimée, "Mai 1856," in *La Correspondance Mérimée—Viollet le Duc*, 53.
13. Françoise Bercé, "Archéologie et Politique," in *Prosper Mérimée: Écrivain, Archéologue, Historien*, ed. Antonia Fonyi (Geneva: Droz, 1999), 3–14.
14. Bercé, "Archéologie et Politique," in *Prosper Mérimée: Écrivain, Archéologue, Historien*, 7. Also in *Des Monuments Historiques*, Bercé points out that Mérimée invariably appealed to the age of a building to justify its protection (31).
15. See Speer, "Is There a Theology of the Gothic Cathedral?" in *Mind's Eye*, in which he argues that "liturgy" was the prompt to redesigning Saint-Denis (68–69). Also see Michael Camille, *Gothic Art: Glorious Visions* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996).
16. As quoted by Bercé, "Archéologie et Politique," 12. For Mérimée's primary affection for Greco-Roman architecture, see letters written to Viollet le Duc in 1858, in *Correspondance*, 65–73.
17. "Venise, 21 août, 1858," in *Correspondance*, 59.
18. E. Viollet le Duc, *Lettres d'Italie 1836–1837*, ed. Geneviève Viollet le Duc (Paris: Léonce Laget, 1971), 327–28.
19. "La Commission décide après discussion qu'une note sera remise officieusement au président de la commission du budget et à quelques-uns de ses membres pour obtenir que l'entretien des édifices diocésains dépende du Ministre de l'Intérieur et non de celui des Cultes.  
M. Vitet expose qu'après avoir consulté quelques jurisconsultes, il a dû reconnaître que la loi du 7 juillet 1833 permettait d'agir en expropriation dans tous les cas où l'intérêt des arts ferait désirer cette mesure. Les termes généraux de cette loi permettent de l'appliquer non seulement au déblayement ou à l'acquisition des monuments historiques mais encore aux fouilles à exécuter sous le sol d'édifices antiques.  
Une ordonnance royale déclarera d'abord monument public un édifice ou un fragment d'édifice, le préfet conformément à la loi du 7 juillet 1833 instituera une enquête sur la nécessité ou l'utilité de la conservation de ce monument" (Bercé, *Les premiers travaux de la commission des monuments historiques 1837–1848: Procès-verbaux et relevés d'architectes*, 29–30).
20. Again, see Denslagen, *Architectural restoration*, 118–25.
21. "En attendant, le Président appelle l'attention de la Commission, sur la manière dont on emploie dans les départements les fonds de concours accordés par le ministre. Dans beaucoup de localités, les réparations exécutées au moyen de ces secours, ne sont l'objet d'aucune surveillance intelligente, et les architectes les exécutent souvent de la manière la plus contraire au bon goût et aux intentions mêmes du gouvernement. Il cite à cette occasion les travaux récemment exécutés sur plusieurs points du département de la Côte-d'Or. Pour mettre un terme à ces traits de vandalisme, la Commission aurait à examiner s'il ne conviendrait pas de retirer aux architectes de département la direction de ces travaux pour en investir des architectes de Paris dont le talent serait connu.  
M. le baron Taylor, fait observer que l'étude des arts du Moyen-Age est trop récente en France pour qu'elle ait pu se répandre encore dans nos provinces, toujours un peu arriérées relativement à la capitale. . . .  
La Commission est unanimement d'avis que lorsque le gouvernement fait les frais d'une restauration considérable, il doit nommer lui-même l'architecte qui la dirigera et que dans le cas où soit les départements, soit les communes s'associeraient aux dépenses nécessaires, l'administration devrait mettre comme condition *sine qua non*, à ces secours, le droit de désigner l'architecte" (Bercé, *Les premiers travaux de la commission des monuments historiques*, 39–40).
22. See Sette, *Il Restauro in Architettura*, for a current discussion of the issues raised by restoration; Denslagen, *Architectural restoration*.
23. Riegl, "The Modern Cult of Monuments," in *Historical and Philosophical Issues*, 77–78.
24. See Choay, *Invention of the Historic Monument*, 102–6, for an elaboration of this problem in reconstruction.
25. "M. Duban demande l'avis de la Commission sur la restauration des deux tourelles à la façade de la Sainte-Chapelle; elles ont été reconstruites à la fin du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle et appartiennent au plus mauvais style de l'ogival en décadence, et remplacent celles du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle dont les amorces sont conservés, et qui s'élevaient aux deux côtés du pignon conservé, du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle comme toutes les autres parties saillantes de l'édifice. Il faut

*en reconstruire une jusqu'à la hauteur des anciennes constructions, et l'autre doit être reprise par incrustation ce qui toujours fait un mauvais effet, sur les plans inclinés; ce ne serait pas le cas de les refaire en style du XIIIe siècle. . . .* M. Duban réclame l'appui de la Commission pour obtenir des entrepreneurs qui puissent exécuter d'une manière satisfaisante les travaux qu'il ordonne, et en partie ceux de peinture, de dorure et de sculpture, et les restaurations de verrières" (Bercé, *Les premiers travaux de la commission des monuments historiques*, 153).

26. On Viollet le Duc as the architect of the "rational school in France," see Frankl, *Gothic*, 563–78.
27. Eugène Emmanuel Viollet le Duc, "Lecture VII," from a series of lectures delivered from the artist's own studio in 1860, in *Discourses on Architecture*, vol. 1, trans. Benjamin Bucknall (Boston: Ticknor, 1889), 297.
28. *Ibid.*, 302.
29. See Viollet le Duc, "Lecture I," in *Discourses on Architecture*, 1:9–33.
30. Viollet le Duc, *L'architecture raisonnée; Extraits du Dictionnaire de l'architecture française*, ed. Hubert Damisch (Paris: Hermann, 1978), 52–53.
31. Viollet le Duc, *Lettres d'Italie: The Architectural Theory of Viollet le Duc: Readings and Commentary*, ed. M. F. Hearn (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990), 1–19.
32. Viollet le Duc, "Lecture 1," in *Discourses on Architecture*, 1:32 (9–33).
33. Viollet le Duc, "Lecture VII," in *Discourses on Architecture*, 1:257.
34. *Ibid.*, 1: 258.
35. *Ibid.*, 1:258–60.
36. *Ibid.*, 1:321–22.
37. *Ibid.*, 1:262, 263–264.
38. Viollet le Duc, "Lecture I," in *Discourses on Architecture*, 1:29.
39. Hubert Damisch, "The Space Between: A Structuralist Approach to the Dictionnaire," *Architectural Design* 3, no. 4 (1980): 86.
40. "Église de la Madeleine à Vézelay," in *Archives de la Commission des Monuments Historiques*, 2:1–8, with twelve plates of Viollet le Duc's original drawings of the church.
41. Viollet le Duc, "Aperçu general et principes de la construction," in *L'architecture raisonnée*, 106–9, 133–34.
42. Viollet le Duc, "L'architecture française, d'une Renaissance à l'autre," in *L'architecture raisonnée*, 140.
43. *Ibid.*, 137–40.
44. Viollet le Duc, "Aperçu général et principes de la construction," in *L'architecture raisonnée*, 108.
45. Viollet le Duc, "Restauration," in *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XIe au XVIe siècle*, 8:14.
46. *Ibid.*, 14–34. The remainder of this section quotes from the original (my loose translation).
47. Viollet le Duc, "L'architecture française, d'une Renaissance à l'autre," in *L'architecture raisonnée*.
48. Viollet le Duc, "Restauration," in *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XIe au XVIe siècle*, 8:14–34.
49. *Ibid.*, 8:14–34.
50. Denslagen, *Architectural restoration*, 126–39.
51. See Daniel D. Reiff, "Viollet le Duc and Historic Restoration: The West Portals of Notre-Dame," *Journal of Society of Architectural Historians* 30 (March 1971): 17–30. See also, Mallion, *Victor Hugo*, 521.
52. Frankl calls this "The Scientific Trend" (*Gothic*, 491–596).
53. Hunt, "Pugin versus the Panopticon," in *Building Jerusalem*, 57–95, for the revival of festivals, pagantry, and "national faith." For the emergence of the taste for ruins in England, specifically, see Paul Zucker, *Fascination of Decay: Ruins. Relic-Symbol-Ornament* (Ridgewood, NJ, Gregg, 1968), 161–91.
54. Central here, especially for Germany and France, is Fritzsche, *Stranded in the Present*.
55. *Ecclesiologist*, November, 1, 1841.
56. See "Ecclesiology," in Clark, *Gothic Revival*, 150–74.
57. Clark's argument in *Gothic Revival*. For the Houses of Parliament, see Clark, *Gothic Revival*, 108–21; see also Andrew Saint, "Pugin's Architecture in Context," in *A. W. N. Pugin, Master of Gothic Revival*, ed. Paul Atterbury (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 84.
58. Thomas Rickman, *An Attempt to discriminate the styles of Architecture in England from the Conquest to the Reformation* (1817; repr., London: John Henry Parker, 1848).

59. Augustus Charles Pugin, *Specimens of Gothic Architecture; Selected from Various Ancient Edifices in England*, 2 vols. (London, 1821; repr., Edinburgh: John Grant, 1895).
60. See Frankl, *Gothic*, 497.
61. John Britton, *Cathedral Antiquities*, vol. 1 of *Historical and Descriptive Account of the Metropolitan Cathedral of Canterbury and York*, 5 vols. (London: M. A. Nattali, 1836), i.
62. Clark, *Gothic Revival*, 79–80.
63. Rickman, "Preface," in *Attempt to Discriminate*, ix.
64. Rickman, "On the Architecture of a part of France," in *Attempt to Discriminate*, lii.
65. Author of *Specimens of Gothic Architecture; Selected from Various Ancient Edifices in England*.
66. Augustus Welby Pugin, *The True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture*; see also Megan Aldrich, "Gothic Sensibility: The Early Years of the Gothic Revival," in A.W.N. Pugin, *Master of Gothic Revival*, 28.
67. Susan Weber Soros, "Foreword," in A.W.N. Pugin, *Master of Gothic Revival*, 6–8.
68. Pugin, *Some Remarks on the Articles*, 17.
69. Again, see Fritzsche, "Specters of History," in *The American Historical Review*; "How Nostalgia Narrates Modernity," in *The Work of Memory*.
70. Pugin, *True Principles*, 47, 48.
71. See Margaret Henderson Floyd, "A W.N. Pugin and the Gothic Movement in North America," in A.W.N. Pugin, *Master of Gothic Revival*, 201–21.
72. Again, see Clark, *Gothic Architecture* 129–33, for a discussion.
73. Pugin, *True Principles*, 55; again, see Ganim, *Medievalism and Orientalism* 36–39, for an extended discussion.
74. Pugin, *True Principles*, 47.
75. "Gothic architecture is generally considered as more picturesque, though less beautiful, than Grecian, and, upon the same principle that a ruin is more so than a new edifice" (Uvedale Price, *An Essay on the Picturesque as Compared with the Sublime and the Beautiful and on the Use of Studying Pictures, for the Purpose of Improving Real Landscape* [London: J. Robson, 1794], 63). For an overview of the development of the idea of the "picturesque," see Frankl, *Gothic*, 428–42; also, Horace Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting in England* (London: Leigh & Sotheby, 1808).
76. Britton, *Cathedral Antiquities*, 1:i.
77. See William Morris, "Manifesto of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings," in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, 319–21.
78. Philippot, "Restoration from the Perspective of the Humanities," in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, 223.
79. For an overview, see Réau, *Monuments détruits*, 1:46–49; see also Dale Kinney, "Spolia"; and Christof Thoenes, "Renaissance St. Peter's" in *St. Peter's in the Vatican*, ed. William Tronzo (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 16–47, 64–92.
80. See especially Ruskin, "The Lamp of Beauty," in *The Seven Lamps*, where he elaborates a quasi-monastic theory of architecture (141), and "Lamp of Memory," 177.
81. Ruskin, "Lamp of Memory," *Seven Lamps*, 184–85.
82. Ruskin, "Lamp of Obedience," *Seven Lamps*, 188.
83. John Ruskin, "Preface to the Third Edition" (1874), in *The Stones of Venice*, 3 vols. (Orpington, Kent: George Allen, 1886), 2:v.
84. <http://www.spab.org.uk/>.
85. See P. A. T. I. Burman, "What is Cultural Heritage?" in *Rational Decision-making in the Preservation of Cultural Property*, ed. N. S. Baer and F. Snickars (Berlin: Dahlem University Press, 2001), 12, for the applicability of Morris's criteria to contemporary definitions of "cultural property."
86. William Morris, "Manifesto of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings," in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, 319–21.
87. "Restauro niente; e buttar via subito, senza remissione, tutti quelli che sono stati fatti sinora, recenti o vecchi" (Camillo Boito, "I restauratori (1884)," in *Ideologie e prassi del restauro con antologia di testi*, ed. Giuseppe La Monica [Palermo: Libreria Nuova Presenza, 1974], 19).
88. "Fermarsi a tempo; e qui sta la saviezza; Contentarsi del meno possibile" (Boito, "I restauratori," 22).

89. "... Il primo e inflessibile principio è questo, di non innovare, quand' anche si fosse spinti alla innovazione dal lodevole intento di compiere o di abbellire" (Boito, "I restauratori," 25). For the Viollet le Duc and Mérimée discussion, see pp. 24–25.
90. "Bisogna fare l'impossibile, bisogna fare miracoli per conservare al monumento il suo vecchio aspetto artistico e pittoresco" (Boito, "I restauratori," 25).
91. "Bisogna che i complimenti, se sono indispensabili, e le aggiunte, se non si possono scansare, mostrino, non di essere opere antiche, ma di essere opere d'oggi" (Boito, "I restauratori," 25).
92. Paul Philippot, "Historic Preservation: Philosophy, Criteria, Guidelines," in *Preservation and Conservation: Principles and Practices*, ed. Sharon Timmons (Washington, D.C.: Preservation Press, National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, 1976), 372.
93. Riegl, "The Modern Cult of Monuments," in *Historical and Philosophical Issues*, 71.
94. See Michael Gubser, *Time's Visible Surface: Alois Riegl and the Discourse on History and Temporality in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2006), 26, for Riegl's theories about time.
95. Riegl, "The Modern Cult of Monuments," 73.
96. *Ibid.*, 75–81.
97. In *Contrasts and the True Principles*; see also, Hunt, *Building Jerusalem*, 57–95.
98. Ruskin, "An Inquiry into some of the conditions at present affecting the Study of Architecture in our schools," in *Seven Lamps*, 345.
99. Rodin, *Les Cathédrales de France*, 5, 36, 116, and 121, for parallels with Cambodian dancers.
100. See Crane, *Collecting and Historical Consciousness in Early Nineteenth-Century Germany*, 19–37.
101. See Zucker, *Fascination of Decay*, 161–63, 195–245.
102. This is the idea developed by Fritzsche, *Stranded in the Present*, in his discussion of ruins in the nineteenth century (92–130).

## CONCLUSION

1. For example, see Hunt, "Pugin versus The Panopticon," in *Building Jerusalem*, 57–95 for the revival of festivals, pageantry, and "national faith."
2. <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich>.
3. <http://www.nps.gov/aboutus/history.htm>.
4. <http://www.nps.gov/aboutus/history.htm>.
5. <http://www.nps.gov/aboutus/history.htm>.
6. Besides Monticello and the University of Virginia, the only U.S. territory man-made monuments on the World Heritage List are Independence Hall, Philadelphia, the Statue of Liberty, and the pre-U.S. Chaco Culture and Pueblo de Taos.
7. For the story of Monticello, see Charles B. Hosmer, Jr., *Presence of the Past: A History of the Preservation Movement in the United States Before Williamsburg* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1965), 153–92, <http://www.monticello.org/about/levy.html>, <http://www.monticello.org/about/foundation.html>.
8. See Hosmer, *Presence of the Past*.
9. For the background, see <http://www.athensguide.com/elginmarbles/work.html>.
10. Lowenthal, *Possessed by the Past*, 243; for Virginia Woolf, see "A Dialogue upon Mount Pentelicus" *Times Literary Supplement*, September 11–17, 1987, 979.
11. Garry Wills, "We Are All Romans Now," review of *Art of the Classical World in the Metropolitan Museum of Art by Carlos Picón and Others*, *New York Review of Books* LIV, no. 9 (May 31, 2007): 12–14.
12. Mariotti, *Legislazione delle Belle Arti*, xl.
13. Réau, *Les Monuments Détruits*, 2:269–72.
14. See Salvatore Settis, *Italia S.p.a. l'assalto al patrimonio culturale* (Turin: Einaudi, 2002) for anxieties about the contemporary assault on Italy's patrimony.
15. See "Greek Antiquities Raids are Linked to Italian Trial," comp. Lawrence Van Gelder, *New York Times*, April 17, 2006.
16. See Roger Atwood, *Stealing History: Tomb Raiders, Smugglers, and the Looting of the Ancient World* (New York: St. Martin's, 2004).
17. Kwame Anthony Appiah, "Whose Culture Is It?" *New York Review of Books*, February 9, 2006, 38–41. For a view of this kind of literary "translation," see Pascale Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*,

- trans. M. B. DeBevoise (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004) for a current discussion of literature crossing borders.
18. Wills, "We Are All Romans."
  19. Settis, *Italia S.p.a. l'assalto al patrimonio culturale*.
  20. For a survey of European legislation, see Gerard Baldwin Brown (1849–1932), *The Care of Ancient Monuments: An Account of the Legislative and Other Measures Adopted in European Countries for Protecting Ancient Monuments and Objects and Scenes of Natural Beauty, and for Preserving the Aspect of Historical Cities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905).
  21. Baldwin Brown, *Care of Ancient Monuments*, 80–90.
  22. Grégoire, *Rapport* (1793), 26.
  23. "Ah! nous sommes encore loin d'égaliser les Italiens pour le respect qu'ils portent à leurs monuments" (in "Lettre 40," *Lettres d'Italie*, 168).
  24. See especially, "Lettre 27" to his father, August 1836, in *Lettres d'Italie*, 117.
  25. For an overview of the present situation that reaches back into Italy's history, see Roberto Cecchi, *I beni culturali: Testimonianza materiale di civiltà* (Milan: Spirali, 2006).
  26. Cecchi, *I beni culturali*, 11.
  27. Settis, *Italia S.p.A.*, 9 (author's translation).
  28. Paleotti, *Discorso intorno alle immagini sacre e profane*.
  29. Anthony Grafton, ed., *Rome Reborn: The Vatican Library & Renaissance Culture* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1993).
  30. For versions of this complex history, see Mariotti, *Legislazione*, 235–41, who connects the Church's support for arts to ancient Roman traditions. See also Choay, *Invention of the Historic Monument*, 34–39; *The Church and the Arts*.
  31. See *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2:774–76; also *Church and the Arts*.
  32. For the documents from 1624 to 1821, see Mariotti, *Legislazione*, 208–44.
  33. See Cecchi, "Appendix for the recommendations, protocols, and legislation from 1967–2000," *I beni culturali*, 145–230.
  34. See Fritzsche, *Stranded in the Present*, 124.
  35. Baldwin Brown, *Care of Ancient Monuments*, 97–125.
  36. *Ibid.*, 166–215.
  37. Bourdieu and Darbel, *L'Amour de l'art: les musées d'art européens et leur public*; Anderson, in chapter 10, "Census, Map, Museum," in Anderson, *Imagined Communities* 163–86.
  38. Hans Erich Nossack, *The End: Hamburg 1943*, trans. and foreword by Joel Agee (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).
  39. Sebald, *On The Natural History of Destruction*, 3–197.
  40. See James E. Young, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993), 27–79.
  41. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/916>.
  42. See Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasts*, 182.
  43. The articles are archived at <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/lawofwar/hague04.htm>.
  44. See <http://www.icrc.org/eng>.
  45. Article 53, 1977, states, "Part IV: Civilian population Section I—General protection against effects of hostilities; Chapter III—Civilian objects, Protection of cultural objects and of places of worship: Without prejudice to the provisions of the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict of 14 May 1954, and of other relevant international instruments, it is prohibited: (a) to commit any acts of hostility directed against the historic monuments, works of art or places of worship which constitute the cultural or spiritual heritage of peoples; (b) to use such objects in support of the military effort; (c) to make such objects the object of reprisals" (<http://www.icrc.org/eng>).
  46. <http://www.icomos.org/hague/HagueArt1.html>.
  47. For the articles, see <http://www.icrc.org/eng>.
  48. Jean-Jacques Renoliet, *L'UNESCO oubliée: La Société des Nations et la coopération intellectuelle (1919–1946)* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1999); Burman, "What is Cultural Heritage?" in *Rational Decision-making in the Preservation of Cultural Property*, 11–22; Rodolfo Stavenhagen, "Cultural Rights: A Social Science Perspective," in *Cultural Rights and Wrongs: A Collection of Essays in Commemoration of*

*the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, ed. Halina Niec (UNESCO: Institute of Art and Law, 1998), 1–20.

49. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/175/>
50. See <http://whc.unesco.org/en/hist/88>.
51. [http://www.icomos.org/athens\\_charter.html](http://www.icomos.org/athens_charter.html).
52. See R. Nanda et al., “Group Report: Values and Society,” in *Rational Decision-Making in the Preservation of Cultural Property*, 65.
53. [http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/venice\\_e.htm](http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.htm).
54. See Starn, “Architectural Imitations,” in *Architectural Imitations*; Choay, *Invention of the Historic Monument*; and Lowenthal, “Why Sanctions Seldom Work: Reflections on Cultural Property Internationalism.” For the flaw in the Venice Charter because it failed to address “cultural diversity,” see R. Nanda, “Values and Society in Rational Decision-Making.”
55. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/175/>
56. <http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>.
57. [http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/stocdec\\_e.htm](http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/stocdec_e.htm).
58. Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques* (Paris: Plon, 1955).
59. Article 1, Definition of Cultural Property. For the articles, see <http://www.international.icomos.home.html>.
60. Stavenhagen, “Cultural Rights: A Social Science Perspective,” in *Cultural Rights and Wrongs*, 1–20.
61. Darrell Addison Posey, “Can Cultural Rights Protect Traditional Cultural Knowledge and Biodiversity?” in *Cultural Rights and Wrongs*, 42.
62. For the ongoing debate, see Burman, “What is Cultural Heritage?”
63. See Stavenhagen, “Cultural Rights: A Social-Science Perspective,” in *Cultural Rights and Wrongs*, 4–7.
64. Ken Saro-Wiwa, *The Singing Anthill: Ogoni Folk Tales* (London: Saros International, 1991), 10.
65. Arundhati Roy, “Lies, dam lies and statistics,” *Guardian*, June 5, 1999.
66. “Mount Graham Coalition,” <http://www.mountgraham.org/new.html>.
67. Ibid.
68. Habermas, *Inclusion of the Other*, 179–80.
69. Paul Ricoeur, “Universal Civilization and National Cultures,” in *History and Truth*, trans. and intro. by Charles A. Kelbley (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1965), 276.
70. See Bruno Foucart, “À l’aube du troisième millénaire,” in Bercé, *Des Monuments Historiques au Patrimoine*, 203–10; Kenneth Frampton, “Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance,” in *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture*, ed. Hal Foster (Seattle: Bay, 1983), 16–30.
71. Pierre Nora, ed., *Les Lieux de mémoire*, 7 vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1984), 1:xvii–xlii.
72. For an excellent essay on this topic that reviews trends in the United States’ attitudes and more recent anti-preservation moves up to the 1980s, see Michael Wallace, “Reflections on the History of Historic Preservation,” in *Presenting the Past: Essays on History and the Public*, ed. Susan Porter Benson, Stephen Brier, and Roy Rosenzweig (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986), 165–99.
73. Paul Philippot, “Historic Preservation: Philosophy, Criteria, Guidelines.” In *Preservation and Conservation: Principles and Practices*, edited by Sharon Timmons (Washington, D.C.: Preservation Press, National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, 1976), 381–82.
74. Ibid.
75. Jeffrey Gettleman, “Ruined Treasures in Babylon Await an Iraq without Fighting,” *New York Times International*, April 28, 2006, A6.



*This page intentionally left blank*

# TERMS

## CONTROVERSIAL WORDS AND CONCEPTS

**Adoration, veneration, and worship.** Confusion among the meanings of these in relationship to images led to the accusation of idolatry. Adoration (Latin, *latreia*) is reserved for God alone, and veneration (Latin, *dulia*) for images. But in the Byzantine context, veneration (*dulia*) is close to adoration because both convey the sense of respect and honor due to the image as a prototype of what is adored or of what is worshipped, which is only God. The assumption that lookers are “worshipping” the artifact led to the accusation of idolatry in both the Byzantine and the Protestant image crises. In the Latin context, “adore” is problematic because it implies worship, which is forbidden. During the destructive outbreaks, iconoclasts lost the precise differences among these concepts.

**Convivencia.** The Spanish term used to describe peaceful coexistence among the three major religious groups (Jews, Christians, and Moslems) during Córdoba Arab rule (eighth–tenth centuries) and during the thirteenth century under Christian rule in Spain.

**Culture, and its adjective, cultural.** A highly complex although comparatively new term given great prominence by the advent of cultural anthropology, a discipline that emerged in the late nineteenth century. In the middle of the nineteenth century, it was used primarily for plant, fish, and animal husbandry (the culture of bees, for example). By the late nineteenth century (1890), it was applied to legacy (as in “Nobody denies the cultural value of Greek and Roman history.”). Preservationists in the nineteenth century referred to buildings, monuments, artwork, and other such heritage sites, not to cultural heritage. But cultural anthropologists by 1875 began to use the word to designate “cultural condition,” as relating to civilization, country, or period. The term “culture” was given special prominence in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, which stated the right of everyone to partake freely in the cultural life of the community. The postwar conventions and preservation manifestoes, however, were still referring to buildings and monuments until the 1956 Hague Convention, which used the term “cultural property” primarily to designate buildings and monuments. Today the term is so broad that it has come to include just about everything that people, in any defined group identity, do, ranging from ancient Greek culture to “football culture.” Because it is an anachronistic term, I have tried to avoid it when discussing medieval social and religious practices and confined it to its modern context.

**Deuteronomic.** A term used by biblical scholars who argue that Deuteronomy through 2 Kings form a single work, the Deuteronomic history, a composite of existing traditions inflected with the authors’ convictions about the history of Israel from Moses to the Babylonian exile, written about 550 BCE.

**Heresy.** From the Greek word *hairesis*, which in Hellenistic, Jewish, and early Christian texts was a technical term for a philosophical school or a received position (Stoics, Pythagoreans, for example, or Sadducees, Pharisees, Essenes, or Christians). It was not a negative term, but it began to take on negative connotations as early as the New Testament (1 Cor. 11:19; Gal. 5:20; 2 Pet. 2:1) to mean sect, division, or erroneous teaching. At the time

of the first Council of Nicaea (326 CE), beliefs deviating from Christian orthodoxy were deemed heretical, meaning false teaching. From then it became a word used within Christianity to designate any belief outside orthodoxy or the correct teaching of the “catholic” and “universal” Church. By the Reformation, with the shattering of the medieval consensus, the word applied to Protestants, splinter groups from various Protestant sects, and Catholics, depending on who was labeling whom. In this study, it applies to what institutional authorities regulating cultural heritage (whether Church, ecclesiastical leader, king, emperor, or academic expert) deem dangerously “false.”

**Heritage.** Simply refers to what began to be called patrimony after the French Revolution, or what our forebears have handed down to us. This study adopts the 1972 definition of the World Heritage Convention (WHC): “Heritage is our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations. Our cultural and natural heritages are both irreplaceable sources of life and inspiration. Places as unique and diverse as the wilds of East Africa’s Serengeti, the Pyramids of Egypt, the Great Barrier Reef in Australia and the Baroque cathedrals of Latin America make up our world’s heritage.” World heritage, in the WHC definition, is a universal concept, making world heritage sites belong to all the peoples of the world, irrespective of the territory on which they are located (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/about/>).

**Icon.** Usually, painting on wooden boards, in the Byzantine context, refers to all forms of religious art, whether mosaics, frescoes, decorated liturgical garments and vessels or books, or statues. *Eikon*, meaning icon, is a Greek word and is also used to refer to Jesus as an *eikon* (or image) of God.

**Iconoclasm.** Attacking religious works of art including religious sites and whole cities, churches, and decorations, specifically those associated with religious worship.

**Idol.** In the Deuteronomic context, it refers to religious artifacts linked to “others” and existing outside the purview of the temple in Jerusalem. When this Deuteronomic notion is adopted later, idol can refer to any religious artifacts (figural representation and decorated cult items), whether pagan or Christian.

**Image.** Used rather than “art,” which belongs to the modern era, and including all decorative elements that pertain to devotional practices, whether statue, stained glass, fresco, painting, reliquary, or other liturgical items used in Christian religious practice. In the medieval context, “image” comprises a huge range of material objects besides those that we might designate “art” today. It could also include processions, gestures (as in liturgical practice when the Eucharistic Host is elevated), the Host itself, and even writing.

**Mihrab.** A single prayer niche within a mosque, sometimes believed to orient the devout toward Mecca.

**Monument.** A historically or artistically important building, statue, or artwork. In a 1530 English meaning, it applied to any edifice that commemorates a person, action, period, or event. In 1602, it referred to a structure, edifice, or erection intended to commemorate a notable person, action, or event. In 1675 it could apply to an enduring evidence or example. In this study, it refers to artifacts of traditional value in religious and devotional practice. The word monument has been linked to the idea of “cultural heritage,” defined by the World Heritage Convention as architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings, and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art, or science. The Venice Charter designated a historic monument as “not only the single architectural work but also the urban or rural setting in which is found the evidence of a particular civilization, a significant development or an historic event. This applies not only to great works of art but also to more modest works of the past that have acquired cultural significance with the passing of time” (<http://www.gdrc.org/heritage/vienna.html>).

- Morisco.** The Spanish word to designate Spanish Moslems who converted to Christianity beginning in the eleventh century.
- Mozarab.** The Spanish term used for Christians living an Arabic lifestyle in medieval Andalusia. It can also apply to liturgy and to architectural, art, and literary style.
- Mudéjar.** A Spanish term coined by José Amador de los Ríos in 1859 to describe the architectural and decorative style of Arab or Arab-inspired craftspeople, who remained in reconquered areas of Spain. The word comes from an Arab word meaning “those permitted to stay behind.” The term applied to Arabs living in Christian lands after the reconquest of Andalusia. See Gonzalo M. Borrás Gualis, “Arte Mudéjar,” in *El Islam: De Córdoba al Mudéjar* (Madrid: Silex, 1990), 191–219 for a discussion and description of this uniquely Iberian artistic style.
- Qibla.** Usually in the wall of the mosque to indicate the direction of prayer, normally toward Mecca.

*This page intentionally left blank*

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## PRIMARY SOURCES, BOOKS, AND JOURNAL AND BOOK ARTICLES

- Adams, Henry. *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres*. 1905. With a new introduction by Francis Henry Taylor. New York: Heritage, 1957.
- Alberti, Leon Battista. *De Pictura*. Edited by Rocco Sinisgalli. Rome: Edizioni Kappa, 2006.
- . *On Painting*. Translated by Cecil Grayson. London: Penguin, 1991.
- Aldrich, Megan. "Gothic Sensibility: The Early Years of the Gothic Revival." In *A. W. N. Pugin, Master of Gothic Revival*, edited by Paul Atterbury, 13–29.
- Alfonso X el Sabio. *Primera Crónica General de España*, edited by Ramón Menéndez Pidal. 2 vols. Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1977.
- Allison, K. J., and P. M. Tillott. "York in the 18th Century." In *History of Yorkshire*, edited by P. M. Tillott, 207–53.
- Anastos, Milton V. "The Ethical Theory of Images Formulated by the Iconoclasts in 754 and 815." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 8 (1954): 151–60.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 2nd ed. London: Verso, 1991.
- Antiguos Inventarios del Archivo Municipal de Córdoba*. Córdoba, Spain: Tip. Artística, 1978.
- Aquileia e il Suo Patriarcato: Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studio*. Udine, Italy: Arti Grafiche Friulane, 2000.
- Archives de la Commission des Monuments Historiques*. 1855–72. 4 vols. Paris: Gide et J. Baudry, 1872.
- Aston, Margaret. "Imageless Devotion: What Kind of an Ideal?" In *Pragmatic Utopias*, edited by Rosemary Horrox and Sarah Rees Jones, 188–203.
- . *England's Iconoclasts*. Vol. 1, *Laws Against Images*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1988.
- . *Faith and Fire: Popular and Unpopular Religion, 1350–1600*. London: Hambledon, 1993.
- . *The King's Bedpost: Reformation and Iconography in a Tudor Group Portrait*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Atterbury, Paul, ed. *A. W. N. Pugin, Master of Gothic Revival*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Atwood, Roger. *Stealing History: Tomb Raiders, Smugglers, and the Looting of the Ancient World*. New York: St. Martin's, 2004.
- Auerbach, Erich. *Literary Language & Its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages*. Translated by Ralph Manheim. New York: Pantheon Books, 1965.
- Augustine. *De Catechizandis Rudibus*. *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* (hereafter CCSL) 46. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1969.
- . *De Doctrina Christiana*. Edited by Joseph Martin. In CCSL, 32:1–167. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1962.

- . *The City of God against the Pagans*. 7 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Auzépy, Marie-France. "La destruction de l'icône du Christ de la Chalcé par Léon III: propagande ou réalité?" *Byzantion* 60 (1990): 445–92.
- Auzépy, Marie-France, ed. and trans. *La Vie d'Étienne le Jeune par Étienne le Diacre*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Variorum, 1997.
- Aylmer, G. E., and Reginald Cant, eds. *A History of York Minster*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.
- Babelon, Jean-Pierre, and A. Chastel. "La Notion de patrimoine." *Revue de l'art* 49 (1980): 5–32.
- Babelon, Jean-Pierre. "The Louvre: Royal Residence and Temple of the Arts." In *Realms of Memory: The Construction of the French Past*, edited by Pierre Nora, 3:253–88.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and His World*. Translated by Hélène Iswolsky. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1968.
- Baer, N. S., and F. Snickars, eds. *Rational Decision-Making in the Preservation of Cultural Property*. Berlin: Dahlem University Press, 2001.
- Al-Bakri, Abu 'Ubayd. *Geografía de España (Kitab Al-Masalik Wa-L-Mamalik)*. *Textos Medievales* 53. Introduction, translation, and notes by Eliseo Vidal Beltran. Zaragoza, Spain: Facsímil, 1982.
- Balut, Pierre-Yves. "La double inconstance: patrimoine et conservation, vandalisme et destruction." In *Révolution française et 'Vandalisme Révolutionnaire': Actes du colloque international de Clermont-Ferrand*, edited by Simone Bernard-Griffiths, Marie-Claude Chemin, and Jean Ehrhard, 7–13. Paris: Universitas, 1992.
- Barber, Charles. "The Truth in Painting: Iconoclasm and Identity in Early-Medieval Art." *Speculum* 72 (1997): 1019–36.
- . *Figure and Likeness: On the Limits of Representation in Byzantine Iconoclasm*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Barnard, L. W. *The Graeco-Roman and Oriental Background of the Iconoclastic Controversy*. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1974.
- Barnes, Timothy David. *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- . *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.
- Baron, Hans. *Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Baschet, Jérôme, and Jean-Claude Schmitt, ed. *L'Image: Fonctions et usages des images dans l'Occident médiéval*. Paris: Le Léopard d'Or, 1996.
- Baschet, Jérôme. "Introduction: L'Image-Objet." In *L'Image: Fonctions et usages des images dans l'Occident médiéval*, edited by Jérôme Baschet and Jean Claude Schmitt, 7–26.
- Basil of Caesarea. *Sur le Saint-Esprit*. In *Sources Chrétiennes* (hereafter SC) 17. Greek edition, introduction, and French translation by Benoît Pruche. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1968.
- Basler Chroniken herausgegeben von der historischen gesellschaft in Basel*. Leipzig, Germany: Verlag von S. Hirzel, 1872.
- Al-Bayano'l-Mogrib. *Histoire de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne*. 2 vols. Edited and translated into French by E. Fagnan. Alger, Algeria: Pierre Fontana, 1904.
- Baynes, Norman H. *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays*. London: Athlone, 1955.
- . "Idolatry and the Early Church." In *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays*, 116–43. London: Athlone, 1955.
- . *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church*. London: Proceedings of the British Academy, Humphrey Milford, 1929.
- Beckwith, John. *Early Christian and Byzantine Art*. New York: Penguin, 1979.
- Bede. *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. Edited and introduction by Judith McClure and Roger Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

- Belting, Hans. *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image before the Era of Art*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations*. Edited and introduction by Hannah Arendt, translated by Harry Zohn. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968.
- . “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction.” In *Illuminations*, edited by Walter Benjamin, 219–53.
- Benson, Susan Porter, Stephen Brier, and Roy Rosenzweig, eds. *Presenting the Past: Essays on History and the Public*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986.
- Bercé, Françoise. “Archéologie et Politique.” In *Prosper Mérimée: Écrivain, Archéologue, Historien*, edited by Antonia Fonyi, 3–14. Geneva: Droz, 1999.
- . *Des Monuments Historiques au Patrimoine du XVIIIe siècle à nos jours, ou, Les “égarements du Cœur et de l’esprit.”* Paris: Flammarion, 2000.
- . *Les premiers travaux de la commission des Monuments historiques 1837–1848: Procès-verbaux et relevés d’architectes*. Paris: A. and J. Picard, 1979.
- Bercé, Françoise, ed. *La Correspondance Mérimée—Viollet le Duc*. Paris: Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques, 2001.
- Bernal Díaz del Castillo. *Historia Verdadera de la Conquista de la Nueva España*. 2 vols. Edited by Ramon Iglesia. Mexico City, Mexico: Editorial Nuevo Mundo, 1943.
- Bernard of Clairvaux. *Liber de diligendo Deo*. In *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, vol. 3 of 8, edited by J. Leclercq, C. H. Talbot, and H. M. Rochais, 109–54. Rome: Cistercienses, 1957–77.
- Bertacchi, Luisa. “Le fasi architettoniche del complesso episcopale di Aquileia nelle variazioni dei mosaici.” In *Aquileia e il Suo Patriarcato*, 67–74.
- Besançon, Alain. *The Forbidden Image: An Intellectual History of Iconoclasm*. Translated from French by Jane Marie Todd. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Bevan, Robert. *The Destruction of Memory: Architecture at War*. London: Reaktion Books, 2005.
- Biré, Edmond. *Victor Hugo et la restauration: étude historique et littéraire*. Paris: Lecoffre, 1869.
- Bisconti, Fabrizio. “The Decoration of Roman Catacombs.” In *The Christian Catacombs of Rome: History*, edited by Vincenzo Fiocchi Nicolai, Fabrizio Bisconti, and Danilo Mazzone, 71–145.
- Black, Jeremy. “Lost Libraries of Ancient Mesopotamia.” In *Lost Libraries*, edited by James Raven, 41–57.
- Boito, Camillo. “I restauratori (1884).” In *Ideologie e prassi del restauro con antologia di testi*, edited by Giuseppe La Monica, 17–25. Palermo, Italy: Libreria Nuova Presenza, 1974.
- Borras Gualis, Gonzalo M. *El Islam: De Córdoba al Mudéjar*. Madrid: Silex, 1990.
- Boulad-Ayoub, Josiane. *L’Abbé Grégoire: Apologète de la République*. Paris: Honoré Champion éditeur, 2005.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Alain Darbel. *L’Amour de l’art: Les musées d’art européens et leur public*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1969.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Translated from French and intro. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- . *Les règles de l’art. Genèse et structure du champ littéraire*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1992.
- Britton, John. *Historical and Descriptive Account of the Metropolitan Cathedral of Canterbury and York*. 5 vols. London: M. A. Nattali, 1836.
- Brown, Gerard Baldwin. *The Care of Ancient Monuments: An Account of the Legislative and Other Measures Adopted in European Countries for Protecting Ancient Monuments and Objects and Scenes of Natural Beauty, and for Preserving the Aspect of Historical Cities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905.
- Brown, Peter. “A Dark-Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy.” *The English Historical Review* 346 (January 1973): 1–34.
- . *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.



- Brown, Sarah. "Our Magnificent Fabrick," *York Minster: An Architectural History c.1220–1500*. Swindon, England: English Heritage, 2003.
- Browne, John. *The History of the Metropolitan Church of St. Peter, York*. London: Longman, 1847.
- Brubaker, Leslie, and John Haldon. *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (ca. 680–850): The Sources*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2001.
- Brusin, Dina dalla Barba. "Una probabile 'aedes catechizandorum' nell' ipogeo di S. Maria in Stelle in Val Pantena." *Aquileia Nostra* 48 (1978): 257–72.
- Bryer, Anthony, and Judith Herrin, eds. *Iconoclasm*. Birmingham, England: University of Birmingham Centre for Byzantine Studies, 1977.
- Burguière, André, and Jacques Revel, eds. *L'état et les pouvoirs*. Vol. 2 of *Histoire de la France*. Paris: Seuil, 1989.
- Burman, P. A. T. I. "What is Cultural Heritage?" In *Rational Decision-Making in the Preservation of Cultural Property*, edited by N. S. Baer and F. Snickars, 11–22.
- Burnet, Gilbert. *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*. Rev. ed., records collated with the originals by Nicholas Pocock. Oxford: Clarendon, 1865.
- Burns, Robert I., S. J., ed. *Las Siete Partidas*. 5 vols. Translated by Samuel Parsons Scott. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Butterworth, G. W. "Clement of Alexandria and Art." *Journal of Theological Studies* 17 (1916): 68–76.
- Cabrera, Emilio. "Violencia Urbana y Crisis Política en Andalucía durante el Siglo XV." In *Aragón en La Edad Media: Sesiones de Trabajo*, IV Seminario de Historia Medieval, 5–25. Zaragoza, Spain: Universidad de Zaragoza, 1995.
- Camacho, José Manuel Escobar. *Córdoba en la Baja Edad Media (Evolución urbana de la ciudad)*. Córdoba, Spain: Caja Provincial de Ahorros de Córdoba, 1989.
- Cameron, Averil. "The Language of Images: The Rise of Icons and Christian Representation." In *The Church and the Arts*, edited by Diana Wood, 1–42.
- . "The Theotokos in Sixth-Century Constantinople: A City Finds its Symbol." *Journal of Theological Studies* 29 (1978): 79–108.
- . "Images of Authority: Elites and Icons in Late Sixth-Century Byzantium." *Past and Present* 84 (August 1979): 3–35.
- Camille, Michael. "The Gregorian Definition Revisited: Writing and the Medieval Image." In *L'Image*, edited by Baschet, Jérôme and Jean-Claude Schmitt, 89–107.
- . "The Iconoclast's Desire: Deguileville's Idolatry in France and England." In *Images, Idolatry, and Iconoclasm*, edited by Jeremy Dimmick, James Simpson and Nicolette Zeman, 151–71.
- . "Seeing and Reading: Some Visual Implications of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy." *Art History* 8, no. 1 (1985): 26–49.
- . *Gothic Art: Glorious Visions*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996.
- Cantarel-Besson, Yveline. *La naissance du musée du Louvre: La politique muséologique sous la Révolution d'après les archives des musées nationaux*. 2 vols. Paris: Ministère de la Culture. Éditions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 1981.
- Capitel, Antón. "La Catedral de Córdoba: Transformación cristiana de la Mezquita." *Arquitectura* 256 (1985): 37–46.
- Capponi, Carlo, ed. *L'Ambone di Sant'Ambrogio*. Milan: Silvana, 2000.
- Casanova, Pascale. *The World Republic of Letters*. Translated by M. B. DeBevoise. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Cassiodorus. *Variarum Libri XII*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1973.
- Castillo, María del Rosario Castro. "El Entorno de la Sinagoga y Judería de Córdoba." In *El Patrimonio Hebreo en la España Medieval*, edited by Alberto Villar Movellán and María del Rosario Castro Castillo, 105–32.

- Castro, Américo. *España en su historia: cristianos, moros, y judíos*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada, 1948.
- Cecchi, Roberto. *I beni culturali: Testimonianza materiale di civiltà*. Milan: Spirali, 2006.
- Chazelle, Celia M. "Pictures, Books, and the Illiterate: Pope Gregory I's Letters to Serenus of Marseilles." *Word and Image* 6, no. 2 (April–June 1990): 138–53.
- Choay, Françoise. *L'Allégorie du Patrimoine*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1992.
- . *The Invention of the Historic Monument*. Translated by Lauren M. O'Connell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Chrysostom, John. *Ad illuminandos catechesis. Patrologia Graeca* (hereafter *PG*) 49. Col. 233.
- . *In dictum Pauli, Nolo vos ignorare* PG 51, Cols. 247–48.
- Christensen, Carl C. "Patterns of Iconoclasm in the Early Reformation: Strasbourg and Basel." In *The Image and the Word*, edited by Joseph Gutmann, 107–47.
- . *Art and the Reformation in Germany*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1979.
- Christin, Olivier. *Une révolution symbolique: l'iconoclisme huguenot et la reconstruction catholique*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1991.
- Clark, Kenneth. *The Gothic Revival: An Essay in the History of Taste*. 1928. Reprint, London: John Murray, 1962.
- . *Moments of Vision and Other Essays*. New York: Harper & Row, 1981.
- Clement of Alexandria. *Christ the Educator*. Translated by Simon P. Wood. In *Fathers of the Church* 23. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1954.
- Cognasso, Francesco. *Bisanzio: Storia di una Civiltà*. Varese, Italy: dall' Ooglio, 1976.
- Colish, Marcia L. *The Mirror of Language: A Study in the Medieval Theory of Knowledge*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1968.
- Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837*. 1992. Reprint, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Compagni, Dino. *Cronica*. Edited by Davida Cappi. Rome: Nella Sede dell' Istituto Palazzo Borromini, 2000.
- Connerton, Paul. *How Societies Remember*. 1989. Reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Cooper, Trevor, ed. *The Journal of William Dowsing: Iconoclasm in East Anglia during the English Civil War*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 2001.
- Cormack, Robin. *Writing in Gold: Byzantine Society and Its Icons*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Corpus Mediaevale Cordubense II (1256–1277)*. Introduction by Manuel Riu Riu. Córdoba, Spain: Publicaciones del Monte de Piedad y Caja de Ahorros de Córdoba, 1980.
- Cowie, Revd. L. W. "Worship in the Minster." In *History of Yorkshire*, edited by P. M. Tillott, 343–57.
- Crane, Susan A. *Collecting and Historical Consciousness in Early Nineteenth-Century Germany*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000.
- Cranmer, Thomas. *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr; 1566*. Edited by John Edmund Cox, Published for the Parker Society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1846.
- Cross, Claire. "From the Reformation to the Restoration." In *History of York Minster*, edited by G. E. Aylmer and Reginald Cant, 193–232.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Cumplido, Manuel Nieto. *Antiguos Inventarios del Archivo Municipal de Córdoba*. Córdoba, Spain: Tip. Artística, 1978.
- . *Córdoba en el Siglo XV*. Mezquita Córdoba, Spain: Tip. Católica, 1973.
- . *La Catedral de Córdoba*. Córdoba, Spain: Publicaciones de la Obra Social y Cultural de Cajasur, 1998.

- . *La Mezquita-Catedral de Córdoba y El ICOMOS*. Córdoba, Spain: Servicio de Publicaciones de Excmo, 1976.
- . *La Miniatura en la Catedral de Córdoba*. Córdoba, Spain: Monte de Piedad and Caja de Ahorros, 1973.
- Curran, John R. *Pagan City and Christian Capital: Rome in the Fourth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- Curtius, E. R. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1967.
- Cuscito, Giuseppe. "Vescovo e Cattedrale nella Documentazione Epigrafica in Occidente." In *Actes du XIe Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, 1:735–78. Rome: Vatican City, 1989.
- Damisch, Hubert. "The Space Between: A Structuralist Approach to the *Dictionnaire*." *Architectural Design* 3, no. 4 (1980): 84–89.
- Davis, Raymond, trans. *The Book of Pontiffs (Liber Pontificalis): The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*. Introduction by Raymond Davis. Liverpool, England: Liverpool University Press, 1989.
- Defoe, Daniel. *A Tour Through England and Wales*. 2 vols. London: J. M. Dent, 1928.
- Denslagen, Wim. *Architectural Restoration in Western Europe: Controversy and Continuity*, translated by Jane Zuyl Moores. Amsterdam: Architectura and Natura, 1994.
- Dickens, A. G. "Tudor York." In *A History of Yorkshire*, edited by P. M. Tillott, 117–59.
- Digester, Elizabeth DePalma. *The Making of a Christian Empire: Lactantius and Rome*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000.
- Dimmick, Jeremy, James Simpson, and Nicolette Zeeman, eds. *Images, Idolatry, and Iconoclasm in Late Medieval England: Textuality and the Visual Image*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000.
- Dobson, Barrie. "The Crown, the Charter and the City, 1396–1461." In *Government of Medieval York*, edited by Sarah Rees Jones, 34–55.
- . "The Later Middle Ages: 1215–1500." In *History of York Minster*, edited by G. E. Aylmer and Reginald Cant, 44–109.
- Dodds, Jerrilynn D. "The Great Mosque of Córdoba." In *Al-Andalus: The Art of Islamic Spain*, edited by Jerrilynn D. Dodds. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992.
- Dothan, Moshe. *Hammath Tiberias, Vol. 1 Early Synagogues*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983.
- Drake, Francis. *Eboracum: Or the History and Antiquities of the City of York, from its Original to the Present Times Together with the History of the Cathedral Church*. London: William Bowyer, 1736.
- Drake, H. A. *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Duchesne, L'Abbé L., ed. *Liber Pontificalis*. 3 vols. Introduction by L'Abbé L. Duchesne. Paris: E. De Boccard, 1955.
- Dudden, F. Homes. *Gregory the Great: His Place in History and Thought*. 2 vols. New York: Russell & Russell, 1905.
- Duffy, Eamon. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Duggan, Lawrence G. "Was Art Really the 'Book of the Illiterate?'" *Word and Image* 5, no. 3 (July–September 1989): 227–51.
- Eales, Jacqueline. "Iconoclasm, Iconography, and the Altar in the English Civil War." In *The Church and the Arts*, edited by Diana Wood, 313–27.
- Eco, Umberto. *The Aesthetics of Thomas Aquinas*. Translated by Hugh Bredin. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Edwards, John. *Christian Córdoba: The City and Its Region in the Late Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

- “Église de la Madeleine à Vézelay.” In *Archives de la Commission des Monuments Historiques* 2:1–8.
- Eire, Carlos M. N. *War Against the Idols: The Reformation of Worship from Erasmus to Calvin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Elsner, Jaś. “Iconoclasm and the Preservation of Memory.” In *Monuments and Memory*, edited by Robert S. Nelson and Margaret Olin, 209–31.
- . *Art and the Roman Viewer: The Transformation of Art from the Pagan World to Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- . “Perspectives in Art.” In *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, edited by Noel Lenski.
- Elton, G. R. *Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- . *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government: Papers and Reviews 1946–1972*. Vol. I, *Tudor Politics/Tudor Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Emery, Elizabeth. *Romancing the Cathedral: Gothic Architecture in Fin-de-Siècle French Culture*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *Opus Epistolarum Desiderius Erasmi Roterodami*. Edited by P. S. Allen and H. M. Allen. 1934. Reprint, Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.
- Erlande-Brandenburg, Alain. *La Cathédrale*. Paris: Fayard, 1989.
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *La Préparation évangélique*. In SC 228. Introduction, Greek text, and French translation by Édouard des Places. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1976–1987.
- . *Das Onomastikon der Biblischen Ortsnamen*. In *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, edited by Erich Klostermann. Leipzig, Germany, 1904.
- . *Histoire Ecclésiastique*. In SC 31, 41, 55, and 73, Greek text and translation by Gustave Bardy. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952–1960.
- . *Eusebius: Life of Constantine*. Introduction, translation, and commentary by Averil Cameron and Stuart G. Hall. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- Evagrius. *Historia ecclesiastica*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2007.
- Farrar, Rev. F. W. *Our English Minsters*. London: Isbister, 1893.
- Fasoli, Gina. “La coscienza nelle ‘Laudes civitatum.’” In *La coscienza cittadina nei comuni italiani del Duecento: Atti dell’ XI Convegno del Centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale*, 9–44. Todi, Italy: Accademia Tudertina, 1972.
- Fine, Steven. *Art and Judaism in the Greco-Roman World: Toward a New Jewish Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Finney, Paul Corby. “Antecedents of Byzantine Iconoclasm: Christian Evidence before Constantine.” In *The Image and the Word*, edited by Joseph Gutmann, 27–47.
- . *The Invisible God: The Earliest Christians on Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Flood, Finbarr Barry. “Between Cult and Culture: Bamiyan, Islamic Iconoclasm, and the Museum.” *Art Bulletin* 84, no. 4 (December 2002): 641–59.
- Floyd, Margaret Henderson. “A. W. N. Pugin and the Gothic Movement in North America.” In *A. W. N. Pugin, Master of Gothic Revival*, edited by Paul Atterbury, 201–21.
- Fontes, A., J.-L. Fournel, and M. Plaisance, eds. *Savonarole: Enjeux, Débats, Questions. Actes du Colloque International (Paris, 1996)*. Paris: Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1997.
- Foster, Hal, ed. *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture*. Seattle, Washington: Bay, 1983.
- Foucart, Bruno. “À l’aube du troisième millénaire.” In *Des Monuments Historiques au Patrimoine*, edited by Françoise Bercé, 203–10.
- Fox, Robin Lane. *Pagans and Christians*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987.
- Foxe, John. *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*. 8 vols. Edited by Rev. George Townsend and Rev. Stephen Reed Cattley. London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1837–41.

- Frampton, Kenneth. "Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance." In *The Anti-Aesthetic*, edited by Hal Foster, 16–30.
- France, James. *The Cistercians in Medieval Art*. London: Sutton, 1998.
- Frankl, Paul. *The Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations through Eight Centuries*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1960.
- Freedberg, David. "The Structure of Byzantine and European Iconoclasm." In *Iconoclasm*, edited by Anthony Bryer and Judith Herrin, 165–77.
- . *Iconoclasts and Their Motives*. Maarssen, Holland: Gary Schwartz, 1985.
- . *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Freeman, Ann. "Scripture and Images in the *Libri Carolini*." In *Testo e Immagine nell'Alto Medioevo* 1. Spoleto, Italy: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1994.
- Freeman, Ann, ed. *Opus Caroli Regis Contra Synodum (Libri Carolini)*. Hannover, Germany: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1998.
- French, Thomas, and David O'Connor. *York Minster, A Catalogue of Medieval Stained Glass: The West Windows of the Nave*. In *Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi*. Great Britain Fasc. 1. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- French, Thomas. *York Minster: The Great East Window*. In *Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Frend, W. H. C. *The Rise of Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Frere, Walter Howard, ed. *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*. 3 vols. London: Longmans, Green, 1910.
- Freshfield, Edwin Hanson, trans. *A Manual of Roman Law: The Ecloga*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Translated by James Strachey. New York: Norton, 1961.
- Fritzsche, Peter. "Chateaubriand's Ruins: Loss and Memory after the French Revolution." *History and Memory: Studies in Representation of the Past* 10, no. 2 (Fall 1998): 102–17.
- . "How Nostalgia Narrates Modernity." In *The Work of Memory: New Directions in the Study of German Society and Culture*, edited by Alon Confino and Peter Fritzsche, 62–85. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002.
- . "Specters of History: On Nostalgia, Exile, and Modernity." *The American Historical Review* 106, no. 5 (2001): 1–31.
- . *Stranded in the Present: Modern Time and the Melancholy of History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Frugoni, Chiara. *A Distant City: Images of Urban Experience in the Medieval World*. Translated by William McCuaig. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- . *Una lontana città, Sentimenti e immagini nel Medioevo*. Turin, Italy: Einaudi, 1983.
- Gamboni, Dario. *The Destruction of Art: Iconoclasm and Vandalism since the French Revolution*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Ganim, John M. *Medievalism and Orientalism: Three Essays on Literature, Architecture and Cultural Identity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- García Gomez, Emilio, ed. and trans. *Anales Palatinos del Califá de Córdoba Al-Hakam II, por 'Isa Ibn Ahmad Al-Razi*. Madrid: Sociedad de Estudios y Publicaciones, 1967.
- Gautier, Théophile. *Dessins de Victor Hugo*. Paris: Castel, 1863.
- Gearey, John, ed. *Essays on Art and Literature*. Translated by Ellen von Nardroff and Ernest H. von Nardroff. New York: Suhrkamp, 1986.
- Geary, Patrick J. *The Myth of Nations: The Medieval Origins of Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Gent, Thomas. *The Antient and Modern History of the Famous City of York; and in a Particular Manner of its Magnificent Cathedral, Commonly Call'd York-Minster*. London: Thomas Hammond, 1730.

- . *The Most Delectable, Scriptural and Pious History of the Famous and Magnificent Great Eastern Window (According to Beautiful Portraits) in St. Peter's Cathedral, York*. York, 1762.
- Gero, Stephen. "Notes on Byzantine Iconoclasm in the Eighth Century." *Byzantion* 44 (1974): 23–42.
- Giakalis, Ambrosios. *Images of the Divine: The Theology of Icons at the Seventh Ecumenical Council*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.
- Glick, T. *Islamic and Christian Spain in the Early Middle Ages: Comparative Perspectives on Social and Cultural Formation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. "On German Architecture." In *Essays on Art and Literature*, edited by John Gearey, 3–10.
- . "On Gothic Architecture." In *Essays on Art and Literature*, edited by John Gearey, 10–14.
- Goldberg, Jeremy. "Craft Guilds, the Corpus Christi Play and Civic Government." In *Government of Medieval York*, edited by Sarah Rees Jones, 141–63.
- Goldschmidt, R. C., ed. *Paulinus' Churches at Nola*. Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche, 1940.
- Goya, José Manuel Losada. "Victor Hugo ou les paradoxes de l'architecture: du livre de pierre au livre de papier." *Travaux de Littérature: Architectes et Architecture dans la Littérature Française* 12 (1999): 163–71.
- Grabar, André. *Christian Iconography: A Study of Its Origins*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- . *L'empereur dans l'art byzantin*. 1936. Reprint, London: Variorum, 1971.
- . *L'Iconoclisme Byzantin: Le Dossier Archéologique*. Paris: Flammarion, 1984.
- Grabar, Oleg. "Notes sur le Mihrâb de la Grande Mosquée de Cordoue." In *Le Mihrâb dans l'Architecture*, edited by Alexandre Papadopoulo, 115–220.
- . "Umayyad Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem." *Ars Orientalis* 3 (1959): 33–62.
- . "Two Paradoxes in the Islamic Art of the Spanish Peninsula." In *Early Islamic Art, 650–1100: Constructing the Study of Islamic Art*, 1:267–75. Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2005.
- . *The Formation of Islamic Art*. 1973. Reprint, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987.
- Grafton, Anthony, ed. *Rome Reborn: The Vatican Library & Renaissance Culture*. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1993.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Gli Intellettuai e l'Organizzazione della Cultura*. Turin, Italy: Einaudi, 1949.
- Grant, Robert M. "The Decalogue in Early Christianity." *Harvard Theological Review* 40, no. 1 (January 1947): 1–17.
- . *Augustus to Constantine: The Rise and Triumph of Christianity in the Roman World*. London: Westminster John Knox, 2004.
- Gratian. "Decreti tertia pars De Consecratione." In *Patrologia Latina (hereafter PL)* 187, cols. 1703–1870.
- Greenberg, Moshe. "The Decalogue Tradition Critically Examined." In *The Ten Commandments in Recent Research*, edited by J. J. Stamm and M. E. Andrew, 83–119. Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, 1967.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Hamlet in Purgatory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Grégoire, Abbé "Mémoire en faveur des gens de couleur (1789)," In *L'Abbé Grégoire: Apologète de la République*, edited by Josiane Boulad-Ayoub, 159–80.
- . "Motion en faveur des Juifs (1789,)." In *L'Abbé Grégoire: Apologète de la République*, edited by Josiane Boulad-Ayoub, 138–57.
- . "Rapport sur les destructions opérées par le vandalisme, et sur les moyens de le réprimer." Suivi du Décret de la *Convention nationale, Comité d'instruction publique*, 1793, 1–28. Paris: De l'imprimerie nationale, 1794.

- . “Troisième rapport sur le vandalisme.” *Convention Nationale, instruction publique*, 1–21. Paris: L’Imprimerie Nationale Des Lois, 1794.
- . *Mémoires de Grégoire, Ancien évêque de Blois*. Preface by Jean-Noël Jeanneney, Introduction by Jean-Michel Leniaud. Paris: Éditions de Santé, 1989.
- Gregory Nazianzus. “Oratio XIII: Funebris oratio in patrem, presente Basilio.” In *PG* 35, col. 985–1044.
- Gregory of Nyssa. “Oratio de Deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti.” In *PG* 46, cols. 571–72C.
- Gregory of Nyssa. “Sancti ac Magni Martyris Theodori.” In *PG* 46, cols. 737–40; 735–748.
- Gregory the Great. *Registrum epistolarum*. In *CCSL* 140–140A. 2 vols. Edited by Dag Norberg. Turnhout: Brepols, 1982.
- . *The Letters of Gregory the Great*. 3 vols. Translated and introduction by John R. C. Martyn. Toronto: PIMS, 2004.
- . *Règle Pastorale*. Edited by Floribert Rommel, translated into French by Charles Morel, and introduction and notes by Bruno Judic. In *SC* 381–82. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992.
- Griffith, Terry. “Eidolon as ‘Idol’ in Non-Jewish and Non-Christian Greek.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 53 (2002): 95–101.
- . *Keep Yourself from Idols: A New Look at 1 John* in *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 233. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Grimaldi, Giacomo. *Descrizione della basilica antica di S. Pietro in Vaticano*, Codice Barberini Latino 2733. Edited by Reto Niggli. Vatican City: BAV, 1972.
- Gubser, Michael. *Time’s Visible Surface: Alois Riegl and the Discourse on History and Temporality in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2006.
- Guha-Thakurta, Tapati. “Archaeology and the Monument: An Embattled Site of History and Memory in Contemporary India.” In *Monuments and Memory*, edited by Robert S. Nelson and Margaret Olin, 233–57.
- Gutmann, Joseph. “Deuteronomy: Religious Reformation or Iconoclastic Revolution?” In *The Image and the Word*, edited by Joseph Gutmann, 5–25.
- . “Prolegomenon.” In *No Graven Images: Studies in Art and the Hebrew Bible*, edited by Joseph Gutmann, xi–lxiii.
- Gutman, Joseph, ed. *The Image and the Word: Confrontations in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1977.
- Gutmann, Joseph, ed. *No Graven Images: Studies in Art and the Hebrew Bible*. New York: KTAV, 1971.
- Guyer, Paul. “Editor’s Introduction.” In Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, xiii–lvii.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *Religion and Rationality: Essays on Reason, God, and Modernity*. Edited and introduction by Eduardo Mendieta. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002.
- . *The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory*. Edited by Ciaran Cronin and Pablo De Greiff. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998.
- Halbental, Moshe, and Avishai Margalit. *Idolatry*. Translated by Naomi Goldblum. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*. 1925. Reprint, Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1952.
- . *On Collective Memory*. Edited translated, and introduction by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Halfpenny, Joseph. *Gothic Ornaments in the Cathedral Church of York*. York, England, 1795.
- Hamburger, Jeffrey F., and Anne-Marie Bouché, eds. *The Mind’s Eye: Art and Theological Argument in the Middle Ages*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Hamburger, Jeffrey F. “The Place of Theology in Medieval Art History: Problems, Positions, Possibilities.” In *Mind’s Eye*, edited by Jeffrey F. Hamburger and Anne-Marie Bouché, 11–31.



- Hargrove, William. *History and Description of the Ancient City of York*. York, England, 1818.
- Harrison, Robert Pogue. *The Dominion of the Dead*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Harvey, John H. "Architectural History from 1291–1558." In *History of York Minster*, edited by G. E. Aylmer and Reginald Cant, 149–92.
- Ibn Hayyan de Córdoba. *Crónica de los emires Albakam I y Abdarrahman II entre los años 796 y 847*. Translated into Spanish from Arabic and notes by Mahmud Ali Makki and Federico Corriente. Zaragoza, Spain: La Aljafería, 2001.
- . *Cronica del Califa Abdarrahman III An-Nasir entre los años 912 y 942 (al-Muqtabis V)*. Translated into Spanish from Arabic by M. Jesús Viguera and Federico Corriente. Zaragoza, Spain: Anubar Ediciones, 1981.
- Ibn Hazm, Ali. *The Dove's Neck-Ring*. Translated by A. R. Nykl. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1931.
- Hearn, M. F., ed. *The Architectural Theory of Viollet le Duc: Readings and Commentary*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990.
- Hennepin, Herman, ed. *Textus Byzantinos ad iconomachiam pertinentes*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969.
- Henry, Patrick. "What was the Iconoclastic Controversy About?" *Church History* 45 (1976): 16–31.
- Hermon-Belot, Rita. *L'Abbé Grégoire: La Politique et la Vérité*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 2000.
- Herrin, Judith. "The Context of Iconoclast Reform." In *Iconoclasm*, edited by Anthony Bryer and Judith Herrin, 15–20.
- Hewison, Robert. *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a Climate of Decline*. London: Methuen, 1987.
- Heylyn, Peter. *Ecclesia Restaurata; or, The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1849.
- Hilary of Poitiers. *De Trinitate Liber VII*. In *PL* 10, cols. 9–472.
- Hildyard, Christopher. *The Antiquities of York City and the Civil Government Thereof: With a List of all the Mayors and Bayliffs, Lord Mayors and Sheriffs, from the Time of King Edward the First, to this Present Year, 1719*. With notes and observations by James Torr, collected from the papers of Christopher Hildyard. York, England: G. White Printed for F. Hildyard, 1719.
- Hildyard, J. *An Accurate Description and History of the Metropolitan and Cathedral Churches of Canterbury and York, From their first Foundation to the present Year*. York, England, 1755.
- Holter, Knut. *Deuteronomy 4 and the Second Commandment*. New York: Peter Lang, 2003.
- Hopkins, C., and P. V. C. Baur. *Christian Church at Dura-Europos*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1934.
- Horrox, Rosemary, and Sarah Rees Jones, eds. *Pragmatic Utopias: Ideals and Communities 1200–1630*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Hosmer, Charles B., Jr. *Presence of the Past: A History of the Preservation Movement in the United States Before Williamsburg*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1965.
- Houlbrooke, Ralph. *Church Courts and the People during the English Reformation, 1520–1570*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Hubert, Jean. "Préface." In Bercé, Françoise. *Les premiers travaux de la commission des Monuments historiques 1837–1848: Procès-verbaux et relevés d'architectes*.
- Hughes, Paul L., and James F. Larkin, eds. *Tudor Royal Proclamations: The Early Tudors (1485–1553)* 1. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1964.
- Hughes, Paul L., and James F. Larkin, eds. *Tudor Royal Proclamations: The Later Tudors (1553–1587)* 2. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.
- Hugo, Victor. "1825, Guerre aux Démolisseurs." In *Oeuvres Complètes*, 5:160–62.
- . "1832, Guerre aux Démolisseurs." In *Oeuvres Complètes*, 5:163–64.
- . "1834, Guerre aux Démolisseurs." In *Oeuvres Complètes*, 5:164–73.



- . *Notre-Dame de Paris 1482*. Edited by Jacques Seebacher and Yves Gohin. Paris: Gallimard, 1975.
- . *Notre-Dame de Paris*. Illustrated by Brion. Paris: J. Hetzel, 1865.
- . *Notre-Dame de Paris*. Illustrated by MM. E de Beaumont, L. Boulanger, Daubigny, T. Johannot, de Lemud, Meissonnier, G. Roqueplan, de Rudder, Steinbeil. Paris: Perrotin, éditeur, 1844.
- . *Notre-Dame of Paris*. Translated by John Sturrock. London: Penguin Books, 1978.
- . *Oeuvres Complètes*. Edited by Jean Massin. Paris: Le Club Française du Livre, 1967.
- Huizinga, Johan. *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*. Translated by Rodney J. Payton and Ulrich Mammitzsch. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Hunt, Tristram. *Building Jerusalem: The Rise and Fall of the Victorian City*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2004.
- Hutchinson, Robert. *Thomas Cromwell: The Rise and Fall of Henry VIII's most Notorious Minister*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2007.
- Hyde, J. K. "Medieval Descriptions of Cities." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 48 (1966): 308–40.
- Imamuddin, S. M. *Muslim Spain: 711–1492 A.D.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981.
- Irwin, Robert. *Islamic Art in Context: Art, Architecture, and the Literary World*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1997.
- Isidore of Seville. *Etimologías*. Edición Bilingüe. 2 vols. Edited and translated into Spanish by José Oroz Reta and Manuel A. Marcus Casquero. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1983.
- Jensen, Robin Margaret. *Understanding Early Christian Art*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Jerome. *Commentarii in Hiezechielem Libri XIV*. CCL 75. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1964.
- Jimenez, Manuel Ocaña. "Arquitectos y mano de obra en la construcción de la gran mezquita de Occidente." *Boletín de la Real Academia de Córdoba, de Ciencias, Bellas Letras y Nobles Artes* 102 (1981): 97–137.
- John of Damascus. *Three Treatises On the Divine Images*. In *PG* 94. Col. 1232A–1420B.
- . *Three Treatises On the Divine Images*. Translated by Andrew Louth. Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003.
- . *On the Divine Images: Three Apologies against Those Who Attack the Divine Images*. Translated by David Anderson. Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980.
- Johnson, Mark J. "Architecture of Empire." In *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, edited by Noel Lenski, 278–97.
- Jones, Norman L. *Faith by Statute: Parliament and the Settlement of Religion 1559*. London: Royal Historical Society, 1982.
- Jones, Sarah Rees. "York's Civic Administration, 1354–1464." In *Government of Medieval York*, edited by Sarah Rees Jones, 108–40.
- Jones, Sarah Rees, ed. *The Government of Medieval York: Essays in Commemoration of the 1396 Royal Charter*. In *Borthwick Studies in History*, 3 (1997).
- Jordan, Mark D. "Words and Word: Incarnation and Signification in Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*." *Augustinian Studies* 11 (1980): 177–96.
- Judic, Bruno. "Introduction." In *Règle Pastorale*, edited by Grégoire le Grand, 39–56.
- Kamerick, Kathleen. *Popular Piety and Art in the Late Middle Ages: Image Worship and Idolatry in England 1350–1500*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. Edited by Paul Guyer, translated by Paul Guyer and Eric Matthews. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Kennedy, George A. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.
- Kessler, Herbert L. "Diction in the 'Bibles of the Illiterate.'" In *World Art: Themes of Unity in Diversity*. Vol. 2: 297–308.

- . “Pictorial Narrative and Church Mission in Sixth-Century Gaul.” In *Pictorial Narrative in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, edited by Herbert L. Kessler and Marianna Shreve Simpson, 75–91.
- . *Studies in the History of Art* 16. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1985.
- . “Facies Bibliothecae Revelata: Carolingian Art as Spiritual Seeing.” In *Testo e Immagine nell’Alto Medioevo* 2. Spoleto, Italy: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1994: 533–84.
- . *Spiritual Seeing: Picturing God’s Invisibility in Medieval Art*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.
- Kessler, Joan C. “‘Certe Babel du monde’: Visionary Architecture in the Poetry of Victor Hugo.” *Nineteenth-century French Studies* 19, no. 3 (1991): 417–31.
- Ibn Khaldūn. *The Muqaddimah*. 3 vols. Translated from Arabic by Franz Rosenthal. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1958.
- Kinney, Dale. “Spolia.” In *St. Peter’s in the Vatican*, edited by William Tronzo, 16–47.
- Kitzinger, Ernst. “The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm.” In *The Art of Byzantium and the Medieval West: Selected Studies*, edited by Kleinbauer, W. Eugene, 90–156. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976. First published in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 8 (1954): 83–150.
- Koch, Hugo. *Die alchristliche Bilderfrage nach den literarischen Quellen*. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917.
- Koolhaas, Rem. “Preservation is Overtaking Us.” *Future Anterior: Journal of Historic Preservation History, Theory and Criticism* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2004): 1–3.
- The Koran*. With parallel Arabic text. Translated with notes by N. J. Dawood. London: Penguin Books, 1990.
- Krauss, Rosalind. “Sculpture in an Expanded Field.” In *The Anti-Aesthetic*, edited by Hal Foster, 31–42.
- Krautheimer, Richard. *Three Christian Capitals: Topography and Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- La Monica, Giuseppe, ed. *Ideologie e prassi del restauro con antologia di testi*. Palermo, Italy: Libreria Nuova Presenza, 1974.
- Lactantius. *De Mortibus persecutorum*. In *SC* 39. 2 vols. Edited by J. Moreau. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1954.
- Landa, Diego de. *Relación de las Cosas de Yucatán*. Introduction and notes by Héctor Pérez Martínez. Mexico City, Mexico: Pedro Robredo, 1938.
- Lara, Jaime. *City, Temple, Stage: Eschatological Architecture and Liturgical Theatrics in New Spain*. Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 2004.
- Lavin, Irving, ed., *World Art: Themes of Unity in Diversity*. In 3 vols. University Park, Penn.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989.
- Le Goff, Jacques. *The Birth of Purgatory*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- . “La genèse de l’état français au Moyen Âge.” *L’état et les pouvoirs*, edited by André Burguière and Jacques Revel, 21–180.
- . *History and Memory*. Translated by Steven Rendall and Elizabeth Claman. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.
- . “Memory in the Middle Ages—Western Europe.” In *History and Memory*, 68–80.
- . *Saint Louis*. Paris: Gallimard, 1996.
- Lehmborg, Stanford E. *Cathedrals Under Siege: Cathedrals and English Society, 1600–1700*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996.
- Lenski, Noel. “The Reign of Constantine.” In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, edited by Noel Lenski, 59–90.
- Lenski, Noel, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

- León-Portilla, Miguel. *Bernardino de Sahagún: First Anthropologist*. Translated by Mauricio J. Mixco. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002.
- Lepilaideur, Nicole Britz. "Analyse Esthétique et Symbolique du Mihrâb de Cordove." In *Le Mihrâb dans l'Architecture*, edited by Alexandre Papadopoulo, 129–35.
- Levi, Gershon, ed. *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University, Magnes Press, 1990.
- Levine, Lee I. *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Lévi-Provençal, E. ed. *España Musulmana Hasta la Caída del Califato de Córdoba (711–1031)*. Vol. 5. In *Historia de España*, edited by Ramón Menéndez Pidal, translated from Arabic by Emilio García Gómez. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1957.
- Lévi-Provençal, E., trans. *La Péninsule Ibérique au Moyen-âge d'après le Kitab Ar-Rawd Al-Mitar Fi Habar Al-Aktar d'Idn 'Abd Al-Muncim Al-Himyari*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1938.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *Tristes Tropiques*. Paris: Plon, 1955.
- Lévy-Leboyer, Claude, ed. *Vandalism: Behaviour and Motivations*. New York: Elsevier Science, 1984.
- Lockhart, James. *The Nahuas after the Conquest: A Social and Cultural History of the Indians of Central Mexico, Sixteenth through Eighteenth Centuries*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- Lockhart, James, ed. and trans. *We People Here: Nahuatl Accounts of the Conquest of Mexico*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Lorcin, Marie-Thérèse. *La France au XIIIe siècle: économie et société*. Paris: Nathan, 1975.
- Louth, Andrew. *St John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Lowenthal, David. "Why Sanctions Seldom Work: Reflections on Cultural Property Internationalism." *International Journal of Cultural Property* 12 (2005): 393–423.
- . *Possessed by the Past: The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. New York: Free Press, 1996.
- Lyon, Sylvia. *The Life and Times of Prosper Mérimée*. New York: Dial, 1948.
- MacCannell, Dean. "Epilogue" to *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*, 189–203.
- . *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. With a new foreword by Lucy Lippard and a new epilogue by the author. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. *The Iconography of the Sarcophagus of Junius Bassus*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Mâle, Émile. *L'Art religieux du XIIIe siècle en France: étude sur l'iconographie du moyen âge et sur ses sources d'inspiration*. Paris: A. Colin, 1902.
- Malkiel, Maria Rosa Lida de. "La ciudad, tema poético de tono juglaresco en el Cancionero de Baena." In *Estudios sobre la literatura española del siglo XV*, 333–37. Madrid: J. Porrúa Turanzas, 1978.
- Mallion, Jean. *Victor Hugo et l'art architectural*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1962.
- Manent, Pierre. *The City of Man*. Translated by Marc A. LePain. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Mango, Cyril. *The Art of the Byzantine Empire, 312–1453*. In *Sources and Documents in the History of Art*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Mangrum, Bryan D., and Giuseppe Scavizzi, trans. with intro. *A Reformation Debate: Karlstadt, Emser, and Eck on Sacred Images. Three Treatises in Translation*. 2nd ed. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 1998.
- Maraval, Pierre. *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient: Histoire et géographie des origines à la conquête arabe*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1985.
- Marcus, Joel. "Idolatry in the New Testament." *Interpretation* 60, no. 2 (2006): 152–64.
- Mariaux, P. A. "L'Image selon Grégoire le Grand et la question de l'art missionnaire." *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 14 (1993): 1–12.

- Marijnissen, R. H. "Degradation, Conservation, and Restoration of Works of Art: Historical Overview." In *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, edited by Nicholas Stanley Price, M. Kirby Talley, Jr., and Alessandra Melucco Vaccaro, 275–80.
- Marin, Louis. *Des pouvoirs de l'image*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1993.
- Mariotti, Filippo. *La Legislazione delle Belle Arti*. Rome: Unione Cooperative Editrice, 1892.
- Markus, R. A. "The Cult of Icons in Sixth-Century Gaul." First published in *Journal of Theological Studies* 29 (1978): 151–57. Reprinted in *From Augustine to Gregory the Great: History and Christianity in Late Antiquity*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1983.
- . "Gregory the Great and a Papal Missionary Strategy." In *The Mission of the Church and the Propagation of the Faith*, edited by C. J. Cuming, 29–38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- . *Gregory the Great and His World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- . "World and Text in Ancient Christianity II: Gregory the Great." In *Signs and Meanings: World and Text in Ancient Christianity*, 45–70. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1996.
- Marquez, Carlos. *Capiteles Romanos de Corduba: Colonia Patricia*. Córdoba, Spain: Monte de Piedad y Caja de Ahorros, 1993.
- Master Gregorius. *The Marvels of Rome*. Translated by John Osborne. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1987.
- Mateo, Luis Recio. *La Mezquita Catedral de Córdoba: Patrimonio de la Humanidad*. Granada, Spain: Ediciones Edilux, 2005.
- McGuckin, John A. "The Theology of Images and the Legitimation of Power in Eighth Century Byzantium." *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 37 (1993): 39–58.
- Menocal, María Rosa. *The Ornament of the World: How Muslims, Jews, and Christians Created a Culture of Tolerance in Medieval Spain*. New York: Little, Brown, 2002.
- Merriman, Roger Bigelow. *Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1902.
- Metzler, Dieter. "Bilderstürme und Bilderfeindlichkeit in der Antike." In *Bildersturm: Die Zerstörung des Kunstwerks*, edited by Martin Warnke, 14–29. Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1973.
- Milburn, Robert. *Early Christian Art and Architecture*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Miller, E. "Medieval York." In *History of Yorkshire*, edited by P. M. Tillott, 25–116.
- Millin, A. L. *Antiquités nationales ou recueil de monumens*. Paris: Chez Drouhin, 1790–99.
- . *Dictionnaire des Beaux-Arts*. Paris: J. N. Barba, 1838.
- More, Thomas. *A Dialogue Concerning Heresies*. In *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, Vol. 6, Pt. 1 and 2, edited by Thomas M. C. Lawler, Germain Marc'Hadour, and Richard C. Marius. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Morris, William. "Manifesto of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings." In *Historical and Philosophical Issues in Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, edited by Nicholas Stanley Price, M. Kirby Talley, Jr., and Alessandra Melucco Vaccaro, 319–21.
- Movellán, Alberto Villar, and María del Rosario Castro Castillo, eds. *El Patrimonio Hebreo en la España Medieval*. Córdoba, Spain: Universidad de Córdoba, 1999.
- Muir, John. *To Yosemite and Beyond: Writings from the Years 1863–1875*. Edited by Robert Engberg and Donald Wesling. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1980.
- Murphy, Kevin D. *Memory and Modernity: Viollet le Duc at Vézelay*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 2000.
- Murray, Mary Charles. "Art and the Early Church." *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., 28, pt. 2 (October 1977): 303–45.
- Nanda, R. et al., "Group Report: Values and Society." In *Rational Decision-Making in the Preservation of Cultural Property*, edited by N. S. Baer and F. Snickars, 61–80.

- Nelson, Robert S. "Appropriation." In *Critical Terms for Art History*, edited by Robert S. Nelson and Richard Shiff, 160–73.
- Nelson, Robert S., and Olin, Margaret. "Destruction/Reconstruction." Introduction to Part III. In *Monuments and Memory*, edited by Robert S. Nelson and Margaret Olin, 205–7.
- Nelson, Robert S. and Margaret Olin, eds. *Monuments and Memory, Made and Unmade*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Nelson, Robert S., and Richard Shiff, eds. *Critical Terms for Art History*. 1996. Reprint, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- The New English Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Nicéphore. *Discours contre les Iconoclastes*. Translated and notes by Marie-José Mondzain-Baudinet. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck, 1989.
- Nicholas, Lynn H. *The Rape of Europa: The Fate of Europe's Treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War*. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.
- Nicolai, Vincenzo Fiocchi, Fabrizio Bisconti, and Danilo Mazzoleni. *The Christian Catacombs of Rome: History, Decoration, Inscriptions*. Regensburg, Germany: Schnell & Steiner, 1999.
- Niec, Halina, ed. *Cultural Rights and Wrongs: A Collection of Essays in Commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Paris: UNESCO: Institute of Art and Law, 1998.
- Nirenberg, David. *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Noble, Thomas F. X. "John Damascene and the History of the Iconoclastic Controversy." In *Religion, Culture, and Society in the Early Middle Ages. Studies in Honor of Richard E. Sullivan*, edited by Thomas F. X. Noble and John J. Contreni, 95–116. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Medieval Institute, 1987.
- Nora, Pierre, ed. *Realms of Memory: The Construction of the French Past*. 3 vols. English version edited by Lawrence D. Kritzman, translated by Arthur Goldhammer. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.
- Nora, Pierre, ed. *Les Lieux de mémoire*. 7 vols. Paris: Gallimard, 1984.
- Norton, Christopher. "Richard II and York Minster." In *The Government of Medieval York*, edited by Sarah Rees Jones, 56–87.
- Nossack, Hans Erich. *The End: Hamburg 1943*. Translated and foreword by Joel Agee. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Noth, Martin. *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*. Translated and introduction by Bernhard W. Anderson. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1972.
- O'Callaghan, Joseph F. *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- O'Connor, David E., and Jeremy Haselock. "The Stained and Painted Glass." In *A History of York Minster*, edited by G. E. Aylmer and Reginald Cant, 313–93.
- Olin, John C. *The Catholic Reformation: Savonarola to Ignatius Loyola. Reform in the Church 1495–1540*. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Origen. *Contre Celse*. In SC 132, 136, 147, 150, 227. Greek edition, introduction, and French translation by Marcel Borret. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1967–76.
- Orlinsky, H. M. *Understanding the Bible through History and Archaeology*. New York: KTAV, 1972.
- Orme, Nicholas. *English Schools in the Middle Ages*. London: Methuen, 1973.
- Ormrod, Mark. "York and the Crown under the First Three Edwards." In *Government of Medieval York*, edited by Sarah Rees Jones, 14–33.
- Ostrogorsky, George. *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites*. Amsterdam: A. M. Hakkert, 1964.
- . *History of the Byzantine State*. Translated by Joan Hussey. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956.

- Paleotti, Gabriele. "Discorso intorno alle immagini sacre e profane." In *Trattati d'Arte del Cinquecento fra Manierismo e Controriforma*, 3 vols, edited by Paola Barocchi. Bari, Italy: Giuseppe Laterza e Figli, 1960–62.
- . *Discorso intorno alle immagini sacre e profane*. Bologna 1582. Ristampa di Poalo Prodi. Bologna, Italy: Arnaldo Forni Editore, 1990.
- Panofsky, E. "Erasmus and the Visual Arts." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 32 (1969): 200–27.
- Papadopoulo, Alexandre, ed. *Le Mihrâb dans l'Architecture et la Religion Musulmanes*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988.
- Papadopoulo, Alexandre. "Débats a la Suite de la Communication du Prof. Grabar." In *Le Mihrâb dans l'Architecture*, edited by Alexandre Papadopoulo, 118–22.
- Paronetto, Vera. "Une présence augustinienne chez Grégoire le Grand: Le *De Catechizandis rudibus* dans la *Regula pastoralis*." In *Grégoire le Grand*, edited by Jacques Fontaine, Robert Gillet, and Stan Pellistrandi, 511–19. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1986.
- Partner, Peter. *God of Battles: Holy Wars of Christianity and Islam*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Paulinus of Nola. *The Poems of St. Paulinus of Nola*. Translated by P. G. Walsh. In *Ancient Christian Writers* 40. New York: Newman, 1975.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine 2. The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600–1700)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Pérez, Joseph. *The Spanish Inquisition: A History*. Translated by Janet Lloyd. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Petrarch, Francesco. *Le Familiari*. 4 vols. Edited by Vittorio Rossi. Florence: G. C. Sansoni, 1942.
- . *Rerum familiarium libri I–VIII*. Translated by Aldo S. Bernardo. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1975.
- Pevsner, Sir Nikolaus. "Ruskin and Viollet le Duc: Englishness and Frenchness in the Appreciation of Gothic Architecture." *Architectural Design* 3, no. 4 (1980): 48–53.
- Philippot, Paul. "Historic Preservation: Philosophy, Criteria, Guidelines." In *Preservation and Conservation: Principles and Practices*, edited by Sharon Timmons. Washington, D.C.: Preservation Press, National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, 1976, 367–82.
- . "Restoration from the Perspective of the Humanities." In *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, edited by Nicholas Stanley Price, M. Kirby Talley, Jr., and Alessandra Melucco Vaccaro, 216–29.
- Phillips, John. *The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England, 1535–1660*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.
- Pighi, G. B., ed. *Laudes Mediolanensis Civitatis, Versus de Verona, Versum de Mediolano civitate*. Bologna, Italy: Zanichelli, 1960.
- Plato. "Phaedo." In *Plato I*, English translation by Harold North Fowler, 200–403. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980.
- Plato. *Republic*. 2 vols. Edited by T. E. Page, E. Capps, and W. H. D. Rouse. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1930, 1935.
- Plotinus. "On the Intelligible Beauty." In *Ennead V*, edited by G. P. Gould, translated by A. H. Armstrong, 233–81. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Polk, Milbry, and Angela M. H. Schusster, eds. *The Looting of the Iraq Museum, Baghdad: The Lost Legacy of Ancient Mesopotamia*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2005.
- Poole, George Ayliffe, and J. W. Hugall. *An Historical and Descriptive Guide to York Cathedral and Its Antiquities*. York, England: R. Sunter, 1850.
- Porter, Stephen. *Destruction in the English Civil Wars*. Dover, NH: Alan Sutton, 1994.

- Posey, Darrell Addison. "Can Cultural Rights Protect Traditional Cultural Knowledge and Biodiversity?" In *Cultural Rights and Wrongs*, edited by Halina Niec, 42–56.
- Preziosi, Donald. "Collecting/Museums." In *Critical Terms for Art History*, edited by Robert S. Nelson and Richard Shiff, 407–18.
- Price, Nicholas Stanley, M. Kirby Talley, Jr., and Alessandra Melucco Vaccaro, eds. *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute, 1996.
- Price, Uvedale. *An Essay on the Picturesque as compared with the Sublime and the Beautiful and on the Use of Studying Pictures, for the Purpose of Improving Real Landscape*. London: J. Robson, 1794.
- The Publications of the Surtees Society* XCI (1892).
- Pugin, Augustus Charles. *Specimens of Gothic Architecture; Selected from Various Ancient Edifices in England*. London, 1821. Reprint, Edinburgh: John Grant, 1895.
- Pugin, Augustus Welby. *Some Remarks on the Articles which have recently appeared in the Rambler relative to Ecclesiastical Architecture and Decoration*. London: Charles Dolman, 1850.
- . *The True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture*. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853.
- Quacquarelli, Antonio. "Note Esetetiche sui Pavimenti Musivi delle Basiliche Teodoriane di Aquileia: 'Il Bestiarius.'" In *Aquileia nel IV Secolo*, 2:429–62. Udine: Arti Grafiche Friulane, 1982.
- Rabbat, Nasser. "The Dialogic Dimension of Umayyad Art." *Res* 43 (Spring 2003): 79–94.
- Raine, James, ed. *The Historians of the Church of York and Its Archbishops*. 3 vols. In *The Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages*. London: Longman, 1879–94.
- Raine, James, ed. "Miscellanea Relating to Archbishop Scrope." In *Historians of the Church of York and the Archbishops*, rolls series 71, 2:304–11. London: Longmans, 1886.
- Ramsay, Nigel. "'The Manuscripts flew about like Butterflies': The Break-Up of English Libraries in the Sixteenth Century." In *Lost Libraries*, edited by Raven James, 125–44.
- Raven, James, ed. *Lost Libraries: The Destruction of Great Book Collections Since Antiquity*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Raven, James. "Introduction." In *Lost Libraries*, edited by James Raven, 1–40.
- Réau, Louis. *Histoire du Vandalisme: Les Monuments Détruits de l'Art Français*. 2 vols. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1959.
- Reiff, Daniel D. "Viollet le Duc and Historic Restoration: The West Portals of Notre-Dame." *Journal of Society of Architectural Historians* 30 (March 1971): 17–30.
- Renan, Ernest. *Histoire des Origines du Christianisme 7: Marc-Aurèle et la fin du monde antique*. Paris: Michel Lévy, 1863.
- Renoliet, Jean-Jacques. *L'UNESCO oubliée: La Société des Nations et la coopération intellectuelle (1919–1946)*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1999.
- Rex, Richard. "The English Campaign Against Luther in the 1520s." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 39 (1989): 85–106.
- Ricard, Robert. *The Spiritual Conquest of Mexico: An Essay on the Apostolate and the Evangelizing Methods of the Mendicant Orders in New Spain, 1523–1572*. Translated by Lesley Byrd Simpson. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966. Originally published as *La "Conquête Spirituelle" du Mexique*, Paris: University of Paris Press, 1933.
- Richard, Jean. *Saint Louis: Crusader King of France*. Edited and abridged by Simon Lloyd, translated by Jean Birrell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Rickman, Thomas. *An Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of Architecture in England from the Conquest to the Reformation*. 1817. Reprint, London: John Henry Parker, 1848.
- Ricoeur, Paul. "Universal Civilization and National Cultures." In *History and Truth*, translated and introduction by Charles A. Kelbley, 271–84. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1965.



- Riegl, Alois. "The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Essence and Its Development." Translated by Karin Bruckner with Karen Williams. In *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, edited by Nicholas Stanley Price, M. Kirby Talley, Jr., and Alessandra Melucco Vaccaro, 69–83.
- . *Der Moderne Denkmalkultus: Sein Wesen und seine Entstehung*. Vienna: W. Braumüller, 1903.
- Rist, John M. *Augustine: Ancient Thought Baptized*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Rivkin, E. *The Shaping of Jewish History: A Radical New Interpretation*. New York: Scribner, 1971.
- Robinson, Rev. Hastings, ed. and trans. *The Zurich Letters, comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1842.
- Roderici Ximenii de Rada. *Historia de Rebus Hispania sive Historia Gothica*. Edited by Juan Fernández Valverde. In *CCSM 72*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1987.
- Rodin, Auguste. *Les Cathédrales de France*. Introduction by Charles Morice. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1914.
- Romero y Barros, Rafael. *Córdoba Monumental y Artística*. Facsimile ed. Córdoba, Spain: Consejería de Cultura y Medio Ambiente de la Junta Andalucía Caja Provincial de Ahorros de Córdoba, 1991.
- Romero-Camacho, Isabel Montes. "La Aljama Judía de Sevilla en la Baja Edad Media." In *El Patrimonio Hebreo en la España Medieval*, edited by Alberto Villar Movellán and María del Rosario Castro Castillo, 25–52.
- Roper, William. *Lyfe of Sir Thomas Moore, knyghte*. Edited by E. V. Hitchcock. In *Early English Texts Society*, original series 197. London: Oxford University Press, 1935.
- Rowe, C. Kavin. "New Testament Iconography? Situating Paul in the Absence of Material Evidence." In *Picturing the New Testament: Studies in Ancient Visual Images*, edited by Annette Weissenrieder, Friederike Wendt, and Petra Von Gemünden, 289–312. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Rücker, Frédéric. *Les Origines de la Conservation des Monuments historiques en France (1790–1830)*. Paris: Jouve & Cie, 1913.
- Rudolph, Conrad. *The "Things of Greater Importance": Bernard of Clairvaux's "Apologia" and the Medieval Attitude toward Art*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990.
- Ruskin, John. *The Seven Lamps of Architecture, the Study of Architecture*. Boston: Dana Estes, 1900.
- . *The Stones of Venice*. 3 vols. Orpington, Kent, UK: George Allen, 1886.
- Rutgers, L. V. *Subterranean Rome: In Search of the Roots of Christianity in the Catacombs of the Eternal City*. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Ryves, Bruno. *Mercurius Rusticus Or, The Countries Complaint of the Sacriedges, Prophanations, and Plunderings, Committed by Schismaticques on the Cathedrall Churches of this Kingdome*. Oxford, 1646.
- Sack, Robert David. *Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Sahagún, Fray Bernardino de. *Florentine Codex: General History of the Things of New Spain*. 13 parts. Translated by Arthur J. O. Anderson and Charles E. Dibble. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1970–82.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1979.
- Saint, Andrew. "Pugin's Architecture in Context." In *A. W.N. Pugin, Master of Gothic Revival*, edited by Paul Atterbury, 79–101.
- Sainte-Beuve, Charles Augustin. "Notes de l'editeur." In *Prospectus pour l'édition de 1832*, Victor Hugo, *Notre-Dame de Paris 1482*, 455. Paris: La Librairie Ollendorff, 1904.
- Al-Saqundi (abu-L-Walid Ismail Ibn Muhammad). *Elogio del Islam Español*. Translated into Spanish by Emilio García Gómez. Madrid: Estanislao Maestre, 1934.



- Saro-Wiwa, Ken. *The Singing Anthill: Ogoni Folk Tales*. London: Saros International, 1991.
- Saul, Nigel. "Richard II and the City of York." In *Government of Medieval York*, edited by Sarah Rees Jones, 1–13.
- Sauvanon, Jeanine. *Les métiers au Moyen-Age: Leurs "signatures" dans les vitraux: Cathédrale de Chartres*. Chartres, France: Éditions Houvet, 1993.
- Schildgen, Brenda. "Augustine's Answer to Jacques Derrida in the *De Doctrina Christiana*." *New Literary History* 25, no. 2 (Spring 1994): 383–97.
- Sebald, W. G. *On the Natural History of Destruction*. Translated by Anthea Bell. New York: Modern Library, 2004.
- Sellheim, R. "Fada'il." In *The Encyclopedia of Islam*. Vol. II New Edition. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965. 728–29.
- Sepinwall, Alyssa Goldstein. *The Abbé Grégoire and the French Revolution: The Making of Modern Universalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Sette, Maria Piera. *Il Restauro in Architettura*. Introduction by Gaetano Miarelli Mariani. Turin: UTET, 2001.
- Settis, Salvatore. *Italia S.p.a. l'assalto al patrimonio culturale*. Turin: Einaudi, 2002.
- Simpson, James. "The Rule of the Medieval Imagination." In *Images, Idolatry, and Iconoclasm*, edited by Jeremy Dimmick, James Simpson, and Nicolette Zeeman, 4–24.
- Skinner, S. A. *Tractarians and the "Condition of England": The Social and Political Thought of the Oxford Movement*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2004.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Soros, Susan Weber. "Foreword." In *A. W.N. Pugin, Master of Gothic Revival*, edited by Paul Atterbury, 6–8.
- Speer, Andreas. "Is There a Theology of the Gothic Cathedral? A Re-reading of Abbot Suger's Writings on the Abbey Church of St.-Denis." In *Mind's Eye*, edited by Jeffrey F. Hamburger and Anne-Marie Bouché, 65–83.
- Spier, Jeffrey. *Late Antique and Early Christian Gems*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Reichert Verlag, 2007.
- . *Picturing the Bible: The Earliest Christian Art*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Spitz, Lewis W. "Further Lines of Inquiry for the Study of 'Reformation and Pedagogy.'" In *The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion: Papers from the University of Michigan Conference*, edited by Charles Trinkaus and Heiko A. Oberman, 294–306. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- Spraggon, Julie. *Puritan Iconoclasm during the English Civil War. Studies in Modern British Religious History Series*. Woodbridge, England: Boydell, 2003.
- Stanbury, Sarah. "The Vivacity of Images: St Katherine, Knighton's Lollards, and the Breaking of Idols." In *Images, Idolatry, and Iconoclasm*, edited by Jeremy Dimmick, James Simpson, and Nicolette Zeeman, 131–50.
- Starn, Randolph. "Architectural Imitations." *Future Anterior* 2, no. 2 (Winter 2005): 75–82.
- . "Authenticity and Historic Preservation: Towards an Authentic History." *History of the Human Sciences* 15, no. 1 (2002): 1–16.
- Statius. *Statius*. Translated by J. H. Mozley. 2 vols. 1928. Reprint, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Stavenhagen, Rodolfo. "Cultural Rights: A Social Science Perspective." In *Cultural Rights and Wrongs*, edited by Halina Niec, 1–20.
- Stock, Brian. *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge, and the Ethics of Interpretation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Straw, Carole. *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

- Suger, Abbot. *Abbot Suger on the Abbey Church of St.-Denis and Its Art Treasures*. Edited, translated, and annotated by Erwin Panofsky. 1946. Reprint, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979.
- Summerson, Sir John. "Viollet le Duc and the Rational Point of View." *Architectural Design* 3, no. 4 (1980): 6–13.
- Tanner, Norman P., ed. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*. 2 vols. With original text established by G. Alberigo, J. A. Dossetti, P.-P. Joannou, C. Leonardi, and P. Prodi. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1990.
- Tate, Robert B. "The Civic Humanism of Alfonso de Palencia." *Renaissance and Modern Studies* 23 (1979): 25–44.
- Tavano, Sergio. "Patriarchi: Titoli e Segni." In *Aquileia e il Suo Patriarcato*, 11–32.
- Taylor, Joan E. *Christians and the Holy Places: The Myth of Jewish-Christian Origins*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- Tertullian. *De Idololatria*. Critical text, translation, and commentary by J. H. Waszink and J. C. M. Van Winden. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1987.
- . *De Pudicitia*. In SC 394–95, introduction by Claudio Micaelli, Latin text and French translation by Charles Munier. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993.
- . *Scorpiace*. Edited by Giovanna Azzali Bernardelli. Florence: Nardini, 1990.
- Testo e Immagine nell'Alto Medioevo* 1. Spoleto, Italy: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1994.
- Theophanes. *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284–813*. Translated by C. Mango and R. Scott. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- . *Chronographia*. 2 vols. Edited by C. de Boor. Leipzig, Germany: Teubner, 1883–85.
- Thoenes, Christof. "Renaissance St. Peter's." In *St. Peter's in the Vatican*, edited by William Tronzo, 64–92.
- Thomas, Charles. *Christianity in Roman Britain to AD 500*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.
- Thoreau, Henry David. *Walden*. Introduction and annotations by Bill McKibben. Boston: Beacon, 1997.
- Tillott, P. M., ed. *A History of Yorkshire: The City of York*. In *The Victoria History of the Counties of England*, edited by R. P. Hugh. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Tomlinson, J. T. *Queen Elizabeth's Crucifix: Its Secret History*. London: Church Association, 1887.
- Townsend, Rev. George, and Rev. Stephen Reed Cattle, eds. *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*. 8 vols. London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1837–41.
- Tronzo, William. "The Prestige of Saint Peter's: Observations on the Function of Monumental Narrative Cycles in Italy." In *Studies in the History of Art* 16, 93–112. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1985.
- Tronzo, William, ed. *St. Peter's in the Vatican*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Turner, A. Richard. *Renaissance Florence: The Invention of a New Art*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1997.
- Tyndale, William. *An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1850.
- Vaes, Jan. "'Nova Construere sed Amplius Vetusta Servare': La Réutilisation Chrétienne d'Édifices Antique en Italie." In *Actes du XIe Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, 1:299–321. Rome: École Française de Rome, 1989.
- Vanmaele, Rev. Père Basile. *L'église Pudencienne de Rome (Santa Pudenziana)*. Louvain, Belgium: E. Warny, 1965.
- Vasari, Giorgio. *Le Opere di Giorgio Vasari*. Edited by Gaetano Milanesi. Florence: Sansoni, 1973.
- Villani, Giovanni. *Croniche*. Edited by Giulio Cura Curà, introduction by Giuseppe Edoardo Sansone. Rome: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 2002.

- Viollet le Duc, Eugène Emmanuel. *L'architecture raisonnée; Extraits du Dictionnaire de l'architecture française*. Edited by Hubert Damisch. Paris: Hermann, 1978.
- Viollet le Duc, Eugène Emmanuel. "Restauration." *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XIe au XVIe siècle* 8, pp. 14–34.
- . *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XIe au XVIe siècle*. 10 vols. Paris: B. Bance, 1858–68.
- . *Discourses on Architecture*. Translated from French by Benjamin Bucknall. Boston: Ticknor, 1889.
- . *Entretiens sur l'Architecture*. Paris: A. Morel, 1863–72.
- . *Lettres d'Italie 1836–1837*. Edited by Geneviève Viollet le Duc. Paris: Léonce Laget, 1971.
- . "Construction." *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XIe au XVIe siècle* 4:1–279.
- De Vita Constantini*. In *PG* 20., cols. 1089–92.
- Vives, José. *Concilios Visigóticos e Hispano-Romanos I*. Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1963.
- Voltaire. *Treatise on Tolerance*. Edited by Simon Harvey, translated from French by Brian Masters. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Waley, Daniel. *The Italian City-Republics*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.
- Wallace, Michael. "Reflections on the History of Historic Preservation." In *Presenting the Past*, edited by Susan Porter Benson, Stephen Brier, and Roy Rosenzweig, 165–99.
- Walpole, Horace. *Anecdotes of Painting in England*. London: Leigh & Sotheby, 1808.
- Wandel, Lee Palmer. *Voracious Idols and Violent Hands: Iconoclasm in Reformation Zurich, Strasbourg, and Basel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Ward, Patricia A. *The Medievalism of Victor Hugo*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1975.
- Weitzmann, Kurt, and Herbert L. Kessler. *The Frescoes of the Dura Synagogue and Christian Art*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1990.
- Wenham, Peter. *The Great and Close Siege of York, 1644*. Kington, England: Roundwood, 1970.
- Werner, Emmy. *Through the Eyes of Innocents: Children Witness World War II*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 2000.
- White, Hayden. "The Politics of Historical Representation: Discipline and De-Sublimation." In *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*, edited by Hayden White, 58–82. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.
- Widdrington, Sir Thomas. *Analecta Eboracensia: Or, some Remaynes of the Ancient City of York*. Edited by Caesar Caine. London: C. J. Clark, 1897.
- Wild, Charles. *Twelve Perspective Views of the Metropolitan Church at York*. London, 1809.
- Wilken, Robert L. *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Willey, Ann. *York Minster*. London: Scala Books, 1998.
- Willis, Browne. *Survey of the Cathedral of York*. York, England, 1727.
- Willson, Edward James. "Remarks on Gothic Architecture and on Modern Imitations." In Pugin, *Specimens of Gothic Architecture*.
- Wolpert, Stanley. *A New History of India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Wood, Diana, ed. *The Church and the Arts*. Published for the Ecclesiastical History Society. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.
- Yarza, Joaquin. *Arte y Arquitectura en España 500–1250*. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 1979.
- Yates, Frances A. *The Art of Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Young, James E. "Memory/Monument." In *Critical Terms for Art History*, edited by Robert S. Nelson and Richard Shiff, 234–47.

- . *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Zagorin, Perez. *How the Idea of Religious Toleration Came to the West*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Zucker, Paul. *Fascination of Decay: Ruins: Relic-Symbol-Ornament*. Ridgewood, New Jersey: Gregg, 1968.

## WEB SITES

### *International Conventions and Declarations*

- All Rights for All. Fiftieth Anniversary of the “Universal Declaration of Human Rights” (1948–98). <http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>.
- Avalon Project. Laws of War: Laws and Customs of War on Land (Hague IV), October 18, 1907. <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/lawofwar/hague04.htm>.
- International Committee for Red Cross. Geneva Conventions. <http://www.icrc.org/eng>.
- UNESCO. <http://www.unesco.org/culture/>.
- UNESCO. “Intangible Heritage.” <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich>.
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre Main Page. <http://whc.unesco.org/>.
- UNESCO World Heritage Convention Text. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/convention>.
- UNESCO World Heritage List. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>.

### *ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) Documents*

- “Athens Charter, 1931.” [http://www.icomos.org/athens\\_charter.html](http://www.icomos.org/athens_charter.html).
- Hague Convention Article 1. Definition of Cultural Property. <http://www.icomos.org/hague/HagueArt1.html>.
- International Council on Monuments and Sites Main Page. <http://www.international.icomos.org/>.
- Stockholm Declaration. Declaration of ICOMOS marking the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1998). [http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/stocdec\\_e.htm](http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/stocdec_e.htm).
- “Venice Charter, 1964.” [http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/venice\\_e.htm](http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.htm).

### *Roman Catacombs*

- Main page for the Roman catacombs. <http://www.catacombe.roma.it/>.
- “Cubicles of the Sacraments.” <http://www.catacombe.roma.it/en/cubicoli.html>.
- “History of the Catacombs.” <http://www.catacombe.roma.it/en/storia.html>.
- “The Symbols.” <http://www.catacombe.roma.it/en/symb.html>.

### *National Organizations*

- National Park Service. <http://www.nps.gov/aboutus/history.htm>.
- Levys at Monticello. <http://www.monticello.org/about/levy.html>.
- Thomas Jefferson Foundation. <http://www.monticello.org/about/foundation.html>.
- Society of Antiquaries of London. <http://www.sal.org.uk>.
- Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. <http://www.spab.org.uk/>.

**Other**

- "Cultural Revolution Posters." <http://kaladarshan.arts.ohio-state.edu/exhib/poster/pages/pages1/C14019.html>.
- Elgin's Work in Athens. <http://www.athensguide.com/elginmarbles/work.html>.
- Glen Canyon Institute. David Brower (1912–2000). <http://www.glencanyon.org/brower/browerhome.php>.
- Mount Graham Coalition. <http://www.mountgraham.org/new.html>.
- "The New 7 Wonders of the World." <http://www.new7wonders.com>.
- "Religious Intolerance in Afghanistan." [http://www.religioustolerance.org/rt\\_afgha.htm](http://www.religioustolerance.org/rt_afgha.htm).

**NEWSPAPER ARTICLES**

- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Whose Culture Is It?" *New York Review of Books*, February 9, 2006, pp. 38–41.
- Bouchenaki, Mounir. "Grim Warnings." *Al-Ahram Weekly* On-Line 873. 29 November-5 December, 2007. <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2007/873/cu1.htm>
- Burkeman, Oliver. "Ancient Archive Lost in Baghdad Library Blaze." *Guardian*, April 15, 2003.
- Cohen, Roger. "The Ghost in the Baghdad Museum." *New York Times*, April 2, 2006, sec. 2, p.1, col. 3.
- Ecclesiologist*, November, 1, 1841.
- Gettleman, Jeffrey. "Ruined Treasures in Babylon Await an Iraq without Fighting." *New York Times International*, April 28, 2006, p. A6.
- Mydans, Seth. "Russia Peels the Veils from Antiquity and Gazes, Awed." *New York Times*, Sunday, October 16, 2005, sec. 1, p. 10, col. 1.
- Roy, Arundhati. "Lies, dam lies and statistics." *Guardian*, June 5, 1999.
- Yorkshire Gazette*, November 6, 1830.
- Van Gelder, Lawrence, comp. "Greek Antiquities Raids are Linked to Italian Trial." *New York Times*, April 17, 2006.
- Wills, Garry. "We Are All Romans Now." *New York Review of Books* LIV: 9, May 31, 2007, pp. 12–14.
- Woolf, Virginia. "A Dialogue upon Mount Pentelicus." 1906. *Times Literary Supplement*, September 11–17, 1987, pp. 979.

# INDEX

- Abbasid, 84  
Act of Toleration (1689), 113  
Adams, Henry (1838–1918), 18, 192  
adoration, 12, 225; versus veneration, 12  
aesthetics, 136–38, 145, 157, 162, 163; and Gervase of Canterbury, description of Canterbury cathedral, 142; and Suger's description of St.-Denis, 142  
Afghanistan, xiii; Bamiyam Valley Buddhas, 5, 7; Taliban, xiii, 5  
Alaska Wildlife Refuge, 183  
Alberti, Leon Battista, 190; *On Painting*, 11  
Alcuin, 102  
Allison, K. J., 211  
Anastos, Milton V., 194  
Anderson, Benedict, 189  
antiquarian, 141; antiquarianism, 160; antiquarianism, monuments, 131; Roman, 58  
Appiah, Kwame Anthony, 169, 221; nationalism and museums, plunder, 171  
Aquileia, Italy, 61  
archaeology, 60, 66, 89, 138; Christian, 58–58  
architects, 149, 155  
architecture, 14, 92, 154; architecture as performance, 87; architectural renaissance of the medieval period, 159; English, 159; Gothic, 96; and history, 152  
archivalism, 133, 136, 157  
archives, 3, 14, 126, 153, 183; French, 121, 128  
art, architecture, and provenance, 171; autonomy of, 137; as Bible for the unlettered, 69, 72, 77; Christian art, 143; Christian, Byzantine, 85, 86; Christian didacticism, 68; Christian narrative, 63, 65, 68; Christian support for, 72; as consumer value, 116, 164; early Christian, 58, 62, 64, 66; effect of, 69; as history, 141; medieval, 138, 142; power of, 11, 12, 66, 74, 77, 78; religious, 58; Syrian, 86; theology of, 67  
art history, 14, 146, 158, 164; art history and preservation, 172; art history value, 163  
Aston, Margaret, 49, 67, 196, 197, 198, 199, 201  
Athens Charter (1931), 177, 178  
Atwood, Roger, 221  
Auerbach, Erich, 202  
Augustine (354–430), 201, 202; *City of God*, 62; *De Catechizandis Rudibus*, 68; *De Doctrina Christiana*, 67  
Austen, Jane, 129  
authority, papal, 47, 48, 52  
Auzépy, Marie-France, 192, 195  
Aztec, 7  
Babelon, Jean-Pierre, 214  
Bakhtin, Mikhail, xvi, 142, 188, 217  
Balut, Pierre-Yves, 187  
Barber, Charles, 194

- Barnard, L. W., 194
- Barnes, Timothy David, 199
- Baroque, 15
- Barry, Charles (1795–1860), 160
- Baschet, Jérôme, 202
- Basil the Great (ca. 329–79), 66, 71, 77, 201, 203
- Battista de Rossi, Giovanni (1822–94), 58
- Baumgarten, Alexander Gottlieb (1714–62), 136
- Bayano'l Mogrib, Al-, 205, 206, 207
- Bayle, Pierre (1647–1706), 113
- Baynes, John, 191, 199
- beauty, concept of, 19, 150
- Bede, Venerable (672–735), 102, 207; *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, 102
- Beckwith, John, 199
- Belting, Hans, 58, 188, 194, 196, 197, 199
- Benjamin, Walter, xiv, 187
- Bercé, Françoise, 192, 214, 217, 218
- Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153), 11, 68, 154, 190
- Besançon, Alain, 193, 196
- Bevan, Robert, 188
- Bible, 15, 22, 23, 37, 86, 100; cities, 4; David and Goliath, 1; Decalogue, 21–23, 33, 46, 50, 51, 58; Deuteronomy, xv, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 34–35, 38, 46, 51, 53, 64, 71; Exodus, xv, 22, 34–35, 38, 64, 71; Ezekiel, 25; Ezekiel, iconoclasm, 28; Genesis, 46; Gospel of John, 35, 60; Greek, 23–24; Hebrew, 24; 1 Kings, 21; 1 Kings, 25; 2 Kings, 27, 28; 2 Kings, 44–45; Leviticus, 34; Moses, 23; New Testament, 24, 35, 37, 71; New Testament, Acts of the Apostles, 24; Paul's Letter to the Corinthians, 24; Paul's 2nd Letter to the Corinthians, 25; Paul's Letter to the Romans, 24, 25; Pentateuch, 86
- Biré, Edmond, 139, 215
- Bisconti, Fabrizio, 200
- Boito, Camillo (1836–1914), 160, 162, 220, 221; and restoration, 163
- Boleyn, Anne, 49
- Boniface IV, Pope, 89
- The Book of Pontiffs*, 64, 89, 207
- Borras Gualis, Gonzalo M., 206, 209
- Bosio, Antonio (1575–1629), 58
- Bosnia, 8, 98
- Bouchenaki, Mounir, 188
- Boulad-Ayoub, Josiane, 213
- Bourdieu, Pierre, 11, 126, 142, 190, 191, 213, 214, 217, 222; concept of symbolic capital, 11
- Bové, José, ecosaboteur, 9
- Britton, John (1771–1857), 158, 159, 220
- Brower, David (1912–2000), 18
- Brown, Gerard Baldwin, 222
- Brown, Peter, 32, 191, 195
- Brown, Sarah, 210
- Browne, John, 212
- Bruno Ryves, 190, 210; *Mercurius Rusticus*, 12, 100
- Brusin, Dina della Barba, 200
- Bugenhagen, Johannes (1485–1558), 45
- buildings, reuse of, Canterbury, 89
- Burgos, Spain, 93, 96
- Burman, P. A. T. I., 220, 223
- Burns, Robert I., 208
- Butterworth, G. W., 200
- Byzantine emperors: Emperor Constantine V (741–75), 23, 31, 34, 35, 37, 48, 51; Emperor Leo III (717–41), 23, 31, 32, ; Emperor Leo III, *The Ecloga (Manual of Roman Law)*, 33; Emperor Leo IV (775–80), 31; Emperor Leo V (813–20), 31, 37; Michael II (820–29), 31; Theophilus (829–42), 31; iconoclast emperors, 53
- Byzantine empress, Irene, 31, 36, 37

- Cabrera, Emilio, 209  
 Caliphate, Córdoba, 86  
 Caliphate, Umayyad, 85  
 Calvin, John (1509–64), 41, 43, 69  
 Camacho, José Manuel Escobar, 207  
 Cameron, Averil, 32, 194, 195, 196  
 Camille, Michael, 190, 197, 202  
 Cantarel-Besson, Yveline, 214  
 Canterbury, England, 102  
 Capitel, Antón, 209  
 Capponi, Carlo, 200  
 Cassiodorus (ca. 485–585), 16, 81, 172, 191; *Variarum*, 81  
 Castillo, María del Rosario Castro, 208  
 Castro, Américo, 209  
 Catacombs, Roman, 58–58, 59  
 cathedral: cathedrals and artistic value, 140; as book, 143; Gothic, 82  
 cathedral cities, Canterbury, 103; Durham, 103; Wells, 103  
 cathedrals, Mezquita, Córdoba, 147; Saint Paul's, London, 112; York, 111; York, Great East Window, 111  
 Catherine of Siena (1347–1380), 41  
 Cecchi, Roberto, 222  
 Charlemagne (742/47–814), 102, 135  
 Charles V (1500–1558), 96  
 Chastel, A., 214  
 Chateaubriand, François René (1768–1848), 129  
 Chazelle, Celia M., 202  
 China, Cultural Revolution (1966–76), 6, 7  
 Choay, Françoise, 187, 214, 218, 222, 223  
 Christensen, Carl C., 196, 197  
 Christianity, cult of the saints, 16  
 Church of the Holy Sepulcher, 26  
 Cicero (106–43 BCE), 62  
 Cistercian order: art, 68; reform, 11, 45  
 cities, praise of, 80, 91  
 citizenship, xvi; citizen as concept, 127  
 civic: commitment, 79, 101–112, 119; power, 103; pride, 101, 141; uniqueness, 104  
 Civil War, Cromwellian, 113  
 Clark, Kenneth, 158, 202, 214, 219, 220  
 clash of civilizations, xiii  
 classical antiquity, 156; classicism, 122; classicism, Italian, style, 130  
 Clement of Alexandria (150–c.215), 60, 63, 200, 201  
 Cluniac order, 12; monastery destroyed, 48  
 Cognasso, Francesco, 196  
 Cohen, Roger, 188  
 Colish, Marcia L., 202  
 collecting, 12  
 Colley, Linda, 117, 212  
 Compagni, Dino, 204  
 Connerton, Paul, 191  
 conservation, 19, 20, 130, 139, 146, 148, 154, 185; preservation, and restorations, 161  
 Constable, Elizabeth, 190  
 Constantine the Great (274/288–337), Roman Emperor, 15, 16, 29, 33, 35, 59, 64, 101, 111; Edict of Milan (313 CE), 15, 59, 61  
 Constantinople, 15  
 construction: medieval buildings, 151  
 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 20  
 Convention for the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 177  
*convivencia*, 95, 225  
 Cooper, Trevor, 188  
 Córdoba, 79–80, 83, 92, 94, 95, 98; Alcázar, 93; archives, 91; capital of Umayyad dynasty, 84; Christian repairs, 90; Córdoba's mezquita/mosque, 79, 82–84, 88, 92, 94, 96, 98; local resistance, 97;



- memory, Umayyad, 90; Renaissance strata, 96
- Council of Trent (1545–1563), 77, 78, 173; on Christian art, 67
- Council of Zamora (1312), 95
- Counter-Reformation, 12, 78
- Cowie, L. W., 210, 211
- Crane, Susan A., 216, 221
- Cranmer, Thomas (1489–1556), Archbishop of Canterbury, 50, 51
- Cromwell, Oliver (1599–1658), 52, 78, 106, 110; commonwealth, 52
- Cromwell, Thomas (1489–1540), 46, 48, 50, 210
- Cross, Claire, 194, 210
- Cross, Frank Moore, 193
- cruciform church, 96
- cultural: heritage, 167, 182, 183, 225; identity, 179; patrimony, 171; preservation, 183 property, 127, 179, 180
- Cumplido, Manuel Nieto, 81, 204, 206, 208, 209
- Cuscito, Giuseppe, 200
- Dante Alighieri (1265–1321), 40; *Purgatory*, 47
- Darbel, Alain, 190, 191, 213, 214, 217, 222
- Defoe, Daniel (1660–1731), *A Tour Through England and Wales*, 113, 114, 211
- Delécluze, Étienne-Jean, 146
- Denslagen, Wim, 187, 212, 214, 217, 219
- Descartes, René (1596–1650), 139
- Dickens, A. G., 198, 210
- Digester, Elizabeth DePalma, 191
- Dobson, Barrie, 210
- Dodds, Jerrilynn, 206
- Dowsing, William (1596–1668), 1, 106, 188, 210
- Drake, Francis (1696–1771), 105, 211; *Eboracum*, 106, 109, 110–112, 119
- Duchesne, L'Abbé, 201
- Duffy, Eamon, 47, 190, 198
- Duggan, Lawrence G., 202
- Dura-Europos, 66; synagogue, 60–61
- Eales, Jaqueline, 211
- Eck, Johannes (1486–1543), 43, 75; against iconoclasm, 75
- Eco, Umberto, 217
- Edwards, John, 209
- Egypt, Ancient, 1; Sphinx of Giza, iconoclasm, 7
- eighteenth century, 137, 139, 140, 145, 147
- Eire, Carlos, 196
- Elgin marbles, 169
- Elsner, J., 188, 199, 200, 207, 209
- Elton, G. R., 197
- Emery, Elizabeth, 214
- Emperor Hadrian (117–38), 89
- Emser, Hieronymus (1478–1527), 43, 58, 75; against iconoclasm, 75, 76
- England, 10; civil war, 99, 101, 105, 106, 108; destroyed buildings, Coventry, 8, 9; dissolution of the monasteries, 40; national identity, 109; National Trust, 172; Restoration of the Monarchy (1660), 105; Wenlock Priory, 39
- Enlightenment, 14, 19, 20, 113, 122, 129, 142; Enlightenment and the museum, 127
- environmentalism, 18
- Epiphanius (ca. 310–403), 64, 65
- Erasmus, D. (1466/69–1536), 43, 77, 197
- Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. 260–d. ca. 341), 15, 29, 62, 64–65, 191, 194, 200, 201; *Ecclesiastical History*, 15, 29, 30, 64
- Evagrius, 194
- Expropriation of cultural property, French Monument Act, 171
- Fairfax, Ferdinando, 107
- Fairfax, Robert, 108

- Farrar, F. W., 212
- Finney, Paul Corby, 187, 199, 201
- Fisher, John (1549–1535), 46, 75
- Flood, Finbarr Barry, 188, 189, 191, 214
- Floyd, Margaret Henderson, 220
- Foucart, Bruno, 223
- Fourth Lateran Council (1251), 94, 95
- Foxe, John (1516–87), 42, 45, 48, 51–53, 99, 104, 197, 209; *The Actes and Monuments of these Latter Perilous Days*, 42, 116
- Fra Angelico, 143
- France: architectural legacy, 134; culture, 151; decrees, 125; and expropriation of national patrimony, 129, 148; historical monuments, 145; July Revolution, 128, 133–34; laws, 128; and legacy, 133–34; medieval architecture, 140; monarchy, 133; nation, 153; nationalizing heritage, 125–26; national monuments, 133; national pride, 153, 157; 139; Republic, 128, 131; revolution, xv, 1, 7, 8, 127, 128, 132–136, 142, 156, 164, 183
- Frankl, Paul, 211, 219, 220
- Freedberg, David, 10, 12, 189, 190, 196, 199
- Freeman, Ann, 196
- French, Thomas, 210
- Frend, W. H. C., 201
- Freshfield, Edwin Hanson, 195
- Freud, Sigmund, 13, 190; *Civilization and Its Discontents*, 13
- Fritzsche, Peter, 192, 214, 219, 220, 221, 222
- Frugoni, Chiara, 204
- Gamboni, 213, 214
- Ganim, John, 197, 212
- Gautier, Théophile, 138
- Geneva Convention, 1949, 176, 177
- genocide, xiii
- Gent, Thomas (1693–1778), 108, 211
- Germany, Dresden, 8; museum of Nazi triumph, 8; Nazi regime, 4, 8; *The Rape of Europa*, 8;
- Gero, Stephen, 194, 195
- Gervase, 217
- Gettleman, Jeffrey, 223
- Giakalis, Ambrosius, 195
- Gilgamesh* cities, 4
- Glick, T., 209
- global economy, 20
- globalization, 168, 182
- Goethe, 129, 131, 140, 160, 214; “Gothic Architecture,” 130; and Gothic architecture as German, 167; “On German Architecture,” 130
- Goldberg, Jeremy, 210
- Gomez, Emilio Garcia, 206
- Gothic, xv, 112, 115, 147, 161; beauty as value, 114
- Gothic architecture, 135; art, 146, 151; as heritage, 158; as style, 112, 116, 117, 118, 130, 148, 155, 160
- Gothic cathedrals, 15, 141; Canterbury England, 114; Chartres, France, 8, 18, 122, 142; Cologne, Germany, 130, 184; Coventry, England, 8, 9, 176; Exeter, England, 100; Lichfield, England, 100; Notre-Dame de Paris, 1, 5, 138, 151, 157; Strasbourg, 130; York, England, 8, 41, 79, 99, 100, 101, 114, 147; Wells, England, 100, 176
- Gough, Richard (1735–1809), 131
- Goya, José Manuel Losada, 215, 216
- Grabar, André, 194, 195, 199, 200, 202
- Grabar, Oleg, 205, 206, 207
- Grafton, Anthony, 222
- Gramsci, Antonio, *Intellectuals and the Organization of Culture*, 128, 214

- Grant, Robert M., 193  
 Gratian, 202  
 Gray, Thomas, 129, 214  
 Greenberg, Moshe, 193  
 Greenblatt, Stephen, 198  
 Grégoire, Abbé (1750–1831), xv,  
 121–28, 134, 172, 187, 213, 222  
 Gregorius, Master, 191  
 Gregory II (715–31), Pope, 32, 34  
 Gregory III (731–41), Pope, 34  
 Gregory Nazianzus (325–84), 66, 201  
 Gregory of Nyssa (ca. 335–85), 66, 201  
 Gregory the Great (580–604), 7, 11,  
 16, 34, 65, 67, 98, 101, 102, 114,  
 172, 173, 199, 202, 210; Bible of  
 the unlettered, 65, 68–69, 111,  
 143; buildings, reuse of, 88, 89;  
 defense of images, 44; against  
 iconoclasm, 67, 68, 69; *Letters*, 7,  
 25, 49, 58, 67, 69, 77, 189, 190;  
 middle way, 41; Pantheon, 89;  
*Regula Pastoralis*, 68, 69  
 Griffith, Terry, 193  
 Grimaldi, Giacomo, 192  
 grotesque, 136, 137  
 Gubser, Michael, 221  
 Guha-Thakurta, Tapati, 188  
 Guizot, François, 139  
 Gutenberg, 140  
 Gutmann, Joseph, 193, 194  
 Guyer, Paul, 216
- Habermas, Jürgen, 137, 182, 191,  
 192, 215, 223; *Religion and  
 Rationality*, 137  
 Hadrian, Pope, 41  
 Hague Convention (1907), 176;  
 (1956), 177, 180; and monu-  
 ments, 180  
 Halbertal, Moshe, 193  
 Halbwachs, Maurice, 198, 214  
 Halfpenny, Joseph (1748–1811),  
*Gothic Ornaments*, 114, 115, 211  
 Hamburger, Jeffrey F., 202  
 Hargrove, William, 211
- Harrison, Robert Pogue, 190  
 Harvey, John H., 210  
 Haselock, Jeremy, 210  
 Hennephof, Herman, 195, 196  
 heresy, 225  
 heritage, 91, 131, 226; as cultural  
 identity, 179; European, 15, 17;  
 Greco-Roman, 17; industry, xiv;  
 intangible, 168, 179, 180, 183,  
 184; Iraq, 1, 98; local, 58; at risk,  
 185; shared, 20; tangible, 168,  
 180, 184; as value, 114, 167;  
 world, 20, 79  
 Hermon-Belot, Rita, 213  
 Herodotus (ca. 484–425 BCE), 24, 62  
 Herrin, Judith, 194, 195  
 Heylyn, Peter, 198; *Ecclesia restaurata*,  
 50, 54  
 Hilary of Poitiers (ca. beginning of  
 fourth century–d. 368), 65, 201  
 Hildyard, Christopher, 112, 211  
 Hildyard, Francis, 107, 108  
 Himyari, Al- (d. 1178), 83, 85, 87  
 historic monument, 124, 129, 134  
 history: local, 101, 109, 110, 112,  
 119; national, 97, 101, 112, 114,  
 118, 119  
 Holter, Knut, 193  
 Hosmer, Charles B., 221  
 Houlbrooke, Ralph, 199  
 Hugall, J. W., 212  
 Hughes, Paul L., 197  
 Hugo, Victor, 128, 129, 134, 136,  
 137, 146, 148, 157, 192, 215–17;  
 “Guerre aux Démolisseurs,” 133;  
*Notre-Dame de Paris*, 1, 5, 129, 133  
 Huguenots, 123  
 Huizinga, Johan, xvi; 188  
 human rights, 179; Stockholm Dec-  
 laration (1998), 179; Universal  
 Declaration of Human Rights, 179  
 Hunt, Tristram, 211, 212, 219  
 Hussein, Saddam, 1, 9  
 Hutchinson, Robert, 197, 198  
 Hyde, J. K., 204

- Ibn 'Idhari (d. 1295), 83, 84, 85, 87
- Ibn Hayyan (b. ca. 986–d. 1076), 83, 85, 94, 205
- Ibn Hazm, Ali, *The Dove's Neck Ring*, 83, 205
- Ibn Khaldūn (1332–1406), *Muqaddimah*, 83, 205
- ICCROM (International Center for Conservation, Rome), 163
- ICOMOS (International Commission on Monuments and Sites), 97, 98, 177, 179, 182
- iconoclasm, xiii, xiv, xv, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 23, 32–34, 65, 79, 88, 108, 117, 118, 121, 125, 126, 152, 161, 164, 226; ancient Hebrew, 25, 26, 27, 29, 78; ancient Roman, 59; arguments against, 71; Byzantine (726–843 CE), xv, 21, 23, 28, 30, 35, 36, 47, 56, 65, 76, 78; contemporary, 183, 184, 185; Cromwellian, 100, 101, 112, 119, 176; Eck against, 75; Emser against, 75; England, 105; French, xv, 122; French Revolution, 123; as heresy, 31, 34; as idolatry, 46; instrumental vs. expressive, 8, 9, 10, 37, 41; John of Damascus' argument against, 72–74; motives, 12–14; official policy, 21; Reformation, 39–42, 51; English Reformation, xv, 40–54; Reformation and Byzantine legacy, 41; as restoration, 163; state-sponsored, 41; Tudor, 68, 78, 100, 102, 119
- icons, iv, 6, 9, 21, 22, 33, 58, 226; dangers of, 38; as illegal, 35; as orthodox, 31; power of, 38; preservation of, 38; restored, 38; veneration, 71; veneration, Byzantine, 61
- iconography, 88; Christian, 63; early Christian, 59–60, 66
- identity, 12; English Protestant, 116; and memory, 132; national, xiv
- idolatry, 11, 21–22, 24, 27, 31, 33–34, 49–50, 52–54, 64, 66, 73, 76, 161
- Idrisi, Al- (1100–1166), 83
- image (defined), 226
- images, 12, 22, 49, 116, 184; biblical narrative, 60–62; Byzantine uses of, 30; Christian defense of, 58; Christian hostility towards, 58; Christian tensions over, 45; effect of, 71; as idols, 43; prohibition of, 65; suppression of, 32, 49; Tudor repudiation of, 49–50, 54
- Imamuddīn, S. M., 207
- India, Babri Masjid Mosque, 6, 98; Ayodhya, 6, 98; Emperor Babur, 6; Hindu Nationalist Party, 6
- industrialization: in England, 172; in Europe, 183
- International Monetary Fund, 181
- Iraq, xiii, 3, 8, 185; archaeological sites, 4; Baghdad, 1; invasion, 2; Samarra, 4
- Irwin, Robert, 189
- Isidore of Seville (570–636), 80
- Italy: and civic art collections, 171; regional protection, 172
- James Torre (1649–99), 105
- Jefferson, Thomas, 169
- Jensen, Robin Margaret, 197, 199, 200
- Jerome, Saint (347–420), 25, 193
- Jerónimo, 80–93, 204, 208; praise of, 81, 93, 97
- Jerusalem, 8, 15, 16, 25; temple, 21, 25
- Jimenez, Manuel Ocaña, 207
- Joan of Arc, 123, 124
- John Chrysostom, 66
- John of Damascus (b. latter half seventh century–d. ca. 750), 16, 34, 49, 65, 71–77, 173, 201; and European Reformation, 71; separation of religious and secular

- powers, 72–73; *The Three Treatises on the Divine Images*, 65, 71
- Johnson, Mark, 191
- Jones, Sarah Reese, 210
- Jordan, Mark D., 202
- Julius Caesar, 169, 172
- Kamerick, Kathleen, 190
- Kant, Emmanuel (1724–1804), 136; concept of beauty, 142; *Critique of Judgment*, 136, 216; sublime, 138
- Karlstadt, Andreas (1486–1541), 39, 43–44, 69, 75, 78, 196; and Bible, 45; and the Decalogue, 44; “On the Removal of Images,” 44
- Katherine of Aragon (1485–1536), 47, 52
- Kebl, John, 116
- Kennedy, George A., 202
- Kessler, Herbert L., 200–203
- Kessler, Joan C., 217
- Kitzinger, Ernst, 193, 194, 199, 202
- Koch, Hugo, 199
- Koolhaas, Rem, 190
- Koran*, 86, 189
- Kosovo, 8, 185
- Krauss, Rosalind, 188
- Krautheimer, Richard, 201
- Lactantius (240–320), 29, 59, 191, 199
- Landa, Diego de, 7, 189
- Larkin, James F., 197
- Lateran decrees, 104
- Latimer, Hugh (1470–1555), 47
- Laudianism, 107
- Le Goff, Jacques, 47, 127, 191, 198, 214, 215
- legacy: cultural, 126, 127; as pleasure, 113; as profit, 113
- legislation: Greece, 174
- Lehmberg, 211
- Lenski, 191
- Leplaideur, Nicole Britz, 206
- Lévi Provençal, E., 205
- Levine, Lee I., 199
- Lévi-Provençal, 208
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude, 223
- Lévy-Leboyer, Claude, 189
- libraries, 48, 49; Baghdad, 1, 2, 3; and book destruction, 125; British, 121; Cluny, 121; monastic, 48, 49; Sarajevo, 98
- Libri Carolini*, 41
- local: community, 104; culture, 96, 181; history, 145; traditions, 107
- Lockhart, James, 188, 189
- Lost Libraries*, 190
- Louth, Andrew, 194, 195, 199, 203
- Lowenthal, David, 187, 191, 192, 221
- Luther, Martin (1483–1546), 43, 45–46
- Lyon, Sylvia, 218
- MacCannell, Dean, 187, 192
- Madame de Staël, 129
- Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers, 200
- Mâle, Émile, 123, 213
- Malkiel, Maria Rosa Lida de, 205
- Mallion, Jean, 214
- Manent, Pierre, 201
- Mango, Cyril, 194, 195, 196
- Manifesto*, Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, 162
- Manrique Bishop Alonso (1516–23), 96
- maqsurat*, 86, 87
- Maraval, Pierre, 191
- Marcus, Joel, 24, 193
- Margalit, Avishai, 193
- Mariaux, P. A., 202
- Marijnissen, Roger H., 19, 192
- Marin, Louis, 190
- Mariotti, Filippo, 169, 192, 221, 222
- Markus, R. A., 199, 202, 203, 207
- Marquez, Carlos, 206
- Master Gregorius, *The Marvels of Rome*, 16
- Mateo, Luis Recio, 206

- McDonald's, 9
- McGuckin, John A., 195
- Mecca, 86
- medieval: books, Victorian editions, 115; Christian legacy, 143; legacy, 138; manuscripts, loss of, 121; patrimony, 126; period, 156
- medievalism, xiv; 113, 118, 122, 130, 131, 136; books, 139; French, 129, 149; and Industrial Revolution, 129; and national history, 119; and nineteenth century, England, 117; and nostalgia, 116
- Medina Azahara, 97
- Melanchthon, Philipp (1497–1560), 43, 44, 45, 49
- memory, 15, 16, 82, 84, 104, 109, 115, 167, 179, 183; and architecture, 84; and buildings, 130; collective, 8, 10, 14, 26, 48, 54, 126, 127; collective national, 83, 126, 128, 129, 183; religious collective, 127
- Menocal, María Rosa, 209
- Mérimée, Prosper (1803–70), 17, 129, 133, 145, 147, 157, 218
- Merriman, Roger Bigelow, 198
- Mesopotamia, Ancient, 3
- Michelangelo, 143; *David*, 10
- Middle Ages, 7, 19; medievalism, 19; scorn of, 42
- mihrab*, 85, 86, 87, 92, 226
- Miller, E., 210
- Millin, A. L., 129, 187, 214, 217
- minaret, 92
- monarchs: Charles I, 110; Edward I, 103; Edward II, 103; Edward III, 103; Henry II, 114; Henry IV, 104; Richard II (1377–99), 103, 104
- monasteries, 21; Clairvaux, 122; monasteries, destroyed, Cluny, 121; Tudor dissolution of, 48, 50, 56
- monasticism: Cluniac, 152, 153 155
- Montalembert, M. de, 133, 138
- monument, xiv, xv, 13, 79, 226; Abu Simbel temples, 177; architecture, 150; Arch of Constantine, 155; Arch of Trajan, 155; as art, 141; Babri Masjid Mosque, 179; Bamiyam Buddhas, 185; Big Ben, 159; Church of the Holy Sepulcher, 26; and civic identity, 96; Colosseum, xiv; Dome of the Rock, 184, 185; Easter Island, xiv; as history, 141; Grand Canyon, 18; Houses of Parliament, 158, 160; Madeleine in Vézelay, 121, 141, 150, 151, 153; and memory, 92, 96, 175; Monticello, 169; Mount Graham, 181; Nubian, 177; Pyramids of Giza, xiv; Pantheon, 16; Parthenon, xiv, 18, 124, 169; Pyramids of Egypt, 92, 140; Robben Island, 176; Saint-Denis, 141, 151, 156; Sayes Court Garden, 172; Sphinx of Giza, 170; Stonehenge, xiv, 172; Taj Mahal, xiv; Umayyad, Dome of the Rock, 86; Western Wall, Jewish Temple, 25, 26; World Heritage, 175
- More, Thomas, 43, 45, 47, 58, 75, 173, 197, 203; *Dialogue Concerning Heresies*, 45, 76, 78
- Morisco, 227
- Morris, William (1834–96), 160, 220; Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, 162
- mudéjar*, 82, 92, 94, 97, 227
- Muir, John (1838–1914), 18, 192
- Murray, Mary Charles, 199, 201
- museums, 5, 14, 15, 127, 142, 183; Baghdad Museum, xiv, 2, 3; Berlin and Egypt, 170; British, 169; Cluny, 135; J. Paul Getty, 10; Metropolitan, 121, 171, 174; and national consciousness, 131; Uffizi, 173
- Mussolini, B., 1, 9
- Mydans, Seth, 188

- Nahuatl, 6, 7  
 Nanda, R., 223  
 Napoleon Bonaparte, 122, 128, 135  
 Napoleonic wars, 158, 169  
 nation, xvi  
 national architecture, 139  
 national buildings, 129  
 national cathedrals, 139  
 national consciousness, 127  
 national culture, 146  
 national education, 132  
 national government, 129  
 national heritage, 126, 138, 145, 147, 167; in England, 115  
 national history, 48, 115, 145; Britain's obsession with, 115; England, 110; and heritage, 10, 114  
 national identity, 127, 160  
 national ideology, 116  
 national institutions, 132  
 national parks: Yellowstone, 18; Yosemite, 18  
 Native Americans, 182  
 Nelson, Robert S., 206  
 neoclassical, 155; neoclassicism, 122, 130  
 Neo-platonism, 62  
 Netherlands, 10  
 Newman, John Henry, 116  
 New York: Twin Towers, 8; World Trade Center, 8  
 Nicephoros (758–828), 37, 196  
 Nicholas, Lynn H., 188  
 Nicolai, Vincenzo Fiocchi, 199  
 nineteenth century, 116, 118; England, 117  
 Nirenberg, David, 209  
 Noble, Thomas F. X., 203  
 Nodier, Charles, 129  
 Nora, Pierre, 132, 183, 214, 223  
 Norton, Christopher, 210  
 Nossack, Hans Erich, *The End of Hamburg 1943*, 175, 222  
 nostalgia, 20, 108, 116, 118, 158, 159, 160, 164  
 Noth, Martin, 193, 194  
 O'Callaghan, Joseph F., 188, 206  
 O'Connor, David E., 210  
 Ogoni people, 181  
 Olin, John C., 196  
 Origen (185–254), 62, 64, 65, 200, 201  
 Orme, Nicholas, 210  
 Ormrod, Mark, 210  
 Oxford Movement, 116, 158  
 paintings: Bryan Organ's *Princess of Wales*, 10; Leonardo's *Mona Lisa*, 10; Michelangelo's *Pietà*, 10; Rembrandt's *The Nightwatch*, 10; Rembrandt's *Self-Portrait*, 10  
 Paleotti, Gabriele (1522–97), 12, 78, 190, 204, 222  
 Palestine, 16  
 Pannini, Giovanni Paolo, 164  
 Papadopoulo, Alexandre, 206  
 Papal exile, Avignon (1307–77)  
 papal monument policy, 173  
 Paronetto, Vera, 202  
 Partner, Peter, 194  
 patrimony, 20, 137, 160; citizen, 126; cultural, 169; historic, xiv; local, 98; and modern education, 128; national, 5, 116, 127, 128, 131, 132; natural, 18; world, xiii, xiv, 98  
 patronage: and citizenry, 146; and the Middle Ages, 141  
 Paulinus of Nola (354–431), 65, 201  
 Pelikan, J., 195  
 Pentagon, 8  
 Pérez, Joseph, 209  
 performance, 142; and nation-making, 142  
 Peter the Venerable, 153  
 Petrarch (1304–1374), 41, 191  
 Philippot, Paul, 163, 192, 221, 223  
 Phillips, John, 196, 197  
 Piranesi, Giovanni Battista, 164  
 Pius II Piccolomini, Raphael (1483–1520), Pope, 17

- Plato (ca. 427–ca. 347 BCE), 24, 193, 200; Plato, *Phaedo*, 62
- Platonism, 136
- Plotinus (ca. 204–70 CE), 62
- Polk, Milbry, 188
- Poole, G. A., 212
- Porphyry (b. ca. 234–ca. 305), 62
- Porter, Stephen, 211
- Portinari, Giovanni, 49
- Posey, Darrell Addison, 223
- preservation, 14, 19, 20, 58, 65, 66, 71, 73, 79, 98, 101, 108, 117, 118, 130, 131, 148, 149, 163, 172; and industrialization, 174; local, 99; preservation movement, 113, 133, 146
- Preziosi, Donald, 127, 213
- printing press, 140
- Protestantism, 116, 117, 118
- Pugin, Augustus Charles, 159, 220; *Specimens of Gothic Architecture*, 158
- Pugin, Augustus Welby, 116, 158, 159, 162, 164, 212; *The True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture*, 159, 160
- Purgatory, 47, 49; Shakespeare, William, *Hamlet* and purgatory, 47
- Pusey, Edward Bouverie, 116
- qibla*, 227
- Rabbat, Nasser, 206, 207
- Raine, James, 210
- Ramsay, Nigel, 198
- Raphael, 143
- Raven, James, 188
- Réau, Louis, 123, 190, 212, 213, 214, 220, 221; taste and destruction, 124
- Reconquista*, 95
- Reformation, xv, xvi, 1, 7, 10, 12, 21, 23, 28, 45, 58–58, 77, 104, 105, 107, 117, 118, 123, 129, 134, 140, 160; English, 7, 64, 183; English history of, 50; French Protestants, 154
- regionalismo*, 97
- Reiff, Daniel D., 219
- Religious Wars, French, 121, 123
- Renaissance, 3, 17, 78, 113, 130, 137, 138, 156, 173; twelfth-century, 11; Italian, 79, 80, 115
- Renoliet, Jean-Jacques, 222
- resistance: local, 100
- restoration, xiv, 118, 130, 148, 156, 157, 158, 163, 164; Gothic architecture, 131; as historical illusion, 163; medieval monuments, 139; nationalism and medievalism in Europe, 158; poor, 117, 118; restoration in the nineteenth century, 145; restoration theory, 162
- Revolution, Cromwellian, xv, 1, 41, 112; French, 121, 122; Hungarian, 3
- Rex, Richard, 197
- Ricard, Robert, 189
- Rickman, Thomas, 158, 219, 220
- Ricoeur, Paul, 182, 223
- Riegl, Alois (1858–1905), 150, 160, 188, 218; *Modern Cult of Monuments*, 163
- rights, 180
- Rist, John M., 202
- Roberts, David, 82; *Sketches in Spain*, 80
- Robinson, Rev. Hastings, 199
- Roderici Ximenii de Rada, 205, 206
- Rodin, Auguste (1840–1917), 18, 151, 164, 192, 221
- Rodrigo Jimenez de Rada (1170–1247), 88; *Historia de Rebus Hispanie*, 83
- Roman Empire, 16
- Rome, 15, 17; Ancient, 1; St. Peter's, 17, 19, 130, 152; Sistine Chapel, 19
- Romero-Camacho, Isabel Montes, 209
- Romero y Barros, Rafael, 209



- Roper, William, 203; *Lyfe of Thomas More*, 76
- Rowe, C. Kavin, 193
- Roy, Arundhati, 181, 223
- Rücker, 214
- Rudolph, Conrad, 190
- Ruins and history, 165
- Ruiz, Hernán, 82
- Ruskin, John (1819–1900), 17, 18, 160, 163, 164, 192, 220; Christian romanticism, 161; *Stones of Venice*, 162
- Sack, David, 201
- Sahagún, Fray Bernadino de (1499–1590), 7; *Florentine Codex*, 189
- Said, Edward, 42
- Saint Augustine: conversion of England, 101
- Sainte-Beuve, Charles Augustin (1804–1869), 138, 146
- San Carlos Apache, 181
- Saqundi, Al-, 81, 90, 91, 94, 205, 207, 208
- Saro-Wiwa, Ken, 181, 223
- Saul, Nigel, 210
- Sauvanon, Jeanine, 217
- Savonarola (1452–98), 40, 43, 172; and iconoclasm, 41
- Schildgen, Brenda, 202
- Schlegel, Friedrich, 129
- Schusster, M. H., 188
- Sebald, W. G., “Air War and Literature: Zurich Letters,” 175, 189, 222
- Seebacher, Jacques, 215
- Segal, Ben-Zion, 193
- Sellheim, R., 204
- separation of powers, 78
- Sepinwall, Alyssa Goldstein, 213
- Sette, Maria Piera, 192, 218
- Settis, Salvatore, 171, 172, 221, 222
- Seven Wonders of the World, xiv, 81, 92, 187
- Shah of Iran, 1
- Simpson, James, 190, 197
- Skinner, S. A., 212
- skyscrapers, 184
- Smith, Jonathan Z., 191
- Soros, Susan Weber, 220
- Soviet Union, 6
- Spain, 6, 10; Alfonso X el Sabio (1221–84), 90, 94, 204, 205, 207, 208; Catholic Kings, 6; Ferdinando III, 94; Henry IV (1454–79), 81; Isabel and Ferdinand, 81, 91, 95; Islamic Spain, 6; Philip of Spain, 52, 53; *Primera Crónica General de España*, 83, 85, 90, 97; *Reconquista*, 40, 94; *Siete Partidas*, 94; Spanish kings, 95
- Speer, 217, 218
- Spier, Jeffrey, 60, 200
- spolia*, 16, 17, 85, 87, 161
- spoliation, 174
- Spraggon, Julie, 197, 210, 211, 222
- Stalin, J, 1, 6, 9
- Stanbury, Sarah, 197
- Starn, Randolph, 187, 192, 223
- Statius (45–96), 204
- Stavenhagen, Rodolfo, 222, 223
- Stephen the Deacon, *The Life of Saint Stephen the Younger (807)*, 36
- Stock, Brian, 202
- Stoicism, 62
- Strauss, Claude Lévi, 179
- Straw, Carol, 202
- style: gothic, 115, 116; neoclassical, 113, 115, 131; neo-Gothic, 155
- sublime, 136
- Suger, Abbé, 141, 153, 156, 217
- Summerson, John, 217
- Switzerland, illegal transfer of cultural artifacts, 4
- symbol system, 10; Christian, 66, 116; symbols, sacred, 14
- symbolic capital, 14, 127
- taste, 19, 100, 117, 118, 122, 134, 137, 138, 146, 150, 153, 156, 163

- Tate, Robert B., 205  
 Tavano, Sergio, 200  
 Taylor, Joan, 191  
 Tertullian (160–230), 64, 65, 201  
 Theodosian code (438 CE), 95  
 Theophanes, 33; *Chronographia*, 29, 32; and icons, 30  
 Thoenes, Christof, 220  
 Thomas Jefferson Foundation, 169  
 Thoreau, Henry David (1817–62), 18, 192; *Walden*, 18  
 Tibet, 8; iconoclasm, 98  
 Tillott, P. M., 211, 209  
 Toledo (1085), 83, 94, 95, 96  
 tolerance, 123  
 Tomlinson, J. T., 199  
 Torre, James, 106, 112; *The Antiquities of York City*, 105, 107, 108  
 tourism, xiv, 3, 20, 108, 109, 113, 164, 178  
 Tronzo, William, 192  
 Truman, Harry: National Trust, 169  
 Tudors, 69; absolute authority, 46, 47, 51; Act of Supremacy (1534), 47, 49, 52; chapel crucifix, 55–56; dissolution of the monasteries, 99, 100, 116, 123; Edward VI (1547–53), 23, 47, 50, 52–54, 100, 104; Elizabeth I, 46, 52–54; Henry VII, 52; Henry VIII, 23, 45–47, 49, 51, 99, 103–04, 115; Mary I, 52–54, 116; and policing of religious practices, 54; private chapel, 55; Royal Injunctions, 50, 53; Royal Proclamations, 46, 54; and separation of religious and secular powers, 49–50, 51, 52, 99, 113; Ten Articles, 49  
 Turner, A. Richard, 190  
 Tyndale, William (1495–1536), 46, 76, 77, 203; *An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue*, 77  
 Umayyads, 82–83, 86, 92, 94  
 UN Charter, 182  
 UNESCO (1972), 4, 20, 167, 177, 179, 188, 192; intangible and tangible heritage, 171; World Heritage, 79, 97  
 United Nations: World Heritage Convention, 177  
 universities: Oxford, 104; Cambridge, 104  
 urbanism, 146, 168; and architecture, 146; consequences to built environment, 129  
 U.S. national parks: National Park Service, 168; Niagara Falls, 168; Yellowstone, 168; Yosemite, 168;  
 Vaes, Jan, 207  
 value: aesthetic, 145, 146, 149, 151, 153, 163; age, 163; artistic, 142, 148, 150, 157, 160, 179; historic, 142, 145–50, 154–55, 161, 163, 179; historic-artistic, 160; market, 136; newness, 163; novelty, xiv; symbolic, 12; use, 163  
 vandalism, xv, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 125, 129, 133, 134, 149, 152, 154; as aesthetics, 124; as elginism, 124; French, 124, 126; as religious bigotry, 124; as restoration, 124; as sentimentalism, 124; as taste, 124  
 Vanmaele, Basile, 200  
 Varro, Marcus (116–27 BCE), 62–63  
 Vasari, Giorgio (1511–74), 17, 130, 135, 187; *Lives of the Painters*, xv  
 veneration, 225  
 Venice Charter (1964), 97, 177, 178  
 Villani, Giovanni (1276/1280–1348), 204  
 Viollet-le Duc, Eugène Emmanuel (1814–79), 16, 17, 124, 133, 145–57, 164, 172, 191–92, 217–19; architecture, 152; and conservation, 162; and Italy, 147–48, 152; rationalist architectural theory, 152, 153; and restoration, 155, 162; and structuralism, 153

- Vitet, Ludovic, 146  
Vives, José, 201  
Voltaire, 211; *Treatise on Tolerance*, 113
- Wallace, Michael, 223  
Walpole, Horace (1717–97), 160  
Wandel, Lee Palmer, 196  
Ward, Patricia A., 216  
Weitzman, Kurt, 200  
Wenham, Peter, 211  
Werner, Emmy, 189  
White, Hayden, 215  
Widdrington, Thomas, 211  
Wild, C., 211  
Wilken, Robert L., 191  
Wills, Garry, 169, 171, 221, 222  
Wolpert, Stanley, 188, 209  
World Heritage Convention, 4, 168, 178, 182; Vienna (2005), 184
- World Heritage List, 169, 180  
world patrimony, 134, 177;  
UNESCO, 167  
World Trade Organization, 181  
world wars: First, 175, 177; Second, 8, 175, 179  
Wren, Christopher (1632–1723), 112  
Wyatt, James (1746–1813), 131
- Yates, 191, 207  
York: archbishops, 102, 103; city of, 101, 102, 105, 114; civic life, 105; Corpus Christi dramas, 105; history, 104; self-promotion, 104  
Young, James E., 190, 205, 207, 222
- Zagorin, Perez, 211  
Zucker, 221  
Zwingli, Ulrich (1484–1531), 43, 45, 69