Architectuuruitbeelding in de Middeleeuwen : oorsprong, verbreiding en betekenis van architectonische beeldtradities in de West-Europese kunst tot omstreeks 1300

Klinkenberg, E.S.

Citation

Klinkenberg, E. S. (2006, January 24). *Architectuuruitbeelding in de Middeleeuwen : oorsprong, verbreiding en betekenis van architectonische beeldtradities in de West-Europese kunst tot omstreeks 1300*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4274

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden

Downloaded from: https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4274

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

English summary

Early and high medieval representations of architecture are little known and studied. For this reason there exists confusion concerning the way in which architectural depictions dating from before 1300 took shape and how they got their meaning. One thing is clear: creators of these representations did not reproduce buildings photographically, but made images that often showed little or no connection with the built environment. Neither did they illustrate descriptions of architecture literally: many representations of the Heavenly Jerusalem or Solomon's Temple differ considerably from the corresponding biblical texts. Therefore this thesis focuses on the formal relationships in the iconographic material and the underlying intentions of patrons and artists expressed. The main questions are: how did the appearance of medieval architectural representations come into being and which messages were given in this way?

In order to answer these questions it was necessary to renew the existing methods of research. The literature of art history frequently presents medieval representations of architecture thematically ordered in groups with similar characteristics - the iconographic traditions. Furthermore, formal aspects are analyzed - such as structure, perspective and realism - to gain insight into the working practise of studios. Interpretations of the material are mostly founded in texts or by making comparisons with built architecture. Each of these approaches has its own problems. Iconographic traditions threaten to become independent phenomena, detached from the historical reality. Most researchers confine their inquiries to one medium, one defined period, a geographically or nationally limited region, or to a specific iconographic context. Due to these limitations the results of such research can give a distorted picture of the subject. Moreover, the emphasis on main themes leads to the disregarding of exceptional details that can be very significant because of their rarity. The study of workshop practises leads scholars to judge medieval representations of architecture according to modern criteria of realism. Art historians focussing on the aspect of meaning generally don not take full account of the difference in the way in which images and texts - each according to their own conventions - give information.

In the light of this difference the image serves as a starting point for this study. The representations of architecture are ordered in iconographic traditions, which are not considered purely as morphological categories, but are regarded as 'channels' through which 'messages' were delivered. This research aims to look beyond the boundaries of the media, iconographical contexts, regions and times as much as possible. Moreover, the investigation into the dispersion of iconographic schemata can give indications about place- or time-bound preferences for certain representations of architecture and shed light on the origin of an iconographic tradition. This origin is deserving of much more attention than has been paid to it up to now, because the first visualisation of a certain meaning by means of a representation of architecture will have taken place deliberately. However, when a iconographic schema is repeated again and again, it becomes difficult to discern if conscious considerations determined the choice for this particular schema, and what those considerations might have been. As a rule, changes which occur during the transmission of iconographic traditions do not benefit the visibility of the original meaning. This concerns simplifications as well as the addition of meaningful elements, which can go back to other iconographic traditions, biblical exegesis, or built architecture. In each case it is enlightening to distinguish between motifs with a specific message and elements which belong to the standard repertoire of a workshop. Sometimes written sources offer a helping hand for the interpretation of this message. Beside this, the research on the application of one motif in different iconographic traditions can clarify the way in which multifaceted meanings were transmitted. The historical context also gives important information, in particular about the intention of the patron. For the rest, the works of art are bound to form, medium, context and function; such realities influenced the composition of representations of architecture too.

In order to do justice to the diversity and connections which characterize the material, this dissertation treats some iconographic and form traditions that are related to the three areas in which architecture is found: in texts, in images and in the built environment. Owing to their heterogeneity it is impossible to order all these traditions in the same way. The first three chapters are about representations of architecture with roots in biblical descriptions. They have been ordered after iconographical subjects. The thematically arranged chapters four and five throw light on combinations of represented architecture. Because very peculiar, complex traditions of forms come up, these must be analyzed separately before themes can be distinguished within this group. Finally images which intentionally refer to the built environment itself are studied at length. They are found in the areas of tension between tradition and realism. In this case the mapping of iconographic traditions must take into account the question to what extent borrowings from influential iconographic schemata or from built architecture co-determined their appearance.

The selection of the separate subjects rests on their importance to the representations of architecture that have been preserved. The presented material mostly stems from the Western-European Middle Ages until about 1300. In order to trace the origins of iconographic traditions and their early proliferation, it was sometimes necessary to widen the horizon of this research into Late Antique, Byzantine or Islamic art. Changes in the researched iconographic and form traditions during the end of the thirteenth century justified limiting the scope of this research to 1300.

I. *The Heavenly Jerusalem*

The numerous contexts, in which the Heavenly Jerusalem is found, bear witness to the dominant role the holy city played among medieval representations of architecture as a whole. These range from illustrations of the text describing the square wall with three gates on each side (Apc 21) to city seals; from sculptured canopies to Psalter illustrations; and, from tombs to incense burners. Overview studies on this theme mainly focus on images of the celestial city as part of cycles of the Apocalypse, neglecting the tradition of iconographic schemata of architecture itself. This shortcoming is also found in Kühnel's study (1987) on representations of the Heavenly Jerusalem before the year 1000. However, Kühnel examines how the changing way of thinking about Jerusalem, architectural motifs, buildings influenced the images of the celestial city. She also aims to shed light on the historical context in which these influences took place. Mostly, however, the research on the iconography of the Heavenly Jerusalem gets stuck in the ordering formal variants and defining which elements are based on the description in the Apocalypse and which on exegetical writings. Detailed studies usually focus on one medium or on a certain period, excluding many parts of the iconographic tradition.

Chapter I aims to overcome these limitations by researching systematically how iconographic traditions of the Heavenly Jerusalem came into being, where they spread and which meaning was attached to them. Images that represent the New Jerusalem with certainty – thanks to the combination with a text, to very clear characteristics, or to the iconographic context – serve as frame of reference for interpreting representations of architecture without such clues.

Firstly the selection of a iconographic schema to represent the holy city could be based on the bible text itself. This is made clear by the miniatures of the New Jerusalem in manuscripts containing the Apocalypse commentary of Beatus of Liébana, showing four fold-out walls around a rectangular square. This use of the radial perspective originates in Roman mosaic floors that 'fix' the reflection of the vault in the central basin of a bathroom or the shadow of the surrounding architecture as framing borders. The projection from above on the plane surface seems to be chosen to depict the Heavenly Jerusalem because of the described descending of the celestial city. The grid on the square indicates the cosmic order in line with illustrations of newly planned towns in Roman land surveyors' tracts. These manuscripts also contain forerunners of the representation of the Heavenly Jerusalem as a square or octagonal city emblem with corner towers. The square plan corresponds with the apocalyptical description. However, in the first place the four corner towers – which are nowhere mentioned in the Bible – state the meaning of the architecture: they also characterize a single city wall, the architectural crowning on an arch, or a church building as depiction of the Heavenly Jerusalem. Besides this, the minor importance of the described city plan made it possible to replace the square with two V-shaped walls. The fold-out celestial wall got much less spread than the square city emblem. Most examples are known from the Iberian Peninsula, where Beatus wrote his Apocalypse commentary. Spanish family ties suggest that Queen Eleonor introduced the Beatus tradition in England. The fold-out celestial city was copied in two manuscripts produced for nunneries which had the queen's special protection and favour.

Secondly, the Anastasis Rotunda, which had been considered a symbol of the new, Christian Jerusalem since its construction in the fourth century, influenced iconographic traditions of the celestial city. The multi-staged tower, for example, which rises in the midst of the four corner towers, originally seems to represent the Holy Sepulchre. The iconographic schema of the Heavenly Jerusalem as twelve concentric circles stems from a medieval plan of the Anastasis and the stacked arcades from the ambulatory with gallery surrounding Christ's tomb (see II). Like the architecture the number eight symbolized the Resurrection, for it was on the day after the Sabbath, and so the eighth day of the Passion Week, that Christ rose from the tomb. Furthermore, the seven days of the week are the image of the time of this world, and the eighth day of life everlasting. From this point of view some medieval artists used the Late Antique octagonal city emblem to represent New Jerusalem.

In the third place, Antique iconographic schemata were adapted that did not have characteristics of the celestial city of their own. Initially, Carolingian miniaturists revived the wall of the holy city which served as a background on images of Christ among his apostles in early Christian art to represent the architectural background on the portraits of the evangelists. Only the opened gates in this wall hinted at the description in the Apocalypse. The growing interest in Antiquity at the court of Charlemagne led to the replacement of this motif by the *exedra* from the antique *scaenae frons*. The royal character that Vitruvius ascribed to this kind of architecture in his book *De architectura*, which was studied again in the ninth century, fits the residence of the Saviour. The foundations of the celestial city or twelve windows – as variant on the twelve gates – were seldom added. The circular city emblem from Antiquity was adapted in a similar way by giving it twelve towers with pearls and twelve foundations.

In the fourth place, artists transformed medieval iconographic schemata of the New Jerusalem in such a way that new traditions were created. For instance, they placed the windows of the *exedra* into the shafts of the columns bearing the arch above the *scaenae frons*. Eleventh-century miniaturists, influenced by this type of column, changed the vertically placed parts of the octagonal celestial wall into heavenly towers. The architectonic frame of stacked figures too seems to have left their mark on this renewal, which has parallels in written interpretations of towers as the heavenly city. This iconographic tradition mainly spread in the South German areas. The circular city emblem was also transformed: miniaturists interpreted the foundations of the city as a second wall. So the iconographic schema of the double walled church building originated in the thirteenth century. Then English illuminators made a keep with three rows of four windows each out of the double wall. Probably Countess Ela of Salisbury (+ 1261) asked to replace such a stronghold by an image of her ancestral castle of Old Sarum, symbolizing the heavenly fatherland of her son who had died during the crusade in Egypt. The new celestial fortress was copied in the surroundings of Salisbury and for Ela's relatives.

The individualization of the heavenly city in England is not an isolated case. Identifiable representations of churches sometimes form a hood over the saint to whom a donor presents a manuscript on dedication miniatures. Toledo has been depicted as a New Jerusalem in order to present the city as the residence of the new David or Solomon, with whom the Visigothic kings compared themselves after the example of the Byzantine emperors. On city seals a square or jewelled celestial wall surrounds a building to which the citizens attached great importance (see VII). The eleventh-century vault painting in S. Pietro al Monte near Civate shows how the symbolism of colours and numbers of the square wall invite a theological play of thoughts within a complex iconographical program. The five red gates symbolize Christ's passion, his rising from the dead and his world dominion. The four green and three white gates point to the spread of the faith in the Trinity in the four wind directions, in accordance with the exegesis of the twelve apostles at the four times three gates of Heaven.

II. *The Heavenly Jerusalem and the Temple*

Some iconographic schemata could be used to represent the celestial city as well as the Temple of Jerusalem. Two widely spread, but scarcely studied examples are the stacked arcades and the dome between two towers. Only for the stacked arcades has an article been written. The author, Gardelles (1987), analyzes Romanesque church façades with two or more arcades on top of each other and compares them with similar structures in images of the Heavenly Jerusalem and Solomon's Temple. He also brings forward some miniatures showing cities and towers with several windowed storeys. But because he does not distinguish between iconographic traditions, the article merely sums up varied material without augmenting the insight into the origin and meaning of the iconographic schema.

To solve this problem, Chapter II focuses on the role played by the stacked arcades and the dome between towers within and outside the iconographic traditions of the Heavenly Jerusalem and the Temple. Furthermore, the connection with buildings which were considered to imitate Solomon's Temple, are studied. The absence of clear-cut traditions to represent the sanctuary of Jerusalem seems to have two important causes. On the one hand, most representations of the Temple illustrate texts which do not or hardly mention architectural details. On the other hand, unclear and mutually contradictory passages darken the Old Testament descriptions of the Temple.

The twofold use of the stacked arcades and the dome between towers is most likely linked with the former position of the Temple in the earthly Jerusalem. Besides this, both iconographic themes represent the dwelling place of God. Yet there is a difference. Stacked arcades as a rule have a simple meaning: they characterize images of either the Heavenly Jerusalem or Solomon's Temple. The dome between towers has such a certainty of meaning only in images of the Temple. Other meanings are always interwoven when the motif is used as characteristic of the celestial city. Because examples of the latter are not known before the twelfth century, this use seems to be secondary.

The ultimate source of the iconographic tradition of the stacked arcades in medieval art is probably the Anastasis Rotunda (see I). The interpretation of this building as New Jerusalem reaches back to Eusebius of Caesarea. For Christians the Anastasis became a new temple too, because they located there many Jewish traditions connected with the Temple (Mount). Stacked arcades characterizing the Temple initially spread through built imitations of Solomon's Temple and can be seen in the churches of Saint Polyeuktos and Hagia Sophia in Constantinople and the Palatine Chapel in Aachen. Since the ninth century the stacked arcade had been preserved as characteristic of representations of the Heavenly Jerusalem. The motif represents the main subject of Augustine's *De civitate Dei* on the frontispiece of this book. Probably this application was influenced by the arcades on canon tables in gospel books, which also give a short outline of the contents. Stacked arcades flanking an enthroned figure seem to be connected with the throne niche in palace façades and the *scaenae frons* of the Roman theatre. But used as background on evangelist portraits they stem from the series of arches in the seat of the authors, which presumably hint at Isaiah's words: "Heaven is my throne" (Is 66:1).

Applications of the iconographic schema in depictions of Solomon's Temple are influenced more than once by the arcade arches with galleries in medieval church architecture. The illustrations of the Temple in Richard of St-Victor's Ezekiel commentary seem to be related to the frontispiece miniatures in manuscripts of *De civitate Dei*. Temple arcades in Mozarabic art, characterized by the combination of stacked and interwoven arches, ultimately reach back to the Great Mosque of Cordoba. Probably the interwoven arches stylize mutually staggered arcades, depicted one behind the other in perspective, as shown by the pergolas on the mosaics of the Great Mosque in Damascus. There, the roof beams rest on small arcades on top of big ones. This structure has antecedents in the clerestory above the arcade arches in Syrian church architecture and in the articulation of Byzantine palace façades. The Umayyad dynasty made the structure the mark of their newly built mosques. According to Islamic written sources the stacked arcades indicated Solomon's palace, where the Old Testament king would have converted the queen of Saba to Islam.

The iconographic tradition of the dome between towers originates in Late Antique images of interiors. The dome as a symbol of heaven emphasizes the sacral centre of these images, where a deity could appear or a ruler could be enthroned. The applications of the iconographic motif in temples, churches, funeral architecture and palaces resulted from this origin. They were combined with the seven columns of the house of wisdom, with the ciborium that stands over a sacral person or place as a hood, and with three arches reducing the imperial palace façade or a basilica church. Miniaturists used this multi-sided meaning to comment a text or image by means of a domed building with flanking towers. These two towers stem from reduced side walls in the aforementioned interiors. The adaptation brought the side walls into agreement with the pair of towers, pylons, obelisks and related cosmic symbols of rule flanking the entrance of a sanctuary or a palace in the built architecture. They are found in medieval church architecture as two stair towers, of which the winding stairs also occur in biblical description of the Temple. According to the exegesis, man climbs these stairs from the earthly world to the realm of eternal blessing, symbolized by the dome.

III. *The Temple of Jerusalem*

Some iconographic schemata of architecture are used to characterize the Temple, but do not play a part in images of the Heavenly Jerusalem. The central column, the interwoven arcades, the two arches, the antique temple front and the quatrefoil belong to this group. They are hardly studied with the exception of the representation of Jerusalem's sanctuary as an antique tetrastyle temple. Krinsky (1970) categorizes these antiquizing images under the early Christian Temple representations, which mostly consist of an elongated or basilical building. Furthermore, he distinguishes two Byzantine and three western iconographic traditions: on the one hand the ciborium and the architectonic background, on the other the architecture on top of an arch, the medieval church building and – after 1300 – the exotic centralized structure. All this iconographic schemata can also represent other architecture than the Temple of Jerusalem. Therefore, their meaning primarily depends on the iconographic context. Krinsky does not investigate if there exist – apart from the centralized structure – architectural characteristics which specifically refer to the Temple.

The central column, the interwoven arcades, the two arches and the quatrefoil can perform this function. The central column is known in many cultures as a symbol of the *axis mundi*. Although much research has been done on this theme, medieval examples are often neglected. The connections between the different contexts in which they appear as well as the role of the temple column have not been studied. A similar gap marks the research on interwoven arcades. Various publications deal with the spread of the motif, but they do not say anything about its relation to the Temple. The state of research on the two arches and the quatrefoil does not differ much, although the origin of both motifs has been investigated.

In general the four mentioned iconographic schemata are unable to identify a representation of architecture unequivocally as temple, unless the iconographic context provides clear information. However, if they are used two or three together, the intended meaning of the image gets better contours. For this reason, the central column is often found in combination with the interwoven arcades or two arches. These three motifs were widely used, probably because they could easily be added to representations of various buildings. The iconographic tradition of Jerusalem's Temple with an antique façade composed of four columns, an entablature and a pediment were mainly dispersed as a consequence of interest in Antiquity. The quatrefoil was only applied as temple motif in representations of the apocalyptical temple in heaven.

The central column probably originates in the central support in tents or dwellings. Thanks to its Christianization in writings, architecture and images, this motif could symbolize – besides the *axis mundi* and the centre of a sanctuary – Christ's triumph over death and His world dominion. The first meaning is found in representations of Pentecost: the column indicates that the apostles will spread God's word all over the world. As centre of temple representations the motif is given special accents, such as a broad shaft, a big spiral, or it supports a fan vault. The ribs of this type of vault refer to the holy tree which – like the cosmic column – connects the earthly with the spiritual world. Accordingly the motif also appears in built and represented architecture with a funerary function, for instance in crypts, chapter houses and mausoleums. The central column in the Apocalypse illustration of the church of Philadelphia however, is based on the comparison of the apostles with columns supporting the Church. In line with this parallel the figures of Christ and saints can take the place of the column shaft. Used as Christian triumph sign the column bears a Chi-Rho monogram, a cross, a lamb, a *tabula ansata* with the names of saints, the figure of Christ, a saint, or an image of the Crucifixion.

Anglo-Saxon book illuminators combined the central column with interwoven arcades. They borrowed the arches from Insular canon tables, which were influenced by ornamental interlacements that were current at that time. Zigzag columns bear the interwoven arches sculptured in the relief on the altar in the church of Vera Cruz in Segovia, which imitates the Anastasis Rotunda and the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem. Presumably they refer to the twisted and knotted columns that had been added to the buildings on the Temple Mount by the crusaders. The similar vine-leaf decorated columns in old St Peter's would stem from Solomon's Temple according to a tradition known from late medieval written sources. But already in the eleventh century pairs of columns with mutually different shafts represent Jachin and Boaz, the pair of columns flanking the entrance of the Salomonic Temple.

The Temple characteristic of the two arches seems to originate in the Ark of the Covenant represented in the form of a torah shrine. The Old Testament mention of two doors in the entrance of the Temple and a second pair in front of the Holy of Holies can have stimulated the replacement of the motif to a representation of the sanctuary as a whole.

The medieval tradition to represent the Temple of Jerusalem by means of an antique tetrastyle temple front is closely connected to Rome, where the oldest examples have been preserved. The iconographic schema was 'religiously neutral' in the Eternal City during late Antiquity. It got a specific meaning by adding cult objects. The meaning of the example in the Roman church S. Maria Maggiore, where Christ's Presentation takes place in front of a temple with a statue of the goddess Roma in the pediment, is contested. The sermons of Pope Leo I offer a starting point to interpret this image. The antique iconographic schema represents the sanctuary of Jerusalem as well as the *templum urbis*, where Roma and Venus were worshipped, symbolizing heathen Rome. Therefore, the Messiah is received as a new emperor and a new high priest in the S. Maria Maggiore. Coins played a part in the limited spread of the iconographic tradition. This mainly occurred as a result of the renewed interest in the Roman past during the Carolingian and Ottonian renaissance. Among others the motif was applied in an eleventh-century gospel book produced for the newly rebuilt cathedral in Salzburg. In this case the motif could also hint at the right of coin mintage granted to the archbishop, which yielded an important resource to finance the building campaign.

The temple in heaven represented as a quatrefoil is only found in the Beatus manuscripts and under their influence in the English Trinity Apocalypse. Beatus' Apocalypse commentary has probably influenced the transformation of a decorative quatrefoil into a representation of architecture. In Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, the quatrefoil surrounds cosmic schemata, the evangelists, the four creatures around God's throne, the wheels from Ezekiel's vision and stories taking place in heaven. Besides this, the Lamb, a Chi-Rho monogram, the cross of Christ and the opening words of biblical books can occupy the centre of the quatrefoil. In accordance with this, the motif seems to visualize Betaus' exegesis of the heavenly temple as Christ. The illustrator replaced the biblical opening words by the Ark of the Covenant, because Beatus explained this as a symbol of Christ's grace, in particular of the gospel.

IV. *Architectural pendants*

Purposeful combinations of representations of architecture with a different character have been preserved in Christian art since the fourth century. Only few scientists have investigated this theme on the basis of examples dating from before 1300. They did not try to interpret the architectonic pendants in the framework of iconographic traditions. As a consequence of this the results of their research are incomplete, sketchy and sometimes disputable.

In general these kinds of architectural representations have a supporting role in transferring meanings. When Luke describes the annunciation to Mary, Joseph's dream and the visitation, he is silent about the two houses out of which Christ will be born. But early Christian mosaics in Rome and Parenzo seem to show them both. The temple with opened veils probably refers to Christ's priestly descent. The royal counterpart exists of a basilica – originally a royal hall – with Corinthian capitals as a sign of imperial architecture, or a sanctuary with a closed door. Bible commentaries link the closed temple gate to Mary's virginity as well as to the royal house of David which will bring forth the Messiah. The prince who will eat bread in the closed temple gate in Ezekiel's vision was compared with Melchisedec, the Old Testament prefiguration of Christ's kingship and priesthood par excellence.

A domed tholos contrasts with a palace characterized by a façade consisting of a pediment resting on two columns on the illustration of Psalm 1 in the Utrecht Psalter (ca. 820-835). Probably the illustrator based the tholos behind the blessed man on the temple of wisdom in an early Christian *Psychomachia* manuscript that the scriptorium copied almost at the same time. The circular temple of wisdom itself seems to have its roots in representations of the cylindrical Vesta temple in Rome, the centre of heathen traditions that in Prudentius' poem are defeated by the Christian virtues in Prudentius' poem. A devil holding squirming snakes in his hands marks the palace behind the seat of pestilence as the negative counterpart of the tholos. A parallel for the antique building with a pediment as a sign of evil - this time as characteristic of Babylon and contrasting with the church in the celestial city - is found in the Trier Apocalypse (ca. 800-825).

When the monks in the scriptorium of Canterbury Cathedral copied the Utrecht Psalter during the twelfth century, they adapted the architectural contrast on the basis of the gloss. Firstly, the tholos gave way to a jewelled church building referring to the New Jerusalem and the antique palace was transformed into a contemporary, well fortified stronghold. A later copyist replaced the church by the celestial city with twelve towers and intensified the contrast by placing the tower of Babel as a symbol of pride on top of the castle.

As far as known the first representation of Ecclesia juxtaposed to Synagogue illustrates the liturgical text for Palm Sunday in the Drogo Sacramentary (ca. 850): the personifications of Christianity and Judaism flank the figure of the Crucified. In line with this composition the foregoing illustration of Christ's Entry into Jerusalem shows a domed building and an antique temple front flanking a tree. Seen in connection with the following image of the Crucifixion and with bible commentaries, the representations of architecture can be interpreted as the Holy Sepulchre and the Jewish Temple on either side of the tree of life. In a similar way the gloss influenced the illustration of Psalm 2 in the twelfth-century copies of the Utrecht Psalter: a synagogue was placed on Christ's right hand side, a church to his left. The Parisian illustrator of a Bible moralisée from about 1220-1226 used this combination typologically. He depicted Solomon's Temple as a domed building with flanking towers in close connection with an old iconographic tradition of the Holy Sepulchre, possibly influenced by seals from the chapter of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. He contrasted this oriental looking building with the local Gothic style. A fusion between the pair Ecclesia – Synagogue and the contrast between good and evil took place during the sharp revival of anti-Semitism in thirteenth-century England, although the Jewish domed temple could still be used as a prefiguration of the church.

V. *Three-dimensional architectural canopies*

New architectural pendants came into being when sculptors started to place three-dimensional architectural canopies above the statues in church portals. This has never been noticed, because research on the meaning of canopies mainly focused on the question whether the Heavenly Jerusalem was represented or not. Furthermore, the structure of the canopies, its changes in the course of time and possibly influences by the built architecture, were studied. An investigation on the basis of iconographic traditions however, can answer the question about the origin of these canopies, their function and their meaning in relation to the statues below them.

Around 1140 the oldest three-dimensional architectural canopies were produced to stand above the jamb figures in the south portal of Notre-Dame in Étampes. Also the capital frieze with narrative scenes under relief canopies crowns the jambs here for the first time. Both renewals seem to have a twofold source: on the one hand the portal sculpture, in particular the arcade above the figures of the apostles on the lintel or the tympanum, on the other the capital sculpture with arches crowning the represented biblical stories. These arches play a part in the narrative and, at the same time, take the capitals in the structure of the built architecture. The structural function dominates in Étampes: the canopies bind the sculpture together in a framework that emphasizes the typological relationship between the Old Testament jamb figures beneath and the New Testament images on the capitals above.

The so-called Étampes Master introduced the renewal in the west portals of Chartres Cathedral. There, canopies representing palaces and temples stress the distinction between the royal and priestly ancestors of Christ, which Fulbert of Chartres had dealt with in an important sermon on Mary's birth. Around 1185, when canopies had already become standard motifs in church portals, such specific meanings often got lost. However, this was not the case with canopies above important figures. Christ, for example, stands under a many-towered celestial city, or under the eastern part of a church, Mary under the Temple with the Ark of the Covenant. The first realistic borrowings from the built architecture, which are found in the north portals of Rheims Cathedral, emphasize the tie between the represented saints and the local church. The canopy on the trumeau of Notre-Dame in Villeneuve-l'Archevêque shows the west façade of Sens Cathedral, probably to document the participation of Archbishop Gautier Cornut in the arrival of the Crown of Thorns in Villeneuve-l'Archevêque and especially the enlargement of his property in that place.

When the iconographic tradition got spread in the Holy Roman Empire from about 1225, the sculpture of Rheims exerted most influence, but there are also lines from Chartres, Bourges, Paris and Amiens. The earliest eastward dispersion is characterized by a lot of individual forms. Ecclesia stands under a canopy representing a church, Synagogue under the Temple and the Last Judgment is placed under the New Jerusalem. The canopies above the imperial donor pair Henry II and Kunigunde in Bamberg Cathedral repeat elements from the church model held by the empress. Emperor Frederick II on horseback and Adam, his biblical-allegorical predecessor as lord over the creation, are both standing under a representation of David's Tower. The choice for this building rests on the comparison between David's and Frederick's kingship over Jerusalem. The tower as a symbol of Mary above a statue of the Virgin imitates the west towers of Laon. Variations in the canopy structure in the west choir of Naumburg Cathedral give expression to family ties and paired connections between the twelve represented donors. Exceptional and realistic elements emphasize the donors to whom the patron attached great importance. In a similar way richly decorated socles, extra towers and realistic details stress the figures of the patron saints in Münster Cathedral, in Our Lady's in Trier and on the rood-screen of Strasbourg Cathedral.

Sometimes the sculptors placed non-architectural or narrative elements in their representations of architecture. For instance, canopies with an opened and a closed gate of Heaven border representations of heaven and hell. Vases or palm-leaves decorate the Temple above the figure of Synagogue. Some canopies show the attribute of the figure they stand over. When angels with incense burners, or a depiction of the Last Judgment appear within the architecture, the Heavenly Jerusalem seems to be represented emphatically.

VI. *Donor's models*

Since the sixth century images have been preserved in Christian art, showing figures of donors presenting a model of the building they had built, rebuilt, repaired, or embellished. Till now these donor's models have mainly been studied from the question of their realism, which turned out to be insignificant in most cases. The idea of a 'flourishing' of exactness after 1100 followed by a 'decline' in the thirteenth century has its roots in the conception of an independent development in art. Besides this, Mączewska-Pilch (1973) tried to explain the differences in the dispersion of the motif in France and the Holy Roman Empire on the basis of the power of politics. However, her explanation rests on an incomplete collection of material and on a gross simplification of the historical context.

In contrast to the focus on realism Chapter VI approaches the donor's models in the first place as part of an iconographic tradition. The patron is considered having the possibility to choose in which way an artist had to represent the building he founded. He could choose whether he wanted a specific view, realism, or symbolic additions. Research on the historical circumstances in that place aims to throw light on the motives behind such choices.

The way in which the iconographic tradition of the donor with an architectural model was initially spread shows a remarkable split. Worldly 'model bearers' are found in Byzantine art, while ecclesiastical ones are mainly found in Western Europe.

This division suggests that donor figures of the most important authorities at that time served as examples: the emperor in Constantinople and the Pope in Rome. The iconographic schema probably had an imperial origin for two reasons. Firstly, figures with architectural models were already represented on coins of eastern cities which had deserved well of the worship of the emperor from the late second until the late third century. Secondly, the Pope filled the imperial power vacuum in Rome.

An early sixteenth-century description of the triumphal arch of old St Peter's in Rome strengthens this assumption. According to this text, Constantine the Great (306-337) was represented showing the church he had built to Christ and Saint Peter. Contrary to the most prevailing opinion the emperor himself can't be under consideration for being the patron of this mosaic, because no monumental figures were represented on church walls before the middle of the fourth century. This situation changed under the rule of Constantine's sun Constantius II (352-361). In all probability he commissioned the apse mosaic in St Peter's, depicting the Traditio legis to the greater honour and glory of his father and himself, thus the dedication inscription. With the same intention he could have commissioned the image on the triumphal arch.

Various characteristics of early Christian decorations on triumphal arches and representations of donors could stem from the abovementioned mosaic in St Peter's. They reinforce the assumption that Constantine was represented as a donor near the tomb of Rome's apostle, but firm proof is lacking. For instance, fifth-century Roman mosaics on triumphal arches also show Christ between Peter and another flanking figure. This composition became current to depict imperial 'model bearers' in Western Europe. Furthermore, since the fifth century figures of emperors and donors are found on and near triumphal arches and high clergymen whose patronage centred around old St Peter's, had themselves immortalized as 'model bearers'.

A long series of preserved representations of popes with donor's models in Rome begin with the restored figure of Felix IV (526-530) on the apse mosaic of SS. Cosma e Damiano. Felix could reckon upon little sympathy during his pontificate because of his friendly connections with the Arian Goth who occupied Italy. He pushed out his adversaries within the Roman clergy without pardon. These circumstances make it unlikely that Felix IV introduced the representation of a Pope holding a church model in Rome. The Arian-Gothic associations the iconographic schema would have evoked in this case do not agree with its numerous applications during the following centuries. Besides this, Felix did not commission to build the church: he only financed the furnishing and the apse mosaic in a building that was given to him by King Theoderic I (493-526) or his daughter in order to make a church out of it. This made a difference at that time, because the apse mosaic of S. Vitale in Ravenna (ca. 546-550) does not show the patron of the mosaic, but the bishop who commissioned the building with an architectural model. Nevertheless, Felix' mosaic was very influential, probably as a result of the meaning of SS. Cosma e Damiano. As the first church in the antique-heathen centre of the Eternal City, the building symbolized the triumph of Christianity.

Perhaps Leo the Great (440-461) was the first Pope who had himself represented as a donor, because the representations of architecture on the mosaics in S. Maria Maggiore in Rome – where Leo's views affected the iconographic program – have the same structure as the oldest church models. In addition, Leo took decisive steps in appropriating the imperial power in Rome.

Lay patrons in the Eternal City adopted the iconographic schema under Byzantine influence. At first, this took place in the circle of the papal Curia. But in the tenth century, when the power of the Apostolic See was strongly reduced, the use of the motif spread further. The combination of an ecclesiastical and a lay donor presumably reaches back to the mentioned apse mosaic in SS. Cosma e Damiano, which documented the collaboration between pope and king by means of the figures of Felix VI and Theodotus as name saint of Theoderic. Leo III (795-816) visualized his alliance with Charlemagne in a similar way. This sub-branch of the iconographic tradition continued to be used through the thirteenth century, on the one hand among princes who had risen in rank, on the other among those who wanted to pretend this.

From the high Middle Ages onwards Rome was no longer the only influential centre from which the motif of the 'model bearer' spread. New centres were important abbeys with papal privileges and close connections to the Apostolic See, such as Montecassino and Cluny. Also cities which presented themselves as *Roma secunda* played this part. On a smaller scale the motif dispersed via religious communities and existing or fabricated family ties. The latter is in particular found among sculptured tombs that not only held in esteem the memory of the founders of the church or monastery: they also had to legitimize the position of power of the family, to heighten its standing and to suggest a continuity of rulers.

At the latest in the sixth century patrons lower in the worldly or ecclesiastical hierarchy adopted the imperial and papal iconographic schema. Initially, several bishops emphasized their independence and equality compared to Rome in this way. The Roman overtone of the 'model bearer' could also express friendly ties with the Pope, strengthen claims on ecclesiastical primacy within a region, or support the presentation of a city as a second Rome. Papal privileges of protection or exemption often lay at the root of such references. Crisis situations made it desirable to warn greedy enemies in this way. Figures of distinguished worldly donors had to perform a similar task.

The omission or use of realism in an architectural model was a way of clarifying the meaning of a donor representation. Schematically rendered hall-churches in Rome characterized the papal tradition passing from one pope to the other. They referred to the realization of the Church on earth in general and were 'tickets of admission' to heaven. During the Middle Ages the latter aspect continued to be an important motive to immortalize patrons in the church they had founded. Realism was used to identify a donor's model, to underline particular elements of the built architecture, to emphasize the extent of the patronage, or to distinguish a 'model bearer' clearly from his rival. Realistic architectural models also got a legal task: they documented the lawfulness and legality of the foundation, of given privileges and of property. Sometimes such donor images bear much resemblance to a false charter, because both can underpin the claims on disputed properties, or rewrite the foundation history of a monastery.

Initially, the imperial or papal tradition determined respectively whether donors presented their church model with the apse turned towards them or away from them. The former position can reach back to the lost triumphal arch mosaic of old St Peter's, where Constantius II most probably had embellished the very choir. The papal hall-churches follow the Late Antique tradition of the rectangular building turning its entrance to the centre of the image. An apse – the domain of the clergy – was added on the side of the donor. Later on, local uses came into being. Besides this, donors often show the side of the church which had to represent the rank of their foundation. Furthermore, new parts of a building, the place of the donor's tomb or other spots with a memorial function were stressed.

Symbolic elements that could be added to a donor's model often refer to the Anastasis Rotunda. For instance, early Christian representations of the Holy Sepulchre seem to have influenced the depiction of S. Vitale in Ravenna. In this way the model emphasizes the hope of the founding bishops resting in the choir to surmount death like Christ and to obtain eternal life. The same message is taken by the roof-tower crowning several architecture models as a non-realistic addition. It has its two- or three-storeyed structure in common with images of the Holy Sepulchre and its octagonal ground-plan with representations of the celestial city (see I). Furthermore, symbolic additions to the represented building give the donor's model the role of a new temple, or a New Jerusalem. Sometimes they hint at the rank of the donor: battlements on the 'palace church' held by the figure of Plectrudis in Cologne fit to the royal status that was ascribed to this Carolingian regent. In spite of such additions, thirteenth-century donor's models bear witness to a tendency of focussing increasingly on the connection between the represented and the built architecture. This individualization reduced the far-reaching influence that seems to have been exerted by the mosaic of the triumphal arch in old St Peter's.

VII. *Seals*

The research on seals with representations of architecture is still in its infancy. The art history literature goes no further than enumerative descriptions and classifications based on seal owners and iconographic characteristics. Only Erben (1931) gave the initial impetus to distinguish between iconographic traditions and to place the selection of certain architectural motifs into a historical context when studying the depictions of Rome on the lead and golden bulls of the rulers of the Holy Roman Empire. Nevertheless, his conclusions are not convincing. This failure is mainly caused by the reconstruction of 'lost' bulls on pivots of his argument. Moreover, Erben separates his genealogy of depictions of Rome too much from other representations of architecture and schematizes the historical circumstances: the emperors either collaborated with the pope, or fought him. However, Erben's approach is continued and extended in Chapter VII. Among others, the influence of the bulls of the German kings and emperors on seals of worldly rulers, religious communities and cities are studied. Besides this, attention is paid to borrowings from other iconographic traditions, the motives behind such imitations and the influence of the built architecture. The aim continues to be the mapping of the origin and dispersion of iconographic traditions in order to reveal the meaning of architectural representations, in this case on seals.

The seal representing architecture in Western-Europe originated around 800-803, when Charlemagne had depicted a city gate as a symbol of Rome on his coronation as emperor. This was the foundation of the tradition to symbolize the renewal and continuity of the Christian Roman Empire on the bulls of the German emperors and kings by means of a representation of architecture. More than once these symbols imitated antique coins. Moreover, the Eternal City was adorned with characteristics of the New Jerusalem. The way in which Rome was depicted often had to legitimize the position of the ruler at that time.

The royal and imperial bulls exerted a great influence as the oldest and very prestigious seals representing architecture. For instance, the high Anglo-Saxon society probably got to know this type of seal through the marriage of the Salian King Henry III with the Danish King's daughter Gundhild in 1035. The chapter of Canterbury Cathedral took it up. The age-old connections with Rome and Canterbury's primacy as the mother of the British Church seem to have determined its choice. The 'townscape', since the eleventh century labelled as AUREA ROMA, gave way to a representation of the local cathedral, fully in line with the increased focus on the local saints and the – threatened – local traditions. This symbol asked for a reaction: Glastonbury Abbey, which tried to compete with Canterbury in age and importance, commissioned a similar seal stamp. Initially, the type of seal mainly spread among religious houses in Southwest-England. This might have been connected with the fact that the monasteries and chapters concerned had been reformed by Dunstan (+ 988), abbot of Glastonbury and archbishop of Canterbury, or by his followers. Twelfth-century applications of the Anglo-Saxon iconographic schema of a church emphasized the rank and the age of the seal owner. St Andrews, for example, wanted to propagate its status as the mother church of Scotland in this way. During the thirteenth century the representations of architecture were often reduced into canopies standing over figures. However, the Anglo-Saxon side-view of a church building continued to be current on early seals of English cities, which did not get civil privileges or the possibility to use their own seal until the new political line of King Richard I (1189-1199). Besides this, the city seal of London showing three dominant towers – the cathedral between two keeps – exerted much influence.

In addition to religious communities, cities presented themselves as *Nova Roma* on their seals. The first example is found in Trier that had imitated the seal of the Roman senate around 1147: the image of a tall figure of Christ behind the city wall is directly linked to the personification of Rome rising above the Eternal City. The archbishops of Mainz and Cologne surpassed their rival by choosing the ruler portrait on the front side of the royal and imperial bulls as the model of their seals, which reflected their position as regents who relieved each other during the second crusade. Other cities immortalized themselves without involving the AUREA ROMA. Their choice for a certain iconographic schema was mostly connected with local built architecture. Utrecht, for instance, placed a quincunx on its seal, referring to the four churches which had been built around the cathedral in a cross-shaped plan. Some cities sought their models in the earthly Jerusalem, such as Mondoubleau, which quoted the Dome of the Rock on the seal of the Knights Templar, because this order had settled itself in the vicinity of the city.

Pope Victor II (1055-1057), a relative of the Salian dynasty and a trusted counsellor of Emperor Henry III, introduced the AUREA ROMA on the reverse of his papal bulls. Only two of his direct successors went on with this renewal. The breaking away from the depiction of Rome under Pope Alexander II (1061-1073) marked the growing gap between the prince and the Apostolic See. At the same time, the first noblemen who were faithful to the emperor took up the seal type with a representation of architecture. They chose for the depiction of a stronghold, a choice that was often based on the dynastic castle after which they named themselves. From the twelfth century onward, town councils also expressed their support for the German king or emperor by borrowing elements from the AUREA ROMA. When such citations marked a political position, the seal stamp mostly quickly fell into disuse. However, when the reference to Rome was reminiscent of imperial recognition of civil self-government, it kept its value. Strongholds depicted on city seals represented the authority of the city lord, although allusive elements could play a part in this case as well. Combinations of representations of a keep and a church tower were used when worldly and ecclesiastical authorities shared the rights in a town. But the combined depiction of the church St-Sernin and the Château Narbonnais on the seal of Toulouse represented the two parts of the town, which collaborated with each other on the basis of mutual equality. The increasing use of seals and the standardization of the crenulated wall with two or three towers led to the insertion of non-architectural allusive elements and references to the town ruler by means of a figure or a coat of arms.

The imperial and papal bulls also left their mark on the oldest seals representing churches outside England, which were first used by religious communities. Local circumstances influenced the choice; for instance, the seals of Palermo, Cefalù and Monreale reflect the rivalry between the (intended) burial churches of the Norman dynasty in Sicily. The composition showing the nimbi of Peter and Paul on either side of a cross, which adorned all papal bulls from the twelfth century onward, was at the root of a seal type showing the patron saints under two arches on which a church building bears the cross. Probably Melk Abbey, of which the abbey church was dedicated to the two apostles, was the first to adapt the papal bull in this way. Its seal had to underline the connections with Rome as well as to defend the rank of sovereign abbey bestowed by the Austrian rulers. The former aspect strongly determined the spread of this type of seal, which initially was concentrated within the Benedictine order. St. Aposteln in Cologne based the representation of a church for its first seal stamp on a iconographic schema that was mostly used to depict Cologne Cathedral. The relationship documented the institutional, liturgical and architectural ties between the cathedral and the collegiate church, as well as their place in the Cologne imitation of Rome's topography. St. Aposteln influenced the thirteenth-century seals of the four cities in the county of Berg through its daughter foundation in Wipperfürth. These reflect a mutual hierarchy by the dimension of the represented churches with or without the presence of city wall: Wipperfürth, the oldest and most important city in the county, had depicted both buildings large on its stamp, the second town of Berg – Lennep – followed with a wall and a small church, Ratingen only got a large church and the modest town of Düsseldorf brought up the rear with only a small church.

The municipal authority was guided by several important considerations in choosing to depict a church on their seal stamps. In the first place, depictions of cathedrals and important abbey churches in particular referred to the town ruler who had granted privileges to the citizens. Secondly, seals documented the importance of the church building within the early city government. Here the citizens were allowed to ring the bells as a warning or to announce a meeting. Here is where the townsfolk or its representatives assembled. Here the consuls and the town ruler acknowledged each other mutually in cities like Montpellier and Cahors. Moreover, the church tower as a well protected, stone building could house the archive of the city. In the third place, the choice for the representation of a church could have a political meaning. For instance, Verdun Cathedral symbolized the triumph of the local bishop over count Renaud I of Bar, who had ruled the city with an iron hand.

Realism on seals with a representation of architecture only acted a secondary part in transferring meanings. This seems to be connected with the serial use of seals, because the recipient of a charter would have understood the message of a traditional motif more easily than that of a specific building, which perhaps he even did not know. For this reason, seal cutters used iconographic schemata of the celestial city or the Temple, copied antique coins and above all, imitated prestigious seals. The combination with realistic elements merely extended the message. This often concerned single parts of a building, such as the tall tower of St Andrews which showed pilgrims the way to the relics of Scotland's patron saint. Deviations of the built architecture accentuated meaningful aspects: the undamaged Coliseum symbolized Rome's eternity on the bull of Frederick I. More than once, strongly realistic representations of churches were made during important building campaigns. Besides this, realism served – in reaction to the spreading use of seals – as a means to distinguish a representation of architecture from others.

To the extent possible, this study aims to do justice to medieval representations of architecture such as they are found. Iconographic schemata of architecture must be approached as part of iconographic traditions, which is the starting point for the method used here. Iconographic traditions link a specific meaning to a certain schema. This meaning was assigned at that time on the basis of formal interrelationships between iconographic schemata and connections with the built architecture. Also texts, in particular bible commentaries, could have played a part in this process. When written sources have been preserved, the history sheds light on the motives of a patron for choosing a certain iconographic schema. Innovative choices, which could be at the root of new iconographic traditions, mostly took place in the focus of cultural developments.

In order to investigate how iconographic traditions spread and so transferred their message in different historical contexts, the study continually tries to look over the borders of time, place and medium. It appeared that most representations of architecture originated in the built environment. Because artists passed on iconographic schemata to each other century after century, iconographic traditions became independent in respect to their source. The imitation of representations of architecture that were commissioned by prominent authorities was essential for their spread. This makes clear that patrons often intended more than just the illustration of a description of architecture or the depiction of the built environment. Representations of architecture could underline the symbolism or the function of a building, give a visual commentary on an image, or express the support for an influential ruler by the way of rendering. Moreover, they documented existing or pretended family ties, legitimized the position of a patron or heightened his prestige. They could also serve as weapon in a fight of competition and – supported by their realism – as visual 'charters'. In the latter case they emphasized the lawfulness and legality of given properties, rights and privileges.