

Recreating the Past:
Aachen and the Problem of the Architectural "Copy"

Jenny H. Shaffer

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

1992

© 1992

Jenny H. Shaffer
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Recreating the Past:
Aachen and the Problem of the Architectural "Copy"

Jenny H. Shaffer

This thesis explores the formal, historiographic and critical issues of similitude and the problem of historical memory through Charlemagne's chapel at Aachen and buildings associated with it. In my study, I seek to understand some of the levels on which reference to and appropriation of Aachen reflect the historical, political and cultural moment unique to each of five selected interpretations and how, in these examples, the perception of Aachen provided an image through which contemporary concerns and meanings could be expressed. The issue, therefore, is not so much what Aachen was like, physically or even ideologically, at the time it was built, but how the chapel was perceived in later times, and, importantly, what the terms of that image were and how that image made the chapel a viable touchstone for later references - often ambiguously termed "copies." These buildings can be seen not simply as subordinate to Aachen, but as works that incorporate an image of Aachen for their own ends; through this incorporation, Aachen can be seen as actually subject to them for its own survival. My study raises the question of what it can mean to remember Aachen and the corollary issue of what it can mean to be like Aachen. My chosen examples underscore that while the chapel

remained a potent image, the perception of Aachen as a work of the past as well as the criteria for likeness are changeable and tied to time and circumstance.

.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS ii

INTRODUCTION
The History of Aachen
and the Problem of the "Copy" 1
Notes 8

CHAPTER ONE
Constructing a Common Past:
Aachen and the Karlsverein, 1814-1914 13
Notes 45

CHAPTER TWO
Putting the Past in Order: The Scholarly Image
of Aachen and Its Place in the History of Art 59
Notes 106

CHAPTER THREE
Rewriting the Past:
Aachen, Germigny-des-Prés and Letaldus of Micy 128
Notes 156

CHAPTER FOUR
Sacred Topography and Universal History:
Aachen, Jerusalem, Liège 182
Notes 205

CHAPTER FIVE
Dismembering Aachen:
Essen, Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol
and the Problem of Formal Similitude 229
Notes 260

The Problem of "Conclusions" 289

WORKS CITED 295
Abbreviations 295
Introduction 295
Chapter One 297
Chapter Two 301
Chapter Three 307
Chapter Four 314
Chapter Five 321

ILLUSTRATIONS 328

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- Figures 1a and 1b. Carolingian Aachen (from Kreuzsch)
- Figure 2. Plan of Aachen today (from Verbeek)
- Figure 3. Aachen from the north, before 1880 (from Belting)
- Figure 4. Aachen from the west with reconstructed tower
(from Faymonville)
- Figure 5. Interior of Aachen, before 1869 (from Belting)
- Figure 6. Interior of Aachen, view of dome decoration,
ca. 1865 (from Belting)
- Figure 7. Interior of Aachen, "restored" dome decoration
before 1901 (from Belting)
- Figure 8. Aachen interior stripped of decoration, 1870-1901
(from Belting)
- Figure 9. Aachen interior with marble revetment, from 1901
(from Belting)
- Figure 10. Exterior of Germigny-des-Prés (from Conant)
- Figure 11. Interior of Germigny-des-Prés (from Conant)
- Figures 12a and 12b. Plan of Germigny-des-Prés before the
restoration and plan of excavations (from Hubert)
- Figure 13. Plan of St. Jean in Liège (from Kubach and
Verbeek)
- Figure 14. View of St. Jean by Le Loup, 1739 (from Verbeek)
- Figure 15. Plan of Liège in the eleventh century
(from Herzog)
- Figure 16. Plan of the Holy Sepulchre before 1009
(from Vincent and Abel)

- Figure 17. Plan of Essen today (from Wilhelm-Kästner)
- Figure 18. Plan of Theophanu's Essen
(from Kubach and Verbeek)
- Figure 19. Plan of Essen's west end
(from Kubach and Verbeek)
- Figure 20. Interior of Essen looking west, ca. 1929
(from Wilhelm-Kästner)
- Figure 21. Capitals of Essen's west end
(from Wilhelm-Kästner)
- Figure 22. Interior view of Essen today, looking west
(from Küppers)
- Figure 23. Plan of Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol (from Beutler)
- Figure 24. Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol, looking west
(from Kubach and Verbeek)
- Figure 25. Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol, columnar screen and
capitals (from Rahtgens)

Introduction:
The History of Aachen and the Problem of the "Copy"

The renown of Charlemagne's Aachen reaches back to its ninth century origins, and continued regard for the chapel has been manifested in recurring recourse to Aachen in later works. That Aachen remained a potent architectural image is indisputable. However, Aachen has been treated as a static monument in scholarship - constant in structure and meaning. The foremost concern of scholars has been the reconstruction, in structure and function, of the Emperor's Carolingian palatine chapel. Scholarly discussions of medieval "copies" of Aachen on the whole have compared the later works to the reconstructed image. (figs. 1a and 1b)

The importance of the issue of Aachen's form and function in the time of Charlemagne cannot be disputed. However, while the allure of Aachen certainly is tied to its association with Charlemagne, historical and literary sources reveal that the historical memory of Charlemagne and his chapel was continually transformed throughout the Middle Ages.¹ Furthermore, the diverse formal and functional interpretations of Aachen found in the "copies" reflect a wider range of meanings, rather than simply a continuing yearning for a display of potency or legitimacy through an architectural reference to the Emperor's palatine chapel.

Historical perspective - which gave rise to the idea of scholarship in the first place - has given us the tendency

to "look back" at the past and perceive it as a linear progression stretching behind us; a sense of separateness has given us license to analyze the past in ways peculiar to our own time.² History, for us, has become a succession of periods, the definition and categorization of which are often amorphous as well as debated.³ Furthermore, the perceived existence of periods assumes an evolutionary model - a model obviously in keeping with our own worldview and idea of progress.⁴ As a result of the prevailing model of history, an unconscious overlay has been applied to the works of the past - in particular to works of art - where they tend to be seen as belonging primarily to the specific past in which they were made - or at least are seen as having their defining moment crystalized in the time in which they were made.

While modern historical studies, at least at the outset, assumed that the past was definable and obtainable, the history of historical scholarship reflects changes in outlook in what has been deemed important or central to the study of the past.⁵ These changes in outlook, which have led to the constant re-definition of the past, mirror modern experience and viewpoints. Moreover, the question of what history is has been debated from the viewpoints of a number of branches of scholarship - no doubt because the study of the past is central to most humanistic disciplines.⁶ In the present, highly self-aware and critical age, it is perhaps

no surprise that the fundamental questions of the definition of history and, importantly, how history has been perceived and presented in scholarship, have become central.⁷ Certainly scholars, in an ultimately self-conscious undertaking, work to articulate the past, or aspects of it, from the vantage point of their own personal presents.

Within a scholarly context, then, the apparent mindset of what has been termed "The Middle Ages" may appear all the more foreign and incomprehensible. As one scholar has stated, "One of the perennial obsessions of medieval authors was the suspicion that the past was superior to the present."⁸ In fact writers, particularly before the twelfth century, tended to posit a "universal history" which cast the present in the mold of the past - specifically the Christian past - highlighting repetitive thematic recurrence and association.⁹ This insistence on remembrance and connection gave levels of potent meaning to the present - not only to its events, but to its people and creations.

It is the norm in medieval texts to make frequent and uncited reference to past, one could even say canonical writings and as well to incorporate passages word for word, or with little change, from such works - a practice that would be prosecutable as plagiarism today. While such conclusions rely on the analysis of texts, the general observations apply as well to architecture. It has been posited that architecture, in particular during the "Early

Medieval Age," was curiously dependent on reference and repetition of the past, and that it was not until the dawn of "Romanesque" that Europe first had its own style.¹⁰ While seen by some from the present mindset as a detraction - an inability to create the new and unique that are so highly prized now - such reference may be seen as the cornerstone of a different worldview.

Though the terminology has remained very broad, the word "copy" has been used in scholarship as a catchall for groups of related - though highly diverse - buildings purportedly based on a specific model. However, the term "copy" is inadequate and certainly misleading for such structures. The modern word "copy" - defined by Webster's as "an imitation, transcript, or reproduction of an original work" - is one that, for us, denotes the idea of exact duplication. In our present, self-conscious Technological Age, a time in which mechanical reproduction is common and taken for granted, when we hear the word "copy," we naturally expect a recognizable reproduction - an imitation, a facsimile, a replica - something that remains true to the concrete, physical nature of that which is being "copied." While "copies" of works of art often conjure images of souvenirs, or kitschy replicas, the value of a "copy" is perceived to be directly related to its degree of conformity to the visual effect of the "original" and its ability to inspire visual association with the model. Inherent in our

understanding of the term "copy" is the notion that the model presents a visual or formal authority that cannot be equaled. A "copy" must be, then, by definition, inferior or subordinate to the model, but somehow satisfy the desire for the original.¹¹

"Copy" is certainly a loaded term, and unfortunately, other words - for example "imitation," "replica" or "duplicate" - eventually lead back to "copy," and the problem compounds itself ad infinitum.¹² The accepted terminology thus has the tendency to disparage reference, recurrence or likeness, and reduce it to uninspired imitation. The essential issue of remembering and referring to the past becomes oversimplified: to use the word "copy" is to intimate that recourse to a given work - no matter when and how it occurs - essentially means the same thing. My goal is not to set up a new hierarchy of terms: to present a rigid vocabulary, even if a new one, would ultimately categorize works and place them in terminological straightjackets. Therefore, I will use the term "copy," always in quotes, when discussing scholarship that itself has used the word or related words.

When used within a discussion of architecture, a "copy" is expected or assumed to adhere to the material authority of the model, and be immediately identifiable. The example of the perceived progeny of the chapel at Aachen readily illustrates the problem of the architectural "copy."

Discussions of recourse to Aachen in later works assume the primacy of the model as a "masterpiece," and therefore give the later works second billing, their value seen as dependent on their use of Aachen. That works of the past can be seen as evocative in a given present (or number of presents), however, is contingent on the desire of that present to recollect that work and incorporate it within what must necessarily be a contemporary image. The recollection or remembrance of a work is therefore not necessarily constant, but subject to its being noticed and assumed, consciously or unconsciously, to be involved in or related to the present. The "history" of a given work can thus be seen as the various recollections and approaches to that work. In looking at Aachen, we are dealing with a building that still exists, physically, today, and whose "history" displays a number of recollections or approaches that present differing attitudes towards the viability of the church and the integration of the chapel within a contemporary worldview.

To contend that Aachen's viability is a strictly "historical" phenomenon does not take into account that the chapel has quite clearly remained a compelling image in the post-medieval world, and as well implies that it was only in the Middle Ages that Aachen - and remembering and even "copying" Aachen - played a significant role. Today, the church is the showpiece - the physical center - of the town

of Aachen, the pristine and prized cathedral always undergoing careful maintenance and preservation. While still obviously part of the living fabric of contemporary life, the chapel - always at least partially covered in scaffolding - is clearly seen as of the past, in a manner that is unique to today's historical consciousness.¹³

Aachen has been classed as a "World Monument" by UNESCO, giving the chapel a privileged place in global cultural history. The contemporary image of Aachen is, at least in part, an exponent of a universal European image important today. This view of the chapel is certainly relatively recent. Aachen has become - or is at least touted in some circles as - an historical portent of the "New Europe" of 1992; Charlemagne is seen as the creator of Europe, and Aachen as the symbol of this unity.

The following study attempts to address the problem of the "copy" as an exponent of historical memory. The question becomes, then, not what Aachen was like when it was built, but how Aachen has been imaged at various junctures and how recourse to Aachen contributed to the expression of contemporary interests. Rather than seeing recourse to Aachen as proof of the primacy of Charlemagne's palatine chapel in 800, these later references underscore that Aachen's survival as an architectural image has been dependent on and subject to its consideration and image at later times.

In exploring this problem, I have chosen five "case studies" that are intended to underscore that there is no one meaning for Aachen, or one correct way to remember or image the chapel. Aachen illustrates that the viability of a work of art is not even contingent on firsthand knowledge of it. What is important is the remembrance and the recollection, the existence of a work as an image in the mind or in the memory.

My five examples, chosen to underscore the variety and complexity of issues inherent in the questions of the recourse to and reuse of Aachen, can be taken as discretionary and subject to the constraints of my approach to the question. While any one of the following chapters could perhaps be taken on its own as discussing aspects of an image of Aachen in time and place, the five together are instructive in their similarities and as well in their divergences, and question what it can mean to be like Aachen.

¹See, for example: R. Folz, Le Souvenir et la Légende de Charlemagne dans l'Empire germanique médiéval, Paris, 1950. See as well below, Chapters Three, Four and Five.

²See especially: David Lowenthal, The Past is a Foreign Country, New York, 1985.

³For aspects of the periodization problem, see, for example: G. Boas, "Historical Periods," Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism 11, no. 3 (March 1953), pp. 248-254. For an insightful article on the specific problem of the period defined as "Carolingian," see: Richard E. Sullivan, "The Carolingian Age: Reflections on Its Place in the History of the Middle Ages," Speculum 64/2 (April 1989), pp. 267-306.

⁴Certainly, the problem of the evolutionary model have been discussed and debated from the viewpoints of various disciplines. See, for example: Aurthur O. Lovejoy, "The Discontinuities of Evolution," University of California Publications in Philosophy, XVI (1932-1953), pp. 249-269; and especially Robert Nisbet, "Genealogy, Growth and Other Metaphors," New Literary History VI (Spring 1970), pp. 351-363; and Nisbet, Social Change and History, New York, 1969. For the problem of periodization and evolution in the history of art, see, for example; James Ackerman, "On Judging Art Without Absolutes," Critical Inquiry 5, no. 3 (Spring 1979), pp. 441-469; and G. Kubler, The Shape of Time. Remarks on the History of Things, New Haven, 1962.

⁵It would be impossible to characterize all of the changes in historical studies. For my purposes, it suffices to say that the impact of historical inquiry in Germany has been substantial. For discussions of the interests and outlooks of historians in nineteenth and twentieth century Germany, see, for example: G. Iggers, The German Conception of History. The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present, revised ed., Middleton, CT., 1983; and Peter Hans Reill, The German Enlightenment and the Rise of Historicism, Berkeley, 1975. The idea that history was definable and its study was a "science" was central to early German works, and Ranke's history "wie es eigentlich gewesen ist" has become a cliché exemplifying aspects of German historical thought. Importantly, the preoccupations of historical study in Germany were (and to a large extent are) legal and imperial/artistocratic history. Textually oriented, this approach ensured that only the upper strata of society would be considered and that that which was not written down could not be "proven." German "Idealism" and "Positivism," the latter the expression of the idea of the "science" of history, certainly have been critiqued, as has the central notion of the untranslatable term "Historismus." See, for example, Hayden White, "Historicism, History and the Historical Imagination," in Tropics of Discourse. Essays in Cultural Criticism, Baltimore, 1978, pp. 101-120. While German historical inquiry could be characterized as providing a model for others, certainly the tenets of that view of history have been challenged, most visibly and vocally - and especially in the study of the Middle Ages - by the Annales School, which, rather than viewing history "from the top down," approaches the past "from the bottom up." More interested in interdisciplinary and structuralist social history, the Annalistes have championed the history of "mentalités" current today. See, for example, the sort of school manifestos: F. Braudel, "La longue durée," Annales 13/4 (October-December 1958), pp. 725-751; and J. Le

Goff, R. Chartier and J. Revel, La nouvelle histoire, Paris, 1978. For a discussion of the interests and outlooks of Annales School medievalists, see: Norman F. Cantor, Inventing the Middle Ages: The Lives, Works and Ideas of the Great Medievalists of the Twentieth Century, New York, 1991, pp. 118-160.

⁶Of course, a great deal of scholarship - primarily in History, Literature and Philosophy and Anthropology - has been devoted to the criticism of the prevailing historical models and as well to the questions of what history is and how it should be approached. See, for example: R. G. Collingwood, The Idea of History, Oxford, 1951; W. B. Gallie, Philosophy and Historical Understanding, New York, 1964; A. Danto, Narration and Knowledge, New York, 1985; Louis O. Mink, "History and Fiction as Modes of Comprehension," The New Literary History 1 (Spring 1970), 541-558; and Peter Geyl, Debates with Historians, Groningen/The Hague, 1955; and Mircea Eliade, The Myth of the Eternal Return, New York, 1954. Perhaps the foremost scholar of historiography and the notion of history - which he likes to call "Cultural Criticism" - is Hayden White. See especially: "The Burden of History," in Tropics of Discourse, pp. 27-50; and "Interpretation in History," in Tropics of Discourse, pp. 51-80.

⁷The notion that writing history is not a detached or objective undertaking has been explicated brilliantly by Hayden White in his self-conscious but extremely insightful book: Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe, Baltimore, 1973. For a discussion of the historiography of twentieth century medieval history in terms of the scholars who created it, see: Cantor, Inventing the Middle Ages; and Cantor, "Medieval Historiography as Modern Political and Social Thought," Journal of Contemporary History 3/2 (1968), pp. 55-73.

⁸B. W. Scholz with B. Rogers, trans., Carolingian Chronicles. Royal Frankish Annals and Nithard's Histories, Ann Arbor, 1972, p. 1.

⁹The question of how history, and therefore, time, were seen has been discussed, for example, by Jaques Le Goff, the medievalist heir to the Annales School approach. See: "Merchant's Time and Church's Time in the Middle Ages," in Time, Work and Culture in the Middle Ages, trans. A. Goldhammer, Chicago, 1980, pp. 29-42, especially pp. 30-34. See as well the insights of: Stephen Nichols, Romanesque Signs. Early Medieval Narrative and Iconography, New Haven, 1983. Le Goff discussed the notion of Christian time and

history, in which time, seen as "theological time," was given a "center" with the advent of Christ. This event necessarily changed the perspective of history, requiring a primarily teleological and secondarily eschatological model: the past, which led up to Christ, was the "history of salvation;" however, the appearance of Christ brought about the idea of the end of time. But, as Le Goff noted, "Christ brought the certainty of salvation with him, but collective and individual history must still accomplish it for all, as well as for each individual. Hence the Christian must simultaneously renounce the world, which is only his transitory resting place, and opt for the world, accept it, and transform it, since it is the workplace of the present history of salvation." (p. 31) Le Goff as well briefly discussed the notion of time and history in the writings of Augustine, noting, after Marrou, that "historical time kept a certain 'ambivalence' so that, within the framework of eternity and subordinated to Providential action, men had some control over their own and mankind's destiny." (p. 32)

As Le Goff stated, "The feudal society in which the church became mired between the ninth and eleventh centuries congeals historical thought and seems to stop historical time or at least assimilate it to the history of the church." (p. 33) Nichols picked up on this notion and took it further, stating that eleventh century monks "wanted to make the past present to show that the present belonged to a coherent cosmology, that it manifested a divine plan for the universe. The key to this plan lay in certain transcendent events of the past, particularly the Christ story, which they interpreted as revealing the whole trajectory of Salvation history, from the beginning to the end of the world . . . By showing that historical events - including the present - could be represented as resembling and thus rephrasing significant past events, notably those found in religious texts, one might then demonstrate that secular history did indeed belong to Salvation history." (p. xi)

The works of both Le Goff and Nichols, in their discussions of historical models, are indebted to the insights of the anthropologist Mircea Eliade. See: The Myth of the Eternal Return.

For discussions of the medieval view of history with reference to more circumscribed subjects, see, for example: J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, "History in the Mind of Archbishop Hincmar," in The Writing of History in the Middle Ages. Essays Presented to Richard William Southern, ed. R. H. C. Davis and J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, Oxford, 1981, pp. 43-70; Eleanor Searle, "Fact and Pattern in Heroic History: Dudo of Saint-Quentin," Viator 15 (1984), pp. 119ff; and Paul Freedman, "Cowardice, Heroism and the Legendary Origins of Catalonia," Past and Present 21 (1988), pp. 3-28. For discussions in a more general vein, and with more attention to the later Middle Ages, see, for example: Bernard Guenée,

Histoire et culture historique dans l'Occident médiéval, Paris, 1980; and Marjorie Chibnall, The World of Orderic Vitalis, New York, 1984, Part V, "The Historian and His World," pp. 169-220 (it should be noted that Chibnall appears to posit "accurate" history - which she felt Orderic wrote - in opposition to more "fanciful" medieval historical constructs).

Inherent in the notion of history is the issue of memory, another highly debated scholarly topic. For insights into the issues, from the viewpoint of sociology, see: Lowenthal, especially pp. 185 ff.; Nathan Wachtel, "Introduction," in Between Memory and History, M. N. Bourguet, L. Valensi and N. Wachtel, eds., History and Anthropology 2, 2 (1987), pp. 207-224. See as well: Jean Starobinski, "The Idea of Nostalgia," Diogenes 54 (1966) pp. 81-103.

¹⁰J. D. Dodds, Architecture and Ideology in Early Medieval Spain, University Park, PA., 1990, p. 113.

¹¹Certainly the definition of "copy" and "imitation" have changed over time. For a discussion of the Renaissance admiration for "copying" and "imitation" of the past see: Lowenthal, pp. 80 ff. For the implications of "copying," see: Lowenthal, pp. 301 ff.

¹²The philosopher Avrum Stroll, in attempting to elucidate some of the problems of circular nature of words and their definitions, fortuitously, for me, used as his example the word "copy." See: A. Stroll, "Linguistic Clusters and the Problem of Universals," Dialectica 27, nos. 3-4 (1975), pp. 219-259. I am indebted to Sheree Jaros for bringing this article to my attention.

¹³For the contemporary penchant for preserving or enshrining the past, see: Lowenthal, especially pp. 263 ff.

Chapter One
Constructing a Common Past:
The Karlsverein and Aachen, 1814-1914

In the early nineteenth century the chapel at Aachen, having just passed its millennium, showed obvious signs of the passing years. Much of Charlemagne's original polygonal structure remained intact, and constituted the core of an architectural hodgepodge that had formed piecemeal over time. (fig. 2) The exterior wall of the church was broken intermittently by chapels of various centuries,¹ and to the east rose the vast choir constructed from 1455 to 1514. The upper reaches of the two-tower west block had been rebuilt in the thirteenth, fourteenth and seventeenth centuries and, in the 1780's the west portal had been replaced by a three-sided entryway. A late seventeenth-century domed roof capped the chapel.

Aachen's interior had been altered as well, the renovations masking the Carolingian structure. The octagonal central space of the chapel was ringed by an ambulatory with a sixteen-sided exterior wall. The central dominating space rose to an eight-part domed vault. This octagonal space, defined by eight massive piers carrying large rounded arches - one per side - communicated with the ambulatory through the openings. The vaulted ambulatory supported a taller second story which opened into the central space through a second range of eight elongated superimposed arches carried on the rising piers. This

architectural shell was completely cloaked in early eighteenth-century Italianate painting and stucco decoration.²

The appearance of Aachen in the early nineteenth century was but the most recent incarnation of the building, which had been modified and remodified throughout the ages.³ The numerous changes were dictated on the one hand by the physical condition of the structure, and particularly by damages suffered in fires.⁴ Yet, on the other hand, many alterations were brought about by the transforming functions of the chapel and by changing needs and tastes. Charlemagne's palace complex, which had originally surrounded his palatine chapel, was long gone. While the building had served as a coronation chapel until the sixteenth century, since then it had been used solely by the canonical community. Additions to the Carolingian structure reflected these changing functions and needs. For example, the larger choir was necessitated by the growing canonical community, and the Karlskapelle had been added to accommodate the growing number of pilgrims.⁵ Alterations such as the interior decoration, or for that matter any of the additions, suggest a preference for contemporary artistic and building styles.

Aachen's conglomerate state, in fact, underscored that the building had been in use over the years and had been adapted to the events and circumstances of passing time.

The motley look of Aachen would seem understandable and even expected, and, moreover, indicated that the preservation of the integrity of the original work had never been an issue. Yet this became the central issue in the early nineteenth century, when Aachen, no longer simply viewed as a building, came to be perceived, rather, as a "monument."⁶

On April 19, 1847 Franz Jungbluth, a local lawyer, invited fifty-three citizens of the town of Aachen to a meeting for the express purpose of founding the Karlsverein zur Wiederherstellung des Aachener Münsters - the Charlemagne Association for the Restoration of Aachen.⁷ Jungbluth's gathering and the Aachen restoration movement were certainly spurred in part by the condition of the chapel, which had suffered considerably over the preceding one hundred years: much of the damage had been left unrepaired due to lack of funds, and the church was in a dismal state of repair. Yet the marked interest in the chapel and the tenets of the Karlsverein reflected as well a particular popular perception of the building and its value which was greatly conditioned by contemporary events and viewpoints.

The preceding fifty years had been particularly grueling for Aachen. Located southwest of Cologne between the Rhine and Maas Rivers, the town lay directly in Napoleon's path and was snatched up by the French. In the scuffle, the chapel's lead overroofing was destroyed,

leaving the domed vault open to the elements. More importantly, the French general, guided as he was by a dream of the Holy Roman Empire, took care to seize what he saw as tangible vestiges of it in those parts of Charlemagne's creation that were removable; in 1794 Aachen was stripped of its remaining Carolingian decoration,⁸ and the columnar screen of the second story interior arcade was dismantled and carted off to the Louvre.⁹

With the defeat of Napoleon in 1815, Aachen was no longer under French rule and, with the rest of the German-speaking Rhineland, was ceded to the Kingdom of Prussia at the Congress of Vienna. With the peace, Aachen received only some of the architectural booty back,¹⁰ and the recovered spoils were simply left lying in and around the chapel. Soon thereafter, in 1821, Aachen was reinstated as a cathedral,¹¹ and thus once again the chapel was given a new or at least renewed overlay of significance through an assigned function. Perhaps in response to Aachen's new role, in 1826 the Provost Matthias Claessen decided that something had to be done with the scattered fragments.¹²

Claessen requested that the Prussian Baurath Cremer prepare a study as to the feasibility of re-erecting the pieces in the interior arcades. Cremer reported that many columns, capitals and bases were missing, and that many that had been recovered were in deplorable condition. Furthermore, it would require money to accomplish such a

task. Cremer appealed Aachen's case to the sympathetic Friedrich Wilhelm IV of Prussia. Royal interest in the project led to financial support, and the restoration began in the spring of 1844 and was completed by the summer of 1847.

The replacement of the columns, however, presented a number of problems, not the least of which was that no one really knew exactly how they had been arranged within the arched openings; after all, a half century had passed since their removal. It was more or less agreed, mainly from modern descriptions and paintings of the building,¹³ that each upper arch had enclosed a two story screen of two superimposed columns, requiring thirty-two columns altogether.¹⁴ There was disagreement as to whether the architrave resting atop the lower columns and forming the base for the upper range had been straight or broken,¹⁵ and it was decided to make each broken by three semi-circular arches.¹⁶

There was, as well, the pressing problem of the missing and damaged architectural members. According to an inventory of 1840, there were twenty-nine and a half columns in Aachen and sixteen and a half in Paris.¹⁷ Of the column bases, only three badly damaged originals remained - the location of the rest was unknown.¹⁸ Eighteen original capitals survived, of which ten were in Aachen.¹⁹ In

order to achieve the desired restoration, enormous gaps would have to be filled.

The original columns - as spolia that Charlemagne had culled from Classical buildings - varied in material and size.²⁰ The French had repolished many,²¹ and many were further reworked for the restoration.²² These altered original columns were interspersed with newly-hewn ones, apparently with attention to their visibility, as their original placement was uncertain.²³ In the lower story, pairs of original granite columns were placed in the east, north and south openings, and a pair of gray marble was placed in the west.²⁴ The rest of the lower screen was completed with eight new granite columns. In the upper story, pairs of original granite columns were set in the east, north and south arches, pairs of grey marble to the west and southwest, and a pair of white variegated marble to the northwest, and a single column of green marble in the north half of the northeast opening.

The three original bases, of various classicizing styles, were not used at all. Thirty-two new bases were made in an identical "Attic" style,²⁵ these of varying heights in order to compensate for the unequal lengths of the spolia columns. The remaining original capitals were of varying classicizing foliate styles.²⁶ Only three - recut before insertion - were used in the restoration, one pair placed in the upper story of the south arch and one capital

in the upper story of the north arch. Twenty-nine new capitals of Cararra marble were made, uniformly fashioned after those of the Pantheon in Rome.²⁷

While quite probably Aachen originally had a superimposed columnar screen in the interior arcades, there was - and is - no certainty as to the particulars of its arrangement or the specific forms of the various architectural members. From the extant original pieces, it is clear that variety - in size and style - was the chosen aesthetic. Certainly the reworking of the members altered forever their original form, and the new uniformly styled architectural members introduced a different aesthetic in the chapel. While the particular choice of "Attic" bases and "Pantheon" capitals was not explained or justified - perhaps because it was felt that no justification was necessary - the stylistic choices intimate the idea of the primacy of the "Classical" that was certainly current at the time. No doubt these ancient models were deemed appropriate for the treasured chapel, yet the resulting monochromatic regularity of the columnar screens can be seen as a contemporary ideal of Classical order and restraint grafted onto Aachen.

Yet such points were not the issue in an endeavor whose main goal, in short, was to put back what the French had had the audacity to take away. Anti-French rhetoric peppered discussions of the column restoration, and the motivation

and accomplishment of the project must be seen as a symbolic act of self-assertion and definition against the recent "oppressor's theft." The columns came to be imbued with the potency of perceived truth, right and victory. In 1833, Karl Friedrich Schinkel, the Königliche Oberbaudirektor, supported the proposed restoration plan, stating:

"The latest destruction by the French of this ancient monument of Charlemagne is still not restored. The famous columns of varying types of polished stone are still lying around . . . but their original places are empty. It would thus surely appear a duty to put an end to this situation, because victory supplied us again with the relics of a memorable time as trophies."²⁸

Claessen echoed similar sentiments in 1834, saying:

"The columns in our church have, mind you , historical importance . . . Their historical importance might even rise dramatically as they would be reerected in their original places - where the aesthetic eye now discerns a disparaging void - as so many monuments to victory over French arrogance."²⁹

The main parties involved in the restoration - the collegiate community and the Prussian monarchy - each had their own score to settle through the project. Both expressed scorn for the French and their ignoble deeds. The gravity of the French actions in Aachen was augmented by a perception of the historical worth of Aachen, seen in rather general terms as an ancient work of Charlemagne. The historical value of the columns had certainly been enhanced by their more recent experiences, and they became both symbols of wrongful oppression and victory over the

oppressors. For Aachen - as victim - their replacement was a matter of personal dignity in the wake of recent humiliation. For Prussia - the conquerors in the Napoleonic struggle and the new rulers of the Rhineland - restoration presented tangible proof of their own supremacy, and was couched as a benevolent gesture to the past.

The emotional post-war issues of the column restoration certainly contributed in part to the Karlsverein's self-appointed task of total restoration. Yet indignation over the events of the recent past had been assuaged by the column project, and, with the Karlsverein, an immediate desire to restore the chapel to its pre-Napoleonic state gave way to a desire to restore and protect the medieval building. The Karlsverein saw its proposed project as a public mission - the restoration was to be funded mainly by contributions - and the group was rife with a crusading zeal that focused on Aachen as the townspeople's personal historical legacy. The association, founded by local professionals - doctors, lawyers, politicians - directed its impassioned appeal for the chapel directly to the populace of Aachen.

On August 1, 1847, the Karlsverein published a "Call to the Citizens" in the local paper in order to drum up support for the association and its restoration goals. The text opened:

"In our church we possess a witness, a grave reminder of the distant past. The splendid

octagon - the single extant Carolingian building in Germany - is the most important monument dating from the outset of the mighty development of German greatness under the beneficent influence of Christianity. As well, the lofty choir constitutes in the boldness of its majestic structure an amazing and arousing monument of national³⁰ architecture. These two main parts of our church, along with their accompanying chapels and structures, testify to the great devoutness of our forefathers and their view of the relationship between the arts and religion. Our venerable temple, as the sepulchre of its great founder Charlemagne, remains for all time an important shrine of the German people. In this holy place, Germany's Emperors received their power and the consecration of religion. Here the glory of the German nation was consecrated. Of course our hometown has lost, through a variety of circumstances, the high status that it was allocated earlier in the ranks of German cities. The severe hardships of the disastrous intervening period and also the accompanying decline of architecture have especially plagued our church terribly. Its protection from further decay and its historically faithful restoration is the grave task of the present citizens."³¹

The opening of the "Call" clearly shows that concern for the events of the more recent past had been replaced by a focus on the distant past - and there was a nostalgic identification with and longing for that lost time.³² An awareness of Aachen as "Medieval" - there was no argument with the chapel's later medieval additions such as the choir and the chapels, but with everything "Modern" - infused the building with a supercharged symbolic value, as that age was perceived as one in which "German" national power and Christian ideals were inextricably intertwined. Charlemagne was seen as the first and great "German" Christian ruler and the builder of Aachen, and Aachen, as his burial site, was

his enduring monument and personal legacy. This Middle Ages was perceived as a glorious past - even a moral standard - to which contemporary individuals were directly related through blood.

The expressed nostalgic feelings of loss and sadness over the fate of Aachen since the Middle Ages were countered by the call to restoration. In wiping out the marks of the modern age, there was a sense that the ideals and values which the medieval monument had come to represent could themselves be retrieved and renewed. The image of medieval Aachen articulated by the Karlsverein voiced a peculiar time-warp notion in which the years separating the present from the Middle Ages fell away;³³ moreover, the image was not simply a local one, as the Karlsverein was heralded not only in Aachen but in Cologne and even in Berlin.³⁴ The conflation of a perceived past and the present in Aachen grafted contemporary issues and longings onto the past and enabled the elevation of the chapel to an inviolate monument into which the present could read its own hopes for self-definition and self-worth.

These perceptions and issues surrounding the call for Aachen's restoration can be understood more clearly when viewed as a particular response to a more widespread phenomenon. On an immediate level, the town of Aachen had been bitten by the restoration bug that had been spreading through Prussia, and the town seems to have caught the fever

directly through an awareness of and participation in the highly publicized restoration and completion of the nearby Cathedral of Cologne. Already in the April 19 meeting Jungbluth acknowledged this connection, stating that:

"the gathering commonly expressed the attitude that the efforts for the local church in no manner constitute a break with the working participation for the Cathedral of Cologne, but rather support for this most glorious work as the solution of a lasting common task . . ."35

The "Call" continued this theme, stating that the citizens of Aachen,

"who through their active participation in the building of the Cathedral of Cologne, prove that they are profoundly imbued with the task of our time; through eager work for the preservation of national architectural monuments their own qualifications prepare them for similar creations. Brought to life by this spirit, our fellow citizens become enthusiastic to hasten the frequently proposed idea to restore our church."36

The activities in Cologne certainly provided an amazing example of restoration fever in the Rhineland. Though rumblings for work on the building had been heard around the time of the end of the Napoleonic Wars, the full-fledged movement did not get off the ground until 1840, when a new wave of enthusiasm swept Cologne.³⁷ Seen as a national task, the project enjoyed widespread participation and the support of the Prussian king. As a church in the Gothic style, the cathedral was seen as the national monument par excellence; it was widely held at the time that the Gothic style was a "German" invention, stemming from the

spirit of the people at their high point of temporal and spiritual power - and, as such, the essence of things "German."³⁸

While Cologne provided a handy "how-to" example, the projects in Aachen and Cologne must be seen as well as individual manifestations of a widespread desire to articulate "German" national identity. Nineteenth-century "German" nationalism presented its own particular visage, primarily because there was no "Germany" to speak of.³⁹ In an age of burgeoning national consolidation and awareness in the West, German-speaking people were scattered throughout a number of countries. The lack of German unity and power was felt keenly in Prussia, where "Germanness" was pursued with vigor. In the post-Napoleonic Rhineland in particular, war had fueled a feeling of "Germanness" and a desire for integration.

The contemporary Romantic movement celebrated "German" group consciousness through stressing shared language, culture and history. The Middle Ages came to be admired as it had not been before, and it was in this particular past that the present need for a strong Christian national power was met. The search for common roots took on many guises, all sharing the rallying point of the cult of history. This was the age of great scholarly enterprises, aimed at defining "German" identity through exploring the past. For example, the Grimm Brothers were seeking "Germanness" in the

fairy tales of the people, while Jacob Grimm's dictionary searched for the roots of the German language.⁴⁰ The founding of the Monumenta Germaniae Historica, funded by the Prussian government, and its mission for collecting the sources for medieval "German" history was yet another facet of this phenomenon.⁴¹

While the Grimms and the MGH fall under the rubric of scholarly endeavors, the interest in and restoration of Aachen - and the restoration craze in Prussia as a whole - must be seen as more popular expressions of nationalistic longing and identification projected onto works of material culture. The prominent role that the image of Aachen played in the "German" popular historical imagination in the mid-nineteenth century can perhaps be gauged in part by other responses to the chapel. The potent image of Aachen as a symbol of "German" identity manifested itself even in America, in the "Kaffee-Kirche" begun in 1846 by "German" immigrants in - appropriately enough - Fredricksburg, Texas.⁴² The church, which is no longer extant, was purportedly modeled on the octagon at Aachen. In building their own Aachen in Texas, the settlers were able to articulate and retain their "German" identity in a new land, and their choice for a model - no doubt seen as the logical one - illustrated the popular and widespread nature of the contemporary image of Aachen.

The restoration movement in Aachen, similarly, had great popular and public support, and the Karlsverein was decidedly democratic in tone. Intended as a movement of the people, the fifty-three citizens invited to the founding meeting were chosen "from all walks of life,"⁴³ and the Karlsverein, in their "Call," appealed to the citizenry as a whole. The political upheavals of 1848 briefly interrupted the progress of the restoration, but by October 15, 1849, the group's "Statutes" were completed.⁴⁴ The thirty-two articles laid out the working order of the association, Article One stating that its purpose was "the protection and historically faithful restoration" of the chapel. Membership was open to all who paid annual dues, and yearly meetings were to be held to give progress reports and also to hold elections for officers. The statutes also designated the Feast Day of Charlemagne as an annual day of celebration for the Karlsverein.

The cogs of the restoration machine began to turn in 1849, and the continuation of work was ensured in 1850, when Friedrich Wilhelm of Prussia became "Protector" of the project and pledged financial support.⁴⁵ As the Gothic choir was in the worst state of repair, work began there. The restoration involved extensive repair and replacement of the structure and decoration. The fourteen statues of the interior were restored and repainted, architectural ornamentation was completely replaced, and extensive work

was done to the stained glass, much of which had been destroyed.⁴⁶ New window tracery was made as well as a number of completely new windows. As the original subject matter of the lacking stained glass was unknown, it was deemed appropriate to depict the Life of the Virgin and twelve great "German" kings and emperors from Louis the Pious to Frederick Barbarossa - in keeping with the perceived spiritual and temporal meaning of the chapel.⁴⁷ Work then began on the Annakapelle in 1857, on the Matthiaskapelle in 1864, and on the Karlskapelle in 1868. These chapels, like the choir, underwent substantial structural repair and were completely repainted and redecorated.⁴⁸

Although the restoration project was well underway and the work was widely supported, the Karlsverein had in fact been coming under fire from individuals who questioned the "historical faithfulness" of the results. Early inklings of discontent appeared with the publication, in 1851, of a book on the chapel and its restoration by Debey, a local doctor.⁴⁹ An ardent supporter of the call for restoration, Debey's book chronicled the history of Aachen and the progress of the work on the church. However, he had reservations about the proposed work on the choir, and included a lengthy proposal on how he thought the work should proceed.⁵⁰

While the book was praised in some quarters as a worthy example of much-needed scholarship on national monuments,⁵¹ it prompted one group of Aachen citizens to voice their own reservations about the project.⁵² Stating that such a complex restoration must give rise to differing opinions and views as to how to proceed, the expressed concerns of a part of Aachen's citizenry that the restoration might be going in the wrong direction were not being heeded. Citing the "faulty" modern additions to the columnar screen, they pleaded with the Karlsverein to meet them on "neutral territory" - the "field of scientific research" - to reconcile the issues.⁵³ The group registered its complaint as well in a letter to the Archbishop of Cologne.⁵⁴ They stated that they feared that an "historically faithful" restoration was not being carried out, as in no way had an attempt been made to ascertain carefully the original disposition of the chapel. They specifically criticized proposed plans for the restoration of the octagon, saying that these, "in the judgement of scholars, carry a modern character, not the medieval style."

The plea for intervention, nevertheless, found no sympathetic ear with the Catholic hierarchy. The Archbishop replied that his respected experts stood behind the restoration, and that the work on the choir reflected the choices of the Aachen canonical community in conjunction with the Karlsverein, guided by the advice of the experts.⁵⁵

As for the Carolingian chapel, work would be carried out with similar care. The reply closed with the Archbishop's sentiments that he:

"favors the hope that the awakened and unfounded worry will disappear, and that the glad courage and enthusiasm will return which earlier united the citizens and rallied them around the revered chapter, and that the significant restoration work of the Aachen citizens - who already held such a warm love and devotion for their venerable Carolingian cathedral built over the grave of the first German king - is supported with all vigor, harmony and perseverance, to the honor of the All Mighty, to the glorification of Mary and to the praise of the ancient royal city and the Catholic community."

This early exchange between those who questioned the restoration methods and results and those running the project was to be but one of many and characteristic of a long struggle waged in print. Aachen's restoration was the topic of newspaper articles and editorials, books and pamphlets, and the arguments invariably centered around the questions of what the chapel "really looked like" versus the Aachen emerging in the restoration.⁵⁶ The specifics of such protests can be seen in the complaints of Franz Bock, one of the more vehement early critics of the restoration. He railed against the "unscientific manner and character" of the work, and stated that:

"it is for all future generations to bewail deeply that, from the outset, the present so-called restoration of our splendid building has fallen into the hands of petty architects - as the practical task for technicians and bureaucrats to try and solve - standing neither on the heights of archeology nor art, and who, in this scientific respect, were not prepared in the least."⁵⁷

Bock gave a blow-by-blow critique of the restoration in 1866, stating that the new columnar screen capitals were of an incorrect form and reflected no knowledge of Carolingian sculpture, and that the arrangement of the columns was wrong and paid no attention to the examples of other extant medieval buildings. As well, the incorrect reworking and repainting of the choir statues had ruined them. The choir tracery, he maintained, was not specifically "German" in style, and the new glass looked totally modern.

Bock's and Debey's concerns about the restoration - like others' - stemmed from a common view of Aachen's worth as a treasure of national architecture and a symbol of the perceived standard that that age represented. For Bock, the chapel manifested "how, from the ninth to the sixteenth century, church architecture in its various phases developed on German soil."⁵⁸ In his work, Debey clearly articulated an image of the chapel and its founder comparable to that expressed by the Karlsverein. Charlemagne was extolled as the great German Christian ruler, the friend of the Pope, and his reign was called "the most significant turning point in history."⁵⁹ Debey related that Aachen - "the church to Our Blessed Lady on German soil," "the shrine to the German nation" - had been built by Charlemagne out of piety and love of art, and that the chapel, "the favorite church of the great Emperor and his later burial site, was the symbol

of, and in later times the monument to, the completion of the developing Carolingian mission to world history."⁶⁰

Though detractors shared a common image of Aachen with the restorers, the question was one of what constituted historical truth. Grievances, in general, centered on specifics of style: the work was seen as inaccurate in form; or it did not look medieval. The protesters feared that the past - a past that they so ardently wanted to recapture - was being irrevocably lost through incorrect restoration. Yet, importantly, there was never any contention that an authentic restoration was not possible; it was felt that Aachen could indeed be restored to its original form. These debates emphasized that each party upheld a view of history that posited one correct and obtainable past; however, the question was how to discover and articulate that past.

The protests display as well an awareness of and trust in the discipline of medieval art history then developing in Prussia - another product of the new interest in the Middle Ages.⁶¹ Yet the pleas for intervention fell, in general, on deaf ears,⁶² for they challenged the formidable force of the desires of the general public, the church and the monarchy. As the restoration continued through the second half of the nineteenth century and into the early twentieth century, scholarly discussion was to have little impact on the project.⁶³

The heated issues surrounding the early phases of Aachen's restoration underscore, on the one hand, the power of the popular movement over its detractors, and on the other hand, the restorers' attitudes towards restoration. It is evident that the goal was to make Aachen look medieval in its entirety, and that in order to do this, much new work had to be added to the structure. It was not seen as a contradiction that the preservation of the medieval monument entailed the incorporation of vast amounts of modern material and even the destruction of original fabric. As long as the additions were seen as authentic - "historically faithful" - they were viewed as valid.

While in the early years the Karlsverein concentrated on the choir and Gothic additions, since its inception, the association had discussed plans for the restoration of the Carolingian structure. While the later additions were highly prized as examples of national art, that name of Charlemagne, "the incomparable founder of German might,"⁶⁴ was tied to the octagon, enhancing its value. The Karlsverein, as their chosen name clearly suggests, was particularly preoccupied with the memory of Charlemagne. As early as 1842 the association, in conjunction with the monarchy, undertook excavations to find the king's burial place within Aachen, though this work came to nought.⁶⁵ Yet Charlemagne's "relics," which had been unearthed by Frederick Barbarossa, were still at Aachen, and the

Karlsverein's focus on the memory of the Carolingian ruler even led to a short-lived movement to build a new tomb worthy of the king.⁶⁶ Regierungsrath Stein, "out of a sense of duty," presented a plan for a kingly crypt. While a majority of the Karlsverein's voting members supported the plan in 1859, reservations on the part of Cologne's Archbishopric - grounded in the logistics of the project - and of Prussian officials shelved the plans.

In the 1860's and 1870's, with the more pressing work on the Gothic additions completed or underway, attention was focused on the octagon. Work began on the exterior, where, according to Jungbluth, alterations "scarcely allow the original architecture to be recognized."⁶⁷ Structures that obscured the view of the north and south sides of the octagon were torn down,⁶⁸ and the exterior masonry was neatened up and made to look newly Carolingian again.⁶⁹ The largest project for the exterior was the restoration of the upper reaches of the west front, the central tower of which had been largely rebuilt after the seventeenth-century fires. (fig. 3) The tower was destroyed and reconstructed to look like its thirteenth-century predecessor - damaged by the fires - the architect Schneider relying on plans and drawings of the seventeenth century for guidance.⁷⁰ (fig. 4) Again, it was deemed "historically faithful" to construct a completely new tower, as it "copied" the medieval one, and thus looked medieval.

A recurring topic throughout the restoration project had been the interior decoration of the octagon. The early eighteenth-century stucco and painted decoration was seen as an atrocious crime of the modern age, (figs. 5 and 6) and a call for the restoration of the interior of the dome was first made by Cremer.⁷¹ However, the original interior decoration was fraught with unknowns. Medieval sources spoke vaguely of splendid gold and silver decoration, but gave no specifics. Lacking medieval sources, the restorers turned to modern descriptions of the chapel interior before its redecoration for clues, the most important works being Nopius' and Beeck's descriptions of the early seventeenth century and a sketch of the dome made by the Italian Ciampini in 1699.⁷² Yet even these provided no clear-cut image; while Nopius described mosaics, Beeck described paintings, and the validity of Ciampini's drawing of the dome mosaic was questioned.⁷³

It was widely held that the dome had originally carried a mosaic, and when tesserae were found during the removal of the stucco decoration, this notion was confirmed.⁷⁴ It was reasoned that the mosaic remains had to be Carolingian rather than from a later period,⁷⁵ and it then became a matter of ascertaining what had been represented. Discussions of the dome revolved around Ciampini's drawing and the general perception that Aachen had to be related to

the appropriately imperial San Vitale in Ravenna, with its rich mosaic decoration.⁷⁶

In 1847, Geheimer Regierungsrath von Quast had drawn up a plan for a mosaic dome based on Ciampini and "analogous" works, primarily San Vitale.⁷⁷ These plans were laid aside, however, as work on the exterior was underway. In 1854 the issue resurfaced when Professor Ernst Deger of Düsseldorf presented a proposal for the painting of the dome.⁷⁸ With the choir iconography in mind, Deger suggested the theme of the coronation of "German" kings and their anointment as Roman emperors. The plan had great support, especially after Geheimer Regierungsrath Zwirner ascertained in 1855 that there were insufficient mosaic remains to provide any clue as to the earlier representation.⁷⁹

Jungbluth reported the quandary in which the Karlsverein and the chapter found themselves, as they very much liked Deger's plan, yet it could in no way be construed as "historically faithful."⁸⁰ He noted in defense that there was little evidence for a mosaic restoration and that the vote of 1859 showed overwhelming support for the painting scheme. However, the project was widely disapproved of, with even the Archbishop of Cologne stating that any work should follow the original disposition; von Quast seconded this bid for a "historically faithful" mosaic.⁸¹

In 1873⁸² a competition was held and three mosaic proposals were considered, those of von Quast, Professor Schneider of Kassel and Baron Bethune d'Ydeville of Ghent.⁸³ The Baron's plan, based mainly on Ciampini, was chosen, and a certain Dr. Salviati of Venice was engaged to carry out the project. Despite controversy as to the specifics of the iconography,⁸⁴ the resulting work was, in general, well received by the public, one report stating that "the representation follows as closely as possible the original which was destroyed during the Rococo period. In its splendid simplicity it exhibits through the splendor of the materials and the peculiar, so to speak, technical execution, a most powerful and high-reaching effect."⁸⁵

There can be no doubt that the dome mosaic is indeed sumptuous. Set against a glittering gold ground, the imagery was derived from the Apocalypse. (fig. 7) Symbols of the four Evangelists hover in the center, and Christ is enthroned in the middle zone. Below Christ, encircling the lower edge of the dome, are the Twenty-four Elders. While the scene may in some way approximate an earlier mosaic, the particulars of the predecessor remain unknown and the new work is decidedly non-Carolingian in style.

The scanty evidence for the decoration - comparable to the lack of evidence for the choir windows - was overshadowed by the resulting work, which satisfied the popular image of what Aachen should look like. The

approximation of imagined Byzantine splendor fulfilled the restorers' long-expressed desire for a fittingly kingly and Christian dome decoration. The dome mosaic, as well as the work on the Gothic additions, underscore that the goal of the work was not simply the preservation of Aachen as a structure, but the recreation of a perception of historical Aachen, a recreation seen and articulated in terms of applied decoration.

With the successful completion of the dome mosaic in the early 1880's, attention was turned to other aspects of the church. In the early 1890's, besides work on the cloister, discussions focused on the "venerable imperial throne" - the so-called "Throne of Charlemagne"⁸⁶ - and the display of the Carolingian wolf and pinecone.⁸⁷ As well, since the late 1880's, there had been talk of completely decorating the interior walls of the octagon, which remained bare after the destruction of the stucco decoration.

(fig. 8) Certainly by the late nineteenth century, there was no question that the structure of Aachen was sound and the chapel therefore ensured of survival. The ensuing work, which continued into the twentieth century, centered primarily on the Carolingian monument, and the goal was, quite simply, the complete outfitting of the chapel.

The discussions of the later nineteenth century underscore that interest in the project at Aachen had not waned, at least as far as the Karlsverein - and no doubt the

cathedral chapter - were concerned. They had, in fact, renewed vigor.⁸⁸ The townspeople, however, apparently had lost or were losing interest, and to remedy this, the Karlsverein turned to the media to revive support.⁸⁹ The Karlsverein reports of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries repeatedly invoke the mandate of the chapter - whose wishes, according to the publications, the Karlsverein was simply carrying out - and as well the renewed support of the monarchy.⁹⁰ In citing these authorities, as well as appropriating the rhetoric of the early Karlsverein,⁹¹ the restorers, by stressing continuity, were able to legitimize as well drum up support for their plans.

The dome tambour, which, with the removal of the modern decoration, was conspicuously unadorned, became a major project. There was absolutely no evidence, medieval or modern, as to its original decoration,⁹² yet it appears that with the lavish dome decoration, it was felt that the entire interior should be as sumptuously adorned. In 1888, a competition was held,⁹³ and the mosaic design of Hermann Schaper was chosen. Funding problems arose, yet after discussions with Berlin, the plans of Schaper - based on the mosaics of San Vitale in Ravenna - were approved,⁹⁴ though in somewhat altered form.⁹⁵ The tambour depicts the apostles and, to the east, the Archangel Michael and the Virgin Mary and St. John the Baptist and the Archangel

Gabriel. Between Mary and Michael kneels Charlemagne, a miniature Aachen in his hands. Pope Leo III, who consecrated the chapel, kneels between St. John and Gabriel.

Integral to Schaper's proposal was the marble revetment of the remaining exposed masonry, which was construed as an appropriate compliment to the splendid mosaics.⁹⁶

Conveniently, the chapter had a large piece of ancient Roman marble that had been donated to Aachen by Pope Pius IX himself.⁹⁷ While the project was discussed as imminent in 1883,⁹⁸ it was not undertaken until the opening years of the twentieth century - after Schaper had made a trip to Turkey to study Byzantine mosaic and marble decoration.⁹⁹ By 1909, the octagon was completely covered in mosaics and richly variegated and patterned marble, the arches of the interior elevation with marble voussoirs of alternating colors.¹⁰⁰

The successful completion of the work - particularly the revetment, which was criticized by many¹⁰¹ - was greatly facilitated by Joseph Buchkremer.¹⁰² Aachen was Buchkremer's passion, as is evident from his impressive number of publications on the chapel. In contrast to many of the earlier publications pressing for restoration, Buchkremer's work is decidedly scholarly in tone, repeatedly emphasizing his desire to return Aachen to its "historically faithful" original state. By assuming a scholarly guise, Buchkremer was able to legitimize the highly controversial projects.

Citing mistakes of past restoration work, Buchkremer stressed the importance of careful scholarly study as a means of ascertaining Aachen's original state.¹⁰³ As "proof" - questionable at best - that Aachen had been covered with marble slabs, Buchkremer presented an extremely detailed study of an obscure late sixteenth-century painting of Aachen's interior by Hendrik van Steenwick the Elder.¹⁰⁴ Using the painting as if it were a photograph, Buchkremer maintained that marks on the octagon's piers in the foreground were obviously clamp marks, which proved that the building had had revetment.¹⁰⁵

Central to Buchkremer's vision was the desire to see Aachen restored to an image of completeness and splendor, an image he strove to justify through "scholarly" research. Buchkremer was responsible for the recreation of the atrium preceding the chapel¹⁰⁶ and contributed as well to the work on the planned restoration of the throne within the Kaiserloge.¹⁰⁷ Under Buchkremer's seemingly tireless efforts, Aachen was more or less complete by the early teens; by 1914, all major work had been carried out.¹⁰⁸

The completion of the restoration of Aachen, which had been spurred partially as a response to war, thus coincided, ironically, with the outbreak of World War I. For the Karlsverein, this coincidence was perceived as portentous. Once again, Aachen - which had been transformed through its restoration into a vital symbol of national identity -

entered into the discussion of contemporary events, which were likened to those of one hundred years past:

"The history of the French Revolution and the early years of the Napoleonic Age saw the same series of events . . . Since the overthrow of French foreign rule exactly one hundred years have passed. This is the issue for the Karlsverein - which put itself in the service of art and took on, above all, the task of the preservation of our precious cathedral . . . the horrors perpetrated - especially by the French - to our works of architecture of the past were dragged before our eyes. These memories must be preserved and time must not fade them.¹⁰⁹

The imminent war - "for us, it was a matter of existence or non-existence" - was seen as particularly dire as Aachen was so close to the border, and the tense situation was seen as giving impetus to a new wave of interest in the cathedral.¹¹⁰ Within this context, memories of past victory - given form through the restoration - made the chapel a rallying point and revived memories of the history and task of the Karlsverein itself:

"The completion of the column reerection signified an implemented atonement - within the bounds of possibility - of the sins perpetrated by the French. The unique octagon appears again in its full structural beauty. The splendid evidence of kingly favor - to which this achievement can be traced back - produced in art circles, most of all in the Aachen citizenry . . . deeply felt thanks, and at the same time also a blazing enthusiasm for the Cathedral problem. Under its influence, it was decided, in 1847, to found an association serving the cathedral church. On October 15, 1849 it came into being with the name "Karlsverein zur Restauration des Aachener Münsters." The annual reports let it be recognized the degree of success it has had in this endeavor."¹¹¹

With the completion of the work on the chapel just before the outbreak of World War I, Aachen had been transformed, over the preceding century, from a timeworn church into a glittering monument - a monument created in answer to the needs of contemporary beholders. While the replacement of the columnar screen satisfied an immediate desire for national self-assertion after the French violation of the building in the early nineteenth century, with the Karlsverein, a nostalgic historical-mindedness emerged that answered a need for national and religious self-definition and expression through the concrete resurrection of a perceived past and its meanings.

Inherent in the work was a very personal and contemporary notion of the past as a political, religious and moral standard to be emulated. The Middle Ages, popularly perceived as the domain of the "German" people, was seen in terms of a cohesion of imperial and religious power and stability, and this vision articulated the hopes of the present. The present could be likened, even merged with this perceived past, and this past was seen as exemplified by its concrete remains - Aachen: if Aachen could be transformed, in its physical form, to its perceived medieval state, then perhaps the image of the past could be made present. Importantly, the nostalgic reverence for the past and the very desire to retrieve it underscored that the past was seen as remote and distant. Enthusiasm for a

church fit for Charlemagne - guided by an image of politico-religious "German" grandeur and moral right - carried the restoration through to completion.

The care and attention lavished on Aachen no doubt saved the building from oblivion. Despite the sincere intentions of the restorers, however, in an ironic turn, their work has been harshly criticized in the more recent past. When seen from a particular late twentieth-century scholarly point of view, the restoration history of Aachen has been assailed as disastrous, a classic "how-not-to" example.¹¹² Criticism of the work has been rife with a self-aware sense of superiority not unlike the denouncement of the modern age by the early Karlsverein. Restoration philosophies and techniques certainly have changed radically. While one can contend - correctly - that what was done to Aachen in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries would never happen today, the point is moot. To lambast what the chapel became clearly champions a contemporary notion of the unadorned "preservation of monuments,"¹¹³ and this current scholarly "objectivity" is certainly at odds with the Karlsverein's identification and longing for the past.

Rather than interpreting Aachen as the low point of modern restoration history, however, the resulting building can be seen instead as yet another image in the history of remembering Aachen - one that is certainly no better or

worse than any of the other countless approaches to the church. Importantly, the restored chapel underscores the ability - as well as the tendency - of a given present to project its own imagination and standards onto a desired past. In imaging Aachen, the restorers modeled their work on what they perceived as "historical Aachen." The chosen model for their work - Aachen itself - necessarily was filtered through a contemporary nostalgic and nationalistic sensibility, and the desire to recapture and express an image of the past in concrete form imbued Aachen with a politico-religious meaning unique to the time. The result is the chapel as we see it today: a beautiful and pristine building that is an image of a lost Aachen - a building that is, essentially, a reflection of itself. (fig. 9)

¹The Ungarischekapelle (1748-1767) is to the southwest; the Matthiaskapelle (first quarter of the fourteenth century) to the southeast; the Annakapelle (thirteenth and fourteenth centuries) opened into the Matthiaskapelle to the east; the Karlskapelle (1455-1474) to the northeast; and the Nikolaskapelle (second half of the fifteenth century) to the northwest. For a comprehensive building history of Aachen, see: K. Faymonville, Der Dom zu Aachen und seine liturgische Ausstattung vom 9. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert, Munich, 1909. See as well: Faymonville, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Aachen: Das Münster zu Aachen, vol 10/1, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Rheinprovinz, ed. P. Clemens, Düsseldorf, 1916, Part II, "Baugeschichte 796-1915," pp. 59-71. See also: H. Kubach and A. Verbeek, Romanische Baukunst an Rhein und Maas. Katalog der vorromanischen und romanischen Denkmäler, vol. 1, Berlin, 1976, pp. 1-13.

²In 1719, Johann Baptist Artari was engaged to redecorate the interior in the style of the "Northern Italian School," and he carried out the work from 1720 to 1730. See: Faymonville, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Aachen, p. 66; and Faymonville, Der Dom zu Aachen, pp. 381-382.

³Again, see Faymonville, Der Dom zu Aachen. For example, the original Ungarischekapelle dated to the second half of the fourteenth century, and the octagon dome was replaced a number of times. See as well: Faymonville, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Aachen, pp. 59-71.

⁴Faymonville, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Aachen, pp. 62 and 66. Sources report fires in the twelfth (1146), thirteenth (1 August 1224) and fourteenth (25 November 1366) centuries. Lightning struck the tower and set it ablaze on 25 June 1624, and on 2 May 1656, a huge fire caused extensive damage to the town and the church.

⁵Pilgrimage to Aachen and the widespread veneration of Charlemagne as a saint became popular beginning in the fourteenth century. See: H. Schiffers, Kulturgeschichte der Aachener Heiligtumsfahrt, Cologne, 1930; B. Lermen and D. Wynands, Die Aachenfahrt in Geschichte und Literatur, Aachen, 1986; and E. Stephany, "Heiligtumsfahrt," and K. Köster, "Mittelalterliche Pilgerzeichen und Wallfahrtsdevotionalien, in Rhein und Maas. Kunst und Kultur 800-1400, Schnütgen-Museum, Cologne, 1972, pp. 142-151.

⁶For the idea of the "Denkmal" and the connections between medieval buildings and nineteenth-century national monuments, see: Thomas Nipperdey, "Nationalidee und Nationaldenkmal in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert," in Gesellschaft, Kultur, Theorie. Gesammelte Aufsätze, Göttingen, 1976; and L. Kerksen, Das Interesse am Mittelalter im deutschen Nationaldenkmal, Berlin, 1975.

The restoration history of Aachen has been of some interest to German scholars, most notably Hans Belting. See: H. Belting, "Das Aachener Münster im 19. Jahrhundert. Zur ersten Krise des Denkmal-Konzepts," Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch 45 (1984), pp. 257-289. In this article, Belting used some of the sources basic to the present chapter, and brought up a number of general points central to it. He provided a more general account of the restoration process, and placed it generally within the nationalistic and religious context of the time. However, he anchored his discussion firmly in the realm of the issues of "Denkmalpflege." Belting's interest was not Aachen, per se, but in using Aachen as the most suitable illustration of a point he wished to make about the development of the attitude towards monuments. As his chosen title would indicate, Belting was interested in recounting the events primarily to underscore the problems of undertaking an "historically accurate" restoration, and thus, in his discussion, he honed in on the strife associated with the restoration in terms of the protests of scholars. In doing

this, he was able to highlight the idea of restoration and conservation from primarily a scholarly viewpoint. See below, note 112.

Belting's general take on Aachen - as a type as well as a masterpiece - gave a particular slant to his discussion. In Section I, Belting codified his subject using the types defined by Nipperdey, and cited Aachen as a "secondary monument" - in other words an historic structure that came to be seen as a monument. In Section II, Belting introduced Aachen as a monument and a building. He maintained that Aachen "bereits eine tausendjährige Vorgeschichte als Denkmal besass, bevor seine Geschichte als Denkmal in unserem Sinne überhaupt erst begann." (p. 258) Belting's view of historical Aachen (pp. 258-259) can be likened to the scholarly image of Aachen discussed below in Chapter 2.

For a general recounting of the restoration of the chapel, see: Faymonville, Der Dom zu Aachen, pp. 399 ff.

⁷Jahrbücher des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande 11 (1847), pp. 151-154; and Kölner Domblatt No. 28 (April 25, 1847). For an exhaustive chronological history of the founding of the association, see: H. Lepper, "'Rettet das, Deutsche Volksheiligthum.'" Die Gründung des Karlsverein zur Restauration des Aachener Münsters, 1847-1850," Karlsverein zur Wiederherstellung des Aachener Domes, 1986-1987. Jungbluth's interest in the chapel may be partially explained through his professional ties to it, as he followed his father in the office of "Stiftssyndikus und Justizkommisar" for the chapter.

⁸For a general discussion of the damages of the French, see: Faymonville, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Aachen, pp. 67-68. E. Stephany published a contemporary account which stated that the columnar screen was taken, the grave of Charlemagne in the center of the octagon was broken into and ransacked, a brass candelabra with a portrait of Charlemagne was taken, the lead roof was used to make bullets, and a brass column was taken. See: "Unbekannte Bilder des Inneren des Aachener Domes," in Vom Bauen, Bilden und Bewahren. Festschrift Willy Weyres, eds. J. Hoster and A. Mann, Cologne, 1964, p. 163. Franz Bock reported that the famous wolf and pinecone were also taken. See: Franz Bock, Das Liebfrauen-Münster zu Aachen in seiner ehemaligen baulichen Entstellung und in seiner theilweise vollzogenen Wiederherstellung, Aachen, 1866, p. 8.

⁹Faymonville, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Aachen, p. 68. Faymonville said that the columns were taken along with two from St. Gereon in Cologne, and that two porphyry columns were broken en route in Liège.

¹⁰It seems that a number of the columns had been incorporated into installations in the Louvre, in the "Salle de la paix" and in the "Salle des empereurs romains." One half of a broken column was kept in the courtyard. See: C. Rhoen, "Die Kapelle der karolingische Pfalz zu Aachen," Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsvereins 8 (1886), p. 66.

¹¹The French had apparently used the chapel as a cathedral as well. See: Bericht des Vorstandes des Karlsvereins zur Restauration des Aachener Münsters unter dem Allerhöchsten Protectorate Seiner Majestät des Kaisers und Königs, Aachen, 1914, p. 16. It appears that this did not count in the eyes of the Germans, who then reestablished Aachen as a cathedral themselves in 1821.

¹²For a recounting of the events, see: Franz Jungbluth, Die Restauration des Aachener Münsters bis zur Hälfte des Jahres 1862, Aachen, 1862, pp. 6 ff.

¹³It is unclear from Jungbluth exactly what evidence was used for the restoration, but then again, this is not surprising. Franz Mertens discussed the evidence of Noppius' seventeenth-century description of the chapel and F. Jansen's 1833 drawing of the chapel as it looked in 1794 in: "Ueber die karolingische Kaiser-Kapelle zu Aachen," Försters Allgemeine Bauzeitung 5 (1840), pp. 135-152. See also: H. Bogner, Das Arkadenmotiv im Obergeschoss des Aachener Münsters und seine Vorgänger, Strassbourg, 1906, pp. 12 ff. Bogner's work basically plagiarized Mertens.

¹⁴There were more than thirty-two columns taken from Aachen. It is unclear what the rest had been used for, and apparently the restorers were unsure as well. See: Mertens, p. 143.

¹⁵See Mertens' analysis, p. 145. The arguments centered around old depictions of the interior, and Mertens thought that there was only one arch in the architrave, based on Jansen's sketch. That the depictions of the interior are inconsistent was noted by Stephany.

¹⁶It is unclear how they came up with this scheme. It appears plausible that the column restoration was influenced at least in part by some of the "copies" of Aachen, in particular the churches at Essen and Cologne. See below, Chapter Five, pp. 200-201.

¹⁷Mertens compiled information and produced a table on all of the columns. He said that the Louvre keep four "red oriental granite" columns, twelve of gray polished granite

and half of a marble column. Aachen had the other half, as well as eleven gray polished granite columns, ten "ordinary" marble ones, fourteen of rough granite, two of green granite and two of white-gray granite. Mertens classified the columns according to where he felt they were supposed to go based on a reading of Noppius. See: Mertens, p. 143.

J. Nöggerath said the two green columns were porphyry and further classified the marble ones by type in his analysis of the columns in: "Die antiken Säulen im Münster zu Aachen," Niederrheinisches Jahrbuch für Geschichte, Kunst und Poesie von L. Lersch, Bonn, 1843 pp. 193-208.

¹⁸See Rhoen, p. 72; and Nöggerath, p. 200.

¹⁹See Faymonville, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Aachen, pp. 77-79; Rhoen, p. 66; and Nöggerath, p. 200.

²⁰For measurements, see: Mertens, p. 143; and Nöggerath, pp. 194 ff.

²¹W. Schöne, "Die kunstlerische und liturgische Gestalt der Pfalzkapelle Karls des Grossen in Aachen," Zeitschrift für Kunstwissenschaft 15 (1961), p. 100.

²²Jungbluth intimated this in the reckoning of the bills. See: Jungbluth, p. 11.

²³It is not clear how the restorers came up with the specific arrangement, though it seems evident that they decided to spread the originals around on the axes.

²⁴Jungbluth, pp. 10-11.

²⁵Faymonville, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Aachen, p. 78.

²⁶Rhoen classified the capitals as Greek Corinthian; completed Roman Corinthian; and incomplete Roman Corinthian. See: Rhoen, p. 71.

²⁷Faymonville, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Aachen, p. 79.

²⁸Jungbluth, p. 7.

²⁹Jungbluth, pp. 7-8.

³⁰The term used consistently in this literature is vaterländisch, the connotations of which are somewhat hard to convey in English.

³¹Published in: Kölner Domblatt No. 32 (August 29, 1847). A portion of the text was reprinted by: Jungbluth, pp. 13-14.

³²For the idea of nostalgia - a rather modern affliction - see: Starobinski; and Lowenthal, especially pp. 4 ff. Lowenthal underscored how upheaval can lead to a sense of nostalgia for what had been before, citing specifically the Napoleonic Age. He discussed as well the modern attraction to the remains of the past, and the desire to retrieve the past.

³³For a compelling article on German identification with the Middle Ages until after World War II, see: G. Siebt, "Eine Epoche ohne Humanismus? Nähe und Ferne des Mittelalters im Spiegel von Mode und Wissenschaft," Merkur 12 (December 1988), pp. 1062-1067.

³⁴See: Kölner Domblatt No. 28 (April 25, 1847). See reprint from the Preussische Allgemeine Zeitung in: Kölner Domblatt No. 34 (October 31, 1847).

³⁵Kölner Domblatt No. 28 (April 25, 1847).

³⁶Kölner Domblatt No. 32 (August 29, 1847). Belting noted the relationship to the work in Cologne, stating that Aachen "stand im Schatten des Kölner Doms." He differentiated the two, seeing Cologne as a religious project and Aachen as manifesting a "kaiserlich-grossdeutsch Konzept." See: Belting, p. 265.

³⁷For a history of the restoration movement in Cologne as a nationalistic movement, see the very insightful articles of Nipperdey: "Der Kölner Dom als Nationaldenkmal," Historische Zeitschrift 233 (1981), pp. 595-613; "Kirchen und Nationaldenkmal. Der Kölner Dom in den 40er Jahren," in Stadt und Gessellschaft im politischen Wandel. Beiträge zur Geschichte der modernen Welt, ed. W. Pöls, Stuttgart, 1979, pp. 175-202; and "Kirchen als Nationaldenkmal. Die Pläne von 1815," in Festschrift für Otto von Simson zum 65. Geburtstag, ed. L. Grisebach and K. Renger, Frankfurt, 1977, pp. 412-431.

³⁸See: Belting, p. 265; and Nipperdey, "Der Kölner Dom als Nationaldenkmal."

³⁹The subject of nineteenth-century German nationalism has been a rather touchy one in scholarship, as works on the subject have tended to look back with ominous hindsight from a World War II and post-World Wars perspective and then chart the "inevitable" course towards National Socialism. More realistically, nationalism was a general European and Western phenomenon in the nineteenth century, having its own expression in different places. Certainly, Jungbluth and the members of the Karlsverein were not proto-Nazis. The pioneering work of H. Kohn is invaluable, though, no doubt influenced by his upbringing in Hapsburgian Prague, he presented a very negative picture of Germany. See his: The Age of Nationalism, New York, 1968; The Mind of Germany, New York, 1960; and The Idea of Nationalism, New York, 1961. For another voice of doom, see: L. Snyder, The Roots of German Nationalism, Bloomington, 1978. For a recent and balanced perspective, see: D. K. Buse, German Nationalism, New York, 1985; and Richard J. Evans, Rethinking German History: Nineteenth-Century Germany and the Origins of the Third Reich, Boston, 1987.

⁴⁰See: Snyder, Chapter 2, "Cultural Nationalism: The Grimm Brothers' Fairy Tales," pp. 35-54; and G.P. Gooch, History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century, 2nd ed., Chapter. 4, "Eichhorn, Savigny and Jacob Grimm," Boston, 1959, pp. 39-59.

⁴¹See: Gooch, Chap. 5, "The Monumenta," pp. 60-71; and Dom David Knowles, Great Historical Enterprises. Problems in Monastic History, "The Monumenta Germaniae Historica," New York, 1963, pp. 63-97. Extremely enlightening is the historical pamphlet available at the MGH in Munich: H. Grundmann, Monumenta Germaniae Historica. 1819-1960, Munich, 1969.

⁴²See: M. Eickenroht, "The Kaffee-Kirche at Fredricksburg, Texas, 1846," Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 25 (1966), pp. 60-63.

⁴³Lepper, p. 122.

⁴⁴Jungbluth, pp. 14-15. For a reprint of the "Statutes," see: Lepper, pp. 176-179.

⁴⁵Jungbluth, p. 20-21.

⁴⁶For the plans and work on the choir, see: Jungbluth, p. 17-34; and also Faymonville, Der Dom zu Aachen, pp. 404-405.

⁴⁷The windows of the Karlsverein no longer exist; those in the choir today date to after World War II.

⁴⁸For the Annakapelle, see: Jungbluth, pp. 35-36; and for the chapels see: Jungbluth, pp. 37-38. See as well: Faymonville, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Aachen, p 69; and Faymonville, Der Dom zu Aachen, pp. 409 ff.

⁴⁹M. Debey, Die Münsterkirche zu Aachen und ihre Wiederherstellung, Aachen, 1851.

⁵⁰Debey, pp. 42 ff.

⁵¹See: Kölner Domblatt No 72 (February 2, 1851), where the book was praised. For a more sober, yet positive review, see: Jahrbücher des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande 16 (1851), pp. 136-139.

⁵²Kölner Domblatt No. 79 (August 31, 1851).

⁵³Kölner Domblatt No. 79 (August 31, 1851).

⁵⁴Kölner Domblatt No. 79 (August 31, 1851).

⁵⁵Kölner Domblatt, No. 80 (October 5, 1851).

⁵⁶The number of publications is enormous. See bibliography in: Faymonville, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Aachen, pp. 18-23.

⁵⁷Bock, Das Liebfrauen-Münster zu Aachen. This is but one of Bock's many publications against the restoration. It should be pointed out that Bock seems to have been, basically, a medieval art buff, and presented himself consistently as a rather obnoxious know-it-all.

⁵⁸Bock, p. 4.

⁵⁹Debey, p. 2.

⁶⁰Debey, pp. 3-4.

⁶¹See below, Chapter Two.

⁶²Aware of its detractors, the Karlsverein used local newspapers for discussion about the progress of work and replies to criticism. One of the more interesting defenses was that of Aachen chapter member W. Prisac, who defended

not only the work at Aachen, but the Catholic church as well. See: "Das radikale Kunstenthusiasmus in der neuern kunstgeschichtlichen Kritik und die Forderungen des Lebens," Echo der Gegenwart, 13 March 1866, No. 72; 14 March 1866, No. 73; 15 March 1866, No. 74.

⁶³Again, see Belting for the scholarly viewpoint.

⁶⁴Jungbluth, p. 3.

⁶⁵Jungbluth, pp. 52-54.

⁶⁶Jungbluth, pp. 50-52.

⁶⁷Jungbluth, p. 38.

⁶⁸Correspondenzblatt des Gesamt-Vereins der deutschen Geschichts- und Alterthums-Verein 20, No. 12 (December 1872), p. 100.

⁶⁹For before and after photo documentation, see: J. Strzygowski, Der Dom zu Aachen und seine Entstellung. Ein Protest, Leipzig, 1904, pp. 66-67.

⁷⁰See Faymonville, Dom zu Aachen, pp. 421-424; and Strzygowski, pp. 62-71.

⁷¹S. Beissel, "Die Pfalzkapelle Karls des zu Aachen und ihre Mosaiken," Stimmen aus Maria Laach 60 (1901), pp. 284-297; and Jungbluth, pp. 11-12.

⁷²These works were consistently discussed as the sources. See: J. Noppius, Aachener Chronick, Cologne, 1632; P. Beeck, Aquisgranum, 1620; Ioannis Ciampini, Vetera monumenta, vol. 2, Rome, 1699.

⁷³Jungbluth, pp. 39-40; and Beissel.

⁷⁴Jungbluth, p. 39.

⁷⁵Beissel provided an account of the bizarre reasoning based on medieval sources: a chronicle from Liège reported that Otto III had an Italian named Johannes paint some part of the interior of Aachen; since Johannes was a painter, the mosaic had to be Carolingian.

⁷⁶Beissel related how Dohme doubted Ciampini, yet he was seen as the main source, probably because his was the

only pictorial evidence. As for the general assumption that Aachen was related to San Vitale, see Chapter Two below.

⁷⁷Jungbluth, p. 42.

⁷⁸Jungbluth, p. 43.

⁷⁹Jungbluth, pp. 45-46.

⁸⁰Jungbluth, pp. 45-48.

⁸¹See Beissel.

⁸²Jungbluth died in 1872, and was succeeded as President of the Karlsverein by Matthias Claessen, who held the position until 1892. See: Lepper.

⁸³See Beissel and Faymonville, Dom zu Aachen, pp. 416-418.

⁸⁴There was some controversy over whether Christ would have been represented as a lamb, due to Iconoclasm. Ciampini's work depicted a man. This question remains debated in scholarship. See particularly: H. Schnitzler, "Das Kuppelmosaik der Aachener Pfalzkapelle," Aachener Kunstblätter 29 (1964), pp. 17-44; and H. Schrade, "Zum Kuppelmosaik der Pfalzkapelle und zum Theoderich-Denkmal in Aachen," Aachener Kunstblätter 30 (1965), pp.25-37.

⁸⁵Archiv für kirchliche Baukunst und Kirchenschmuck 5, No. 7 (1881), p. 55.

⁸⁶It was assumed that the throne dated to Charlemagne's time. However, through dendochronological study, it has been suggested that it may date to the tenth century. See: C. Heitz, L'architecture religieuse carolingienne. Les formes et leurs fonctions, Paris, 1980, p. 74 and note 41, p. 240. Heitz wanted to see the throne as Carolingian anyway, stating that the wood could have simply been replaced later. The desire to see the throne as Carolingian, however, is inextricably tied to the image of Charlemagne as Emperor and the notion of the westwork as an imperial throne space. For the westwork, see Chapter Five, pp. 202-203.

⁸⁷Karlsverein zur Restauration des Aachener Münsters (unter dem Allerhöchsten Protectorate Seiner Majestät des Kaisers und Königs), Aachen, 1893, pp. 5-9. A committee was formed to accept proposals for work on the throne, and

discussions about the placement of the wolf and pinecone caused some difficulties. There was talk of a cloister garden in which the wolf and pinecone could be displayed, the latter as a fountain. Some felt that the fountain should be in front of the church - since "everywhere, fountains have been the customary decoration in the forecourts of churches as symbols of Eternity and Purity" - while others felt it should be near the door.

⁸⁸It appears that enthusiasm for further work grew in the late nineteenth century. In any case, the Karlsverein began to have a higher profile. Beginning in the 1890's, the reports became an annual occurrence. Yearly reports continued into the teens, and then appeared sporadically up to the present. Some of the renewed enthusiasm for the project may be perhaps due to shifts in leadership in the Karlsverein. Claessen was President until his death in 1892, at which time D. Carl Dubusc took over the office (1893-1903). Following Dubusc were Adolf Wüllner (1903-1908) and Ludwig Schmitz (1909-1917).

⁸⁹Karlsverein zur Restauration des Aachener Münsters, 1893, p. 5.

⁹⁰The support of the monarchy was mentioned in the reports of the Karlsverein in the early 1890s. See: Karlsverein zur Restauration des Aachener Münsters, 1893, p. 5; Bericht des Vorstandes des Karlsvereins zur Restauration des Aachener Münsters unter dem Allerhöchsten Protectorate Seiner Majestät des Kaisers und Königs, Aachen, 1894, p. 5. The continued role of the king is evident in later reports.

⁹¹The later reports of the Karlsverein were rife with a nationalistic-religious rhetoric reminiscent of the early days. At times the actual words of the early Karlsverein would be quoted, no doubt to underscore that work on Aachen was continuing in the original vein. For example, in 1894, during the height of the discussions about the tambour decoration, the annual report closed with a quote from the 1872 Jubilee speech which characterized the Karlsverein as following the mandate of the chapter. See: Bericht, 1894, p. 15. As well, at the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Karlsverein, the President closed his speech by quoting from the speech for the twenty-fifth Jubilee. See: Bericht, 1897, p. 26.

⁹²Strzygowski, pp. 80-89.

⁹³Bericht, Aachen, 1897, p. 12. Four proposals were considered, those of Geiges in Freiburg, Schapen in Hannover, Schneider in Kassel, and Lennemann in Frankfurt.

⁹⁴Bericht, Aachen, 1897, pp. 13-14. The plans were tied up in Berlin for a long time, awaiting approval, as the king had only agreed to pay for less extravagant stucco decoration. See: Bericht, Aachen, 1894, pp. 12-13. In 1896, the king apparently decided to help finance the plan. See: Bericht, Aachen, 1896, p. 10.

⁹⁵Discussions about the projected mosaics were complex and centered mainly on subject matter and style. Schaper's original design called for depictions of "German" kings and Emperors. This idea was eventually rejected and alternatives were discussed by a committee of scholars. For the process, see: Bericht, Aachen, 1896, pp. 10-14; and Bericht, Aachen, 1897, pp. 13-14.

⁹⁶Schaper was not alone in his assessment. In 1881 it was suggested that "the most suitable" decoration would be marble revetment, "such as was common in the most magnificent Roman buildings." See: A. Reichensperger, "Die Ausschmückung der Palast-kapelle Karl's des in Aachen betreffend," Archiv für kirchliche Baukunst und Kirchenschmuck 5, No. 3 (1881), p. 18-19.

⁹⁷Pius IX donated the marble especially for Aachen, and, apparently, Leo XIII was equally enthusiastic about the project. See: Bericht, Aachen, 1897, pp. 8-9. See as well: Reichensperger, p. 18.

⁹⁸Archiv für kirchliche Baukunst und Kirchenschmuck 7, No. 6 (1883), p. 47.

⁹⁹Bericht, 1904, pp. 17-27.

¹⁰⁰Bericht, 1909, pp. 4 and 6. The ambulatory and upper ambulatory walls were mosaiked, primarily with aniconic decoration.

¹⁰¹See Faymonville bibliography, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Aachen, pp. 19-20. Stryzowski's protest was especially virulent. See: Stryzowski, pp. 89-92. See also the reaction to protests: Bericht, 1904, pp. 8-16.

¹⁰²Buchkremer was an architect and Dozent at the Technische Hochschule in Aachen, and he eventually became Dombaumeister of the cathedral. From at least 1915, he

wrote the reports of the Karlsverein. For a discussion of Buchkremer as Dombaumeister, see: I. Schild, "Die Baumeister am Aachener Dom," Karlsverein zur Wiederherstellung des Aachener Domes. Bericht, (August 1983).

103J. Buchkremer, "Zur Baugeschichte des Aachener Münsters," Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsvereins 22 (1900), pp. 198-199.

104Buchkremer, "Zur Baugeschichte des Aachener Münsters," pp. 200 ff.; Bericht, 1900, p. 7; and Karlsverein zur Wiederherstellung des Aachener Münsters, 1901, p. 5. See also: Stephany, pp. 149-153.

105Faymonville analyzed the painting and said that the marks were probably just masonry joints or markings. See his: Zur Kritik der Restauration des Aachener Münsters. Beschreibende Darstellung der ältesten Abbildungen seines Innern, Aachen, 1904. Protest against the revetment plans was strong, and especially harsh in the case of Strzygowski. See: Faymonville bibliography, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Aachen, pp. 20-21.

106The issue of the atrium had been on the agenda since 1885. Buchkremer excavated the site and proposed "an exact restoration in keeping with the style" with the original. See: Bericht, 1898, p. 8 and "Anlage," "Atrium am Karolinger-Münster zu Aachen."

107Discussions dragged on about the placement and setting of the throne in the upper ambulatory to the west. Using Widikund as a source - he was present for Otto I's coronation - it was thought that it was originally between two columns. They tore up the floor, but found no supporting evidence, and so began to question Widikund's viewpoint within the chapel. They also were cleaning the throne and excising additions and replacing missing pieces. Unfortunately, they were unable to find porphyry for the columns. Buchkremer was given the task of the preliminary work for the restoration of the four columns in the arch of the Kaiserloge behind the throne. See: Bericht, 1899, pp. 7-8. The columns and capitals were erected under his direction in 1900. See: Bericht, 1900, pp. 11-12.

108Bericht, 1914, p. 5.

109Bericht, 1914, p. 9.

110Bericht, 1914, p. 8.

¹¹¹Bericht, 1914, p. 29.

¹¹²As the title of his article indicates, Belting was concerned with the nineteenth-century restoration of Aachen as an example to illustrate the questions and methods of conservation-restoration history. He opened by stating: "An der Geschichte des Aachener Münsters im 19. Jahrhundert lassen sich Entstehung und Krise eines Denkmal-Konzepts ablesen." (p. 257) In his final section, Belting brought the example of Aachen back to his subject of restoration/conservation, stating that: "Der Fall Aachen endet mit einer Krise, die von der wissenschaftlichen Begründung der Denkmalpraxis heraufbeschworen war. Die Krise wirkte sich in Aachen nur mehr in der Kritik an den Resultaten und einer Abkehr von dem darin angewandten Konzept aus. Sie hatte paradoxerweise mit der Auflösung der wirklichen historischen Tradition als Kult des Historischen begonnen." (p. 284) Using the example of Aachen as a jumping-off point, Belting discussed the changing view of the care of buildings - "monuments" - and the present attitude, which he championed as more historically correct. He closed by stating: "Die Denkmalpflege sieht, wie der Fall Aachen bewiest, auf eine geradezu stürmische Tradition zurück. Ihr Umgang mit dem historischen Baudenkmal war schon von Anfang an voller Widersprüche und zudem von Konflikten mit der Öffentlichkeit und deren historischen Interessen belastet. Die Geschichte des Aachener Münsters im 19. Jahrhundert ist eine Problemgeschichte des frühen Konzepts vom historischen Baudenkmal." (pp. 285-286) Belting plugged Aachen into his thesis as the prime example to show that this would not happen today. For a brief discussion of problematic aspects of the restoration and care of Aachen in the twentieth century, see: Schild.

¹¹³For the modern idea of preserving the past, see especially: Lowenthal, pp. 384 ff.

Chapter Two
Putting the Past in Order:
The Scholarly Image of Aachen
and Its Place in the History of Architecture

While a popular image of Aachen, dictated by a contemporary vision of the past, was given concrete form through the restoration of the chapel in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, a related image of Aachen came to be codified and objectified within the framework of the discipline of art history. The first inklings of scholarly interest coincided, in fact, with the more popular interest in the chapel. Certainly scholarly attention to Aachen - and for that matter to Medieval art in general - was tied to the national-historical consciousness current in the nineteenth century. Art historians in Prussia, while involved not only in the study of the Middle Ages, betrayed an inordinate interest in that age and its monuments as a time which mirrored the glories of their forefathers, and Aachen held a special place in scholarship.

The sheer amount of scholarly literature on Aachen produced since the beginning of the nineteenth century is staggering, and in its abundance it is indicative of the importance accorded the chapel.¹ This literature is primarily - though not surprisingly - the work of German-speaking scholars, first Prussian subjects and later, German citizens. Importantly, the outlooks, goals and methodology of early scholarship set the pace for art history; even to

the present, the image and issues of Aachen in scholarship have remained peculiarly constant.

The outlooks and interests of early art historical inquiry dictated the backdrop against which Aachen would be seen. Studies on the chapel itself concentrated on its original Carolingian form and perceived politico-religious function.² Yet discussions of Aachen were found mainly within the context of the broad art historical survey. These ambitious works of the first half of the nineteenth century appear as the major scholarly vehicle of the day, and their influence and impact - many were reprinted even well into the twentieth century - cannot be underestimated.

These works varied in their scope, a number dedicated to specifically "German" art and/or architecture, some to Christian monuments, some to works of the Middle Ages, and some to the entire history of art and/or architecture. Certainly each author brought to his subject his own personal outlook, yet the works as a whole shared common goals and a common general approach, and Aachen's treatment within this nineteenth-century scholarly genre affords a view of the reconstructed chapel and the perception of its value and role on a larger scale.

The survey cast a net wide over all or a chunk of historical time to gather up monuments with the intention of laying them out chronologically in order to discern and discuss the development of art. Thus history was perceived

as a continuum, this linear development or evolution punctuated by coherent periods, defined usually by the power markers of conquests and nationally-oriented dynasties. Such a model of history - preoccupied as it was with the figure of the ruler and the exercise of power - certainly was adopted from and was meant as a corollary to the Prussian historical scholarship of the time;³ in fact, the art historian Franz Kugler stated that it was "the general historical science, in whose service we strive to conquer this [art historical] realm."⁴

History was seen as a landscape of great and powerful men, and art history the landscape of their creations. It was a given that the greatest men necessarily created the greatest and most influential works, and that all production of a given period could be seen with reference to these highpoints of achievement. Just as key men exerted power, so their creations exerted influence. Thus, as historical periods were conceived in terms of a cohesion of power and the exertion of that power, the corresponding art historical periods were as well given a coherence based on the "objective" elements of form and style and a network of dependencies. Successive periods were linked, ensuring the developmental flow: it was assumed that the designated highpoints of a given period would be adopted yet transformed in the perceived great monuments of the succeeding period.

The survey format was certainly the ideal vehicle for the dissemination of this view of the history of art. The sheer number of surveys published between approximately 1840 and 1860 indicated, firstly, the popularity of the genre, and secondly, that these books were intended to fill a perceived need. Articulating the reasons for his choice of the survey, Franz Kugler⁵ presented his Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte, first published in 1842, as "an overview of the artworks of the past centuries, from the first attempts in the realm of art to the state in the present day," citing that "the goal of all historical research and account [is] to detect the course of development . . ."⁶ In his introduction, the author expressed a wonderful enthusiasm for the new discipline of art history and a sort of pioneering spirit towards his chosen task, saying:

" . . . our science is still in its infancy; it is a realm whose conquest we are just beginning to work at, whose valleys and forests we are just beginning to clear, whose desolate arid tracts we still must reclaim . . . We still have a lot - quite a lot - to do in our science, as already there is such a great number of details available and these, as much as is possible, must be put in order."⁷

Kugler thus saw art as a developmental process governed by discernable laws and rules that gave it an apparent and proper order, and that the task of art historians was to ascertain that order from the works. His chosen metaphors for describing art history - as in the young stages of a life-like process, as a realm to be conquered, as a chaotic

wilderness to be cleared by a process of civilization - unconsciously expressed the tenets of the developmental approach he, and his contemporaries, grafted onto the subject. In approaching his work, Kugler championed the survey format, articulating his viewpoint through a life-process metaphor:

" . . . there is, for us [art historians], an essential requirement: if we look at only the individual, we might easily meet with the danger of dulling our sense for the far and wide which the whole embraces. We must not forget that the specific only has its foremost meaning as a part of the whole. So we must keep the near and far before our eyes in equal measure if we want to successfully move forward, as blood must flow into the heart and out of the heart, if life should develop beneficially."⁸

Indeed, many authors, like Kugler, expressed the view that they were filling a void in scholarly literature. Wilhelm Lübke⁹ noted in his introduction that although architecture is the oldest and most accessible of the fine arts, little scholarly attention had been paid to it in comparison with painting and sculpture. He stated that "above all, one must look at architecture in connection with the general development of humanity, to provide proof how, in their works, the spiritual directions of peoples, of their centuries, express themselves," and that he attempted "only to offer an exhibition of the various building systems."¹⁰

Many, in attempting to fill the scholarly lacunae, strove as well to educate the public - a public, as has been

seen, that was interested particularly in the monuments of the "German" past. Ernst Förster, in his massive twelve volume work on "German"¹¹ works from the introduction of Christianity to the present, opened by stating that "looking back on the past invigorates a nation . . . The past of a nation lives vividly in its artistic monuments . . .," and said that presently no survey of "German" monuments was available.¹² He lamented that so many monuments remained unknown, or at least unrecognized, but maintained "that with a basic knowledge of the same, a love, even an enthusiasm for them can be awakened."¹³ Förster had had to pick and choose which monuments to include in his nationalistically-oriented study, and his criteria were works that had "historical/art historical meaning", were "characteristic" and beautiful; he added that "what is not of monumental character, does not belong here."¹⁴

Gottfried Kinkel noted that, while there were books on Greek and Roman art, little was written on works of later periods "in their historical context;"¹⁵ those that were available either had too many plates, and were therefore too expensive, or had no plates, and were too hard for the average person to understand. He stated that "still the endeavor shows itself everywhere in the German people to be acquainted again accurately with the artistic creations of their great distant past; one may even say that a clear knowledge of modern art history already belongs to the

imperative requirements of general education."¹⁶ In thus aiming to fulfill the needs of the greater reading public, Kinkel stated that his work was "for anyone, even if he brings to the book no specialized knowledge, and as well in particular [the book is intended] to be comprehensible to educated women."¹⁷

The assumptions, preoccupations and implications of this scholarly genre created an atmosphere in which Aachen prospered. Within this arena, the perception of Aachen as a "national monument" would have a corollary in the scholarly image of Aachen as the normative Carolingian - yet still "German" - monument, the highpoint of its age. The chapel was thus a linchpin, an essential link in the chain of developmental history.¹⁸ The elevation of Aachen to this exalted pedestal was inextricably tied to the perception of its patron and Aachen's meaning, by association, as an imperial, even "German" monument.

First and foremost, Aachen was seen as Carolingian Aachen, the great Emperor Charlemagne's magnificent palatine chapel of ca. 800. This image of Charlemagne and Aachen, imbued with contemporary nationalistic and imperial enthusiasm and an attending politico-religious gloss, was coupled with the chapel's preservation - a somewhat rare circumstance for a Carolingian building; Aachen was thus assured top billing. Kugler heralded the rule of Charlemagne as "the heyday of architecture in the Frankish

kingdom."¹⁹ He characterized the palace at Aachen as Charlemagne's favored residence, and the chapel as "the most superb example of Early Christian architecture on this side of the Alps"²⁰ (thus locating Kugler firmly in Northern Europe).

Carl Schnaase, in his Geschichte der bildenen Künste im Mittelalter, first published in 1843, attempted to mirror post-Classical "culture" as a whole.²¹ Within this scheme, Carolingian art was characterized as "the beginnings of Christian-Germanic art," and Schnaase introduced the Carolingian Age by saying:

"there are certain places in history where we are clearly more aware than with others of the dominant hand of Providence. Such a place is the meeting of Christianity and the Germanic people; here there appears a recognizable preordination of what this religion and this nationality did for each other - only through evangelization could this people attain their higher development, and only through this people could Christianity merge fully with the people in free form."²²

Quoting liberally from Tacitus, Schnaase drew a picture of the invading Germanic tribes akin to that of the noble savage. Although the Goths were the first to embrace culture, as Arians their potential for significance was thwarted; it was in the Franks, as the first people to adopt "Catholicism," that Schnaase could see "the German spirit more purely."²³ Charlemagne was the greatest of the Franks, the architect of the mighty Empire, and in him Schnaase saw an authoritative Christian and German figure.

Schnaase took care to note that while Charlemagne looked to Rome, he was truly Germanic: he collected German folksongs, gave the months German names, and wore Frankish clothing. Charlemagne's greatness lay in his desire to fuse "both elements, Roman culture and German power."²⁴ The Franks were thus ascribed a sort of romanticized split personality:

"[Charlemagne's] Franks would have acquired Roman learning and a civilized mode of behavior, but they would not stop being German. . . They wanted to be only Christian, only Roman, yet the German nature always came out . . . They thought, they felt German, certainly also like raw, sensual, wild Germans, but these feelings were accompanied by a consciousness of their barbarian origins."²⁵

Schnaase maintained that architecture at this time looked to imperial monuments of Classical Antiquity, and although most Carolingian works were gone, Aachen remained, "and, in fact, one can see it as the highest architectural achievement of the time, completely sufficient to gauge the direction and capacity of knowledge."²⁶

In introducing their overview of Christian architecture in the West, G.G. Kallenbach and J. Schmitt stated that:

"although the Christian church moved through centuries and centuries, races and nations - to a newborn, invigorating, educating, illuminating and warming current, always with the same lasting strength - even so the success of its effectiveness . . . depended on the type and degree to which peoples were qualified for the Christian influence."²⁷

The Barbarians, apparently deemed worthy, were christianized, and "the development of the Middle Ages

climbed in an unbroken succession of steps forward to its highpoint . . . in the direction of the course of time the architecture of the entire West shared a common physiognomy, in the direction of nationalities, however, each special corresponding nationality."²⁸ Opening with "Old Christian Art," the authors introduced the central plan, citing Constantinian and Byzantine examples, and noted that there were few domed buildings in the West before 1000. However, they maintained, "the court church of Charlemagne at Aachen, later consecrated as the present cathedral, is the most splendid monument of this form (genus) preserved for us."²⁹

Lübke characterized the invading tribes as having no indigenous architecture, which necessitated their turning to the remains around them. With condescending wonder, he said:

"we will have to pursue these developmental processes later, so we can speak here in the meantime only of the stuttering attempts to speak in a foreign artistic language. We find little curious, new, but nevertheless the energy, the active enthusiasm with which the childlike underdeveloped peoples sacrificed themselves to an overpowering form through their splendor and greatness and the willing courage with which they ventured their first step on the way to higher culture - something gripping."³⁰

After a discussion of Theodoric and Merovingian architecture, Lübke introduced Charlemagne, who, he said, raised the Frankish kingdom to "the central point of all cultural life of the Germanic people."³¹ Aachen was "one of the most important witnesses for the development of art at

this time. What it would mean, to stage such a splendid building in an almost cultureless land, one can take from the institutions and preparations that Charlemagne met to this end."³²

Ernst aus'm Weerth presented his work as an overview of architecture, sculpture and painting of the "extant medieval monuments in the Prussian Rhineland," presented geographically.³³ The Carolingian Age was described as a "cultural epoch," and Aachen characterized as "the unshakeable pillar of the Germanic tribe's development, from which [Charlemagne] founded, through the power of his victorious weapons and the spirit and strength of ruler's genius, that great Reich . . . it is the showplace of his mission of world history."³⁴ Aus'm Weerth described the chapel as "the pearl of Charlemagne's artistic creations . . . that magnificent centrally-planned building in which the German Emperors of later centuries received the crown. . ."³⁵

The eulogization of Charlemagne - as a great Christian and "German" king - and the Franks - as proto-Germans and the fitting receptacles for Christianity - expressed by these authors clearly conveyed their identification with their perceived forefathers, and mirrored the image of Charlemagne expressed by the chapel's restorers. This image of Charlemagne certainly influenced their perception of his chapel at Aachen: Aachen's primary import could only be its

meaning as Charlemagne's palatine chapel, as his timeless creation of ca. 800.

Placed within the continuum, as the highpoint of artistic creation of the age, the main questions, couched in "scientific" art historical terms, were perceived to be those of Aachen's original form, its formal sources and its influence on later architecture. Kugler briefly and generally discussed Aachen, a description of the church preceded by the comment that "the plan generally is recognizable as a copy of the church of San Vitale in Ravenna."³⁶ Aachen, discussed in terms of its plan and form, was compared and contrasted with the alleged model.³⁷ Schnaase said that, as a palace church and grave monument, Aachen appropriately was a central domed building. While he compared Aachen to San Vitale, he said that Aachen was simpler, and created a new building from an old type. Furthermore, in terms of form, while the plan came from San Vitale, the columnar screen arrangement came from Hagia Sophia.³⁸ Lübke saw the polygonal form as fitting for a palace chapel, and likened the plan to that of San Vitale,³⁹ while aus'm Weerth cited Aachen's model as San Vitale, saying, however, that "once more the Roman picture was carried out with the Germanic spirit."⁴⁰ According to Kallenbach and Schmitt, Aachen "in its main forms partially follows San Vitale," though it differed in the particular form of the dome.⁴¹

Aachen's perceived connection with San Vitale certainly rested in part on the formal comparison of the two churches. While it is apparent that, in looking for Aachen's origins, formal similitude was the accepted criterion, inherent in the comparison of Aachen and San Vitale - the latter another fortuitous survivor and therefore a handy comparison⁴² - was the unexpressed notion that Charlemagne's model for Aachen necessarily had to be one of the "major" - and "imperial" - works of the past. Importantly, however, Aachen was seen as going beyond its model, as infusing into it some sort of "Germanness" that made Aachen itself an autonomous masterpiece.

Having successfully linked Aachen to a great work of the past and an appropriately regal model, the remaining pressing issue was that of Aachen's impact on subsequent architecture. In these early works, this impact was seen primarily in terms of "copies"⁴³ of the chapel. Such an approach certainly was in keeping with the chosen methodology, and can be seen as corresponding to the way in which the model for Aachen was ascertained. Kugler initiated the topic by introducing some of Charlemagne's other palaces, among them denoting the church at Nijmegen as "a sixteen-sided baptistry, completely from the form of the church at Aachen."⁴⁴ Having introduced a "copy" of Aachen, Kugler then briefly discussed the church at Ottmarsheim, which he called "a second copy."⁴⁵ Schnaase, after

discussing Aachen, moved directly to a brief discussion of Aachen's "copies," enumerating them and discussing them in formal terms.⁴⁶ In their treatment of Aachen, Kallenbach and Schmitt stated "and moreover, [the chapel] served as a model for copies. . . ." and briefly mentioned a few, particularly Ottmarsheim - "throughout similar to Aachen" - and Nijmegen.⁴⁷

In their analysis of Aachen's impact, these authors relied consistently on formal comparisons with later buildings, denoting works that were seen as similar to the Carolingian chapel, and highlighting especially those that in the entirety of their structure were seen as comparable to Aachen. Their discussion of these "copies" was brief, most probably because, with the state of scholarship, the number of known comparative works was relatively small. Importantly, these "copies" were not seen as manifesting a dazzling array of "major" or necessarily "imperial" monuments, and therefore they appeared generally as a subset of the imperial chapel, their value seen in terms of their corroboration of the perceived status of Aachen.

While the above-mentioned literature discussed the role of Aachen within the proposed continuum of more general art historical development, the chapel was treated as well within surveys devoted to the more specific question of the development of building types, specifically of the centrally-planned building. In such works, the issues for

Aachen remained the same and the basic formal and comparative methodology continued to be employed, yet the specificity of the undertakings indicates a desire for a further codification, clarification and systematization of the questions of the form.

Of these works, J. Rudolf Rahn's of 1866 was one of the most exhaustive and oft-cited.⁴⁸ Rahn limited himself to the centrally-planned and domed buildings of the Christian world, and had as his goal to trace the evolutionary development of this form from Constantine through the Middle Ages. He prefaced his main subject, therefore, by stating that "in order to understand the development, it is first necessary to see the relationship of Christian architecture to the achievements of the past."⁴⁹ Rahn's last chapter discussed the building forms of the Christian West, and his primary aim was to ascertain whether these buildings derived from western or Byzantine models. In this discussion, Aachen played the pivotal role. Rahn opened the section with Aachen, stating that:

"of all the rotundas on this side of the Alps, it is the palatine chapel of Charlemagne at Aachen which rightly claims the greatest amount of interest. . . a bridge member, as it were, between the central layout of the Early Christian epoch and the later rotundas of the Middle Ages, it instructs us about which alterations those older ground plans went through and how, gradually, certain essential features, which became decisive for the later development of the round and polygonal building, developed."⁵⁰

One of Rahn's main objectives was to refute the generally accepted stance that Aachen's model was San Vitale.⁵¹ He pointed out that it was commonly held that the basilica form ruled in the West and the central plan in the East, and thus scholars wanted to place Aachen in the Byzantine orbit.⁵² Stating that the central plan "is not an exclusive feature of the Byzantine style," Rahn maintained that if "one wants to stipulate the Ravenna church as the true model, it is necessary to establish proof through a range of characteristic particulars which themselves are imitated at Aachen."⁵³ After a feature-by-feature formal comparison of the two churches, Rahn acknowledged general similarities - the octagonal core, eight supporting piers with round arches, a tambour, a dome and an ambulatory - yet he detected great divergences in the particular forms and concluded that "thus Aachen cannot be a direct imitation of San Vitale."⁵⁴

Rahn then placed Aachen in the western orbit, asserting that the Germanic people owed much to Rome in terms of religion and culture and that the basis for Germanic artistic creations was Roman art and technical capability. Focusing on the comparative analysis of western works, he concluded:

"one only considers how the system of the central plan in Aachen was handled completely freely and independently, how one in this case was intimate with all of the advantages of vaulting and how to make use of them with the result of a thoroughly new and original total framework, and it

establishes furthermore that similar buildings outside of Italy were built already a century earlier; thus one cannot help thinking that the centrally-planned and domed building had had, since the outset, a general and traditional meaning in the West, and that it has the same origin with many other elements and ground forms of western architecture."⁵⁵

Rahn asserted that while even pre-Carolingian art displayed Roman influence, "before all it was the Age of Charlemagne that appears as the true time of the rebirth of Antiquity."⁵⁶ He added that "of course, in order to establish such a tie with certainty, it will be necessary to bring round and polygonal buildings into question."⁵⁷ Rahn began with a brief discussion of Aachen's "copies,"⁵⁸ and moved on to other "round and polygonal buildings outside of these specific copies."⁵⁹ He maintained that the general form of all of these buildings, as "columned rotundas," went back to a common form seen in Santa Costanza in Rome, and that in terms of general function, the western buildings were as well tied to specific Roman forms. In the final analysis, Rahn was able to plant Aachen, and thus later medieval centrally-planned buildings, firmly within a continuous formal and functional development from a Christian Constantinian form. Yet, Rahn noted, beside all of these medieval monuments, "the palatine chapel of Aachen appears in comparison more splendid and rich."⁶⁰

The survey continued to be a popular scholarly vehicle in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These later works, tied to earlier surveys in terms of approach

and goals, convey a sense of developmental progress in themselves, at least in terms of the progress of scholarship. R. Dohme articulated this notion in the introduction to his 1887 survey of German architecture, saying:

"through the compilation of an inventory of monuments the work of architectural history entered, for Germany, a new stage. Until now, the production of a accurate complete survey of all the more important monuments and thorough characteristics of the major creations belonged to the task of the historian; thus may the same now, thanks to the 'inventory makers,' abstain from the exhausting treatment of this more statistical chapter."⁶¹

Dohme expressed a desire for the further codification and objectification of monuments within the history of architecture, and to this end, he wanted to borrow from the terminology of natural scientists, in order to "offer the developmental history of German architecture."⁶² Dohme asserted that, since Schnaase, art historians tended to "season the objective rationality of expert discussions with the input of general excursus of cultural history. . . but the ideas of architectural history in particulars ripen almost exclusively at the building site itself."⁶³

Dohme's introduction underscored contemporary technological advances that were aiding scholars in their research. His discussion of photographic documentation underscores that scholars had been hampered by a lack of access to monuments and had had to rely on drawings. Dohme praised the advances in photography, which he found helped

enormously in the comparison of details, for it was the details that concerned Dohme and his contemporaries:

"First if we [were to] possess, next to general views of the monuments, mathematically exact photos of their details as well, comparative criticism becomes possible in architectural history . . . Only when this takes place, can every uncertainty of the work of architectural history disappear, which today still give rise to so many disputes, which alone arise from inadequate knowledge of the total material."⁶⁴

Certainly the discipline of art history had "grown" out of the state of "infancy" in which Kugler had found it: that which is approached developmentally is, in fact, bound to exhibit signs of growth. Through the efforts of art historians, more monuments were uncovered, and techniques for codifying and analyzing these works became more refined. In the developmental process of art history, Dohme's concerns, like those of his contemporaries, such as F. X. Kraus,⁶⁵ G. Dehio and G. von Bezold,⁶⁶ E. Gradmann,⁶⁷ Heinrich Bergner,⁶⁸ Georg Humann,⁶⁹ and Friedrich Ostendorf,⁷⁰ still centered around the questions posed by their predecessors. In the case of Aachen, these issues remained, of course, the chapel's original form, the formal origins of Aachen, and its influence.

The image of Aachen as a great and pivotal monument, the palatine chapel of the powerful Charlemagne, remained intact, although nationalistic and imperial hyperbole gave way, for the most part, to a more generalized reverence. Aachen's supremacy seemed to be taken for granted, and

therefore was not a point for excessive discussion. The scholarly image of Aachen, in fact, was firmly entrenched, and this being the case, scholars could proceed in their task of further codifying Aachen's place in a history of "Great Monuments."

As well, Aachen's tie to San Vitale appeared, at least partially, as a given. Gradmann stated, for example, that "the imitation of the church of San Vitale in Ravenna is clear" in Aachen, though Aachen was a simplified version,⁷¹ and Kraus maintained that there was "no doubt that San Vitale in Ravenna influenced" Aachen, though the construction method was "simpler and clearer" in Aachen.⁷² While some, such as Bergner, stated that Aachen no longer was seen as having the single prototype of San Vitale, but more generally followed the "Italian centralized type."⁷³ Dohme echoed this notion as well, saying "with greater probability, we have to look in Ravenna for the preliminary steps for Charlemagne's creation at Aachen."⁷⁴ However, asserting that such a work could not be the creation of a Carolingian builder, Dohme stated that while San Vitale may have provided the general plan, the details differ, and that Aachen was perhaps a conflation of a number of works.⁷⁵

In these later surveys more attention was given to Aachen's influence, seen again in "copies," perhaps because the developments in the field had brought more monuments to light, and thus a greater codification of these monuments

was achieved. Increasingly more buildings came to appear in the corpus of "copies," primarily through the exercise of formal comparison. It is apparent, however, from these discussions that the definition and implications of the word "copy" were not of importance to the scholars. The value of these churches was couched again in terms of their affirmation of the primacy of Aachen as the splendid imperial creation of Charlemagne and their assumed supporting role in the developmental process of architecture.

Bergner, for example, said that "the deep respect for this monument expressed itself in numerous copies until the twelfth century," Nijmegen presenting a "pretty true" copy, Diedenhofen, Liège and Groningen being lost "copies," Mettlach "show[ing] the system in reduction," Essen using "a section" of Aachen in the west choir, and Ottmarsheim "repeat[ing] once again the model exactly," though the exterior was only eight-sided.⁷⁶ Gradmann stated that "until the twelfth century, the palatine chapel at Aachen found copies," partially as palatine chapels, like Ottmarsheim,⁷⁷ and some in nunneries, like Essen, yet some, such as Mettlach, which are compared to Aachen in contemporary texts, were really not formally related to the chapel.⁷⁸ Dohme stated that "in naive homage to the miraculous building, one reproduced it manifold in reduced form in the next centuries."⁷⁹

The development of the centrally-planned building came to be further clarified as well⁸⁰ in such works as that of Heinz Biehn on the history of the central plan in Germany.⁸¹ He separated his material into chapters based on stylistic periods, Chapter One dealing with the pre-Romanesque central plan and Chapter Two with the Romanesque, and within each chapter, he designated strict formal types: the niche type from Würzburg; the polygonal type from Aachen; the rotunda of Fulda; and the cruciform type. Under the "Aachen type," Biehn stated that the chapel's origins were uncertain, but he enumerated its "copies," naming Groningen, Liège, Diedenhofen, Compiègne, Nijmegen, Essen, Wimpfen and Mettlach (saying of the latter that it more rightly goes with the Würzburg type). In Chapter Two, Biehn said that there were not as many Romanesque "copies" of Aachen, specifying only Ottmarsheim, Goslar and Canterbury. Biehn wrapped up the subject of the Aachen "copies" by stating that:

"the followers of the Aachen type strayed little from the model. Aachen was, in its level of form, a developed representative which already had taken ahead certain elements of the coming new expression of the Romanesque. The reshuffling exists only in a ridding of individual elements which are no longer adequate to the Romanesque Will to Form . . ."82

The increasing analytical codification seen in the above works was representative of the developments in Aachen scholarship in the early twentieth century. While the questions remained the same, the focus of studies

telescoped. The search for Aachen's origins was of particular interest to Heinrich Bogner, who wrote prolifically on the chapel. Bogner's mission, seemingly, was to place the general form and the individual forms of Aachen within the art historical continuum. He placed Aachen within the development of the central plan,⁸³ and discussed the models for the church⁸⁴ as well as particular motifs of the building.⁸⁵ Bogner's approach and methodology did not depart from that of previous scholars, yet his consistent tendency to reduce Aachen to its component parts - its plan, apse, vaulting, and columnar screen, for example - and hone in on the origins of these specific structural features demonstrated the further codification of the developmental and formal approach in scholarly literature. Certainly, such a morphological approach was the logical advancement in this methodology.

The increasing clarification of building types and the codification of formal and stylistic development was as well the general tendency of art historical surveys in the early twentieth century. Perhaps the most well-known - and byzantine - expression of this methodological specialization was Edgar Lehmann's Die frühe deutsche Kirchenbau.⁸⁶ Lehmann opened with a discussion of his "theoretical" foundation, through which he was able to reduce his subject matter to ultimately formal properties.⁸⁷ Lehmann's ensuing analysis was most arcane, owing to his convoluted framework,

and the result was the complete structural systematization of his subject. His discussion of the buildings, in particular of Aachen, centered around the familiar questions of the origins and influence of major monuments. Lehmann discussed Aachen in his section on architecture under Charlemagne - his divisions were dictated by rulers and dynastic periods - and assessed the chapel in terms of its formal structure and origins as a central plan. Aachen's "copies" fell under the section on "Centralizing Tendencies and Central Plans under Otto II and Otto III," and Lehmann's brief discussion of select "copies" enumerated and described the basic architectural features of the churches.⁸⁸

While Lehmann's work can be seen as a continuation of the approach of earlier scholarship, his tone, as well as his chosen title, betrayed a certain reverence for the early Middle Ages - especially the Ottonian Age - as a period of imperial power and "German" glory. He stated, for example, that "the emperors and kings of the Saxon house were no longer east Franks, they were German rulers. The age of their rule signified a first heyday of German architecture," and that "the age of Otto II and Otto III is, in spite of its gradual inner decline, a time of enthusiastic exterior brilliance of German power."⁸⁹ Lehmann's work - perhaps as an indication of the time in which he lived - was inordinately concerned with the question of the German past and the affirmation of the supremacy of "German" rulers and

their art. This is certainly apparent in his conclusion, which eulogized things "German."⁹⁰ Lehmann's preoccupation with "German" imperial power in the guise of the Ottonian dynasty⁹¹ - the First Reich - was certainly not unique in the scholarship of 1930's and 1940's in Germany, and Aachen's imperial image as well took a somewhat chilling turn in some of the scholarship written during the National Socialist regime.⁹²

The war brought a number of German scholars to America, and of these, Richard Krautheimer in particular contributed to scholarly discussions on Aachen as well as the "copy" - thus introducing the issues of art historical scholarship on the Early Medieval Age, which had been a staple of German inquiry, to a relatively uninitiated audience. However, while the majority of scholarship attempted to place works within a formal developmental and evolutionary context, Krautheimer, in his pioneering article of 1942 on the medieval architectural "copy"⁹³ concerned himself with the issues of meaning in the medieval model-"copy" relationship and the subject of architectural origins.

In this work, Krautheimer questioned the validity of a purely formal and structural approach to medieval architecture. Noting that medieval descriptions of buildings do not stress the qualities of construction and design, Krautheimer made the observation that "the content of architecture seems to have been among the more important

problems of medieval architectural theory; perhaps indeed it was the most important problem."⁹⁴ Krautheimer suggested that the exploration of "copies" in medieval architecture - buildings that were considered as replications in the Middle Ages, though they do not necessarily adhere to modern criteria for "copies" - was a subject through which we could examine the issue of the content of medieval buildings. In order to ascertain what constituted a "copy" in medieval terms, Krautheimer considered buildings regarded as imitations of the Holy Sepulchre.

His analysis underscored the variety apparent among the "copies" and their model. Krautheimer stressed the "inexactness" of the reproduction, in plan and elevation, of the Holy Sepulchre and its imitations; the "copies" resembled their prototype only in a general way. He concluded that medieval architectural "copies" are characterized by the breakdown, or reduction of the model into its salient components - such distinguishing features as plan type, number of columns or measurements - with the selective transfer of elements from the model to the "copy." Furthermore, the model's features might be reshuffled, and even supplemented by features foreign to the prototype in the "copy." It would appear, therefore, that a few distinguishing architectural features were considered sufficient to connect a "copy" to its model.

Krautheimer stressed that "any medieval building was meant to convey a meaning which transcends the visual pattern of the structure."⁹⁵ The question of the content of a building is therefore tied to the issue of its value and desirability as a model to be emulated.⁹⁶ Krautheimer noted that associations of form and content could be more general, and connections between buildings could be made on the basis of dedication; for example, churches of the Holy Cross are often cruciform, churches to St. Michael are often found on heights, and churches to Mary are often round. In his analysis, Krautheimer asserted that the most important factor in a medieval "copy" was not the exact replication of the model but, rather, the harnessing, through selected visual references, of the content of the model.

Applying these ideas in another article, in which he explored the question of why churches to Mary are often centrally-planned, Krautheimer touched on the problem of Aachen's origins.⁹⁷ Rather than searching for a building that resembled Aachen exactly, he explored the issues of association, meaning and general architectural similitude. Noting, after Grabar,⁹⁸ that Aachen was tied to *martyria* structures, and it was dedicated primarily to the Virgin, Krautheimer looked to Early Christian *martyria* to the Virgin, which are located in the East.⁹⁹ Krautheimer concluded that Aachen may have intended to call to mind the church at Tal Josephat, either directly or by way of Hagia

Soros.¹⁰⁰ The important tie between these buildings was, according to Krautheimer, their dedication, and he outlined possible reasons why this dedication to the Virgin may have been desirable at Aachen.¹⁰¹

Krautheimer's work is somewhat of an anomaly in the scholarship on Aachen as well as the "copy." On the one hand, Krautheimer was obviously steeped in the tradition of German scholarship; however, on the other hand, he used information familiar to German scholars and presented and interpreted it in a different way. While his work on "copies" still emphasized, to some degree, structure, form and type, his downplaying of comparative formal analysis and insistence on the importance of meaning gave a different slant to the problem of architectural origins and influence. Krautheimer's works are certainly familiar to the English-speaking scholarly audience; however, they never essentially infiltrated the bastions of the German scholarly world.¹⁰²

With the end of World War II in Germany, interest in medieval monuments came to be articulated in a different manner. Scholarship gained purpose through concern, as so many works had been damaged or destroyed by the war, and, ironically, bombings led to greater archeological knowledge of medieval buildings.¹⁰³ Despite the chaos in the wake of war, German scholars more or less picked up where they had left off. While there was no major change in methodology, approach or perception of the issues, it is apparent that

scholars took care to distance themselves from "German" monuments, perhaps to avoid accusations of Nazi-inspired nationalism. As a result, post-World War II scholarship on Aachen can be characterized, for the most part, as dry and sterile, and so completely bogged down in "objective" analysis that it is utterly boring.

Despite the surfeit of printed material on Aachen, there remained no real consensus as to the answers to the perceived issues for the chapel, and these issues remained the staples for discussions of Aachen in the twentieth century, even to the present. Of these issues, perhaps the one that has been dealt with, at least in some aspects, most satisfactorily - due to information gleaned from sporadic excavations - is that of the Carolingian form of the chapel and the palace.¹⁰⁴ Yet the questions of Aachen's model and the use of Aachen as a model continued to provide fodder for scholarly consumption, and discussions have become increasingly involved and complex as more works of the past - and therefore more comparative material - have come to light.

These questions, originally posed within the context of the wide-ranging general survey,¹⁰⁵ came to be the focus of specialized studies aimed at elucidating the problems of Aachen's model and Aachen's "copies." Yet within this more telescoped view, the approaches to the problems remained quite constant. Aachen continued to be seen as Carolingian

Aachen - the creation of the Emperor Charlemagne. The chapel thus retained its special status within the art historical continuum, and the problems of the model-"copy" relationship continued to be couched primarily in formal terms.

The number of more recent lengthy studies devoted to the issue of the origins of Aachen is intimidatingly vast - and the conclusions certainly varied, as evidenced in such articles as those of Fichtenau, the major partisan for a Byzantine model for Aachen, citing its the origins as the Chrysotriclinos by way of San Vitale,¹⁰⁶ Ramackers, who couched Aachen's origins in terms of funerary architecture,¹⁰⁷ Boeckelmann, who tried to integrate the East versus West viewpoints,¹⁰⁸ and Kreuzsch, who attempted to broaden the definition of Aachen's meaning.¹⁰⁹ Yet of these more recent works devoted to the origins of Aachen, that of Günther Bandmann is perhaps the best known and is considered by many to provide the definitive analysis of the problem.¹¹⁰

Bandmann was interested in seeking "which models and ideas" Charlemagne was drawing on.¹¹¹ He briefly stated that the problems of the medieval "copy" are particular, noting that we might not recognize Aachen's model because we do not fully understand the nature of the model-copy relationship in the Middle Ages. Bandmann postulated, since no extant building corresponds in all "significant

characteristics" to the chapel, that there were two possible solutions to the question of the models for Aachen: a "lost model;" or a new "unity" of a number of models that underscores "a new allegiance with Rome and the rival Byzantium."¹¹²

Bandmann's extremely lengthy analysis involved a brief discussion of every - or so it seems - centrally-planned building in the East and West, and he loosely organized his discussion around the major issues of the various traditions for the palatine complex and the ramifications of the dedication of the church.¹¹³ Bandmann's article is helpful mainly as an overview of all of the issues and monuments scholarship has raised in the quest for the model of Aachen. Bandmann himself, however, was rather inconclusive. He rejected some possibilities outright and presented others merely as possibilities. Ultimately he settled, with little discussion, on the model of San Vitale, the traditional answer for the origins of Aachen. Bandmann essentially rehashed the scholarship aimed at discovering the chapel's archeological and formal model, and it appears that his brief interest in the complexities of the model-copy relationship was not reflected in his ultimate conclusion.

While Krautheimer's insights did not have a significant impact on German scholarship, certainly German scholars delved into the subject of the "copy" and its meaning. In this arena, the most influential work was again that of

Bandmann. In his well-known - and rather convoluted - work, Mittelalterliche Architektur als Bedeutungsträger,¹¹⁴ the basic tenets of the developmental approach were applied to meaning, even the meaning of medieval architectural "copies." Bandmann's approach was inextricably tied to that of previous German scholars, as his aim was ultimately to systematize and codify his subject matter - in this case "meaning," a notoriously nebulous or at least multi-faceted subject, one that is, without a doubt, resistant to systematization. Bandmann asserted that meaning was ultimately tied to the intention of the patron. While certainly the role of the patron is important, since Bandmann's patrons were almost always the Kaiser, his conclusions on the meaning of medieval architecture dealt almost exclusively with imperial significance.¹¹⁵

Aachen remained imbued with the timeless mystique of Charlemagne and imperial tradition, as Bandmann stated that:

"Charlemagne began the building at the latest in 796, when he saw himself already as the most powerful ruler in the West, but still had not been crowned Emperor. . . The church was, most importantly, the palatine chapel for the Kaiser and the court, a treasury and, in the antique tradition, a mausoleum, but during his own lifetime. Charlemagne legitimized himself in that he entered the Mediterranean tradition which was offered to him in Ravenna through the court church of Justinian. It is conceivable that with the imperial coronation Charlemagne's view was focused in a special way on Rome, where the idea of the meaning of the church was different than in the Byzantine sphere. There the personal church of the ruler still had received a part of its meaning in the antique sense from the ruler standing in the highest sacral rank. The church, above all

the court church, was his culminating achievement and his appropriate universe, in which his actions had their natural place. This right, which Charlemagne as well as earlier Germanic kings within the Roman Empire picked up, went back to the Roman imperial coronation."¹¹⁶

Bandmann's discussion of Aachen's influence - its "copies" - centered on the notion of Aachen's image as the eternal imperial chapel. Although he briefly discussed and acknowledged Krautheimer's ideas on the "copy,"¹¹⁷ Bandmann remained rigid in his definition of Aachen's meaning and the issues of the medieval "copy." He stated, in discussing the development of the central plan, that:

"Charlemagne thus erected a palatine chapel in Aachen which he outfitted in such a way that it towered above contemporary episcopal and monastic churches. With this church, which documents the self-consciousness of Charlemagne before the imperial coronation, Charlemagne represented this notion, which already a few years later became restricted, but had momentous influence into the thirteenth century."¹¹⁸

Of the "copies" he said:

"Aachen's copies still have similarity to the eastern buildings . . . [yet] German architecture followed in most cases the simplified manner of the Aachen model. This following is in part recognizable in polygonal plan, in the galleries and before all else in the Aachen column screen motif in the chapels and churches in Nijmegen, Ottmarsheim, Groningen, St. John in Liège, Goslar and in the western block of Essen Cathedral and in the church of Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol in Cologne; in some the formal relationship is, in addition, secured through written reports: in Germigny-des-Prés, in Mettlach and in Diedenhofen."¹¹⁹

Ultimately, thus, Bandmann's "copies" were simply enumerated and compared in formal terms, motifs seen as morphemes of structure cashing in on Aachen's timeless imperial image.

In his approach, Bandmann clearly aligned himself with the traditions of earlier German scholarship, and this tendency can be seen as well in scholarly literature on the "copies" of Aachen. Studies devoted to the "copies" as a subject of scholarly inquiry unto itself are somewhat rare, and particularly so before the mid-1960's. Two rather tentative articles, those of Georg Humann¹²⁰ and Emile Male,¹²¹ date from earlier in the twentieth century and, while similar in their approach, they differ in scope. Both scholars, however, betray a desire to codify further and systematize the growing corpus of Aachen "copies," and even to trim down the corpus through their analyses.

Humann was concerned primarily with Mettlach, an Aachen "copy," yet preceding the treatment of this church he discussed the "copies" of Aachen as a group. In outlook and approach, Humann can be likened to earlier scholars. He opened by stating:

"the palatine church at Aachen, the splendid creation of Charlemagne, was admired not only by contemporaries. The deep respect which was still given this work in the following centuries is attested to through a number of buildings which come to light partially through texts and partially through their structuring as copies."¹²²

Humann began with extant buildings, noting that three of these were tied to Aachen through texts, before moving on to discuss works tied to Aachen through formal comparison. His discussion of each church provided a brief history including the patron and the building date, yet the bulk of the

discussions centered on form and structure. In closing each discussion, Humann gave his assessment of the building's relationship - or lack thereof - to Aachen; he noted that a few buildings, seen by some as "copies," should be approached with caution, as their form strayed too far from Aachen to really be considered within the corpus.¹²³

Male's shorter article was much less comprehensive than Humann's, as the author restricted his inquiry to Aachen's "influence in the Rhine Valley." He stated at the outset that his criteria for comparing buildings would be the plan and elevation of Aachen,¹²⁴ and then discussed the model for Aachen, saying that while most see it as San Vitale, Aachen is much simpler, and the model must be the church of Hierapolis in Phrygia, which Male described as "exactly" the same as Aachen. Having established the formal grounds in which the material would be considered, Male then very briefly discussed his selected "copies."¹²⁵ The article is certainly cursory, yet Male's aim was not to provide an in-depth account of the works, but rather to illustrate his viewpoint about the developmental process of art; in his final paragraph he stated that "we discover here one of the great laws of art which can be formulated as follows: every celebrated monument gives rise to numerous imitations. In the history of art, original creations are rare and - more or less - accurate imitation is the law."¹²⁶

These articles on the "copies" remained more or less isolated scholarly incidents until the mid-1960's, which saw a surge of interest in Aachen's "copies" as a special and specific topic for scholarly consideration. The reasons for this interest are unclear, but perhaps some impetus came from a resurgence of awareness of Aachen and Charlemagne generated by the exhibition, in 1964, for the anniversary of Charlemagne's death.¹²⁷ This awareness most probably influenced the two lengthy articles of 1964 and 1967 by the German scholar Verbeek.¹²⁸ However, two other articles, one from the American scholar Kleinbauer in 1965,¹²⁹ and the other by the French scholar Sieffert in 1967,¹³⁰ were conceived independently from one another and from the work of Verbeek.

Kleinbauer's short article - the only one on the subject in English - was not intended as an exhaustive study, but, rather, was meant to provide insight into the problem of the medieval "copy;" he therefore came to his subject through the work of Krautheimer. Kleinbauer, however, utilized the familiar approach of comparisons of buildings to Carolingian Aachen. He opened with the history and form of Charlemagne's Aachen, noting that, despite transformations, "the chapel itself remained, from a structural standpoint, virtually intact."¹³¹ In his second section, "Problems of Medieval Architectural Copies," Kleinbauer began with Aachen's origins, and concluded that

"a comparison of San Vitale with Aachen evinces a model-copy relationship: polygonal ground plan, domed octagonal central space encircled by ambulatory and galleries, east apsidal projection, towered entrance porch or narthex, and atrium,"¹³² though he maintained that the two differed in execution, style and feeling.

Having established Aachen as the church of Charlemagne and the descendent of great architectural and imperial structures, Kleinbauer moved to the topic of "copies," saying:

"an ecclesiastical building of such monumentality, assurance and splendor was destined to influence subsequent European architecture. . . . It was the palatine chapel of Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, and their Ottonian successors, and consequently represented the nerve center of the Carolingian and Ottonian Empires. The palace functioned politically as well as ecclesiastically in the great cosmic order of medieval government."¹³³

In discussing the "copies," Kleinbauer began with buildings compared to Aachen in medieval texts - works seen as problematic - that led him to the conclusion that "none of the buildings . . . can be regarded as *architectural copies* of the palatine chapel at Aachen."¹³⁴ Stating that the fame of Aachen rested on its "political-religious significance,"¹³⁵ he discussed formally comparable buildings, saying "the forceful impact of this building is even more dramatically revealed, however, by a number of edifices which were directly inspired by it."¹³⁶ In these

"true architectural copies," Kleinbauer saw exact formal similitude with the model.

After his brief discussion of the buildings, Kleinbauer concluded that "a few overall patterns of development seem to emerge."¹³⁷ In his analysis, the "copies" served as palatine, episcopal or mortuary chapels, and many were dedicated to the Virgin (but not to both the Virgin and Christ). Apparently wishing to build upon the insights of Krautheimer, Kleinbauer stated that "it is clear that the *content* or meaning of a religious building was an important characteristic during the Middle Ages," and that while there was a "freedom of formal expression . . . certain salient features of the *form*" of Aachen were "chose[n] and remoulded."¹³⁸ He concluded that strict attention was paid to the model's shape - a foregone conclusion, as all of the churches that he designates as "copies" were polygonal in plan. Having seemingly misinterpreted, at least partially, Krautheimer, Kleinbauer concluded: "I submit, therefore, that in the early Middle Ages careful attention was given to the form as well as the meaning of a highly venerated monument."¹³⁹

In contrast to Kleinbauer, Sieffert's aim was to offer a comprehensive "state of the question" of the subject of Aachen's "copies." His approach to the subject was similar, however, in that he opened with a discussion of Aachen's form and its relationship to San Vitale.¹⁴⁰ Sieffert then

presented the "copies," in a sort of catalogue form. His discussions centered around the structure and form of the buildings, as well as their building history, and he closed each section with an analysis of each work's relationship to the model.¹⁴¹ In his following statistical analysis, Sieffert compared the buildings in measurement, in terms of five structural features,¹⁴² and as well in terms of geographical distribution. Lastly, seeing in the chapel three main functions: as a palatine chapel; a chapel-reliquary; and a mausoleum; he stated that the "copies" had to respond to one of these functions, and then briefly grouped them.

Sieffert's interest was quite obviously the codification of Aachen's "copies." Despite the superficiality of Sieffert's treatment of the buildings, the work, especially in comparison to Kleinbauer's, provided a thorough general overview of the scholarly corpus and, as well, recognized the intricacies of the problems of the medieval "copy." In his analysis, furthermore, Sieffert was much more generous in his assessments than Kleinbauer - or Verbeek.¹⁴³

While this oddly international group of scholars appeared to indicate a more widespread interest in the "copies" of Aachen, the work of Verbeek presented the most exhaustive handling of the subject and has been perceived as the "last word" on the topic.¹⁴⁴ Verbeek's two articles

differ in their scope, and the differentiation of subject matter underscored the scholar's methodological assumptions - assumptions that in fact derived from the German scholarly tradition to which Verbeek was undoubtedly a successor. His 1964 article, "Zentralbauten in der Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle," dealt exclusively with centrally-planned architectural "copies" of Aachen, while his 1967 work, "Die architektonische Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle," discussed the emulation and influence of Aachen within a broader context defined by formal motifs. In these articles, therefore, Verbeek made a primary distinction in his subject matter based on structure and form: the total, or real "copy" indicated by the central plan; versus partial imitation and influence. In making this distinction, Verbeek was simply further codifying the questions of structure and form defined by his predecessors.

In "Zentralbauten," in fact, Verbeek telescoped the focus of earlier scholars of the central plan type by focusing solely on Aachen's centrally-planned "copies." Verbeek's approach and methodology clearly stemmed from those seen in Rahn and, in terms of the specification of formal types, Biehn. Essential to this approach was the assertion of Aachen's unique place in the development of architecture. Aachen was designated, as indicated in the article's title, as Charlemagne's palatine chapel. Verbeek stated, at the outset, that:

"the Carolingian palatine chapel at Aachen holds, as the single monumental legacy of Charlemagne, a special position in architectural history. That it found varied emulations in the following periods is based, above all, on its looming significance within the politico-spiritual sphere."¹⁴⁵

Verbeek thus asserted straight away that Aachen's meaning and value was to be found in its role as the Carolingian palatine chapel. He as well upheld the notion of Aachen's unique formal properties, stating that, with Aachen, a new building type was introduced into the West; "political and cultural demands" made it necessary for Charlemagne, who wished to express concretely his parity with eastern rulers, to adopt aspects of Byzantine architectural form for his chapel.¹⁴⁶ Verbeek - again asserting Aachen's status as a unique creation - saw no one model for Aachen; he maintained, rather, that Charlemagne adopted aspects of eastern architecture to convey meaning in his preferred palace and burial site, and in this adaptation initiated the formation of the western "Hofkapelle."¹⁴⁷

Verbeek then described the church, thus establishing the formal terms in which Aachen would be seen and the grounds on which the perceived "copies" would be compared to the model.¹⁴⁸ In introducing the "copies," Verbeek distinguished two groups: those designated as "copies" in texts; and those seen as "copies" on formal grounds. He began by discussing the "copies" related to Aachen in texts, starting with those still extant in order to have "a starting point for the general assessment of the worth of

contemporary texts."¹⁴⁹ These buildings did not fare well on Verbeek's formal scale, leading the author to caution, like Kleinbauer, against giving much credence to medieval comparisons and allowing him to maintain that lost buildings compared to Aachen in texts should be approached with caution. Verbeek then provided an analysis of the development of the designated "copies" couched in dynastic terms, asserting that after the Salian period, during which most of his "copies" were built, centrally-planned "copies" of Aachen came to an end. He asserted that then "the after-effect branches out into single motifs."¹⁵⁰

Verbeek's second article, "Die architektonische Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle," picked up this briefly mentioned notion that the whole structure, yet also parts of it, were subsequently imitated. In thus formally deconstructing Aachen, in a Bogner-like fashion, Verbeek treated the chapel as the font, seemingly, of all medieval architectural form. He began by briefly rehashing the centrally-planned "copies," concluding that:

"the patrons of all of these central plans, the Kaiser himself, or dynasts or Imperial Bishops, came to decide on this form from looking at Aachen, because a 'political' meaning befitted it and it offered them a special representative place for the participation in services."¹⁵¹

This assertion gave Verbeek licence to dissect Aachen, saying that it was not always possible to use the central plan, which carried with it the place for the lord, and that when an axial church was called for, "a strange

reorganization and alignment of the Aachen original type arose into a central west church."¹⁵² Verbeek thus credited Aachen as the origin of the idea of the westwork, stressing the structuring of the galleries and the importance of the place for the emperor.¹⁵³ Taking this notion further, Verbeek concluded that "for polygonal central buildings, westworks and Doppelkapellen the Aachen court church was an exemplar in its entirety, yet besides this, single parts also produced schools."¹⁵⁴

While this later development of motifs was discussed only briefly in "Zentralbauten," its inclusion allowed Verbeek to isolate his Early Medieval centrally-planned "copies" and establish their development - for he indeed saw them as a developmental group. He asserted that "the historical survey instructs that only in the early Kaiserzeit were the qualifications given for a 'total' - though reduced - 'copy' of the Carolingian palatine chapel."¹⁵⁵ However, the conscious establishment by Charlemagne of the desire for the unity of the kingdom and political and cultural authority did not explain all, and thus the "artistic will" of the polygonal basilica and the purpose of the buildings also had to be considered. He maintained that although "the precise dating is in many cases still unsure, there is still a pretty clear picture of development. Because the literarily-attested copies of the

ninth century are no longer extant, we first know central plans emulating Aachen in the tenth century."¹⁵⁶

Verbeek, like Sieffert, provided statistical analyses of the "copies" in terms of geography as well as relative size and form.¹⁵⁷ Importantly, in presenting the buildings in a chart of scale plans for comparison, Verbeek reduced the churches to two-dimensional structures, thus clearly defining his terms for comparison. He then discussed the buildings in terms of their use, maintaining that the Early Medieval centrally-planned building had general specific functions, primarily as baptistries, mausolea and court churches, in continuance with the Roman tradition. However, "the palatine chapel of Charlemagne worked a new Western European prototype, in which various strains of development came together" and this new creation greatly influenced later buildings.¹⁵⁸ Verbeek concluded that:

"the palatine chapel of Charlemagne asserted, in increasing measure since the coronation of Otto I in 936, a unique place above all churches of the realm north of the Alps. The function was not the actual connecting link to the centralized copies, but rather the claim to power connected to Aachen. This becomes confirmed with reflection on the unusually rich transmission of the architecture of Aachen in many of its elements - not only in view of the polygonal centralized building."¹⁵⁹

In his work, Verbeek encapsulated the approaches and findings of earlier scholars and brought the question of Aachen's role in the history of architecture to the logical conclusion of the chosen methodology.¹⁶⁰ In this light, it is not surprising that Verbeek's work has been seen as the

"last word" on the "copies," nor is it surprising that this "last word" was not written until the 1960's; by that time, the development of the discipline itself enabled such a comprehensive analysis. Verbeek was able to assess the works in terms of structure and form and place them within the parameters of the accepted scholarly tradition. While his articles can be seen as an unconscious, though inevitable expression of German scholarship's accumulated notions about Aachen and the nature of similitude, nevertheless his interpretations have continued to be influential and widely accepted.¹⁶¹

While the above discussion of scholarship could be interpreted as a "State of the Question" for Aachen studies, it is intended, rather, as an explication of the ways in which Aachen has been envisioned in scholarly literature. The self-defined task of scholarship, articulated in the early nineteenth century and tacitly assumed thereafter, has been to bring order to the past. Such a task assumes, firstly, that order exists, and necessitates, secondly, the establishment of a framework. Aachen certainly has been granted a preeminent position within a scholarly construct that has posited and prescribed a definable order on the past. This construct, which mirrors the concerns of scholarship, has defined order through periodization - articulating the assumption that the past is understandable primarily in imperial and dynastic terms. Order has been

brought to the works of the past through the application of a hierarchical framework of monuments defined in objective formal and analytical terms and assessed, in these terms, in relation to works bracketing them on a dictated timeline.

Over the course of more than one hundred years of scholarship, Aachen has been honed into a rather calcified monument, a codified structural and formal Carolingian masterpiece with an awe-inspiring imperial personality. That this image of Aachen is the logical outcome of scholars' chosen methodology, as well as the product of their viewpoints and interests, is self-evident. Yet the authenticity of Aachen as a structural and imperial type in modern scholarly terms need not be questioned; the persistent codification of Aachen as an authoritative centrally-planned structure with politico-religious significance has fulfilled a need to order the past in such terms.

It is the image of Aachen perpetuated in scholarship today. Aachen is a blip on the timeline, firmly centered in ca. 800. The chapel is seen as an exemplary "great work" - a monument that, while borrowing from past "great works," was still a new and unique creation. As such, it exerted influence. This influence, perceived in terms of formally comparable "copies," has been seen, importantly, as more or less confined to the time period assigned Aachen - in other words, the Middle Ages.

Scholars have chosen to approach Aachen in terms of structure and form and evolutionary development, using theories of typing and transference and methods for determining similitude within a "great buildings" context based on dynastic and royal patronage. Their pursuit has been Carolingian Aachen. As supporting players in a timeless drama, buildings related to Aachen necessarily have been relegated to a limbo bracketed by the time in which the chapel was built and the age of modern historical inquiry. Not considered as individual expressions in time and place that in themselves pose questions about a constant one-dimensional image of Aachen and the nature of similitude, the buildings appear primarily as evidence of the supremacy of Aachen as an imperial structure.

That the image of Aachen is changeable and conditioned by time, circumstance and outlook is seen in the restoration of the chapel, and as well in the scholarly image of Aachen. While Aachen's role in a perceived developmental continuum is, at this point, accepted as common knowledge, the question of Aachen's role can be approached from other suppositions. Rather than assuming that Aachen was a timeless structural image, the repeated reference and recurring image of the chapel may be seen as repeated approaches to the chapel that, like the "restoration" and scholarly vision, reveal interest in the chapel tied to contemporary concerns and interests. The question becomes,

then, not what type of supporting role these "copies" played in the history of architecture but, rather, what role they played in their own time and how they, in fact, have been instrumental in defining an image of Aachen.

¹Aachen has been mentioned, seemingly, in every discussion of medieval architecture, making it impossible - not to mention undesirable - to mention every work. As well, to discuss every work would be rather repetitive, as the image of Aachen in scholarship has remained rather constant. In the following chapter, I have selected works, based on their perceived importance and standing in scholarship, in order to give a representative view of the scholarly image of Aachen.

²The seminal article on Carolingian Aachen - at least perceived as seminal by contemporary scholars - was that of Franz Mertens: "Ueber die Karolingische Kaiser-Kapelle zu Aachen." This lengthy article was the first comprehensive scholarly work on the chapel, and in its interests it stood as exemplary for Aachen studies. Divided into six sections, the first, in which Mertens eulogized Charlemagne and his accomplishments, discussed the historical background of Carolingian Aachen. In the second section, on the structure of the building, he provided a formal description of the church and discussed its formal origins. The lengthy third section dealt with the contemporary issue of the columnar screen and its original disposition, while the fourth and the fifth discussed the mosaic decoration and the bronze work of the interior. The sixth considered the chapel as the coronation site of "German" kings, highlighting Merten's view of the primary value and meaning of the chapel.

³See: Iggers, especially Chapter II ("The Origins of German Historicism: The Transformation of German Historical Thought from Herder's Cosmopolitan Culture-Oriented Nationalism to the State-Centered Exclusive Nationalism of the Wars of Liberation") and Chapter III ("The Theoretical Foundations of German Historicism I: Wilhelm von Humbolt"). See as well: Reill; and A. Nitschke, "German Politics and Medieval History," Journal of Contemporary History 3, no. 2 (1968), pp. 75-92.

⁴Franz Kugler, Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte, Stuttgart, 1842, p. x.

⁵Kugler's biography is of some interest. Not only did he write a number of art historical works, he was known as a

poet and as well authored a book on Friedrich Barbarossa. He is perhaps best known as the teacher and friend of Jacob Burckhardt. Most interestingly, Kugler was the first "Art Consultant" to the Prussian government. His writings in service of this office provide insight into his view of art and society. See particularly: "Über die gegenwärtigen Verhältnisse der Kunst zum Leben," in Kleine Schriften zur Kunstgeschichte, vol. 3, Stuttgart, 1854, pp. 206-232; and "Die Kunst als Gegenstand der Staatsverwaltung," Kleine Schriften, vol. 3, pp. 578-603. For a detailed biography of Kugler, see: Wilhelm Waetzoldt, Deutsche Kunsthistoriker, vol. 2, Von Passavant bis Justi, 1965, pp. 142-172. For a very brief and general discussion, see: Udo Kulturmann, Geschichte der Kunstgeschichte. Der Weg einer Wissenschaft, Düsseldorf, 1966, pp. 165-169. Kulturmann compared Kugler's aims to those of von Humbolt.

⁶Kugler, Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte, Dedication passage preceding the Introduction in Volume I. The dedication itself is rather telling, as Kugler presented his book "an Seine Majestaet den Koenig Friedrich Wilhelm den Vierten von Preussen;" the predilection for dedicating scholarly works to the king was common at the time, and indicative of the prevalent consciousness of imperial power that pervaded many aspects of life.

⁷Kugler, p. x.

⁸Kugler, p. x-xi.

⁹Wilhelm Lübke, Geschichte der Architektur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart, Leipzig, 1855.

¹⁰Lübke, Introduction, p. vii.

¹¹"German" was very broadly defined, as Förster included works in, for example, Poland and Belgium in his survey.

¹²E. Förster, Denkmale deutscher Kunst von Einführung des Christenthums bis auf die neueste Zeit, 12 vols., Leipzig, 1855-1869, dedication pages in Volume I, p. v. The work was dedicated "An seine Majestät den König Friedrich Wilhelm von Preussen den Kenntnissreichen Verehrer und hochherzigen Beschützer vaterländischer Kunst und Kunstwissenschaft."

¹³Förster, p. v.

¹⁴Förster, p. vii.

¹⁵Gottfried Kinkel, Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den christlichen Völkern, vom Anfang unserer Zeitrechnung bis zur Gegenwart, Bonn, 1845, "Prospectus," n.p.

¹⁶Kinkel, "Prospectus," n.p.

¹⁷Kinkel, "Prospectus," n.p.

¹⁸Implicit in the evaluation of the Carolingian Age on the historical timeline were - and are - assumptions about the way in which the past - specifically Classical Antiquity - were regarded and used. Such a construct of art history necessitates a reliance on the designated authoritative forms of the past, and the tyranny of the Classical model in scholarship is certainly well known. The heated issue of the "Carolingian Renaissance" has been a recurring one, and the bibliography on the subject is rather large. For my purposes, it suffices to mention that the gloss of a "renaissance" has been one used in scholarship to give value to - or reject - various designated time periods on the basis of perceptions of what "Classical" was. For this issue see especially: E. Panofsky, Renaissance and Resuscitations in Western Art, New York, 1972, pp. 1-113; and John J. Contreni, "The Carolingian Renaissance," in Renaissances before the Renaissance: Cultural Revivals of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, ed. W. Treadgold, Stanford, 1984, pp. 59-74.

¹⁹Kugler, p. 353.

²⁰Kugler, p. 353. The names given the different periods obviously changed. In Kugler's day, there was apparently no real consensus as to what to call perceived periods.

²¹Carl Schnaase, Geschichte der bildenen Künste im Mittelalter, Düsseldorf, 1843. Schnaase was one of the most influential scholars of his day. See: Michael Podro, The Critical Historians of Art, Chapter III, "Schnaase's Prototype of Critical History," New Haven, 1982, pp. 31-43. Podro, in this chapter, dealt with the more theoretical first work of Schnaase, noting that his survey was less theoretical in nature. See also: Waetzholt, vol. 2, pp. 70-92.

²²Schnaase, p. 454.

²³Schnaase, p. 498.

²⁴Schnaase, p. 500.

²⁵Schnaase, p. 505.

²⁶Schnaase, p. 528.

²⁷G.G. Kallenbach and J. Schmitt, Die christliche Kirchen-Baukunst des Abendlandes von ihren Anfängen bis zur vollendeten Durchbildung des Spitzbogen-Styls, Halle, 1850, p. 6.

²⁸Kallenbach and Schmitt, p. 8.

²⁹Kallenbach and Schmitt, p. 29.

³⁰Lübke, pp. 260-261.

³¹Lübke, p. 264.

³²Lübke, pp. 264 ff.

³³Ernst aus'm Weerth, Kunstdenkmäler des christlichen Mittelalters in den Rheinlanden, 3 vols., Leipzig, 1857-1868, vol. I, p. v. Considering the title, it is not surprising that the book was dedicated to Friedrich Wilhelm IV of Prussia.

³⁴aus'm Weerth, vol. II, pp. 55-57.

³⁵aus'm Weerth, vol. II, p. 58.

³⁶Kugler, p. 354.

³⁷Kugler made apparent what he saw as the characteristic formal aspects of Aachen: the octagonal core with a sixteen-sided ambulatory, defined by eight piers and having an eight part central dome (yet no niches like San Vitale); a groin vaulted ambulatory opening into the octagon; and a second barrel vaulted gallery opening into the central space through a columnar screen (Kugler briefly discussed the atrocities of the French at this point, indicating his interest and awareness in contemporary issues) topped by a tambour.

For a similar analysis of Aachen and early medieval architecture, see also: Kugler, Geschichte der Baukunst, vol. 1, Stuttgart, 1856, pp. 407-410. The discussion generally repeated that of his earlier book, though it should be noted that Kugler said that San Vitale was not the

direct model for Aachen, as there were some differences in plan between the two buildings.

³⁸Schnaase, pp. 530-533.

³⁹Lübke, p. 264.

⁴⁰aus'm Weerth, vol. II, p. 58.

⁴¹Kallenbach and Schmitt, p. 29.

⁴²The use of San Vitale as Aachen's possible model highlights the problem in scholarship of "lost" or even unknown buildings. Since San Vitale is still extant, it is - and was - no doubt seen as an appropriate and available source. Certainly the number of known or extant centrally-planned buildings in northern Europe is limited, and was very limited in the nineteenth century. However, even as buildings came to light, Ravenna was still pegged as Aachen's model, apparently because of its imperial masterpiece status in literature. In contrast, for example, the church of St. Mary at St. Riquier - a small polygonal building most probably predating Aachen by a few years - generally has not entered discussions of Aachen's possible sources, no doubt because it has been seen as inappropriately small and non-imperial. See, for example: H. Bernard, "Les fouilles de Saint-Riquier," Bulletin de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France (1962), pp. 203-205; and W. Effmann, Centula. Saint Riquier. Eine Untersuchung zur Geschichte der kirchlichen Baukunst in der karolingischer Zeit, Münster, 1912, pp. 19 ff.

⁴³The terminology used varies, but the meaning basically remained the same (See: Introduction, p. 4). Kugler used the word "Nachbild," Schnaase "Nachahmung" and "Copie," and Kallenbach and Schmitt "Nachahmung." The fact that no rigid terminology was in place again underscored the pioneering nature of these works. As well, it makes apparent that these scholars were either unaware of or comfortable with the implications of their word choice.

⁴⁴Kugler, p. 355. Kugler designated Nijmegen as Carolingian, thus seeing the chapel as an example of Charlemagne "copying" his own palatine chapel at Aachen. No doubt part of the reason that Nijmegen was dated to the Carolingian Age was because it was seen as resembling Aachen so closely. However, the "Valkhof" in Nijmegen has been shown to post-date the Carolingian Age. See: Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 2, Berlin, 1976, pp. 882-883; and H. van Agt, "Die Nikolauskapelle auf dem Valkhof in Nymegen," in

Karolingische und Ottonische Kunst. Werden. Wesen. Wirkung, Wiesbaden, 1957, pp. 179-192.

⁴⁵Kugler, p. 355.

⁴⁶Schnaase, pp. 535-536. Schnaase mentioned Nijmegen, which he also saw as Carolingian, Thionville (known from texts), Liège, Groningen, the "very strange . . . western choir" of Essen, Ottmarsheim and Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol.

⁴⁷Kallenbach and Schmitt, pp. 29-31.

⁴⁸J. Rudolf Rahn, Über den Ursprung und die Entwicklung des christlichen Central- und Kuppelbaus, Leipzig, 1866. Rahn dedicated his work to Lübke and Anton Springer.

⁴⁹Rahn, p. 3.

⁵⁰Rahn, p. 144.

⁵¹It is important to note that, when playing the game of formal comparison, different schemas could be proposed. Thus Unger, a contemporary of Rahn, derived a completely different formal development for Aachen and centrally planned churches in the West. See: "Ueber die christlichen Rund- und Octogon-Bauten," Jahrbücher des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande 41 (1866), pp. 25-42. Unger aimed to give an overview of the form and plans of the buildings, the origins of these forms - especially of the octagon - and the relationship of the latter to technical developments. He was apparently more literal in his approach to form than Rahn, simply looking for shapes from the past. He found the oldest octagon in the Golden Octagon in Antioch, and the form's first appearance in the West in the Lateran Baptistery in Rome and then in Ravenna, specifically in San Vitale. Aachen figured prominently in the evolution of the form, and later octagons, such as Nijmegen and Ottmarsheim, were tied to the chapel. He concluded that the octagon was not exclusively a Greek and Roman form, yet that the Golden Octagon gave rise to San Vitale and Anglo-Saxon buildings, and then indirectly to Aachen and its copies. The issue of these works, however, is not which is right and which wrong, but, more importantly, the problems of the methodology.

⁵²Rahn, p. 145

⁵³Rahn, pp. 146-147.

⁵⁴Rahn, p. 148.

⁵⁵Rahn, p. 150.

⁵⁶Rahn, p. 151.

⁵⁷Rahn, p. 152.

⁵⁸Rahn cited Nijmegen, Germigny-des-Prés, Thionville, Liège and Groningen, all but the first no longer extant, and Ottmarsheim was then upheld as the most noteworthy "copy."

⁵⁹Rahn, p. 152.

⁶⁰Rahn, p. 154

⁶¹R. Dohme, Geschichte der deutschen Baukunst, Berlin, 1887, p. I.

⁶²Dohme, p. I.

⁶³Dohme, p. I.

⁶⁴Dohme, p. II.

⁶⁵F. X. Kraus, Geschichte der christlichen Kunst, 2 vols., Freiburg, 1896-97. Kraus's works were particularly colored by his background in theology and interest, therefore, in religion.

⁶⁶G. Dehio and G. von Bezold, Die kirchliche Baukunst des Abendlandes, 2. vols, Stuttgart, 1892. See as well: Dehio, Geschichte der deutschen Kunst, 3rd ed., vol I, Berlin/Leipzig, 1923, pp. 37 ff.

⁶⁷E. Gradmann, Geschichte der christlichen Kunst, Stuttgart, 1902.

⁶⁸Heinrich Bergner, Handbuch der kirchlichen Kunstialtertümer in Deutschland, Leipzig, 1905.

⁶⁹G. Humann, Zur Geschichte der karolingischen Baukunst, Strassbourg, 1909 (Studien zur deutschen Geschichte, vol. 120). Interestingly, Humann dealt with monuments exclusive of Aachen, stating that they have been ignored in comparison to the palatine chapel. For his take on the "copies" of Aachen, see below, pp. 78-79 and as well, Chapter Five, pp.198-202.

⁷⁰Friedrich Ostendorf, Die Deutsche Baukunst im Mittelalter, vol. 1, Differenzierung der Bautypen, Berlin, 1922.

⁷¹Gradmann, p. 184.

⁷²Kraus, vol. 2, p. 7. He also detected Lombard influence in Aachen.

⁷³Bergner, ca. p. 65.

⁷⁴Dohme, p. 8.

⁷⁵Dohme, p. 10. Dohme investigated the choice of a central plan, noting that the West, and specifically Rome, more commonly used the basilica. He wondered if Charlemagne ever saw San Vitale or even Hagia Sophia, and spoke of Roman funerary monuments. Dohme concluded "perhaps all of these worked together" in Aachen.

⁷⁶Bergner, pp. 66-67.

⁷⁷Why he said this, I do not know, as Ottmarsheim was within a convent.

⁷⁸Gradmann, p. 185.

⁷⁹Dohme, p. 11. He named Nijmegen, Diedenhofen, Liège, Groningen, Ottmarsheim, Mettlach, Lonnig, Goslar, Essen and Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol in Cologne.

⁸⁰It should be noted, however, that in surveys the dichotomy between the basilica and the central plan in the West gave structure to discussions of architecture.

⁸¹Heinz Biehn, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Zentralbaues bis zum Jahre 1500, Worms, 1933. In characterizing the centrally-planned building, he stated: "Das Abendland ist im allgemeinen kein günstiger Boden für den Zentralbau, und sein Auftreten im Westen ist gegenüber der Basilika eine sekundäre Erscheinung." (pp. vii-viii) In addition, the work of Klapeck should be noted as an example that straddled the line between the question of the origins of Aachen and the history of the central plan type. See: R. Klapeck, Carls des Grossen Pfalzkapelle zu Aachen. Die Genesis ihrer Grundrissdisposition, Diss., Bonn, 1909. The work was conceived as an "Entwicklungsgeschichte," and the

main focus was ultimately on the formal connections between San Vitale and Aachen.

⁸²Biehn, p. 51.

⁸³Heinrich Bogner, Die Grundrissdisposition der Aachen Pfalzkapelle und ihre Vorgänger, Strassbourg, 1906 (Studien zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte, v. 73). In this article, Bogner mainly hunted down form. In another article, "Die Bedeutung des Aachener Oktogons als Zentralbau," Archiv für christliche Kunst nrs. 1 and 2 (1906), pp. 1-4 and 17-19, Bogner traced the model through the meaning of the funerary church, stating: "Es ist nach vorstehenden Ausführungen anzunehmen, daß die Wahl des Zentralbaues im Aachener Münster durch seinen Zweck als Grabkapelle bestimmt wurde und lag in diesem Falle als Vorbild die Grabkirche S. Vitale in Ravenna nahe. . . Die andere Bestimmung der Pfalzkapelle als Hof-, als Palastkirche beeinflusste wahrscheinlich weit weniger die Gesamtform, war nur Veranlassung zur Einrichtung von Emporen." (p. 18.)

⁸⁴See: "Drei Fragen über das karolingische Münster zu Aachen. 2. Gibt es ein direktes Vorbild für das karolingische Münster zu Aachen?" Der Kunstfreund 11 (1908), pp. 198-203.

⁸⁵"Drei Fragen über das karolingische Münster zu Aachen. 3. Wo finden sich Vorbilder für die an der Aachener Pfalzkapelle noch erhaltenen Motive?" Der Kunstfreund 12 (1908), pp. 241-248. This article was basically a summary of everything he had ever written about. He proceeded motif by motif, examining briefly and finding models for the plan, the vaulting, the tambour, the dome, the galleries, the column screen, the entryway, the stair towers, and the choir plan. A separate work appeared on the origins of the column screen. See: Das Arkadenmotiv im Obergeschoss des Aachener Münsters und seine Vorgänger. As well, he wrote an articles on the origins of the galleries and the east end. See: "Über die Emporen in christlichen Kirchen der ersten acht Jahrhunderte," Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst No. 4 (1906), pp. 109-118; and "Der Altarraum in der Aachener Pfalzkapelle und seine Beziehung zur Baukunst der Vorzeit," Die christliche Kunst 4, nr. 8 (May 1908), pp. 177-190. In the latter, Bogner speculated on the form of the choir, enumerating the various hypothetical reconstructions of other art historians. It should be noted that their formal comparative approach did not yield the correct answer, found through excavations.

Bogner also wrote a number of other articles on Aachen. In "Drei Fragen über das karolingische Münster zu Aachen. 1. Ist die Aachener Pfalzkapelle durchweg ein Werk Karls

des Großen?" Der Kunstfreund¹⁰ (1908), pp. 188-190, he tackled an issue solved definitively by excavations, as to whether the octagon was completely a Carolingian work. For another issue answered by later excavations, see: "Die Bautradition bezüglich der karolingischen Bauannexe der Aachener Pfalzkapelle," Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft.

⁸⁶Edgar Lehmann, Die frühe deutsche Kirchenbau. Die Entwicklung seiner Raumanordnung bis 1080, 2nd ed., 2 vols., Berlin, 1949. In 1937, the dissertation on which the book was based was partially published under the same title. Soon thereafter, the first edition of the book appeared. The publication of the second edition was delayed because of the war, which led to the destruction of many research facilities and as well made finding paper for publication difficult. See: "Vorwort" and "Vorwort zur zweiten Auflage."

⁸⁷Lehmann, pp. 9-12. It is rather hard to follow Lehmann's preface. He stated: "Architekturgeschichte ist ein organischer Teil der Gesamtgeschichte. . . Nur soll nicht der frühe deutsche Kirchenbau in seiner Ganzheit betrachtet werden, sondern ein architektonisch besonders bedeutsames Teilgebiet daraus. Wir nennen es 'Raumanordnung.'" Lehmann then named three basic concepts that he would discuss with respect to his subject: "Raumanordnung;" "Raumformung;" and "Körperformung;" and discussed the idea of the standardization of the relationship of spaces to each other and to "centralization," and the grouping of masses on the exterior and their relationship to plan. Noting that the "order" that he described was not only an aesthetic consideration, Lehmann said that the question of "practical purpose" would also be discussed.

⁸⁸Lehmann, p. 34.

⁸⁹Lehmann, p. 31 and 34.

⁹⁰Lehmann, p. 88. That Lehmann continued to see medieval architecture as a function of the power of the ruler is seen in: "Die Architektur zur Zeit Karls des Grossen," in Karl der Grosse, vol. 3, Karolingische Kunst, eds. W. Braunfels and H. Schnitzler, Düsseldorf, 1965, pp. 301-319. Lehmann was interested in assigning a specific symbolic character to the "court architecture" of Charlemagne - presenting it as a rather complex package of primarily Byzantine elements combined to create an architecture meant to present the power of the ruler - in opposition to architecture outside the court sphere. Lehmann wanted "to get to know Charlemagne as a builder,"

and contended that Aachen was the key to this aspect of the ruler. Lehmann's analysis of Aachen stressed Byzantine models for the chapel, its mosaic decoration, its throne room (in this case the westwork), though he saw the building as exhibiting Roman construction methods. Essential to Charlemagne's architectural iconography of power, according to Lehmann, was the concept of the westwork as throne room and towered facade and the equation of the ruler with Christ as Savior, seen at Aachen through the dome mosaic. St. Riquier and the plan of St. Gall were then discussed as adhering to the imperial model.

⁹¹The 1940's and early 1950's were, in fact, a time in which interest in the Ottonian Age was reflected in the publication of books devoted solely to the art of that time. See, for example: Hans Jantzen, Ottonische Kunst, Munich, 1947.

⁹²For Aachen through a Nazi lens, see, for example: A. Stange, "Arteigene und Artfremde Züge in deutschen Kirchengrundriss," Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft, 2 (1935), pp. 229-252; G. Schlag, "Der Zentrale Mehreckbau in der Baukunst der deutschen Kaiserzeit," Elsaß-Lothringisches Jahrbuch, 21 (1943), pp. 62-80. Quite interestingly, Buchkremer apparently jumped onto the Nazi bandwagon, at least for the duration of the regime. See especially: "Die Seele der Aachener Pfalzkapelle Karls des Grossen," Zentralblatt der Bauverwaltung, 60, No. 13 (27 March 1940), pp. 191-199. For an interesting view of and reaction to German scholarship, obviously influenced by the contemporary political situation, see: P. Francastel, L'histoire de l'art, instrument de la propagande germanique, Paris, 1945.

⁹³Richard Krautheimer, "Introduction to an 'Iconography of Medieval Architecture,'" Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 5, 1942, pp. 1-33. (The article was reprinted, with comments from Krautheimer, in: Studies in Early Christian, Medieval and Renaissance Art, New York, 1969, pp. 115-150.)

⁹⁴Krautheimer, "Introduction to an 'Iconography of Medieval Architecture,'" p. 1.

⁹⁵Krautheimer, "Introduction to an 'Iconography of Medieval Architecture,'" p. 20.

⁹⁶Krautheimer illustrated this tie in form and content between the Anastasis and medieval baptistries. He elucidated the general similarity in plan and architectural

forms, and the association in meaning, which can be discerned between the building erected on the site of Christ's triumph over Death and the buildings in which Christians were baptized, a rite which symbolizes rebirth.

⁹⁷R. Krautheimer, "Sancta Maria Rotunda," in Studies in Early Christian, Medieval and Renaissance Art, pp. 107-114. (The article was originally published in: Arte del primo millennio (Atti del 11' convegno per lo studio dell'arte dell'alto medioevo, Parma 1950), Turin, 1953, pp. 23-27.)

Krautheimer dealt as well with the questions of the model for the entire palace at Aachen in his article. See: "The Carolingian Revival of Early Christian Architecture," Art Bulletin (1942), pp. 1-38. (Reprinted with commentary in: Studies in Early Christian, Medieval and Renaissance Art, pp. 203-256.) As almost all of the complex is gone and its layout is only partially known through excavations, little can be said about the particular architectural prototypes. However, Krautheimer stated that "while the material model remains obscure, it nevertheless seems certain, that the ideal model, or at least one of the ideal models which Charlemagne and his advisors had in mind, was the Lateran in Rome." Krautheimer's assertion rested on textual evidence and knowledge of objects known to have been situated within the palace complex. In a number of documents, buildings within the palace, and at least once the complex as a whole, are referred to as "the Lateran." Furthermore, there are references and remains of treasures kept at Aachen, all objects that appear to emulate distinctive works housed in the Lateran. The bronze she-wolf in the chapel vestibule parallels the *Lupa* kept in the Lateran in the Middle Ages. An equestrian statue was imported to Aachen from Ravenna and parallels the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius which was at the Lateran. Importantly, in the Middle Ages the Lateran statue was thought to represent Constantine, who, of course, had built the Lateran. Krautheimer suggested that another reference to the Lateran might be seen in the dedication of the palatine chapel at Aachen: the church was dedicated to the Virgin and the Saviour, and the Lateran was originally dedicated to the Savior.

The historian Ludwig Falkenstein attempted, through a discussion of the documentary evidence, to prove that the Lateran terminology in Carolingian texts refers not to the palace of Aachen as a whole, but only to a specific administrative building within the complex whose function was similar to that of the Lateran in Rome. See: Der "Lateran" der karolingischen Pfalz zu Aachen, Cologne, 1966. While Falkenstein's argument is provocative, it does not outweigh the evidence of Krautheimer. Furthermore, Krautheimer's discussion of Aachen must be viewed within the whole of his strong argument for a revival of Constantinian

models in the Carolingian Age. Interestingly, the palace at Aachen achieved an equation with the Lateran not through architectural typology, but through the typology of the treasures.

⁹⁸A. Grabar, Martyrium, Paris, 1946. Grabar's interest was not specifically in Carolingian architecture, but rather in tracing the development of the antique funerary forms (mausolea and heroa) as they were adopted and transformed for Christian needs into martyria in the Early Christian era and in the Middle Ages; continuity and adaptation were Grabar's main concern. In the development, Grabar championed the primary role of the cult of relics. Grabar observed a break between the East and the West in the development of the martyrium: in the east, the martyrium remained an independent structure; in the West, the martyrial cults seemed to have been incorporated into the basilical church in the Early Christian Age, housed under or in the east apse or transept. With the increasing importance of the cult of the relics, and the desire for ad sanctos burial, the eastern crypts increased in size and complexity, especially in the Carolingian Age. Grabar credited the cult of the relics as well for the appearance of a number of Carolingian forms: rotundas; double-apsed churches; westworks (thus stressing their use as "reliquaries"); and even palatine chapels - such as Aachen - which he characterized as great Imperial reliquaries.

In attempting to understand the complex issues discussed by Grabar, Richard Krautheimer's handy review is helpful. See: Studies in Early Christian, Medieval and Renaissance Art, pp. 254-256. Krautheimer pointed out that Grabar was perhaps a bit too zealous in ascribing so much solely to the martyrium form and the cult of the relics, and discussed briefly other possible influences on the Carolingian forms discussed by Grabar: the role of Santa Maria Rotunda in Carolingian rotundas; centralized imperial Early Christian structures, such as S. Lorenzo in Milan and the Octagon in Antioch, in the development of the palatine chapel; and the strong possibility of numerous influences in the structure of the westwork.

For a recent discussion of Grabar, see: A. J. Wharton, "Rereading Martyrium: The Modernist and Postmodernist Texts," Gesta XXIX/1 (1990), pp. 3-7.

⁹⁹While the fifth-century buildings in Tyre and Mt. Garazim seem to have been octagonal structures dedicated to the Theotokos, Krautheimer found a more specific parallel to Aachen in Hagia Soros, the now-lost church which was within the Blachernae palace in Constantinople, and housed relics of the Virgin. Descriptions of Hagia Soros are very general, saying only that it was round, probably had a dome,

was entered through a narthex that stood opposite the apse, and that there was a second story box for the Emperor which gave access to the neighboring palace. For the documents relating to this and the following building, see: Krautheimer, "Sancta Maria Rotunda," pp. 109-111. Krautheimer related this church, structurally and typologically, to the now -lost building erected on the supposed site of the burial of the Virgin in Tal Josephat. Early medieval descriptions of the Early Christian structure say that it had two-stories, the lower story covered with a stone ceiling, round in shape and having an altar to the east.

¹⁰⁰Krautheimer, "Sancta Maria Rotunda," p. 112. There was a general similarity in plan and structure between these churches and Aachen - round centrally-planned buildings of two stories, with eastern altars. The ties to Hagia Soros may be seen as more particular, as both it an the chapel at Aachen were within palaces and had second story spaces for the Emperor, the westwork at Aachen performing this function.

¹⁰¹Krautheimer, "Sancta Maria Rotunda," pp. 110-111.

¹⁰²Perhaps because the German scholarly community, especially until the post-World War II era, can generally be characterized as a closed society, it is not surprising that the scholarship of people working outside of Germany did not receive much attention. Krautheimer's insights into the copy, however, at least received lip service by some scholars, notably Kreuzsch, Bandmann and Verbeek. Despite their acknowledgement of Krautheimer, however, his ideas were not integrated into their discussions in any essential manner.

¹⁰³Certainly the church at Essen is a good example of this interest and exploration. See below, Chapter Five.

¹⁰⁴For a comprehensive bibliography of excavation literature as well as an archeological description of the reconstructed Aachen, see: Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 1, pp. 1-13.

¹⁰⁵Certainly these issues were central to more recent surveys. See, for a discussion of Aachen's "copies," particularly: Louis Grodecki, Au seuil de l'art roman. L'architecture ottonienne, Paris, 1958, pp. 166-174. See as well: Carol Heitz, L'architecture religieuse carolingienne. Les formes et leurs fonctions, Paris, 1980, pp. 79-86.

¹⁰⁶Heinrich Fichtenau, "Byzance und die Pfalz zu Aachen," Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 59, 1951, pp. 1-54.

¹⁰⁷Johannes Ramackers, "Das Grab Karls des Großen und die Frage nach dem Ursprung des Aachener Oktogons," Historisches Jahrbuch, 75 (1955), pp. 121-153.

¹⁰⁸Walter Boeckelmann, "Von den Ursprüngen der Aachener Pfalzkapelle," Wallraf-Richarz Jahrbuch, 19, 1957, 9-13. Boeckelmann characterized the debate as one between scholars who champion a Byzantine model for the chapel and those who see an indigenous Frankish tradition behind it. In this conflict, the author basically concurred with Fichtenau, agreeing that there is an unquestionable similitude between Aachen and San Vitale. However, he noted that Fichtenau could not explain why Aachen is "different" from San Vitale, and asserted that the answer to this problem was to be found in a reconciliation between the two opposing viewpoints on the origins of the chapel.

Boeckelmann suggested that the basis for uniting the two was found in a quotation from Notker the Stammerer's biography of Charlemagne, penned in 883. Notker stated that the chapel at Aachen "fabricare propria dispositione molitus." Boeckelmann linked these words to the terminology of Vitruvius' six considerations for architecture, from De Architectura, Book 1, Chapter 2. He cited the first two Vitruvian principles, ordinatio, the general modular arrangement, and dispositio, the way in which the elements are assembled with respect to groundplan, elevation and perspective, as the keys to reconciling the two basic viewpoints about Aachen, asserting that Aachen has "byzantine ordinatio" and a "frankish dispositio." He then suggested that Aachen was based on a 50' module, which was used to form the "quadratur" - a basic design element seen in earlier Frankish churches - of the plan. At Aachen, Boeckelmann maintained that the simple Frankish "quadratur" was "rotated" four times on its axis in order to conform to the more complex ordinatio of San Vitale.

Boeckelmann was correct in his basic observation that the East versus West polemic concerning the origins of the chapel is unsatisfactory. However, Boeckelmann's extremely convoluted argument, rather than proving his proposition of dual influences, raises many questions. For example, Boeckelmann relied on Notker, whose account, written long after the death of Charlemagne, is clearly mythically anecdotal, for the "factual" premise of his argument. (On Notker, see below, Chapter 4) He then removed the two words entirely from their text, and groundlessly asserted that they must refer to Vitruvius. Within this questionable framework, the introduction and application of a "module" -

a recurring theme in Aachen studies - is particularly confusing; the problem with the module is that it is virtually impossible to figure out where a scholar gets this "factual" information, or by what authority he manipulates it in order to attain his (desired) results. On the whole, Boeckelmann's thesis of a "byzantine ordinatio" and a "frankish dispositione" is unbelievably complex and contrived, and essentially based on nothing. While his attempt to explore the difference between Aachen and San Vitale is admirable in its intention; however, ultimately, Boeckelmann's analysis did not clarify the issue.

For an article that articulates beautifully in modern terms the differences in style between Aachen and San Vitale, see: Schöne.

¹⁰⁹Felix Kreuzsch, "Das Mass des Engels," in Vom Bauten, Bilden und Bewahren: Festschrift für Willy Weyres, Cologne, 1964, 61-82. Kreuzsch's point of departure for discussion was the determination that the perimeter of Aachen is 144 Carolingian feet - the measurement of the Heavenly Jerusalem given in Revelation 21. He maintained that this must be of significance, and sees it as a way through which he can "track down the outline of the Aachen groundplan."

He went about this by giving the measurement of fourteen centrally-planned buildings that date to the Classical, Early Christian and Byzantine periods. From his collected data, Kreuzsch divided his structures into groups. He said that six buildings (the Mausoleum of Helena, the Anastasis, St. Aquilino, St. Gregorio in Milan, the church of St. Mary at Garazin, and the Hierapolis) measure 144 in perimeter, and that these examples were all martyria or memorial structures. He concluded that, as such, through a reference to the Heavenly Jerusalem these underscore the notion of Life after Death. Three of the main group, all baptistries (the Lateran Baptistry, the Milan Baptistry, and the Baptistry of the Orthodox in Ravenna), do not measure 144. Kreuzsch concluded then that baptistries as a type make no reference to the Heavenly Jerusalem. (In this, he differs with Richard Krautheimer. See below.) Three of the buildings, all Byzantine (the Church of Mary in Tal Josephat, SS. Sergios and Bakchos and San Vitale), each have a rounded apse that projects from one of its octagonal sides; Kreuzsch asserted, however, that if one considers the measurements of the remaining sides, these buildings are 144 also. Of the three, Kreuzsch said only the Church of Mary is a memorial structure; the other two are "regular" churches following the byzantine preference for the central plan. Kreuzsch used his remaining two buildings, which are Roman (the Domus Aurea and the Mausoleum of Diocletian), as "controls."

Kreuzsch used this data to speculate on Aachen. The chapel corresponds in measurement to the six memorial

structures. Kreuzsch suggested, without foundation, that Aachen may thus have been intended from the outset to be the burial place of Charlemagne. More realistically, Kreuzsch said that the memorial reference may be tied to the relics from Jerusalem housed in Aachen. Kreuzsch then jumped to the subject of the physical models for Aachen. He seems to divide possible models into three groups: ideological; technical; and decorative. In "function and program," he saw the model for Aachen as memorial structures to Mary, in particular, the Blachernae Church; thus Kreuzsch associates Aachen by its measurement with memorial structures and is also able to concur generally with Krautheimer. In technical and formal aspects, Kreuzsch said that Italian models can be seen in Aachen, specifically in the influence of St. Aquilino. The decoration of Aachen, as well as the idea of a palatine chapel, came from Byzantium according to Kreuzsch, specifically from SS. Sergios and Bakchos by way of San Vitale.

Kreusch's willingness to see a variety of influences in Aachen is commendable. However, his discussion and analysis of the models was extremely superficial, and actually digressed from the main point of his article. Kreuzsch's initial and most interesting point about the chapel is its measurement; however, the ramifications of this reference to the Heavenly Jerusalem remain unexamined. By only saying that, through its measurement, Aachen is related to memorial structures, Kreuzsch avoided the issue of the interpretation of its "measurement of the angel." Kreuzsch abandoned this question in order to name particular models for different aspects of the chapel. Such divisions for influences, as well as the need to name names, seems rather contrived. Furthermore, Kreuzsch restricted his discussion of models to his fourteen comparative churches - chosen for a reason unbeknownst to us. While aspects of Kreuzsch's discussion are interesting, his ultimately superficial comparisons presented Aachen as a somewhat inexplicable hodge-podge.

Kreusch, a prolific writer on Aachen, was the Dombaumeister of Aachen after the death of Buchkremer in 1955. For his work, see: Schild.

¹¹⁰G. Bandmann, "Die Vorbilder der Aachener Pfalzkapelle," in Karl der Grosse, vol. 3, Karolingische Kunst, ed. W. Braunfels and H. Schnitzler, Düsseldorf, 1965, pp. 424-462. As for Bandmann's influence, Heitz, for example, noted this "excellent study" in his book on Carolingian architecture.

¹¹¹Bandmann, p. 424.

¹¹²Bandmann, p. 425.

113 Bandmann began by discussing Pepin's palatine chapel at Aachen, and moved on to the palatine chapels of the Merovingians, Franks, Ostrogoths and Lombards, all of which he more or less reject as models for Aachen. He then moved to San Vitale, which he maintained was the most plausible prototype. Bandmann saw San Vitale as a "type" standing for the Byzantine imperial chapel, and thus asserted that such buildings as SS. Sergios and Bakchos and Hagia Sophia were the ultimate models for Aachen. Bandmann touched on the issue of the imperial palatine mausoleum before he moved on to the throne room possibility. In his discussion of the latter issue, Bandmann rejected the Chrysotriclinos as a model, but seemed to consider the notion of a reference to the Dome of the Rock, which was thought to be Solomon's Temple, a possibility. He lastly discussed the possible models that could be related to Aachen through dedication, citing such buildings as the Anastasis and memorial churches to Mary.

114 Günther Bandmann, Mittelalterliche Architektur als Bedeutungsträger, 9th ed., Berlin, 1990. (first published in 1951.) See as well Bandmann's article: "Ikonologie der Architektur," Jahrbuch für Aesthetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft, 1 (1951), pp. 67-109.

115 In a review of the book, Robert Branner pointed this out. See: Art Bulletin, 35 (1953), pp. 307-310. See as well an article that is not so much a review as an assessment of the work of a number of scholars, including Krautheimer and Bandmann: Paul Crossley, "Medieval architecture and meaning: the limits of iconography," The Burlington Magazine, 130, no. 1019 (February 1988), pp. 116-121.

116 Bandmann, Mittelalterliche Architektur als Bedeutungsträger, p. 106.

117 Bandmann, Mittelalterliche Architektur als Bedeutungsträger, p. 48.

118 Bandmann, Mittelalterliche Architektur als Bedeutungsträger, p. 201.

119 Bandmann, Mittelalterliche Architektur als Bedeutungsträger, p. 206.

120 Georg Humann, "Der Zentralbau zu Mettlach und die von der Aachener Pfalzkapelle beeinflussten Bauten," Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst, v. 31, 1918, pp. 81-94.

121E Male; "L'église d'Aix-la-Chapelle et son influence dans la vallée du Rhin," Memoires de la Société National des Antiquaires de France 83, 9th series, 3 (1959), 127-129.

122Humann, p. 81.

123Interestingly, he did not reject outright textually related "copies." Cf. the views of Kleinbauer and Verbeek, below. See as well Chapter Three.

124Male described Aachen as a rotunda with an ambulatory, a square apse and a two story elevation.

125Male characterized Nijmegen as "an exact reproduction of the plan and elevation" of Aachen, Liège and Groningen as lost copies, Essen as "the most curious" of the copies, Ottmarsheim as exactly the same in elevation and plan, save that the exterior of the ambulatory is not sixteen-sided, and Mettlach as an example in which "it is hard to find the original." See: Male, pp. 127-129.

126Male, p. 129.

127Karl der Grosse. Werk und Wirkung, Aachen, 1965.

128Albert Verbeek, "Zentralbauten in der Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle," in Das Erste Jahrtausend, vol. II, ed. V. Elbern, Düsseldorf, 1964, pp. 898-947; and "Die architektonische Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle," in Karl der Grosse, vol. 4, Das Nachleben, eds. W. Braunfels and P. Schramm, Düsseldorf, 1967, pp. 113-156.

129Eugene Kleinbauer, "Charlemagne's Palace Chapel at Aachen and Its Copies," Gesta, 4 (Spring 1965), pp. 2-11.

130Germain Sieffert, "Les imitations de la chapelle palatine de Charlemagne à Aix-la-Chapelle," Cahiers de l'art médiéval, 5, fasc. 2, 1968-69, pp. 29-70.

131Kleinbauer, p. 2.

132Kleinbauer, p. 3. He mentioned its comparison to the Lateran, the Golden Triclinium and finally, to San Vitale.

133Kleinbauer, p. 3.

134 Kleinbauer, p. 4.

135 Kleinbauer, p. 4.

136 Kleinbauer, p. 4.

137 Kleinbauer, p. 6.

138 Kleinbauer, p. 6.

139 Kleinbauer, p. 6.

140 Sieffert, pp. 30-32. He concluded: "Il est certain que cette église a produit une très forte impression sur les contemporains de Charlemagne et de ses successeurs, non seulement en raison de ses originalités architecturales, mais encore de son riche décor constitué de chapiteaux antiques de remploi, de plaques de porphyre et de mosaïques. Il est très probable aussi que le prestige de Charlemagne dont cette église servait de mausolée, comme la présence de reliques insignes dans ce monument n'étaient pas étrangers à cette renommée dont nous allons maintenant retrouver les traces ailleurs."

141 In this process, Sieffert discussed Germigny-des-Prés, Nijmegen, Brugges, Liège, Muizen, Groningen, Wimpfen, Mettlach, Ottmarsheim, Essen, Bamberg, Hereford, and Georgenberg. Sieffert had a particular interest in Ottmarsheim, evidenced by an article he wrote on it in which he as well recapitulated his work on the "copies" in brief. See: "Ottmarsheim," Congrès archéologique 136 (1978).

142 He chose to discuss: piers with projecting moldings; tribunes or galleries; a two-story column screen; a square or rectangular apse; and a west block flanked by stair towers.

143 In a postscript to the article, pp. 68-70, Sieffert noted the publication of Verbeek's first article, and added a bit of the information given there on specific monuments.

144 See, for example: Heitz, p. 79.

145 Verbeek, "Zentralbauten," p. 897.

146 Verbeek, "Zentralbauten," p. 897.

147 Verbeek, "Zentralbauten," p. 897.

¹⁴⁸Aachen was characterized as a directional central plan with galleries, superimposed choirs to the east and a throne over the west entrance hall in the western block. The particular vaulting forms of the sixteen-sided ambulatory and the intricate foundation structures of the building were discussed as well, reinforcing that Verbeek's primary interest was, in fact, in structure.

¹⁴⁹Verbeek, "Zentralbauten," p. 902.

¹⁵⁰Verbeek, "Zentralbauten," pp. 936-937. In order to structure his discussion of the formally-identified "copies," Verbeek established a thematically designated group - not surprisingly, the palatine chapel - and described Nijmegen, Bamberg and St. Donatien in Brugges. He then moved to Liège, apparently following the path of geographical location set up by Brugges, and then on to Muizen, Löwen and Groningen. Verbeek then presented Ottmarsheim, Wimpfen and Goslar chronologically.

¹⁵¹Verbeek, "Die architektonische Nachfolge," p. 121.

¹⁵²Verbeek, "Die architektonische Nachfolge," p. 121.

¹⁵³See Chapter Five, pp. 202-205.

¹⁵⁴Verbeek, "Die architektonische Nachfolge," p. 140. Verbeek's discussion of the influence of parts of Aachen centered on a discussion of the three-part west block or Westbau, which he saw - no doubt following Bandmann - as having meaning as a symbol of the city. He discussed as well the later use of Aachen's particular and innovative vaulting systems.

¹⁵⁵Verbeek, "Zentralbauten," p. 939.

¹⁵⁶Verbeek, "Zentralbauten," p. 939. In the ensuing developmental chronology, Brugges was characterized as a precursor of the Ottonian buildings, seen in Mettlach, Liège and Muizen, and the majority of "copies" which fall between 1030 and 1050 - the Early Salian period.

¹⁵⁷He assessed them geographically, concluding that most were found in the narrow area of Aachen and its sphere of political influence. Noting the varied functions of the "copies," Verbeek provided general ideas that might link them to Aachen - a palatine chapel, a throne area, a

canonical community, a religious function, a funerary function, a patron.

¹⁵⁸Verbeek, "Zentralbauten," pp. 946-947.

¹⁵⁹Verbeek, "Zentralbauten," p. 947.

¹⁶⁰The evolution and perpetuation of this scholarly image may be tied, in fact, to the particular tenets of the German university system. See: F. Ringer, The Decline of the German Mandarins, Cambridge, MA., 1969.

¹⁶¹See, for example: B. Schütz and W. Müller, Deutsche Romanik. Die Kirchenbauten der Kaiser, Bischöfe und Klöster, Freiburg, 1989, "Aachen-Kopien," pp. 527-533. The analysis of the "copies" in this work was obviously indebted to Verbeek. As well, Heitz relied greatly on Verbeek for his analysis of select "copies" in his survey of Carolingian architecture. Importantly, Heitz chose to present the "copies" directly after his discussion of Aachen itself, thus the buildings were presented once again as a subset of the imperial chapel. See: L'architecture religieuse carolingienne, pp. 78-86.

Chapter Three
Rewriting the Past:
Aachen, Germigny-des-Prés and Letaldus of Micy

While Aachen's history in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries can be considered in terms of the renewed interest in medieval works, the attraction to the remains of the Middle Ages certainly was not a strictly German phenomenon, and this more widespread concern was current especially in France. The Carolingian oratory of Theodulf at Germigny-des-Prés as it appears today primarily reflects an image of medieval architecture propounded during its restoration; in 1867, the dilapidated chapel was almost totally demolished and then reconstructed.¹ (figs. 10 and 11) However, despite alterations to the building over the centuries and the problems of the nineteenth-century alterations, the original disposition of Germigny-des-Prés has been ascertained by scholars, primarily through information gleaned by Hubert during the excavations of 1930² (figs. 12a and 12b) and the pre-restoration description of the building provided by Bouet.³

Not surprisingly, the primary concern of Germigny-des-Prés scholarship has been to clarify the church's original form and to place the oratory within the development of medieval architecture. However, when seen in formal, structural and stylistic terms, it is apparent why scholars have long been puzzled by the questions of Germigny-des-Prés and its origins. The small oratory is a centrally-planned

square structure, the square core of the building divided into nine bays of unequal size by four square piers. These four piers define the central and largest interior space and support the high square tower that caps this central focus of the chapel. Despite the restorers' truncation of the tower,⁴ the interior elevation of the central space is still discernible. The four piers carry an arcade of horseshoe arches, each arch opening widely into the adjoining bay. A more complex second story, composed of a large arch molding framing a small open arcade of three horseshoe arches, sits atop the arcade. Light comes through the openings from a window - visible only from the exterior - behind the space, on the exterior wall. Above each second story arch is a small window emitting light directly from the exterior. While the windows to the north, south and west are arched openings, that to the east distinguishes this area of the church by being square.

The rest of the chapel remains subordinated to the tall, light-filled central space. Opening off the space through the arches held on the four piers are four large rectangular bays.⁵ These bays were originally tunnel-vaulted, at about the height of the arcade, thus inscribing a cross within the square plan. The four remaining bays - the smallest corner spaces - were originally domed and are accessible through horseshoe arches from the larger bays.

Each of the large bays of the inscribed cross opens into a large horseshoe-shaped apse, the western apse now gone,⁶ each being markedly different in shape and size.⁷ Reaching the height of the bays preceding them, the apses were half-domed. In addition to these large apses, originally two smaller apses flanked the eastern apse,⁸ accessible through the small corner bays into which they opened. The central plan was thus given directionality, the emphasis placed on the east end - an emphasis further expressed through the use of plastic decoration. While the opening into each large apse is articulated through the use of a small column placed about halfway up the wall, visually supporting the springing of the arch opening, the eastern bay opening has, in addition, a pair of small colonnettes on each side of the intrados.⁹

The accentuation of the east end of the church was further articulated through its decoration - most pointedly by the famous apse mosaic of the Ark of the Covenant that exists today in heavily-restored form,¹⁰ and, below it, a row of blind arches originally filled with mosaic decoration.¹¹ Originally there were, as well, more mosaics, which were completely destroyed during the rebuilding and are now known only through drawings.¹² The entire interior of the church was richly embellished with sculpted capitals and decoration as well as with stucco decoration; the vast majority of this work was destroyed during the

reconstruction, though some fragments remain today in the Musée de l'Orléanais.¹³

The above consideration of the formal properties of Theodulf's oratory establishes the accepted grounds for scholarly discussion of the chapel and certainly makes clear why scholars have seen Germigny-des-Prés as a seeming anomaly among known Carolingian buildings. While aspects of Germigny-des-Prés permit comparison with known contemporary monuments - primarily in terms of the rich mosaic decoration and the massing of the hierarchically arranged forms on the exterior - the plan and elevation of the oratory cannot be related formally to other works of the Carolingian Age or even with certainty to available prototypes. While much has been made of Theodulf's Visigothic roots and the "eastern" turn of the building, no convincing consensus has been reached as to the sources for the oratory, and scholars have had to rely on formal references to buildings in distant Armenia.¹⁴ In such analyses, it remains unexplained how or why these forms were transmitted to Neustria; however, this issue has not entered into these discussions, which aim to find buildings seen as comparable in form and structure to Germigny-des-Prés.

This scholarly problem has been exacerbated by the question of Germigny-des-Prés' relation to Aachen. While scholars have gone in search of formal and structural equivalents, the only building to which Germigny-des-Prés is

compared in known medieval texts is Aachen - and Germigny-des-Prés, in scholarly analytical terms, cannot be compared to Aachen. The problem centers on part of one line found in Letaldus of Micy's late tenth-century Miracula Sancti Maximini, in which the author stated: "And among his other works, Bishop Theodulf built a wondrous church, manifestly in the likeness of the one built at Aachen, in the town called Germigny . . ."15 This rather emphatic statement, however, generally has been viewed as suspect.

Krautheimer used the example of Germigny-des-Prés to illustrate that the idea of similitude obviously meant something different to the medieval observer than it does to the modern architectural historian, and, in Germigny-des-Prés, he saw the alleged comparison as based in a very general formal connection to Aachen as well as a link in dedication.¹⁶ Scholarly analyses of Germigny-des-Prés' status as a possible "copy" of Aachen, however, have rested ultimately on a formal analytical model of comparison. Perplexed by Letaldus' statement and unable to dismiss it without some consideration, scholars have attempted to reconcile the text with the two buildings involved, resorting ultimately to Krautheimer's ideas about general formal connections - both Germigny-des-Prés and Aachen are centrally planned - and dedication.¹⁷ In their discussions, moreover, scholars have raised - though not explored - issues important to a consideration of the relationship

between Germigny-des-Prés and Aachen: the question of the churches' functions; the issue of intentionality on Theodulf's part; and the relationship of the Miracula to other texts.¹⁸

Yet despite attempts to see connections between the two buildings, Germigny-des-Prés has been judged by the majority of scholars as the consummate "non-copy," as it bore little formal resemblance to Aachen outside of its central plan. The formal differences alone allowed for the dismissal of Germigny-des-Prés by many, yet corollary to this was the question of the scholarly worth of Letaldus' text.¹⁹ Ironically, the perceived primacy of textual sources has been the cornerstone of modern historical inquiry. There is a hierarchy within this methodological framework, however, and a saint's life such as the Miracula can be deemed uncritical and unreliable, as hagiography is permeated with such non-factual phenomena as miracles. Letaldus' account, therefore, commonly has been put aside as the non-historical ravings of a confused monk.

Yet certainly the goal of hagiography was not historical veracity in any modern sense of the word; as one scholar aptly stated, "hagiography . . . was considered to be ethically rather than factually true."²⁰ The writing of hagiographic texts - primarily a monastic literary form - was commonplace in the Middle Ages.²¹ Hagiographic works were meant to be edifying, the chosen subjects intended to

present a moral ideal, one that reflected the monastic value system. Monastic authors returned again and again to the same subjects, which were timeless in their appeal. Due to shared general goals and the value of tradition, originality was not an issue; it is not uncommon to see the use of earlier works in later handlings of a saint. Intended to support the cause of a saintly cult, the works were imbued with a mythic and even propagandistic flavor, and, clearly separated from mundane experience by their very subject matter, the accounts were unconcerned with strict chronological time and place.²² Saintly "types" and miraculous topoi intermingle easily with imperial reigns in a deceptively quasi-historical manner.

The negative assessment of Letaldus certainly has stemmed from critical assumptions about the purpose of texts and their value for historical inquiry. These assumptions, however, have divorced Letaldus' words not only from their text and its intentions, but also from the context in which they were written. While there is no need to posit that Letaldus presents an incontrovertible authority on medieval architecture, his comparison of Aachen and Germigny-des-Prés highlights the issues of the "copy" and historical memory, and his work questions assumptions not only about the value of the text, but about the nature of likeness. A consideration of Letaldus and his text, in conjunction with the buildings and the contemporary historical situation,

firstly, questions a purely formal approach to the medieval architectural "copy," and, secondly, asserts that the image of Aachen - and Germigny-des-Prés - reflected in the Miracula was greatly influenced by time and circumstance.

The history of Germigny-des-Prés itself provides a backdrop for the consideration of Letaldus' assertion. Built by Theodulf, the Bishop of Orléans, Germigny-des-Prés has been dated to after Theodulf became, simultaneously with his office of bishop, the abbot of Fleury,²³ a position that he was given in 799 or 802.²⁴ Germigny-des-Prés, located near the monastery, was owned by Fleury and was the site of the abbot's now lost villa. The dating of Germigny-des-Prés, which was originally dedicated to the Savior, has been honed down then to the early years of the ninth century.²⁵ Certainly the patron was Theodulf, as is evidenced by his own poetic references to his church.²⁶ The uses of the chapel are not specifically known, yet its small size and location within Theodulf's private villa strongly suggest that it was intended for his personal use. While entry into the church may have been gained originally through the western apse,²⁷ there is evidence as well that a small classicizing doorway once opened in the wall at the northeast corner bay,²⁸ perhaps evidence of a private entrance for Theodulf from his adjoining villa.²⁹ The chapel remained in use at least until 818, when Theodulf was banished after having been accused of complicity in a plot

against the Emperor Louis the Pious, and he then died two years later in disgrace in a prison in Angers.³⁰

Theodulf's impact on the region where he was simultaneously the Bishop of Orléans and the Abbot of Fleury should not be underestimated. His prestige as the imperial appointee to a major episcopal see was enhanced by his designation as the abbot of Fleury. The special status of Fleury as a monastic center was due the presence of the relics of St. Benedict, the founder of the Benedictine order, at St.-Benoit,³¹ and from early on the foundation was the monastic magnet in the Orléanais. Founded in the seventh century,³² Fleury had a venerable history as a cultural and intellectual center. The monastery, moreover, became an important hub under the Carolingians due to Theodulf's presence there and his patronage of literature and the arts.³³

It was from within the parameters of the ecclesiastical world of the Orléanais established by Theodulf that Letaldus produced his Miracula sancti Maximini. Letaldus, while still young, was given to the monastery of Micy-Saint-Mesmin,³⁴ located near Orléans, and lived most of his life within this important microcosm of the monastic world.³⁵ The history of Micy tied it to the nearby power centers of the Orléanais. The early history of the monastery is obscure, related only in hagiographic texts devoted to the life of the first abbot, St. Mesmin. The earliest life, by

the monk Bertold, dates to the mid-ninth century,³⁶ an anonymous life was also written in the ninth century³⁷ and Letaldus' Miracula dates to 986 or 987.³⁸

All written by monks of Micy, these works related similar stories of the monastery's founding and history. It was said that the rebellious people of the town of Verdun were saved from the wrath of the angry Clovis through the intercession of the local priest Euspicius. Impressed with the venerable Euspicius, Clovis pardoned the rebels and asked the priest to accompany him to Orléans. Clovis presented the priest, who brought his nephew Mesmin with him, with the lands of Micy, where Euspicius spent the remainder of his life. After the death of his uncle, Mesmin, by then a priest himself, became the first abbot of Micy. Mesmin remained abbot of Micy until his death in ca. 520. His saintly credentials rested primarily on his actions to rid the local populace of the problem of a menacing dragon who lived in one of the many caves along the nearby Loire. Mesmin entered the "grotto" and slew the monster, and, at his own request, he was buried in the Grotto of the Dragon.³⁹ Despite the loss of their abbot, the young monastery was said to have flourished and produced an astounding number of saints.⁴⁰ Yet, after the tenure of the fourth abbot, the monastery fell mysteriously into decline and nothing was known of Micy in the following two centuries.⁴¹

The reported decline of Micy was mitigated by the refounding of the monastery by the Bishop Theodulf, who requested that twelve monks be sent from Aniane to refound Micy.⁴² After Theodulf's intervention, the monastery flourished.⁴³ The monastic fervor of the refounded Micy can clearly be gauged by the hagiographic texts produced there in the ninth century.

Micy's perceived early ties to Orléans, reestablished through Theodulf, continued to have an important impact on the monastery in its subsequent history, and interchange between the institutions was commonplace.⁴⁴ Furthermore, the monastery of Micy was tied to the Orléans bishopric as part of the patrimony of the bishops, though in 825 the monastery was given the right of abbatial election by the king.⁴⁵ While the Bishopric of Orléans exerted power and a measure of control over Micy, Fleury, as a nearby and preeminent monastic institution, had a great impact on the intellectual life of the monastery. While Fleury was the major monastic power in the Orléanais, the monastery's influence as a major "European" intellectual center blossomed after the reformation of the abbey under Odo of Cluny, who was the Abbot of Fleury from ca. 930 to 942.⁴⁶ In turn, Fleury itself became a center of the tenth-century reform movement, and reformed Micy.⁴⁷

As an intellectual center, the presence of Abbo, first as armarius, marked the beginning of Fleury's period of

unprecedented brilliance,⁴⁸ and some of his students went on to become the intellectual core of the foundation, while others became abbots themselves, spreading the influence of Fleury.⁴⁹ One of Fleury's monks, Constantine, in fact became the Abbot of Micy in the late tenth century.⁵⁰ Abbo's role as teacher continued after he became abbot in 988. Considered as one of the great minds of his time - comparable, according to some, only to Gerbert of Aurillac⁵¹ - Abbo penned numerous works, many of which have been lost.⁵² The richness of intellectual life nurtured by Abbo continued under his successors. The sheer number of works written at Fleury from the late tenth century and into the eleventh bears witness to this unique moment in time and these works, primarily historical and hagiographic texts, illustrate the intellectual preoccupations of the foundation.⁵³

Letaldus, living in the second half of the tenth century, knew Micy as a brilliant monastic light, intimately connected with the great ecclesiastical and monastic centers of the Orléanais. Letaldus himself emerges as a colorful and highly regarded figure within this ecclesiastical orbit and coalescing intellectual world. In the tradition of Fleury - and Micy - and perhaps inspired by their precedent, Letaldus is certainly best known from his writings, primarily for his hagiographic works.⁵⁴ In addition to the Miracula Sancti Maximini, he wrote the Delatio Corporis

Sancti Juniani,⁵⁵ the Vita Sancti Juliani⁵⁶, and also a life of Saint Martin of Vertou.⁵⁷ As well, he wrote at least one poetic work, which has been praised by modern scholars for its intellectual sophistication and craftsmanship.⁵⁸ Moreover, Letaldus was known to the great intellects of the Orléanais; Abbo referred to him specifically in a letter to the monks of Micy and mentioned him as well in his Apologeticus.⁵⁹

Engaged in the intellectual discourse of the day and known to the luminaries of his monastic world, Letaldus must be seen as an active participant in the discussions of his time. It is against the backdrop of the monastic and episcopal world of the late tenth-century Orléanais that Letaldus and his Miracula must be considered. Importantly, the character of hagiographic texts changed subtly during the Middle Ages, and the tenth century in particular was a time in which many hagiographers returned to and rewrote the lives of earlier saints.⁶⁰ Moreover, while the general goals of hagiography can be seen as constant, certainly authors could have more specific, even personal aims in penning their works, and this tendency is seen in the Miracula.

The Miracula purported to be a recounting of the miracles of Saint Mesmin. It is clear from the Miracula that Letaldus was familiar with at least Bertold's Life and certainly relied on earlier works for his own recounting of

Micy's early history,⁶¹ yet the peculiar hagiographic make-up and forceful commentary provided in the Miracula reveal that Letaldus' intentions diverged greatly from those of his predecessors. In contrast, Letaldus' work is striking for its lengthy historical critique of Micy since the time of Theodulf, and the book, far from simply enumerating Mesmin's miracles, was "a history of the relationship between the Bishops of Orléans and the monastery of Micy."⁶²

Letaldus' degree of self-awareness and purpose was clearly articulated in his Prologue, and it is evident that he was a monastic partisan - an ardent champion of Micy.⁶³ The Miracula, in fact, reflected the author's preoccupations and his views - and perhaps Micy's views - on the past, an image influenced by and even necessitated by the present. It is important to consider the forum chosen by Letaldus: as a monk, a hagiographic text could be seen as a natural choice, yet Letaldus just as easily could have written, for example, an ecclesiastical history. By presenting and commenting on Micy's past within a hagiographical context, Letaldus imbued his account and its image of the past with a moral authority and an incorruptible quality.

Letaldus' presentation of Theodulf underscored his particular bent. Letaldus devoted an entire section of his third chapter to the bishop, and provided a distinctive image of Theodulf as well as an alternative history for the end of his life:

And so in the time of the divine memory of Charles Augustus (also known as the Great), God was arranging all things so as to return that same place [Micy] to its former glory, Theodulf, most noble in character and birth, and of the keenest intellect, succeeded as bishop of the church of Orleans. And diligently urging the extent to which this place might be restored to its former glory, and finding the monks of the neighboring regions ill-suited for accomplishing this, he drew some from Septimania, to whom he gave that place, along with the things formerly allotted to it, adding over and above from his own things besides. In so doing he did not regret what he had done, for certainly in his time the glory of his church shone forth such that its supervenient beauty [or honor] overshadowed the shame of its former ignominy, and its newfound gains outweighed its past expenses. And among his other works, Bishop Theodulf built a wondrous church, manifestly in the likeness of Aachen, in the town called Germigny (near the monastery of Fleury), whose memory he elegantly expressed in these his own verses:

Theodulf consecrated this temple in honor of God,
So that whoever comes here, I pray, will remember
me.

But this venerable priest was falsely accused of treason before the king and was removed from the office of bishop, and for many days he was placed under custody, but presently by a miraculous change of affairs he fully cleansed himself of the charge, was restored to the king's favor, and received again the former dignity of the bishop's chair, never to lose it again. For he who lives in exile bears the destruction of his things by evil force, the free reign of power, and the assailing of his goods until they are exhausted by cupidity.⁶⁴

Letaldus thus opened by placing his subject in time, denoted specifically as the time of Charlemagne.⁶⁵ This time was characterized in Christian terms, God seen working to right monastic affairs, particularly at Micy. God's agent in this matter was Theodulf, the Bishop of Orléans, who was introduced as a great, virtuous and generous man -

characteristics reflected in his move to refound Micy and restore the monastery's honor. Importantly, Theodulf was implicitly imaged as a model bishop: pious, good and interested in monastic affairs. He was described as having been responsible for a number of works of which one, Germigny-des-Prés, was singled out as notable and described as obviously like, or comparable to, Aachen. Letaldus then related the accusation of conspiracy and Theodulf's imprisonment, yet went on to say that this indictment was reversed and Theodulf restored to his former glory.

Letaldus' account of Theodulf's salvation from ignominy can certainly be seen as crucial to the self-image of Micy, as Theodulf's role as the monastery's refounder made him a critical figure in Micy's history. Theodulf's legitimacy was a necessity for Micy, and his alleged crimes had to be expunged. Theodulf's extrication, perfunctorily delivered at the end of the passage, was presaged and even required by the description of the bishop that preceded it. Theodulf's character was established as honorable, respectable and pious - above reproach - primarily through his implicit association and comparison with Charlemagne. Theodulf lived in the age of Charlemagne, a time in which the hand of God was evident, and Theodulf himself restored order to Micy. Moreover, Theodulf's noble and pious character was further established in terms of his material legacy, which was

directly compared to that of Charlemagne: Germigny-des-Prés was singled out, and described as an image of Aachen.

The act of building a church was seen as a pious one, one that reflected the character of the patron,⁶⁶ and the comparison of Germigny-des-Prés to Aachen was presented as if it required no qualification. There was, furthermore, the tacit assumption that everyone would know that Aachen was Charlemagne's creation. Letaldus' assertion of similitude, however, was not based on rigid formal and stylistic characteristics. In fact, he made no mention of what either building looked like. Rather, Letaldus' statement voiced a perception of the past in which Charlemagne - and Aachen - were upheld as incontrovertible standards, and Theodulf and Germigny-des-Prés favorably equated with them. Theodulf and his church thus were seen as standards through association. It was the image of Aachen as the personal creation of Charlemagne and therefore as a reflection of him that was evoked through Letaldus' comparison.

From his later vantage point, Letaldus relegated Charlemagne and Aachen and Theodulf and Germigny-des-Prés to hagiographic time and standards. These characters, then, were accorded special meaning by their very inclusion within the discourse. In particular Theodulf, remembered and described within a hagiographical context, was given an inviolate status - he was a hagiographical image, with the

attending gloss of sanctity and legitimacy.⁶⁷ Moreover, Theodulf was cast in the mold of Charlemagne, who obviously by this time was seen as a semi-sanctified figure. This perception of pious and moral intention and deed in a distant past was articulated within the inherently mythicizing, propagandistic discourse of a hagiographic text: the legendary Charlemagne created Aachen just as Theodulf - the king's associate and a pivotal character in the history of Micy - created his own chapel.

That the time of Charlemagne would be perceived in the tenth-century Orléanais as a mythic standard is certainly not surprising. Separated by almost two centuries, the age of Charlemagne represented the halcyon time of the foundation of the Carolingian dynasty. While Charlemagne's Empire was fragmented and numerous changes had occurred since his death in 814, the Orléanais had remained, with the Western Empire, under the power of the Carolingian heirs. This chain of power, reaching back to the legendary Charlemagne, presented a continuity and an authority, even a security. Certainly Letaldus saw the time of Charlemagne as a standard in ecclesiastical matters. In associating Theodulf directly with Charlemagne, Letaldus evoked the legitimacy of the Carolingians and as well harkened back to the importance and status of Micy at that time.

The age of Charlemagne and Theodulf must have appeared even more idyllic and authoritative when compared to the

situation of monasteries in the Orléanais in the late tenth century. The very time in which Letaldus wrote the Miracula was one of grave uncertainty for the Carolingians, and, in fact, 987 witnessed the downfall of Carolingian power and the rise of Hughes Capet.⁶⁸ The advent of Hughes Capet certainly was a cause of anxiety for the monasteries in the Empire that traced their heritage, and thus their self-image and authority to the early Carolingians.⁶⁹ The anxiety was particularly acute for Fleury, as it was tied directly to the Carolingian dynasty.⁷⁰

The events of the last fifteen years of the tenth century were, in fact, particularly tumultuous for monastic foundations. Letaldus' text - with its requisite mythologization of Theodulf - may reflect the author's concern with the contemporary situation. The bishops of the realm wielded tremendous power - they were, in a sense, temporal lords - and often they attempted to use their power at the expense of monastic interests.⁷¹ Micy, directly under the power of the bishops, was certainly vulnerable. Letaldus' text as a whole championed the rights of the monastery of Micy with respect to Orléans, and Letaldus, by his own words, was uncertain and concerned about Micy's future.⁷² Fleury, although not directly under the bishop's power, had experienced the calamity of a mysterious "intruder" abbot, whom even Gerbert of Aurillac urged the monks to expel.⁷³ The struggle to uphold monastic rights,

particularly against the whims of episcopal powers, was a leitmotiv in the Orléanais in the late tenth century, and an already difficult situation was exacerbated by the dynastic upheaval.

Letaldus' text appears, in fact, to presage the calamitous struggles between monastic and episcopal powers in the Orléanais that rocked the newly formed Capetian Empire.⁷⁴ Perhaps the most active champion of monastic issues in the area was Abbo of Fleury,⁷⁵ who apparently resorted to forging a papal document to ensure Fleury's independence.⁷⁶ While Abbo's style of defense differed from Letaldus' - he certainly had more resources and power at his disposal - the abbot's struggles for monastic autonomy colored the late tenth-century history of the Orléanais. Abbo's greatest conflicts were with the Bishop of Orléans, and his antipathy towards Hughes Capet's faithful appointee, Arnulf, is well known. Arnulf hoped to secure an oath from Fleury, as he perhaps had from Micy, only to meet with a stern refusal from Abbo.⁷⁷ The two men clashed over the question of what to do with the duplicitous Archbishop Arnulf of Reims, an illegitimate son of Lothaire who, having renounced his Carolingian ties, proceeded to support the claim of Charles of Lorraine to the Carolingian throne.⁷⁸ Hughes Capet imprisoned both Arnulf and Charles in Orléans, and Gerbert of Aurillac became Archbishop. Abbo's defense of Arnulf of Reims - the abbot was an upholder of the law,

especially when doing so curbed the growth of episcopal power - won him the enmity of Gerbert, a supporter of the prosecutor, Arnulf of Orléans.⁷⁹

The rift between Abbo and Arnulf of Orléans widened in 994 at the Council of St. Denis, where their differences led to Abbo's excommunication by Gerbert.⁸⁰ This event gave Abbo occasion to write the Liber Apologeticus, which he addressed to the king in defense of his stance. The second part of the tract addressed the accusations of Arnulf of Orléans, and constituted an eloquent defense of monastic interests.⁸¹ An aspect of Abbo's defense was his short reference to Letaldus, whom he says the Bishop had treated unjustly.⁸² The particulars of this mistreatment are unknown, but judging from Abbo's context, Arnulf's problems with Letaldus no doubt had to do with differences regarding monastic rights in relation to the bishopric.⁸³

The reference to Letaldus in the Apologeticus may indicate some activity or at least outspokenness on Letaldus' part. From what is known of Letaldus and his partisanship, it is clear that his methods differed greatly from Abbo's: Abbo defended Fleury through recourse to law and tradition, while Letaldus, as a mere monk, turned to other avenues of defense. Letaldus' concern for Micy, reflected in his account of the founder of the monastery, was, in fact, not to be simply a unique gesture on the monk's part. His upholding of monastic authority may

actually be taken as portentous of later actions on behalf of his monastery, when the monks of Micy took exception to King Robert's appointment of Robert of St. Florent to the office of Abbot of Micy in 997.⁸⁴ The monks, apparently following Letaldus' cue, staged a successful revolt no later than 1003, driving Robert out of the monastery, though he was restored to his position with the help of Abbo and the king.⁸⁵ Abbo, as upholder of the law, wrote to the monks of Micy, asking Letaldus in particular to search his heart and consider his actions.⁸⁶

It is thought that Letaldus' actions garnered him a one way ticket to Le Mans, where he probably spent the rest of his life.⁸⁷ His activities at Micy reflected his sympathies with the concerns of the monastic community of the Orléanais, and the Miracula stands as an early indication of his convictions. Certainly Letaldus' account of Theodulf illustrates the preoccupations of the author in his struggle to establish his monastery's position through a reference to Carolingian authority. However, the question remains as to whether Letaldus' image of Germigny-des-Prés and Theodulf was fabricated to articulate his point, or whether Letaldus was in fact transmitting a more widely held notion, something that was considered "common knowledge" at Micy or even in the Orléanais.

Letaldus' preoccupation with Germigny-des-Prés was not unique. Germane to his comparison of Germigny-des-Prés to

Aachen - and the view it affords into the historical memory regarding Theodulf - is the account of Theodulf found in the Catalogus abbatum Floriacensium.⁸⁸ The Catalogus lists the abbots of Fleury, with the dates of their tenure, from the monastery's foundation through Theodulf.⁸⁹ The Catalogus distinguishes itself particularly through the entry on Theodulf. While the preceding abbots, with the exception of the famous first abbot Mumolus, simply are listed by name and tenure, the account of Theodulf is lengthy, stating:⁹⁰

. . . The fourteenth abbot, Theodulf, [ruled] nineteen and one half years. Having been brought to France from Spain by the most illustrious Charlemagne by reason of his knowledge of learning, in which he excelled, was made abbot of Fleury and bishop of Orleans. Wherefore, as we have said, he was held to be distinguished in learning and renowned in theology, he produced a gloss on the Athanasian creed, which is sung every day by the monks at prime after the three regular psalms. Also he expounded the sacrament of the mass - or those things performed therein, which contain the mysteries - and many other things besides in a very concise and splendid way. Nor was his zeal any less for the raising of the most elegant buildings. For instance, there is a town called Germigny-des-Prés three miles from our monastery. Some land here had been donated, and some sold, mainly by earlier abbots but also in part by God-fearing men who had inherited it. In this same place Theodulf, as abbot and bishop, built a church of such great art that, before it was destroyed by fire, no other architectural work in all of Neustria could be found to equal it. The whole basilica raised up on vaulted work, the interior embellished with stucco flowers and mosaics, and the floor illustrated with figures in marble, was such that the eyes of the onlookers could scarcely take in the pleasing sight. Furthermore, in the timbered tower, where there hung crosses, the following verses had been inscribed in silver:

Theodulf consecrated this temple in
 honor of God,
 So that whoever comes here, I pray, will
 remember me.

In this he emulated Charlemagne, who while at Aachen had built a church of such great beauty that none like it was to be found in all of Gaul. For the aforesaid prince instructed that he should build a temple of God to be dedicated to the honor of the Mother Mary. For truly Theodulf, in consecrating to God, Lord and Savior of all, the church that he had constructed, embellished the Cherubim that graced the seat above the altar with these verses, most artfully expressed:

Here look upon the holy oracle and
 Cherubim!
 And behold the shining Ark of the
 Covenant of God.
 Marking this with prayers, and following
 the sounding Thunder of the Lord,
 I seek your prayers, Theodulf.

But because he is always envied for his wisdom, and it is difficult not to envy prosperity, he was accused before the Emperor Louis of having knowingly plotted against him, was exiled to Angers, and released from his charge. There, on Palm Sunday, in the presence of the Emperor, those most beautiful verses proclaiming the glory and praise of Christ, which today are sung by holy men throughout all of Gaul, he sang from the tower where he had composed them, beginning as follows:

All glory, laud and honor to thee,
 Redeemer, King,
 To whom the lips of children made sweet
 hosannas ring.

The Catalogus account, while differing from that in the Miracula, certainly presents points of comparison in terms of interests and intent. Theodulf was described as Charlemagne's choice, in this case for both the offices of Abbot of Fleury and Bishop of Orléans - for Fleury as well had a stake in Theodulf's history - and as an intellect and a man of God. The fall of Theodulf was included, and though

he was not reinstated in this version, he was imaged as the victim of jealous rivals and, to the end, as a pious - innocent - man, singing psalms in his tower prison.

Within the text, an inordinate amount of space was dedicated to discussing Germigny-des-Prés as Theodulf's creation. Upheld as a standard specifically for Neustria, it was described through its marvelous interior decoration. The church was again compared to Aachen - and Theodulf to Charlemagne. Theodulf was perceived as having emulated Charlemagne in building Germigny-des-Prés, as the emperor built Aachen.⁹¹ A territorial competition of sorts was constructed with respect to the two men and their churches and the standards they presented: while Aachen had no rival in Gaul, Germigny-des-Prés had none in Neustria. The churches were further differentiated by their dedications: Charlemagne dedicated his church to the Virgin, while Theodulf consecrated his to Christ. Yet, despite these perceived differences, the comparison again highlighted intention and deed in the personal creation specifically of a church.

While the Catalogus is indeed similar in a very general way to the Miracula in its treatment of Theodulf, any chronological relationship between the texts is difficult to determine, as the date as well as the origin of the Catalogus are uncertain.⁹² According to Vidier, the Catalogus dates to the beginning of the twelfth century,

though he said that the text, particularly the treatment of Theodulf, suggests an author possibly of the early ninth century.⁹³ Vidier's assumption that the account of Theodulf, and the fact that the text ends with Theodulf, must indicate that the text was written relatively soon after his death is not necessarily justifiable. The very length and content of the entry signifies the need to justify Theodulf in some manner, certainly after his death, yet most likely after the passage of some time. The list in fact appears contrived, as if it were created to eulogize and defend the dead Theodulf. Furthermore, as the text mentions a fire at Germigny-des-Prés, Holder-Egger dated it later.⁹⁴ While the exact date of the curious text remains unknown, it is highly doubtful that it dates to before, at the earliest, the late ninth century. Furthermore, while the exact provenance of the manuscript remains open to question, the list of possible origins has been confined to Fleury and certain dependents in its orbit. However, it appears likely that the text came from Fleury or was at least at Fleury in the early twelfth century, as it was used as a source by Hughes of Fleury,⁹⁵ and it is thus reasonable to suggest that it dates to the tenth or the eleventh century, to Fleury or a close dependent.

The particulars of its dating and provenance aside, the Catalogus clearly shows that, at least according to Fleury and/or certain affiliated monasteries in the tenth or

eleventh century, it was seen as reasonable to compare Theodulf and Charlemagne, and, in turn, Germigny-des-Prés and Aachen. Furthermore, it gives insight into Letaldus' comparison. Though it is unsure which text predates the other, the issue is not necessarily one of precedence; the content and language of the texts suggests that they are not directly related or dependent on one another. It therefore seems likely that the interest in Theodulf and the analogy of Germigny-des-Prés and Aachen was prevalent within the Fleury monastic orbit. If this image were, in fact, a creation of Letaldus, or even of the Catalogus author, the monasteries in the Fleury orbit, or most probably those that had a stake in Theodulf's image, found it acceptable and perpetuated it.

Letaldus' account of the end of Theodulf's life, however - while it has given scholar's pause to worry about the exact year of Jonas' occupation of the episcopal seat⁹⁶ - may have originated, at least in written form, with Letaldus. However, his image of Theodulf's salvation from prison, as well as the account of the end of the Bishop's life given in the Catalogus, were used as sources in at least one later work, Hughes of Fleury's early eleventh-century Historia Ecclesiae. Hughes' account of the end of Theodulf's life is a conflation of the two, while his account of Jonas, Theodulf's successor, stemmed directly from Letaldus.⁹⁷ With Hughes of Fleury, there was, then, a

tacit acceptance and perpetuation of the local perception of Theodulf articulated in the preceding works. In Hughes' work, there is none of the urgency of the earlier accounts; certainly the need to evoke the memory of Theodulf or defend him had subsided.

The Miracula of Letaldus - and the Catalogus - besides providing fodder for later Fleury authors, offer evidence that Theodulf and Germigny-des-Prés were very much on the minds of the monks of the Fleury orbit in the late Carolingian and early post-Carolingian age.⁹⁸ Letaldus' perception of Theodulf, and his comparison of Germigny-des-Prés and Aachen, suggest an image prevalent within an area separated by time from the Carolingian Age and by distance from Aachen. The image of Aachen - as the creation of Charlemagne and a reflection of him - was of a legendary standard, not of form and style, but of pious intention, deed and personal character. This view of Aachen, coupled with the needs of the local memory of Theodulf and his creation, was seen as a logical equation and wielded to bolster and provide proof for the image of Theodulf.

Letaldus' assertion - and for that matter the assertion of the Catalogus - does not explicitly signify earlier comparison of Aachen and Germigny-des-Prés or even intention on Theodulf's part; however, implicitly, it does. As these references were couched as tradition, Theodulf may well have intended Germigny-des-Prés to reflect his own image of

Aachen. If this were the case, it is strikingly apparent that he paid little attention to the physical form of his model - a building that he had no doubt seen. It would seem obvious that Theodulf did not want a "copy" of Aachen, but a building that in its creation expressed the authority, character and status of its creator. In turning to Aachen, however, Theodulf would be promulgating not so much an image of Charlemagne, but an image of himself.

Such an appropriation of Aachen would not represent an underling genuflecting to the imperial might of his superior, but Theodulf's self-conscious usurpation of an authoritative Christian image for his own glorification - on his own turf. In fact, over time, Germigny-des-Prés was remembered primarily as Theodulf's personal creation. Germigny-des-Prés may have been compared to Aachen, but it was seen as Aachen's equal, even its rival. It is apparent that Germigny-des-Prés was the standard in its orbit, not Aachen. While certainly it is tenable that the equation of Germigny-des-Prés and Aachen was a later perception, brought on by time and circumstance, this is certainly not the issue. Letaldus' statement articulates a tenth-century image of Aachen - and Germigny-des-Prés - that reflects the perceived history of a past time.

¹The modern history of Germigny-des-Prés provides an example of the medieval restoration craze in nineteenth-century France. The church, like Aachen, had been substantially altered over the centuries. For the restoration history as given below, see: Jean Hubert, "Germigny-des-Prés," Congrès archéologique de France 93

(1930), pp. 539-540. In 1840, Germigny-des-Prés was classified as an historic monument, primarily due to its mosaic decoration. In 1841, the government had an Italian restorer, Ciuli, restore the mosaics. At the same time, some architectural work was done by Delton. Under orders from Prosper Mérimée in 1845, the south apse was entirely rebuilt, and in 1860 the architect Millet worked on the central tower, which was threatening to collapse. It was felt that the piers and arches of the interior demanded restoration, and in place of mere repairs, it was decided that the building as a whole should be reconstructed. In 1867, the government approved the project of the architect Just Lisch. Despite some objections, the work began in 1876. At the time, it was decided that it was useless to conserve the stucco decoration and sculpture found during the demolition, and the pieces that remained were eventually taken to the Musée de l'Orléanais. For an analysis by Mérimée of the church, see: "Église de Germigny (Loiret)," Revue générale de l'architecture et des travaux publics 8 (1849-50), pp. 113-118.

²Hubert, pp. 534-568. Hubert's article remains the most important for the study of Germigny-des-Prés. However, it should be noted that he offered nothing but archeological confirmation for reconstructions long suspected, and that the usefulness of his article lies in his bringing together all available information on the church. See as well: M. Vieillard-Troiekouroff, "L'architecture en France du temps de Charlemagne," in Karl der Grosse, vol. III, Karolingische Kunst, ed. W. Braunfels and H. Schnitzler, Düsseldorf, 1965, p. 356. In this short discussion, the author referred mainly to Hubert, and to the few articles written more recently on the decoration of the chapel. For a more complete and recent overview of the church and its decoration, see: R. Louis, "L'église de Germigny-des-Prés," in Études ligériennes d'histoire et d'archéologie médiévales, ed. R. Louis, Paris/Auxerre (1975), 419-431. See as well Heitz's entry on the church in: La Neustrie. Les pays au nord de la Loire de Dagobert à Charles le Chauve (vii^e-ix^e siècles), eds. P. Périn and L-C. Feffer, Rouen, 1985, no. 36, p. 158.

³G. Bouet, "Germigny-des-Prés," Bulletin monumental 34 (1868), pp. 569-588. Bouet's work is particularly important for the information it provides about the church's decoration before Lisch's demolition of the building.

⁴Hubert, pp. 547-549. Hubert stated that Lisch cut the tower down by four meters and covered it with a cupola, a reconstruction with no foundation.

⁵The bays are all of slightly different sizes. It is important to note that irregularity is a leitmotif that permeates the entire structure. Cf. below, footnote 7.

⁶In the eleventh century, the west apse was demolished and replaced by a nave; this nave was then rebuilt in the fifteenth or sixteenth century. In his excavations, Hubert confirmed the belief that there had been a large west apse; he found the remains of a polygonal apse atop those of an earlier semi-circular apse, which he felt was contemporary to the eastern apse based on a comparison of the rubble and mortar. See: Hubert, p. 538 and pp. 545-546.

⁷The marked differences between the apses led A. Khatchatrian to hypothesize that they dated to different times. He based his notions on formal and constructional details (gleaned mainly from a reading of Hubert), and concluded that the eastern apse and its two flanking apses were Carolingian, the two kinds of mortar in the west apse showed a rebuilding of the mid-ninth century which included the addition of a porch (signaled by the remains of a wall jutting out from the apse), the north and south apses were set on original foundations, and that while all of the apses had buttresses, these dated to different times. He named two stages of construction: the original campaign of ca. 806 which consisted of the central square with its nine surrounding bays, the three eastern apses and the western apse (he hypothesized that the west apse served as a "palatine chapel," with Theodulf emulating Charlemagne and Aachen); he dated the second period of construction to ca. 854-866, stating that with the death of Theodulf the western throne area was not necessary and the western apse was changed into an entryway with a porch, and that at this time the side apses were added or completely transformed, perhaps because space was needed. See: "Notes sur l'architecture de l'église de Germigny-des-Prés," Cahiers archéologiques 7 (1954), 161-172.

Khatchatrian used Hubert as a reference point for pure speculation. There is certainly no evidence for a porch or a western throne area; the assertion of an imperial westwork seems to have been extrapolated from the idea of Germigny-des-Prés as a "copy" of Aachen. As well, the author's reliance on decorative details was based on shaky evidence, as much of the decorative work inside the chapel does not date to the ninth century or was put in place during the restoration. Khatchatrian rejected the notion of rebuildings or repairs after possible fires, though these occurrences certainly would explain rebuildings. Furthermore, he based his ideas of different campaigns mainly on the "irregularities" of the large apses, though it must be noted that irregularity permeates the entire

building and therefore cannot be the basis of finding successive construction campaigns.

The author opened his article by discussing Germigny-des-Prés' formal properties and the church's relation to other buildings as a way to underscore that Germigny-des-Prés' unusual plan must be additive. See footnote 14 below.

⁸Lisch demolished the two flanking eastern apses; Hubert's excavations confirmed that they were contemporary with the central apse, which Hubert saw as original because of the mosaic and its inscription. See: Hubert, pp. 543-544.

⁹See entry by Vieillard-Troiekouroff in: La Neustrie, no. 57, p. 197.

¹⁰Although the mosaic was heavily and somewhat incorrectly restored, it has been of great interest to scholars primarily for its unusual subject matter and the aniconic nature of the representation, which has been tied to Theodulf's aniconism as expressed through his Libri Carolini. See the work of Vieillard-Troiekouroff: "À propos de Germigny-des-Prés," Cahiers archéologiques, v. 13 (1962), pp. 267-268; "Nouvelles études sur les mosaïques de Germigny-des-Prés," Cahiers archéologiques, v. 17 (1967), pp. 103-112; and "Germigny-des-Prés, l'oratoire privé de l'Abbé Theodulphe," Dossiers de l'archéologie, v. 30 (Sept./Oct. 1978), pp. 40-49. See as well: A. Grabar, "Les mosaïques de Germigny-des-Prés," Cahiers archéologiques 7 (1954), pp. 171-183; Peter Bloch, "Das Apsismosaik von Germigny-des-Prés. Karl der Grosse und der Alte Bund," in Karl der Grosse, vol. III, Karolingische Kunst, eds. W. Braunfels and H. Schnitzler, Düsseldorf, 1965, pp. 234-261; and Paul Clemen, Die romanische Monumentalmalerei in den Rheinlanden, Düsseldorf, 1916, pp. 54-59. For a summary of the discussions on the east apse mosaic, see: Louis, pp. 423-431.

¹¹Colonnets of black marble, now in the Musée de l'Orléanais, that once were part of the blind arcade, appear to be spolia. See: P. Jouvellier, "Les fragments décoratifs carolingiens de Germigny-des-Prés conservés au Musée historique d'Orléanais," in Études ligériennes d'histoire et d'archéologie médiévales, p. 434.

¹²In addition to Vieillard-Troiekouroff and Grabar, for a summary of the evidence for the remains, and the drawings, see: Hubert, pp. 554-560.

¹³For the history of the remainder of the east apse interior decoration exclusive of the mosaics, see: Jouvellier, pp. 432-435. The apse was the most highly decorated area of the church, and the stucco decoration was removed and the blind arcade on the lower level more or less reconstructed after the restoration of the building. Some of the fragments were thrown away, and some simply left outside the church. It was not until 1878 that the government decided that the fragments should go to the museum in Orléans, where they then were forgotten until the early years of the twentieth century, when they were used, along with fragments from other locations, to construct an aedicula in the museum. The pieces not used were displayed on a nearly wall. This construction was torn down in 1938, and the pieces placed together on a wall. They were found again after the fire of June 1940. The remaining pieces - most are of stucco, the others of stone and terra cotta - number fifty-six.

For the stucco work, see the brief comments of X. Barral i Altet: "Le decor des monuments religieux de Neustrie," in La Neustrie. Les pays au nord de la Loire de 650 à 850. Colloque historique international, vol. 2, ed. H. Atsma, Sigmaringen, 1989, pp. 212-216. For the original plastic decoration, see as well: Hubert, pp. 561-568. For more detailed information, see the numerous articles of Vieillard-Troiekouroff (which vary in scope but tend to say the same thing over and over): "Germigny-des-Prés, l'oratoire privé de l'Abbé Theodulpe," pp. 45-49; in La Neustrie, no. 58, p. 198 and 67 a and b, p. 206; "La sculpture en Neustrie," in La Neustrie. Les pays au nord de la Loire de 650 à 850. Colloque historique international, vol. 2, pp.253-255; and especially "Tables de canons et stucs carolingiens. Le décor architectural et anicônique des bibles de Theodulpe et celui de l'église de Germigny-des-Prés," in Stucchi e mosaici alto medioevali. Atti dell'ottavo Congresso di studi sull'arte dell'alto Medioevo, vol. I, Milan, 1962, pp. 154-178. See as well: Clemen, pp. 54-59.

¹⁴For example, Henri Focillon discussed Germigny-des-Prés' "Oriental silhouette" and its "exotic" horseshoe apses, and ultimately compared the church to the slightly later church of San Miguel de Lino in Theodulf's native Spain. Focillon concluded that "both must derive from some unknown prototype inspired by an Oriental model - the latter doubtless the Armenian cathedral of Etschmiadzin, which was rebuilt after 618." See: The Art of the West in the Middle Ages, Vol. 1, Romanesque Art, trans. Donald King, London, 1963, p. 21. In his standard Carolingian and Romanesque Architecture, Kenneth Conant stated: "Heretofore we have seen how Carolingian architects used Roman, Early Christian,

Byzantine, and Germanic forms. At Germigny-des-Prés the tincture is Byzantine and oriental . . . The oriental flavour of the building is due to the horseshoe arches in plan and elevation. These were certainly inspired by Visigothic art, and the plan and elevation of the building may also have been inspired by Old Christian work in Spain. But the type is one which we owe to the Roman world, and its effective development took place in Armenia and the Byzantine lands . . . [Germigny-des-Prés] antedates any known Byzantine example, but the strong oriental flavor makes it clear that the type was not originated in Neustria." See: Carolingian and Romanesque Architecture 800-1200, New York, 1959, pp. 51-52. Khatchatrian opened by comparing the church to Italian, Armenian and Spanish buildings, settling on Armenian as being the closest, formally speaking. He used the fact that Germigny-des-Prés does not really compare formally to any church as a springboard for his theory that the building was constructed in two different campaigns. See Khatchatrian: pp. 161-164. See as well: J. Strzygowski, Die Baukunst der Armenier und Europa, vol II, Vienna, 1918, pp. 766-770.

¹⁵"Theodulfus igitur episcopus inter caetera suorum operum basilicam miri operis, instar videlicet ejus quae Aquis est constituta, aedificavit in villa quae dicitur Germiniacus . . ." PL 137, p. 802. It is important to note that many scholars, such as Humann and Kleinbauer, cited the quote as given in J. von Schlosser's compilation of medieval textual references, rather than from the entire text. While von Schlosser's work is an invaluable reference, in presenting isolated quotes, it engenders in scholars the tendency to view words out of their intended contexts, resulting in possible misconceptions about the intentions of the author or the significance of the quotes. See: von Schlosser, Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der karolingischen Kunst, Vienna (1892), p. 218, no. 682.

¹⁶See: "Introduction to an 'Iconography of Mediaeval Architecture.'" As Krautheimer's aim was to discuss "copies" of the Holy Sepulchre, he dealt with Germigny-des-Prés only perfunctorily, saying: "Often when two buildings are compared with one another in mediaeval writings the modern reader may wonder how the author came to see any resemblance between the two. The 10th century Miracula S. Maximini, for instance, records that the church at Germigny-des-Prés was built like the palatine chapel at Aachen . . . The chapel at Aix, with its domical-vaulted octagonal centre-room surrounded by a sixteen-sided ambulatory and by galleries, seems quite different from the square church of Germigny with its open central tower, its barrel-vaulted cross arms and its domed corner bays (p. 2) . . . Germigny-

des-Prés, in spite of all differences, shared with Aix-la-Chapelle the central plan, arranged around a dominating central 'tower' and a dedication to the Mother of the Lord." (p. 15)

¹⁷It is important to note that Krautheimer ultimately settled on formal comparisons, though his definition of similitude was not rigid. Scholars have relied greatly on Krautheimer's general observations and ideas in their search for explanations for the association of Germigny-des-Prés with Aachen, yet they go no farther in their explorations. Kleinbauer's discussion of Germigny-des-Prés revealed, in its word choice, a condescension to the text, yet, like Sieffert, he raised the issue of a possible link in dedication for the two churches. The idea of a link in dedication is difficult to maintain, as Germigny-des-Prés was dedicated to the Savior primarily, and not to the Virgin.

Scholars of the "copies" of Aachen who discussed the text have not been able to reject it without explanation. Humann perplexedly blamed the comparison on a simplicity of mind without giving the issue much attention. He provided a formal comparison of the two, and concluded that "the church at Germigny deviates so fundamentally from that at Aachen that both churches have only the central plan in common, and yet still the church at Germigny was held by contemporaries to be an imitation of Aachen." See: Humann, p. 81.

Kleinbauer dogmatically rejected the text, saying that Germigny-des-Prés "has been regarded at least in ideological terms as a 'copy' of Aachen. A connection between Germigny-des-Prés and Aachen is based on the allegation of a late tenth century document and the fact that the episcopal chapel was dedicated to Our Lady (but not to Christ). The text states that there is an 'obvious resemblance' between the two chapels; it does not allege that Theodulf originally intended to have a copy made of Aachen in his villa. A comparison of the two edifices indicates different types of structures: the one at Aachen is a double-shelled polygonal building and the one at Germigny-des-Prés in plan is a cross inscribed in a square and in elevation lacks a gallery." Kleinbauer concluded that there is "little formal resemblance" between the churches," and that "in [his] estimation, the principle value of the late tenth-century source lies in the 'political' homage its author pays to Aachen and the memory of Charlemagne." See: Kleinbauer, p. 3.

Sieffert, although he stated that Germigny-des-Prés "shows no resemblance to the model invoked by Letaldus" in terms of its structure, was more open to the text, attempting to find some ties between the buildings. He noted, for example, that both buildings are centrally planned, that the triple-opening windows in the tower of

Germigny-des-Prés recall the three-arch openings in Aachen, and that perhaps Letaldus was simply referring to the mosaic decoration found in each church. He as well stated that he felt that the view could not be simply a personal observation on Letaldus' part, but must reflect the views of his contemporaries. He then settled on the shared central plan and private chapel function, and, following Grabar, the "reliquary" function. Sieffert as well noted the observations of Krautheimer, who saw the intended relationship as a very general one, based in their shared central plan with a central tower, and primarily in their dedication to the Virgin. Sieffert concluded that Theodulf indeed intended to build a chapel that in some manner reflected Aachen, in order to cash in on Charlemagne's political power. See: "Les imitations de la chapelle palatine de Charlemagne a Aix-la-Chapelle," p. 32.

Verbeek could not accept Germigny-des-Prés as a copy of Aachen, yet he attempted to assimilate Letaldus' assertion into his discussion of the oratory. In rejecting Germigny-des-Prés in his article "Zentralbauten in der Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle," Verbeek based his analysis on the chapel's formal properties in relation to Aachen, saying "the small building with four supports holding an elevated central cupola has scarcely anything to do, architectonically, with the alleged decisive central plan at Aachen. Foremost, it lacks a second story." He found the grounds to Letaldus' connection in the lavish decoration of the two chapels, interpreting miri operis as a reference to the ornament. (This conclusion was one voiced by other scholars as well. See, for example, Vieillard-Troiekoureff, "Germigny-des-Prés," p. 40.) He used then the example of Letaldus and Germigny as a caution against the witness of contemporary texts, and extrapolated from this example that one should be wary of other examples for which the buildings are no longer extant. In "Die architektonische Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle," Verbeek summed up Germigny-des-Prés saying it "belongs much more to another intermediate building type - presumably coming from the patron, the West Goth Theodulf," and restated that the connections lie in the private chapel theme, the expenditure and the concept of the western throne - the latter possibility, one must note, is purely conjectural at Germigny-des-Prés. See: "Zentralbauten in der Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle," p. 903; and "Die architektonische Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle," pp. 113-114.

Quite interestingly, Heitz chose to treat Germigny-des-Prés briefly under his section on "imitations de la chapelle palatine," which immediately followed his discussion of Aachen. See: L'architecture religieuse carolingienne, pp. 82-85.

¹⁸Sieffert, as well as Verbeek, raised the questions of function. Kleinbauer, again like Sieffert, raised the question of intentionality, stating that simply because Letaldus made a later connection between Germigny-des-Prés and Aachen does not necessarily mean that Theodulf intended a "copy" of Aachen. Sieffert, in contrast, assumed that Letaldus was voicing the views of his contemporaries and that Theodulf indeed intentionally "copied" Aachen due to an awareness of Aachen's political value. Kleinbauer brought up this last issue as well, by vaguely asserting that Letaldus' text was a "political homage to Charlemagne."

While Hubert simply dismissed Letaldus' text out of hand, he raised the question of its relationship to other texts. In trying to deal with the allegations of the text, Hubert relegated the quote to a footnote, saying "from all evidence, this passage of Letaldus, a monk at Micy at the end of the tenth century, is only the clumsy summary of a previous text [the Catalogus abbatum Floriacensium]. One may not therefore draw the conclusion, as has often been done, and imagine that the church of Theodulf was built 'in imitation' of the palatine chapel at Aachen." Hubert's dismissal of the text is perfunctory, and his rejection perhaps the strongest. See: Hubert, p. 537.

¹⁹Of these scholars, Verbeek most pointedly used his discussion of Letaldus as a platform to validate the potential unreliability of medieval observers. Verbeek opened his discussion of centrally-planned "copies" of Aachen with a discussion of buildings related to Aachen in medieval texts, beginning with the Miracula and Germigny-des-Prés, and then moving to Mettlach and Hereford and their textual references. None of the examples fared well under his scrutiny, though the Miracula was seen as the least helpful text. See: Verbeek, "Zentralbauten," pp. 902-909.

²⁰This quote is the only thing of use in a rather general book. See: A. G. Elliott, Roads to Paradise: Reading the Lives of the Early Saints, Hanover, N.H., 1987, p. 6.

²¹For brief introductions to the cult of the saints and medieval hagiography, see the standard introduction provided by: H. Delehaye, The Legends of the Saints, 3rd. ed., trans. D. Attwater, New York, 1962. See as well: A. Vauchez, La sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du moyen âge (d'après les procès canonisation et les documents hagiographiques), Paris (1981), Chapter 1; and Joseph-Claude Poulin, L'idéal de sainteté dans l'Aquitaine carolingienne d'après les sources hagiographiques (750-950), Quebec, 1975, Introduction (especially for the monastic context and its propagandistic aims); René Aigrain, L'hagiographie. Ses

sources. Ses méthodes. Son histoire, Poitiers, 1953 (especially Part II, "La critique hagiographique," pp. 195-290, and Part III, "Histoire de l'hagiographie," pp. 291-388); Baudouin de Gaiffier, Études critiques d'hagiographie et d'iconologie, Brussels, 1967; de Gaiffier, "Hagiographie et historiographie. Quelques aspects du problème," Settimane di studi del Centro Italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo 1969. La Storiographia altomedievale XVII, 1 (1970), 139-166; and R. Boyer, "An Attempt to Define the Typology of Medieval Hagiography," in Hagiography and Medieval Literature. A Symposium, eds. H. Bekker-Nielsen, P. Foote, J. H. Jorgensen and T. Nyberg, Odensee, 1981, 27-36. See as well: Brigitte Cazelles, "Introduction," in Images of Sainthood in Medieval Europe, Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Timea Szell, eds., Ithaca, 1991, pp. 1-17.

²²See especially: Delehayé, pp. 16 ff.

²³Fleury is also known as St.-Benoit-sur-Loire, or Fleury-sur-Loire.

²⁴Hubert, p. 535.

²⁵For the original dedication of Germigny-des-Prés, see: Jaques Soyer, "Les inscriptions gravées sur les piliers de l'église carolingienne de Germigny-des-Prés sont-elles authentiques?" Bulletin archéologique, 1923, pp. 201-208. The dedication of the church given on the northeast pier - to Saints Germain and Ginevre - is evidence of the spurious nature of the inscription. These saints were never the patrons of Germigny-des-Prés, and their cult was unknown before the nineteenth century at the church (Soyer, p. 216). There is abundant textual evidence that Germigny-des-Prés was dedicated to Christ in the Middle Ages. Soyer cited Letaldus, the Catalogus abbatum Floriacensium, the Vita Gauzlini and Book IV of the Miracula Sancti Benedicti of Andre of Fleury, as well as Raoul Tortaire's seventh book of the Miracula. Soyer concluded therefore that at least through the twelfth century the church was dedicated to Christ. He pushed the dating back to the early ninth century because of his dating of the Catalogus to 818; for the problems of this text, see below, pp. 127-131.

Lisch preserved the moldings of the southeast and northeast piers in his restoration due to the inscriptions found on them. The inscriptions were taken as authentic by many until the insights of Soyer. See: Soyer, pp. 197-216. The inscription on the southeast pier reads (in abbreviated form): "Tertio nonas januaris dedicatio hujus aecclesiae;" the northeast pier reads: "Anno incarnationis Domini octingentesimo et sexto, sub invocatione sanctae Ginevrae et sancti Germini." Soyer, through philological and

epigraphical analysis, showed that only the former is authentic, and he dated it to the ninth, tenth or early eleventh century. He also noted that it was mentioned by Dom Chazal in 1725. Soyer noted, prudently, that it is unsure if the dedication referred to in this inscription is the original one or a later rededication - perhaps after the repairs of the probable damage caused to the church by the Normans (Soyer, p. 211). The inscription on the northeast pier was, in fact, unknown before 1847 - during the period of the early phases of the restoration - and, according to Soyer, is an inept forgery done between 1840 and 1846. He cited philological errors, as well as the evidence of the incorrect dedication of the church to Saints Germain and Ginevra.

Despite the fact that the inscription which gives Germigny-des-Prés' dedication year as 806 is a forgery, this is generally the date assigned to the building. Hubert said that the date of 806 on the nineteenth-century inscription "seems not to have been invented." He noted, for example, a late eighteenth-century inscription in stucco which dates Germigny-des-Prés to 806. He felt, in any case, that the point is not that important, as the building can be securely tied to the abbacy of Theodulf. See: Hubert, pp. 563-564.

²⁶See, for example: MGH Poetae I, 554-555 (no. LIX) and p. 556 (No. LXV).

²⁷Hubert said that he found evidence of an opening, but did not elaborate. See: Hubert, p. 552.

²⁸See Hubert, p. 552. This doorway was destroyed by Lisch, but is known through the description and drawing of Bouet. See: Bouet, p. 584.

²⁹It is known that Theodulf himself did not construct the entire villa. The fate of the villa is unknown, and nothing remains. Abbé Prevost reported in the nineteenth century that from time to time farmers would come across remains while plowing, and sections of a hypocaust system came to light as well. Prevost described it as Gallo-Roman. See: Abbé Prevost, La basilique de Theodulfe et la paroisse de Germigny-des-Prés, Orléans, 1889, pp. 15-16 and 27.

³⁰Theodulf apparently did not support the idea that the kingdom of Charlemagne should be divided among his sons after his death, but was then pleased when Louis the Pious became the sole heir of the kingdom after the deaths of his brothers. However, in 817 the nephew of Louis rebelled, and Theodulf was seen as part of the opposition, and then imprisoned in Angers. From prison, he wrote a poetic work to Modoin of Autun, explaining his life in exile and asking

for intervention. See: H. Liebeschütz, "Theodulf of Orleans and the Problem of the Carolingian Renaissance," in Fritz Saxl (1890-1948): A Volume of Memorial Essays from his Friends in England, ed. D. J. Gordon, NY (1957), pp. 87-91.

R. McKitterick discussed the house-cleaning activities of Louis the Pious in: The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians 751-987, New York, 1983. She noted that many were run out of the royal circle, exclusive of those accused in the revolt.

The subsequent history of Germigny-des-Prés in the Middle Ages is somewhat obscure. After the death of Theodulf, it seems that the villa was confiscated by the emperor, or was at least used in part as a royal residence. Hubert conjectured this. He noted that conferences were held there in 843 and 844, and that Charles the Bald stayed at Germigny-des-Prés on at least two occasions, in 854 and 855, according to documents written there where the location is called the royal palace. See: Hubert, p. 537. In these instances, Hubert was referring to documents in: Maurice Prou and Alexandre Vidier, Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Saint-Benoit-sur-Loire, v. I, Paris/Orleans, 1900 p. 93.

For the significance of the choice of Germigny-des-Prés as the site of Charles the Bald's conference in 843, see: J.-H. Bauchy, "L'assemblée royale de Germigny-des-Prés en Septembre 843 et sa portée politique," in Études ligériennes d'histoire et d'archéologie médiévales, pp. 19-24.

At some point, there was a fire, at which time Hubert speculated that the western apse of the church was seriously damaged. See: Hubert, p. 538. He assumed the usual Norman marauder theory; Norman raids occurred in 856, 865 and 866, and Hubert suggested that it was at this time that the villa itself was destroyed.

In ca. 1060, Germigny-des-Prés was in such a state of disrepair that Hughes, the Abbot of Fleury, had some monks do some work to the building. Hubert suggests that it was at this time that the western apse was torn down and a nave was constructed. See: Hubert, p. 538. See as well: E. de Certain, ed., Les Miracles de Saint Benoit, Paris, 1858, pp. 237-238.

³¹For the history of St. Benoit, see: G. Chenesseau, L'abbaye de Fleury à Saint-Benoit-sur-Loire. Son histoire - ses institutions - ses édifices, Paris, 1931, pp. 3-23. For a brief recounting of the history of the abbey and its role as a cultural center, see: E. Vergnolle, Saint-Benoit-sur-Loire et la sculpture du XI^e siècle, Paris, 1985, pp. 10-12.

³²The date of the foundation of Fleury is taken from the Helgaud of Fleury's Life of Robert the Pious. See: Vie de Robert le Pieux. Epitoma Vitae Regis Rotberti Pii, ed.

and trans. R.-H. Bautier and G. Labory, Paris, 1965, pp. 56-57; and Prou and Vidier, vol. 1, I. Helgaud's life seems to be the earliest mention of Leodebod's foundation. It is important to note that Bautier dated the text to ca. 1041. See: Bautier, pp. 36-37.

³³Theodulf is primarily known for his interest in texts, and during his abbacy, the library of Fleury grew. See: M. Mostert, The Library of Fleury: A Provisional List of Manuscripts, Hilversum, 1989, pp. 21-24. Theodulf is known particularly for his revival of and interest in classical culture, interests which he brought to his own works. See, for example: L. Nees, A Tainted Mantel: Hercules and the Classical Tradition at the Carolingian Court. Philadelphia, 1991. Nees discussed, in note 54, pp. 105-106, what is known of the Fleury collections, and what may have then been available to Theodulf.

For the activity of the scriptorium, see: Jean Vezin, "Les scriptoria de Neustrie 650-850," in La Neustrie. Les Pays au nord de la Loire de 650 à 850. Colloque historique internationale, pp. 311-312. Religious books produced for Theodulf at the scriptorium of Fleury appear to be generally aniconic which has been attributed to Theodulf's probable authorship of the Libri Carolini. For the Libri Carolini, see: Ann Freeman, "Theodulf of Orleans and the Libri Carolini," Speculum 32 (October 1957), pp. 663-705. For the question of aniconic decoration, see: F. Mutherich and J. E. Gaehde, Carolingian Painting, New York, 1976, p. 53; M. Vieillard-Troiekouroff, "Les bibles de Theodulfe et leur décor anicônique," Études ligériennes d'histoire et d'archéologie médiévales, Auxerre, 1975, pp 345-60; J. Porcher, "La pienture provinciale" in Karl der Grosse, vol. III, Karolingische Kunst, pp. 63-73; and in La Neustrie, no. 107, pp. 270-271.

³⁴For the history of Micy, see: Abbé Eugène Jarossay, Histoire de l'abbaye de Micy-Saint-Mesmin-lez-Orléans (502-1790). Son influence religieuse et sociale, Paris/Orléans, 1902. Jarossay's book is somewhat problematic in that it used hagiographical sources as strictly factual and historical texts, and therefore presented a somewhat distorted picture of "historical truth." See a critical precis of the history taken from Jarossay in: A. Poncelet, "Les saints de Micy," Analecta Bollandiana 24 (1905), pp. 5-14.

³⁵There are no firm dates for Letaldus' life. In the Miracula, he stated that grew up at Micy when Anno was abbot (942-972). He lived at Micy at least through the opening years of the eleventh century, and then was at Le Mans.

³⁶See: Mabillon, Acta I 591-597 (2nd ed. 573-579). The work was dedicated to Theodulf's successor as Bishop of Orléans, Jonas, who translated the relics of Mesmin back to Micy from Orléans. For the dating and chronology of the three Lives, see: A. Poncelet, "Les saints de Micy," pp.10-11.

³⁷See: Mabillon, Acta I, 581-591 (2nd ed. 564-573) The exact dating is unsure. The Anonymous life has been thought to be the basis for Bertold's work (Mabillon thought it dated to the seventh century), but Poncelet saw this as open to question, as it refers to Jonas, and in the past tense at that. See: Poncelet, "Les saints de Micy," p. 11.

³⁸The dating of the text is based on internal evidence. It seems to have been written ca. 10 years after the death of Annon (973) but before the reign of Hughes Capet (June/July 987). See: Histoire littéraire de la France, v. 6, p. 532. Manitius dated it as well to 986 or 987. See: M. Manitius, Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters, vol. II, Munich (1923), p. 427. For the authenticity and dating of Letaldus' work, see as well: A. Poncelet, "La bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Micy au IX^e et au X^e siècle," Analecta Bollandiana, 23, 1 (1904), pp. 76-84.

³⁹See: M.J. Banchereau, "La chapelle Saint-Mesmin," Congrès archéologique 93 (1930), 271-277. Banchereau related the story that a certain Agilus, who was probably a Roman noble man, built a chapel above the grotto in ca. 550, as he had been converted by the miracles emanating from Mesmin. Agilus' chapel was replaced in the eleventh century by a church of a plan type well-known in the Orléanais, having a nave with side aisles, each ending on an apse, and no transept. The chapel of St. Mesmin was damaged by the Protestants in 1562, but was then walled up in the early seventeenth century. In 1857, it was restored. According to Banchereau, vestiges of Carolingian, and perhaps Merovingian decoration were found, though this fleeting reference remains unsupported. See as well: du Challais, "Note sur la chapelle St.-Mesmin, près D'Orléans," Bulletin monumental 3 (1837) 175-180.

For an insightful discussion of the dragon topos on hagiographical literature, see: J. Le. Goff, "Ecclesiastical Culture and Folklore in the Middle Ages: Saint Marcellus of Paris and the Dragon," in Time, Work and Culture in the Middle Ages, pp. 159-188.

⁴⁰See: Poncelet, "Les saints de Micy."

⁴¹There is certainly some question as to the veracity of this early history of the monastery. There is no other mention of the siege of Verdun in texts. As well, no document or text relating to Micy predates the Carolingian period or the tenure of Theodulf. Three documents of Clovis have been shown to be forgeries, as has a document of Louis the Pious. An authentic document of Louis the Pious, dated 8 January 815, is the first bit of evidence for Micy. See: Poncelet, "Les saints de Micy," pp. 6-8, for a recounting of the documentary history of the abbey. See as well: H. Leclercq, "Micy-Saint-Mesmin," in Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie, vol. 11, Paris (1933), pp. 912-927.

Certainly examples of fanciful monastic foundation accounts were legion in the Middle Ages, and if Micy's early history was in fact not quite as it was eventually related, the invention must be seen as one of propagandistic intent. In any case, as Poncelet pointed out, it appears that the early history of Micy was considered more or less as common knowledge, at least in the Orléanais; Theodulf mentioned the refounding, and from his words it is apparent that he thought, or at least pretended to think, that Micy had had a monastery, and St. Mesmin had been the abbot. See: MGH Poetae I, pp. 520-521 (No. XXX). However, the mention of Theodulf and Micy in the Life of St. Benedict, written at Fleury, is a bit more hazy, stating: ". . . Theodulfus quoque Aurelianensium presul, cum monasterium Sancti Maximini construere vellet, a iam prefato viro postulat regularis disciplinae peritos . . ." See: Vita Benedicti Abbatís Anianensis et Indensis Auctore Ardone, MGH XV/I, p. 209.

The origins of Micy have been doubted for the most part, or at least approached with extreme caution. See: C. Cuissard, "Theodulphe, Évêque d'Orléans. Sa vie et ses oeuvres," Memoires de la Société Archéologique et Historique de l'Orléanais 24 (1892), Chapter 9 ("Reformation de Micy"), pp. 149-162; P. Arnauld, Bulletin de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France (1903), pp. 270-277 and (1904), 220-227. Some scholars simply assumed that Micy was a Carolingian foundation. See: J. Dehal and J.-M. Berland, "La ville, des origines au X^e siècle," in Histoire d'Orléans et de son terroir, vol. 1, Des origines a la fin du XV^e siècle (1983), pp. 219-220.

⁴²MGH SS XV,1, p. 209 (Vita Benedicti Abbatís Anianensis et Indensis Auctore Ardone)

⁴³As an indication of Theodulf's intimate connection to Micy, he is at times referred to by scholars as the Abbot of Fleury and Micy, though there appears to be no reason to believe that he did anything more than establish or

reestablish monastic life at the site. See, for example: Porcher, p. 63.

⁴⁴For example, after Theodulf's tenure at Orléans, Jonas, his successor as Bishop, served as well as abbot of Micy. According to Jarossay, the monks were somewhat upset by Jonas' presence; worried about their sovereignty, he was only allowed to look after the monks. See: Jarossay, p. 70. In the mid-tenth century, the Bishop of Orléans Ermenthée, chose Micy as his place for retirement. It should be noted that Ermenthée's stay was not a happy one from Letaldus' point of view, as the Bishop tried to meddle in monastic affairs.

⁴⁵Henri Lévy-Bruhl, Études sur les élections abbatiales en France jusqu'à la fin du règne de Charles le Chauve, Paris (1913), p. 165. The diploma was from Louis the Debonnaire and Lothaire, but Lévy-Bruhl felt that it was simply a confirmation of a similar privilege granted by the Bishops of Orléans. According to him, the king made clear that the monks should not be tempted to use the document as a means to circumvent the authority of the Bishop. See as well: F. Lot, Les derniers carolingiens, Paris, 1891 (Bibliothèque École des Chartes LXXXVII); and Lot, Études sur le règne de Hugues Capet et la fin du X^e siècle, Paris, 1903, pp. 226 and 430. The Carolingian kings routinely confirmed the bishopric's possession of Micy - both of the monastery and the "cella" of St. Mesmin. See: G. Tessier, Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve Roi de France, vol. I, Paris (1943), n. 25, pp. 62-65; L. Halphen and F. Lot, Recueil des actes de Lothaire et de Louis V Rois de France (954-987), Paris (1907), n. XXXIII, pp. 80-83 and n. LXIX, pp. 169-173.

⁴⁶M. Mostert, The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury. A Study of the Ideas about Society and Law of the Tenth-Century Monastic Reform Movement. Hilversum, 1987, pp. 26-27; and Vergnolle, p. 10.

⁴⁷For the influence of Fleury as a reform center, see: L. Donnat, "Recherches sur l'influence de Fleury au X^e siècle.," Études ligériennes d'histoire et d'archéologie médiévales, pp. 165-174. For the reformation of Micy, see K. Hallinger, Gorze-Kluny. Studien zu den monastischen Lebensformen und Gegensätzen im Hochmittelalter, vol. II Rome (1951), p. 879, note 41; and Donnat, p. 170.

⁴⁸For Abbo, see: M. Mostert, The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury, Hilversum, 1987, p. 17. Abbo was born in ca. 940 in the Orléanais, and he studied at Fleury, as well

as Reims, Paris and Orléans. See as well: Dom Patrice Cousin, Abbon de Fleury-sur-Loire, Paris, 1954.

Mostert discussed the job of the armarius, stating that "he is the archivist, who is also the schoolmaster and librarian." See: The Library of Fleury, pp. 24-25.

The vitality of Fleury in the tenth century can be seen as an aspect of the vigor of intellectual life at the time. While the tenth century has often been maligned as "The Age of Iron and Lead," a time of great decline with and after the Invasions, there is certainly much evidence to refute this viewpoint. See, for example, P. Riché, "La 'Renaissance' intellectuelle du X^e siècle en Occident," Cahiers d'histoire 21 (1976), pp. 27-42 (for Fleury and Abbo, especially pp. 29 and 34 ff.); Riché, ed., X^eme siècle. Recherches nouvelles, Paris, 1987 (Centre de Recherches sur l'Antiquité tardive et le Haut Moyen Age).

⁴⁹Mostert, The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury, p.30-31.

⁵⁰See below, footnote 83.

⁵¹Mostert, The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury, p. 17; and Vergnolle, p. 10.

⁵²For Abbo's political works, see: Mostert, The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury. For discussions of some of Abbo's other works, see, for example: A. van de Vyver, "Les oeuvres inédites d'Abbon de Fleury," Revue bénédictine 47 (1935), pp. 125-169; and A. Guerreau-Jalabert, Abbo Floriacensis, Quaestiones grammaticales, Paris, 1982.

⁵³Andre of Fleury, in his Vita Gauzlini, opened his account by enumerating the works written at Fleury. See: Andre de Fleury, Vie de Gauzlin, Abbé de Fleury (Vita Gauzlini Abbatii Floriacensis monasterii), ed. and trans. R.-H. Bautier and G. Labory, Paris, 1969 (Sources d'histoire médiévale, vol. 2), p. 32-39.

An invaluable reference to the works written at Fleury is provided by: A. Vidier, L'historiographie à Saint-Benoit-sur-Loire et les Miracles de Saint Benoit, Paris, 1965. In conjunction with this, for a critique of Vidier, see: R.-H. Bautier, "La place de l'abbaye de Fleury-sur-Loire dans l'historiographie française du IX^e au XII^e siècle," in Études ligériennes d'histoire et d'archéologie médiévales, pp. 25-33.

⁵⁴For Letaldus, see: Manitius, pp. 426-430; Histoire littéraire de la France, v. 6, 1742, p.534; A. Ledru,

"Origine de Lethald, Moine de Micy (fin du X^e siècle)," La Province du Maine 16 (1908) 326-328. Poulin perceived a change in the writing of hagiography in Aquitaine in the mid-tenth century, in which there was a move from the local and aquitainian to what he calls "professional hagiographers;" he used Letaldus as an example.

⁵⁵Letaldus wrote this work for Constantine, the Abbot of Noaillé (near Poitiers) and former abbot of Micy to recount the miracles that occurred en route when the monks of the abbey carried the relics of St. Junien to the Council of Charroux in 988 (or 989). See: Manitius, p. 429; Histoire littéraire de la France, v. 6, 1742, p.534. The text is found in: PL 137.824 ff.

⁵⁶This work was written for Bishop Avesgaud of Le Mans after Letaldus went there in the late tenth or early eleventh century. The text can be found in: PL 137.781-796.

⁵⁷Only Poncelet mentioned this work as being Letaldus'. See: "La bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Micy," p. 80.

⁵⁸See: Cora E. Lutz, "Letaldus, A Wit of the Tenth Century," Viator 1 (1970), 97-106; and Jan Ziolkowski, "Folklore and Learned Lore in Letaldus' Whale Poem," Viator 15 (1984), 107-118. Both scholars commented on Letaldus' gifts as a writer and his obvious familiarity with classical literature.

⁵⁹See: S. Abbonis Epistolae, PL 139, p. 438, in which Abbo referred to Letaldus, stating: "Tandem ad te, mi quondam familiaris Letalde, nunc sermo dirigitur, cujus alias singularem scientiam mea parvitas amplectitur et summis laudibus extollere nititur." See as well: Apoligetius, PL 139, p. 469. (For the rather infamous episode that led to the writing of this letter, see below, pp. 124-127.)

⁶⁰See: Vauchez, pp. 18 ff. The Merovingian Age, which saw the codification of cults recognized by the church, ensured the continuation of a more localized veneration of saints through the writing of hagiographic works. With the tightening of imperial and ecclesiastical control under the Carolingians, less saints were named, and hagiographical literature was given a more official character. For the Carolingian period, which has been much less studied than the Merovingian, see Poulin. The tenth century in particular saw an expansion on older works. See: L. Zoepf, Das Heiligen-Leben im 10. Jahrhundert, Leipzig/Berlin, 1908.

Although Zoepf talks only about "German" saints, his general observations are helpful.

⁶¹In part Three of his Prologue, Letaldus mentioned Bertold's work, saying: ". . . Bertholdum quoque virum cruditissimum qui Vitam veterem patris Maximini dicitur edidisse . . ." On Letaldus' sources, see: Manitius, p. 427. Manitius provided the only cogent and perceptive analysis of Letaldus and particularly of the Miracula, and his work is invaluable for the consideration of Letaldus and his goals. See: Manitius, pp. 426-429.

⁶²Manitius, p. 428. Manitius noted as well that Letaldus concentrated primarily on the more modern history of the monastery, giving only a brief recounting of the founding of Micy and Mesmin.

⁶³Manitius, p. 427. It is interesting to note that Letaldus was eulogized as a champion of monastic rights in: Histoire litteraire de la France, vol. 6 (1974), pp. 528-537.

⁶⁴The above translation, by E. Jager, is of the text found in PL 137, p. 802, which reads as follows:

Temporibus igitur divae memoriae Caroli Augusti (cognomento Magni) disponente rerum omnium Domino eundem locum pristinae reddere nobilitati; Theodulfus nobilissimus et moribus et genere, acerrimique ingenii Aurelianensis Ecclesiae episcopus subrogatur. Hic itaque multa industria certans quatenus idem locus in antiquum revocaretur honorem, dum in contiguas regionibus minus idoneos invenisset ad id efficiendum monachos, ex Septimaniae partibus ascivit, quibus et locum dedit, et res illi loco olim attributas de suo insuper addens contradidit. In qua re non poenituit eum facti sui: quippe cujus temporibus in tantum ejus loci gloria enituit; ut veteris ignominiae dedecus honestas superveniens obumbraret et praeteritorum dispendia lucra sequentia compensarent. Theodulfus igitur episcopus inter caetera suorum operum basilicam miri operis, instar videlicet ejus quae Aquis est constituta, aedificavit in villa quae dicitur Germiniacus, quo etiam his versibus sui memoriam eleganter expressit.

Haec in honore Dei Theodulfus templa sacravi
Quae dum quisquis adis, oro memento mei.

Hic itaque venerabilis sacerdos insimulatus
 conjurationis apud regem de episcopatu dejectus,
 et multis diebus custodiae mancipatus est,
 postmodum mirabili rerum conversione et crimen
 promptissime abluit, et regis gratiam consecutus
 cathedram pristinae dignitatis non diu victurus
 recepit. Fertur enim vi veneni ab his extinctus
 qui dum exsularet, libertate potiti, bona ejus
 invadendi jam hauserant cupiditatem.

The last two sentences, as they appear above, have been very lossely translated. As well, it should be noted that the word "instar," which has been translated as "likeness," could also mean more simply "like" or "correspnding to."

⁶⁵The image of Theodulf and his deeds can certainly be seen as well within the context of the associative view of history - historia - in the tenth and eleventh centuries. See: Nichols; above, "Introduction;" and below, Chapter Four.

⁶⁶Importantly, Einhard, in his Vita Caroli, characterized Charlemagne's building of Aachen as a pious act, stating: "Charlemagne practised the Christian religion with great devotion and piety, for he had been brought up in this faith since early childhood. This explains why he built a cathedral of such great beauty at Aachen . . ." See: Einhard and Notker the Stammerer. Two Lives of Charlemagne, ed. and trans. L. Thorpe, New York, 1969, p. 79. (For the text, see Chapter Four, footnote 62.) For aspects of the image of patronage and piety in the Gothic age, see: Clark Maines, "Good Works, Social Ties, and the Hope of Salvation: Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis," in Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis. A Symposium, ed. P. Gerson, New York, 1986, pp. 76-94.

⁶⁷As has been stated, "historical persons are deprived of their individuality [in hagiographical texts], removed from their proper surrounding, and in a way isolated in time and space, so that their image in people's minds is an incongruous and unreal one. An idealized figure takes the place of history's sharply defined and living portrait, and this figure is no more than the personification of an abstraction: instead of an individual, the people see only a type." See: Delehay, p. 19.

⁶⁸For the complex events of the last years of Carolingian rule, see: McKitterick, Chapter 12 "The Last Carolingians," pp. 305-339; and Lot, Études sur le règne de Hugues Capet et la fin du X^e siècle.

⁶⁹For the importance of the memory of the Carolingians, particularly in monasteries, see: J. Ehlers, "Karolingische Tradition und Frühes Nationalbewußtsein in Frankreich," Francia 4 (1976), 213-235.

⁷⁰Mostert noted the concern of Fleury annalists of rise of Capet. At Fleury, King Lothaire had enjoyed complete authority over the monastery, and the change of power understandably brought some anxiety to the foundation, as it wondered what would happen under the new ruler. See: Mostert, The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury p. 37.

⁷¹See: J. Boussard, "Les évêques en Neustrie avant la réforme grégorienne (950-1050 environ)," Journal des savantes (July/September 1970), pp. 161-196.

⁷²PL 137.795-798, "Prologue."

⁷³The period from the death of Abbot Amalbert in 985 to the taking of the office of Abbot by Abbo in 988 is somewhat murky. Letters from Gerbert of Aurillac to Constantine, apparently the armarius of Fleury during Abbo's stay at Ramsey in England, speak of the atrocity of an unnamed "intruder" abbot whom Gerbert as well as abbots in the Empire felt should be removed. See: H. P. Lattin, The Letters of Gerbert, New York 1961, nos. 92, 93, 97 and 151. Lattin identified the intruder as Oylbold. It appears that Oylbold did in fact follow Amalbert, and is named in a document of Hughes Capet of 987 (See: Prou and Vidier, vol. 1, no. LXIX, pp. 181-182).

However, Mostert said the identity of the intruder is unknown, saying that Oylbold was Abbot from 985 until his death in 987, at which point the intruder came to office with the aid of the Carolingians; Hughes Capet then would not allow him to retain office. The death of the intruder in 988 then allowed for the election of Abbo. See: M. Mostert, "Le séjour d'Abbon de Fleury à Ramsey," Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 144 (1986), pp. 202-203. (Mostert's article was concerned primarily with the question of why Abbo, the intellectual star of the monastery, went to the rather obscure monastery of Ramsey in England. Mostert concluded, from textual evidence, the Oylbold sent him there, and that the two had a difference of opinion. Mostert conjectured, perhaps with cause, that Abbo wanted to be elected to the abbacy in 985.) The evidence of the letters of Gerbert to Constantine, however, suggests that the unwanted abbot was in fact Oylbold.

⁷⁴Manitius noted that Letaldus was very true to his monastery, and that he had had to live through the great

monastic controversies of his time. He noted, quite rightly, that it is no surprise that Letaldus wrote his book when he did, a book about the monastery's founder. See: Manitius, pp. 426-428.

⁷⁵For the tightrope that Abbo walked in order to defend Fleury, see: Mostert, The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury.

⁷⁶See: M. Mostert, "Die Urkundenfälschungen Abbos von Fleury," in Fälschungen im Mittelalter. Internationaler Kongress der Monumenta Germaniae Historica München, 16.-19. September 1986. Teil IV. Diplomatische Fälschungen (II), Hannover, 1988, pp. 287-318 (MGH Schriften, vol. 33, part 4). In this article Mostert set out to show that Abbo was only responsible for one forgery, in the name of Pope Gregory IV, and not as well for a number of others that have been attributed to him.

⁷⁷See: Mostert, The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury, pp. 36-37. Mostert maintained that Arnulf had been able to extract an oath from Micy, but there does not seem to be any evidence of this. De Certain alluded to this possibility in his article on Arnulf, in which he championed the Bishop as a strong man of the king. See: E. de Certain, "Arnoul, évêque d'Orléans," Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 14 (1952/53), pp. 425-463, especially p 452.

⁷⁸See: Mostert, The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury, pp. 46-48. At the council of Verzy in 991, Arnulf of Orléans played prosecutor to Abbo's defense. Mostert characterized Abbo's position of one meant to ensure that the situation was handled according to law, and that the rights of bishops were not extended even further; again, his stance seems to be strictly pro-monastic. See as well, de Certain, pp. 440-443.

⁷⁹See Gerbert's letter to Constantine expressing his disapproval of Abbo's trip to Rome on Arnulf's behalf in: Latin, The Letters of Gerbert, no. 204.

⁸⁰See: Mostert, The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury, p. 48.

⁸¹Mostert, The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury, p. 49.

⁸²Lot brought up the relationship of Arnulf and Letaldus without mentioning the Apologeticus. Oddly, in the

errata, he rescinded the remark. See: Huques Capet, p. 37, note 4, and p. 444.

⁸³Manitius conjectured that perhaps it was the Miracula that so upset Arnulf. See: Manitius, p. 427.

⁸⁴For synopses of the events, see: Bernard S. Bachrach, "Robert of Blois, Abbot of Saint-Florent de Saumur and Saint-Mesmin de Micy (985-1011)," Revue bénédictine, 88? (1978), 132-134; and M. Mostert, The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury, 62-63.

Bachrach noted that the exact date is somewhat unsure, yet most scholars accept Lot's reasoning that Robert could not have come to Micy before 997. Jarossay gave the date as 994, yet Bachrach noted the problems of the book as a source. See: Bachrach, p. 132. Bachrach suggested that the appointment was a power play on the part of King Robert, as Robert of Florent was a loyal supporter of the crown. Bachrach assumed this necessity, as he asserted that at the time, Constantine of Fleury was the temporary Abbot of Micy, and Constantine was a great friend of Gerbert of Aurillac, with whom the king did not get along.

Exactly when Constantine was at Micy, and when he became Abbot, is somewhat under dispute. Mostert referred to him as the dean of Micy, using as his source a letter of Abbo written in 1004, in which the Abbot of Fleury defended the right of Abbot Robert. In this well-known letter, Abbo referred specifically to Letaldus, whom he calls "mi quondam familiaris," and beseeched him to think about his behavior. See: Mostert, pp. 62-63.

The question of Constantine's time at Micy is exacerbated by letters written to him by Gerbert. In a letter of 15 February 996, Gerbert addressed Constantine as Abbot of Micy. This would seem to jibe with the account given in the Vita Gauzlini, which says that Bishop Arnulf (971/2-1003) made Constantine Abbot. See: Andre de Fleury, Vie de Gauzlin, pp. 38-39.

However, Bautier said there were two different Constantines. Constantine of Fleury was Abbot of Micy, yet became Abbot of Noaillé between 991 and 994. Bautier saw the letter of Abbo to Constantine, the dean of Fleury in 1004, as another Constantine altogether. See: Helgaud de Fleury, Vie de Robert le Pieux, Introduction, pp. 23-24.

⁸⁵Bachrach noted that it was within the context of King Robert's excommunication by Pope Gregory V in 999 - and Gerbert's elevation soon thereafter to Pope (999-1003) that the events took place. See: Bachrach, p. 132.

Apparently, the monks may have had cause for dissatisfaction; on top of the abbot's support of the disgraced king, it seems Robert spent much time away from

the monastery (See: Mostert, p. 62), and also was filching from the fisc of Micy to benefit St. Florent (Bachrach, p. 133.).

For a different slant on the events and their outcome, art-historically speaking, see: B. Watkinson, "Lorsch, Jouarre et l'appareil décoratif du Val de Loire," Cahiers de civilisation médiévale XXXIII (1990), pp. 49-63.

⁸⁶See: S. Abbonis Epistolae, PL 139, p. 438.

⁸⁷Manitius, p. 429. In any case, Letaldus wrote his Vita S. Juliani at the request of the Bishop of Le Mans. See: Lutz, p. 99.

⁸⁸MGH SS XV, I, pp 500-501.

⁸⁹For a description of the manuscript, see: Vidier, L'historiographie a Saint-Benoit-sur-Loire, p. 87.

⁹⁰The translation above, by E. Jager (borrowing, for the last two lines, the 1854 translation of John Mason Neale), was made from the text in: MGH SS XV, pp. 500-501, which reads as follows:

Quartus decimus abbas Teodulphus annos 19 et dimidium. Qui a gloriosissimo imperatore Karolo ex Hesperia propter erudicionis scientiam, qua pollebat, in Gallias adductus, Floriacensibus abbas et Aurelianensibus datus est pontifex. Hic itaque, cum, ut diximus, erudicione precipuus doctrinaque haberetur preclarus, explanacionem edidit simboli sancti Athanasii, quod a monachis post tres regulares psalmos ad primam cotidie canitur. Sacramentum quoque misse seu eorum que in ea geruntur, quid misterii contineant, aliquaque quam plura succincto narrandi genere luculentissime digessit. Nec minus ei studium in elegantissimorum opere edificiorum fuit. Denique Germaniacus dicitur villa tribus a nostro monasterio distans milibus. Hec [ab] abbatibus qui ante eum fuerant maxima ex parte a fidelibus viris, quorum hereditas erat, partim data, partim vendita est. In hac igitur idem Theodulfus abbas et episcopus ecclesiam tam mirifici operis construxit, ut nullum in tota Neustria inveniri posset edificii opus, quod ei, antequam igne cremaretur, valeret equari. Totam namque archuato opere eandem extruens basilicam, ita floribus gipseis atque musivo eius venustavit interiora, pavimentum quoque marmoreo depinxit emblemate, ut oculi intuentium vix grata saciarentur specie.

Porro in matherio turris, de qua signa pendebant,
huiusmodi inseruit versus argenteo colore
expressos:

Haec in honore Dei Theodulfus templa
sacravi
Que dum quisquis adis, oro, memento mei.

Emulatus itaque in hoc facto Magnum Karolum, qui
ea tempestate Aquisgrani palatio tanti decoris
edificaverat ecclesiam, ut in omni Gallia nullam
habeat similem. Verum memoratus princeps illud
quod fecerat templum sancte Dei genitricis Mariae
dedicari sub honore precepit. At vero Theodulphus
aulam a se constructam omnium conditori ac
salvatori rerum Deo consecrans, Cherubim glorie
obumbrantia propiciatorium super altare ipsius
artificiosissimo magisterio expressum his
decoravit versibus:

Oraculum sanctum et Cherubim hic aspice
spectams!
Et testamenti en micat archa Dei
Hec cernens precibusque studens pulsare
Tonatem
Theodulphum votis iungito, queso, tuis.

Sed quia semper sapientibus invidetur difficileque
est in prosperis invidia carere, apud imperatorem
Ludovicum ab emulis accusatus coniurationis
adversus eum facte conscius fuisse, Andegavis
exiliatus, custodie etiam mancipatus est. Ubi in
die palmarum, presente ipso rege, illos
pulcherrimos versus gloriam laudis Christi
personantes, qui hodi per universas Gallias ab
ecclesiasticis decantantur viris, e turri in qua
custodiebatur a se compositos cecinit, quorum hoc
est exordium:

Gloria, laus et honor tibi sit, rex
Christe redemptor
Cui puerile decus prompsit osanna pium.

⁹¹Some scholars have used the Catalogus as a basis for relating Germigny-des-Prés to Aachen. See, for example: Heitz, L'architecture religieuse carolingienne, p. 82.

⁹²According to Vidier, p. 50, the manuscript within which the list is found (BN lat. 1720) is a compilation of a number of texts: folios 2-7 are of a piece, with folios 2-6r on Saint Benedict and ff. 6v-7v the Catalogus; ff. 8v-111

contain the Hexameron of Ambrose. Vidier stated that ff. 2-7 "originaires de Fleury, début XII^e s." On p. 87 he discussed the Catalogus itself, and stated that the arrest of Theodulf and the section devoted to him indicate an author of the ninth century. He maintained further that the work may come from the early ninth century, as the account of Mumolus given in the text (the first abbot - the only abbot besides Theodulf to get any account at all) is not that popularized by Adrevald later in the century.

For the most recent catalogue account of the manuscript, and a rundown of the possible places of origin for the manuscript, see: Mostert, The Library of Fleury, p. 201, no. BF 1022. For a discussion of the dating problems of the manuscript, see as well: Falkenstein, p. 66, note 96.

⁹³Vidier, p. 50 and p. 87.

⁹⁴Holder-Egger, MGH, XV/I, p. 500. He dated it to after 818, most probably to the ninth or tenth century.

⁹⁵Vidier, p. 87.

⁹⁶Letaldus has presented a problem for historians in their desire to ascertain the date when Jonas became Bishop. The majority opinion goes with 818, when Theodulf was presumably imprisoned, though some accept the 821 date. See: J.H. Bauchy, "Aspects de la Renaissance carolingienne en Orléanais," in Histoire religieuse de l'Orléanais, pp. 54-70, especially 66-67. For a discussion of the problem of the date, see especially: Jean Renviron, Les Idées politico-religieuses d'un évêque du IX^e siècle. Jonas d'Orléans et son 'De institutione regia, Paris, 1930, pp. 25-26.

⁹⁷See: MGH SS IX, pp. 363-364.

That Germigny-des-Prés continued to be on the minds of the monastic world of the Orléanais is shown in references to it in Fleury works. Andre of Fleury, in his Vita Gauzlini, stated that one of Gauzlin's main concerns was the state of Germigny, which was then in secular hands. See: Vita Gauzlini, Ch. 3, pp. 38-41. The account is quite interesting as a corollary to the idea of the rights of monasteries over secular powers. According to the story, Gauzlin had to resort to his natural cunning, taking advantage of the fact that the church had been given to Fleury by the Frankish monarchy on the condition that the monks pray for the health and souls of the kings.

Chapter Four
Sacred Topography and Universal History:
Aachen, Jerusalem, Liège

While Letaldus' comparison of Germigny-des-Prés and Aachen rests in part on their status as contemporary works of a legendary past, the church of St. Jean l'Evangélist in Liège, constructed roughly two centuries after Aachen was built, presents the problem of the changing meaning of Aachen over time. Although the building can be seen as contemporary with Letaldus' vision of Aachen, Liège was located in Ottonian Lotharingia and it manifested a perception of Aachen quite different from that prevalent in the Orléanais. The church of St. Jean served a funerary function within an urban and episcopal context, and, while Liège can be placed under the general rubric of funerary structures, the building expressed this function and its significance - and the image of Aachen - in a particular manner.

The chapel, built by Bishop Notker (972-1008) as his retreat in life and intended burial place, is no longer extant, and although there is uncertainty about the specific year in which it was constructed, it is safe to say that St. Jean was built sometime between 981 and 997.¹ The church underwent a number of alterations during the Middle Ages, and of these, a two-tower west facade, which was added in the eleventh century and partially rebuilt in the twelfth century, is extant - though barely.² The medieval chapel,

exclusive of the west facade, was completely torn down in the eighteenth century. The church at the site today was built in the mid-eighteenth century, the whole in desperate need of repair. (fig. 13)

The church of St. Jean at Liège, in contrast to Germigny-des-Prés, has been considered by scholars to be an exemplary "copy" of Aachen on the basis of its reconstructed form.³ However, the original form of the chapel is open to question, and its comparison to Aachen is based partially on the assumption that the present church was erected on the foundations of its predecessor and as well on the evidence of depictions and descriptions pre-dating the chapel's destruction.

The church of St. Jean as it appears today is a splendid image of Aachen filtered through a Baroque sensibility.⁴ The eighteenth-century church certainly does resemble Aachen in a manner - importantly - that falls within modern and scholarly expectations for a "copy;"⁵ most notably, in plan, the octagonal core of the building is surrounded by a sixteen sided ambulatory. However, despite the tendency of some scholars to state unequivocally that the eighteenth-century church was built "on the foundations" of Notger's church,⁶ there is no archeological evidence to substantiate this, and certainly, in the particulars of its plan and elevation - not to mention style - the extant church without a doubt strays in some measure from any

underlying tenth-century foundations or lost structure.⁷ In fact, the building as it appears today begs the question of whether the model for the rebuilding was the earlier church of St. Jean or, in actuality, the nearby church at Aachen.⁸

The question of the relation of the later church to the tenth-century chapel is significant, as it had been long held in the area that St. Jean was modeled on Aachen. The self-image of the area was grounded in part on its legendary association with Charlemagne and the early Carolingians; it was conjectured, for example, that Charlemagne was born at either Herstal or Jupille, and numerous stories grew around the local image of the Emperor.⁹ Consciously or unconsciously, the feeling no doubt was that any new church should again recall Aachen. The continuing desire to articulate this perceived connection, etched in the local historical memory, was clearly expressed in formal and structural terms - terms that satisfied an eighteenth-century image of identification with Aachen.¹⁰

In upholding a connection between St. Jean and Aachen, the eighteenth-century builders were reiterating, in their own terms, a fundamental local perception that had been expressed in varying ways since the Middle Ages. The earliest recorded expressions of an analogy of St. Jean with Aachen are found in written accounts that pointedly compared the two buildings. Jean d'Outremeuse,¹¹ in the fourteenth century, and Ortelius,¹² who saw St. Jean in 1575, clearly

and authoritatively expressed that they perceived a similarity between the two buildings. Their statements obviously referred to the centrally-planned core of the chapel, and the terms of the comparisons appear then to be based on a recognition of the similarities between the basic form of the two churches.

The analogy between Liège and Aachen, moreover, was certainly prevalent in the Gothic Age, as was suggested by Liège's fourteenth-century choir, which had formal affinities to Aachen's enlarged choir of late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries.¹³ It cannot be a mere coincidence that at both Liège and Aachen it was decided that enlarged choirs - both "copies" of the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris - would be appropriate. These roughly contemporary structures raise the question of precedence: was it decided simultaneously in both Liège and Aachen to enlarge the choirs; or did one project precipitate the other? The rebuilding of the choirs certainly suggests that some sort of equation between Liège and Aachen was seen as acceptable at least since the fourteenth century. That the perceived relationship between the two churches predated the textual and architectural references is most probable, the written sources recording long-held notions and the Gothic structures simply reaffirming a prevalent image.

In addition to these relatively early and rather general comparisons, later depictions and descriptions have

fueled the modern analogy of St. Jean with Aachen and provided the foundations for the proposed reconstructions of the chapel. However, the evidence gleaned from these sources presents inconsistencies. The mid-seventeenth-century view of the city by Jean Blaeu¹⁴ depicted St. Jean as a polygonal building with what appears to be an octagonal core, the centralized structure surrounded by later additions. The primary pictorial source for the reconstruction of the church has been the more detailed engraving of a drawing of St. Jean by Remacle Leloup (fig. 14), which provided an illustration for de Saumery's 1738 book on Liège.¹⁵ In this depiction, the outer wall of the central structure appears to be flat, and thus circular, and the polygonal core seems to be at least ten-sided.

The etching of Leloup, besides providing conflicting evidence when compared to the work of Blaeu, presents a puzzling and contradictory image of the chapel when compared to the written account of de Saumery. De Saumery's extremely general written description suggests an octagonal building, with eight interior arches, an ambulatory, an upper gallery and a domed roof.¹⁶ The evidence of Leloup's drawing is, however, corroborated in part by the completely unrelated description of the church written by Philippe de Hurgés in 1615.¹⁷ De Hurgés' account, especially in comparison to de Saumery's, displays an interest in detailed and exact formal description. Importantly, the author

presumed the church's relation to Aachen, yet St. Jean was described as a round building with a decagonal core - deviating fundamentally in form from its model. As the author specifically compared St. Jean and Aachen in basic formal terms, however, his work has been seen as particularly valuable by scholars. With its detailed comparison of numbers and angles, the account appears to fulfill modern expectations for accurate description - and therefore, de Hurgès has been seen as giving some credence to Leloup's etching.¹⁸

Although de Hurgès' reliance on specific detail and comparison might give a measure of credence to his description, when viewed in conjunction with other written and pictorial evidence, one can only conclude that, with the dearth of archeological evidence, very little is certain about the physical appearance of Notger's St. Jean, and firm statements about the formal ties between the churches can be misleading.¹⁹ Obviously the artists and writers cited above were not primarily interested in presenting archeologically accurate visual or written descriptions of St. Jean. Despite the problematic aspects of this material, the evidence as a whole, coupled with the idea that St. Jean "copied" Aachen, has led to numerous explanations for the inconsistencies in the sources as well as various conclusions about the original disposition of the church.²⁰ However, all that can be gathered from the available

information is that the church was round or polygonal, with a polygonal core, and had an inner ambulatory and at least one upper gallery and perhaps a domed roof. What is highly probable is that the tenth-century church in Liège differed - in formal and physical terms - from its supposed model in nearby Aachen, as well as from its modern successor.

It is, furthermore, of some consequence that all of the above descriptions and comparisons, which have provided fodder for modern scholars, postdate the time in which the church was built. The few textual references to the building that date to the eleventh and twelfth centuries do not concern themselves with the type of information needed to reconstruct the church. Folcuin, in his Gesta abbatum Lobensium²¹, discussed the building projects of Notger, as did Anselm, in his continuation of Heriger of Lobbes' Gesta episcoporum,²² and the anonymous author of the Vita Notgeri.²³ The importance of these accounts lies in their eulogization of Notger, particularly as a "Building Bishop."

The complex role of bishops in the Ottonian Empire required that they played both a religious and a political role,²⁴ and while Notker has been discussed as one of the Emperor's right hand men of the so-called "Reichskirche,"²⁵ his significance as a patron of architecture and the arts in Liège has never been allowed to transcend fully the perceived exclusive primacy of his political role. Known as the "Second Founder of Liège," a city renowned as the

resting place of St. Lambert, Notker initiated a virtual rebuilding of the episcopal city.²⁶

Notger's building fever was not unusual among bishops of the time, and his undertakings in Liège can be seen as an attempt to conform or even outdo the illustrious achievements of some of his distinguished contemporaries.²⁷ Yet Notger's situation differed somewhat from that of many other bishops: Liège was on the frontier of the Empire, in the historically recalcitrant territory of Lotharingia²⁸ in which Notger was a foreigner - a Swabian.²⁹ Notger's rebuilding of Liège suggests his bid to create a new and authoritative image for the city - certainly one that would make Liège, a large and important bishopric,³⁰ a showpiece of the Empire, yet also one that would bear the personal mark of the Bishop - as a secular and ecclesiastical figure. As a measure of his success it should be noted that Notger is remembered for having put Liège on the map, and he has even been credited with initiating "Mosan" art.³¹

Notger literally re-shaped the city, creating a new terrain into which he then inserted his own architectural commissions - none of which, unfortunately, have survived. (fig. 15) He began by fortifying the city and canalizing the Meuse; Notger thus created a fortified "cité" and an island "bourg," the latter secured by the deepened river itself.³² Within this imposed scheme, Notger incorporated the few existing ecclesiastical monuments, founded and built

by his episcopal predecessors. The architectural activity of Notger must be seen, then, as a continuation of the embellishment of the episcopal city initiated by earlier bishops, yet the scope of his undertakings separated him from these more modest precursors.

Notger's building activities primarily revolved around the construction of collegiate foundations.³³ Within Liège, the "cité" was the episcopal center. The wall enclosed the churches of St. Martin, Sainte Croix, St. Pierre and St. Denis, as well as the cathedral of Notre Dame and St. Lambert and its accompanying episcopal buildings.³⁴ The collegiate church of St. Martin³⁵ had been built by Bishop Heraclius, Notger's predecessor, and was found just within the Notger's imposed precinct, next to the eastern stretch of the wall. The church of St. Pierre³⁶ had been consecrated in 922, and was as well a collegiate church. Found on the Meuse, the church was incorporated into Notger's wall. In ca. 978 Notger founded the collegiate church of Ste. Croix,³⁷ which was perhaps consecrated in 986, and the church was built on a hill near the northern limits of the city. The church of St. Denis,³⁸ again a collegiate foundation, was founded by Notger and built in the south of the city. Notger began the rebuilding of the Cathedral itself.³⁹ The building, however, was not completed during his lifetime, and was consecrated in 1015 under his successor.

The island "bourg" had only two major foundations. The collegiate church of St. Paul,⁴⁰ founded in the eighth century, had been rebuilt under Heraclius. On the northwestern tip of the island Notger founded and erected the collegiate church of St. Jean. The Vita Notgeri characterized St. Jean as Notger's favorite foundation; the bishop presented lavish gifts - which perhaps included the well-known Ivory of Notger⁴¹ - to the foundation, and he was buried there upon his death in 1008.⁴²

Notger's intense building activities resulted in a new and complex topography for the city. His constructions certainly were not haphazard, but intended to present some sort of unified face for Liège. The author of the Vita Notgeri interpreted Notger's imposed landscape as a poignant tableau of Golgatha in the grouping of Ste. Croix, the Cathedral to St. Mary (and St. Lambert), and St. Jean - with John watching over the mother of Christ, as Christ implored his beloved apostle while on the cross.⁴³

This predilection towards seeing symbolic structure within the imposed topography was certainly de rigueur for the time. However, such constructs were not necessarily the product of overimaginative minds. A consideration of episcopal urban planning in the Ottonian Age, in fact, reveals the fundamental importance of the imposed Christianized landscape; at the very least, a "garland" of foundations, often placed on heights for visibility,

emphasized the episcopal center - as was the case in Liège.⁴⁴ Certainly, the goal was to make evident in no uncertain terms the glory and power of the episcopate. In Liège, the chosen dedications for the foundations underscored episcopal authority: beside the obvious significance of Mary, Christ (implied by Ste. Croix), Peter, Paul and John were foundations to three Bishop-saints - Lambert, Martin and Denis.

Beyond the more general topographical emphasis inherent in Ottonian episcopal sites, moreover, many Ottonian bishops prescribed a symbolic cross configuration for their sites, with foundations placed at the cardinal points in relation to the cathedral center. Such configurations were essential in the planning of Paderborn, Utrecht and Bamberg.⁴⁵ Importantly, the images reflected in such sites - and articulated by the author of the Vita Notgeri - were not solely of political dominance or Ottonian splendor, but visions permeated with Christian and apotropaic significance.

While one might argue that Notger did not necessarily intend to propound the particular image articulated years later in the Vita Notgeri, the evidence of his rebuilding of Liège does in fact suggest a Christianization of the landscape very much in keeping with the Crucifixion - and thus the salvation theme - implied in the text. In an article on the meaning of the enigmatic Ivory of Notger,⁴⁶

Philippe Stiennon made the compelling suggestion that Notger, through the placement and dedications of the Cathedral to the Virgin and the collegiate foundations to Ste. Croix and St. Jean, conceived Liège in accordance with the layout of Jerusalem, specifically with the precinct of the Holy Sepulchre, with St. Jean standing as the Anastasis.⁴⁷

The contention of a possible association of Liège with Jerusalem - and St. Jean with the Holy Sepulchre - merits consideration in light of the potency and pervasiveness of the image of that holiest of cities and its landmarks for the medieval Christian. The centrality of the image of Jerusalem should not be underestimated. As the primary point of reference for the Christian, Jerusalem was pregnant with exegetical significance.⁴⁸ As the advent of Christ had given time and history a center,⁴⁹ Jerusalem, as the place in which Salvation history had been played out, provided the earth with a center; Jerusalem was seen, quite simply, as the "Navel of the World."⁵⁰ Not merely interpreted as a place on the map, however, Jerusalem was a multivalent cosmological symbol: it was the Earthly Jerusalem, yet in its very existence it prefigured the Heavenly City; it was the "civitas Dei," and "Ecclesia;" Jerusalem was the goal, literally and figuratively, of the Christian.⁵¹

As the earthly stage for sacred history, Jerusalem was, in its physical manifestation, the original sacralized

landscape. The terrestrial city was, in essence, an amalgamation of highly charged sacred sites.⁵² The speciality of these individual holy sites was articulated and commemorated in architectural form, and the buildings in turn embodied and even symbolized the elaborate meanings invoked by the particular sites. The import of these sites for the pilgrim is self-evident, yet the desire for the essential image of Jerusalem led, on the one hand, to pictorial expressions resonant with the significance of the site,⁵³ and, on the other hand, to the persistent recreation of the city - and aspects of it.

Of the many sanctified locations in Jerusalem, even in the Holy Land, none excited as much interest and response as the Holy Sepulchre, or Anastasis, built atop the site of Christ's entombment.⁵⁴ (fig. 16) The Holy Sepulchre - as the site of Christ's burial and thus his resurrection - was the locus that embodied the most basic belief and hope of the Christian and thus, as the premier site in the Jerusalem landscape, it could subsume and exemplify the meanings of the city in itself. Within the teleological and eschatological scheme of the medieval worldview, the Holy Sepulchre conjoined the consummation of Biblical prophesy with the future expectation - salvation and resurrection - that the fulfillment of that prophesy promised. The fundamental image of the Holy Sepulchre was elaborate and multivalent, and its primacy lay in its myriad associations.

The associative power of the image of the Holy Sepulchre understandably gave rise to architectural reference to the structure - buildings intended to harness the rich meanings associated with the site - and, in number, references to the Holy Sepulchre outstripped references to any other Christian structure. The corpus of medieval buildings modeled on the Anastasis constitutes an enormous body of related structures, richly varied and highly inventive in their interpretations.⁵⁵ While motivations for recreating the Holy Sepulchre varied - for example, as an ersatz locus, an alternative to pilgrimage; as an appropriate shelter for a relic from the Holy Land; or as a funerary structure⁵⁶ - stretching across centuries, not to mention miles, these buildings presented different facets of the perceived meaning of their inspiration. The repeated recreation of the Holy Sepulchre, importantly, profoundly reflected the medieval desire to merge the present and the past, to cast the present in the mold of sacred history.

The image of the Holy Sepulchre, moreover, was tapped by a number of Ottonian patrons, and, importantly, many of these buildings carried funerary connotations.⁵⁷ Notger's church of St. Jean certainly can be viewed within this corpus. If one were to adopt Krautheimer's tenets of very general and selective formal similitude, St. Jean no doubt recalled the Holy Sepulchre. As Notger's funerary monument, furthermore, the model of the Holy Sepulchre certainly would

be appropriate. However, given the apparent generalizing nature of "copies" - and the specific problem at hand - difficulty in distinguishing between buildings that took their inspiration from the Holy Sepulchre and those modeled on Aachen is evident: both models were centrally planned, with an ambulatory and a gallery, and a domed roof; and both were funerary structures, as Charlemagne was buried in Aachen.

The church of St. Jean in Liège presents, then, a conundrum of sorts: the church, on the one hand, has been tied to Aachen, yet on the other hand, it has been tied to the Holy Sepulchre. The purported models certainly raise issues about formal differentiation in "copies." The question, however, is not whether Liège "copied" either Aachen or the Holy Sepulchre, but, more importantly, how and why Liège apparently embodied references to both structures.⁵⁸

While it is generally maintained that the reference to Aachen in St. Jean was used primarily to underscore Ottonian might,⁵⁹ the ramifications of the architectural context in Liège, viewed in conjunction with the meanings of Aachen itself, suggest a more complex associative significance. Certainly, on a basic level, Aachen, through its mosaic decoration of the Last Judgement, inherently imaged Christ's Resurrection, specifically the idea of the Heavenly Jerusalem of the Second Coming. Aspects of St. Jean appear

to point quite directly to these ideas articulated in the book of Revelation. The dedication of the chapel to John the Evangelist - the author of Revelation - indicated a reference to the biblical text and its imagery of the Heavenly Jerusalem.⁶⁰ The very location of the chapel - on the island "bourg" - recalled John's apocalyptic vision on the island of Patmos.

While such general associations can be made between the meanings of Aachen and St. Jean, these notions, coupled with contemporary textual images of Charlemagne, intimate that a more complex meaning for Aachen may have been reflected in St. Jean. The image of Charlemagne was continually evolving in the Middle Ages, and by the late tenth century Charlemagne's increasingly pious image, recorded in textual accounts,⁶¹ securely placed him in a new relationship with the Holy Land, and specifically with the Holy Sepulchre.

The foundations for associating Charlemagne with the Holy Land were laid during the Carolingian Age, and transmitted in "official" - court - texts of the first quarter of the ninth century, particularly in the Vita Caroli of Einhard and in the Royal Frankish Annals. Both works discussed Charlemagne's relations with Harun-al-Rashid, the Persian ruler of Palestine, as well as with the Patriarch of Jerusalem. Einhard's discussion⁶² was rather short and unelaborated, and quite obviously intended to paint Charlemagne in a most flattering light. The account

couched the relationship between the two sovereigns in terms of their exchange of gifts.⁶³ Charlemagne sent envoys bearing gifts for the Holy Sepulchre, which led Harun to give Charlemagne authority over the site. The envoys returned to the West laden with gifts from Harun, most notably an elephant.

The Annals,⁶⁴ which were used as a source by Einhard, were a bit more specific in their handling of communication and gift-giving between Charlemagne and Jerusalem, and thus more elaborate in their discussion. According to the entries, in 799, a monk sent by the Patriarch of Jerusalem arrived, bringing "blessings and relics of the Lord's Sepulchre."⁶⁵ Charlemagne then sent the monk back with a priest of his palace, Zacharias, with gifts for the Patriarch. Zacharias returned later that year to Rome with two monks from Jerusalem who had been sent from the Patriarch, and, "as a sign of his [the Patriarch's] good will they brought along the keys of the Lord's Sepulchre and of Calvary, also the keys of the city and of Mount Zion along with a flag."⁶⁶ The grateful Charlemagne entertained the monks for a few days before sending them home.⁶⁷

The merit and meaning of these references have been the subject of scholarly debate, primarily in the early part of this century.⁶⁸ Scholarly reaction to these accounts has been, in general, a negative one, in which the "historical veracity" of the texts has been scrutinized and, for the

most part impugned. However, the goal of these scholars was simply to prove or disprove the existence of a "Frankish Protectorate" in the Holy Land.

While there appears to be little evidence to support the idea that Charlemagne ruled such an institution, this point has little bearing on the import and significance of these accounts, particularly for the post-Charlemagne era. While the works give evidence of, at least communications between the Emperor and the Holy Land, more importantly - as widely copied and read texts - the information they provided became the grist for the historical imagination. These accounts were the seeds for stories that subsequently arose, in which Charlemagne became more closely and intimately connected to the Holy Land. Importantly, both the works tied Charlemagne - and Aachen - to the Holy Sepulchre: Einhard imaged Charlemagne as giving gifts to the Holy Sepulchre, while the Annals related that Charlemagne, at Aachen, was given relics from that foundation and also was given at least ceremonial jurisdiction over the site.

That these early, somewhat sketchy episodes concerning the communications between Charlemagne and the Holy Land would become elaborated was no doubt inevitable, and it was primarily in monasteries that legends began to unfold.⁶⁹ Notker the Stammerer's De Carolo Magno, written at St. Gall in 884, clearly shows that Charlemagne and his deeds already had passed into myth.⁷⁰ The particularly monastic character

of Notker's account, as well as his separation in time and place from the events that he related, underscores the mythic quality of the tale, and, importantly, Notker was recording, at times, oral information.⁷¹

Notger's anecdotal account of the Emperor's relations with the Holy Land began with Persian envoys bearing gifts, and the story's purpose was clearly to glorify Charlemagne at the expense of the Persian Sovereign.⁷² Charlemagne reciprocated by sending gifts to the Persian King, among these some hunting dogs that the King had specifically requested. Notker related how the king then put the dogs to test hunting a lion, and was so amazed at the dogs' prowess in capturing the ferocious creature that he felt the only worthy gift for the illustrious emperor was sovereignty over the Holy Land. The king concluded: "I will give the land to him, so that he may hold it. I myself will rule over it as his representative. Whenever he wishes and whenever the opportunity offers, he may send his envoys to me. He will find me a most faithful steward of the revenues of that province."

Notger's aggrandized version of Charlemagne's dealings with the Persian King is striking evidence of the elaboration of Charlemagne's image over time, specifically in relation to the Holy Land. The flattering image of Charlemagne was expressed primarily at the expense of the rival ruler: the account inherently compared the two power

figures, and upheld the uncontested primacy of the Frank. Charlemagne was tacitly imaged as an authority, one for whom the logical gift was the Holy Land. Importantly, the tale assumed Charlemagne's sovereignty over the area, rather than the presentation being simply a ceremonial gesture on the Persian King's part. This elaborated account clearly revealed a desire to claim part of the coveted Holy Land and its significance for the West through the potent image of the legendary Frankish emperor.

While Notker's work could be seen as an isolated aberration,⁷³ a number of tenth-century monastic texts reveal the increasingly close tie perceived between Charlemagne - and Aachen - and the Holy Sepulchre. Stephen Nichols has discussed how these texts - the Translatio Sanguinis and the Chronicle of Benedict of Mount Soracte - elaborated the tie between Charlemagne to the Holy Land and associated him specifically to the Holy Sepulchre.⁷⁴ The Translatio Sanguinis⁷⁵ was written in ca. 950 at the monastery of Reichenau, and concerned the history of the foundation's relic - purportedly a gift from Charlemagne - of a cross holding drops of Christ's blood.⁷⁶ Charlemagne was said to have procured a number of precious relics of the Passion from the Prefect of Jerusalem and the pious Emperor himself walked barefoot from Ravenna to Sicily, followed by pilgrims, to retrieve the sacred objects. He then gave some of the relics to various foundations, and, importantly,

placed some in his own church - thus conferring on Aachen a potent association with the Holy Land. Benedict's chronicle⁷⁷ of 968 imaged Charlemagne as actually traveling to Jerusalem, where Harun-al-Rashid made him the Protector of the Holy Sepulchre just when Charlemagne came to the site to pay homage.⁷⁸

Nichols used these examples of monastic traditions to bolster his contention of a more insidious identification in historical texts of Charlemagne not only with Christ, but with Constantine as well. The growing myth of the Carolingian king was on the minds of those in power in the late tenth century, and their particular image of Charlemagne gave rise to the peculiar activities of Pentecost in the year 1000: on this day, Emperor Otto III revealed Charlemagne's burial place within the church at Aachen. In analyzing texts that relate the drama of this "resurrection" of Charlemagne - the reports of Thietmar of Merseburg (975-1018), Otto of Lomello and Ademar of Chabannes (988-1034) - Nichols concluded:

"In the account of the 'invention' of Charlemagne's tomb by Otto III, just as Constantine's mother, St. Helena, reportedly discovered the Holy Sepulchre and the True Cross, we find a clear example of the way in which the art and literature of the period used 'historical' characters and events to demonstrate the symbolic unity in the world, a unity which was based upon the primacy of Christ as sign and signifier, and which ordinary space and time tended to diffuse."⁷⁹

Nichols stressed the progressive elaboration in the accounts of the discovery, as well as the significance of the elements that the accounts have in common.⁸⁰ Central to each telling of the events was the place - Aachen - in which the revelation took place, and the significance of the church as a shelter for the tomb - as an "archetypal martyrrium" reminiscent of the Anastasis.⁸¹ Citing the earlier textual evidence which associated Charlemagne with the Holy Land and particularly with the Holy Sepulchre, Nichols concluded that "by the later tenth century, then, to mention the Holy Sepulchre no longer automatically called up the sole image of Constantine, but also, and perhaps even rather, Charlemagne . . . Thanks to the special nature of Christian time, Charlemagne could be seen less as a successor to Constantine than as a renovatio of him, a representation of what he was perceived to have stood for. It makes no difference that it was not so at the beginning . . ."⁸² Within this historical - or to us anti-historical - construct, Aachen could then be seen as an image of the Holy Sepulchre through association.⁸³

Certainly the implications of this evolving image of Aachen are extraordinary for the church of St. Jean in Liège. While it may be argued that the event of the discovery of Charlemagne's tomb, as well as the writing of the texts, postdated the structure, Liège must be seen as testimony to the contemporary preoccupation with Charlemagne

and his gravesite within Aachen:⁸⁴ the interest in Charlemagne as a saintly figure - his body, when discovered, was reportedly uncorrupted - as well as a parallel to Constantine and even to Christ was brewing long before the actual discovery of the tomb and the recorded accounts. That Notger would be aware - consciously or unconsciously - of the prevalent image of Charlemagne and Aachen is indisputable. Prior to his elevation to the Bishopric, he may have been at St. Gall,⁸⁵ and therefore within the monastic orbit, and he then spent time at court, and therefore at Aachen, during his tenure in Liège.⁸⁶ The complex connotations inherent in his personal church at Liège were witness to these perceived associations.⁸⁷

Notger's chapel at Liège can be seen, then, as a reminder of the rich meanings that a medieval building could embrace for a wide and diverse audience. Ironically, it was clearly the lack of specificity in the structure that allowed for a variety of mobile metaphors to be intrinsic to the chapel. To a large degree, therefore, the exact reconstruction of the lost church does not appear to be very important. The extremely general formal aspects of the chapel - notably its central plan - sufficed to universalize Liège and open the possibility for perceiving complex levels of meaning and association based on contemporary images of the past. The universalizing nature of the chapel can be

seen, moreover, as Notger's bid to secure, for himself, a place in universal history.

In his chapel, Notger can be seen as hedging his bets. The wealth of associations Aachen embodied by the late tenth century makes it unlikely that Notger was simply bowing to the power of the Ottonians or trying to get to the Holy Sepulchre. In referencing Aachen, the bishop was able to tap the complex perceived meanings of Charlemagne's nearby chapel - an unmistakable image that clearly would have been understood in the immediate area. The church of St. Jean appears as a much more personal statement, one that reflected Notger's view of himself, his hopes for the future and his desire to be remembered as a pious patron comparable to archetypal figures of the Christian past.⁸⁸ There was certainly a degree of self-aggrandizement inherent in Notger's commission - a personal monument that expressed and perpetuated a mythic image of himself: in his own funerary monument, Notger managed to place himself not only in the company of the saintly Charlemagne, but, also in that of Constantine and even Christ.

¹For the problems of dating the church, see: J. Deckers, "Notger et la fondation de la collégiale Saint-Jean l'Évangéliste à Liège," in La collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège. Mille ans d'art et d'histoire, ed. J. Deckers, Brussels, 1981, pp. 13-16; Deckers, "La fondation de la collégiale Saint-Jean l'Évangéliste à Liège," in Millenaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège. Exposition d'art et d'histoire, Ministère de la Communauté française, ed., Liège, 1982, pp. 13-14; and, especially, L. Lahaye, Inventaire analytique des chartes de la collégiale de Saint-Jean l'Évangéliste à Liège, Brussels, 1921, pp. i-ii (Commission royale d'histoire v. 35). The canons of St.

Jean traditionally dated the foundation to 981, probably getting their information from Jean D'Outremeuse, who wrote in the fourteenth century, detailing the history of the church. According to him, Notger dedicated the church on 1 May 987 after a six year construction period. See: Jean d'Outremeuse, Ly myreur des histours, vol. IV, Corps des Chroniques Liégoises, ed. S. Bormans, Brussels, 1877, pp. p. 155.

Lahaye noted that these dates may approximate reality, saying that the service commemorating the foundation of the church had always been celebrated on 1 May. As well, there are a number of contemporary documents for the church. An imperial document of 9 April 997 referred to St. Jean as "recently built" and gave the foundation Heerwaarden (Lahaye, No. 3.) In another royal document of 15 June 983, Otto II gave Notger the rights of tonlieu for Vise; these monies passed into the hands of St. Jean, and the foundation conserved the document (Lahaye No. 1). Deckers felt that this document might allow scholars to suppose that construction on the church began at this time, but it must be noted that according to Lahaye the monies stipulated in the document were for Ste. Marie and St. Lambert - the cathedral. In any case, a certain Enghenulphus gave lands to the church on 13 November 990, so it can be assumed that St. Jean existed in some form by that time (Lahaye No. 2).

For a short synopsis of the documents see: L.-F.

Genicot, Les églises mosanes du XI^e siècle, Louvain, 1972, note 48, pp. 88-89. Kubach and Verbeek stated that, according to later sources, the church was built in 977 or 980-988, and they said it was finished by 997. See: Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 2, p. 712.

²The choir was rebuilt, and greatly enlarged, in the fourteenth century. See: Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 2, p. 712. In the twelfth century, the upper reaches of the west facade were rebuilt, and, at the same time, the eastern choir was rebuilt. See: Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 2, p. 712. See also: L.-F. Genicot, "L'église romane de Notger et l'avant-corps" in Millenaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège, pp. 43-58. Genicot discussed the evolution of the western block from Notger through the thirteenth century. It is important to note that he took as given that Liège was a "copy" of Aachen, and that Aachen, with its central plan, gave that plan type a primarily political meaning. As well, Genicot stated that Aachen was the origin of the westwork, and that this form spread from there. For this issue, see Chapter Five, pp. 202-204.

³Verbeek stated that the church has been held as the truest "copy" of Aachen, even in its measurements, although the chapel differed from the model in its particulars. See:

"Die architektonische Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle," p. 116. The issue of measurements, as well as proportions, has, of course, been central in the discussion of "copies," and Verbeek's analyses honed in repeatedly on this question. See especially: "Zentralbauten," pp. 944-946; and as well: Sieffert, "Les imitations de la chapelle palatine de Charlemagne à Aix-la-Chapelle," pp. 52 ff; and C. Heitz (following Verbeek), L'architecture religieuse carolingienne, p. 79. While the conjectured parity in measurement between St. Jean and Aachen may be grounds to see a relationship between the two, the measurements may also intimate a wider circle of associations for Liège. See below, footnotes 57 and 83.

In "Zentralbauten," Verbeek characterized Liège as "vielleicht die bedeutendste, jedenfalls die bekannteste vollständige Nachbildung der Aachener Pfalzkapelle." See: "Zentralbauten," p. 916. Kleinbauer stated that Liège "closely reflected the design of Aachen." See: Kleinbauer, p. 4. The literature devoted to Liège itself repeatedly has underscored the church's alleged tie to Aachen, and works devoted solely to the church have tended to underscore Liège's role as a "copy." For example, F. Bonvier stated: "cette église rappelant assez fidèlement l'église carolingienne d'Aix-la-Chapelle, à laquelle on l'a souvent comparée; il est certain toutefois qu'elle en diffèrait notablement par diverses dispositions." See: F. Bonvier, L'église Saint-Jean l'Évangéliste à Liège, Liège, 1959, p. 1.

⁴For the history of the rebuilding of the church, and the Baroque church, see: P. Stiennon, "La reconstruction de Saint-Jean l'Évangéliste (1752-1770)," in Millenaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège, pp. 71-106. Originally, the canons of St. Jean wanted simply to repair the existing church, which was quite worse for the wear and tear of the centuries. It was decided, however, that a reconstruction was the only answer. A number of different schemes were presented in a competition - schemes notable in their variations on a central plan "built on the foundations" of the earlier church - and the canons opted for the plan of Pisoni.

⁵It is interesting that scholars have had no problem with seeing this church as a "copy" of Aachen, though in detail it differs substantially. Generous as scholars are, it should be noted that many have not been as generous with medieval "copies" that stray in their particulars.

⁶See, for example: Lahaye, p. 4-5; and Rhein und Maas. Kunst und Kultur 800-1400, p. 112. J. Mertens stated, rather cryptically, that "il est probable que cette rotonde

du XVIII^e siècle reprend la disposition d'un édifice préexistant, tel qu'il nous est montré par certaines gravures anciennes et que cette configuration a plan central remonte à l'époque de la fondation par Notger qui construit l'église pour lui servir de sépulture." See: J. Mertens, "Quelques édifices religieux a plan central découverts récemment en Belgique," Geneva 11 (1963), p. 155-156.

Kubach and Verbeek, as well as Verbeek, noted that there is no certainty as to the extent to which the present church adhered to the tenth-century foundations below. See: Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 2, p. 712; and Verbeek, "Zentralbauten," pp. 916-919. Genicot and Lahaye as well questioned this notion. See: Les églises mosanes, p. 89; and Lahaye, p. v.

⁷For example the six rectangular chapels ringing the church are no doubt not from the original design. Perhaps their inspiration came from the numerous chapels that were added to the exterior wall of the church over the centuries - in a manner not unlike the addition of chapels to Aachen itself. For a discussion of whether St. Jean originally had chapels, see: Lahaye, pp. v-vi.

Kubach and Verbeek, true to form, enumerated the differences between the Baroque church and Aachen, failing to acknowledge that a "copy," be it Medieval or Baroque, might incorporate elements alien to the model. See: Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 2, p. 712.

⁸The Baroque church seems to be a conflation of the two.

⁹See: M. Piron, "Le cycle carolingien dans les traditions du pays de Liège," in Charlemagne et l'épopée romane. Actes du VIIe Congrès International de la Société Rencevals, Paris, 1978, pp. 177-188 (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, fasc. CCXXV). For a discussion of the legends of Charlemagne and the Carolingians as disseminated by Jean d'Outremeuse, see: Louis Michel, Les Legendes Épiques Carolingiennes dans l'oeuvre de Jean d'Outremeuse, Paris, 1935, especially Part 3, pp. 137 ff. It should be noted that Jean d'Outremeuse has been credited with the dispersion of the local Carolingian tradition. See: Piron, pp. 177-179; and Michel.

¹⁰In the absence of archeological information about Notger's church, perhaps it can be seen as understandable that the later church is compared directly to Aachen; however, this analogy presents a particular attitude towards the model-"copy" relationship of the tenth-century church, and the assumption that the earlier church resembled Aachen

in the same manner. For an analysis of the later church with reference to Aachen, see: F. Ullrich, "Étude comparative des plans de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège et du 'Dom' d'Aix-la-Chapelle," in Millenaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège, pp.63-67.

¹¹Jean d'Outremeuse stated that St. Jean was "de la fachon et forme reonde, ensi que astoit et est l'englise Nostre Damme d'Yais-le-grain." See: Jean d'Outremeuse, p. 150.

¹²"Aedem, Aquisgranensi perquam similem et rotundam penitus nisi quod ad latera sacella postmodum accessere." See Lahaye's discussion of these sources: Lahaye, pp. iv-vi.

¹³Verbeek and Gurlitt noted that fact that both Aachen and Liège received similar choirs in the Gothic Age. See: C. Gurlitt, Historische Städtebilder, vol. IX, Lüttich, Berlin, 1906, p. 5.

Furthermore, in another "copy" of Aachen, Ottmarsheim, a similar type of structure was built next to the square choir, to the northeast, in the second half of the sixteenth century. See: Sieffert, "Ottmarsheim," pp. 300-329. In any case, it cannot be mere coincidence that these three churches all received similar east end structures; the situation would appear to indicate some kind of awareness or knowledge of each other in the Middle Ages.

¹⁴See : M. Josse, "Le peuplement de l'île," in Millenaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège, pp. 27-32.

¹⁵de Saumery, Les delices du pais de Liège ou description des monuments sacrés et profanes, Liège (1738), pp. 135-137.

¹⁶De Saumery described the church as follows:

"C'est un octogone surmonté d'un Dôme qui n'est aujourd'hui que médiocrement élevé; car à mesure qu'on a exhaussé les Ruës pour embellir la Ville, & pour mettre le Quartier, ouu elle est située, a l'abri des inondations de la Meuse, on à été obligé de relever son pavé, & par consequent de l'enterrer; ce qui aiant été sait plusieurs fois, a diminué sa hauteur de huit ou dix piés. Cet Edifice est composé de huit arches, dont la plûpart sont ornées de grandes niches portant sur des Colonnes de marbre, ou de très-belles figures sont placées avec beaucoup d'ordre. Une double

Galerie qui regne à l'entour, & une grande Couronne de cuivre, qui rempli presque la circonférence, donnent à cet Edifice une air de beauté, qui répond à toutes celles qu'on y trouve; mais pour qu'il frape la vûe, il faut être dans la Sanctuaire; car quelque autre part qu'on se place on ne sauroit s'en apercevoir. Une de ces arches forme l'entrée du choeur par un Jubé de marbre acompagné de deux Chapelles en face, fermé de deux Batans de cuivre travaillé à jour . . . les six autres arches répondent à six Chapelles, laissant un contour assés vastes pour les séparer . . . Tout l'Edifice tire du jour principalement de la Nef, qui couvre le Choeur & le Sanctuaire, & qui lui en donne assés pour le rendre riant & agréable. Le Choeur pavé de marbre, ainsi que le Sanctuaire, est fermé par des Tableaux . . ."

¹⁷Voyages de Philippe de Hurges à Liège et à Maestricht, ed. Henri Michelant, Liège, 1872, pp. 167 ff. The description, recounted in Millenaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège, is as follows:

"Elle est ronde par le dehors, mais par le dedans elle est façonnée à recoings tirez en ligne, et à treize angles, n'estant toutesfois si vaste que celle de Nostre-Dame d'Aix, que je juge avoir esté bastie à l'imitation de celle-cy, je dis la grosse tour et le choeur, car il y a fort peu de différence de l'une de ces structures à l'autre, sauf que la tour et le choeur d'Aix sont plus larges et plus eslevez de beaucoup; aussi la tour de Nostre-Dame d'Aix est faite à recoings par le dehors, et celle-cy est ronde; celle d'Aix ne contient que huict faces, qui font neuf angles au dedans, celle-cy en contient douze, et treize angles . . . Par le dedans il contient trois rancs de galleries à jour, en hauteur, soustenuës de gros piliers de pierre pareille à celle de l'exterieur; et y a-t-il ouverture par laquelle on monte et l'on peut aller promener en ces galleries. La voute est faite de grand artifice, et formée à peu près en estoille, toute peinte et dorée, d'un ouvrage si ancien que désormais les figures ne s'en peuvent discerner. La couverture est de lames de plomb, façonnées comme la voute, et peut-on promener tout à l'entour par une gallerie qui l'environne, de laquelle on passe en celle qui ceint l'autre plommée, laquelle couvre le choeur."

¹⁸For example, R. Forgeur, in discussing Saumery, de Hurgues and Leloup, stated: "Malgré la contradiction entre les auteurs, il est plus raisonnable de penser que les deux derniers ont raison car de Hurgues compare le nombre de côtés de l'église Saint-Jean (12) à celui d'Aix-la-Chapelle (8); la différence l'a donc frappé et Remacle Le Loup a dû observer l'édifice pour le dessiner mieux que ne l'aura fait Saumery, souvent imprecis et superficiel." See: L'église Saint-Jean l'Evangéliste à Liège, Liège, 1967, pp. 4-5.

These sources were used to construct models of the successive phases of the church before its demolition. See: P. Stiennon, "Reconstitution par Joseph de la Croix de l'église Saint-Jean, états successifs jusqu'en 1738," in Millénaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège, p. 69-70.

For a discussion of the ties between Leloup and de Hurgues, see: Verbeek, "Zentralbauten," pp. 918-919.

¹⁹The curious tendency of scholars to espouse the view that Liège was an "accurate copy" of Aachen is due, perhaps, to the facility with which one can exploit "lost monuments." St. Jean no longer exists, except in a Baroque form that quite obviously references Aachen, and in the absence of an actual building, scholars are willing to accept Liège as a "true" copy of Aachen, and many base their reconstructions on the formal aspects of Aachen.

²⁰For example, T. Gobert stated: "Leon Lahaye, dans ses recherches récentes sur l'ancienne collégiale, a pu s'assurer que Jean d'Outremeuse et Philippe de Hurgues ne se sont nullement trompés en décrivent une rotonde purement circulaire." See: T. Gobert, Liège à travers les âges. Les rues de Liège, vol. 3, Liège, 1927, p. 373.

Gurlitt was perplexed by the inconsistencies in de Hurgues, Blaeu and le Loup. His attempt to reconcile the sources resulted in a rather far-fetched theory based on the sources, Aachen and another "copy" of Aachen, Mettlach. He stated: "Auf den älteren Bildern [Blaeu and le Loup] erscheint die Kirche dreigeschossig, auf jenen von 1739 scheint ein Geschoss zu fehlen. Der Reisende [de Hurgues] beschreibt sie als dreigeschossig, sowohl im Aeussern als im Innern, wo er von 'trois rancs de galleries a jour en hauteur' spricht. Die Lösung ist wohl darin zu finden, dass im 16. Jahrhundert an die Kirche niedrige Umgänge angebaut wurden, die im Jahre 1739 schon teilweise durch grössere zur Kirche radial stehende Kapellen verdrängt worden waren. Endlich entfernte der Umbau von 1754 die Umgänge wie die alte Konchen, um nur die an die Quadratfelder des Umganges radial sich anlegenden Kapellen auszubauen. Der Reisende sagte, die Bleidachung habe unmittelbar auf dem Gewölbe gelegen. Dies dürfte sich auf das Dach des Mittelgeschosses bezogen haben, das demnach wahrscheinlich die anstiegenderen

Tonnengewölbe des Aachener Domes nachahmte. Dies ist in der Rekonstruktion angedeutet, während dort hinsichtlich der triforienartigen Ausgestaltung des Geschosses nach innen das Vorbild des alten Turmes in Mettlach verwendet wurde. Beim Umbau von 1754 wurde dieses Mittelgeschoss völlig entfernt." See: Gurlitt, pp. 6-7.

Verbeek as well discussed the relative merits of the sources: "Die Südansicht auf dem Stich von le Loup stellt den hohen Umgang mit Empore als reine Rotunda dar . . . als Polygon wächst erst der ähnlich gegliederte turmartige Mittelraum heraus. . . . Getreuer scheint trotz der Verkleinerung auf den ersten Blick die Wiedergabe auf der Stadtansicht von Blaeu aus dem Jahre 1627 zu sein, die ein basilikal gestuftes Polygon mit Umgang und Kapellenkranz zeigt, ohne daß man die Seiten zuverlässig zählen könnte. . . . Das Emporengeschoß über dem Umgang ist gesichert, nach Philippe de Hurgues waren es mit den Ansichten übereinstimmend 'trois estages ou rancs de fenestres;' ob der Chor ursprünglich ein Obergeschoß mit Altar hatte, ist dagegen fraglich. Über die Seitenzahl des Polygons macht Philippe de Hurgues genaue Angaben, die zunächst verwirren. Er spricht ausdrücklich von rundem Außenbau und innerem Zwölfeck, den Unterschied zu Aachen besonders betonend. . . . Abgesehen von der seltsamen Unterscheidung der Seiten- und Eckenzahl, die nur zuträfe, wenn man einen Ausbau mitrechnete, ist der Text unmißverständlich: der Kernraum bildete kein Achteck wie in Aachen, sondern ein Zwölfeck, und die Umschließung des Umganges war rund, ganz wie es der Stich von le Loup wiedergibt. Die Übereinstimmung von Bild und Text (die miteinander nichts zu tun hatten) ist in der Tat verblüffend. Es scheint also, daß wir der Darstellung des schematisierenden Stichs, dem sichtlich eine getreue Zeichnung nach der Natur zugrunde gelegen hat, auch in Einzelheiten vertrauen dürfen." See: Verbeek, "Zentralbauten," pp. 918-919.

Genicot stated that St. Jean is usually reconstructed as an octagon with an exterior sixteen-sided ambulatory, and eastern choir, a western block, an interior gallery (from de Hurgues), and a vaulted dome and ambulatory. See: Genicot, Les églises mosanes, p. 89. Others seem to take even more for granted the role of Aachen in Liège. In Lehmann's plan, for example, St. Jean is shown as sixteen-sided on the exterior, with an octagonal core and a possible square apse. See: Die frühe deutsche Kirchenbau, vol. 2, no. 134.

²¹Folcuini Gesta abbatum Lobensium, MGH SS IV, pp. 70-71.

²²Anselmi Gesta episcoporum Tungrensium, Traiectensium et Leodiensium, MGH SS VII, pp. 203-206.

²³Vita Notgeri episcopi Leodiensis, in Notger de Liège et la civilisation du X^e siècle, ed. G. Kurth, Brussels, 1905, vol. 2, Appendix II, pp. 10-15. The work was discovered by Kurth and he dated the manuscript quite early, to the late eleventh century. He maintained that, from the obvious familiarity of the author with his location and subject, the work was written by a local, probably after 1060 but certainly before the great 1185 fire that destroyed the cathedral. He noted that the text does not mention the 1135 moving of a door and the 1095 moving of a cross, so he concluded that the work dated to ca. 1060-1095, probably closer to the latter.

There is, however, some question as to the dating of the text. For a discussion of the work and the problems surrounding it, see: Deckers, "Les Vitae Notgeri: une source capitale pour l'histoire de la collégiale Saint-Jean l'Évangéliste à Liège," in La collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège. Mille ans d'art et d'histoire, pp. 21-28; and Deckers, "Les Vitae Notgeri: sources d'histoire de la collégiale Saint-Jean l'Évangéliste à Liège," in Millenaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège, pp. 19-20.. The general consensus is that one can only conclude with surety that the text dates to before the 1185 fire. See: J.-L. Kupper, "Sources écrites: des origines à 1185," in Les fouilles de la place Saint-Lambert à Liège, ed. M. Otto, Liège, 1984, pp. 31-34.

²⁴See: Kupper, Liège et l'église impériale, XI^e-XII^e siècles, Paris, 1981, p. 10. See as well: E. N. Johnson, The Secular Activities of the German Episcopate, Chicago, 1931; and Stephen Jaeger, "The Courtier Bishop in vitae from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century," Speculum 58/2 (1983), pp. 291-325. (Although Jaeger did not deal specifically with Notger, his analysis is illuminating for the question of the role and memory of the bishops as a group.)

²⁵For a recent treatment of the church in Liège and its relation to the Ottonian hierarchy, see: Kupper, Liège et l'église impériale, XI^e-XII^e siècles. Kupper as well provided a discussion and extensive bibliography on the so-called "Reichskirche," which he defined as a German term with a very narrow and specific focus; Kupper chose to see "Reichskirche" in a broad sense as a group of churches in the Empire united under the sovereign by certain laws and connections: See: Kupper, pp. 9-10.

See as well: G. Kurth, Notger de Liège et la civilisation du X^e siècle, Brussels, 1905, especially Chapters V-VIII, pp 56-114. Kurth remains the fundamental source for Notger. However, it should be noted that his unexpressed goal - as a sort of Belgian nationalist - was to glorify Notger and Liège. He saw Notger primarily as the

king's man, and as well as the "Second Founder of Liège." Kurth's high opinion of Notger, and his view of his goals and interests, certainly colored the way in which he saw St. Jean and its connections to Aachen.

²⁶See: Kurth, Chapter X, "Notger, Second fondateur de Liège," pp. 130-169. According to Kurth, St. Hubert was the "First Founder" of the city. See Kurth, p. 136.

²⁷Kurth compared Notger to Bernward of Hildesheim. In doing so, he appeared to have been trying to elevate the image of Notger, and put him on the level of an Ottonian bishop who was clearly known for his artistic enterprises. See: Kurth, pp. 130-131. As well, bishops of Notger's day had to contend with the fresh memory of Bruno of Cologne; Liège, like Utrecht, Münster, Osnabrück and Minden, were subject to the Archdiocese of Cologne. Kurth saw the direct influence of Cologne in the works of Notger. See: Kurth, p. 310. For an article that compares the artistic commissions of Bernward and Notger, see: S. Collon-Gevaert, "Notger de Liège et Saint Bernward de Hildesheim: À propos d'un ivoire et d'une miniature," in Studien zur Buchmalerei und Goldschmiedekunst des Mittelalters. Festschrift für Karl Hermann Usener zum 60. Geburtstag am 19. August 1965. eds. F. Dettweiler, H. Köllner and P. A. Riedl, Marburg an der Lahn, 1967, pp. 27-32.

²⁸It was not until 924-925 that Henry I secured the territory for the Empire. In the post-Carolingian age, the area had been passed back and forth between the territory's neighbors. The mid-tenth century was a critical time in Liège, as in 953 a revolt took place. When Bruno became Archbishop of Cologne, he was given extraordinary power, which he used to whip Liège into shape. Rathier of Lobbes was made Bishop from 953-955, Balderic from 955-959, and then Eracle preceded Notger from 959-971.

For a discussion of Liège before Notger, see: Kurth, Chapter II, pp. 6-31; and Kupper, Liège et l'église imperiale, XI^e-XII^e siècles, p. 77. Kurth wanted to highlight the problems unique to the area - which he saw implicitly as Belgium - particularly the fact that there were two distinct ethnic groups (described in philological terms) - the Germanic and the Roman - and a strong sense of nationalism. For Kurth, it was the decisive action of Bruno of Cologne that brought the area into the fold. See: Kurth, pp. 9-10.

For aspects of the problems in Liège in the early tenth century, see: H. Zimmermann, "Der Streit um das Lütticher Bistum vom Jahre 920-921. Geschichte, Quellen und Kirchenrechtshistorische Bedeutung," Mitteilungen des

Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung 65 (1957), pp. 15-52.

²⁹According to texts, Notger was Swabian or at least of Germanic stock. See: Anselmi Gesta episcoporum Tungrensium, Traiectensium et Leodiensium, p. 203; and Vita Notgeri, p. 10. In putting a foreigner in the Bishopric of Liège, the monarchy was continuing a policy that it had begun under Bruno. It must be noted that, by the time Notger came to the office, the situation in the Lorraine had eased up somewhat; nevertheless, the policy was continued, perhaps as a way to ensure the loyalty of the bishopric to the archbishopric over local ties and concerns. See: Kurth, Chapter III, pp. 32 ff.

³⁰Liège apparently had been somewhat of a backwater. St. Lambert's remains were translated to Liège from Maastricht in the early eighth century, because Liège had been the principle residence of the Bishop of Tongres. The appearance of St. Lambert elevated Liège, but considering the history of the area, it is not surprising that Liège did not get its act together until a bit later. See: Kurth, p. 136.

³¹It is generally held that with Notger came the advent of "Mosan" - a nineteenth-century term - art. For example, Comte J. de Borchgrave d'Altenet and Abbé Coenen stated that Mosan art first appeared in ivories associated with the time of Notger. See: Exposition de l'art ancien au pays de Liège, "L'art religieux", Liège, 1924, p. 45. In his work on Mosan churches, Genicot stated: "Il y a mille ans, en avril 972, Notger de Souabe montait sur le trône épiscopal de Liège. Il devait l'occuper trente-six ans. C'est ainsi qu'a véritablement débuté la grande aventure de l'art mosan." See: Les églises mosanes du XI^e siècle, p. xix.

This view of Notger may perhaps have begun with Kurth. See: Kurth, Chapter XV, pp. 300-331. He saw Notger's artistic commissions as coinciding with the birth of the Romanesque. Kurth characterized the influences on Notger as coming from two distinct sources: first, the local influence of Aachen, seen especially in St. Jean; and secondly, the great influence of Cologne, seen especially in the cathedral and church of Ste. Croix, which were double-apsed and had no side aisles or vaults. Kurth stated that "La construction de Saint-Jean est un hommage de respect et un acte de vasselage artistique envers la grande mémoire de Charlemagne, mais elle reste un fait isolé. A part cette unique exception, l'architecture notgérienne, sous les réserves formulées ci-dessous, est orientée sur la métropole de l'église liégeoise, sur la 'sainte Cologne.'" (p. 310) It is apparent that in naming these sources, Kurth wished to

see Notger as faithful to, on the one hand, the monarchy, and on the other hand, to the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

³²See: Kurth, Chapter X, pp. 130-169 Of Notger's activities, Kurth stated: "En essayant de présenter ici le tableau d'une activité qui a été gigantesque, il import de rappeler qu'elle fut la réalisation d'un programme qui peut se résumer en ces trois mots: agrandir, embellir et fortifier la ville épiscopal." (p. 131) Kurth characterized the tenth century as an age of military architecture (p. 132), but stated that the canalization of the Meuse in Liège was more of a commercial than a military strategy (pp. 144-145). See as well: J. Lejeune, Liège de la principauté à la métropole, Anvers, 1967, pp. 41 ff.

³³Thus Liège, in the Ottonian Age, was a city of canons rather than monks. The only monastery, St. Laurent, was founded by Notger's predecessor Heraclius, and was outside of Notger's wall. Notger had roofs built over the completed parts of the church. Bishop Wolbodo (1018-1021) was apparently that main benefactor of the foundation, however. See: Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 2, pp. 714-715. See as well, for more detailed information: F. Ulrix, "Fouilles archéologiques récentes à l'abbataile Saint-Laurent de Liège," in Saint-Laurent de Liège. Église, abbaye et hôpital militaire. Mille ans d'histoire, ed. R. Lejeune, Liège, 1968, pp. 25-40; and H. Wellmer, "L'Évêque Eracle et sa fondation de Saint-Laurent de Liège," in Saint-Laurent de Liège, pp. 41-47.

In choosing to concentrate on collegiate foundations, Bishop Notger was not unique in his time. (Cf. Chapter Five) His preference specifically for canons has led to debate over the nature of their purpose - whether they were primarily secular or ecclesiastical creatures. See: C. Dereine, "Clercs et moines au diocèse de Liège au X^e au XII^e siècle," Annales de la Société Archéologique de Namur, 45 (1949), 183-203; Dereine, Les chanoines réguliers au diocèse de Liège avant Saint Norbert, Brussels, 1952 (Classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques. Mémoires, XLVII, fasc. 1); and H. Silvestre, "Sur une des causes de la grande expansion de l'ordre canonial dans le diocèse de Liège aux X^e et XI^e siècles," Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire 31 (1953), 65-74. This debate tends to polarize the political and ecclesiastical characters of Ottonian Bishops; it appears more likely that canons were able to satisfy both secular and ecclesiastical demands. It is certainly apparent that Notger felt that a surfeit of canons were desirable for his episcopal capital.

Notger was involved as well in the construction of parish churches, notably Notre Dame, attached to the

Cathedral, and St. Adalbert, near St. Jean. See: Kurth, pp. 164-165.

³⁴For the various churches of Liège, and their history, see: Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 2, 695-717. For the history of Notger's foundations and buildings, see as well: Kurth, pp. 147 ff.; and Genicot, Les églises mosans, p. 4. Genicot stated that St. Denis was consecrated in 999, Sainte Croix was begun in 978 and perhaps consecrated as early as 986, and the Cathedral, begun by Notger, was consecrated after his death, in 1015.

³⁵See: Kubach and Verbeek, vol 2, p. 715. Little is known about the church. According to Kubach and Verbeek, Heraclius had intended to found the cathedral here. The tenth-century church was replaced completely in the sixteenth century, but the earlier church is known to have had both an east and a west choir.

³⁶See: Kubach and Verbeek, vol 2, p. 716. Very little is known about the church, which was at least damaged in the 1185 fire that destroyed much of the city.

³⁷See: Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 2, pp. 709-710. The tenth-century church is completely gone. The church today is somewhat of a hodgepodge. The west end dates to the rebuilding of ca. 1220-1230. The nave and east end are Gothic, and date to the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

³⁸See: Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 2, pp. 706-709. According to Kubach and Verbeek, the church was first consecrated in 990, and they note that Genicot stated that a second consecration took place in 1011. Parts of the tenth-century church remain, incorporated in rebuildings dating from the twelfth century on.

³⁹Very little is known about the Cathedral. See: Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 2, pp. 696-701. For a discussion of the archeological excavations on the site, see: M. Otto, ed., Les fouilles de la place Saint-Lambert à Liège, 2 vols., Liège, 1984.

⁴⁰See: Kubach and Verbeek, vol 2, p. 716. The church was rebuilt in the thirteenth century.

⁴¹See: Vita Notgeri, pp. 14-15. For the Ivory of Notger, see: P. Stiennon, "L'ivoire de Notger et la fondation de la collégiale Saint-Jean (nouvelles

hypothèses)," Millenaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège, pp. 33-42.

⁴²Vita Notgeri, pp. 11-12 and 14-15.

⁴³See: Vita Notgeri, p. 12.

⁴⁴See: E. Herzog, Die ottonische Stadt, Berlin, 1964, especially pp. 241-251. Herzog repeatedly underscored, in his many examples, the sacral nature of episcopal planning, stating, for example, on p. 250: "Der geplante Kirchenkranz ist das Kennzeichen der ottonischen Stadt." On p. 245, Herzog discussed Liège as a prime example of the medieval ecclesiastical landscape.

⁴⁵See: Herzog, pp. 242-243, 246-247 and especially 250-251. Kubach and Verbeek mentioned in passing the "symbolic cross form" within the cities of Aachen, eleventh-century Fulda, Hildesheim, Paderborn and Utrecht. See: Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 1, p. 14. The authors apparently were referring only to the particular form inscribed by the placement of various churches, not necessarily taking dedications into account. It appears most likely that they got this notion from Herzog, whose plans they used in their work.

⁴⁶The Ivory of Notger, now in the Musée Curtius in Liège, has been the subject of controversy, primarily in terms of its iconography. Stiennon provided synopses of earlier ideas about the meaning of the image, as well as an exhaustive bibliography. See: Stiennon, "L'ivoire de Notger et la fondation de la collégiale Saint-Jean," pp. 33-35.

⁴⁷Philippe Stiennon, "L'ivoire de Notger et la fondation de la collégiale Saint-Jean," pp. 33-41.

⁴⁸For medieval exegesis and Jerusalem, see: Mähl, pp. 11-12; Adrian H. Bredero, "Jérusalem dans l'Occident médiéval," in Mélanges offerts à René Crozet, vol. 1, ed. P. Gallais and Y.-J. Rion, Poitiers, 1966, pp. 259-271, especially pp. 259-262; and Anna C. Esmeijer, Divina Quaternitas. A Preliminary Study in the Method and Application of Visual Exegesis, Amsterdam, 1978, especially Chapter IV, "Hierusalem Urbs Quadrata," pp. 72-96.

⁴⁹See above, Introduction.

⁵⁰See: S. Mähl, "Jerusalem im mittelalterlichen Sicht," Die Welt als Geschichte 22 (1962), pp. 11-26. See

especially pp. 17-20 for a discussion of the image of Jerusalem as the center of the world. See also: Nichols, pp. 2 ff.; and Eliade, pp. 8-9 and 15-18.

⁵¹See: Mähl, pp. 12 ff.

⁵²See especially: Bredero, pp. 264 ff.; and Mähl.

⁵³Images and references to Jerusalem abound in the art of the Middle Ages. See, for example: M.-T. Gousset, "La représentation de la Jérusalem céleste à l'époque carolingienne," Cahiers archéologiques 23 (1974), pp. 47-58 (for manuscript illuminations); J. Gardelles, "Recherches sur les origines des façades a étages d'arcatures des églises médiévales," Bulletin monumental 136 (1978), pp. 113-133 (for sculpture); and C. Heitz, Recherches sur les rapports entre architecture et liturgie à l'époque carolingienne, pp. 211 ff. (for ivories).

⁵⁴See: Bredero, pp. 264-265.

On a more prosaic level, the site of the Holy Sepulchre had sustained a number of upheavals and rebuildings in its long history. Originally conceived and at least begun by Constantine, the church survived, with modifications, until its destruction in 1009 by Calif Hakim. The architectural complex at the site incorporated a number of holy loci within its precinct, with the Anastasis as the focal point and perceived centerpiece. The site was a well-known pilgrimage destination, and travelers to the Holy Land brought back reports and information about the sites of their journeys.

For an overview of Constantine's church, see: G. T. Armstrong, "Constantine's Churches: Symbol and Structure," Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 33 (1974) pp. 15-16. See as well: Charles Couâson, The Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1972, London, 1974. For the Holy Sepulchre from 614 to 1009, see especially: H. Vincent and F.-M. Abel, Jérusalem. Recherches de topographie, d'archéologie et d'histoire, vol. II, Jérusalem nouvelle, Paris, 1914, Chapter VIII, "Le Saint-Sépulchre de 614 à 1009," pp. 219-247.

⁵⁵For the fundamental study of buildings related to the Holy Sepulchre, see: Krautheimer, "Introduction to an 'Iconography of Mediaeval Architecture.'" With reference to particular buildings, see as well: Krautheimer, "Santo Stefano Rotondo in Rome and the Rotunda of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem," in Studies in Early Christian, Medieval, and Renaissance Art, New York, 1969, pp. 69-106; V. Munteanu, "A Romanesque Copy of the Anastasis: The

Chapel of St. Jean of Le Liget," Gesta 16 (1977), pp. 27-40; R. G. Ousterhout, "The Church of Santo Stefano: A 'Jerusalem in Bologna,'" Gesta 20 (1981), pp. 311-321. For a less satisfactory discussion of "German" copies of the Holy Sepulchre, see: G. Dalman, Das Grab Christi in Deutschland, Leipzig, 1922 (Studien über christliche Denkmäler 14). See as well: G. Bresc-Bautier, "Les imitations du Saint-Sepulchre de Jérusalem (IX^e-XV^e siècles)," Revue de l'histoire de la spiritualité 50 (1974), pp. 319-42.

⁵⁶For a discussion of motivations for "copying" the Holy Sepulchre, see: Bresc-Bautier.

⁵⁷Dalman noted the Carolingian church of St. Michael at Fulda, the chapel of St. Maurice at Constance, the chapel of Otto and Edith at Magdeburg and Meinwerk's Busdorfkirche. For Fulda, see: E. Sturm, Die Bau- und Kunstdenkmale der Stadt Fulda, vol. 3, Fulda, 1984, pp. 232 ff.; and F. Oswald, L. Schaefer and H. R. Sennhausen, Vorromanische Kirchenbauten. Katalog der Denkmäler bis zum Ausgang der Ottonen, Munich, 1966, (Veröffentlichungen des Zentralinstituts für Kunstgeschichte in München, ed. F. Mutherich, vol. III) pp. 87-89. The first church on the site dated to the Carolingian Age, and was built by Abbot Eigil in ca. 820 as a funerary church for the monastery. The church was largely destroyed in the tenth century, exclusive of the still extant crypt, and then rebuilt in the late eleventh century.

The Busdorfkirche of Meinwerk is perhaps the most well-known Ottonian example. According to the Vita Meinwerki, the Bishop sent Wino to the Holy Land in 1033 to get the measurements of the Holy Sepulchre so he could construct a burial chapel for himself. See: MGH, SS XI, p. 158. Meinwerk was buried in or by the completed church. With Paderborn, there is, then, evidence that, at least in this case measurements were seen as significant for reference. Interestingly, Kreuzsch associated Aachen to the Holy Sepulchre through measurement. See: "Das Mass des Engels," especially pp. 65 and 75; also, see Chapter Two, footnote 109. For the possible ramifications of this association, see below, footnote 83.

The chapel of St. Maurice, according to twelfth-century Lives of Bishop Conrad of Constance, was built by Conrad as a "Holy Sepulchre" and he was buried before the church. See: Dalman, p. 30; and MGH SS IV p. 432 and p. 434; and MGH SS IV p. 439.

⁵⁸Stiennon appeared to have had problems reconciling the two. He stated: "Précisons cependant que l'intention politique de l'évêque de copier la chapelle palatine de Charlemagne à Aix ne peut être remise en cause. L'identité

pratiquement parfait entre le plan terrier d'Aix et celui de l'église notgérienne, qui a été reprise presque fidèlement lors de la reconstruction du XVIII^e siècle, ne laisse aucun doute à ce sujet." See: Stiennon, "L'ivoire de Notger et la fondation de la collégiale Saint-Jean," p. 37. Stiennon's goal, however, was to tie the perplexing iconography of the Ivory of Notger to the foundation of the church. In his work, he suggested that the small structure in the Ivory of Notger, before which a figure - presumably Notger - kneels, was intended to be the empty tomb of Christ. This notion of the interest in the Anastasis supported his contention that St. Jean was tied to the Holy Sepulchre. In his concluding remarks, Stiennon queried whether we could be certain that Notger saw his church as a copy of the Holy Sepulchre, noting that the Vita Notgeri made no mention of this model. Stiennon stated that Notger's church, in its hypothetical structure, could be considered as a "copy" of the Anastasis. Ultimately, he wished to show its tie to the Holy Sepulchre, presumably over Aachen. See: Stiennon, "L'ivoire de Notger et la fondation de la collégiale Saint-Jean," p. 40.

⁵⁹The idea of the political value of Aachen has been the general reason given for its use by Notger. This assumed political tie is mentioned generally as a given, with little substantiation outside of the fact that Notger was "the king's man." See, for example: Gobert, p. 373. Again, Kurth championed such a view, stating: "La construction de Saint-Jean est un hommage de respect et un acte de vasselage artistique envers la grande mémoire de Charlemagne . . ." See: Kurth, p. 310.

⁶⁰The "copy" of the Holy Sepulchre at Le Liget was also dedicated to John the Evangelist. See: Munteanu.

⁶¹The specialized study of these particular texts was seen as an historical problem in the early twentieth century. The more general study of texts that dealt with Charlemagne, however, had a much longer history. For an identification and discussion of texts, chronologically and thematically, from an obviously philological viewpoint, see: Gaston Paris, Histoire poétique de Charlemagne, Paris, 1865. See as well: Heinrich Hoffmann, Karl der Grosse im Bilde der Geschichtsschreibung des frühen Mittelalters (800-1250), Berlin, 1937 (Historische Studien, ed. K. Ebering, vol. 137); and Gerhart Lohse, "Das Nachleben Karls des Grossen in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters, in Karl der Grosse, vol. 4, Das Nachleben, ed. W. Braunfels, Düsseldorf, 1967, pp. 367-347. See as well: Baudouin de Gaiffier, "La légende de Charlemagne. Le péché de l'empereur et son pardon," in Études Critiques d'hagiographie et d'iconologie,

Brussels, 1967, pp. 260-275. For the related endeavor of discussing the depiction of Charlemagne, see: P. Clemen, "Die Porträtdarstellung Karls des Grossen," Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsvereins 11 (1889), pp. 184-271 and 12 (1890), pp. 1-147.

⁶²Einhard's text is without a doubt the most well known work of the Carolingian Age. For a brief introduction to the text, see: Thorpe, Introduction, pp. 15-21. Einhard, a functionary of the court, probably wrote his work between 829 and 836. The aim of the book was most obviously to glorify the recently deceased Emperor and, fittingly, Einhard used the work of Suetonius as his model. His sources apparently included court documents, the Royal Annals and his own knowledge as a contemporary and associate of Charlemagne.

As the work of a contemporary, Einhard's text has been referred to habitually as an "historical document," though one must keep in mind that Einhard himself had an agenda and, as Thorpe remarked, was very careful about his inclusions and exclusions. The influence of the text and its popularity is evidenced by the many extant copies; the work was without a doubt well-known in the Middle Ages, particularly in the monastic orbit.

See as well: Folz, pp. 4-9. See especially pp. 8-9 for the transmission and copies of the manuscript.

⁶³See: Thorpe, p. 70:

"With Harun-al-Rashid, King of the Persians . . . Charlemagne was on such friendly terms that Harun valued his goodwill more than the approval of all the other kings and princes in the entire world, and considered that he alone was worthy of being honoured and propitiated with gifts. When Charlemagne's messengers, whom he had sent with offerings to the most Holy Sepulchre of our Lord and Savior to the place of His resurrection, came to Harun and told him of their master's intention, he not only granted all that was asked but even went so far as to agree that this sacred scene of our redemption should be placed under Charlemagne's own jurisdiction. When the time came for these messengers to return homewards, Harun sent some of his own men to accompany them and dispatched to Charlemagne costly gifts . . . A few years earlier Harun had sent Charlemagne the only elephant he possessed, simply because the Frankish King asked for it."

⁶⁴For a brief introduction to the work, see: Carolingian Chronicles. Royal Frankish Annals and Nithard's

Histories, trans. B. W. Scholz with B. Rogers, "Introduction," pp. 2-20. The Annals have long been heralded as the most important work for the history of the early Carolingian period, and their purpose, as Scholz noted, "was obviously to influence public opinion and to convey to posterity the Carolingian version of Carolingian history." The work encompassed the years 741 to 829 and, at least according to Ranke, emanated from the court. Ranke's analysis of the work is still the basis of scholarly consideration of the text. He attributed the first part of the work, the years 741 to 795, to one author, a man who could not have been a monk, as he had intimate knowledge of the affairs and workings of the state.

The composite nature of the work has led to theories on the various authors. According to Scholz, it is generally accepted that the first author compiled his section between 787 and 793, using as his sources earlier annals and Fredegar. To these earlier sources he then appended contemporary events. The second part of the Annals deals with the years 795 to 807, and Scholz stated that "the entries during these years are obviously contemporaneous with the events, but there is no agreement about the exact year in which authors changed." He stated that the third part of the text, the years 808 to 829, are also contemporaneous with the events discussed.

The question of authorship has plagued historians, who seemingly need to attach a name to all important works. The name most often mentioned with the Annals is Einhard, though Scholz stated that no argument for his authorship is very convincing. Scholz noted that the reliance of Einhard on the Annals for his Life of Charlemagne explains certain connection between the two. It seems that, in fact, the connection of Einhard with the Annals dates even to the Carolingian Age.

Compounding this problem of Einhard's relationship to the Annals is the revised edition of the text found in a number of manuscripts. After Ranke and others, one sees these referred to as Annales qui dicuntur Einhardi, so named because scholars thought they were written by Einhard. Scholz stated that there are problems as to the date of the revisions, but that generally today it is thought that they date to after Charlemagne's death in 814 but to before 817. The reasoning is that Einhard was familiar with the revised text, used in his work on Charlemagne.

Achoz remarked that the Annals obviously were considered important works in the Early Middle Ages, judging from the sheer number of manuscripts still extant. Again, like Einhard's Vita, one must keep in mind the widespread knowledge of this work.

⁶⁵Scholz, p. 78.

⁶⁶Scholz, p. 81.

⁶⁷Reports of other exchanges are found as well. It was reported that in 801 two envoys of the Persian King arrived in Pisa, and were then brought to court. They said that Isaac, whom Charlemagne had sent, along with two others, with gifts to present to the King, was on his way home alone, as his companions had died, and that he was loaded down with large presents. Charlemagne then made preparations for the transportations of the expected gifts - including the elephant - which arrived, along with Abraham, in Italy in October. It was not until July of 802 that Abraham and his charge, Abul Abaz the Elephant, arrived in Aachen. Again, in 807, an envoy of the Persian King, Abdallah, arrived with monks of Jerusalem, bearing gifts for the Emperor.

⁶⁸The major players in this arena were Bréhier, Kleinclausz and Joranson. Again, the goals of these scholars were to argue for or against the establishment of a "Protectorate" by Charlemagne in the Holy Land, based on the textual evidence.

Louis Bréhier argued that there was such an institution, and that it continued long after Charlemagne's death. See: "La situation des chrétiens de Palestine a la fin du VIII^e siècle et établissement du Protectorat de Charlemagne," Le Moyen Age 21 (2nd ser., vol. 30 of whole) (January-June 1919), pp. 67-75; L'église et l'Orient au Moyen Age. Les Croisades, 4th ed., Paris, 1921, pp. 22-34; "Charlemagne et la Palestine," Revue historique 157 (January-April 1928), pp. 277-291. The last work was Bréhier's reply to the works of Kleinclausz and Joranson.

A. Kleinclausz argued for the legendary nature of the supposed Protectorate. See: La légende du Protectorat de Charlemagne sur la Terre Sainte, Paris, 1926. Einar Joranson's work is an extremely self-righteous and harsh criticism particularly of Bréhier. See: "The Alleges Frankish Protectorate in Palestine," American Historical Review 32 (October 1926-July 1927), pp. 241-261. An attempt to prove to discover the "historical truth," Joranson went through the texts for information and concluded that the Protectorate was a myth.

⁶⁹See especially: Folz, pp. 10-12.

⁷⁰Unfortunately, Notker's work has been dismissed more often than not by scholars as a work of little "historical value." This has certainly been the case with historians considering the notion of the "Frankish Protectorate." As Thorpe noted, "when De Carolo Magno is mentioned at all, it

is customary to compare it adversely with Einhard's Vita Caroli. . . Our first danger is that when we put the De Carolo Magno side by side with the Vita Caroli we may be comparing it with something quite dissimilar; and our second that we may be criticizing both Einhard and the Monk of Saint Gall for failing to achieve what they did not set out to do." For a brief introduction to Notker and the text, see: Thorpe, "Introduction," pp. 21-41. Thorpe rightly emphasized that the work is not a biography, but an account full of allegorical stories and "monkish anecdotes." He noted as well that Notker was writing seventy years after Charlemagne's death and that he "is very far from being an orthodox historian."

For a long time, the authorship of the text was unknown. Scholars, however, came to identify it with a monk of St. Gall, through internal references to the monastery. Through knowledge of monks at the foundation in the late ninth century, they came to the conclusion that the author was Notker the Stammerer.

See as well: Folz, pp. 13-15.

⁷¹See: Thorpe, Bk. II, Chap. 1, p. 135.

⁷²See: Thorpe, p. 148.

"At this sight, Harun, the most powerful of all the rulers who inherited that name, recognized from such minute indications the superior might of Charlemagne, and he began to praise him in the following words: 'Now I realize that what I have heard of my brother Charles is true. By going hunting so frequently, and by exercising his mind and body with such unremitting zeal, he has acquired the habit of conquering everything under heaven. What can I offer him in return that is worthy of him, seeing that he has gone to such trouble to honour me? If I give him the land that was promised to Abraham and shown to Joshua, it is so far away that he cannot defend it from the barbarians. If, with his customary courage, he tries to defend it, I am afraid that the provinces bordering on the Kingdom of the Franks may secede from his Empire. All the same I will try to show my gratitude for his generosity in the way which I have said. I will give the land to him, so that he may hold it. I myself will rule over it as his representative. Whenever he wishes and whenever the opportunity offers, he may send his envoys to me. He will find me a most faithful steward of the revenues of that province."

⁷³For the history of the text, see: Thorpe, pp. 40-41; and Folz, p. 15.

⁷⁴See: Nichols, especially Chapter 3, "Charlemagne Redivivus: From History to Historia," pp. 66-76. (Nichols concentrated on the later texts, though he did mention in passing the works discussed above.) It should be mentioned that Nichols' book has created somewhat of a stir in the scholarly world. As a literary historian, Nichols attempted to branch out, bringing, in particular, visual material into play to support his ideas. While the book has been heralded in some circles (see, for example: R. Howard Bloch, Review of Romanesque Signs: Early Medieval Narrative and Iconography, by S. Nichols, Speculum 59/2 (1984), pp. 421-425.), art historians in particular have been bothered by Nichols' use of images (see E. Sears, Review of Romanesque Signs: Early Medieval Narrative and Iconography, by S. Nichols, Art Bulletin LXX/2 (June 1988), 347-350.). It is unfortunate that, for the most part, negative reviews have honed in on specifics of Nichols' argument, rather than considering the ramifications of his general ideas for a number of disciplines. For a discussion of the ramifications of Nichols' work for architectural historians in particular, see: J. J. Dodds, "Terror of the Year 1000: Architectural Historians Face the Millennium," Design Book Review 20 (Spring 1991), pp. 37-38.

⁷⁵MGH SS IV, 447-449.

⁷⁶See: Nichols, p. 72; and Folz, pp. 24-25.

⁷⁷MGH SS III, p. 708, Ch. 23.

⁷⁸See: Nichols, 72-73; and Folz, pp. 133-134.

⁷⁹Nichols, p. 66.

⁸⁰Nichols, pp. 66-69. Nichols noted that while Thietmar of Merseburg's account is brief - and "favored by historians because of its comforting lack of elaboration" - Otto of Lomello's first-person account presents an elaboration of the drama, more specific in its details. Ademar of Chabanne's account provides the most criticized view of the event, one that introduced, at least in written form, an amazing elaboration of the activities of Pentecost in Aachen.

⁸¹Nichols, pp. 70-71.

⁸²Nichols, p. 73.

⁸³Nichols, pp. 74-75. On p. 74, Nichols stated:

" . . . Charlemagne's Palatine Chapel at Aix may be seen as an edifice whose meaning, like that of Charlemagne himself, by this time, derived from a ternary relationship as sign and referent. . . . Strictly speaking, the Palatine Chapel does not fall into the group of conscious 'copies' of the Anastasis that were built in Europe beginning in the first half of the eleventh century, soon after the events we are discussing. . . . Given Charlemagne's close association with the Holy Sepulchre, it hardly seems radical to assume that, as the archetype for the Anastasis became more prevalent in Europe, the Rotunda at Aix, itself a martyrrium dedicated to Christ, would assume a typological association with the Holy Sepulchre."

Again, possible support for the idea that Aachen could be tied to the Holy Sepulchre may be provided by Kreuzsch, who associated the two buildings through their measurement. See Chapter Two, footnote 109. Scholars have conjectured that St. Jean was comparable in measurement to Aachen. See above, footnote 3. This measurement chain, then, could be seen as support for the notion that Liège could be associated to the Holy Sepulchre through Aachen. However, this chain theory raises questions. Through the similar measurement of 144 feet, one could then conjecture that Aachen was modeled on the Holy Sepulchre from the outset, which, though possible, does not seem probable. The magical number of 144, rather, perhaps recalled the Heavenly Jerusalem - and the image of a church as the Heavenly Jerusalem was certainly not unusual in the Middle Ages. Despite the perceived specificity of the measurements, they instead raise the question of universals.

⁸⁴Ironically, in a sort of *imitatio* of Otto, the question of the burial place of Charlemagne became an obsession for scholars. See, for example: T. Lindner, "Die Fabel von der Bestattung Karls des Grossen," Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsvereins 14 (1892), pp. 131-212; H. Schiffers, Karls des Großen Grab in der Vorhalle des Aachener Münsters? Aachen, 1934; and Chapter One, especially p.28. Similarly, the possible location of Notger's burial place within his church was an important issue for Kurth - as it had been for monks of St. Jean. See: Kurth, vol. 2, Appendix V, "Possédons nous les restes de Notger?", pp. 40-58.

⁸⁵See: Kurth, p. 35. According to the Annales de Hildesheim, which Kurth approached with caution, there was a Notger at St. Gall in the tenth century.

⁸⁶See: Kurth, Chapters V-VIII.

⁸⁷Support for the meaning of Liège might be provided by the evidence - what little there is - of the chapel of St. Lambert at Muizen. Only part of the two story western entrance remains of the small church, which was rebuilt in the Gothic era, and destroyed in World War II, but knowledge of the earlier church has been gleaned through the excavations of J. Mertens. Mertens reconstructed the church from its foundations as having an octagonal core with a sixteen-sided ambulatory. For a synopsis of Muizen, see: Mertens, pp. 143-146. The dating of the church is problematic, as there is no known textual evidence. Mertens, however, placed Muizen in the late tenth century on the basis of archeological evidence. He furthered his assertion by pointing out that at that time, Muizen was a dependence of Liège, and he saw certain affinities between St. Lambert and St. Jean. It must be noted that the argument is rather circular, and there is no evidence that Notger built the church or had anything to do with it. While Mertens saw the possible influence of Notger, Verbeek saw the bishop as the possible patron of the church. See: "Zentralbauten," p. 919. These speculations aside, the dedication to St. Lambert tied the chapel in some way to Liège. Furthermore, the excavations of Mertens revealed that the church was built to replace a small wooden church in a graveyard. See: Verbeek, "Zentralbauten," p. 922.

⁸⁸Again, see Maines. Notger's commission, as a "pious act," can thus be compared, very generally, to Theodulf and his church.

Chapter Five
Dismembering Aachen:
Essen and Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol
and the Problem of Formal Similitude

The sepulchral character of Liège may indicate an awareness of the contemporary interest in Charlemagne's unknown burial site within Aachen - an interest that led to the revelation of his tomb by Otto III in 1000. The numerous "copies" dating from 1020 to 1050¹ suggest that this event catapulted Aachen to a new visibility. Among these diverse buildings are two - the church of the Holy Trinity in Essen and Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol in Cologne - that display strikingly exact yet piecemeal uses of Aachen. The main churches for female religious communities, the churches were built by sisters, Theophanu of Essen and Ida of Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol, the abbesses of their respective houses and members of a prominent aristocratic family. The painstaking imitation - yet fragmentation - of Aachen at Essen and Cologne raises numerous questions - historiographic, historical and theoretical - central to the issue of the "copy."

The church of Essen today reflects aspects of the foundation's tremendous building activity throughout the Middle Ages as well as, unfortunately, the disastrous history of the structure in the modern age. The main body of the church - the nave and side aisles, built as a hall church, the transept and east end, and the upper story of

the outer crypt - were built in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.² (fig. 17) The Gothic structure, incorporating much of the previous structure, was built atop the partially razed nave, transept and choir walls of Theophanu's church and retained the west atrium, west end structure and lower outer crypt of the eleventh century. Essen was severely damaged by the bombings of World War II and the only relatively unscathed parts of the building were the eastern crypt and the west end. The church was virtually rebuilt in the late 1940's and early 1950's, and appears today, one could say, as a "copy" of its pre-destruction state.³

The destruction of the church during the war allowed for the extensive study of the site, which resulted in the archeological clarification of the building history of Essen⁴ - an issue that previously had been central to Essen studies. Theophanu's church was the third major building at the site. The foundation was an old and venerable one, steeped in the traditions of its early years. Essen had been founded by Bishop Altfred of Hildesheim (851-874) in ca. 845-852 as a foundation for aristocratic canonesses,⁵ and at its inception was part of the patrimony of the bishopric, although sometime before 947 Essen became an independent royal foundation with protection and immunity through the monarchy.⁶ The first church at Essen - dedicated to the Holy Trinity, the Virgin, and Saints Cosmos

and Damien - was constructed ca. 850-870, and the rudiments of the simple basilica plan are known through excavations.⁷ The church partially burned in a fire in 946, and was repaired soon thereafter, the new building incorporating the extensive remains of the original structure; in the second half of the tenth century, a westwork and an outer crypt were added to the new church.⁸

Theophanu's (1039-1058) rebuilding of the church⁹ was based largely on the existing foundations of the expanded tenth-century structure - thus, like the Gothic rebuilding, there was a sense of reverence or adherence to the remains of the past. (fig. 18) While the reasons for her undertaking are not known, it is doubtful that Essen was rebuilt from necessity; it appears more likely that Theophanu was simply an ambitious patron.¹⁰ As the highly visible remains of Theophanu's undertaking, the western structure affords a glimpse - albeit an incomplete one - of her interests.

Using the existing space delineated by the tenth-century two-bay west end, Theophanu had a new and extremely complex multi-storied structure, rising on the exterior as an octagonal tower, virtually inserted into the space. (figs. 19 and 20) The central bay, which opens directly into the nave space, is terminated to the west by three sides of an inscribed polygon.¹¹ Each of the three bays of the multi-story structure visible from the nave is carried

on a large round arch opening, above which stands a second arch. Each second story arched opening contains a two-story columnar screen of classicizing columns and capitals.

(fig. 21)

The general structural and formal appearance and even the stylistic details of Essen appear to be unmistakably indebted to Aachen. The interior polygonal disposition of the west end certainly is reminiscent of Aachen, as is the columnar screen that defines the elevation of the multi-storied structure. The individual elements of the screen, especially the capitals, which stylistically belong to the "Corinthian" foliate tradition, recall those of the Aachen screen. The general formal relationship of Essen to Aachen is pronounced as well on the exterior, in the towered facade preceded by a forecourt.

The west end of Essen has elicited great attention from scholars, and scholarship, particularly in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, focused on issues that underscored the assumptions and perceived problems of Essen. Early discussions about the church centered on the work of von Quast and Humann,¹² and the main goal of these endeavors was to place Essen within the envisioned timeline of the art historical discipline. Both tried to achieve this goal through a formal examination of Essen, with particular reference to Aachen.

Von Quast's major article on Essen¹³ eulogized the church as a "Great Monument" of Germany, one that embodied the gamut of medieval styles in much the same way as Aachen was praised as reflecting, through its various medieval styles, the spirit of the Middle Ages.¹⁴ In discussing the west end of Essen, von Quast opened by noting its ties to Aachen. Establishing his base of inquiry through describing Aachen, von Quast then compared Essen to the proposed model in formal and structural terms, both on the exterior and the interior.¹⁵ Von Quast's exhaustive formal comparison led him to praise the west end of Essen as a "direct imitation" that nonetheless was an ingenious creation.¹⁶ The detailed description of the church was then used as a base for assigning dates to the various parts of the building. Mustering his physical and available textual evidence, von Quast presented a very confusing argument for the possible timeframe of the west end, settling eventually on a tenth-century date.¹⁷

While von Quast appeared to have had a more or less passing interest in Essen - a desire to place another monument before the scholarly community¹⁸ - Humann was by far the most prolific writer on the church, reiterating and honing his viewpoints in a series of articles.¹⁹ In these works, Humann's pointed desire to uphold Essen as a major monument, specifically of the "Saxon Period" - the Ottonian Age - is evident. In doing this, then, he was attempting to

create the normative masterpiece for that period on the timeline - designated of course in dynastic terms.²⁰

Humann worked towards definitively dating the west end within the building history of the entire church, and, in this endeavor, he moved towards his comprehensive statement of 1890.²¹ Rallying the available textual evidence and combining it with his formal and structural analysis, Humann ultimately concluded that the lower walls on which the Gothic structure was built were from Altfrid's basilica and that the west end was added to this first church during the tenure of Mathilde (971-1011).²² While, importantly, his chronology was generally accepted until the post-war excavations of the church,²³ Humann's rather odd reasoning revealed certain assumptions. He dated the lower walls of the church to the time of Altfrid because the shallow-niche structure indicated to him - although he gave no grounds - an early date.²⁴ In assigning a date to the west end, Humann used what textual information was known about the abbesses and more or less conjectured which one, at Essen during his proposed timeframe, was most likely to have built the western structure.²⁵

In his analysis of Essen, one of Humann's main objectives was to argue with von Quast, who, he said, had misled many scholars by relegating Essen to the class of a mere "copy" of Aachen.²⁶ Humann vehemently differentiated Aachen and Essen in formal and structural terms: Aachen was

seen as a freestanding centrally-planned building, while Essen terminated the west end of a nave; Aachen was an octagonal/sixteen sided central plan, while Essen was half of a hexagon inserted into a rectangular space; Aachen had a choir to the east and a tower structure to the west, while Essen united the choir and tower structures.²⁷ Humann noted that there was a correspondence between the columnar screens of Essen and Aachen, but maintained that in its particulars, Essen differed²⁸ and was not necessarily influenced directly by Aachen, but that the two works had a common Italian model.²⁹ Humann went even so far as to say that Essen had to have been built by foreigners, most probably Italians, specifically Lombards.³⁰

Humann's reasoning for his distancing of Essen from Aachen was byzantine in its intricacy, and based, apparently, on his notions of function derived from his structural and formal distinctions. In differentiating Aachen and Essen, he stressed Essen's role as a "Westbau," a structure with its own purpose and uses that precluded any ties to the entire church at Aachen. In doing this, Humann introduced a level of specificity into the Essen question - certainly in keeping with the development of the study of specialized structural form - and sequestered Essen within the discourse of the Westwerk. The subtext of Humann's argument for distancing Essen from Aachen, however, was that

Essen, as a "Great Monument," necessarily had to be unique and independent.

Despite Humann's attempts to disengage Essen from Aachen, it appears that von Quast won, as the west end of Essen continued to be seen, and is still discussed, as being dependent on Aachen.³¹ This equation of Aachen and Essen and the corollary emphasis on Aachen in Essen studies perhaps is elucidated in part by von Quast's very involvement in the study of Essen. Von Quast, a Prussian functionary with a great interest and involvement in the restoration of Aachen, was no doubt partially drawn to Essen as he saw in it a reflection of Charlemagne's chapel, and, at least in von Quast's mind, Essen itself - as well as other "copies" - played a role in the restoration of Aachen.³²

The intricacies of these assumptions and circular associations are confusing, to say the least, but from them one can surmise that the uncanny resemblance of Essen and Aachen today is, at least in part, the result of a self-fulfilling prophecy. The two buildings have been seen as related for so long and any resemblance they had has been magnified by the continual recourse to one monument in the imaging of the other. Thus the west end of Essen today - the cleaned-up, post-war version - further ties the structure, at least superficially, to Aachen, as the

elevation is now painted, its most striking characteristic being its polychrome alternating voussoirs. (fig. 22)

While von Quast's contention of a relationship between Essen and Aachen has remained intact, Humann's image of Essen as an Ottonian masterpiece has remained current. Seen as a unique and inventive work, Essen is firmly entrenched in the pantheon of "Great Buildings."³³ The assumed relationship between Essen and Aachen, however, has proffered a challenge, as Essen presented a problematic and unexpected twist to the subset theory of architectural reference: although indebted to Aachen, the west end of the church has been viewed as a thoroughly unique design creation - in other words, not simply a replica - yet, simultaneously, as owing a measure of its greatness to the choice of Aachen as the model. Discussions of Essen, therefore, like discussions of Aachen's perceived relation to San Vitale, see Essen as transforming the model, injecting something new and unique - for one scholar, "feminine elegance."³⁴

Despite, however, the assumed association between the two buildings, Essen - because it has been perceived as a unique creation - generally has not been categorized as a true "copy." Although Humann was unsuccessful in extracting Aachen from discussions of Essen, his emphasis on its "Westbau" status led to the further compartmentalization of the form, and has remained paramount in studies of the

church. The treatment of Essen has been seen, therefore, as necessitating a conflation of the issue of its reference to Aachen and the "Westwerkproblem."

The problem of the westwork has been hotly debated, and to delve into the subject is to become immured in the intricacies of primarily German scholarship and its preoccupation with formal and structural distinctions and imperial symbolism. Within this discourse, the major issues have been construed as the definition, development and evolution of western structures - the westwork in particular - and as well the function and meaning of the westwork. The first of these topics is obviously neatly inscribed within the traditional questions of formal types, their origins and their destinations. The westwork, seen as the great creation of the Carolingian Age, was defined as a complex, multi-storied structure which grew out of other, more simple western structures and which developed in response to the need for more cultic spaces.³⁵ In discussing its subsequent development, scholars have focused on the "reduction" or simplification of the westwork form beginning in the tenth century and, ultimately, the westwork's formative role in the development of the two-towered facade.³⁶

The second question, that of the function and meaning of the westwork, has been a much more thorny issue. Seen as multi-storied, multi-purpose structures,³⁷ discussions have revolved around the many uses of the westwork, including its

function as a parish church, replete with baptismal function,³⁸ its use as a space answering the liturgical and cultic needs of monastic communities, and specifically as the place for the enactment of the Easter Liturgy.³⁹ While the diverse functions of the complex structures have been stressed, their imperial function and meaning, as a space set aside specifically for the Emperor as a throne area, have been paramount.⁴⁰ It has even been stated by some that the westwork found its prototypical form at Aachen,⁴¹ and that the spread of the structural form was due to its imperial connotations.⁴²

The enigma of Essen repeatedly has been couched within discussions of the function and meaning of the west end, yet the defined issues of the westwork and westwork-like structures in scholarship provide no clear answers for Essen or the significance of its relation to Aachen. The west end of Essen defies categorization among the scholarly types of western structures and has been seen within the post-tenth-century reduction of the form as a sort of hybrid creation.⁴³ While it has often been conjectured that the upper stories in the west served as a choir for the canonesses,⁴⁴ it has been pointed out that at Essen the spaces created are simply too small to hold the number of women in the community.⁴⁵

The question of the westwork as the locus for the enactment of the "Quem queritas" Easter liturgy, with the

westwork structure as a sort of Holy Sepulchre, has more recently been an issue in the analysis of Essen. In conjunction with the fourteenth-century Essen liturgical text, the Liber ordinarius, Carol Heitz conjectured that the west end of Essen was the space used for the reenactment of the Easter liturgy.⁴⁶ However, the late date of the manuscript, as well as the issue of possible use of the outer crypt by the eleventh century for the Easter liturgy, have brought this conclusion into question.⁴⁷ Yet while it cannot be certain that the west end at Essen was used for the Easter event, the possibility cannot be completely ruled out, especially in light of the relationship of Aachen to the Anastasis seen in Liège. This possible function of Essen's western structure, however, would not completely explain the way in which Aachen was imaged; liturgical needs would not necessarily dictate such pointed use of Aachen.

Furthermore, discussions of the west end of Essen have revolved primarily around the perception of the westwork as a Kaiserloge - an imperial symbol.⁴⁸ This explication of the westwork, coupled with the obvious reference to Aachen, has been viewed as particularly important for Essen, as Theophanu was related to the Ottonian imperial house through her mother. The general and amorphous rubric of "imperial influence or reference" has thus been seen as the obvious answer to the appearance of Aachen in the west end at Essen, and, needless to say, the image of Aachen to which Essen has

continually been compared is that of Charlemagne's church of ca. 800.⁴⁹ Verbeek's analysis of Essen epitomized these scholarly currents. He did not discuss Essen in his article on "centrally planned imitations," but in his work on the influence of Aachen. Verbeek characterized Essen as a great and unique work, an odd example of the Aachen westwork tradition that was so specific in its reference that it could only point to the legacy of monarchical power seen in the throne in the westwork at Aachen - reflected then in Essen as the imperial canonesses' choir.⁵⁰

The question of Theophanu's Essen is further complicated by the consideration of her sister's church at Cologne. Like Essen, Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol⁵¹ is extolled as a "Major Monument," and the foundation has a long - though somewhat murky - history and building history before the tenure of Ida.⁵² Since at least the twelfth century, it was held that Santa-Maria was founded and built on a Roman temple site late in the seventh century by Plectrude, the wife of Pepin,⁵³ though little archeological evidence for early structures remains.⁵⁴ It has been suggested, from the analysis of textual evidence, that Plectrude's early foundation grew into a parish church, but was refounded as a Benedictine nunnery by Bruno, the Archbishop of Cologne.⁵⁵

The earliest evidence of building activity in fact dates to the tenth century, when Bruno apparently instated the Benedictine rule at the already-existing site.⁵⁶ While

textual references point to Bruno's role in building at Santa Maria, little is known of what was built; it appears, however, that at least the west end contains parts of this earlier structure.⁵⁷ That the church was rebuilt at least in part by Ida (1015-1060) is suggested by references to a 1049 consecration of the Holy Cross altar by Pope Leo IX, and a 1065 consecration of the choir and crypt altars by Archbishop Anno of Cologne.⁵⁸

In the eleventh century the church had a nave with side aisles, terminated to the east by an expansive tri-lobed space which covered an extensive crypt complex and to the west by a relatively simple three-tower west block.

(fig. 23) Scholars have suggested building histories for the church,⁵⁹ based primarily on an analysis of the structure. However, these complex discussions appear impenetrable, and the evidence for the most part unfortunately unconfirmable, as the church was largely destroyed, along with most of the rest of Cologne, during the bombardments of the city in the Second World War. Santa-Maria exists today in a rebuilt - "restored" - form that, despite its rather sanitized appearance, gives some sense of the grandeur of the eleventh and twelfth-century church.⁶⁰ The immense size and complexity of Santa-Maria certainly speak of the enormity of the undertaking as well as the wealth and status of the foundation.

According to current scholarship,⁶¹ work began in ca. 1040 to the east with the crypt, built atop Roman remains, and the tri-conch space above. Building then began on the nave, which progressed from west to east, and then, finally, the west block was built. According to this analysis the church is of a piece - the commission of Ida - with the 1049 consecration taking place in the nave and the 1065 ceremony signaling the completion of the church.

The building history of Santa-Maria, however, was highly debated in scholarship in the early twentieth century. Scholars repeatedly preoccupied themselves with the origins and dates of aspects of the church's plan, once again breaking down the structure into its perceived component parts, and these discussions reveal a desire to integrate the perceived salient features of Santa-Maria within a proposed timeline of structural development. The sophisticated tri-conch east end has been of particular interest for its unexpected appearance at such an early date and the fact that it was to become de riqueur in Cologne itself and the surrounding area in the next century.⁶² The complex eastern crypt has been given much attention as well for its ties to those of other churches.⁶³ While disagreement over the particulars of the east end was commonplace, the dating of the main body of the church - the nave and east end - to the tenure of Ida was not questioned.

The west block, however, has been a bone of contention in scholarly literature, and the issues of these discussions highlight assumptions about style and imitation central to Santa-Maria. While it is generally held today from archeological evidence that the western block incorporates parts of Bruno's walls, earlier scholarship posed the question as to whether the west end of Santa-Maria was not, in its entirety, a leftover from the tenth-century church. Central to this issue was the appearance of Aachen in the west block, and the contention of some that, stylistically speaking, the west end differed from the more "advanced" body of the church.

The first story vestibule of the west block - again a reduced westwork form⁶⁴ - provided entry into the nave through a large arch opening subdivided into a triple arcade by two columns carrying cubic capitals. (fig. 24) The upper wall, which was not brought to scholarly attention until the mid-nineteenth century when it was uncovered after having been walled up,⁶⁵ corresponded to a second floor which opened into the nave through a large arch. This opening contained a two-story columnar screen composed of columns with Attic bases and acanthus capitals in the Corinthian tradition. The upper screen wall has been touted for its similarity to the elevation at Aachen, although scholars have repeatedly noted that the screen includes

attached half columns to the sides, unseen in Aachen - or Essen.⁶⁶ (fig. 25)

The problem of dating the west block primarily involved the dissection of single motifs, in particular the individual forms of the columnar screen. Hugo Rahtgens, who wrote two monographs on the church, maintained that the entire structure of Santa-Maria dated to the eleventh century; therefore, the west end, which he saw as a choir for the canonesses, incorporated remains of the tenth-century church, but was built in the eleventh century.⁶⁷ Integral to his analysis was a discussion of the columns and capitals of the columnar screen separating the west block from the nave, which he explicated in terms of form and style and ultimately dated to the mid-eleventh century through comparison to capitals of other monuments.⁶⁸ Hermann Eiken most strongly articulated the opposite viewpoint, his analysis homing in on the "archaizing" style of the individual forms of the screen - especially of the capitals in comparison to the cubic capitals of the rest of the church - which he saw as a clear indication of a pre-eleventh-century date for the western structure.⁶⁹

While Eiken's conclusions about Santa-Maria in general were vehemently contested,⁷⁰ the notion of the "older" style of elements of the west end screen and the possibility of an earlier date for the structure are still discussed with reference to the work of Meyer-Barkhausen.⁷¹ Meyer-

Barkhausen's almost impenetrable formal and stylistic analysis of the capitals of the upper screen was based on their comparison with what he considered to be Ottonian works.⁷² His analysis led him to conjecture that the capitals not only came from the earlier church, but that, most probably, Bruno's church already had the Aachen columnar screen motif.⁷³ His point of departure, similar to Eiken's, was the observation that the capitals of the upper screen, with their Corinthian forms, were so different from the cubic capitals - seen as obviously Ottonian - in not only the lower arch of the screen, but in the rest of the church. The ensuing analysis of the forms within the church clearly showed that Meyer-Barkhausen felt that unity would have been the desired aesthetic, and that the perceived discordance of Corinthian forms had to indicate certain circumstances for the origins of the columnar screen.

While it may well be that elements of the screen are in fact spolia, the leap in logic that because they are now in part of the west end screen of Santa-Maria they must indicate an earlier columnar screen simply does not follow. However, the underpinnings of this approach to and speculation about the west block of Santa Maria are clearly the premises of theories of evolution and development, in which the basic assumption is that the "older" style of the west block must necessarily indicate an earlier date for the structure in one way or another. While perhaps the west

wall of Santa-Maria presents a different face that can be characterized as "archaizing" or "antiquating," scholarly presuppositions about a necessary unity of the whole and the development of style rarely take into account the notion of such an appearance as deliberate or intentional.⁷⁴ In this vein, discussions of the west end of Santa-Maria can be compared to those of Essen: both were at times assumed to be earlier in date than is actually the case, simply by the way in which Aachen was imaged in the west ends of the churches. The question has been more critical for Santa-Maria, perhaps because the nave is extant for comparative analysis and has been repeatedly characterized as groundbreaking in its form.

The question of Santa Maria's relationship to Aachen, however, has not elicited the contention of Essen's. While it has certainly been generally acknowledged that the columnar screen resembles that found at Aachen,⁷⁵ Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol has never been considered to be a "copy" of Aachen per se,⁷⁶ as the church has been characterized as only borrowing a single motif from Aachen - not even a substantial portion of the structure as at Essen. Verbeek again expressed the basic premises of scholarship in his discussion of Cologne. As with Essen, Cologne was considered in his article on the broader influence of Aachen. Cologne appeared in his section on the spread of Aachen decorative motifs, directly after he tied the

pilaster decoration of Essen's tower exterior and interior column screen to Aachen. Cologne's use of certain motifs was seen then as understandable, as Ida was Theophanu's sister and both were related to the Ottonian imperial house. Verbeek thus ultimately tied the motifs - such as the columnar screen and the large niche - to ideas of sovereignty.⁷⁷

The fact that Essen and Santa-Maria were built by sisters can perhaps be taken as tangential evidence that the buildings are of a later and contemporaneous date, as it certainly was not mere coincidence that these sisters' churches both incorporated Aachen in such an obvious manner. Certainly the use and even co-option of Aachen as a palatine chapel by the Ottonian emperors cannot be disputed.⁷⁸ In this imperial scheme, Ida, who began Santa-Maria after Theophanu began Essen, was seen by Verbeek as following her sister's lead of referring to what can only be characterized as an amorphous notion of Ottonian imperial might. In underscoring the kinship of Theophanu and Ida, however, as well as their family background,⁷⁹ scholars have introduced - yet ultimately skirted around - an important aspect of the appearance of Aachen in both churches. In scholarship, the notion of imperial power has remained undefined - something seemingly self-explanatory - and Aachen has remained, of course, an eternal palatine chapel. However, the question must be raised as to exactly what imperial power, if indeed

Essen and Cologne can be seen within such a construct, could possibly have meant to Theophanu and Ida, who, while related to the Ottonians, were women living in religious communities. Essen and Cologne raise the problem of what relationship these women felt they had to imperial power, and moreover, why they felt they had recourse to Aachen and why Aachen could be seen as a suitable image for their churches. The question becomes one of how Theophanu and Ida saw themselves, and how and why this self-image could bring Aachen into the picture.

The ways in which Theophanu and Ida pictured themselves in light of their family ties can be seen as extremely important, given the nature and structure of the Ottonian aristocracy and the importance they placed on kinship.⁸⁰ This upper stratum was a closed and select society, membership contingent on high blood and position dependent on powerful connections and the perpetuation of those connections from generation to generation. These privileged few, the political and cultural center in their day, were consciously removed from what they perceived to be the rank and file. Within this already exclusive group, pedigree was everything, and family members, through the rank or achievements of their kin, could enjoy status by association. The resulting group mentality made an individual's self image contingent on the kinship cluster,

and for Theophanu and Ida, their family relations had important implications for their view of themselves.

Theophanu and Ida can be and have been termed, at least in part, Ezzonen.⁸¹ An aristocratic family that enjoyed a great deal of power during the tenure of the Ottonians,⁸² the power of the Ezzonen was consolidated under Ezzo (955-1034) - the namegiver of the line.⁸³ His prestige and power were raised immeasurably - and perhaps to a large degree established - through his ca. 991 marriage to Mathilde,⁸⁴ the daughter of Otto II and Theophanu and the sister of Otto III.⁸⁵ The family holdings in the Rhineland were extensive,⁸⁶ and, importantly, the marriage raised the influence of Ezzo's line in and beyond the Rhineland, giving it a definitely Saxon - and royal - flavor. Moreover, within the Ottonian aristocracy, matrilineal ties could prevail - if the pedigree warranted attention.⁸⁷ This certainly was the case for the offspring of Ezzo and Mathilde, who were graced with direct identification with the Ottonian House through their mother.

Ezzo and Mathilde had three sons and seven daughters. The eldest son, Ludolf, died in 1031, while the second son, Otto, was the Herzog of Schwabend (d. 1047). The third son, Hermann (d. 1056), became the Archbishop of Cologne. The careers of the daughters were no less spectacular. The eldest, Richeza (d. 1063), married the King of Poland. Perhaps in the interest of keeping down the number of heirs,

and certainly to consolidate the family's power in the ecclesiastical sphere,⁸⁸ the six younger daughters - Adelheid, Helwyga, Mathilde, and Sophie, in addition to Theophanu and Ida - entered the church, becoming abbesses of influential aristocratic foundations.⁸⁹

The very names given the children suggested the cachet of the Ottonian House, their names reading as a kind of who's who of the Ottonian family tree.⁹⁰ Moreover, in securing ecclesiastical posts for the younger children, Ezzo and Mathilde were not only keeping with the practice of the aristocracy,⁹¹ they were following the precedent of Mathilde's Ottonian forebearers.⁹² This certainly was the case for the daughters of Ezzo and Mathilde: a career in the church placed them within the rarified cultural sphere of foundations for aristocratic and imperial women.⁹³

The foundation and endowment of female religious houses, particularly for aristocratic women, was especially pronounced under the Ottonians, specifically in Saxony and its spheres of influence.⁹⁴ The establishment and care of these houses was an indication of the needs of the tight-knit world of the Saxon aristocracy, in which women sometimes did not marry at all, or, due to the violent nature of that society, often outlived their husbands and even their sons; the care and protection of women therefore was a concern to a group that looked after its own.⁹⁵ Moreover, the establishment and endowment of these houses

was often the work of aristocratic and imperial women who, able to inherit wealth, could secure that wealth for themselves and/or their daughters through religious foundations.⁹⁶ The surprisingly numerous foundations, protected by the ruler, enjoyed a great measure of autonomy and power as well as prestige.⁹⁷ The revered traditions of these houses provided Ottonian noblewomen with a sense of self-determination and continuity, and through these establishments, they were able to exercise familial power outside of marriage - which was perfectly legitimate and even encouraged within the structure of Ottonian aristocratic society.

The proliferation and popularity of these foundations reflected as well the special role of noble and imperial women in Saxon society and its religious culture.⁹⁸ The perception of certain women of the royal house transcended mere respect; the perceived sanctity of Ottonians was expressed through the astonishing number of saints that the line produced, and of these saints, quite a few were women.⁹⁹ Importantly, saintliness was secured through a reputation for sanctity based on deeds performed during life on earth.¹⁰⁰ Ottonian women were revered for their devotion and contributions to, not surprisingly, the family sphere, not only as mothers and wives, but through the attention given dead kin through religious observance.¹⁰¹ A behavioral paradigm can be seen in Mathilde, the wife of the

first Ottonian Emperor Henry I, who, after fulfilling her wifely and motherly role - bearing children for the line and caring for her husband until his death - devoted her time and money to Quedlinburg, the favored family foundation of the imperial house and, therefore, the premier foundation for women in the Empire.¹⁰² Mathilde's example was played out in numerous other foundations. The desire to emulate such models was no doubt due to the group mentality of the aristocratic caste and their common interest in and preoccupation with family and its perpetuity.

A hallmark of the leaders and abbesses of these women's foundations was the tradition of magnificent architectural commissions.¹⁰³ Importantly, as patrons, the daughters of Ezzo distinguished themselves.¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, not only did abbesses commission resplendent churches, but they then lavishly outfitted them with costly artworks.¹⁰⁵ Ida and Theophanu certainly conformed to this mode of behavior, Theophanu in particular carrying on the remarkable tradition of patronage for her church at Essen.¹⁰⁶

Theophanu's adherence - and to a seemingly more "modest" degree Ida's - to a tradition of lavish patronage revealed an interest in continuing the standards of the past.¹⁰⁷ In the case of the two churches in question, the sisters' patronage as a whole certainly reveals a particular adherence to the tradition of imperial female religious devotion and the perceived precedent and example of their

female kin. Theophanu and Ida were clearly identifying themselves within this Ottonian tradition through their actions. It has often been noted by scholars that Theophanu in particular clearly allied herself with the family of her mother, the inscription on her gravestone identifying her as the "daughter of Mathilde, daughter of Emperor Otto II."¹⁰⁸ Theophanu and Ida's consciousness of themselves within a family tradition no doubt gave them an acute awareness of their situation and of the past, and the upholding of such tradition raises questions when considered against the backdrop of the climate in which these works were produced.

Theophanu and Ida can be seen as behaving as their predecessors and relatives had - one could say that they were comporting themselves as Ottonians, and somewhat sanctified ones at that - in a post-Ottonian world. In scholarly discussions of Essen and Cologne today it is not uncommon to refer to them as "Salian" buildings,¹⁰⁹ simply because, chronologically speaking, they fall within the tenure of the Salian rulers who came to power in 1024 after the death of Henry II. While certainly their own self-images may have led them to follow Ottonian tradition, that the sisters may have been touting "Ottonianness" as a defensive stance is quite possible. With the end of the Ottonian dynasty, female religious institutions appeared no longer to have enjoyed such popularity or support,¹¹⁰ and, furthermore, the power bases were shifting under the

Salians.¹¹¹ Moreover, Theophanu and Ida - good examples of the long-livedness of some Ottonian women - outlived their parents and most of their siblings; they may have been aware that they were, in a sense, the end of the line, and that the secure aristocratic world they felt was their inheritance was disappearing.¹¹²

Aachen was an artifact, a thing of the past to which pointed and unmistakable reference was made. The images of Aachen in Essen and Cologne, in light of the conditions under which they were articulated, suggest that Theophanu and Ida did, in fact, draw "imperial power" from Aachen. But that power had a particular resonance. Ottonian imperial power was not simply the implied might of emperors, but a power imbued with the perceived sanctity of a kinship circle that prominently included women. In the imperial kinship group, members could bask not only in the prestige of temporal rulers, but also of female religious exemplars. While Aachen certainly can be seen as a symbol co-opted by the Ottonians, discussions of that co-option have remained within the parameters of discussions of the power of the emperor and the primacy of the scholarly image of the palatine chapel. Theophanu and Ida, however, may be seen as calling upon what they thought was theirs as Ottonian religious women through imaging Aachen. In so pointedly referencing Aachen within their churches - specifically meant for female religious communities - they can be seen as

keeping a receding specter of their image of themselves, as part of a family, in view. That image obviously was intended primarily for the select audience of the religious community, located inside the church.

The question, moreover, of the categorization of Essen and Cologne becomes one of definition that highlights aspects of the problems of periodization: are they Salian, simply because of when they were built, or are they Ottonian because their patrons were aligning themselves very self-consciously with that dynasty? Then again, perhaps they could be considered Carolingian because of their chosen reference to Aachen.¹¹³ While the basic assumption has been that dynasties - and dynastically constructed periods - intrinsically had their own architectural or artistic styles and forms, such chronological constructs present problems.

Essen and Cologne exemplify aspects of this problem, as they beg the question of how "archaizing" styles or structures, and for that matter "copies," fit into the periodization schema. The ways in which the west ends of the two churches have been handled in scholarship emphasize that they cannot fit within the strictures of what have been defined as particularly "Ottonian" or "Salian," let alone "Carolingian." Central to this problem are the ways in which Aachen was imaged within the churches. The question of Essen and Cologne's relationship to Aachen, as well as their relationship to one another,¹¹⁴ raise complex issues

due to the apparently idiosyncratic mode of reference. At Essen and Cologne the pressing question is not simply why Aachen, but how.

Essen and Cologne are noted by scholars for their "incompleteness:" Aachen was imaged only in part, and, furthermore, confined to the west end, therefore excluding the churches from the strictly defined scholarly corpus of "copies." They present, however, formal, structural and stylistic affinities to Aachen - affinities unseen in the majority of "complete copies." The obvious - even shocking - image of Aachen in the west ends of Essen and Cologne is certainly unusual, as architectural reference in the canonical corpus of Aachen "copies" - and medieval architectural "copies" in general - can be characterized broadly as more subtle and obscure. Essen and Santa-Maria differ fundamentally from the accepted "copies," yet it is the way in which these sisters imaged Aachen that raises very different questions of likeness and meaning, as well as the notion of reference to the past.

What is critical is the way in which the histories of Essen and Cologne in scholarship have imaged the buildings in relation to Aachen. The historiographic issues of the dating of the structures underscore certain assumptions about likeness. In discussions of Essen and Cologne, the churches were originally seen as earlier than they actually are, precisely because they do look so much like Aachen.

The assumption - voiced or unvoiced - was that the more something looks like something else, the closer it must be chronologically to that which it resembles. Thus, in this "trickle-down" theory of reference, approximate likeness must indicate a greater separation in time. Essen and Cologne emphasize, however, that the opposite may be at times true. More removed in time from Aachen than, say, Germigny-des-Prés or Liège, Essen and Cologne refer more pointedly - and apparently consciously - to aspects of Aachen - though they do not "copy" the whole.

Yet it is the very "archaizing" nature of the west ends at Essen and Cologne that could be seen as indicating their later date. Rather than evoking Aachen in a general way, Theophanu and Ida apparently wanted no mistake made as to their reference, and they expressed this through painstaking attention to form and style. In Essen and Cologne, reference to Aachen was specific and exact; Aachen was something seemingly immutable and unalterable. The suggestion of timelessness is paramount. The exactness - down to the capitals - suggests an attempt to resuscitate something, or keep something that is gone alive in a pristine and unaltered manner.

Aachen appears as a talisman. At Essen, Aachen was cut in half and miniaturized, and given a memento-like quality. Cologne imaged Aachen simply as a wall or a window, but, importantly, a memento-like quality, imbued with the notion

of the power of the past, was perhaps articulated through the possible use of spolia in the columnar screen.¹¹⁵ Apparently, in the case of these two churches, "completeness" was not a criterion. Recognition seems to have been a primary motivation, and the idea of a "quotation" - a fragment standing for the whole - sufficed. Moreover, in both churches, Aachen was used specifically as a backdrop, a visual and structural terminus to the vista created by the stretch of space delineated by the nave.

Essen and Cologne, then, raise not only the by now familiar issue of the changing and multivalent image of Aachen, and how the perception of that image was influenced by time and circumstance, but also aspects of the question of what can constitute likeness or reference. Again, Aachen - certainly directly known to Theophanu and Ida as a building - provided a material form that could be drawn on and interpreted for the expression of subtle and perceived meanings specific to time and place. In Essen and Cologne, the terms of reference were reflected in attention to formal, structural and stylistic detail - perhaps because the image was intended to be unmistakable - while it was not seen as necessary to image Aachen as a "whole." These terms of recourse to Aachen appear to indicate that the chosen and specific forms of the chapel were seen as having meaning. Essen and Cologne illustrate, therefore, how intentional and

exacting formal similitude, while not a criteria for reference, can in and of itself convey meaning.

¹From the list of "copies" compiled by Heitz, after Verbeek, the following buildings date to this period: Deutz (1020); Groningen (1040-50); Goslar (1030 -); Ottmarsheim (ca. 1030); Wimpfen-im-Tal (1040-1050); Louvain (ca. 1050); Nijmegen (1024-1039); and Bamberg (1050). See: L'architecture religieuse carolingienne, p. 79. Grodecki noted the rise in the number of "copies" after the events of Pentecost 1000. See: Grodecki, pp. 169-170.

²For an overview of the later building history, see: Rhein und Maas. Kunst und Kultur 800-1400, p. 110. A fire damaged the church in 1276, and rebuilding was underway until 1327. For a more detailed discussion, see: Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 1, pp. 275-277.

³On March 5 and 6, 1943, the foundation was largely destroyed by bombs, with the west end, including the atrium, the crypt and part of the transept surviving relatively unscathed. In 1947, the crossing fell. The church was rebuilt from 1948-1957. See: A. Pothmann, Das Münster zu Essen (Kleine Kunstführer 1700), 2nd ed., 1990, p. 12.

⁴The most exhaustive and recent book on Essen is that of Zimmermann, who was involved in the excavation of the site before the rebuilding of the church after the Second World War. The excavations began on 4 June 1951, and Zimmermann was assisted, oddly enough, by Verbeek. See: Das Münster zu Essen, Essen, 1956.

⁵For the foundation's early history see: Zimmermann, pp. 34 ff. The only textual evidence for the foundation of Essen is a note at the beginning of the Liber ordinarius, which dates most probably from the fourteenth century, which states that Essen was founded in 852, the building was begun four years later and finished in 872. Despite the late date of the notice, Zimmermann contended that it probably reported a much earlier tradition. (p. 34) He noted as well that many accept the 852 date, though some push the foundation back even further. Zimmermann saw Altfrid as starting the process in ca. 845-847, and then founding it officially in 852. For the short form of Zimmermann, see: Kubach and Verbeek, vol 1, p. 268. See as well: Leonhard Küppers, Das Essener Münster, Essen, 1963, pp. 9 ff.

⁶To use the German terminology, Essen was at the outset an Eigenkirche under Hildesheim, and, with Otto I, a Reichsstift.

⁷Again, it is through the work of Zimmermann that what little evidence there is of the early building is known. See: Zimmermann; Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 1, p. 269; and for very brief discussions, Pothmann, p. 4; and Walter Sölter, Der Essener Dom, Neuß, 1982 (Rheinische Kunststätten 265). The church had a nave, side aisles, a transept and a three-part east end.

⁸See: Zimmermann, pp. 48-50 and 214 ff. The fire was reported in the Cologne Annales. (See: MGH SS, XVI, p. 731.) That the church was built by Hadwig can be gleaned from textual evidence and her tombstone, which names her as the patron. (For a discussion of the building activity begun under Hadwig, see: Zimmermann, pp. 49-50 and 214-222; Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 1, p. 269; Küppers, pp. 16-21; and Sölter, p. 8.) Apparently the fire damaged the roof and ceiling of the church, which Abbess Ida (d. 971), according to her tombstone, rebuilt in ca. 950. In a campaign unrelated to the fire rebuilding, the church was given an outer crypt to the east as well as a westwerk and a west atrium preceded by a chapel to St. John the Baptist.

⁹That Theophanu rebuilt much of the church has always been accepted. She was responsible for the eastern outer crypt, in which she was buried, and which has an inscription giving the consecration date as 9 September 1051, with the Abbess' brother, the Archbishop of Cologne, presiding. For the east end, see: Verbeek, "Die Aussenkrypta. Werden einer Bauform des frühen Mittelalters," Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 13 (1950), pp. 7-38, especially pp. 18-19 and 27; and W. Sanderson, "Monastic Reform and the Architecture of the Outer Crypt, 950-1100," Transactions of the American Philosophical Association n.s. 61, pt. 6 (June 1971), pp. 3-36, especially pp. 29-35.

That the church, including the west end, was rebuilt by Theophanu was suggested by Zimmermann. See: Zimmermann, p. 52 ff.; and Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 1, pp. 268 ff. Before the excavations, it had been conjectured by Humann that Mathilde (d. 1011) was most likely responsible for the westwork. See below, pp. 198-199. The root of the problem for scholars was a lack of evidence, textual or material. Zimmermann's analysis of the archeological remains appear conclusive, the church appearing to be of a piece. See: Zimmermann, pp. 227 ff. Zimmermann cited, in support of his analysis, the Fundatio monasterii Brunwilarensis, in which Theophanu was hailed as a patron. See: MGH SS XI, pp. 394-408, Chapter 6.

Despite Zimmermann's conclusions, some scholars still state that Mathilde at least began the rebuilding, which was then completed by Theophanu. See, for example: Pothmann, p. 8. Pothmann gave no reasoning for his statement, and perhaps it can be assumed that his conjecture was a conflation of Zimmermann and earlier scholars.

¹⁰See below, footnote 106, for the patronage of Theophanu.

¹¹The structure has often been termed a "hexagon," though one could contend that an octagon is in fact implied by the space.

¹²It should be noted that both of these men were involved in discussions about Aachen, von Quast as the Prussian functionary during the chapel's restoration, and Humann as a scholar of the "copies" of Aachen and Aachen itself. Their treatment of Essen must be seen as corollary to their other works. See Chapter One, pp. 30-31, and Chapter Two, pp. 78-79.

¹³See: F. von Quast, "Die Münsterkirche zu Essen," Zeitschrift für christliche Archäologie und Kunst 1 (1856), pp. 1-20. Von Quast had discussed Essen in a more superficial manner in an earlier two-part article in which his goal was to date the buildings of Cologne. See: F. von Quast, "Beiträge zur chronologischen Bestimmung der ältern Gebäude Cölns bis zum XI. Jahrhundert I," Jahrbücher des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande 10 (1847), pp. 186-224 and "Beiträge zur chronologischen Bestimmung der ältern Gebäude Cölns bis zum XI. Jahrhundert II," Jahrbücher des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande 13 (1848), pp. 168-188. In Part II, von Quast discussed Essen after he characterized Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol as "copying" the interior arcade of Aachen. Interestingly, von Quast upheld Essen not only as the oldest "copy" of Aachen, but also as the most exact, stating that Essen was a building "wo jede der drei Polygonseiten den einzelnen Polygonseiten des Münsters zu Aachen selbst bis in die Details hinein fast wörtlich entspricht. Die oberen Bogenöffnungen mit ihren Säulenstellungen dienten auch hier zur Verbindung des Nonnenchors mit dem Schiffe der Kirche. Die achteckige Kuppel über diesem Architekturtheile ist gleichfalls eine Nachahmung der zu Aachen befindlichen, wenn auch etwas freier behandelt." (p. 182)

¹⁴Von Quast stated: "Es giebt wenige Kirchen in Deutschland, welche ein so bedeutendes archäologisches Interesse haben, wie die Münsterkirche in Essen. Die Kirche selbst und deren Zubehör zeigen eine Zussamenstellung von

Architekturen sehr verschiedener Jahrhunderte, deren ältere noch die Reste von Bauten aufbewahren, die zu den eigenthümlichsten derartigen Anlagen gehören und unter den Incunabeln der deutschen Baukunst eine hervorragende Stellung nehmen." See: von Quast, "Die Münsterkirche zu Essen," p. 1.

For the notion of Aachen having value because it included elements from the range of medieval styles, see Chapter One, especially pp. 18 ff.

¹⁵von Quast, "Die Münsterkirche zu Essen," pp. 2-5.

¹⁶von Quast, "Die Münsterkirche zu Essen," p. 9. He stated: "Fassen wir nun das Gesamtbild dieser ältesten Bauanlage zusammen, so werden wir, bei den vielfachen Analogien, welche sie mit dem Münster zu Aachen hat und welche die unmittelbare Nachahmung des so bedeutenden Vorbildes nicht verkennen lassen, doch zugleich die Freiheit und künstlerische Fortführung des Essener Baumeisters nicht verkennen. Wer das Aachener Vorbild nicht kennt, würde glauben, das Ganze sei als ein einziger Guss aus dem Haupte seines Erfinders hervorgegangen, so harmonisch stimmen alle Theile zusammen. Wie geistreich ist die Anordnung des halben Polygons und wie geschickt für das Aeussere dennoch die des vollen Achtecks gewonnen."

¹⁷Von Quast's train of thought revealed much about his attitude towards the monument as well as the tenets of his methodology for dating buildings based on comparative analysis. Citing Essen's 874 consecration, he compared this to the ca. 800 date of Aachen. These facts were seen, taking the formal ties of Essen to Aachen, as possible evidence that Essen could have been built ca. seventy years after Aachen. He added that it would be more welcome if Essen were a "Late Carolingian" work, as none were known to fit that lacuna in the timeline of monuments. Von Quast noted, however, that the 947 document that refers to the fire that ravaged Essen spoke against an early date. This document, however, was not specific as to the extent of the damage to the church. Von Quast maintained that the question of ascertaining the date of the west end - if it dated to the late ninth or the early tenth century - was a difficult one, again because there were no known comparative monuments for either period. He stated that the correspondence of Essen with Aachen would indicate a close time period, thus to the late ninth century, yet, the details of Essen's construction indicated a later date. Von Quast noted that other "copies," Ottmarsheim and Cologne, that have Aachen's arcade, dated later. Then, considering the capitals, von Quast saw a tenth-century date as most possible. This date, he felt, would not endanger the

importance of the work, as little was known of the time, but would, in fact, raise its value.

¹⁸This notion was evident in his remarks about Essen in comparison to other buildings. Von Quast mentioned, in opposition to Essen, the church at Ottmarsheim as a "copy," stating that it was more well known, "während die noch bedeutendere, zugleich genauere und originallere Nachahmung in Essen bisher noch so gut wie unbekannt bleibt." See: "Beiträge zur chronologischen Bestimmung der ältern Gebäude Cölns bis zum XI. Jahrhundert II," p. 183.

¹⁹See: G. Humann, "Der Westbau der Münsterkirche zu Essen," Korespondenzblatt des Gesamtvereins der deutschen Geschichts- und Alterthumsvereine, 32, no. 11 (November 1884), pp. 81-89; "Die deutsche Kunst zur Zeit der sächsischen Kaiser," Archiv für kirchliche Baukunst und Kirchenschmuck, vol. 12 (1888), pp. 1-15; Der Westbau des Münsters zu Essen, Essen 1890; and "Die ältesten Bautheile des Münsters zu Essen," Jahrbücher des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande 93 (1892), pp. 89-107.

²⁰Humann in fact juxtaposed Essen's western structure with Aachen and the Torhalle at Lorsch, the former characterized as the great creation of the Carolingian period and the later as the highpoint of the late Carolingian. See: "Der Westbau der Münsterkirche zu Essen," p. 81. Humann opened by stating: "Wenn wir einen Blick zurückwerfen auf die frühesten kirchlichen Monumentalbauten unseres Volkes, so treten uns zunächst vor Augen drei, in hohem Grade merkwürdige Schöpfungen: das Münster zu Aachen, die Vorhalle zu Lorsch und der Westbau der Stiftskirche zu Essen. Das erstgenannte Bauwerk, die imposante Palastkapelle Karls des Grossen vertritt in charakteristischer Weise die Kunstbestrebungen jenes grossen Herrschers, der zwar in seiner Grundriss-Disposition unbedeutende, doch im Bezug auf seinen äusseren architektonischen Schmuck und seine Detailformen sehr bemerkenswerte Bau zu Lorsch gehört der späteren Zeit der Karolinger an, der Westbau der Kirche zu Essen erscheint wiederum als die ausgezeichneteste architektonische Schöpfung einer bedeutsamen glanzvollen Periode; er stammt aus der glorreichen Zeit der sächsischen Kaiser."

In Humann's most pointed expression of Essen's rank within the art of the perceived period, he expressed the notion that the Ottonians were the salvation of "German" history, and their artistic production was a natural offshoot of their empire. In naming and discussing buildings - primarily foundations of members of the Ottonian house - he stated that these works paled in comparison to the west end of Essen. See: "Die deutsche Kunst zur Zeit

der sächsischen Kaiser." Humann opened by eulogizing the Ottonians, stating that the Frankish Kingdoms were falling apart and becoming weaker through misrule, and that in the late ninth and early tenth centuries "begann für unser Vaterland mit der Regierung Heinrichs I. eine neue, ruhmvolle Zeit. . . Auch die folgenden, durch hohe Bildung ausgezeichneten Herrscher trugen wesentlich dazu bei, die Regierungszeit der sächsischen Kaiser zu einer der ruhmreichen Perioden deutscher Geschichte zu erheben." (p. 1)

²¹Humann, Der Westbau des Münsters zu Essen.

²²In his earlier articles, Humann discussed the dating of the west end in a more general manner. In "Der Westbau der Münsterkirche zu Essen," he stated that the west end "without a doubt" dated to the second half of the tenth century, or at the latest the beginning of the eleventh century. He said this as well in: "Die deutsche Kunst zur Zeit der sächsischen Kaiser," p. 6.

²³It should be noted that Humann's dating of Essen was accepted - despite its rather illogical reasoning - up until the work of Zimmermann. For the impact of Zimmermann's archeological findings, see, for example: Verbeek, "Ottonische und staufische Wandgliederung am Niederrhein," in Beiträge zur Kunst des Mittelalters. Vorträge der Ersten Deutschen Kunsthistorikertagung auf Schloß Brühl 1948, Berlin, 1950, pp. 70-83. Verbeek's paper opens from the standpoint that, with the work of Zimmermann, certain questions about Essen were answered and the development of architecture could be reassessed. What is interesting is that, in postulating that Ottonian architecture was dependent on Carolingian, and that certain forms - especially the niched wall - "developed" and "spread," Verbeek, rather than questioning the suppositions of development in art that Essen raises, simply plugged monuments into his new schema.

²⁴Humann articulated this notion in most of his articles. See: "Der Westbau der Münsterkirche zu Essen," p. 86-87; "Die deutsche Kunst zur Zeit der sächsischen Kaiser," p. 6; "Die ältesten Bauheile des Münsters zu Essen," pp. 89-107; and Der Westbau des Münsters zu Essen, "Die Basilika des heil. Altfrid," pp. 3-7. His reasoning for the dating of the lower walls is instructive in terms of the problems of dating by formal properties.

²⁵It was in Der Westbau des Münsters zu Essen that Humann mustered all of the possible textual evidence to support his ideas. He narrowed it down to Sophie and

Mathilde, and decided that Sophie was too busy arguing with the church about Gandersheim to have built the church. (For Sophie's trials and tribulations, see: Otto Perst, "Die Kaisertochter Sophie. Abtissin von Gandersheim und Essen (975-1039)," Braunschweigisches Jahrbuch 38 (1957), pp. 5-46.) In Humann's estimation, as Mathilde commissioned a number of small scale objects for Essen, she also could have built the church. See: Der Westbau des Münsters zu Essen, "Zeitstellung," pp. 30-34. See as well: "Die ältesten Bauthelle des Münsters zu Essen," pp. 94-103. For Mathilde's patronage, see below, footnote 106.

²⁶"Der Westbau der Münsterkirche zu Essen," p. 82. Humann stated: ". . . von manchen Kunsthistoriker sind nach dem Vorgange von v. Quast, welcher den Essener Bau mehrfach als eine "Kopie," an einer Stelle sogar als eine "fast sklavische" Nachahmung des Aachener Münsters bezeichnet." Humann is referring to von Quast's earlier two-part article. In Part one, he did refer to Essen, in reference to Aachen, as "fast sklavisch nachgebildeten," (See: "Beiträge zur chronologischen Bestimmung der ältern Gebäude Cölns bis zum XI. Jahrhundert I," p. 198) and in Part II as a "Nachahmung" (See: "Beiträge zur chronologischen Bestimmung der ältern Gebäude Cölns bis zum XI. Jahrhundert II," pp. 182-183). While Humann was obviously upset by this, it should be noted that it appears that these statements were made more or less in passing, and von Quast made no such statements in his later, more thorough article. In fact, in his work of 1856 he upheld Essen (as he did in Part II of his earlier article) as a new "creation," particularly with reference to Ottmarsheim, which he characterized as a "sklavische Copie des Originals." See: "Die Münsterkirche zu Essen," p. 9. One suspects that Humann's reading of von Quast was perhaps hasty, or, more pointedly, he was attempting to secure Essen's role in his proposed timeline. Humann as well noted this statement of von Quast in: Der Westbau des Münsters zu Essen, p. 1, note 1. Yet in this case, he was upholding his notion that Essen is not a "direct imitation" of Aachen. In this article, as in the earlier, Humann was disturbed because he felt that many art historians had been swayed by the linking of the two, which he somehow tied to their reliance on illustrations, rather than, presumably, the monuments themselves.

²⁷"Der Westbau der Münsterkirche zu Essen," pp. 82-83; and Der Westbau des Münsters zu Essen, pp. 36-37.

²⁸"Der Westbau der Münsterkirche zu Essen," p. 82. "Aber auch hier wird diese nicht einmal in den Einzelheiten vorhandene Übereinstimmung mit dem Aachener Münster, wie

überhaupt die ganze Komposition des Westbaues wohl nicht lediglich aus der Absicht nachzuahmen, sondern aus den gegebenen Verhältnissen und den dem Bau zu Grunde gelegten Zweckbestimmungen hervorgegangen seien!"

²⁹"Die deutsche Kunst zur Zeit der sächsischen Kaiser," p. 9. Wilhelm-Kästner as well voiced the idea that Essen's columnar screen may have derived from antique models, though not as vociferously as Humann. His "Introduction" displayed a certain dependence on the work of Humann, however, which could explain his discussion of the screen, in which he stated: "Die Säulenstellungen erinnern an altchristlich-byzantinische Baukunst; die korinthischen Akanthuskapitelle daneben auch ausgesprochen jonische Volutenkapitelle wie die Perlschnurverzierungen an einigen Gesimsprofilen weisen unmittelbar auf den antiken Formenschatz und charakterisieren damit in bezeichnenden Weise die Entwicklung der frühen christlichen Kunst auf Grund der reichen antiken Überlieferung." See: K. Wilhelm-Kästner, Das Münster in Essen, Essen, 1929, p. 26.

³⁰Der Westbau des Münsters zu Essen, p. 35.

³¹Sölter, for example, stated: "Diese Sechseck bedeutet eine Wiederaufnahme des Oktogons der Aachener Pfalzkapelle . . ." See Sölter, p. 10. Wilhelm-Kästner stated: "Das System des Inneren mit seiner Zentralgerichteten Anlage ruft ohne weiteres Erinnerungen an das Aachener Münster nach, das als Pfalzkapelle Karls des Großen im Jahre 805 geweiht worden ist. . . Der Aufbau mit seinen Bogenstellungen, seinen Pfeilern und Zwischensäulen läßt sich in Aachen in gleicher Weise wiederfinden, selbst die Art der Wölbung im Erdgeschoss . . ." See: Wilhelm-Kästner, pp. 24-25.

³²In Part II of his article on the churches of Cologne in which von Quast discussed Essen, his perhaps unconscious emphasis on the Essen-Aachen connection was brought out by a reference to the restoration of the chapel in a footnote, in which he stated: "Die von mir damals erhobenen Zweifel gegen die von Herrn Mertens angenommene Restauration sind seitdem durch genauere Untersuchung des Mauerwerks bei Gelegenheit der Wiederaufrichtung der Säulen, sodann durch die alte, ehemals im Vatican befindliche Abbildung des Innern, deren Ankunft durch die Gnade Sr. Majestät des Königs gelungen ist, und endlich durch die gleich zu nennenden Nachahmungen nunmehr völlig bestätigt worden, und ist demgemäss auch die Ausführung der Restauration im Münster zu Aachen erfolgt." See: "Beiträge zur chronologischen Bestimmung der ältern Gebäude Cölns bis zum XI. Jahrhundert II," pp. 182, note 1.

Von Quast's use of "copies" for his image of what the restored chapel should be could perhaps shed light on some of the particulars of the restoration of Aachen - for instance, the choice of "Attic" bases for the column screen, which are found at Essen. See above, Chapter One, pp. 15-16.

³³Sölter, for example, saw Essen as innovative and influential. See: Sölter, p. 19. See as well: Wilhelm-Kästner, p. 26. The image of Essen as a "Great Work" has also been couched in terms of what an inventive job Theophanu did while under the constraints of using existing architectural remains. Zimmermann stated: "Der Grundriß ist also völlig abhängig von dem Vorgängerbau, aber was ist daraus gemacht!" See: Zimmermann, p. 227. Sölter - paraphrasing Zimmermann and thus revealing his obvious indebtedness to Zimmermann's work - stated: "Der Theophanu-Bau war ein umfassender Neubau zwar unter weitgehender Verwendung der älteren Fundamente, aber welche Veränderung!" See Sölter, p. 9.

³⁴Sölter, p. 11.

³⁵The principals in the scholarly discourse at the outset were Wilhelm Effmann and his student Alois Fuchs. See especially: W. Effmann, Die karolingisch-ottonischen Bauten zu Werden, 2 vols., Strassbourg, 1899-1922; Effman, Centula-St. Riquier, 2 vols., Münster, 1912; and A. Fuchs, Die karolingischen Westwerke und andere Fragen der karolingischen Baukunst, Paderborn, 1929. Fuchs' work of 1929 was a clear expression of the perceived importance of the definition, origins and development of the westwork. For a generally favorable discussion of the book as an important contribution to the systematization of building types, see: R. Kautzsch, Review of Die karolingischen Westwerke und andere Fragen der karolingischen Baukunst by A. Fuchs, Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft 52 (1931), pp. 17-18.

As Fuchs set out to systematize types of west end structures and determine their origins and developments, he set up a construct of structural types in the Carolingian period: "Tor- und Turmkapellen," tied to atrium structures with upper stories for the cult of St. Michael; "Westchöre," or western apses that mirrored the configuration of the east end, sometimes even having a western transept; "Westwerken und Westoratorien," which, in opposition to "Westchöre," were never apse-shaped but rather rectangular or square, and incorporated the main entrance to the church and at least one upper story with, usually, an altar. Following the work of Effmann, Fuchs saw St. Riquier as the first "Vollwestwerk." Fuchs characterized "Westoratorien" as

growing out of the "Torkapellen." In discussing the "Westwerk," Fuchs articulated the notion that the structure, rather than being an organic part of the basilica, was a centrally-planned building tacked on to the west end. This notion of the western church obviously grew from the breakdown of monuments into their component parts, and the desire to see architecture in these terms. The centralizing form of the westwork was seen as appropriate, given the functions assigned the space.

³⁶Fuchs discussed the development of the structural forms in "reductive" terms. See: Die karolingischen Westwerke und andere Fragen der karolingischen Baukunst, pp. 47 ff. His general ideas were more fully discussed by later scholars. For the notion of the westwork as a linchpin in the development of the Romanesque two-tower facade, see: H. Reinhardt and E. Fels, "Étude sur les églises-porches carolingiennes et sur leur survivance dans l'art roman," Bulletin monumental 92 (1933), 331-363 and suite, 96 (1937), 422-469; and H. Schaefer, "The Origins of the Two-Tower Facade in Romanesque Architecture," Art Bulletin 27 (1945), pp. 85-108, especially pp. 103 ff.. Rheinhardt and Fels stressed that liturgical needs gave rise to the westwork, but their main goal was to trace the formal development of the westwork into a number of Romanesque facade types.

³⁷Effmann's reconstructions of the churches at Werden, and especially of St. Riquier, defined for scholarship the multi-storied, multi-purpose notion of the westwork. In his reconstructions, these western structures incorporated all possible aspects of the westwork.

³⁸See especially Effmann, Centula-St Riquier; and Fuchs, Die karolingische Westwerk, pp. 39-42. A critique of westwork scholarship was provided by Friedrich Möbius. For his comments on the idea of the parish church and baptistry functions of the westwork, see: Westwerkstudien, Jena, 1968, pp. 11-13.

³⁹Again, Effmann saw St. Riquier in this light. See also: Otto Gruber, "Das Westwerk: Symbol und Baugestaltung germanischen Christentums," Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft, 3 (1936), pp. 149-173; and Möbius, pp. 9-11. The liturgical function of the westwork has been the focus of a number of studies. Most recently, Carol Heitz attempted to explain the development of the western structure through a discussion of the Easter liturgy, primarily at St. Riquier; in approaching his subject in this way, he was picking up mainly on the ideas of Effmann. See: Recherches sur les rapports. Heitz's goal was to study the development and research the origins

of the carolingian "église-porche," thus entrenching himself within the discussion of developmental architectural forms. He characterized two types of structures: the Carolingian "Vollwestwerk;" and the post-Carolingian (defined as beginning in the tenth century) reduced type. Heitz traced the liturgical function of the westwork from Carolingian examples, most notably St. Riquier, and suggested that the structure, which was often dedicated to the Savior, was meant to imitate the Holy Sepulchre. Despite his liturgical bent, Heitz nevertheless saw the westwork as a primarily imperial space. For the short form on Heitz's views on a tie between St. Riquier and the Holy Sepulchre, see: L'architecture religieuse carolingienne, pp. 51-63.

⁴⁰The greatest champion of this viewpoint was Fuchs. See: "Entstehung und Zweckbestimmung der Westwerke," Westfälische Zeitschrift 100 (1950), pp. 227-91. Fuchs maintained that westworks were Kaiserkirchen, even Pfalzkapellen or Hofkirchen, found in churches in the imperial orbit as spaces for visiting leaders. Citing Centula and Corvey as proof - he maintained the monasteries were intimately tied to the ruler - Fuchs compared these westworks to the church of Aachen itself with its second story throne space. He suspected, then, that there were thrones in all westworks. His theory did not exclude other functions for the westwork - they were multi-storied - but he saw the imperial meaning as paramount. Fuchs' viewpoint was not always accepted, and his contentions gave rise to numerous articles. See, for example: Ernst Gall, "Westwerkfragen," Kunstchronik 7 (1954), pp. 274-276; and W. Lotz, "Zum Problem des karolingischen Westwerks," Kunstchronik 5 (March 1952), pp. 65-71. Lotz maintained, in opposition to Fuchs, that westworks were "Salvatorkirchen" and also used for altars to the archangels. Fuchs answered Gall's negative review in: "Zur Probleme der Westwerke," in Karolingische und ottonische Kunst. Werden. Wesen. Wirkung. Internationaler Kongress für Frühmittelalterlichenforschung 1954, Wiesbaden, 1957, pp. 109-117.

Adolf Schmidt, in the vein of Fuchs, focused on the importance of court liturgy in west end structures of the Early Medieval period. See: "Westwerke und Doppelchöre," Westfälische Zeitschrift 106 (1956), 347-438. Schmidt clearly viewed medieval architecture as springing from imperial sources, and his insistence on the imperial meaning of the westwork, and the importance of Aachen in the development of the westwork, made him heir to the German scholarly tradition. He specifically cited nuns' choirs as tied to spaces for rulers, and noted that many abbesses were of the royal house; Essen was his primary example, as it reflected Aachen as well. (p. 395)

A critique of this long-standing position, with attention to St. Riquier, was provided by Möbius in: "Die 'Ecclesia Maior' von Centula (790-799). Wanderliturgie im höfischen Kontext," Kritische Berichte 11 (1983), pp. 42-58. See also: Westwerkstudien.

⁴¹See, for example: Leo Hugot, "Der Westbau des Aachener Domes," Aachener Kunstblätter 24/25 (1963), pp. 102-120. Hugot, who was Dombaumeister of Aachen, was primarily interested in elevating Aachen's role in the history of architecture. In this article, a proposed a reconstruction of the original westwork, which has been altered over the centuries. In his reconstruction, based on spurious evidence, it is apparent that Hugot wanted to see Aachen's west end as having all of the requisite functions of the Carolingian westwork.

⁴²For the most outspoken expression of Aachen as the font of the westwork, see (not surprisingly): E. Lehmann, "Zur Deutung des karolingisches Westerk," Forschungen und Fortschritte 37, 1963. See as well: Fuchs, "Entstehung und Zweckbestimmung der Westwerke."

⁴³The west end of Essen does not conform to any of the types defined by Fuchs. Therefore, Heitz, for example, saw it as a synthesis of the "église-porche," the palatine chapel and the western apse ideas. See: Recherches sur les rapports.

⁴⁴See, for example: Wilhelm-Kästner, p. 26; and Gruber, p. 151

⁴⁵See: Zimmermann, p. 220. Zimmermann was discussing the first western structure, but as he contended that Theophanu's west end was based, in its size, on its predecessor, the observation goes for the extant church as well. See as well: Sölter, p. 8.

⁴⁶Heitz, Recherches sur les rapports, pp. 189 ff. For the text see: Franz Arens, Der Liber ordinarius der Essener Stiftskirche, Paderborn, 1908.

⁴⁷Sanderson, pp. 30-36. It should be noted that Sanderson's article is not at all conclusive. In postulating a change in location for the Easter liturgy, he gave no explanation for the west end form. While there are problems with the article, however, he did point out the problems of relying on the much later text for Essen.

⁴⁸Zimmermann came to this conclusion apparently through a process of elimination based on the size of the space and the possible choices for function: "Für eine Beschränkung auf Benützung als Pfarrkirche zeigt sich die Essener Anlage als kaum geeignet. Nichts deutet auf ein solches Vorhaben. Es wird bei Erläuterung von Westbau II auf diese Frage zurückzukommen sein. Mit Sicherheit ist kein Westchor anzunehmen. Für die Bestimmung entscheidend ist der westliche Eingang, die monumentale Ausgestaltung mit Turm und Seitenteilen und die schmale Westempore. Ihre zeitweise Benützung als Kaiserloge halte ich für möglich, wenn es auch dafür ebensowenig wie bei anderen Beispielen einen quellenmäßigen Beleg gibt. Als Empore für die Stiftsdamen ist sie jedenfalls wegen ihrer Kleinheit völlig ungeeignet." See: Zimmermann, p. 222; and Sölter, p. 8.

⁴⁹For example, Sölter stated: "Denn sie [Theophanu] war ja nicht nur die Enkelin Kaiser Ottos II, sondern hatte auch den Namen ihrer Großmutter, der Kaiserin TheophanuEs ist deshalb verständlich, warum ausgerechnet die kaiserliche Pfalzkapelle Karls des Großen in Aachen als architektonisches Vorbild gewählt wurde, denn die Vorsteherin des Essener Reichstifts sonnte sich gern im Glanz ihrer kaiserlichen Vergangenheit." See: Sölter, pp. 10-11. Wilhelm-Kästner, for example, cited the tie between Essen and Aachen, and characterized Aachen "als Pfalzkapelle Karls des Grossen . . . im Jahre 805 [gewieht]." See: Wilhelm-Kästner, p. 25.

⁵⁰See: Verbeek, "Die architektonische Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle," pp. 127-128. He stated: "Außerhalb dieser Tradition ist gegen Mitte des 11. Jahrhunderts in Essen an Stelle eines älteren westwerkartigen Bauteils ein merkwürdiger Westbau entstanden, der in geschlossener Gesamtform verschiedenartige Elemente vereint. Aachener Reminiszenzen sind dabei offenkundig. Die dreiseitige Apsis des Mittelstucks ist von zwei- und dreistöckigen Nebenräumen umlagert, die sich über den Erdgeschossarkaden in zweigeschossigen Säulengittern öffnen. Bis in die Einzelformen ist dieses mit hohem Können in ein dreiteiliges Quereck mit zwei Treppentürmen verschachtelte halbe Hexagon so getreu dem Aachener Oktogon nachgebildet, daß die bewußte Zurschaustellung dieser Beziehung nicht zu verkennen ist. Die achtseitige, mit Eckpilastern gegliederte Turmbekrönung über der Mitte beruft auch im Äußern noch einmal das Vorbild. Ohne Zweifel war die durch Hoheitsformen Aachener Herkunft ausgezeichnete Westempore dazu bestimmt, den Ehrensitz der fürstlichen Äbtissin aufzunehmen und nicht den Nonnenchor. Wie stark das Bewußtsein der Bauherrin Theophanu (Äbtissin 1039-1058) von ihrer kaiserlichen Abkunft war, bezeugt deren kürzlich

aufgefundene Grabschrift . . . Der Essener Westbau blieb mit der architektonisch sinnfällig gemachten Verbindung von Funktionen der Westwerke und Westchöre durch Wiederholung des Aachener Zentralbaues in halbierter Abkürzung 'ein genialer Einzelfall.'

In choosing this tack for discussing Essen, Verbeek was not alone among the scholars of Aachen's "copies," though his pointed differentiation and classification of "copy" versus "influence" separated him from the others. Kleinbauer discussed Essen and Cologne together as examples in which parts of Aachen were "copied," stating: "The formal and iconographic connections which obtain between the chapel at Aachen and the origins and development of the Carolingian and Ottonian Westwerk are of paramount importance for the understanding of the widespread influence of Charlemagne's church and early medieval architecture in general, but are far too involved and intricate for discussion in this essay." See: Kleinbauer, p. 6.

Sieffert, in discussing the formal properties of Essen vs. Aachen, noted that, liturgically speaking, Aachen's polygon was a sort of nave, while Essen's was a western sanctuary. Following Heitz, he saw the west end in relation the Easter liturgy, and tied it as well to other aspects of the westwork. He concluded, however, that "l'abbataile d'Essen confirme qu'au milieu du XI^e siècle la chapelle palatine d'Aix jouissait d'une grande célébrité puisque certains aspects en ont été très fidèlement reproduits. L'église en elle-même n'en est pourtant pas une copie." See: "Les imitations de la chapelle palatine de Charlemagne à Aix-la-Chapelle," pp. 46-48.

⁵¹The designation of "im-Kapitol," which is common usage today, postdates the eleventh century. For a discussion of the designation, see: H. Rahtgens, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Köln vol II, Pt. 1, Die kirchlichen Denkmäler der Stadt Köln, Düsseldorf, 1911, pp. 189-190; and U. Krings, "St. Maria im Kapitol. Die Bautätigkeit des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit bis zum Zweiten Weltkrieg," in Köln: die romanischen Kirchen, eds. H. Kier and U. Krings, vol. 1 of Stadtspüren - Denkmäler in Köln, Cologne, 1984, p. 346.

⁵²For a recent overview of the scholarly take on the history and building history of the medieval foundation, see: Krings, pp. 345-353; and Christian Beutler, Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol zu Köln, Cologne, 1981 (Rheinische Kunststätten 59). On Cologne, see as well: Rahtgens, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Köln; and Rahtgens, Die Kirche S. Maria im Kapitol zu Köln, Düsseldorf, 1913.

⁵³The Chronica Regia of ca. 1217, reads: "Plektrudis, que etiam Colonie in Capitolio egregiam ecclesiam in honore sanctae Dei Genetris Mariae construxit," and the thirteenth-century Life of Pletrude's niece St. Notburga related the foundation as well. See: Krings, p. 345. The veneration of the founder was seen as well at this time, and a tomb relief of "S. Plektrudis Regina" dates to the twelfth century. In 1956-57 a Merovingian sarcophagus was found that is thought to be the eighth century burial of Pletrude. Krings saw the gravesite as probable evidence of the veneration of the founder long before the twelfth century. See as well: Beutler, p. 3.

⁵⁴See: Krings, p. 345; and Kubach and Verbeek, p. 557.

⁵⁵This is the accepted interpretation of the available texts, as argued by E. Hlawitschka. His construct more or less put to rest a long-raging controversy over the nature of the foundation. See: "Zu den klosterlichen Anfängen in St. Maria im Kapitol zu Köln," Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter, 31 (1966-67), pp. 1-16.

⁵⁶See: Krings, pp. 346-347; and Beutler, p. 3.

⁵⁷See: Krings, p. 346; Kubach and Verbeek, vol 1, p. 558; and Rahtgens, Die Kirche S. Maria im Kapitol zu Köln, pp. 50-51. The west wall apparently predates the rest of the west end.

⁵⁸Rahtgens, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Köln, pp. 40-42; and Beutler, p. 3.

⁵⁹In ca. 1175 the upper reaches of the west tower were rebuilt, and in ca. 1200 changes were made to the east end. In 1466 the chapel of St. Hardenrath and in 1493 the chapel of St. Hittz were added to the east end. In the seventeenth, eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries changes were made to the west towers. See: Beutler, p. 3; and for a detailed discussion, Krings, pp. 357 ff.

⁶⁰There were a number of restorations of the church in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. See: Beutler, p. 3; and Krings, pp. 357-376. The restored church was then heavily bombed during the war. For a brief synopsis of the damage during the War, see: A. Verbeek and W. Zimmermann, "Die Zerstörung an Kölner Bauwerken während des Krieges 1939-1945," in Untersuchungen zur frühen Kölner Stadt-, Kunst- und Kirchengeschichte, ed. W. Zimmermann, Essen 1950, pp. 194 (Die Kunstdenkmäler des Rheinlands,

Beiheft 12). In 1957, the rebuilt nave was reconsecrated, and in 1975 the rebuilding of the east end was completed.

⁶¹See synopses, see: Krings, p. 347; Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 1, pp. 558 ff.; and Beutler, pp. 3-6.

⁶²See Krings, pp. 354-355. According to Beutler, it was the east end that made Santa-Maria such an important church. He stated: "Die für das 11. Jh. einzigartige Grundrißgestaltung, kleeblattförmiger Chor mit Umgängen, als einheitliche Schöpfung kurz nach der Jahrtausendwende erstaunlich, erhebt Maria im Kapitol zu einem der bedeutendsten Kirchenbauten des Abendlandes." See: Beutler, p. 6. It was in the east end that Eiken, as well, saw the greatness of Santa-Maria, saying: "Sein Einfluß auf die Entwicklung nicht nur der lokalen, sondern der ganzen altdeutschen Baukunst ist allgemein anerkannt. Auch darüber kann kein Zweifel bestehen, das dieser Ostbau die geniale Schöpfung eines seine Zeitgenossen überragenden Architekten ist, eines Mannes, der mit künstlerischer Selbstständigkeit sich von den antikisierenden Einflüssen der vor hergehenden Epoche emanzipierte, der ein neue Formal fand für die Lösung eines der Zeit eigentümlichen Bauideals: des Zentalbaues." See: H. Eiken, "St. Maria im Kapitol," Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Architkture 5 (August/December 1912), p. 233. Rahtgens, too, saw the east end as the source of a development, saying: In der Verbindung von Dreikonchenanlage und Umgängen steht St. Marien i. Kap. unter diesen Kirchen [St. Andreas, St. Aposteln and Gr. St. Martin in Cologne] aber ganz isoliert und ist als Bauschöpfung des 11. Jh. überhaupt eine einzigartige Erscheinung." See: Rahtgens, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Köln, p. 194.

The germ of these ideas can be seen in von Quast's article of 1847-8 on the buildings of Cologne. He characterized Santa-Maria as one of the great Romanesque buildings, and in dating the structure brought to light for the first time in scholarship the document of the Leo IX consecration. Of the east end of the church, he stated: "Anstatt ein Vorbild der ähnlichen Cölner Anlagen, nämentlich in S. Martin und S. Aposteln zu sein, dürfte die obere Chorhaube von S. Maria in Capitolio eher als die jüngste Nachahmung von jenen zu betrachten sein." See: "Beiträge zur chronologischen Bestimmung der ältern Gebäude Cölns bis zum XI. Jahrhundert I," pp. 201-207.

⁶³Cologne's extensive crypt plan has been compared consistently to that built under Poppo at Stablo and that of the church as Brauweiler - the family foundation of the Ezzonen. Cologne has been seen as the model, in fact, for Brauweiler's complex. See: Krings, p. 355; and Kubach and

Verbeek, vol. 1, p. 564. This idea has recently been disputed. See: L. Bosman, "Architektur und Klosterreform: die Zusammenhänge zwischen Stablo, Brauweiler und St. Maria im Kapitol, Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft XLI, no. 1 (1987), pp. 3-15. Oddly, Beutler characterized Santa-Maria's crypt plan as following that in Speyer, the necropolis of the Salians. See: Beutler, p. 6.

⁶⁴This had to do at least partially with the comparison of the west end to similar structures, notably Bruno's church of Saint Pantaleon in Cologne. This structural comparison is still pulled out today. See, for example: Krings, p. 354; Beutler, p. 3. See as well: Rahtgens, Die Kirche S. Maria im Kapitol zu Köln, pp. 68 ff. For St. Pantaleon, see: Karl Heinz Bergmann, St. Pantaleon in Köln, 3rd. ed., Neuss, 1982 (Rheinische Kunststätten 146) Importantly, while Bruno is seen as the patron of the church, the Empress Theophanu completed the building, and, in particular, she rebuilt the westwork. Theophanu's special interest in St. Pantaleon is well-known, and she was buried within the church. Her role in the construction of St. Pantaleon may have been grounds for Ida's possible interest in it.

⁶⁵Von Quast brought this up in the second part of his article on the churches of Cologne. He discussed Santa-Maria again specifically because the west wall had come to light. See: "Beiträge zur chronologischen Bestimmung der ältern Gebäude Cölns bis zum XI. Jahrhundert II," p. 180.

⁶⁶Von Quast, for example, stated that the half columns differed, "und fehlt in den anderen wenigen Repliken, welche wir von dieser Bogenstellung besitzen." See: "Beiträge zur chronologischen Bestimmung der ältern Gebäude Cölns bis zum XI. Jahrhundert II," p. 181. Von Quast's interest in Cologne can be compared, like his interest in Essen, to Aachen's restoration.

⁶⁷Rahtgens, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Köln, pp. 196 and 208-209; and Rahtgens, Die Kirche S. Maria im Kapitol zu Köln, pp. 50-76. Rahtgens simply assumed the function of the space was for the nuns. See: Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Köln, p. 208. Eiken disagreed, feeling the space was too small. See: Eiken, p. 247.

Von Quast's discussion of the wall centered on the ties of the columnar screen to Aachen and, in some detail, the capital forms. He began by describing the structure, particularly the capitals - which were gilded - of the two levels of the upper arch screen. He noted that: "Uebrigens stimmt keins der Kapitäle völlig mit dem anderen überein."

He went on to say: "Jene obere Bogen- u. Säulenstellung, welche in alter Zeit geöffnet war u. den grossen Raum innerhalb des jetzigen Thurmes, der den ehemaligen Nonnen als Chor diente, mit der Kirche verband, ist nun offenbar eine Nachahmung der fast völlig gleichen Anordnung im Münster zu Aachen, deren Wiederherstellung neuerlich durch die Gnade seiner Majestät des Königs anbefohlen wurde. . . . Bermerkenswert ist es noch, dass die Gliederungen . . . den Profilen des Karolingischen Baues gleichfalls völlig entsprechen . . . während die Kämpfer der unteren Bogenstellung . . . mit den in der übrigen Kirche herrschenden Profilen genauer übereinstimmen; der Karniess hat bei jenen die mehr ausladende römische, bei letzteren die schon mehr mittelalterliche, eingezogenere Form." This discussion then led him to the known "copies." See: "Beiträge zur chronologischen Bestimmung der ältern Gebäude Cölns bis zum XI. Jahrhundert II," pp. 180-182.

⁶⁸Rahtgens, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Köln, pp. 208-209; and, for an expanded analysis, Rahtgens, Die Kirche S. Maria im Kapitol zu Köln, pp. 56-60.

⁶⁹Eiken proposed his own building history of Santa-Maria with the west end dating to the tenth-century building. He stated: "Der Unterbau dieser Turmgruppe, im Verband mit den schon als alt konstatierten Schiffsmauern, stammt vom Bau des Brunos. Dieser Westbau ist entstanden nach dem Vorbild der von Karl dem Grosssen in Aachen geschaffenen Palastkapelle." Eiken's contention was that the entire tenth-century church was influenced by Aachen, with the east end being polygonal, and he brought up the examples of Aachen influence seen in Nijmegen, Essen and Ottmarsheim. He then honed in on the west wall, and stated: "Es erscheint auf den ersten Blick klar, daß dasjenige, was oben vom Westbau im allgemeinen gesagt wurde, von dieser Abschlußwand im besonderen gilt. Ihre antikisierenden Formen können nicht von dem Ostbauarchitekten herrühren, es sei denn, daß dieser bei ihrer Schaffung einen plötzlichen Anfall von Reaktion gehabt hätte. Man vergleiche diese Wand mit entsprechenden Bauteilen der schon genannten Kirchen. Wir dort sind in den oberen Halbkreisbogen der Wand jene Säulchen eingestellt in derselben gedanklosen, sklavischen Nachahmung des Aachener Vorbildes, ohne Verständnis und Sinn für die Funktion und Kraftlinie eines Bogens. Die Arkade darunter zeigt dieselbe Form und Aufteilung. Die Kapitäle hier oben haben jene charakteristische Form, die der frühromanische Stil zunächst aus der karolingischen Zeit übernahm. Sie sind stark korinthisierend, vasenförmig gebildet, mit mehreren Blattreihen übereinander, die Blätter nach außen übergebogen. Darüber liegt der Abakus, eine dünne, viereckige Deckplatte, unter welcher sich zwischen

dem Blattwerk kleine Schneckenstengel ansetzen. Die Säulenkapitale der untersten Arkade zeigen die erste frühe Form des romanischen Würfelkapitāls, die Kämpfer darüber aber noch antiken Einfluß." Eiken said that the choice of Aachen had to do with the need for upper spaces for the Canonesses [sic] and that the choice of Aachen for Essen and Cologne, as well as Ottmarsheim - all churches for women - was only natural given their need for an upper space. See: Eiken, pp. 244-248.

⁷⁰See: W. Effmann, Zur Baugeschichte der Kirche S. Maria im Kapitol zu Kōn, ed. A. Fuchs, Paderborn, 1931; and Rahtgens, "Nachträgliche Bermerkungen zu St. Maria im Kapitol," Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft 40 (1917), pp. 270-279.

⁷¹W. Meyer-Barkhausen, "Die Westarkadenwand von St. Maria im Kapitol in Zusammenhange ottonischer Kapitellkunst," Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch 14 (1952), 9-40. That this article and its conclusions have been seen as noteworthy is evident from its mention by Kubach and Verbeek and Krings.

⁷²In order to achieve his conclusions, Meyer-Barkhausen went through an extremely convoluted reassessment of the development of Ottonian capital decoration. As the capitals of Cologne had been compared to those of Rasdorf, which had been seen as dating from the Romanesque age, he needed to redefine these capitals as Ottonian. To do this, he compared them with Carolingian and Ottonian capitals and then contrasted his finding with ninth and tenth-century Italian capitals. In discussing the Cologne captials in this context, he concluded: "Die Kapitelle von St. Maria im Kapitol zeigen also im ganzen gegenüber Rasdorf die gleiche Umprägung des Akanthuskapitells ins Anorganisch-Flächige wie wir sie im Karolingischen an dem Kapitell in Tauberbischofsheim mit Bezug auf die Kapitelle der Fuldaer Ratgarbasilika feststellen konnten. Nur stellen jetzt die Kölner Kapitelle jene Weiterentwicklung der anorganischen Blattform dar, die schon an den oberitalienischen Kapitellen hervortrat . . . Kann es nach allem noch zweifelhaft sein, daß es sich in Köln um ottonische Kapitelle handelt, zumal das für Rasdorf geltende Datum um 970 fast genau mit der durch das Testament Erzbischof Brunos für den ottonischen Bau von Maria im Kapitol gegebenen Zeitbestimmung 965 übereinstimmt?" (pp. 27-28) It must be noted that such analyses are rather manipulative, and that it seems that any desired point could be proven through a formal and stylistic dating analysis. It is instructive to compare Meyer-Barkhausen's points with those made by Rahtgens (against

whom he pitted himself) and Eiken, to see how the same material was used to arrive at different conclusions.

⁷³Having established that he saw the upper arcade capitals within the Ottonian orbit, Meyer-Barkhausen then questioned the date of the west screen wall, again stating that the corinthian capital forms contrasted sharply with the cubic capitals in the rest of the church. He found it impossible to believe that the lower and upper parts of the screen could be seen as a whole, as the capital styles were so divergent, stating, cryptically, that "so wirken die oberen Säulenstellungen mit ihren antikisierenden Kapitellen, Kämpfern und Gesimsen wie ein Fremdkörper in der mit ihren Würfelkapitellen so einheitlichen Kirche des 11. Jahrhunderts." (p. 30) Having upheld this difference, Meyer-Barkhausen felt that there were two possible explanations: "Entweder hat man das Motiv der zwei Säulenstellungen übereinander nach dem Muster von Aachen oder Essen erst im Bau des 11. Jahrhunderts angewandt und hat durch die Benutzung älterer Formstücke . . . oder auch durch deren Nachahmung dem altertümlichen Charakter des Vorbilds möglichst nahe kommen wollen. Abgesehen von der Unwahrscheinlichkeit solcher archaisierenden Tendenzen, würde man in diesem Fall wohl kaum eine formale Einheitlichkeit erreicht haben, wie sie die Arkaden und ihre Einzelformen doch erkennen lassen. Sehr viel wahrscheinlicher ist es, daß schon der Brunonische Bau als Westabschluß des Langhauses das Aachener Arkadenmotiv gehabt hat und daß die Westarkadenwand mit den alten Formstücken unter Einfügung der Erdgeschoßarkaden um 1065 neu aufgebaut worden ist." (p. 30)

⁷⁴Eiken's stance can be compared to Meyer-Barkhausen's. Eiken stated: "Ihre [the capitals] antikisierenden Formen können nicht von dem Ostbauarchitekten herrühren, es sei dann, daß dieser bei ihrer Schaffung einen plötzlichen Anfall von Reaktion gehabt hätte." See: Eiken, p. 245. Verbeek's take on Essen as well betrayed certain assumptions about recourse to the past and the development of architecture. See: Verbeek, "Ottonische und staufische Wandgliederung am Niederrhein," pp.70-72. Braunfels, in contrast, saw the "archaising" tendencies of Essen and Cologne as indicative of the goals of the patrons and the sort of "classicizing" phase of Ottonian architecture. See: "Die Kirchenbauten der Ottonen-Äbtissinnen," in Beiträge zur Kunst des Mittelalters. Festschrift für Hans Wentzel zum 60. Geburtstag, Berlin, 1975, pp. 33-40. His work, which was concerned with the architectural commissions of the women of Theophanu and Ida's family, while bringing up extremely important points about the material, ultimately

couched the buildings and their decoration in terms of imperial reference and necessity.

⁷⁵Eiken, in keeping with his contention that the tenth-century church as a whole was indebted to Aachen, stated: "Dieser Westbau ist entstanden nach dem Vorbild der von Karl dem Großen in Aachen geschaffenen Palastkapelle." See: Eiken, p. 244. Again, Aachen was discussed as Charlemagne's palatine chapel of ca. 800. Quite interestingly, Rahtgens, while noting the resemblance between Cologne and Aachen, saw Essen as the model for Santa-Maria's west wall. See: Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Köln, p. 208; and Die Kirche S. Maria im Kapitol zu Köln, p. 57. For the general notion of a tie between Cologne and Aachen, see: Krings, p. 354.

⁷⁶Sieffert did not mention Santa-Maria in his article on the "copies." Kleinbauer paired Cologne with Essen, and categorized it as borrowing an "individual part or motif" from Aachen, and tied the two to the dissemination of the westwork. See: Kleinbauer, p. 6.

⁷⁷See: Verbeek, "Die architektonische Nachfolge," pp. 144-146. Verbeek's reasoning was a bit dense. He said: "Heir in Köln bleibt die betonte Aachener Reminiszenz indes fremd in der sonst folgerichtig entwickelten salischer Architekture des Neubaus, sie muß also außerkünstlerische Gründe von besonderem Gewicht haben. Wie zeitgemäße Arkaden bevorzugter Westemporen mit dem herrscherlichen Ehrenplatz aussahen, mag das Beispiel Oberkaufungen, Witwensitz der Kaiserin Kunigunde (d. 1033) lehren. Solche dreifachen Bogenstellungen, wie sich auch das Erdgeschoß unter der Westempore der Kölner Kapiltolskirche hat, sind noch bis ins 13. Jahrhundert üblich geblieben, vom Mindener Dom bis zur Frankenberger Kirche in Goslar, allenfalls gestaffelt mit größerem Mittelbogen wie um 1160 in Merten an der Sieg. Das Motiv des Aachener Säulengitters scheint demnach wie das des Oktogons oder der großen Tornische als Hoheitsform verwendet zu sein. Als Nachklang des untektionisch gedachten Gebildes dürfen um die Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts in Brauweiler und der Kölner Georgskirche die dekorativen Gliederungen von Gewölbeschildfeldern durch eingeblendete Säulen gelten. Das ganze, die Oktogonseiten in Bogen übergreifende System, das aus der byzantinischen Baukunst übernommen wurde, steht am Anfang der Entwicklung zur Jochbildung in der abendlandischen Architektur."

⁷⁸See, for example: Karl Hauck, "Die Ottonen und Aachen," Karl der Grosse, vol. 4, Das Nachleben, ed. W. Braunfels, Dusseldorf, 1967, pp. 39-53.

⁷⁹While this relationship is commonly acknowledged, see especially: Verbeek, "Die architektonische Nachfolge;" and Braunfels.

⁸⁰For my discussion of the Ottonian aristocratic family, I am indebted to: K. J. Leyser, "The German Aristocracy from the Ninth to the Early Twelfth Century. A Historical and Cultural Sketch," Past and Present 41 (1968), pp. 25-53.

⁸¹I will use the German term, in the absence of a simple word in English, to designate the family of Ezzo.

⁸²For the Ezzonen, see: F. Steinbach, "Die Ezzonen. Ein Versuch nach territorial politischen Zusammenschlusses der fränkischen Rheinlande," in Das Erste Jahrtausend, pp. 848-866; and F. Prinz, "Die Machtstellung der Ezzonen in ottonischer Zeit," in Werdendes Abendland an Rhein und Ruhr, Essen (1956), p. 309. For the most comprehensive study on the family, see: U. Lewald, "Die Ezzonen. Das Schicksal eines rheinischen Fürstengeschlechtes," Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter 43 (1979), pp. 120-168.

⁸³Ezzo was the son of Hermann, who as well had another son, Hezelin, who was the Graf of Zülpichgau. See: W. Bader, Die ehemalige Benedikterabtei Brauweiler in Pulheim bei Köln, 2nd. ed., Cologne, 1976 (Rheinische Kunststätten); and Lewald, pp. 121 ff.

⁸⁴Certainly relation with the ruling house raised one's status. See: Lewald, p. 120. The actual date of Ezzo and Mathilde's wedding is unsure, as texts give conflicting reports. For the problems of the dating, see: A. Hofmeister, "Studien zur Theophanu," in Festschrift Edmund E. Stengel, Cologne, 1952, pp. 330-331. Thietmar of Merseberg mentioned the marriage after he talked about the death of Otto III, though he gave no date for the nuptials. Some feel that the marriage took place before 1002, and also probably before 999 in light of the children born to them.

⁸⁵For a discussion of the progeny of Otto II and Theophanu, and the problems as discerning birth order and age, see: Hofmeister, pp. 223-262. Hofmeister's subject was Otto's Queen, and he divided his inquiry into pertinent subheadings. The first of these subsections, "Die Kinder Ottos II und der Theophanu," noted that there are no sources that provide a complete and detailed account of the children. It is only known that there were at least three daughters - Adelheid, Sophia and Mathilde - and one son -

Otto III. The relative ages and birth order of the daughters remains somewhat debated.

⁸⁶See: Prinz, p 211; and Lewald, p. 122.

⁸⁷See: Leyser, "The German Aristocracy," pp. 33-35; and especially, Leyser, "Maternal Kin in Early Medieval Germany," Past and Present 49 (1970), pp. 126-134. In characterizing the "fluidity" of kinship association - the ways in which families' self-identities could seemingly change over rather short periods of time - Leyser noted: "Some of this fluidity can be explained by the importance of maternal relatives and descent. They ranked as high as and even higher than paternal kin, if they were thought to be nobler and had better things to offer." (p. 126)

⁸⁸Steinbach, p. 861; Leyser, "The German Aristocracy," pp. 37.

⁸⁹Besides Theophanu and Ida, Adelheid (d. ca. 1020) became Abbess of Nivelles, Helwyga (d. 1076) at Neuss, Mathilde (d. after 1021) at Dietkirchen and Vilich, and Sophie (d. before 1038) at Gandersheim and Mainz (from 1027). This information, taken from the Fundatio monasterii Brunwilarensis, is, according to Lewald, in error. Ida was Abbess of Gandersheim before she went to Cologne, while Sophie had already died in Mainz, where the two sisters had gone to escape the grasp of their Aunt Sophie at Gandersheim. See: Lewald, p. 135. Lewald discussed the text in depth, highlighting its intention to eulogize the family and its lineage, especially its relation to the royal house. See: Lewald, pp. 123 ff.

⁹⁰For the idea of keeping names alive, see: Leyser, "The German Aristocracy," pp. 32-33. See the family tree in : Leyser, Rule and Conflict in an Early Medieval Society: Ottonian Saxony, Worcester, 1989, pp. xii-xiii.

⁹¹A prerequisite for ecclesiastical office was, almost always, noble blood, as well as royal favor. See: Leyser, "The German Aristocracy," especially pp. 37-38.

⁹²Certainly the significance of Herimann's elevation to the Bishopric of Cologne is self-evident. As for the female children, the six daughters of Ezzo and Mathilde were following in the career footsteps of the women of their mother's royal line. Mathilde's sisters were both abbesses of prestigious foundations, Sophie of Gandersheim and Essen, and Adelheid of Gandersheim and Quedlinberg. Adelheid was born in 999, and became Abbess of Quedlinberg in 1039, and

she was as well Abbess of Gandersheim. She died in 1043 and was buried at Quedlinberg, in a sarcophagus that identifies her as the daughter of the Emperor Otto. (Her self-consciously Ottonian epitaph can be compared to Theophanu's. See below, p. 215.) Her aunt, also named Mathilde, the sister of Otto II, had also been Abbess of Quedlinburg. For examples of Ottonian women as abbesses, see: Leyser, Rule and Conflict, Part II, "The Women of the Saxon Aristocracy," pp. 48-76.

The abbess of Essen in particular had been more or less an Ottonian post, and the foundation could almost be said to be a family domain of the Ottonian house. See: Inge Gampl, Adelige Damenstifte. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung adeliger Damenstifte in Österreich unter besondere Berücksichtigung der alten Kanonissenstifte Deutschlands und Lothringens, Vienna/Munich, 1960, p. 30.

⁹³On the establishment and nature of Ottonian female religious devotion, see: Leyser, Rule and Conflict, Chapter 6, "The Saxon Nunneries," pp. 63-73; K. Heinrich Schäfer, Die Kanonissenstifter im deutschen Mittelalter, Stuttgart, 1907 (Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen 43 and 44); J. Heineken, Die Anfänge der sächsischen Frauenkloster, Göttingen, 1909; and Gampl.

⁹⁴See: Leyser, Rule and Conflict, pp. 64-65. The predilection for founding houses for women was most notable in the tenth century and into the eleventh century. Schäfer characterized the Saxon Age - from the ninth into the eleventh century - as one of the great flowerings of such institutions. See: Schäfer, pp. 70-76. The rise in foundations for women at this time can be compared, very generally, to other points in the Middle Ages when female religious institutions were favored, such as with the Merovingians. See: S. Wemple, Women in Frankish Society: Marriage and the Cloister, Philadelphia, 1981, Chapter VII, "The Search for Spiritual Perfection and Freedom."

⁹⁵For the conditions under which women lived in Saxon society, see: Leyser, Rule and Conflict, Chapter 5, "Survival and Inheritance," pp. 49-62.

⁹⁶See: Leyser, Rule and Conflict, pp. 63 ff. Included in this group as well are the older foundations - such as Essen and Cologne - which often carried greater prestige, perhaps because of their antiquity.

⁹⁷Schäfer discussed the conditions of, specifically, canonical life. Importantly, canonesses were not cut off from the world and they were not required to take any vows. See: Schäfer, pp. 15-17 and 68-69. For the independence

and opportunities that such institutions offered, see: Leyser, Rule and Conflict, pp. 49-73.

⁹⁸See Leyser, Rule and Conflict, pp. 72-73.

⁹⁹See: Patrick Corbet, Les saints ottoniens. Sainteté dynastique, sainteté royale et sainteté féminine autour de l'an Mil, Sigmaringen, 1986 (Beihefte der Francia 15); Corbet, "Saints et sainteté chez les ottoniens autour de l'an Mil," in x^{eme} siècle. Recherches nouvelles, ed. P. Riché, pp. 13-15. See as well: M.-L. Portmann, Die Darstellung der Frau in der Geschichtsschreibung des früheren Mittelalters, Stuttgart 1958 (Basler Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft 69); T. Vogelsang, Die Frau als Herrscherin im hohen Mittelalter, Göttingen, (Göttinger Bausteine zur Geschichtswissenschaft 7).

¹⁰⁰Leyser, "The German Aristocracy," p. 26; and Corbet, Les saints ottoniens, p. 27.

¹⁰¹Leyser, Rule and Conflict, p. 72.

¹⁰²Corbet, Les saints ottoniens, Chapter I, "La grande sainte dynastique: la reine Mathilde (v. 895-968), femme d'Henri I^{er}," pp. 30-40.

¹⁰³While perhaps they could be seen as emulating the model of bishops and abbots of the realm in their undertakings, their interest in commissions recalls not only their Ottonian forebearers in particular, but as well the more general model of aristocratic female saints as architectural patrons. See: Jane Tibbetts Schulenberg, "Female Sanctity: Public and Private Roles, ca. 500-1100," in Women and Power in the Middle Ages, eds. M. Erler and M. Kowaleski, Athens, GA., 1988, pp. 102-125.

¹⁰⁴The general building activity of the sisters is often mentioned. See, for example: Lewald, pp. 135-136; and especially Braunfels. Alongside the churches built under Theophanu and Ida, Adelheid built Nivelles (cons. 1046), Mathilde built the second church at Vilich, and Richeza rebuilt the family foundation of Brauweiler. For Nivelles, see: Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 2, pp. 864 ff. For Vilich, see: I. Achter, Die Stiftskirche St. Peter in Vilich, Düsseldorf 1968 (Beiheft/Kunstdenkmäler des Rheinlandes 12); and Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 2, pp. 1187 ff. For Brauweiler, see: W. Bader, Die Benediktinerabtei Brauweiler bei Köln, Berlin, 1937, Chapter III, "Das zweite Kloster (1048 bis vor 1091)," pp. 64 ff.; and, for the short

form, Bader, Die ehemalige Benediktinerabtei Brauweiler in Pulheim bei Köln, 2nd ed. Cologne, 1976.

Ezzo founded Brauweiler as a sort of family foundation, in an act common with the Ottonian aristocracy and the royal family. Certainly the abbey of Quedlinburg served as a sort of model for these foundations. (See: Leyser, "Maternal Kin," pp. 127-128; and Corbet, Les saints ottoniens, p. 32) Brauweiler was given to Mathilde as her "Morgengabe." Brauweiler was intended to be a sort of family necropolis - previously they had been buried in St. Gereon in Cologne - and when Ezzo died in 1034, he was buried there, as Mathilde had been upon her death in 1025 (the church was not completed at this time, so she was buried the cloister that was under construction). Of the children, Luidolf (d. 1031), Otto (d. 1047) and Adelheid (d. after 1020) were buried at Brauweiler, as was a son of Luidolf (d. 1031). The first church, to Sts. Nicholas and Medard (the latter the original patron of the existing site), was built from ca. 1024-28 and monks were sent from St. Maximin in Trier. After the death of her husband, Richeza returned from Poland in 1036 with her son and moved into the family home with her brother Otto. With Otto's sudden death in 1047, Richeza allegedly gave up her queenly accoutrements and devoted herself to Brauweiler.

¹⁰⁵See, for example: Leyser, Rule and Conflict, p. 50.

¹⁰⁶In keeping with this tradition, Ida commissioned the intricate wooden doors still in the church of Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol and, along with her brother, the enigmatic Herimann Cross. For the doors, see: Rahtgens, 1911, pp. 233-236; and Ornamenta ecclesiae. Kunst und Künstler der Romanik in Köln. Katalog zur Ausstellung des Schnütgen-Museums in der Josef-Haubrich-Kunsthalle, vol. 2, ed. A. Legner, Cologne, 1985, no. E-96. The intricate doors depict twenty-six scenes from the New Testament, with some fields larger than others, thus highlighting selected scenes. See as well: Beutler, p. 6. The current name of the cross is obviously somewhat misleading, giving Herimann the credit for a commission most probably intended for the foundation of his sister. The cross, now in Cologne, is unusual in that the effigy of Christ on the face has, for its head, an ancient cameo that obviously portrays a woman. This odd treatment of Christ - no doubt tied to the special views of female patrons - has received little comment, scholars preferring to view the cross within the context of stylistic progression and development. See: J. Eschweiler, "Das Herimannkreuz im erzbisch. Diözesanmuseum zu Köln," Jahrbuch des kölnischen Geschichtsvereins 6/7 (1925), pp. 46-51; D. Marie and R. Klessmann, "Zum Stil des Herimannkreuzes in Köln," in Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte. Eine Festgabe für

Heinz Rudolf Rosemann zum 9. Oktober 1060, ed. E. Guldan, pp. 9-20; R. Wesenberg, "Der Werdener Bronzekruzifixus und eine Essen-Werdener Schule des 11. Jahrhunderts," in Bewahren und Gestalten. Festschrift zum siebzigsten Geburtstag von Günther Grundmann, eds. J. Gerhardt and W. Gramberg, Hamburg, 1962, pp. 157-163. See as well: Ornamenta ecclesiae, vol. 1, no. B-9.

The inheritance of lavish commissions is most clearly seen at the church at Essen, where today the church and treasury still bear witness to the tradition of patronage established and upheld by the foundation's aristocratic abbesses in the Ottonian Age. See: A. Pothmann, Die Schatzkammer des Essener Münsters, Munich, 1988; Humann, Die Kunstwerke der Münsterkirche zu Essen, Düsseldorf, 1904; Wilhelm-Kästner; H. Schnitzler, Rheinische Schatzkammer, Düsseldorf, 1957; and V. Elbern, Der Münsterschatz von Essen, Mönchengladbach, 1966.

Mathilde, the granddaughter of Otto the Great, was particularly active in securing commissions for her foundation. The famous "Golden Madonna" of the late tenth century is still found within the church, as is the seven-armed candelabra of ca. 1000, both works commissioned by Abbess Mathilde (949-1011, at Essen from ca. 973). For the candelabra, see: P. Bloch, "Seibenarmige Leuchter in christlichen Kirchen," Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch 23 (1961), pp. 55-190. Bloch named Mathilde as the instigator of the great tradition of Essen patronage. (p. 105). Mathilde commissioned as well at least two sumptuous altar crosses still found in the Treasury, the "Otto-Mathilde Cross" and the "Mathilde Cross," and as well a shrine reliquary to St. Mauritius - the patron saint of the Ottonian House - that is now lost. She was as well probably responsible for a third cross in the treasury, decorated with the Evangelist symbols and dating to ca. 1000.

She has been characterized, along with Theophanu, as the greatest of Essen patrons. See: Pothmann, p. 6; and Bloch. Theophanu clearly fostered the continuation of Essen patronage tradition so clearly established by Mathilde. In addition to the rebuilding of the church, Theophanu commissioned an ornate processional cross incorporating a piece of the True Cross, a reliquary with a nail of the True Cross (The reliquary was altered in the Gothic Age, and can be seen in this form today in the Treasury at Essen, and an ornate gospel book with an elaborate ivory and beaten gold cover which shows Theophanu prostrate at the feet of the Virgin and Child. Theophanu's pattern of patronage led to her eulogization in the Fundatio monasterii Brunwilarensis, where she was said to be "like a man" in the scope of her undertakings.

¹⁰⁷Braunfels intimated the tradition of commissions for female religious houses. See: Braunfels, pp. 33-35.

¹⁰⁸For the grave, see: W. Zimmermann, "Das Grab der Äbtissin Theophanu von Essen," Bonner Jahrbücher 152 (1952), pp. 226-227. Such an epitaph was not uncommon for Ottonian women. See, for example, above, footnote 92.

¹⁰⁹Conant for example, placed Santa-Maria under the rubric of the Salian Emperors. (p. 135.) (It should be noted that Conant discussed Essen under Ottonian architecture, accepting the late tenth-century date. See: p. 124.) Krings described Santa Maria as "spatottonisch-salisch." (p. 353) Kubach and Verbeek discussed it as Salian. See: Kubach and Verbeek, vol. 1, p. 558. Jantzen, for example, discussed the problem of periodization, and the futility of trying to make distinctions between, especially, Ottonian and Salian works. See: Ottonische Kunst.

¹¹⁰The heyday of foundations for women ended in the eleventh century, more or less concurrently with the imperial power of the Ottonian dynasty. See: Schäfer, pp. 75-76. Leyser noted that from the third decade of the eleventh century, Saxon nobles no longer had a predilection for founding institutions for women, and concentrated instead on foundations for men. See: Leyser, Rule and Conflict, p. 65. It is unclear whether the new rulers, the Salians, were more hostile to the idea; considering their tenure, it may simply be that they had other things to worry about.

The tradition of patronage at Essen in particular seems to have died, more or less, with Theophanu. After her tenure, little is known until the time of Svanhild in the late eleventh century. Svanhild at least apparently attempted to keep the patronage tradition alive, seen in the evangeliary she commissioned. See: Rainer Kahsnitz, "Die Essener Äbtissin Svanhild und ihr Evangeliar in Manchester," Beiträge zur Geschichte von Stadt und Stift Essen 85 (1970), pp. 13-80.

¹¹¹Theophanu and Ida's brother's successor to the archbishopric of Cologne, Anno, was not at all sympathetic to the Ezzonen. While his rise to power in 1056 would have no influence on the works especially of Theophanu, his conflicts over Brauweiler with Richeza - the last of Ezzo and Mathilde's offspring to die - clearly illustrated the growing shift in power. See: Lewald; and G. Jenal, Erzbischof Anno II. von Köln (1056-75) und sein politisches Wirken. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Reichs- und Territorialpolitik im 11. Jahrhundert, vol. 1, Stuttgart, 1974, pp. 110 ff.

¹¹²Professor Jo Anne McNamara, as a reader of this dissertation, provided a stimulating, if differing, interpretation of this situation. Professor McNamara questioned whether being "the end of the [Ezzonen] line" would have been meaningful to Theophanu and Ida - whether, in fact, their monastic family and its continuity were not their primary concern, a concern reflected in their patronage. She therefore arrived at a conclusion more or less opposite of my own, approaching the situation from the other perspective.

¹¹³This issue was highlighted by Verbeek in: "Ottonische und staufische Wandgliederung," p. 83. He stated: "Haben wir in Essen tatsächlich, wie Pinder es bezeichnet hat, eine 'letzte Spätform des Karolingischen' vor uns . . ." The tendency of scholars to discuss the "copies" directly after the introduction of Aachen in chronological surveys as well intimates that the works belong in the Carolingian slot because of their reference. See above, Chapter Two.

¹¹⁴The "reduction" of Aachen from Essen to Cologne could be seen as Ida taking off from the lead of Theophanu, as Verbeek conjectured. To assume this, however, would be to assume that forms and structures naturally get watered down with reuse, and that is not necessarily tenable, especially in light of the "copies" history."

¹¹⁵Certainly the question of whether Cologne's screen is composed of spolia is an open one. However, if the capitals are in fact reused Ottonian material, the screen wall could be seen as imbued with even more meaning - as more poignantly referring to and deriving power from the past. Not only was Aachen's original columnar screen composed of spolia, perhaps providing a precedent, but the very use of spolia could indicate the magical or powerful quality of the past through its physical remains. While the literature on spolia is relatively large, for the ideological implications of reuse, see especially: Beat Brenk, "Spolia from Constantine to Charlemagne: Aesthetics versus Ideology," Dumbarton Oaks Papers 41 (1987), pp. 103-109.

The Problem of "Conclusions"

In this study, I have explored the broad questions of attitudes towards and responses to the past through the issues of the image of Aachen and the problem of the "copy." The above examples are intended to underscore that the "meaning" of Aachen was - and is - changeable and rooted in time and place, and that while all share the general notion of reference to Aachen, the examples provided do not present a unified or predictable pattern. I have, in fact, pointedly presented five separate "case studies" - a format purposely devised to circumvent the imposition of an evolutionary or universal model. Within this presentation, then, the problem of "drawing conclusions" comes into focus.

Within the accepted structure of scholarly discourse, there is often the expectation of a "conclusion." The desire for a closing statement - as an identifiable expression of "closure" - highlights issues central to this study. The perceived need for the neat and precise closure provided by a "conclusion" - an artificial construct which imposes a sense of order on the given material - raises questions central to the discussion of assumptions about "history."

Conventionally, a "conclusion" - by whatever name - entails either a summary reiteration, in authoritative, unambiguous prose, of that which has been "proven;" or, alternatively, an essay which provides suggestions for

"further work" in light of a given discussion, whether that would entail the enumeration of specific issues that call for more investigation or the discussion of the "broader applications" of a work. Either approach, however, would be inappropriate within the context of the present study.

The first alternative would necessarily require the simplification and ordering of the points of each chapter. Such an approach, while helpful in certain instances, in this case would nullify the complexity and subtlety of the issues presented. Moreover, such an undertaking, by its very nature, would presuppose a certain ordering and linkage of themes or "histories," and would suggest, therefore, a codified, linear answer to the problems presented.

The second possibility - albeit it a more open format - would tacitly assume, through the type of questions raised, the problematic paradigm of scholarship that presupposes the progressive, evolutionary, and universalizing nature of scholarly inquiry. Such a construct necessarily would rest on the assumption that the validity of any discussion is directly proportional to its applicability. Moreover, while the examples presented doubtless foster points of comparison and contrast - this is the intent - to provide a conventional closing statement not only would suggest implicitly that the material presented embodies some sort of encoded, discernable and absolute structure, but as well, to

do so might give the impression that I am offering a new model - presenting a new paradigm to be followed.

Certainly the particular questions raised could be pursued further. There are, for example, more "copies" of Aachen - each of which reflects its own history and own image of the chapel. To consider them all would be to end up with a patchwork, one from which no apparent structure could be gleaned. Such an undertaking would simply reinforce the evocative, mutable nature of the image of Aachen. However, such an "expansion" or "application" would be problematic, in that it would presuppose a finite group - a codified corpus of "copies" - a construct I have tried to avoid by not presenting my chosen examples as a "group."

Moreover, while the general approach I formulated for this study could be applied to other perceived "groups" of so-called "copies" - for example, those of the Holy Sepulchre or the Sainte-Chapelle - to presuppose a correlation in such other examples, even as a "test," could be characterized as naive - imposing an answer or model on the material. The exercise of plugging works into adopted frameworks is a dubious undertaking at best.

It goes without saying that some of the broader issues raised could be explored further as well. For example, the interpretive problem of the "Major Monument" could provide impetus for the exploration of the classification of any other work upheld as such. There is, however, no formula

for such a "deconstruction:" any work, whether a building, a painting, or whatever, generates its own questions and approach - has its own history. To consider any example would require a methodological formulation tailored to the perceived issues of the individual work. As well, the framework devised necessarily would reflect the interests of the individual pursuing the question.

The notion of the adoption or application of methodologies is based on the assumption that specific interpretations or approaches to an historical problem can be universalized. The desire to appropriate and universalize models for scholarship, while at times useful, raises questions. As I have discussed above, a problem of scholarship has been the assumption of universals - the application of devised formats to the history of art. Assuming universals - and therefore absolutes - tends to overlook the questions unique to a given work, and a given example can get lost in an imposed construct. As well, such an approach can obscure the role of the interpreter by falsely presenting the scholar as a detached observer - an oracle simply relating the facts.

This is certainly not to contend that there is only one way to deal with any given problem, or that there are right answers or correct approaches. Within the context of this particular study and its aims, however, a move towards simple summation or even broad applications would be

inappropriate. If I must provide any "parting thought," perhaps it would be to highlight the very open-endedness of some of the complex questions posed by the issues presented - questions for which there are no definitive answers or approaches. How can works carry meaning? In what ways do works reference other works, and what can this tell us about attitudes towards the past and the present? What can it mean to be like something else? How is history defined at various times and in various places? How and why do works articulate such views?

Certainly I have made no attempt to provide any definitive answers. Rather, I have interpreted aspects of the problem, from my own vantage point in time and place, through the chosen examples of the issues of Aachen. The very open-endedness of this study should be seen, then, as questioning the need for "closure." In attempting to avoid the pitfalls of "finite" history, I have tried to underscore the non-evolutionary, non-conclusive nature of historical inquiry. I have provided five "case studies" - as separate discussions - that, considered alone or as a group, are intended to generate questions about providing conclusions. While that lack of a closing statement no doubt could be interpreted by some as a fault - as being afraid "to take a stand" - the structure of my study, and the notion of leaving the ramifications of issues raised open, is deliberate and intended as provocative.

Our own recourse to the past can be seen as being limited to its material remains. While the desire to explore the past is understandable, the hope of discovering a "complete" or "accurate" picture is certainly misguided. What makes the past - and its exploration - evocative, interesting, and exciting is its resistance to codification - its constant reformulation.

WORKS CITED

ABBREVIATIONS

MGH Poetae: Monumenta Germaniae Historica Poetae
 MGH SS: Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores
 PL: Patriologia Latinae

INTRODUCTION: The History of Aachen and the Problem of the
 "Copy"

Ackerman, James. "On Judging Art Without Absolutes." Critical Inquiry 5, No. 3 (Spring 1979), 441-469.

Boas, G. "Historical Periods." Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism 11, No. 3 (March 1953), 248-254.

Braudel, F. "La longue durée." Annales 13/4 (October/December 1958), 725-751.

Cantor, Norman F. Inventing the Middle Ages: The Lives, Works and Ideas of the Great Medievalists of the Twentieth Century. New York, 1991.

Cantor, Norman F. "Medieval Historiography as Modern Political and Social Thought." Journal of Contemporary History 3/2 (1968), 55-73.

Chibnall, M. The World of Orderic Vitalis. New York, 1984.

Collingwood, R. G. The Idea of History. Oxford, 1951.

Danto, A. Narration and Knowledge. New York, 1985.

Dodds, J. D. Architecture and Ideology in Early Medieval Spain. University Park, PA. 1990.

Eliade, Mircea. The Myth of the Eternal Return. New York, 1954.

Folz, R. Le Souvenir et la Légende de Charlemagne dans l'Empire germanique médiéval. Paris, 1950.

Freedman, Paul. "Cowardice, Heroism and the Legendary Origins of Catalonia." Past and Present 21 (1988), 3-28.

Gallie, W. B. Philosophy and Historical Understanding. New York, 1964.

Geyl, Peter. Debates with Historians. Groningen/The Hague, 1955.

Guenée, Bernard. Histoire et culture historique dans l'Occident médiéval. Paris, 1980.

Iggers, G. The German Conception of History. The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present. Revised Ed. Middleton, CT., 1983.

Kubler, G. The Shape of Time. Remarks on the History of Things. New Haven, 1962.

Le Goff, J., R. Chartier and J. Revel, Eds. La nouvelle histoire. Paris, 1978.

Le Goff, Jaques. "Merchant's Time and Church's Time in the Middle Ages." In Time, Work and Culture in the Middle Ages. Trans. A. Goldhammer. Chicago, 1980, 29-42.

Lowenthal, David. The Past is a Foreign Country. New York, 1985.

Lovejoy, Aurthur O. "The Discontinuities of Evolution." University of California Publications in Philosophy, XVI (1932-1953), 249-269.

Mink, Louis O. "History and Fiction as Modes of Comprehension." The New Literary History 1 (Spring 1970), 541-558.

Nichols, Stephen. Romanesque Signs. Early Medieval Narrative and Iconography. New Haven, 1983.

Nisbet, Robert. "Genealogy, Growth and Other Metaphors." New Literary History VI (Spring 1970), 351-363.

Nisbet, Robert. Social Change and History, New York, 1969.

Reill, Peter Hans. The German Enlightenment and the Rise of Historicism. Berkeley, 1975.

Scholz, B. W., with B. Rogers, Trans. Carolingian Chronicles Royal Frankish Annals and Nithard's Histories. Ann Arbor, 1972.

Searle, Eleanor. "Fact and Pattern in Heroic History: Dudo of Saint-Quentin." Viator 15 (1984), 119-.

Starobinski, Jean. "The Idea of Nostalgia." Diogenes 54 (1966) 81-103.

Stroll, Avrum. "Linguistic Clusters and the Problem of Universals." Dialecta 27, Nos. 3-4 (1975), 219-259.

Sullivan, Richard E. "The Carolingian Age: Reflections on Its Place in the History of the Middle Ages." Speculum 64/2 (April 1989), 267-306.

Wachtel, Nathan. "Introduction." In Between Memory and History. Eds. M. N. Bourguet, L. Valensi and N. Wachtel. History and Anthropology 2 (1987), 207-224.

Wallace-Hadrill, J. M. "History in the Mind of Archbishop Hincmar." In The Writing of History in the Middle Ages. Essays Presented to Richard William Southern. Ed. R. H. C. Davis and J. M. Wallace-Hadrill. Oxford, 1981, 43-70.

White, Hayden. Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe. Baltimore, 1973.

White, Hayden. Tropics of Discourse. Essays in Cultural Criticism. Baltimore, 1978.

CHAPTER ONE: Constructing a Common Past: Aachen and the Karlsverein, 1814-1914

Archiv für kirchliche Baukunst und Kirchenschmuck 5, No. 7 (1881), 55.

Archiv für kirchliche Baukunst und Kirchenschmuck 7, No. 6 (1883), 47.

Beeck, P. Aquisgranum. 1620.

Beissel, S. "Die Pfalzkapelle Karls des Grossen zu Aachen und ihre Mosaiken." Stimmen aus Maria Laach 60 (1901), 136-153 and 284-297.

Belting, H. "Das Aachener Münster im 19. Jahrhundert. Zur ersten Krise des Denkmal-Konzepts." Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch 45 (1984), 257-289.

Bericht des Vorstandes des Karlsvereins zur Restauration des Aachener Münsters unter dem Allerhöchsten Protectorate Seiner Majestät des Kaisers und Königs. Aachen, 1894, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1904, 1909, 1914.

Bericht des Vorstandes des Karlsvereins zur Wiederherstellung des Aachener Münsters. Aachen, 1938.

Bock, Franz. Das Liebfrauen-Münster zu Aachen in seiner ehemaligen baulichen Entstellung und in seiner theilweise vollzogenen Wiederherstellung. Aachen, 1866.

Bogner, H. Das Arkadenmotiv im Obergeschoß des Aachener Münsters. Strassbourg, 1906.

Buchkremer, J. "Zur Baugeschichte des Aachener Münsters." Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsvereins 22 (1900), 198-271.

Buse, D. K. German Nationalism. New York, 1985.

Ciampini, Ioannis. Vetera monumenta. Rome, 1699.

Correspondenzblatt des Gesant-Vereins der deutschen Geschichts- und Alterthums-Verein 20, No. 12 (December 1872), 100.

Debey, M. Die Münsterkirche zu Aachen und ihre Wiederherstellung. Aachen, 1851.

Eickenroht, M. "The Kaffee-Kirche at Fredricksburg, Texas, 1846." Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 25 (1966), 60-63.

Evans, Richard J. Rethinking German History: Nineteenth-Century Germany and the Origins of the Third Reich. Boston, 1987.

Faymonville, Karl. Der Dom zu Aachen und seine liturgische Ausstattung vom 9. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert. Munich, 1909.

Faymonville, Karl., Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Aachen: Das Münster zu Aachen. Vol 10/1. Die Kunstdenkmäler der Rheinprovinz. Ed. P. Clemens. Düsseldorf, 1916.

Faymonville, K. Zur Kritik der Restauration des Aachener Münsters. Beschreibende Darstellung der ältesten Abbildung seines Innern. Aachen, 1904.

Gooch, George P. History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century. 2nd Ed. Boston, 1959.

Grabar, A. Martyrium. Paris, 1943-1946.

Grundmann, H. Monumenta Germaniae Historica. 1819-1960. Munich, 1969.

Heitz, C. L'architecture religieuse carolingienne. Les formes et leurs fonctions. Paris, 1980.

Iggers, Georg G. The German Conception of History. The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present. Revised Ed. Middleton, CT., 1983.

Jungbluth, Franz. Die Restauration des Aachener Münsters bis zur Hälfte des Jahres 1862. Aachen, 1862.

Jungbluth, Franz. Jahrbücher des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande 11 (1847), 151-154.

Jungbluth, Franz, Kölner Domblatt No. 28 (April 25, 1847).

Karlsverein zur Restauration des Aachener Münsters (unter dem Allerhöchsten Protectorate Seiner Majestät des Kaisers und Königs). Aachen, 1893.

Karlsverein zur Wiederherstellung des Aachener Munsters. Aachen, 1901.

Kerssen, L. Das Interesse im Mittelalter im deutschen Nationaldenkmal. Berlin, 1975.

Knowles, Dom David. Great Historical Enterprises. Problems in Monastic History. New York, 1963.

Kohn, H. The Age of Nationalism. New York, 1968.

Kohn, H., Ed. German History: Some New German Ideas. Boston, 1954.

Kohn, H. The Idea of Nationalism. New York, 1961.

Kohn, H. The Mind of Germany. New York, 1960.

Kubach, H. and A. Verbeek. Romanische Baukunst an Rhein und Maas. Katalog der vorromanischen und romanischen Denkmäler. Vol. 1. Berlin, 1976.

Lepper, H. "'Rettet das, Deutsche Volksheligthum.' Die Gründung des Karlsverein zur Restauration des Aachener Münsters, 1847-1850." Karlsverein zur Wiederherstellung des Aachener Domes (1986-87).

Lermen, B. and D. Wynands. Die Aachenfahrt in Geschichte und Literatur. Aachen, 1986.

Lowenthal, David. The Past is a Foreign Country. New York, 1985.

Mertens, Franz. "Ueber die karolingische Kaiser-Kapelle zu Aachen." Allgemeine Bauzeitung 5 (1840), 135-52.

Nipperdey, T. "Der Kölner Dom als Nationaldenkmal." Historische Zeitschrift 233 (1981), 595-613.

Nipperdey, T. "Kirchen als Nationaldenkmal. Die Pläne von 1815." In Festschrift für Otto von Simson zum 65. Geburtstag. Eds. L. Grisebach and K. Renger. Frankfurt, 1977, 412-431.

Nipperdey, T. "Kirchen und Nationaldenkmal. Der Kölner Dom in den 40^{er} Jahren." In Stadt und Gessellschaft im politischen Wandel. Beiträge zur Geschichte der modernen Welt. Ed. W. Pöls. Stuttgart, 1979, 175-202.

Nipperdey, T. "Nationalidee und Nationaldenkmal in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert." In Gessellschaft, Kultur, Theorie. Gesammelte Aufsätze. Göttingen, 1976.

Nöggerrath, J. "Die antiken Säulen im Aachener Münster." Niederrheinisches Jahrbuch für Geschichte, Kunst und Poesie von L. Lersch. Bonn, 1843, 193-208.

Noppius, J. Aachener Chronick. Cologne, 1632.

Prisac, W. "Das radikale Kunstenthussiasmus in der neuern kunstgeschichtlichen Kritik und die Forderungen des Lebens." Echo der Gegenwart 13 March 1866, No. 72; 14 March 1866, No. 73; 15 March 1866, No. 74.

Reichensperger, A. "Die Ausschmückung der Palastkapelle Karls des Grossen in Aachen betreffend." Archiv für kirchliche Baukunst und Kirchenschmuck. 5, No. 3 (1881), 18-19.

Reill, Peter Hans. The German Enlightenment and the Rise of Historicism. Berkeley, 1975.

Review of Die Münsterkirche zu Aachen und ihre Wiederherstellung, by M. Debey. Kölner Domblatt No. 72 (February 2, 1851), n.p.

Rhein und Maas. Kunst und Kultur 800-1400. Schnütgen-Museum. Cologne, 1972.

Rhoen, C. "Die Kapelle der karolingischen Pflaz zu Aachen." Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsvereins 8 (1886), 15-96.

Salomon, G. Das Mittelalter als Ideal in der Romanik. Munich, 1922.

Savelsberg. Review of Die Münsterkirche zu Aachen und ihre Wiederherstellung, by M. Debey. Jahrbücher des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande 16 (1851), 136-139.

Schiffers, H. Kulturgeschichte der Aachener Heiligtumsfahrt. Cologne, 1930.

Schild, I. "Die Baumeister am Aachener Dom." Karlsverein zur Wiederherstellung des Aachener Domes. Bericht (August 1983).

Schnitzler, H. "Das Kuppelmosaik der Aachener Pfalzkapelle." Aachener Kunstblätter 29 (1964), 17-44.

Schöne, W. "Die kunstlerische und liturgische Gestalt der Pfalzkapelle Karls des Grossen in Aachen." Zeitschrift für Kunstwissenschaft 15 (1961), 97-148.

Schrade, H. Das deutsche Nationaldenkmal. Munich, 1934.

Schrade, H. "Zum Kuppelmosaik der Pfalzkapelle und zum Theoderich-Denkmal in Aachen." Aachener Kunstblätter 30 (1965), 25-37.

Siebt, G. "Eine Epoche ohne Humanismus? Nähe und Ferne des Mittelalters im Spiegel von Mode und Wissenschaft." Merkur 12 (December 1988), 1062-1067.

Snyder, L. The Roots of German Nationalism. Bloomington, 1978.

Starobinski, Jean. "The Idea of Nostalgia." Diogenes 54 (1966) 81-103.

Stephany, E., "Unbekannte Bilder des Inneren des Aachener Domes." In Vom Bauen, Bilden und Bewahren. Festschrift Willy Weyres. Eds. J. Hoster and A. Mann. Cologne, 1964, 149-164.

Strzygowski, J. Der Dom zu Aachen und seine Entstellung. Ein Protest. Leipzig, 1904.

CHAPTER TWO: Putting the Past in Order: The Scholarly Image of Aachen and Its Place in the History of Architecture

aus'm Weerth, E. Kunstdenkmäler des christlichen Mittelalters in den Rheinlanden. 3 Vols. Leipzig, 1857-1868.

Bandmann, G. "Die Vorbilder der Aachener Pflazkapelle." In Karl der Grosse. Vol. 3. Karolingische Kunst. Ed. W. Braunfels and H. Schnitzler. Düsseldorf, 1965, 424-462.

Bandmann, G. "Ikonologie der Architektur." Jahrbuch für Aesthetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft 1 (1951), 67-109.

Bandmann, G. Mittelalterliche Architektur als Bedeutungsträger. 9th Ed. Berlin, 1990.

Bergner, H. Handbuch der kirchlichen Kunstaltertümer in Deutschland. Leipzig, 1905.

Bernard, H. "Les fouilles de Saint-Riquier." Bulletin de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France (1962), 203-205.

Biehn, H. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Zentralbaues bis zum Jahre 1500. Worms, 1933.

Boeckelmann, W. "Von den Ursprungen der Aachener Pfalzkapelle." Wallraf-Richarz Jahrbuch 19 (1957), 9-13.

Bogner, H. Das Arkadenmotiv im Obergeschoß des Aachener Münsters und seine Vorgänger. Strassbourg, 1906.

Bogner, H. "Der Altarraum in der Aachener Pfalzkapelle und seine Beziehung zur Baukunst der Vorzeit." Die christliche Kunst 4, No. 8 (May 1908), 177-190.

Bogner, H. "Die Bautradition bezüglich der karolingischen Bauannexe der Aachener Pfalzkapelle." Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft.

Bogner, H. "Die Bedeutung des Aachener Oktogons als Zentralbau." Archiv für christliche Kunst Nrs. 1 and 2 (1906), 1-4 and 17-19.

Bogner, H. Die Grundrissdisposition der Aachen Pfalzkapelle und ihre Vorgänger. Strassbourg, 1906 (Studien zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte 73).

Bogner, H. "Drei Fragen über das karolingische Münster zu Aachen. 2. Gibt es ein direktes Vorbild für das karolingische Münster zu Aachen?" Der Kunstfreund 11 (1908), 198-203.

Bogner, H. "Drei Fragen über das karolingische Münster zu Aachen. 1. Ist die Aachener Pfalzkapelle durchweg ein Werk Karls des Großen?" Der Kunstfreund 10 (1908), 188-190.

Bogner, H. "Drei Fragen über das karolingische Münster zu Aachen. 3. Wo finden sich Vorbilder für die an der Aachener Pfalzkapelle noch erhaltenen Motive?" Der Kunstfreund 12 (1908), 241-248.

Bogner, H. "Über die Emporen in christlichen Kirchen der ersten acht Jahrhunderte." Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst No. 4 (1906), 109-118.

Branner, R. Review of Mittelalterliche Architektur als Bedeutungsträger, by G. Bandmann. Art Bulletin 35 (1953), 307-310.

Buchkremer, J. "Die Seele der Aachener Pfalzkapelle Karls des Grossen." Zentralblatt der Bauverwaltung 60, No. 13 (27 March 1940), 191-199.

Contreni, John J. "The Carolingian Renaissance." In Renaissances before the Renaissance: Cultural Revivals of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Ed. W. Treadgold. Stanford, 1984, 59-74.

Crossley, P. "Medieval Architecture and Meaning: the Limits of Iconography." The Burlington Magazine 130, No. 1019 (February 1988), 116-121.

Dehio, G. and G. von Bezold. Die kirchliche Baukunst des Abendlandes. Text Vols. I and II. Atlas Vols. I, II and III. Stuttgart, 1884-1892.

Dehio, G. Geschichte der deutschen Kunst. Vol. 1. 3rd. Ed. Berlin, Leipzig, 1923.

Dohme, R. Geschichte der deutschen Baukunst. Berlin, 1887.

Effmann, W. Centula. Saint Riquier. Eine Untersuchung zur Geschichte der kirchlichen Baukunst in der karolingischen Zeit. 2 Vols. Münster, 1912.

Falkenstein, L. Der "Lateran" der karolingischen Pfalz zu Aachen. Cologne, 1966.

Fichtenau, H. "Byzance und die Pfalz zu Aachen." Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 59 (1951), 1-54.

Förster, E. Denkmale deutscher Kunst von Einführung des Christenthums bis auf die neueste Zeit. Vols. 1-12. Leipzig, 1855-.

Francastel, P. L'histoire de l'art, instrument de la propagande germanique. Paris, 1945.

Grabar, A. Martyrium. Paris, 1943-1946.

Gradmann, E. Geschichte der christlichen Kunst. Stuttgart, 1902.

Grodecki, L. Au seuil de l'art roman. L'architecture ottonienne. Paris, 1958.

Heitz, C. L'architecture religieuse carolingienne. Les formes et leurs fonctions. Paris, 1980.

Humann, G. "Der Zentralbau zu Mettlach und die von der Aachener Pfalzkapelle beeinflussten Bauten." Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst 31 (1918), 81-94.

Humann, G. Zur Geschichte der karolingischen Baukunst. Strassburg, 1909 (Studien zur deutschen Geschichte 120).

Iggers, Georg G. The German Conception of History. The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present. Revised Ed. Middleton, CT., 1983.

Jantzen, H. Geist und Schicksal der deutschen Kunst. Cologne, 1935.

Jantzen, Hans. Ottonische Kunst. Munich, 1947.

Kallenbach, G. and J. Schmitt. Die christliche Kirchen-Baukunst des Abendlandes von ihren Anfängen bis zur vollendeten Durchbildung des Spitzbogen-Styls. Halle, 1850.

Karl der Grosse. Werk und Wirkung. Aachen, 1965.

Kinkel, G. Geschichte der bildenen Künste bei den christlichen Volkern, vom Anfang unserer Zeitrechnung bis zur Gegenwart. Bonn, 1845.

Klapeck, R. Carls des Grossen Pfalzkapelle zu Aachen. Die Genesis ihrer Grundrissdisposition. Diss., Bonn, 1909.

Kleinbauer, E. "Charlemagne's Palace Chapel at Aachen and Its Copies." Gesta 4 (Spring 1965), 2-11.

Kraus, F. X. Geschichte der christlichen Kunst. Freiburg, 1897.

Krautheimer, R. "The Carolingian Revival of Early Christian Architecture." Art Bulletin (1942), 1-38.

- Krautheimer, R. "Introduction to an 'Iconography of Medieval Architecture.'" Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 5 (1942), 1-33.
- Krautheimer, R. "Sancta Maria Rotunda." In Studies in Early Christian, Medieval and Renaissance Art. New York, 1969, 107-114.
- Kreusch, F. "Das Mass des Engels." In Vom Bauen, Bilden und Bewahren: Festschrift für Willy Weyres. Cologne, 1964, 61-82.
- Kubach, H. and A. Verbeek. Romanische Baukunst an Rhein und Maas: Katalogue der vorromanischen und romanischen Denkmäler. 2 Vols. Berlin, 1976.
- Kugler, F. Geschichte der Baukunst. Stuttgart, 1856.
- Kugler, F. Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte. Stuttgart, 1842.
- Kugler, F. Kleine Schriften zur Kunstgeschichte. Vol. III. Stuttgart, 1854.
- Kulturmann, U. Geschichte der Kunstgeschichte. Der Weg einer Wissenschaft. Düsseldorf, 1966.
- Lehmann, E. "Die Architektur zur Zeit Karls des Grossen." In Karl der Grosse. Vol. 3. Karolingische Kunst. Eds. W. Braunsfels and H. Schnitzler. Düsseldorf, 1965, 301-319.
- Lehmann, E. Die frühe deutsche Kirchenbau. Die Entwicklung seiner Raumanordnung bis 1080. 2nd Ed. 2. Vols. Berlin, 1949.
- Lübke, W. Geschichte der Architektur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart. Leipzig, 1855.
- Male, E. "L'église d'Aix-la-Chapelle et son influence dans la vallée du Rhin." Memoires de la Société National des Antiquaires de France 83, 9th series, 3 (1959), 127-129.
- Mertens, F. "Ueber die Karolingische Kaiser-Kapelle zu Aachen." Allgemeine Bauzeitung 5 (1840), 135-152.
- Ostendorf, F. Die Deutsche Baukunst im Mittelalter. Vol. 1. Differenzierung der Bautypen. Berlin, 1922.
- Panofsky, E. Renaissance and Resuscitations in Western Art. New York, 1972.

- Podro, M. The Critical Historians of Art. New Haven, 1982.
- Rahn, J. R. Ueber den Ursprung und die Entwicklung des christlichen Central- und Kuppelbaues. Leipzig, 1866.
- Ramackers, J. "Das Grab Karls des Großen und die Frage nach dem Ursprung des Aachener Oktogons." Historisches Jahrbuch 75 (1955), 121-153.
- Reill, Peter Hans. The German Enlightenment and the Rise of Historicism. Berkeley, 1975.
- Ringer, F. The Decline of the German Mandarins. Cambridge, MA., 1969.
- Schild, I. "Die Dombaumeister am Aachener Dom." Karlsverein zur Wiederherstellung des Aachener Domes. Bericht (August 1983).
- Schlag, G. "Der Zentrale Mehreckbau in der Baukunst der deutschen Kaiserzeit." Elsaß-Lothringisches Jahrbuch 21 (1943), 62-80.
- Schnaase, C. Geschichte der bildenen Künste im Mittelalter. Düsseldorf, 1843.
- Schöne, W. "Die kunstlerische und liturgische Gestalt der Pfalzkapelle Karls des Grossen in Aachen." Zeitschrift für Kunstwissenschaft. 15 (1961), 97-148.
- Sieffert, G. "Les imitations de la chapelle palatine de Charlemagne à Aix-la-Chapelle." Cahiers de l'art médiéval 5, fasc. 2 (1968-69), 29-70.
- Sieffert, G. "Ottmarsheim." Congrès archéologique 136 (1978).
- Springer, A. H. Die Baukunst des christlichen Mittelalters. 1854.
- Stange, A. "Arteigene und Artfremde Züge in deutschen Kirchengrundriss." Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft 2 (1935), 229-252.
- Stieglitz, C. L. Von altdeutscher Baukunst. Leipzig, 1820.
- Unger. "Ueber die christlichen Rund- und Octogon-Bauten." Jahrbücher des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande 41 (1866), 25-42.

van Agt, H. "Die Nikolauskapelle auf dem Valkhof in Nymegen." In Karolingische und Ottonische Kunst. Werden. Wesen. Wirkung. Internationaler Kongress für Frühmittelalterlichenforschung 1954. Wiesbaden, 1957, 179-192.

Verbeek, A. "Die architektonische Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle." In Karl der Grosse. Vol. 4. Das Nachleben. Eds. W. Braunfels and P. Schramm. Düsseldorf, 1967, 113-156.

Verbeek, A. "Zentralbauten in der Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle." In Das Erste Jahrtausend. Vol. II. Ed. V. Elbern. Düsseldorf, 1964, 898-947.

Waetzoldt, W. Deutsche Kunsthistoriker. Vol. 2. Von Passavant bis Justi, 1965.

Wharton, A. J. "Rereading Martyrium: The Modernist and Postmodernist Texts." Gesta XXIX/1 (1990), 3-7.

CHAPTER THREE. Rewriting the Past: Aachen, Germigny-des-Prés
and Letaldus of Micy

Abbo of Fleury. Apoligeticus, PL 139, 469.

Abbo of Fleury. Epistolae, PL 139, 438.

Aigrain, René. L'hagiographie. Ses sources. Ses méthodes. Son histoire. Poitiers, 1953.

Arnauld, P. Bulletin de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France (1903), 270-277 and (1904), 220-227.

Bachrach, Bernard S. "Robert of Blois, Abbot of Saint-Florent de Saumur and Saint-Mesmin de Micy (985-1011). A Study in Small Power Politics." Revue bénédictine 88 (1978), 123-146.

Banchereau, M. J. "La chapelle Saint-Mesmin." Congrès archéologique 93 (1930), 271-277.

Barral i Altet, X. "Le decor des monuments religieux de Neustrie." In La Neustrie. Les pays au nord de la Loire de 650 à 850. Colloque historique international. Vol. 2. Ed. H. Atsma. Sigmaringen, 1988, 212-216.

Bauchy, J.-H. "L'assemblée royale de Germigny-des-Prés en Septembre 843 et sa portée politique." In Études ligériennes d'histoire et d'archéologie médiévales. Ed. R. Louis. Paris/Auxerre, 1975, 19-24.

Bauchy, J. H. "Aspects de la Renaissance carolingienne en Orléanais." In Histoire religieuse de l'Orléanais. Ed. G.-M. Oury. 54-70.

Bautier, R.-H. "La place de l'abbaye de Fleury-sur-Loire dans l'historiographie française du IXe au XIIe siècle." In Études ligériennes d'histoire et d'archéologie médiévales. Ed. R. Louis. Paris/Auxerre, 1975, 25-33.

Bloch, Peter. "Das Apsismosaik von Germigny-des-Prés. Karl der Grosse und der Alte Bund." In Karl der Grosse. Vol. III, Karolingische Kunst. Eds. W. Braunfels and H. Schnitzler. Düsseldorf (1965), 234-261.

Bouet, G. "Germigny-des-Prés." Bulletin monumental 34 (1868), 569-588.

Boussard, J. "Les évêques en Neustrie avant la réforme grégorienne (950-1050 environ)." Journal des savantes (July/September 1970), 161-196.

Boyer, R. "An Attempt to Define the Typology of Medieval Hagiography." In Hagiography and Medieval Literature. A Symposium. Eds. H. Bekker-Nielsen, P. Foote, J. H. Jorgensen and T. Nyberg. Odensee, 1981, 27-36.

Cazelles, Brigitte. "Introduction." In Images of Sainthood in Medieval Europe. Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Timea Szell, Eds. Ithaca, 1991, 1-17.

Chenesseau, G. L'abbaye de Fleury à Saint-Benoit-sur-Loire. Son histoire - ses institutions - ses édifices. Paris, 1931.

Clemen, Paul Die romanische Monumentalmalerei in den Rheinlanden. Düsseldorf, 1916.

Conant, K. J. Carolingian and Romanesque Architecture 800-1200. New York, 1975.

Cousin, Dom Patrice, Abbon de Fleury-sur-Loire. Paris, 1954.

Cuissard, C. "Theodulphe, Évêque d'Orléans. Sa vie et ses oeuvres." Memoires de la Société Archéologique et Historique de l'Orléanais 24 (1892).

—

- de Certain, E. "Arnoul, évêque d'Orléans." Bibliothèque de l'école des Chartes 14 (1952/53), 425-463.
- de Certain, E. Les miracles de St. Benoit. Paris, 1858.
- de Gaiffier, Baudouin. Études critiques d'hagiographie et d'iconologie. Brussels, 1967.
- de Gaiffier, Baudouin. "Hagiographie et historiographie. Quelques aspects du problème." Settimane di studi del Centro Italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo 1969. La Storiografia altomedievale XVII/1 (1970), 139-166.
- Dehal, J. and J.-M. Berland, "La ville, des origines au X^e siècle." In Histoire d'Orléans et de son terroir. Vol. 1. Des origines a la fin du XVI^e siècle. 1983.
- Delehaye, H. The Legends of the Saints. 3rd. Ed. Trans. D. Attwater. New York, 1962.
- Donnat, L. "Recherches sur l'influence de Fleury au X^e siècle." In Études ligériennes d'histoire et d'archéologie médiévales. Ed. R. Louis. Paris/Auxerre, 1975, 165-174.
- du Challais. "Note sur la chapelle St.-Mesmin, près D'Orléans." Bulletin monumental 3 (1837), 175-180.
- Einhard and Notker the Stammerer. Two Lives of Charlemagne. Ed. and Trans. L. Thorpe. New York, 1969.
- Ehlers, J. "Karolingische Tradition und Frühes Nationalbewußtsein in Frankreich." Francia 4 (1976), 213-235.
- Elliott, A. G. Roads to Paradise: Reading the Lives of the Early Saints. Hanover, N.H., 1987.
- Falkenstein, L. Der "Lateran" der karolingischen Pfalz zu Aachen. Cologne, 1966.
- Focillon, Henri. The Art of the West. Vol. 1. Romanesque Art. Trans. D. King. London, 1963.
- Freeman, A. "Theodulf of Orleans and the Libri Carolini." Speculum 32 (October 1957), 663-705.
- Grabar, A. "Les mosaïques de Germigny-des-Prés." Cahiers archéologiques 7 (1954), 171-183.

Guerreau-Jalabert, A. Abbo Floriacensis, Quaestiones grammaticales. Paris, 1982.

Hallinger, K. Gorze-Kluny. Studien zu den monastischen Lebensformen und Gegensätzen im Hochmittelalter. 2 Vols. Rome, 1951.

Halphen, L. and F. Lot. Recueil des actes de Lothaire et de Louis V Rois de France (954-987). Paris, 1907.

Haureau, B. Histoire littéraire du Maine 7 (1874), 188-200.

Heitz, C. L'architecture religieuse carolingienne. Les formes et leurs fonctions. Paris, 1980.

Histoire littéraire de la France. Vol. 6. Paris, 1742.

Hubert, Jean, "Germigny-des-Prés." Congrès archéologique de France 93 (1930), 534-568.

Humann, G. "Der Zentralbau zu Mettlach und die von der Aachener Pfalzkapelle beeinflussten Bauten." Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst 31 (1918), 81-94.

Jarossay, Abbe Eugène. Histoire de l'abbaye de Micy-Saint-Mesmin lez-Orléans (502-1790). Son influence religieuse et sociale. Paris/Orleans, 1902.

Jouvellier, P. "Les fragments décoratifs carolingiens de Germigny-des-Prés conservés au Musée historique d l'Orléanais." In Études ligériennes d'histoire et d'archéologie médiévales. Ed. R. Louis. Paris/Auxerre (1975) 432-435.

Khatchatrian, A. "Notes sur l'architecture de l'église de Germigny-des-Prés." Cahiers archéologiques 7 (1954), 161-172.

Kleinbauer, E. "Charlemagne's Palace Chapel at Aachen and Its Copies." Gesta 4 (Spring 1965), 2-11.

Krautheimer, R. "Introduction to an 'Iconography of Mediaeval Architecture.'" Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 5 (1942), 1-33.

La Neustrie. Les pays au nord de la Loire de Dagobert à Charles le Chauve (vii^e-ix^e siècles). Eds. P. Périn and L-C. Feffer. Rouen, 1985.

Lattin, H. P. The Letters of Gerbert. New York 1961.

Le Goff, J. "Ecclesiastical Culture and Folklore in the Middle Ages: Saint Marcellus of Paris and the Dragon." In Time, Work and Culture in the Middle Ages. Trans. A. Goldhammer. Chicago, 1980, 159-188.

Leclercq, H. "Micy-Saint-Mesmin." In Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie. Vol. 11. Paris, 1933, 912-927.

Ledru, A. "Origine de Lethald, Moine de Micy (fin du X^e siècle)." La Province du Maine 16 (1908) 326-328.

Lévy-Bruhl, Henri. Études sur les élections abbatiales en France jusqu'à la fin du règne de Charles le Chauve. Paris, 1913.

Liebeschütz, H. "Theodulf of Orleans and the Problem of the Carolingian Renaissance." In Fritz Saxl (1890-1948): A Volume of Memorial Essays from his Friends in England. Ed. D. J. Gordon. New York, 1957, 87-91.

Lot, F. Les derniers carolingiens. Paris, 1891 (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes LXXXVII).

Lot, F. Études sur le règne de Hugues Capet et la fin du X^e siècle. Paris, 1903.

Louis, R. "L'église de Germigny-des-Prés." In Études ligériennes d'histoire et d'archéologie médiévales. Ed. R. Louis. Paris/Auxerre, 1975, 419-431.

Lutz, Cora E., "Letaldus, a Wit of the Tenth Century." Viator, 1 (1970), 97-106.

Maines, Clark. "Good Works, Social Ties, and the Hope of Salvation: Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis." In Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis. A Symposium. Ed. P. Gerson. New York, 1986, 76-94.

Manitius, M. Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters. Munich, 1923.

McKitterick, R. The Frankish Kingdoms Under the Carolingians, 751-987. New York, 1983.

Mérimée, Prosper. "Église de Germigny (Loiret)." Revue générale de l'architecture et des travaux publics 8 (1849-50), 113-118.

Mostert, M. "Die Urkundenfälschungen Abbos von Fleury." In Fälschungen im Mittelalter. Internationaler Kongress der Monumenta Germaniae Historica Muenchen, 16.-19. September 1986. Teil IV. Diplomatische Fälschungen (II). Hannover, 1988, 287-318 (MGH Schriften 33, Pt. 4).

Mostert, M. "Le séjour d'Abbon de Fleury à Ramsey." Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 144 (1986), 199-208.

Mostert, M. The Library of Fleury: A Provisional List of Manuscripts. Hilversum, 1989.

Mostert, M. The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury. A Study of the Ideas about Society and Law of the Tenth-Century Monastic Reform Movement. Hilversum, 1987.

Mütherich, F. and J. E. Gaehde. Carolingian Painting. New York, 1976.

Nees, L. A Tainted Mantel: Hercules and the Classical Tradition at the Carolingian Court. Philadelphia, 1991.

Nichols, Stephen. Romanesque Signs: Early Medieval Narrative and Iconography. New Haven, 1983.

Poncelet, A., "La Bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Micy au IX^e et au X^e siècle," Analecta Bollandiana 23/1 (1904), 76-84.

Poncelet, A., "Les Saints de Micy." Analecta Bollandiana 24/1 (1905), 5-104.

Porcher, J. "La peinture provinciale." In Karl der Grosse. Vol. III. Karolingische Kunst. Ed. W. Braunfels and H. Schnitzler. Düsseldorf, 1965, 63-73.

Poulin, Joseph-Claude. L'idéal de sainteté dans l'Aquitaine carolingienne d'après les sources hagiographiques (750-950). Quebec, 1975.

Prevost, Abbé. La basilique de Theodulfe et la paroisse de Germigny-des-Près. Orleans, 1889.

Prou, M. and A. Vidier. Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de St.-Benoit-sur-Loire. 2 Vols. Paris/Orleans, 1900.

Riché, P. "La 'Renaissance' intellectuelle du X^e siècle en Occident." Cahiers d'histoire 21 (1976), 27-42.

Riché, P., Ed. x^{eme} siècle. Recherches nouvelles, Paris, 1987 (Centre de Recherches sur l'Antiquité tardive et le Haut Moyen Age).

Sieffert, G. "Les imitations de la chapelle palatine de Charlemagne à Aix-la-Chapelle." Cahiers de l'art médiéval 5, fasc. 2 (1968-69), 29-70.

Soyer, Jaques. "Les inscriptions gravées sur les piliers de l'église carolingienne de Germigny-des-Prés sont-elles authentiques?" Bulletin archéologique 1923, 201-208.

Strzygowski, J. Die Baukunst der Armenier und Europa. Vol II. Vienna, 1918.

Tessier, G. Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve Roi de France. Vol. I. Paris, 1943.

van de Vyver, A. "Les oeuvres inédites d'Abbon de Fleury." Revue bénédictine 47 (1935), 125-169.

Vauchez, A. La sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du moyen age (d'après les procès canonisation et les documents hagiographiques). Paris, 1981.

Verbeek A. "Die architektonische Nachfolge der Aachener Pflazkapelle." In Karl der Grosse. Vol. 4. Das Nachleben. Eds. W. Braunfels and P. Schramm. Düsseldorf, 1967, 113-156.

Verbeek, A. "Zentralbauten in der Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle." In Das Erste Jahrtausend. Vol. II. Ed. V. Elbern. Düsseldorf, 1964, 898-947.

Vergnolle, E. Saint-Benoit-sur-Loire et la sculpture du XI^e siècle. Paris, 1985.

Vidier, A., L'historiographie à Saint-Benoit-sur-Loire et les Miracles de Saint Benoit. Paris, 1965.

Vie de Gauzlin, Abbé de Fleury (Vita Gauzlini Abbatis Florieensis monasterii). Ed. and Trans. R.-H. Bautier and G. Labory. Paris, 1969.

Vie de Robert le Pieux. Epitoma Vitae Regis Rotberti Pii. Ed. and Trans. R.-H. Bautier and G. Labory. Paris, 1965.

Vieillard-Troiekourov, May. "À propos de Germigny-des-Prés." Cahiers archéologiques 13 (1962), 267-268.

Vieillard-Troiekouroff, May. "Germigny-des-Prés, l'oratoire privé de l'Abbé Theodulphe." Dossiers de l'archéologie 30 (Sept./Oct. 1978), 40-49.

Viellard-Troiekouroff, May. "L'architecture en France du temps de Charlemagne." In Karl der Grosse. Vol. III. Karolingische Kunst. Ed. W. Braunfels and H. Schnitzler. Düsseldorf, 1965, 336-368.

Vieillard-Troiekouroff, May. "Les bibles de Theodulfe et leur décor aniconique." Études ligériennes d'histoire et d'archéologie médiévales. Ed. R. Louis. Paris/Auxerre, 1975, 345-360.

Vieillard-Troiekouroff, May. "Nouvelles études sur les mosaïques de Germigny-des-Prés." Cahiers archéologiques 17 (1967), 103-112.

Vieillard-Troiekouroff, May. "Tables de canons et stucs carolingiens, Le décor architectural et aniconique des bibles de Theodulphe et celui de l'église de Germigny-des-Prés." In Stucchi e mosaici alto medioevali. Atti dell'ottavo Congresso di studi sull'arte dell'alto Medioevo. Vol. I. Milan, 1962, 154-178.

von Schlosser, J. Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der karolingischen Kunst. Vienna (1892).

Watkinson, B. "Lorsch, Jouarre et l'appareil décoratif du Val de Loire." Cahiers de civilisation médiévale XXXIII (1990), 49-63.

Ziolkowski, Jan, "Folklore and Learned Lore in Letaldus' Whale Poem," Viator 15 (1984), 107-118.

Zoepf, L. Das Heiligen-Leben im 10. Jahrhundert. Leipzig/Berlin, 1908.

CHAPTER FOUR. Sacred Topography and Universal History:
Aachen, Liège, Jerusalem

Anselmi Gesta episcoporum Tungrensium, Traiectensium et Leodiensium. MGH SS VII, 189-234.

Armstrong, G. T. "Constantine's Churches: Symbol and Structure." Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 33 (1974), 15-16.

Bloch, R. Howard. Review of Romanesque Signs: Early Medieval Narrative and Iconography, by S. Nichols. Speculum 59/2 (1984), 421-425.

Bonvier, F. L'église Saint-Jean l'Evangeliste à Liège. Liège, 1959.

Bredero, Adrian H. "Jérusalem dans l'Occident médiéval." In Mélanges offerts à René Crozet. Vol. 1. Ed. P. Gallais and Y.-J. Rion. Poitiers, 1966, 259-271.

Bréhier, L. "Charlemagne et la Palestine." Revue historique 157 (January-April 1928), 277-291.

Bréhier, L. "La situation des chrétiens de Palestine a la fin du VIII^e siècle et établissement du Protectorat de Charlemagne." Le Moyen Age 21 (2nd Ser.) (30 of whole) (January-June 1919), 67-75.

Bréhier, L. L'église et l'Orient au Moyen Age. Les Croisades. 4th Ed. Paris, 1921.

Bresc-Bautier, G. "Les imitations du Saint-Sepulchre de Jerusalem (IX^e-XV^e siècles)." Revue de l'histoire de la spiritualité 50 (1974), 319-42.

Clemen, P. "Die Porträtdarstellung Karls des Grossen." Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsvereins 11 (1889), 184-271 and 12 (1890), 1-147.

Collon-Gevaert, S. "Notger de Liège et Saint Bernward de Hildesheim: À propos d'un ivoire et d'une miniature." In Studien zur Buchmalerei und Goldschmiedekunst des Mittelalters. Festschrift für Karl Hermann Usener zum 60. Geburtstag am 19. August 1965. Eds. F. Dettweiler, H. Köllner and P. A. Riedl. Marburg an der Lahn, 1967, 27-32.

Coüasnon, Charles. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1972. London, 1974.

Dalman, G. Das Grab Christi in Deutschland. Leipzig, 1922 (Studien über christliche Denkmäler 14).

de Gaiffier, Baudouin. "La légende de Charlemagne. Le péché de l'empereur et son pardon." In Études Critiques d'hagiographie et d'iconologie. Brussels, 1967, 260-275.

de Saumery. Les delices du pais de Liège ou description des monuments sacrés et profanes. Liège, 1738.

Deckers, J. "La fondation de la collégiale Saint-Jean l'Évangéliste à Liège." In Millénaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège. Exposition d'art et d'histoire. Ministère de la Communauté française, Ed. Liège, 1982, 13-16.

Deckers, J. "Les Vitae Notgeri: sources d'histoire de la collégiale Saint-Jean l'Évangéliste à Liège." In Millénaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège. Exposition d'art et d'histoire. Ministère de la Communauté française, Ed. Liège, 1982, 19-20.

Deckers, J. "Les Vitae Notgeri: une source capitale pour l'histoire de la collégiale Saint-Jean l'Évangéliste à Liège." In La collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège. Mille ans d'art et d'histoire. Ed. J. Deckers. Brussels, 1981, 21-28.

Deckers, J. "Notger et la fondation de la collégiale Saint-Jean l'Évangéliste à Liège." In La collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège. Mille ans d'art et d'histoire. Ed. J. Deckers. Brussels, 1981, 13-16.

Dereine, C. "Clercs et moines au diocèse de Liège au X^e au XII^e siècle." Annales de la Société Archéologique de Namur 45 (1949), 183-203.

Dereine, C. Les chanoines réguliers au diocèse de Liège avant Saint Norbert. Brussels, 1952 (Classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques. Mémoires, XLVII, fasc. 1).

Dodds, J. D. "Terror of the Year 1000: Architectural Historians Face the Millenium." Design Book Review 20 (Spring 1991), 37-38.

Einhard and Notker the Stammerer. Two Lives of Charlemagne. Ed. and Trans. L. Thorpe. New York, 1969.

Eliade, Mircea. The Myth of the Eternal Return. New York, 1954.

Esmeijer, Anna C. Divina Quaternitas. A Preliminary Study in the Method and Application of Visual Exegesis. Amsterdam, 1978.

Exposition de l'art ancien au pays de Liège. Liège, 1924.

Folcuini Gesta abbatum Lobiensium. MGH SS IV, 52-74.

Folz, R. Le Souvenir et la Légende de Charlemagne dans l'Empire germanique médiéval. Paris, 1950.

Forgeur, R. L'église Saint-Jean l'Évangéliste à Liège. Liège, 1967.

Gardelles, J. "Recherches sur les origines des façades à étages d'arcatures des églises médiévales." Bulletin monumental 136 (1978), 113-133.

Genicot, L.-F. "L'église romane de Notger et l'avant-corps." In Millénaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège. Exposition d'art et d'histoire. Ministère de la Communauté française, Ed. Liège, 1982, 43-58.

Genicot, L.-F. Les églises mosanes du XI^e siècle. Louvain, 1972.

Gobert, T. Liège à travers les âges. Les rues de Liège. Vol. 3. Liège, 1927.

Gousset, M.-T. "La représentation de la Jérusalem céleste à l'époque carolingienne." Cahiers archéologiques 23 (1974), 47-58.

Gurlitt, C. Historische Städtebilder. Vol. IX. Lüttich. Berlin, 1906.

Heitz, C. L'architecture religieuse carolingienne. Les formes et leurs fonctions. Paris, 1980.

Heitz, C. Recherches sur les rapports entre architecture et liturgie à l'époque carolingienne. Paris, 1963.

Herzog, E. Die ottonische Stadt. Berlin, 1964.

Hoffmann, Heinrich. Karl der Grosse im Bilde der Geschichtsschreibung des frühen Mittelalters (800-1250). Berlin, 1937 (Historische Studien 137. Ed. K. Ebering).

Jaeger, Stephen. "The Courtier Bishop in vitae from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century." Speculum 58/2 (1983), 291-325.

Jean d'Outemeuse. Ly myreur des historis. Vol. IV. Corps des Chroniques Liégeoises. Ed. S. Bormans. Brussels, 1877.

Johnson, E. N. The Secular Activities of the German Episcopate. Chicago, 1931.

Joranson, E. "The Alleged Frankish Protectorat in Palestine." American Historical Review 32 (October 1926-July 1927), 241-261.

Josse, M. "Le peuplement de l'île." In Millenaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège. Exposition d'art et d'histoire. Ed. Ministère de la Communauté française. Liège, 1982, 27-32.

Kleinbauer, E. "Charlemagne's Palace Chapel at Aachen and Its Copies." Gesta 4 (Spring 1965), 2-11.

Kleinclausz, A. La légende du Protectorat de Charlemagne sur la Terre Sainte. Paris, 1926.

Krautheimer, R. "Introduction to an 'Iconography of Mediaeval Architecture.'" Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 5 (1942), 1-33.

Krautheimer, R. "Santo Stefano Rotundo in Rome and the Rotunda of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem." In Studies in Early Christian, Medieval, and Renaissance Art. New York, 1969, 69-106.

Kreusch, F. "Das Mass des Engels." In Vom Bauten, Bilden und Bewahren: Festschrift für Willy Weyres. Cologne, 1964, 61-82.

Kubach, H., and A. Verbeek. Romanische Baukunst an Rhein und Maas: Kataloge der vorromanischen und romanischen Denkmäler. 2 Vols. Berlin, 1976.

Kupper, J.-L. Liège et l'église impériale, XI^e-XII^e siècles. Paris, 1981.

Kupper, J.-L. "Sources écrites: des origines à 1185." In Les fouilles de la place Saint-Lambert à Liège. Ed. M. Otto. Liège, 1984, 31-34.

Kurth, G. Notger de Liège et la civilisation du X^e siècle. Brussels, 1905.

Lahaye, L. Inventaire analytique des chartes de la collégiale de Saint-Jean l'Évangéliste à Liège. Brussels, 1921 (Commission royale d'histoire 35).

Lehmann, E. Die frühe deutsche Kirchenbau. Die Entwicklung seiner Raumanordnung bis 1080. 2 Vols. 2nd Ed. Berlin, 1949.

Lejeune, J. Liège de la principauté à la métropole. Anvers, 1967.

Lindner, T. "Die Fabel von der Bestattung Karls des Grossen." Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsverein 14 (1892), 131-212.

Lohse, Gerhart. "Das Nachleben Karls des Grossen in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters." In Karl der Grosse. Vol. 4. Das Nachleben. Ed. W. Braunfels. Düsseldorf, 1967, 367-347.

Mähl, S. "Jerusalem im mittelalterlichen Sicht." Die Welt als Geschichte 22 (1962), 11-26.

Maines, Clark. "Good Works, Social Ties, and the Hope of Salvation: Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis." In Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis. A Symposium. Ed. P. Gerson. New York, 1986, 76-94.

Mertens, J. "Quelques édifices religieux a plan central découverts récemment en Belgique." Geneva 11 (1963), 141-161.

Michel, Louis. Les Legendes Epiques Carolingiennes dans l'oeuvre de Jean d'Outremeuse. Paris, 1935.

Michelant, H., Ed. Voyages de Philippe de Hurges à Liège et à Maestricht. Liège, 1872.

Munteanu, V. "A Romanesque Copy of the Anastasis: The Chapel of St. Jean of Le Liget." Gesta 16 (1977), 27-40.

Nichols, Stephen. Romanesque Signs: Early Medieval Narrative and Iconography. New Haven, 1983.

Oswald, F., L. Schaefer and H. R. Sennhausen. Vorromanische Kirchenbauten. Katalog der Denkmäler bis zum Ausgang der Ottonen. Munich, 1966 (Veröffentlichungen des Zentralinstituts für Kunstgeschichte in München. Vol. III. Ed. F. Mutherich).

Otto, M., Ed. Les fouilles de la place Saint-Lambert à Liège. 2 Vols. Liège, 1984.

Ousterhout, R. G. "The Church of Santo Stefano: A 'Jerusalem in Bologna.'" Gesta 20 (1981), 311-321.

Paris, Gaston. Histoire poétique de Charlemagne. Paris, 1865.

Piron, M. "Le cycle carolingien dans les traditions du pays de Liège." In Charlemagne et l'épopée romane. Actes du VIIe Congrès International de la Société Rencevals. Paris, 1978, 177-188 (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, fasc. CCXXV).

Rhein und Maas. Kunst und Kultur 800-1400. Schnütgen-Museum. Cologne, 1972.

Schiffers, H. Karls des Großen Grab in der Vorhalle des Aachener Münsters? Aachen, 1934.

Scholz, B.W., with B. Rogers, Trans. Carolingian Chronicles. Royal Frankish Annals and Nithard's Histories. Ann Arbor, 1972.

Sears, E. Review of Romanesque Signs: Early Medieval Narrative and Iconography, by S. Nichols. Art Bulletin LXX/2 (June 1988), 347-350.

Sieffert, G. "Ottmarsheim." Congrès archéologique 136 (1978), 300-329.

Silvestre, H. "Sur une des causes de la grande expansion de l'ordre canonial dans le diocèse de Liège aux X^e et XI^e siècles." Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire 31 (1953), 65-74.

Stiennon, P. "La reconstruction de Saint-Jean l'Évangéliste (1752-1770)." In Millenaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège. Exposition d'art et d'histoire. Ministère de la Communauté française, Ed. Liège, 1982, 71-106.

Stiennon, P. "L'ivoire de Notger et la fondation de la collégiale Saint-Jean (nouvelles hypothèses)." Millenaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège. Exposition d'art et d'histoire. Ministère de la Communauté française, Ed. Liège, 1982, 33-42.

Stiennon, P. "Reconstitution par Joseph de la Croix de l'église Saint-Jean, états successifs jusqu'en 1738." In Millenaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège. Exposition d'art et d'histoire. Ministère de la Communauté française, Ed. Liège, 1982, 69-70.

Sturm, E. Die Bau- und Kunstdenkmale der Stadt Fulda. Vol. 3. Fulda, 1984.

Ulrix, F. "Étude comparative des plans de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège et du 'Dom' d'Aix-la-Chapelle." In Millénaire de la collégiale Saint-Jean de Liège. Exposition d'art et d'histoire. Ministère de la Communauté française, Ed. Liège, 1982, 63-68.

Ulrix, F. "Fouilles archéologiques récentes à l'abbataile Saint-Laurent de Liège." In Saint-Laurent de Liège. Église, abbaye et hôpital militaire. Mille ans d'histoire. Ed. R. Lejeune. Liège, 1968, 25-40.

Verbeek, A. "Die architektonische Nachfolge der Aachener Pflazkapelle." In Karl der Grosse. Vol. 4. Das Nachleben. Eds. W. Braunfels and P. Schramm. Düsseldorf, 1967, 113-156.

Verbeek, A. "Zentralbauten in der Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle." In Das Erste Jahrtausend. Vol. II. Ed. V. Elbern. Düsseldorf, 1964, 898-947.

Vincent, H., and F.-M. Abel. Jérusalem. Recherches de topographie, d'archéologie et d'histoire. Vol. II. Jérusalem nouvelle. Paris, 1914.

Wellmer, H. "L'Évêque Eracle et sa fondation de Saint-Laurent de Liège." In Saint-Laurent de Liège. Église, abbaye et hôpital militaire. Mille ans d'histoire. Ed. R. Lejeune. Liège, 1968, 41-47.

Zimmermann, H. "Der Streit um das Lütticher Bistum vom Jahre 920-921. Geschichte, Quellen und Kirchenrechtshistorische Bedeutung." Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung 65 (1957), 15-52.

CHAPTER FIVE: Dismembering Aachen: Essen and Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol
and the Problem of Formal Similitude

Achter, I. Die Stiftskirche St. Peter in Vilich. Düsseldorf, 1968 (Beiheft/Kunstdenkmäler des Rheinlandes 12).

Bader, W. Die Benediktinerabtei Brauweiler bei Köln. Berlin, 1937.

Bader, W. Die ehemalige Benedikterabtei Brauweiler in Pulheim bei Köln. 2nd. Ed. Cologne, 1976 (Rheinische Kunststätten).

Bergmann, Karl Heinz. St. Pantaleon in Köln. 3rd. Ed. Neuss, 1982 (Rheinische Kunststätten 146).

Beutler, Christian. Santa-Maria-im-Kapitol zu Köln. Cologne, 1981 (Rheinische Kunststätten 59).

Bloch, P. "Seibenarmige Leuchter in christlichen Kirchen." Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch 23 (1961), 55-190.

Bosman, L. "Architektur und Klosterreform: die Zusammenhänge zwischen Stablo, Brauweiler und St. Maria im Kapitol." Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft XLI/1 (1987), 3-15.

Braunfels, W. "Die Kirchenbauten der Ottonenabtissinnen." In Beiträge zur Kunst des Mittelalters. Festschrift für Hans Wentzel zum 60. Geburtstag. Berlin, 1975, 33-40.

Brenk, Beat. "Spolia from Constantine to Charlemagne: Aesthetics versus Ideology." Dumbarton Oaks Papers 41 (1987), 103-109.

Conant, K. J. Carolingian and Romanesque Architecture 800-1200. New York, 1975.

Corbet, Patrick. Les saints ottoniens. Sainteté dynastique, sainteté royale et sainteté féminine autour de l'an Mil. Sigmaringen, 1986 (Beihefte der Francia 15).

Corbet, Patrick. "Saints et sainteté chez les ottoniens autour de l'an Mil." In X^{eme} siècle. Recherches nouvelles. Ed. P. Riché. Paris, 1987, 13-15 (Centre de Recherches sur l'Antiquité tardive et le Haut Moyen Age).

Effmann, W. Centula-St. Riquier. Eine Untersuchung zur Geschichte der kirchlichen Baukunst in der karolingischer Zeit. 2 Vols. Münster, 1912.

Effmann, W. Die karolingisch-ottonischen Bauten zu Werden. 2 Vols. Strassbourg, 1899-1922.

Effmann, W. Zur Baugeschichte der Kirche S. Maria im Kapitol zu Köln. Ed. A. Fuchs. Paderborn, 1931.

Eiken, H. "St. Maria im Kapitol." Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Architkture 5 (August/December 1912), 233-251.

Elbern, V. Der Münsterschatz von Essen. Mönchengladbach, 1966.

- Eschweiler, J. "Das Herimannkreuz im erzbisch. Diözesanmuseum zu Köln." Jahrbuch des kölnischen Geschichtsvereins 6-7 (1925), 46-51.
- Fuchs, A. Die karolingischen Westwerke und andere Fragen der karolingischen Baukunst. Paderborn, 1929.
- Fuchs, A. "Entstehung und Zweckbestimmung der Westwerke." Westfälische Zeitschrift 100 (1950), 227-91.
- Fuchs, A. "Zur Probleme der Westwerke." In Karolingische und ottonische Kunst. Werden. Wesen. Wirkung. Internationaler Kongress für Frühmittelalterlichenforschung 1954. Wiesbaden, 1957, 109-117.
- Gall, Ernst. "Westwerkfragen." Kunstchronik 7 (1954), 274-276.
- Gampl, Inge. Adelige Damenstifte. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung adeliger Damenstifte in Österreich unter besondere Berücksichtigung der alten Kanonissenstifte Deutschlands und Lothringens. Vienna/Munich, 1960.
- Grodecki, Louis. Au seuil de l'art roman. L'architecture ottonienne. Paris, 1958.
- Gruber, Otto. "Das Westwerk: Symbol und Baugestaltung germanischen Christentums." Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft, 3 (1936), 149-173.
- Hauck, Karl. "Die Ottonen und Aachen." Karl der Grosse. Vol. 4. Das Nachleben. Ed. W. Braunfels and P. Schramm. Düsseldorf, 1967, 39-53.
- Heineken, J. Die Anfänge der sächsischen Frauenkloster. Göttingen, 1909.
- Heitz, C. L'architecture religieuse carolingienne. Les formes et leurs fonctions. Paris, 1980.
- Heitz, C. Recherches sur les rapports entre architecture et liturgie a l'epoque carolingienne. Paris, 1963.
- Hlawitschka, E. "Zu den klosterlichen Anfängen in St. Maria im Kapitol zu Köln." Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter, 31 (1966-67), 1-16.
- Hofmeister, A. "Studien zur Theophanu." In Festschrift Edmund E. Stengel. Cologne, 1952, 223-262.

Humann, G. "Der Westbau der Münsterkirche zu Essen." Korespondenzblatt des Gesamtvereins der deutschen Geschichts- und Alterthmsvereine 32, No. 11 (November 1884), 81-89.

Humann, G. Der Westbau des Münsters zu Essen. Essen, 1890.

Humann, G. "Die ältesten Bautheile des Münsters zu Essen." Jahrbücher des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande 93 (1892), 89-107.

Humann, G. "Die deutsche Kunst zur Zeit der sächsischen Kaiser," Archiv für kirchliche Baukunst und Kirchenschmuck 12 (1888), 1-15.

Humann, G. Die Kunstwerke der Münsterkirche zu Essen. Düsseldorf, 1904.

Jantzen, Hans. Ottonische Kunst. Munich, 1947.

Jenal, G. Erzbischof Anno II. von Köln (1056-75) und sein politisches Wirken. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Reichs- und Territorialpolitik im 11. Jahrhundert. 2 Vols. Stuttgart, 1974.

Kahsnitz, Rainer. "Die Essener Abtissin Svanhild und ihr Evangeliar in Manchester." Beiträge zur Geschichte von Stadt und Stift Essen 85 (1970), 13-80.

Kautzsch, R. Review of Die karolingischen Westwerke und andere Fragen der karolingischen Baukunst by A. Fuchs. Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft 52 (1931), 17-18.

Krings, U. "St. Maria im Kapitol. Die Bautätigkeit des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit bis zum Zweiten Weltkriegs." In Köln: die romanischen Kirchen. Eds. H. Kier and U. Krings. Cologne, 1984, 345-380.

Kubach, H., and A. Verbeek. Romanische Baukunst an Rhein und Maas. Katalog der vorromanischen und romanischen Denkmäler. 2 Vols. Berlin, 1976.

Küppers, Leonhard. Das Essener Münster. Essen, 1963.

Lehamnn, E. "Zur Deutung des karolingisches Westerk." Forschungen und Fortschritte 37 (1963).

Lewald, U. "Die Ezzonen. Das Schicksal eines rheinischen Fürstengeschlechtes." Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter 43 (1979), 120-168.

Leyser, Karl J. "The German Aristocracy from the Ninth to the Early Twelfth Century. A Historical and Cultural Sketch." Past and Present 41 (1968), 25-53.

Leyser, Karl J. "Maternal Kin in Early Medieval Germany." Past and Present 49 (1970), 126-134.

Leyser, Karl. J. Rule and Conflict in an Early Medieval Society: Ottonian Saxony. Worcester, 1989.

Lotz, W. "Zum Problem des karolingischen Westwerks." Kunstchronik 5 (March 1952), 65-71.

Marie, D., and R. Klessmann, "Zum Stil des Herimannkreuzes in Köln." In Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte. Eine Festgabe für Heinz Rudolf Rosemann zum 9. Oktober 1060. Ed. E. Guldan. 9-20.

Meyer-Barkhausen, W. "Die Westarkadenwand von St. Maria im Kapitol in Zusammenhange ottonischer Kapitellkunst." Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch 14 (1952), 9-40.

Möbius, Friedrich. "Die 'Ecclesia Maior' von Centula (790-799). Wanderliturgie im höfischen Kontext." Kritische Berichte 11 (1983), 42-58.

Möbius, Friedrich. Westwerkstudien. Jena, 1968.

Ornamenta ecclesiae. Kunst und Künstler der Romanik in Köln. Katalog zur Ausstellung des Schnütgen-Museums in der Josef-Haubrich-Kunsthalle. Vol. 2. Ed. A. Legner. Cologne, 1985.

Portmann, M.-L. Die Darstellung der Frau in der Geschichtsschreibung des früheren Mittelalters. Stuttgart, 1958 (Basler Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft 69).

Pothmann, A. Das Münster zu Essen. 2nd Ed. Regensburg. 1990 (Kleine Kunstführer 1700).

Pothmann, A. Die Schatzkammer des Essener Münsters. Munich, 1988.

Prinz, F. "Die Machtstellung der Ezzonen in ottonischer Zeit " In Werdendes Abendland an Rhein und Ruhr. Essen, 1956, 309.

Rahtgens, Hugo. Die Kirche S. Maria im Kapitol zu Köln. Düsseldorf, 1913.

Rahtgens, Hugo. Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Köln. Vol II/1. Die kirchlichen Denkmäler der Stadt Köln. Düsseldorf, 1911.

Rahtgens, Hugo. "Nachträgliche Bemerkungen zu St. Maria im Kapitol." Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft 40 (1917), 270-279.

Reinhardt, H., and E. Fels, "Étude sur les églises-porches carolingiennes et sur leur survivance dans l'art roman." Bulletin monumental 92 (1933), 331-363, and suite, 96 (1937), 422-469.

Rhein und Maas. Kunst und Kultur 800-1400. Schnütgen-Museum. Cologne, 1972.

Sanderson, W. "Monastic Reform and the Architecture of the Outer Crypt, 950-1100." Transactions of the American Philological Society 61, Pt. 6 (1971), 3-36.

Schaefer, H. "The Origins of the Two-Tower Facade in Romanesque Architecture." Art Bulletin 27 (1945), 85-108.

Schäfer, K. Heinrich. Die Kanonissenstifter im deutschen Mittelalter. Stuttgart, 1907 (Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen 43 and 44).

Schmidt, Adolf. "Westwerke und Doppelchöre." Westfälische Zeitschrift 106 (1956), 347-438.

Schnitzler, H. Rheinische Schatzkammer. Düsseldorf, 1957.

Schulenberg, Jane Tibbetts. "Female Sanctity: Public and Private Roles, ca. 500-1100." In Women and Power in the Middle Ages. Eds. M. Erler and M. Kowaleski. Athens, GA., 1988, 102-125.

Sölter, Walter. Der Essener Dom. Neuß, 1982 (Rheinische Kunststätten 265).

Steinbach, F. "Die Ezzonen. Ein Versuch nach territorial politischen Zusammenschlusses der fränkischen Rheinlande." In Das Erste Jahrtausend. Vol. II. Ed. V. Elbern. Düsseldorf, 1964, 848-866.

Verbeek, A. "Die architektonische Nachfolge der Aachener Pflazkapelle." In Karl der Grosse. Vol. 4. Das Nachleben. Eds. W. Braunfels and P. Schramm. Düsseldorf, 1967, 113-156.

Verbeek, A. "Ottonische und staufische Wandgliederung am Niederrhein." In Beiträge zur Kunst des Mittelalters. Vorträge der Ersten Deutschen Kunsthistorikertagung auf Schloß Brühl 1948. Berlin, 1950, 70-83.

Verbeek, A. "Zentralbauten in der Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle." In Das Erste Jahrtausend. Vol. II. Ed. V. Elbern. Düsseldorf, 1964, 898-947.

Verbeek, A., and W. Zimmermann. "Die Zerstörung an Kölner Bauwerken während des Krieges 1939-1945." In Untersuchungen zur frühen Kölner Stadt-, Kunst- und Kirchengeschichte. Ed. W. Zimmermann. Essen 1950 (Die Kunstdenkmäler des Rheinlands, Beiheft 12).

Vogelsang, T. Die Frau als Herrscherin im hohen Mittelalter. Göttingen (Göttlinger Bausteine zur Geschichtswissenschaft 7).

von Quast, F. "Beiträge zur chronologischen Bestimmung der ältern Gebäude Cölns bis zum XI. Jahrhundert I." Jahrbücher des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande 10 (1847), 186-224.

von Quast, F. "Beiträge zur chronologischen Bestimmung der ältern Gebäude Cölns bis zum XI. Jahrhundert II." Jahrbücher des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande 13 (1848), 168-188.

von Quast, F. "Die Münsterkirche zu Essen." Zeitschrift für christliche Archäologie und Kunst 1 (1856), 1-20.

Wemple, S. Women in Frankish Society: Marriage and the Cloister. Philadelphia, 1981.

Wesenberg, R. "Der Werdener Bronzekruzifixus und eine Essen-Werdener Schule des 11. Jahrhunderts." In Bewahren und Gestalten. Festschrift zum siebzigsten Geburtstag von Günther Grundmann. Eds. J. Gerhardt and W. Gramberg. Hamburg, 1962, 157-163.

Wilhelm-Kästner, K. Das Münster in Essen. Essen, 1929.

Zimmermann, W. "Das Grab der Äbtissin Theophanu von Essen." Bonner Jahrbücher 152 (1952), 226-227.

Zimmermann, W. Das Münster zu Essen. Essen, 1956.

PLEASE NOTE

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

Pages 328-354, Figures 1-25

University Microfilms International