SIBLE DE BLAAUW

ARCHITECTURE AND LITURGY
IN LATE ANTIQUITY AND THE MIDDLE AGES

Traditions and Trends in Modern Scholarship[1]

Contents: 1. The Problem / 2. General Studies / 3. The Ancient East / 3.1. Syria / 3.2. Greece / 3.3. Constantinople / 3.4. Medieval Developments / 4. The Ancient West / 4.1. North Africa / 4.2. Spain / 4.3. Northern Italy and the Adriatic Provinces / 4.4. Rome / 5. The Medieval West / 5.1. Monastic Churches in the Frankish Empire / 5.2. Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman Churches / 5.3. Cathedrals and Monastic Churches in the High and Late Middle Ages / 6. Theory and Methodology / 7. Conclusions and Prospects.

1. The Problem

„L'église est d'abord fonctionnelle. Sa structure répond à la dynamique interne des exercices de la prière collective qu'elle a pour mission d'abriter."[2] Georges DUBY expressed a generally accepted view in his standard work *Le temps des cathédrales*: churches are primarily designed to accommodate public Christian worship. Though few would contest this axiom, it plays a remarkably small role in the formation of the current image of the ecclesiastical architecture of the past. Duby's statement may be contrasted with the view propounded in another famous book on Gothic architecture: David MACAULY's popular *Cathedral – The Story of its Construction.*[3] The final scene of this imaginatively illustrated story shows the population of Chutreaux gathering for the first time in the just completed Gothic cathedral. The citizens are all obviously looking at something happening in the east end of the interior, but the picture only reveals an immense space with colonnaded pillars and high cross vaults. In spite of the people within, the new church looks like an empty stage. One senses the embarrassment of the author when it comes to giving his readers an idea of the liturgical life that daily filled a medieval cathedral.

Systematic and integrative studies pertaining to the interplay of architecture and Christian worship are rare. Among the reasons for this discrepancy are the distance between the traditional historical, art-historical and theological disciplines, and obvious hesitations on questions of method.

The history of Christian church architecture has traditionally been covered by two disciplines, depending on the chronology. The ecclesiastical architecture of

[2] G. DUBY, *Le temps des cathédrales. L'art et la société.* Paris 1976, 336.
[3] 1973; afterwards published in several languages.

Late Antiquity is to an important extent the domain of Christian archaeology, a field in which church historians and theologians have always played an important role. The classic discussion around the genesis of the Christian basilica, however, shows that in this professional field too, the functional aspect ultimately occupied a secondary position and that, above all, architectural typology and theological preoccupations about sacred space were able to catch the interest of the scientific spirits.[4] Meanwhile, liturgiological scholarship was traditionally focussed upon texts and much less upon the spatial implications of worship. Systematic research into the liturgical function of church architecture has remained scarce even in Christian archaeology.

The ecclesiastical architecture of the Middle Ages has long been studied almost exclusively by art historians. In contrast to research in the field of Early Christian architecture, where a direct relationship between architecture and liturgical function was at least presupposed, medieval studies have long tended to concentrate on structural forms and static proportions – in the tradition of VIOLLET-LE-DUC – or on style and symbolism, the latter predominantly in the German-speaking world. The liturgiologist Cyrille VOGEL noted „the lack of interest manifested by so many medievalists in the evidence of Christian worship and the embarrassment some of them apparently feel about trespassing into the supposedly special domain of the clergy".[5] It must be admitted, however, that liturgiological scholarship itself offered little stimulation to research on liturgy and medieval architecture, because medieval liturgy was considered a top-heavy, decadent offshoot of the pure state of worship of Early Christianity.[6] The common view seems well summarized by the title of the chapter on this period in KLAUSER's well-known handbook on the history of Christian worship: *Dissolution, Elaboration, Reinterpretation and Misinterpretation.*[7] Consequently, a contradiction could be felt between the impressive achievement of medieval architecture, and the low esteem in which the state of liturgy practiced within those buildings was held. This paradox has functioned as an alibi.

Despite this rather negative general balance, scholarly interest in the relationship between church building and liturgy is obviously growing at present. The functional aspects of art and the role of ritual in past societies have been the topics of important recent publications.[8] Various conferences held in the last decade bear witness to the concern of archaeologists, historians and art historians with liturgy.[9] Art-historical contributions have appeared that concentrate on the functional elements of church buildings, particularly on liturgical furnishing. Liturgiological studies have been undertaken that clarify the performance of liturgical procedures and actions. Finally, there have been some truly interdisciplinary attempts.

The aim of this paper is to draw attention to and bring together the most significant of these scattered publications, in order to make a contribution to the development of knowledge and methods in the field of architecture and liturgy up to the Reformation. This starting point has determined the choice of geographical landscapes, the themes and the titles of publications covered. The emphasis is on studies which have appeared in recent decades, so that an image may be given of the directions in which research is currently moving.[10]

2. General Studies

The number of publications dealing with the question of the liturgical function of ecclesiastical architecture with a more or less general scope, is extremely limited.[11] The modern scholarly approach to the theme has its roots in Germany, where in the 19th and early 20th centuries a series of monographs appeared on the influence of liturgy on Christian architecture. While ranging in their viewpoints from liturgy as the determining factor for the formal lay-out of a church, to a complete denial of the formative role of liturgy in architecture, they have in common the virtual absence of any systematic examination of the disposition of the monuments and of liturgical sources.[12]

The first comprehensive discussion of the theme after the Second World War was Gerhard KUNZE's *Lehre, Gottesdienst, Kirchenbau.*[13] This work, published in two volumes, the first in 1949 and the second, posthumously, in 1960, presents a good illustration of the scholarly situation that

---

4   A recent state-of-research analysis: P. C. FINNEY, *Early Christian Architecture: The Beginning (A Review Article),* in: HThR 81. 1988, 319-339.

5   Author's preface in C. VOGEL, *Medieval Liturgy. An Introduction to the Sources.* W. STOREY – N. RASMUSSEN (eds). Washington D.C. 1986, XVIII.

6   R. W. PFAFF, *Medieval Latin Liturgy.* Toronto 1982, XIV: „...the middle ages are not liturgically fashionable now, and the subject seems to deserve no more than passing attention from those who are concerned with ‚liturgics' ".

7   Th. KLAUSER, *A Short History of the Western Liturgy.* London 1979 (2nd ed. Original German edition: Bonn 1965), Ch. III.

8   To mention only a few examples: S. G. MACCORMACK, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity.* London 1981; E. MUIR, *Civic Ritual in Renaissance Venice.* Princeton 1981; J. SHEARMAN, *A Functional Interpretation of Villa Madama,* in: Röm. Jb. für Kunstgesch. 20. 1983, 313-327; W. TRONZO (ed.), *Italian Church Decoration of the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance. Functions, Forms and Regional Traditions.* Bologna 1989.

9   The Dumbarton Oaks Symposium in 1979 was devoted to „Byzantine liturgy". In 1985 the Settimana di studio in Spoleto was held on the theme: „Signs and Rites in the Early-Medieval Western Church".

10   Hence, this article may not be considered a bibliographical account with any pretension to completeness. For this, needless to say, the reader is referred to the appropriate sections of the regular „Literaturberichte" in this review. For a recent bibliography on liturgy and architecture since the Second Vatican Council (reflections of „a re-thinking of the nature and function of the liturgical environment") see S. J. WHITE, *Liturgical Architecture, 1960-1990: A Select Bibliography,* in: StLi 20. 1990, 219-238.

11   There are works with a practical, programmatic or semi-popular scope that may contain stimulating ideas, but have to be excluded here, e.g. A. BIÉLER, *Kirchbau und Gottesdienst.* Neukirchen 1965; L. BOUYER, *Architecture et liturgie.* Paris 1967; J. RYKWERT, *Church Building.* London 1966.

12   For titles and arguments I refer to the historiographic overview given by C. PEETERS, *De liturgische dispositie van het vroegchristelijk kerkgebouw.* Assen 1969, 6-8.

13   G. KUNZE, *Lehre, Gottesdienst, Kirchenbau in ihren gegenseitigen Beziehungen.* 1-2. Berlin, Göttingen 1949-1960.

constituted the point of departure for modern research. Though the book contains valuable accounts of liturgical dispositions and functions from Early Christian community houses to classicist Protestant churches, it is, like its predecessors, still based on unproven, general assumptions, such as: „das urchristliche Fühlen des um den Mahltisch kreisenden Raumes". Indeed, KUNZE's real theme is not the actual liturgical functioning of spaces, but the underlying attitude of mind that expresses itself in liturgy as well as in architecture. From that perspective, the author draws analogies such as that between the architectural arrangement of St. Cyriacus' church in Gernrode and the poetic structure of Notker Balbulus' sequence to be sung in the Christmas liturgy, both composed out of „unequal elements in rhythmic periods".[14] KUNZE's spiritual interpretations are clearly indebted to the methods of the German „Geistesgeschichte", in which architecture was primarily seen in connection with other aspects of civilization and sometimes even as formally determined by specific cultural forces. The vision of the Gothic cathedral as a scholastic ‚Summa' in stone is but the most famous example.[15]

The second part of KUNZE's work was published after the author's death by Alfred WECKWERTH, who looked at the theme in the light of an approach that had a long tradition but was „rediscovered" in the 1940s and 50s: the so-called „iconography of architecture", the search for the symbolic „content" of a building. The editor stressed the well-known concept of the Early Christian and medieval church building as a representation of the universal church and of divine order.[16] The secular authority would be connected with the atrium or the westwork, the priestly authority with the apse.

Although KUNZE and WECKWERTH represent two different schools of thought, both tend to neglect the historicity of liturgical practice within a church building in favour of more or less ingenious afterthoughts. The sections on the altar of the Cross constitute an illustrative case. KUNZE, a Protestant ecclesiastic, saw the Cross altar in the nave of a medieval church as a genuine Christian protest against the victory of sacrifice over communion in the medieval mass,[17] whereas WECKWERTH, in his symbolist interpretation, declared the altar of the Cross the real high altar of an early medieval church, standing as it did between the two poles of imperium and sacerdotium, in the midst of the community.[18]

A new direction of research came to the fore in the 1960s. It is characterized by a pragmatic approach, providing a critical analysis of the archaeological or architectural evidence on the one hand, and of liturgical sources on the other, without maintaining a spiritual or symbolic interpretation. C. PEETERS' *De liturgische dispositie van het vroegchristelijk kerkgebouw* is a plea for the rehabilitation of the „Kleinarchitektur" in the historical context of a church interior.[19] Only by examining altars, platforms, chancel barriers and pulpits as an integral part of the architecture, is it possible to perceive how the building functioned. Proceeding from this basic conviction, PEETERS undertakes an investigation of the monuments in the entire Early Christian world and confronts the evidence with what is known about the liturgical customs of the respective regions.[20] The

14 Ibidem 160-168; another example on 152-154.
15 Nearly contemporaneous with KUNZE: H. SEDLMAYR, *Die Entstehung der Kathedrale.* Zürich 1950 (reprint Graz 1976 and 1988), and E. PANOFSKY, *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism.* Latrobe 1951. On the „Geistesgeschichte" since DVORÁK: P. CROSSLEY, *Medieval Architecture and Meaning: the Limits of Iconography*, in: Burlington Magazine 130. 1988, 116-121 esp. 118.
16 Obviously under the impact of BANDMANN and SEDLMAYR, cf. CROSSLEY, *Architecture* 118f. Cf. A. WECKWERTH, *Die christliche Basilika – ein theologischer Begriff und eine theologische Gestalt*, in: WestfZs 112. 1962, 205-223.
17 KUNZE, *Lehre* 194.
18 Ibidem, 274-279.
19 Supra n. 12.
20 The same approach can be found in G. P. P. VRINS' article on the ambo: *De ambon. Oorsprong en verspreiding tot 600*, in: *Feestbundel F. van der Meer.* Amsterdam, Brussels 1966, 11-55. Both VRINS and PEETERS drew their initial inspiration from their teacher F. VAN DER MEER, whose *Christus' oudste gewaad.* Utrecht, Brussels 1949, is one of the high-water marks in the treatment of architecture, art and liturgy as one integrated whole.

result is the first all-encompassing treatment of the liturgical disposition of churches in Early Christianity.

Revealing a similar attitude, but focussed on one specific issue, is *Der Standort des Liturgen am christlichen Altar vor dem Jahre 1000*, by the liturgiologist Otto NUSSBAUM.[21] This book presents a discussion of the altar arrangement in relation to the entire lay-out of churches, in order to find out whether, during the celebration of mass, the officiant stood in front of or behind the altar. The fact that the theme was obviously inspired by the growing popularity of the celebration of the mass facing the people, around the time of the Second Vatican Council, aroused the suspicion of critics. Indeed, NUSSBAUM's conclusions turned out to be not beyond serious criticism,[22] but the freshness with which the question was presented has shown the way for further research.

The studies referred to above deal exclusively with the main space of Christian worship: the ‚aula dei', conceived to house the regular celebration of the eucharist. Spaces intended for other types of worship, like baptism and the cult of the martyrs, have been the object of separate research.

On the one hand, J. G. DAVIES' *The Architectural Setting of Baptism*, belongs to the above-mentioned category of pragmatic approach, but on the other hand incorporates the perspective of architectural iconography.[23] DAVIES gives an account of the architectural developments of baptisteries and baptismal fonts and examines the liturgical evidence concerning the sacrament of initiation. Sometimes these lines could be brought together in a topographical reconstruction of the baptismal ceremony in a particular building. The complex rite with a sequence of different ritual elements produced a series of rooms, each corresponding to one element in the whole. But the general shape of the building, according to DAVIES, was determined by its function of conveying a meaning, as all architecture in the ancient world would have been. Baptism was believed to be a rebirth (dying and rising with Christ) and this idea found expression in the plan and elevation of the baptistery, which was supposed to recall a mausoleum.

The book by André GRABAR: *Martyrium. Recherches sur le culte des reliques et l'art chrétien antique*, published 1943-1946, made a considerable impact.[24] The essence of GRABAR's contribution is the division of Early Christian cult buildings – in the 4th century – into two classes, distinct both in shape and in function: longitudinal halls of the basilical type for the regular eucharistic synaxes of the congregation, and centralized, vaulted ‚martyria' or ‚memoriae', marking a holy site or a martyr's tomb. The thesis led to a growing awareness of the importance of establishing the functions of the buildings to be examined, but could also easily be misunderstood. Though GRABAR himself sketched the different developments in East and West after the 4th century and the process of formal and functional interminglings in the course of history, his thesis carried the danger of an over-schematic formulation of the connection between form and function. In 1953 KRAUTHEIMER showed that the reality was more complex. Centralized types like the Golden Octagon in Antioch and S. Lorenzo in Milan, for example, apparently always functioned as churches for the regular celebration of the mass.[25] The original function of many other Early

21 1-2. Bonn 1965.
22 N. concluded for 192 churches out of the 560 examined a celebration versus populum. M. METZGER, *La place des liturges à l'autel*, in: RevSR 45. 1971, 113-145 established that this was necessarily so only in about 20 cases. All the other cases could have had the celebrant in front of the altar as well. ‚Versus populum' would be a rather recent notion, unknown in Early Christianity, contrary to ‚versus ad orientem'. A similar conclusion was drawn by K. GAMBER, *Conversi ad Dominum. Die Hinwendung von Priester und Volk nach Osten bei der Meßfeier im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert*, in: RQ 67. 1972, 49-64. For an answer by NUSSBAUM to his first critics: O. NUSSBAUM, *Die Zelebration versus populum und der Opfercharakter der Messe*, in: ZKTh 93. 1971, 148-167.
23 London 1962. Cf. the exclusively typological catalogue of baptisteries by A. KHATCHATRIAN (F. BUHLER ed.), *Origine et typologie des baptistères paléochrétiens.* Mulhouse 1982.
24 1-2. Paris 1943-1946.
25 Review of A. GRABAR, *Martyrium*, in: R. KRAUTHEIMER, *Studies in Early Christian, Medieval and Renaissance Art.* New York, London 1969, 151-160.

Christian buildings of both formal types will remain obscure: the absence of inscriptions or distinctive furniture makes it impossible to determine their exact use.

The most distinguished general works covering a more or less general range are thus relatively old. More recent studies, indeed, tend to concentrate on subjects with a limited geographical and chronological scope.

3. The Ancient East

3.1. Syria

The cultural area of Syria in Late Antiquity, with its sizeable Christian population, has left not only numerous church ruins, but also a relatively rich tradition of liturgical texts. These circumstances have led to several studies on the connection between church architecture and liturgy in this region.[26] Research has shown notable local differences in church disposition. However, it is by no means clear to what extent those differences have anything to do with a divergent liturgical tradition. Almost the entire area belonged to the sphere of influence of the patriarch of Antioch.

Thanks to the sources, a reasonably sharp picture of the Early Christian liturgy in Syrian church buildings is available. In the Northern regions the altar was in the apse; elsewhere in front of it. For a part of the eucharist it was hidden behind curtains.[27] On either side of the apse there were rooms which could serve as sacristy, martyrium or baptistery.[28] The worshippers in the nave were strictly separated according to sex.

Much attention was devoted to the North Syrian disposition with an enclosed platform in the central nave, on which were placed the lecterns and priests' benches, opposite the altar in the apse (late 4th - early 7th century). LASSUS and TCHALENKO (1951) were able to confirm the identification of the construction in the nave with the bema mentioned in some texts.[29] The confrontation between liturgical texts and archaeological data, however, can be more complicated than it may at first appear, as was demonstrated by the liturgical historian Robert TAFT.[30] Most monuments with nave-bemas (32 in number) have been preserved on the north-western limestone plateaux. The liturgical sources from that area do speak, it is true, of readings in the nave, but say nothing about the clergy remaining here during the entire liturgy of the word, which of course is what constitutes the real purpose of a podium with seats. Far more explicit about this specific function of a bema in the nave are the Nestorian sources regarding the liturgy in north-eastern Syria and in Mesopotamia. Here, however, there are only two examples of a nave-bema which have been archaeologically ascertained.

---

26 Important point of departure: J. LASSUS, *Sanctuaires chrétiens de Syrie: essai sur la genèse, la forme et l'usage liturgique des édifices du culte chrétien, en Syrie, du IIIe siècle à la conquête musulmane*. Paris 1947, esp. Ch. IV: *Le culte dans l'Église*.

27 G. KHOURI-SARKIS, *Notes sur l'anaphore syriaque: Prière du voile*, in: OrSyr 5. 1960, 363-384; 7. 1962, 277-296; 8. 1963, 3-20.

28 G. DESCOEUDRES, *Die Pastophorien im syro-byzantinischen Osten. Eine Untersuchung zu architektur- und liturgiegeschichtlichen Problemen*. Wiesbaden 1983 (Schr. zur Geistesgesch. des östl. Europa 16): a study of the form and function of the pastophories of Constantinople and Syria, which concludes that no consistent relationship exists between placement, function and denomination of these chambers and that the fixation of a ,prothesis' at the north and a ,diakonikon' at the south side can only be assigned a post-Byzantine date. Critical on DESCOEUDRES' limited use of the sources: H. BRAKMANN in ALw 30. 1988, 406-409.

29 J. LASSUS - G. TCHALENKO, *Ambons syriens*, in: Cah. archéolog. 5. 1951, 75-122; first proposed by J.-B. CHABOT, *L'Architecture gréco-syrienne*, in: Journal des Savants 1914, 436-442. For further bibliography see R. F. TAFT, *Some Notes on the Bema in the East and West Syrian Traditions*, in: OrChrP 34. 1968, 326-359.

30 TAFT, ibidem.

The case of Syria makes it clear that the chronological and topographic concentration of texts and monuments does not guarantee a complete explanation of the historical reality. With regard to spatial aspects, liturgical texts can be consciously general in approach - that is true of the 4th century *Constitutiones Apostolorum* - or want to present an ideal image. Even when they are more specific in their directions (such as the 5th century *Testamentum Domini*), their localization with regard to concrete monuments turns out to remain problematic.[31] On the other hand, there are also continual variants in the liturgical disposition which are not provided for in the texts and that cannot, it seems, be ascribed exclusively to incomplete survival. Noël DUVAL (1977), for example, pointed out a group of churches which is characterised by two well-defined rectangular chancels, behind each other in the longitudinal axis of the nave.[32] There are no mentions in the texts of such lay-outs, while there are also no archaeological indications available regarding the function of these areas, for example, as altar rooms or reading places.

3.2. Greece

In Greece and on the Aegean islands there are the remains of hundreds of Early Christian churches. Since the 1920s in particular, they have been the subject of archaeological research. Scholars like SOTERIOU and ORLANDOS were particularly interested in the liturgical disposition of these buildings. ORLANDOS has left numerous clearly drawn reconstructions, which sometimes suggest, however, there being more archaeological evidence regarding the church lay-out than is justified by actual fact. The general picture of these buildings - mostly 5th and 6th century - has nevertheless been fixed. As a rule, we are dealing with a simple basilica, composed of nave and single aisles on each side, with the priests' benches in the apse and the altar immediately in front of it. The altar space is characterised by benches at the side; the whole is surrounded by railings, at the front monumentalised by a pergola or a central entrance portal in canopy form. The ambo often stands isolated in the nave, usually beside the longitudinal axis.

Hypotheses on the liturgical use of these buildings, in the absence of liturgical sources from the Greek region, were until a short time ago based on the archaeological data. The frequent presence of stylobates in the colonnades which separate nave from side aisles led, for example, to a reconstruction of the liturgy in which the nave is completely reserved for liturgical actions, while the worshippers could only occupy the aisles and the galleries, if present.[33] Moreover, the „strong axiality" in Greek church design (the central door of the façade is on the same axis as the central entrance of the presbytery, unlike northern Syria and North Africa) would imply an important ceremonial for the introit procession.[34]

In recent decades however, the liturgy in itself is being increasingly turned to as a source of knowledge and possible explanation of the architecture. That tendency was clearly noticeable at the Xth International Congress for Christian Archaeology in 1980 in Thessalonica, which

---

31 E.g. regarding the narthex in A. M. SCHNEIDER, *Liturgie und Kirchenbau in Syrien*, in: NAWG 1949, 45-68. SCHNEIDER contradicts himself when he identifies the catechumen room of the 5th century *Testamentum Domini* as the narthex: the narthex is rare in 5th century Syria, and is also hardly ever in open communication with the nave.

32 N. DUVAL, *Notes sur l'église de Kabr Hiram (Liban) et ses installations liturgiques*, in: Cah. archéolog. 26. 1977, 81-104. Both barriers are, in some cases at least, contemporaneous. Characterisations as „dédoublement du bêma" (p. 89) and the comparison with the „dédoublement des choeurs" in North Africa (p. 102) appear to give an implicit interpretation of the Lebanese lay-out which the author himself would not wish to defend.

33 R. KRAUTHEIMER, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*. 4th ed. Harmondsworth 1986, 101-102. 217-218.

34 Th. ULBERT, *Die religiöse Architektur im östlichen Illyricum*, in: *Actes du Xe Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne. Thessalonique 28 septembre - 4 octobre 1980*. 1-2. Vatican City, Thessalonica 1984, 1,161-179, esp. 168f.

focussed on the Early Christian architecture of Greece (East Illyricum).[35] Specialists who are often to be heard on this subject include PALLAS and SODINI.

SODINI (1975/1984) approaches the liturgical lay-out mainly with archaeological means. His monograph on the double-church complex of Aliki demonstrates a fundamental interest in the liturgical appointments.[36] In studies regarding the entire Greek area regional variations in the disposition receive much attention and are indicated on maps.[37] In this way separate profiles in northern and southern church design begin to appear. SODINI posits that the regional differences are related to divergent liturgical observances, but regards the material as insufficient for further hypotheses.[38]

PALLAS tries to bring the archaeological data directly into relation with the liturgical sources. In a series of publications, he comes to the conclusion, through comparison of the architectural peculiarities of the churches in East Illyricum with well known liturgical ordines like the *Constitutiones Apostolicae* and the *Testamentum Domini*, that these documents originate from Greece and can therefore explain the regional architecture and disposition.[39] When the *Testamentum Domini* for example, mentions a room attached to the church building as accommodation for the catechumens, PALLAS sees the – as a rule - closed narthices in Greece as answering perfectly to this use.[40] The same document assumes a diaconicon at the entrance to the church, where the worshippers could leave their offerings: in this way PALLAS explains the side room at the narthex which is frequently found in Greece. Because the *Testamentum Domini* lays down that the presbytery must be closed off by a curtain, a direct function can also be allotted to the pergola. Other peculiarities of Greek church building, failing explicit mentions in the text, are explained by liturgical history in general. For example, the tripartite arched opening in the façade of many churches, according to PALLAS, refers to a solemn entry procession.[41]

PALLAS' working methods and his notable localization in Greece of texts regarded as Syrian has

35 *Actes du Xᵉ Congrès*: see the contribution of PALLAS (infra) and that of GOUNARIS on the two ambones in the octogon of Philippi. The studies by ULBERT, SODINI and SNIVELY are based on pure archaeological data, but aim at interrelations with the liturgy.

36 J.-P. SODINI - K. KOLOKOTSAS, *Aliki II. La basilique double*. Athens, Paris 1984.

37 J.-P. SODINI, *Note sur deux variantes régionales dans les basiliques de Grèce et des Balkans: Le tribélon et l'emplacement de l'ambon*, in: Bull. de Correspondance Hellénique 99. 1975, 581-588; idem, *Les dispositifs liturgiques des basiliques paléochrétiennes en Grèce et dans les Balkans*, in: *XXXI Corso di Cultura sull'Arte Ravennate e Bizantina, 7 - 14 Aprile 1984. La Grecia paleocristiana e bizantina*. Ravenna 1984, 441-473.

38 The archaeological approach also underlies a special study of one piece of church furniture in Greece: P. H. F. JAKOBS, *Die frühchristlichen Ambone Griechenlands*. Bonn 1987. For criticism of this work see the review by N. DUVAL in: Bull. monumental 146-IV. 1988, 368-371, and my review in JAC 32. 1989, 227-230.

39 D. PALLAS, *L'édifice cultuel chrétien et la liturgie dans l'Illyricum oriental*, in: *Actes du Xᵉ Congrès* 1, 85-160; idem, *Monuments et textes. Remarques sur la liturgie dans quelques basiliques paléochrétiennes de l'Illyricum oriental*, in: Epetêris tês hetaireias byzantinôn spoudôn 44. 1979-1980, 37-116.

40 PALLAS, *Édifice* 508-514. Cf. the same argument of SCHNEIDER with regard to Syria: supra n. 31. Cf. further J.-Ch. PICARD, *L'atrium dans les églises paléochrétiennes d'occident*, in: *Actes du XIᵉ Congrès International d'Archéologie Chrétienne. Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève et Aoste (21-28 septembre 1986)*. 1-3. Vatican City 1989, 1, 505-558, where the thesis is pronounced that the Early Christian atrium (the narthex included) – primarily in the West – „ne s'explique pas d'abord par sa fonction liturgique" and that it is „avant tout un luxe et (ou) une commodité": hence, its practical liturgical use would be only secondary. PALLAS objects to PICARD's conclusion that it is „minimisant sa fonction liturgique": ibidem 555f.

41 Cf. a recent contribution by PALLAS: *Die Baptisterien und das Kirchengebäude im altchristlichen Griechenland*, in: *Festschrift für Kl. Wessel zum 70. Geburtstag in memoriam*. M. RESTLE ed. München 1988, 215-230.

invited the warranted criticism. POST (1981) reproves him for making a comparison containing too many unknowns: a text which is not at all certainly dated and localised has to explain and identify buildings whose chronology and reconstruction is often not known, and vice versa.[42] The criticism is in fact opposed to a vision of church architecture which wants, in principle, to give a functional explanation for all architectural forms. With regard to the tripartite entrance arch it would imply for example that where this tribelon is not present, namely in Southern Greece, a processional entrance was not usual.

3.3. Constantinople

The „truly determinant factor" in the evolution of the vaulted centrally-planned churches of Justinian's time was liturgy. The statement is Richard KRAUTHEIMER's in his handbook on *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, in the introduction to the chapters on the first clear break with the tradition of the basilical hall as the building type for churches: „A centrally-planned building ... was ideally suited to the requirements of a service in which the performance of the Mass [processional entrances, readings] occupied the central area both liturgically and architecturally."[43]

What is unusual about the capital of the Eastern Roman Empire is not that the liturgy would play a more formative role here than elsewhere in the development of church architecture, but the relatively strong concentration of archaeological data and liturgical documentation. It is true that relatively little is known about church architecture before Justinian, but there is information available about the architecture and liturgical usage from the 6th century on, particulary with regard to the patriarchal church of Hagia Sophia. The earliest liturgical sources are commentaries by Maximus (7th century) and by Germanus (8th century), followed by liturgical text-books such as the Euchologion, the Typicon and the imperial book of ceremonies of Constantine Porphyrogenitus (10th century). This favorable situation with regard to sources has provided an entire series of studies on the theme of architecture and liturgy, which begins with EBERSOLT in 1910 and reaches a climax with MATHEWS' book of 1971.[44]

Thomas MATHEWS' *The Early Churches of Constantinople. Architecture and Liturgy*, reprinted a number of times since 1971, consists of two parts, which reflect the methodological approach. The first section is an analysis of the pre-Iconoclastic architecture on the basis of archaeological data. In the second part liturgical texts which can be brought into relation with the relevant buildings in topographical and chronological terms are scrutinized for what they have to say about the liturgical use of these buildings and their lay-out. Only at this stage is the architecture brought in to reconstruct the liturgy and vice versa.

MATHEWS was able to describe the church architecture in Constantinople in his period in terms of a common basic plan, despite the sometimes extremely diverse solutions in the architectural design. The churches were equipped with atrium and narthex: important for the entrance procession of priest and people. The apse sheltered the synthronon; the altar was in front of the apse in a rectangular projecting chancel. The ambo for readings and singing stood on the central axis, generally joined to the sanctuary by means of a solea. The liturgical activities were completely visible from the nave: the entire pre-Iconoclastic liturgy breathed, according to MATHEWS, an atmosphere of openness. The church was accessible through numerous doors and the sanctuary was visually open. The templon was not yet the solid barrier of the iconostasis. The apse had no

42 P. POST, *La liturgie en tant qu'architecture? Remarques sur la relation entre le „Testamentum Domini Jesu Christi" et l'architecture des églises dans l'Illyricum oriental*, in: Bijdragen 42. 1981, 392-420; cf. CHRISTERN, in: *Actes du Xᵉ Congrès* 202.

43 KRAUTHEIMER, *Architecture* (as n. 33) 203.

44 J. EBERSOLT, *Sainte Sophie de Constantinople: Étude de topographie d'après les cérémonies*. Paris 1910; later e.g. S. G. XYDIS, *The Chancel Barrier, Solea and Ambo of the Hagia Sophia*, in: The Art Bulletin 29. 1947, 1-24; see further Bibliography in: Th. F. MATHEWS, *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy*. Pennsylvania, London 1971.

sile rooms: the Great Entrance procession with the eucharistic offerings took place in Hagia Sophia from a separate subsidiary building, the ‚skeuophylakion'.

The conclusions arrived at by this two-sided method are sometimes surprising, to architectural historians as well as to liturgiologists. The liturgiologist TAFT for instance noticed MATHEWS' „revolutionary conclusion" that the Great Entrance was, indeed, not a procession which left from the sanctuary and returned to it, as it is today, but a real introit from without: an insight that could not be deduced from the liturgical sources alone.[45]

MATHEWS' work does not stand alone, either in its conviction that liturgical planning is one of the dynamic constituents of church architecture, or in its approach. In 1973 appeared a book by Christina STRUBE on the entrance architecture of the Justinian churches, in which the entrance route and the imperial chambers in the church were studied.[46] George MAJESKA (1978) studied the four green marble bands across the floor of Hagia Sophia and came to the conclusion that their function was that of „stopping places for the various magnificent processions".[47]

Because the coincidence of liturgical texts and archaeological evidence is seldom perfect, many questions remain unanswered. One of these concerns the function of the galleries which are frequently found in Constantinople. MATHEWS rejects the common notion that they were places for the women, because the stairs in some instances have been found to be outside of the church; this means that the liturgy, including communion, would be inaccessible to women. He comes to the conclusion that the galleries in the pre-Iconoclastic period were assigned to the catechumens (and a limited group of women?) and that the women, like the men – but certainly separated from them – attended the service from the central nave and side aisles.[48] Robert TAFT made a short critical comment on MATHEWS' explanation: the Emperor and his family were able to receive communion on the gallery of Hagia Sophia. Why not the women also?[49] STRUBE produced another hypothesis. She accepts the term „women's part" (‚gynaikites') for the galleries in the 6th century as an indication that these functioned as the regular place for women; a special part could have been screened off for the use of catechumens. The fact that in the 10th century the northern aisles at ground-level were called „women's parts", is to her mind related to the rise of a type of church without galleries: as a consequence of this the women were given, for the first time, a place on the ground floor.[50]

This respectable scholarly tradition ensures that a book can no longer be published on Hagia Sophia without taking liturgy into consideration. However, that this can be done from different approaches is shown by Rowland MAINSTONE's monograph. Its main issue is the unparalleled structural tour de force of Justinian's architects, but it contains a special chapter on the liturgical functioning of the Great Church, that gives an account of the impact the vast scale of the new architectural setting must have had on liturgical procedure.[51] Here, therefore, the accent is not on the influence of the liturgy on the architecture, but on the no less real effect of the architecture on the liturgy.

[45] R. TAFT, Review of MATHEWS, Early Churches, in: OrChrP 40. 1974, 201. Cf. the dissenting view of N. K. MORAN, expressed in The Skeuophylakion of the Hagia Sophia, in: Cah. archéolog. 34. 1986, 29-32, disapproved by H. BRAKMANN in ALw 24. 1982, 386; 30. 1988, 340.

[46] Ch. STRUBE, Die westliche Eingangsseite der Kirchen von Konstantinopel in justinianischer Zeit. Architektonische und quellenkritische Untersuchung. Wiesbaden 1973 (Schr. zur Geistesgesch. des östl. Europa 6).

[47] G. P. MAJESKA, Notes on the Archeology of St. Sophia at Constantinople: The Green Marble Bands on the Floor, in: DumbOP 32. 1978, 299-308.

[48] MATHEWS, Early Churches 128-134.

[49] TAFT, Review of MATHEWS, Early Churches 202; idem, Review of STRUBE, Eingangsseite, in: OrChrP 42. 1976, 296-303.

[50] STRUBE, Eingangsseite 164. Cf. TAFT, Review of STRUBE.

[51] R. J. MAINSTONE, Hagia Sophia. Architecture, Structure and Liturgy in Justinian's Great Church. London 1988, Ch. 9.

3.4. Medieval Developments

The history of architecture and liturgy in the Christian East during the Middle Ages has attracted much less interest than that of the early centuries. A satisfactory modern treatment of the medieval iconostasis, for example, is still painfully overdue.[52] However, one of the most characteristic developments of liturgy in this period, the multiplication of worship, has been the subject of a range of publications that try to integrate liturgical and architectural evidence.

The emergence of private celebrations and commemorative services has as a matter of course been linked with the existence of small rooms annexed to church buildings. G. BABIĆ (1969) argues that separate accommodations for additional services were already in use in Palestinian and Egyptian monasteries in the 4th century, but written sources regarding the practice date only from the 9th century onwards.[53] The texts point to a commemorative intention of the additional liturgy: services in commemoration of saints, deceased monks or founders. BABIĆ's study, however, lacks a real confrontation between liturgical sources and the architectural substance. The 4th and 5th centuries exhibit a variety of annexed chambers, but proof that any of them functioned as a chapel is dubious. ĆURČIĆ demonstrated that lateral rooms became formally standardized and integrated into the body of the church only after the Iconoclastic controversy: from then on there was a continued recurrence of flanking rooms both on ground level and on that of the galleries.[54] Only at this stage do monuments and the liturgical evidence adduced by BABIĆ coincide in such a way that the identification as chapels can be assumed to be certain.

Caution in the functional identification of this type of room is shown in the article by Barbara SCHELLEWALD on the upper-story chambers in Syrian, Caucasian and Byzantine church building.[55] These chambers, above the rooms flanking the sanctuary and possibly also at the opposite end of the church, generally do not seem to have had a chapel function in Syria or in the earliest examples in Armenia. Though documents are lacking, their extremely limited space and their virtual inaccessibility indicate a function as treasury or storage. Only in later Armenian and post-Iconoclastic Byzantine churches their function as chapels is certain. SCHELLEWALD's results correspond to a certain extent with those of a study on upper story chapels that was carried out almost simultaneously by N. TETERIATNIKOV, but here the function of chapel for the upper rooms seems all too prematurely assumed.[56]

Both recent contributions on the upper-story chambers could profit from a study published in 1982 by Th. MATHEWS, that put the emergence of the subsidiary chapels into a broader liturgical perspective than the funerary and commemorative function stressed by BABIĆ.[57] MATHEWS calls attention not only to the recurrence of lateral chapels but to the noticeable reduction in scale in Byzantine church architecture after Iconoclasm. The author sees this miniaturization not as the consequence of a drop in population, but of a liturgical development which had set in earlier. This process is characterised by the evolution from open to closed forms: the shrinking of the

[52] J. DWIRNYK, Rôle de l'iconostase dans le culte divin. Montréal 1960, is largely theoretical and for the archaeological component completely dependent on secondary literature. Cf. A. W. EPSTEIN, The Middle Byzantine Sanctuary Barrier: Templon or Iconostasis?, in: Journal of the British Archaeolog. Assoc. 134. 1981, 1-28; N. LABREQUE-PERVOUCHINE, L'iconostase: une évolution historique en Russie. Montréal 1982.

[53] G. BABIĆ, Les chapelles annexes des églises byzantines. Fonction liturgique et programmes iconographiques. Paris 1969.

[54] S. ĆURČIĆ, Architectural Significance of Subsidiary Chapels in Middle Byzantine Churches, in: Journal of the Soc. of Architectural Historians 36. 1977, 94-110.

[55] B. SCHELLEWALD, Zur Typologie, Entwicklung und Funktion von Oberräumen in Syrien, Armenien und Byzanz, in: JAC 27/28. 1984/1985, 171-218.

[56] N. TETERIATNIKOV, Upper-Story Chapels Near the Sanctuary in Churches of the Christian East, in: DumbOP 42. 1988, 65-72.

[57] Th. F. MATHEWS, „Private" liturgy in Byzantine architecture. Toward a Re-appraisal, in: Cah. archéolog. 30. 1982, 125-138.

processions, the increasing concentration on a strictly closed sanctuary. Related to this is the privatisation of the liturgy. The decreasing significance of the collective, public, service reduces the need for big buildings and also leads to the multiplication of oratories. The history of liturgy explains, in this context, not so much specific forms in architecture, but basic notions of scale and number. That practical requirements of proximity and accessibility also played a role, in Russia with its severe winters for example, confirms that also on this level the liturgy cannot be regarded as the only determining factor.

4. The Ancient West

4.1. North Africa

The Christian monuments of North Africa have been preserved, at the best, as ruins. Despite the intensive archaeological research of the last decades there is as yet no coherent picture or fixed chronology of North African church architecture. Almost nothing is known about the service in this province of the ancient world: there are no liturgical texts, notwithstanding the large literary legacy of Augustine for example. The knowledge of liturgy and its spatial aspects is based then to a great extent on the interpretation of archaeological data.

The risks of a one-sided method dictated by necessity are apparent in the study by A. G. LUIKS, who, on the basis of a cathedra erected high in the apse, above the altar which is placed in the middle of the nave, ascribes a hegemony of word over table to the North African service.[58] The altar takes on the features of a proto-Calvinist communion table. In this, LUIKS ignored the coherence of the total disposition, in which sometimes a considerable part of the nave was reserved as sanctuary, and passed by the monumental apparatus which surrounded the altar.[59] Noël DUVAL, on the other hand, in his research applied a clear distinction between systematic archaeological documentation and historical interpretation.[60] His analysis is based on a relatively small group among North African churches, namely the churches with square or semi-circular counter-apses. All known counter-apses appear to have been added to an existing building. For the addition, in the 5th and 6th centuries, no single motive can be deduced. They were used as funerary exedra, as a second liturgical centre or as a martyrium, possibly in combination. As well as functional requirements a formal preference for bi-polar rooms seems also to have played a role.[61] Eventually, however, the author came to stress the introduction of the cult of the martyrs in urban churches as a determining factor in the development of counter-apses.[62]

DUVAL's work shows that the same functional requirements could lead to different solutions. The building in of a second apse against the inner nave façade of some churches in North Africa was accompanied in Sbeitla I by the addition of flanking rooms in the side aisles, while in La Skhira this was not done, in order to keep open an entrance through the side doors in the outer wall. Obviously,

58 A. G. LUIKS, *Cathedra en Mensa. De plaats van preekstoel en avondmaalstafel in het oudchristelijk kerkgebouw volgens de opgravingen in Noord-Afrika.* Franeker 1955.

59 Cf. F. VAN DER MEER, Review of LUIKS, *Cathedra,* in: Bibl. orientalis 1957, 185ff; PEETERS, *Dispositie* (as n. 12) 283.

60 N. DUVAL, *Les églises africaines à deux absides. Recherches archéologiques sur la liturgie chrétienne en Afrique du Nord.* 1-2. Paris 1971-1973. – 1: *Recherches archéologiques à Sbeitla.* 2: *Inventaire des monuments – Interprétation.*

61 DUVAL, *Églises* 2,378f, cf. 368. In the meantime, the strongly developed martyr cult in North Africa has been further studied by Yvette DUVAL, particularly on the basis of epigraphic sources. The study confirms the function of a considerable number of basilicas ad corpus with coemetrial function and furnishings for the martyr liturgy as well as the important role of relics in the setting up of altars in numerous other churches from the early 5th century: Y. DUVAL, *Loca sanctorum Africae. Le culte des martyrs en Afrique, du 4e au 7e siècle.* 1-2. Rome 1982.

62 See N. DUVAL, *L'évêque et la cathédrale en Afrique du Nord,* in: *Actes du XIe Congrès* 1,345-399, esp. 359.

in one case the need to ensure smooth circulation of the worshippers prevailed, in the other the commodity of ancillary rooms.[63]

4.2. Spain

Spain's own Latin liturgical tradition has come down in written form from the 6th/7th centuries: in proceedings and canons of councils, euchological texts, descriptions, commentaries and ‚ordines'. This so-called Visigothic or Mozarabic liturgy is characterised by a great wealth of formulae and rituals. Contemporary studies have the tendency to emphasise the originality of the Hispanic tradition while the long-standing postulated influences from North Africa, the East and Milan have been qualified.[64] The rite existed in and alongside the Arab occupation (from 711) for a long period, to a great extent isolated from the rest of Western Europe. Only in the 11th century did the Roman liturgy definitively supplant the indigenous tradition.

The monuments from Late Antiquity and the period of the Visigoths (4th – 7th century) were studied fragmentarily in the past, especially by P. de PALOL, but were only presented to an international public in a comprehensive overview by SCHLUNK and HAUSCHILD in 1978.[65] The image of church architecture from before the Arab conquest, to say nothing of the centuries following it, is however far from complete. Too many monuments were lost, sometimes under the Arab conquerors, sometimes only through replacement after the „Reconquista". Except in Barcelona, not a single Early Christian urban cathedral is known. Besides, the elementary question for interpretation of the liturgy, namely the status of a church building, remains unanswered.[66] Is it a bishop's church, a parish church, a memoria, a monastery church, a private church, a funerary church? This identification appears to be time and again problematic in Spain and Portugal, partly because the topography of the surroundings has not yet been researched.

The study of the possible relation between the specific characteristics of the Hispanic liturgy and certain peculiarities of church architecture on the Iberian peninsula has up to now been mainly directed at the double apses and the side rooms of the apse.

Four countryside monuments have definitely been identified as double-apsed churches. All seem to date from around 500 or somewhat later in the 6th century. The monuments of this type have been studied by Thilo ULBERT and almost simultaneously, but independently, by Stephanie Jernigan MALONEY.[67] ULBERT's monograph offers a complete analysis of the disposition of the churches concerned, based on archaeological evidence. The altar, according to Spanish use, is located within the eastern apse; in front of it is the presbytery, whereas a walkway, protected by barriers, extending through the nave, connects the eastern choir with the western apse. ULBERT observes that the second apse belongs to the original fabric of the church, contrary to the double-apsed churches in North Africa. This important fact is confirmed by MALONEY.

The functional interpretation of the Iberian double-apse design turns out to be difficult: as direct

63 DUVAL, *Églises* 2,316.

64 For example, M. S. GROS Y PUJOL, *Utilització arqueològica de la litúrgia hispana. Possibilitats i límits,* in: *Il reunió d'arqueologia paleocristiana hispànica. Montserrat, 2 – 5 novembre 1978.* Barcelona 1982, 147-166.

65 H. SCHLUNK – Th. HAUSCHILD, *Die Denkmäler der frühchristlichen und westgotischen Zeit.* Mainz 1978 (Hispania Antiqua 1).

66 This does not imply that the status of a church would be determining for its form or disposition. As a matter of fact, several contributions to the 11th International Congress of Christian Archaeology on the theme „L'éveque et la cathédrale" made clear that Early Christian cathedrals rarely distinguish themselves formally from other functional categories of churches: *Actes du XIe Congrès* 1 (e.g. DUVAL, SODINI, ULBERT).

67 Th. ULBERT, *Frühchristliche Basiliken mit Doppelapsiden auf der iberischen Halbinsel: Studien zur Architektur- und Liturgiegeschichte.* Berlin 1978 (Archäolog. Forsch. 5); S. J. MALONEY, *Early Christian Double-apsed Churches in Iberia. Some Considerations,* in: Art History 3. 1980, 129-143.

documentation is lacking, the authors base their arguments on archaeological evidence and comparative liturgical reasoning. Both proceed by checking the functional parameters adduced by DUVAL in examining the African counterparts. Inversion of orientation is of course irrelevant, the two apses being coeval. A funerary purpose is improbable in view of the absence of burials in the Iberian secondary apses. The martyrological and strictly liturgical functions remain. MALONEY rejects the first, because there are no indications for martyr's burials or dedications to a saint. Her tentative liturgical explanation however, seems motivated by embarrassment: the second apse might have functioned like the North Syrian nave bema, providing a place for the seating of the clergy and the readings of the scriptures. But why then would counter-apses be so exceptional in Spain? ULBERT in fact, inclines towards the martyrological explanation, though he avoids a definite hypothesis.[68] This is finally presented by Jürgen CHRISTERN in a review of ULBERT's book.[69] He thought that ULBERT had based himself too much on the premise that, when there were no gravestones in the floor, a function of dedication to a saint or martyr burial is excluded. CHRISTERN proposes an above-ground cult object, as is found in North Africa, in this case a shrine with the translated relics of a saint: the second apse would be a martyrium. The numerous graves in the rest of the churches concerned are then graves 'ad sanctos'.[70]

A much more widespread characteristic of church architecture in the territory of the Hispanic liturgy is the side rooms on either side of the apse, nave or transept. These occur in both the Visigothic period and Mozarabic churches from the 9th and 10th centuries and are obviously not chapels. Already in 1927, WHITEHILL had made a connection between them and the offertory rite from the old-Spanish liturgy: the offerings were presented before the mass by the worshippers, and then prepared by the clergy and brought to the altar during the offertory.[71] The Mozarabic missal in this context points to a 'preparatorium': the identification with one of the two rooms is obvious.[72] Neither the rite, nor the presence of side rooms, however, is specific to the Iberian peninsula. Furthermore, there are clear examples where one of the side rooms had the function of a baptistery from the very beginning.[73]

The strict compartmentalization of church buildings is a third characteristic for which explanations have been sought in liturgical usage. In S. Gião in Portugal, for example, transept and nave are only connected by three rather small arched openings in a wall. SCHLUNK points out the

---

[68] ULBERT, *Basiliken* 131f.

[69] BoJ 184. 1984, 761-766.

[70] CHRISTERN's hypothesis seems plausible, although it is not liturgically documented. The author considers that ULBERT is being over-cautious, when he refuses to relate the rubrics from the 'Liber Ordinum' with indications like 'in duos choros' and 'secundo choro', directly with the four churches with double apses which he is discussing (see ULBERT, *Basiliken* 135-138: as function, he suggests a podium for readings or a choir for the singers). In terms of methodology, ULBERT would seem to be right in this. The 'Liber Ordinum' is a 10th century compilation which while it does have early roots, describes an episcopal liturgy which could be followed in other churches. GROS, *Utilització* 162ff, surmises that the 'Liber Ordinum' reflects the liturgy of Oviedo, the Asturian capital, around 800. The churches with counter-apses, however, were standard in neither the Early Christian period, nor in the 10th century. The terminology of a second choir can also be explained in terms of a complicated system of barriers around the altar in the eastern apse.

[71] W. M. WHITEHILL, *Liturgical Influence on Pre-Romanesque Apses in Spain*, in: Art Studies 5. 1927, 150-156.

[72] I am taking this interpretation from an unpublished study by E. QUEVEDO, *The Lateral Chambers in Pre-Romanesque Spanish Churches and their Liturgical Function*, a thesis under the guidance of MATHEWS and DODDS, Institute of Fine Arts New York 1984. Cf., too, GROS, *Utilització* 164.

[73] ULBERT, *Basiliken* 114, 124. 129, refers to these complications (in the case of the churches with counter-apses one of the side rooms also served as narthex).

---

prescribed strict division between clergy and laity, and sees the transept as a place for the clergy (monks?), because the apse was occupied by the altar.[74]

A direct confrontation between monuments and liturgical sources was possible in ULBERT's chapter on the baptisteries of the churches with counter-apses.[75] On the one hand, there are three baptisteries which can be accurately reconstructed with their lay-out and subsidiary rooms, on the other hand there are texts – partly contemporary, partly later – which indicate the functions of the rooms. The archaeological particulars, in their turn, make it again possible to make a more detailed reconstruction of the baptism ritual and to give an overall picture of its development during the 6th and 7th centuries. As an example, ULBERT attempts to explain the installation of large basins in the 6th century as a solemnizing of adult baptism by means of immersion.[76] On the basis of the 10th century 'Liber ordinum' the routes of clergy and persons to be baptized through the rooms concerned can be precisely plotted. In this case the literary source links up perfectly with an archaeological situation which is three or four centuries older.[77]

4.3. Northern Italy and the Adriatic Provinces

Some of the features of ancient ecclesiastical architecture in Northern Italy and the Adriatic coastal areas and hinterlands are among the most frequently discussed topics in the scholarly history of architecture and liturgy: twin cathedrals and lateral chambers. Other characteristic features, such as the free-standing benches and solea-like pathways, have likewise attracted intensive scholarly attention. When a formal architectural interpretation is less obvious, then it would appear that a functional explanation is all the more urgent. Yet most of the problems have remained unresolved, due to the almost complete lack of liturgical documentation. However, some new results can be reported concerning the side chambers and the baptistery.

The double churches or „twin cathedrals", concentrated in Northern Italy and on the Adriatic shores, but not exclusively there, have occupied generations of scholars. It has been noticed that double temples were frequent in ancient Istria.[78] But the Christian adaptation of this local tradition poses the question of liturgical functioning. A sporadic record mentioning the arrangement of different functions in different spaces, namely the instruction of the catechumens and the celebration of the eucharist, has been applied to the twin halls.[79] A crucial case is that of Aquileia, with its early 4th century complex. The arguments for identifying the northern hall as that of the catechumens, and the southern hall as the church of the faithful – or the reverse – are always archaeological finds, like a floor mosaic that is thought to indicate the location of the altar or cathedra and grooves that might mark the position of chancel screens.[80] As long as less ambiguous indications are not at hand, an all-encompassing and differentiated image of planning and function of the double churches will remain out of reach. On the other hand, enough indications exist as not to expect a fixed pattern of usage. SODINI's catalogue of 71 double churches in the Early Christian world suggests that the twin arrangement is not specific for any functional purpose.[81] Though the author tends to isolate the cult of the martyrs and baptism as the most frequent factors that could be

---

[74] H. SCHLUNK, *Die Kirche von S. Gião bei Nataré (Portugal). Ein Beitrag zur Bedeutung der Liturgie für die Gestaltung des Kirchengebäudes*, in: Madrider Mitt. 12. 1971, 205-240.

[75] ULBERT, *Basiliken*, Ch. IV.

[76] Ibidem 175f.

[77] Cf. C. GODOY FERNÁNDEZ, *Baptisterios hispánicos (siglos IV al VIII). Arqueología y liturgia*, in: Actes du XIe Congrès 1,607-635.

[78] KRAUTHEIMER, *Architecture* (as n. 33) 43.

[79] J. HUBERT, *Les „cathédrales doubles" et l'histoire de la liturgie*, in: Atti del Primo congresso internazionale di studi longobardi. Spoleto, 27-30 settembre 1951. Spoleto 1952, 167-176; R. KRAUTHEIMER, *The Twin Cathedral at Pavia*, in: KRAUTHEIMER, *Studies* 161-180.

[80] PEETERS, *Dispositie* (as n. 12) 226-231 with references to older literature. For more recent contributions see the titles of FRANKE and GAMBER, infra n. 85-86.

[81] SODINI - KOLOKOTSAS, *Aliki II* (as n. 36), 255-312.

established as having played a role in the use of double churches, his conclusion is unambiguously „qu'aucun programme liturgique ne rend nécessaire l'établissement d'une basilique double".[82]

Another controversial issue concerns a large number of smaller churches on the north shore of the Adriatic and its deep hinterlands. These particular monuments are generally simple box churches without an apse and early in date (early 4th century): they have a free-standing semicircular bench behind the more or less centrally positioned altar. Einar DYGGVE identified them without hesitation as benches for the clergy.[83] Later on Klaus GAMBER launched a different hypothesis.[84] He saw the benches as a proof in stone of his conviction that the buildings enveloping them were originally house churches: the benches would be intended for the participants of an agapè-meal, an ancient Christian use connected with the eucharist, that would have survived relatively long in the Adriatic, Danube and Alp regions. The severe criticism of both the content and methodology of GAMBER's argument referred to the fact that there is no documentary source which bears witness to the curiously late survival of a custom demonstrably fallen into disuse nearly everywhere in the Early Christian world by 300. Moreover, GAMBER's catalogue of monuments with the free-standing bench was found to be arbitrary, incomplete and not based on a well defined coherent territory. Finally, GAMBER did not follow GRABAR's main point and failed to distinguish between congregational churches and funerary chapels: in fact, both categories appear to have had semicircular benches.[85] These ponderous arguments were not without effect and in 1983 GAMBER abandoned his previous view and recognized that in the early 4th century the agapè-eucharist was surviving exclusively in the Coptic world.[86] In the meantime, however, there is still no fresh study of sigma-benches in the Adriatic and neighbouring provinces.

The most important centres of the region were the two subsequent capitals: Milan and Ravenna. In Milan six vast basilicas were built in the second half of the 4th century, whose „widely differing plans show the inventiveness of the builders".[87] The church of the Holy Apostles, built by Milan's bishop, Saint Ambrose, was laid out in the plan of a huge cross. The cross plan was not unusual in North Italy in this period, but in this case the intended meaning of the lay-out has come down to us in a dedicatory inscription, that refers to the cruciform plan as a symbol of the triumph of Christ.[88] It is one of the few original symbolical interpretations of Early Christian churches, but though it was conceived directly by the person responsible for building the church, it does not prove that symbolism actually determined the cross-shaped plan.

A distinctive part of the liturgical arrangement has been discovered in the remains of the 4th-century Milanese cathedral under the present Piazza del Duomo: a pathway or ‚solea', projecting from the chancel into the nave. A similar lay-out has been found in a large number of other North Italian churches, sometimes at nave floor level and only discernible in the pavement pattern,

---

82 Ibidem 312.
83 E. DYGGVE, Über die freistehende Klerusbank. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bema, in: Beiträge zur älteren europäischen Kulturgeschichte. Festschrift für R. Egger. 1-3. Klagenfurt 1952, 1,41-52. D. attributed to these benches a connection with the Syrian bema, though their position and function were entirely different.
84 K. GAMBER, Domus ecclesiae. Die ältesten Kirchenbauten Aquilejas sowie im Alpen- und Donaugebiet bis zum Beginn des 5. Jh. liturgiegeschichtlich untersucht. Regensburg 1968 (SPLi 2).
85 The main critics are: H. BRAKMANN, Die angeblichen eucharistischen Mahlzeiten des 4. und 5. Jahrhunderts. Zu einem neuen Buch Klaus Gambers, in: RQ 65. 1970, 82-97; Th. KLAUSER, Review of GAMBER, Domus ecclesiae, in: JAC 11/12. 1968/1969, 215-224; P. FRANKE, Zur Frage der frühchristlichen liturgischen Mahlzeiten in Aquileia, in: ALw 14. 1972, 139-155.
86 K. GAMBER, Sacrificium vespertinum. Lucernarium und eucharistisches Opfer am Abend und ihre Abhängigkeit von den Riten der Juden. Regensburg 1983 (SPLi 12), esp. 43ff, and Nochmals zur ältesten Bischofskirche von Aquileja, in: ALw 26. 1984, 347-350.
87 KRAUTHEIMER, Architecture 78.
88 E. DIEHL, Inscriptiones latinae christianae veteres. 1-3. Berlin 1961, no. 1800: „Forma crucis templum est, templum victoria Christi. Sacra triumphalis signat imago locum."

---

sometimes one step higher. A series of these Italian solea-dispositions, partially discovered only recently, was presented by Giuseppe CUSCITO in an attempt to unravel its liturgical purpose.[89] Because ritual evidence regarding a possible use of the solea is lacking, the author proposes some tentative explanations, such as a way to the ambo for readings or an enclosure for the distribution of communion. Paradoxically enough, he himself has discarded the interpretation of a monumental route for the entrance procession, as the introit procession is thought to have been a 6th century „Eastern" development.[90]

Though its 5th and 6th century churches with remnants of liturgical furniture have been well preserved, Ravenna has attracted few scholars in the field of liturgy and architecture, because here too ritual documentation is lacking.[91] One aspect has become the subject of a special examination: the rooms flanking the main apses. In her 1987 study Janet Charlotte SMITH gives a catalogue of the available examples in Ravenna and Classe and a discussion of their shapes and functional features, such as doors, windows and niches.[92] The original usage of these rooms had to be deduced from these features, often only in the form of a hypothesis. Some of them are supposed to have been a library, others a memoria, mausoleum, sacristy, store-room or chapel. The general conclusion is clear enough: there is no linear development in the architectural form of the side chambers and there are no apparent liturgical requirements common to all Ravennate side-chambers. Numerous 5th and 6th century churches in the city did not have lateral rooms, so that they cannot have been obligatory for the regular eucharistic service. Hence, the side-chambers are „a regional solution for the placement of diverse ancillary rooms with a wide variety of functions".[93] In this sense, SMITH's results correspond with those regarding Syria and probably also Spain, where no consistent relationship could be found between either placement, form and function of the lateral chambers. At the same time the evidence from Ravenna exhibits a parallel with that of the upper-story rooms in the East: both SCHELLEWALD and SMITH established that during the last period under examination the dominant form of usage of the annexed lateral rooms became that of chapel.

A combined use of archaeological and liturgical evidence from both capitals gives an exceptionally clear picture of architecture and liturgy around the sacrament of baptism. Bishop Ambrose has given a rather complete description of baptism in Milan, and the building where it was administered is known from modern excavations. The 4th-century Milanese baptistery was an octagonal domed room with niches at its sides and an eight-sided font in the centre. Ambrose himself gives a symbolical interpretation of the design: the number eight that determined the plan represented the death and rebirth of Christ and thus of the neophyte.[94] A careful reconstruction of the ritual procedure in the architectural context of the baptismal hall has been carried out by

---

89 G. CUSCITO, Riquadri musivi a destinazione liturgica nelle basiliche paleocristiane dell'alto adriatico, in: Mosaici in Aquileia e nell'Alto Adriatico. Udine 1975 (Antichità Altoadriatiche 8) 177-216.
90 Ibidem 185. CUSCITO expresses the hope for „più dettagliate conoscenze delle rubriche liturgiche": ibidem 215.
91 The hypothesis by K. GAMBER, Der Ordo Romanus IV ein Dokument der ravennatischen Liturgie des 8. Jh., in: RQ 66. 1971, 154-170, to locate the mass-rubrics of ‚Ordo Romanus' IV in Ravenna, has not convinced his liturgiological confreres. On the liturgical use of Ravenna see J. LEMARIÉ, La liturgie de Ravenne au temps de Pierre Chrysologue et l'ancienne liturgie d'Aquilée, in: Aquileia e Ravenna. Udine 1978 (Antichità Altoadriatiche 13) 355-373: Roman tradition, strong connections with Aquileia and no significant Byzantine influence.
92 J. Ch. SMITH, A Study of Architectural Form and Function: The Side Chambers of Fifth and Sixth Century Churches in Ravenna and Classe (Diss. Univ. of Pennsylvania 1987).
93 Ibidem 108.
94 J. SCHMITZ, Gottesdienst im altchristlichen Mailand. Eine liturgiewissenschaftliche Untersuchung über Initiation und Meßfeier während des Jahres zur Zeit des Bischofs Ambrosius († 397). Köln, Bonn 1975 (Theophaneia 25) 11-14.

the liturgiologist Josef SCHMITZ in a monograph on liturgy in Ambrose's episcopate.[95]

The baptistery of the cathedral in Ravenna was built partly about 400 and partly about 450, and shows many similarities to that of Milan. As the Ravenna baptistery has been superbly preserved, including its mosaic decoration, its *Ritual and Reconstructed Meaning* have been the theme of a contribution by Annabel Jane WHARTON.[96] She establishes the liturgical functioning of the baptistery on the base of Ambrose's writings. It appears that the positioning of certain mosaic scenes has been determined by the route of the candidates. The aim of the author, however, is to demonstrate that the ritual function made the baptistery with its pictorial programme into a social integrator between the bishop, who played the principal role in the ceremonial, and the civic congregation. In view of the centrality of baptism in the life of Early Christians and of the spiritual and political authority of the bishop, the baptismal chapel „assumed civic importance as the visible sign of social coherence". The baptistery is seen to be more than can be explained „narrowly in terms of cult requirements",[97] but the same is doubtlessly true for the church building itself.

4.4. Rome

In few Early Christian metropolises has such a large amount of material survived with regard to church architecture and liturgy as in Rome. Dozens of Early Christian and medieval church buildings have been preserved or are traceable in their original form and the surviving amount of liturgical texts is considerable, especially due to the exceptional development of the Roman episcopal see. Much of this material is available in modern editions: reconstructions of nearly all churches up to the 9th century in the *Corpus Basilicarum* of KRAUTHEIMER and his collaborators,[98] the liturgical ‚ordines' and ceremonies in publications by ANDRIEU, VAN DIJK, SCHIMMELPFENNIG and DYKMANS.[99] Unlike Syria and Constantinople the remains, however, cover a wide chronological range. The most important church buildings date from the 4th and 5th centuries, while the liturgical sources begin to survive more consistently only from the 7th century onwards. Also, almost all liturgical texts are related to the papal service, while most churches functioned mainly with the non-papal liturgy. These methodical complications must be the reason why comparatively few studies have been devoted to the relation between architecture and liturgy in the spiritual centre of Western Christianity.[100]

MATHEWS, before he undertook his study of Constantinople, made a limited attempt to explain, with the aid of the early medieval papal ‚ordines', some late antique church dispositions in Rome.[101] The author was able to show that the small solea-like precincts stretching over the longitudinal axis of the nave, which have been excavated in some churches, were connected to the

95 Ibidem, esp. 77 ff. Cf. two recent studies on baptism: C. BONNET, *Baptistères et groupes épiscopaux d'Aoste et de Genève: Évolution architecturale et aménagements liturgiques*, in: *Actes du XIe Congrès* 2,1407-1426, and J.-Ch. PICARD, *Ce que les textes nous apprennent sur les équipements et le mobilier liturgique nécessaires pour le baptême. Dans le sud de la Gaule et l'Italie du Nord*: ibidem 1451-1468.

96 A. J. WHARTON, *Ritual and Reconstructed Meaning: The Neonian Baptistery in Ravenna*, in: The Art Bulletin 69. 1987, 358-375.

97 Ibidem 368 n. 79, regarding the large baptisteries of Italian cities in the high Middle Ages.

98 R. KRAUTHEIMER – S. CORBETT – W. FRANKL – A. K. FRAZER, *Corpus basilicarum Christianarum Romae. The Early Christian Basilicas of Rome (IV-IX Cent.).* 1-5. Vatican City, Rome, New York 1937-1977.

99 I refer to the bibliography of sources in: S. de BLAAUW, *Cultus et decor. Liturgie en architectuur in laatantiek en middeleeuws Rome: Basilica Salvatoris, Sanctae Mariae, Sancti Petri.* Delft 1987, 548-553.

100 The only comprehensive discussion from a relatively recent date is the chapter on Rome in PEETERS, *Dispositie,* Ch. 8.

101 Th. F. MATHEWS, *An Early Roman Chancel Arrangement and its Liturgical Functions*, in: RAC 38. 1962, 73-95.

form of the entrance procession in the papal liturgy. The discrepancy between the physical remains and the written sources however, was such that MATHEWS' effort has remained a somewhat isolated phenomenon.[102] Nevertheless, it found a chronological successor in Elaine De BENEDICTIS' dissertation, in which form and function of the chancel precincts in Roman churches during the high Middle Ages are studied.[103] The author argues that the usual designation ‚schola cantorum' is misplaced, and comes to the conclusion that these enclosures, wider and shorter than those from the early Middle Ages, generally functioned for the offices of the chapters or convents attached to the church. Compared to the period studied by MATHEWS then, both form and function had changed.

The author of this article has himself attempted to overcome the traditional barriers in the research field between architecture and liturgy, with a study published in 1987 on the three most important churches – from the liturgical point of view – of the city: the Lateran basilica, S. Maria Maggiore and Old St. Peter's.[104] One of the methods applied here is the study of a long time span (from the 4th to the 14th century) in order to bridge the lacunae in the archaeological and textual sources by establishing continuous factors in lay-out and ritual. Though the Lateran basilica (4th century) and S. Maria Maggiore fulfilled the same liturgical function, they belonged to different architectural types: the Lateran basilica had a normal apse whereas S. Maria Maggiore (5th C.) was built with an apse that opened into a surrounding ambulatory. On the other hand, St. Peter's originally had a distinct function, that of memoria for the apostle, but assumed the same liturgical role of papal „cathedral", like that of both other churches, in the 6th century. After that, the particular architectural shape and the liturgical disposition of St. Peter's became a model for other churches, S. Maria Maggiore included: what originated in the specific situation of the apostle's grave was adopted by churches that initially had no saint's tomb at all. The Lateran always tried to resist this tendency and conserved the main elements of its original Constantinian disposition. Consequently, this study too, displays a certain independence of architectural form from liturgical function and vice versa.

Modern scholarship on Rome shows that research in the field of architecture and liturgy need not be expected exclusively in special integrative studies. Several recent monographs on the architectural history of specific Roman churches contain an analysis of the liturgical disposition as a substantial part of the overall treatment.[105] They are obviously inspired by the attention to liturgical appointments in the *Corpus Basilicarum* and testify to a growing awareness of the functional and liturgical component in architecture and art.[106]

102 Cf. a few other attempts to study archaeological evidence in confrontation with early medieval liturgical sources: E. De BENEDICTIS, *The Senatorium and Matroneum in the Early Roman Church*, in: RAC 57. 1981, 69-85 (with critical notes regarding MATHEWS), and F. GANDOLFO, *La Cattedra di Pasquale I in S. Maria Maggiore*, in: *Roma e l'età Carolingia.* Rome 1976, 57-67.

103 E. De BENEDICTIS, *The „Schola Cantorum" in Rome during the High Middle Ages* (Diss. Bryn Mawr Univ. 1983.)

104 De BLAAUW, *Cultus et decor* (as n. 99).

105 E.g. R. E. MALMSTROM, *S. Maria in Aracoeli at Rome* (Diss. New York Univ. 1973); D. KINNEY, *S. Maria in Trastevere from its founding to 1215* (Diss. New York Univ. 1975); J. BARCLAY LLOYD, *The Medieval Church and Canonry of S. Clemente in Rome.* Rome 1989; I. M. VOSS, *Die Benediktinerabtei S. Andrea in Flumine bei Ponzano Romano.* Bonn 1985.

106 By way of supplement, because beyond the chronological scope of this paper, a few studies concerning architecture and liturgy in 16th century Rome deserve to be mentioned, which show an interesting method of „cross-analyzing" textual and visual evidence (accurate drawings of liturgical ceremonies): N. H. MINNICH – H. W. PFEIFFER, *De Grassi's „Conciliabulum" at Lateran V: The de Gargiis Woodcut of Lateran V Re-examined*, in: AHP 19. 1981, 147-172; N. K. RASMUSSEN, *Maiestas Pontificia. A Liturgical Reading of Etienne Dupérac's Engraving of the Capella Sixtina from 1578*, in: ARID 12. 1983, 109-148, and idem, *Iconography and Liturgy at the Canonization of Carlo Borromeo*, in: ARID 15. 1986, 119-150.

5. The Medieval West

5.1. Monastic Churches in the Frankish Empire

The elaborate western termination of Carolingian churches has been the subject of a long scholarly tradition. Soon after the Second World War the dominant trend was to assign the „Westwerk" or „Église-porche" an imperial meaning, that would express itself on a practical level by functioning as an imperial throne-room, a court chapel or a lodge in which the Emperor could attend the services.[107] But the majority of the churches with a westwork do not seem to have had any imperial or royal connection. And would a purely symbolical reference produce such a developed architectural feature? Some critics sought an alternative interpretation by linking up the westwork again with the regular liturgy.[108]

The most detailed attempt to trace the liturgical significance of the westwork was undertaken by Carol HEITZ in 1963.[109] In this, a key role is played by the abbey church of St. Riquier-Centula (790-800), the first known example of a westwork and one of the few on which there is a surviving liturgical source. The Institutio de diversitate officiorum of the abbot and builder Angilbert not only gives us an insight into the Sunday processions along the altars, „une sorte de choréographie itinérante", but also into the special significance of the westwork as the location for the pascal liturgy, with singers as „angelic choirs" on the galleries. In the existence of two distinct liturgical foci (main altar in the east and Salvator altar in the westwork), HEITZ sees a reflection of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. Angilbert, it is suggested, had an imitation of the holy places in Jerusalem in mind, whereby the westwork would be a „copy" of the Anastasis of Jerusalem and at the same time a symbol of the heavenly Jerusalem.[110] In this way, the author makes the step from the determining of an actual function, the pascal liturgy, and its context, to the symbolic meaning of the architecture. As neither the architectural reconstruction of the church of Centula, nor the textual tradition of Angilbert's Institutio are completely certain, there is the risk of developing an equation with two unknowns.[111] Moreover, the sources on the liturgy in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre are four centuries older than those of Centula: a chronological gap which is difficult to ignore. HEITZ's reconstruction of the actual functioning of the westwork is therefore nothing more than a hypothesis. It is doubtful whether the next step can be taken on this basis: the „explanation" of the architectural phenomenon, the westwork, by a liturgical function which is only determined for a single occasion in the year, the causal relation between this function and the chosen form of building and the key role of the fortuitously preserved documentation concerning Centula for other westworks. Finally, there is the problematic iconographic relationship between the Anastasis model and the supposed Carolingian „copies".[112]

[107] A. FUCHS (1950), A. SCHMIDT (1956) and by way of a synthesis D. GROSSMANN, Zum Stand der Westwerkforschung, in: WRJ 19. 1957, 253-264 (older titles ibidem).

[108] E. GALL (1954) and F. KREUSCH (1963) suggested that the supposed imperial box in Corvey was a singers' gallery. For the older liturgical interpretations see F. MÖBIUS, Westwerkstudien. Jena 1968, esp. 9-13. 18.

[109] C. HEITZ, Recherches sur les rapports entre architecture et liturgie à l'époque carolingienne. Paris 1963 (Bibl. générale de l'école pratique des hautes études, 6e sect.).

[110] The author confirms his older thesis in C. HEITZ, Eucharistie, Synaxe et espace liturgique, in: Segni e riti nella chiesa altomedievale occidentale. 1-2. Spoleto 1987 (Settimane di studio 33) 609-630, esp. 619-625.

[111] Substantial critics in reviews of HEITZ, Recherches, by: H. HOFFMANN, Zs. für Kunstgesch. 27. 1964; P. SALMON, CCM 7. 1964, 510f and in P.-A. FÉVRIER, Architecture et liturgie. A propos d'un livre récent, in: Bibl. de l'École des Chartes 122. 1964, 268-273.

[112] Cf. new hypothesis by F. MÖBIUS, Buticum in Centula. Mit einer Einführung in die Bedeutung der mittelalterlichen Architektur. Berlin 1985 (Abh. der sächs. Akad. der Wiss. zu Leipzig. Philol.-hist. Klasse 71,1): not the westwork but the „buticum" of the eastern crossing would be a quotation of the Jerusalem Anastasis. Would the eastern hexagon with 12-sided ambulatory of the secondary church of St. Mary's represent another Anastasis copy in the same Centula complex?

HEITZ's liturgical approach has brought the exclusively imperial conception of the westwork to an end. Friedrich MÖBIUS brought the regular liturgical usage to the fore as well, but looked for a synthesis by advancing the possibility of the functions as imperial chapel or fortified church („Wehrkirche") as secondary ones.[113] All this, however, in MÖBIUS's view served a higher purpose: the westwork as architectural motif was a conscious reflection of the ideal feudal society of which the Saviour and the Emperor in close alliance formed the summit, and in which everybody else had his place during the liturgy, the abbot as imperial representative with the noble monks above, the people underneath.

The same pattern in levels of explanation, from practical-functional to symbolic and social, has been developed with regard to another phenomenon in the Carolingian monastery churches: the multiplication of the altars.

Günter BANDMANN concluded that there was no compelling functional motive for the multiplication.[114] The decisive reason would have been the allegorical concept of the church building as the heavenly church, with multiple altars sheltering relics as the houses of the saints: the altar-placement was a „Darstellung der himmlischen personalen Hierarchie, verkörpert in den Reliquien, die die Altäre umschlossen". A similar tendency in interpretation appears in a liturgiological study by Angelus HÄUSSLING on the frequency of celebration of mass in monasteries.[115] The several altars would not have been built due to the functional necessity of accommodating the increasing number of priest-monks, but rather as a representation. Contrary to that of BANDMANN, HÄUSSLING's representation is not of a „symbolic", but of a „historical" nature (a category of meaning recognized also by BANDMANN), that is: the multiple altars in one church constituted an imitation of the „family of churches" of the city of Rome. Each Frankish monastery or bishop's church was thus a structural and liturgical microcosm of the Eternal City: the whole scheme of altars and masses, according to HÄUSSLING, was modelled on the Roman pattern.

Whereas BANDMANN is prone to slip from a functional question to a dissertation on symbolism and HÄUSSLING to a politico-historical explanation, in his study of the altars of Centula, Edgar LEHMANN remains on the level of practical function.[116] In contrast to St. Gall which is crucial in BANDMANN's argument, liturgical texts are available. LEHMANN used them to reconstruct the procession routes through the church and thus to reconstruct the position of the altars themselves. In that way the essential similarities between Centula and St. Gall became visible: in both churches the principal altars stood on the longitudinal axis of the building and formed the focus of several sub-churches, one of them the westwork or the western apse.[117]

The increasing number of altars has traditionally been connected with the architectural development of the presbytery in monastic architecture towards an aisled chancel with several apses. This evolution, from the 8th to the 11th century, from Centula to Cluny III, is the theme of

[113] Westwerkstudien (as n. 108) esp. 90: „Das Westwerk wurde als Kultraum entworfen und hat in erster Instanz als Kultraum gedient."

[114] G. BANDMANN, Früh- und hochmittelalterliche Altaranordnung als Darstellung, in: Das erste Jahrtausend. Textband 1. Düsseldorf 1962, 371-411.

[115] A. HÄUSSLING, Mönchskonvent und Eucharistiefeier. Eine Studie über die Messe in der abendländischen Klosterliturgie des frühen Mittelalters und zur Geschichte der Meßhäufigkeit. Münster 1973 (LQF 58).

[116] Following in the footsteps of DURAND (1907-1911) and EFFMANN (1912): E. LEHMANN, Die Anordnung der Altäre in der karolingischen Klosterkirche zu Centula, in: Karl der Große. Lebenswerk und Nachleben. 1-5. Düsseldorf 1965-1968, 3,374-383. Cf. a similar basic attitude of TAYLOR, infra n. 123.

[117] Cf. F. MÖBIUS' contributions on the theme, Die „Ecclesia maior" von Centula (790-799). Wanderliturgie im höfischen Kontext, in: Krit. Berichte 11. 1983, 42-58, and Buticum (as n. 112), in which he proposes a social interpretation of the monastic „Wanderliturgie" (though not after an intense examination of the actual functioning, illustrated with reconstruction drawings): it is supposed to be a conscious attempt to tame the local nobility within the order of the upcoming feudal state.

studies by MÖBIUS, who accepts the common explanation of the growing significance of private mass and monopoly by the priest-monks, but wants to go a step further.[118] In order to explain not only the architectural development by changing liturgical requirements, but also the liturgical change by the social forces that, according to Marxist doctrine, determined them, the author concludes: „Die Priestermönche übernahmen Führungsfunktionen und eigene liturgische Aufgaben im Kloster des frühen Feudalismus, weil sie im Dienste spezifischer Forderungen des Gesellschaftsprozesses standen."[119]

MÖBIUS gives a description of the liturgical use of the eastern part of monastic churches, mainly following well-known Cluniac sources. In fact, his argument must be limited to the sphere of Cluny and Hirsau, with its solemn ritual executed by monks recruited predominantly from the feudal caste. MÖBIUS' conclusion is that the movement of all liturgical foci to the east end, the development of an elaborate sanctuary, east of the choir stalls in the crossing of the church, reflects the social dualism between the collectivity of the convent and the privileged, noble class of priest-monks, who wanted a working-place of their own, representing their specific social status. That was the reason, in the author's view, that the altars, which in Centula and St. Gall were still distributed over the entire nave, were now all concentrated in the eastern part of the church.[120] In short, the internal arrangement of a church is considered a model of society: „Raumordnung als soziales Modell".[121]

At least three different levels of investigation, then, may be distinguished in the scholarly approach to the liturgical function of early and high medieval monastic churches. LEHMANN reconstructs the actual altar placement and its liturgical functioning; BANDMANN and HÄUSSLING take the actual historical situation for granted and proceed to a spiritual interpretation; MÖBIUS, finally, is searching for a social explanation. Urgent though the questions of the social and spiritual dimensions may be, it is becoming increasingly clear that any attempt to answer them can only be made after the actual liturgical functioning of a given space has been established. This pitfall is clearly to be seen in MÖBIUS' essay on the aisled nave: the predilection for a nave with aisles in early medieval architecture is supposed to have been determined by the subordination of the laity, without it ever having been established that the people did indeed stay in the aisles during the services, and if so, when and where.[122]

5.2. Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman Churches

The interest „in the detailed use of early buildings and the extent to which the needs of the user are likely to have influenced the design" is characteristic of a tradition in recent research of pre-Conquest churches in England, of which Harold TAYLOR – the author of the principle quoted – might be called the leading light.[123]

118 F. MÖBIUS, *Die Chorpartie der westeuropäischen Klosterkirche zwischen 8. und 11. Jahrhundert. Kulturgeschichtliche Voraussetzungen, liturgischer Gebrauch, soziale Funktion*, in: F. MÖBIUS – E. SCHUBERT (eds), *Architektur des Mittelalters. Funktion und Gestalt*. Weimar 1973, 2nd ed. 1984, 9-41; cf. idem, *Die frühmittelalterliche Basilika. Zur Soziologie und Symbolik eines architektonischen Typs*, in: Krit. Berichte 9. 1981, 3-19.

119 *Chorpartie* 32.

120 Ibidem 40: „Die architektonische Entfaltung des Sanktuariums ging auf den Zwang zurück, ehemals das Langhaus besetzende Altäre stärker im Ostbereich zu konzentrieren. Nicht die Gebete der Mönche wurden zur Triebkraft der architektonischen Entwicklung, sondern letztlich soziale Differenzierungsprozesse ausserhalb der Klostermauern ..."

121 Cf. also F. MÖBIUS, *Das Langhaus der Klosterkirche als Festtagspfarrkirche*, in: F. MÖBIUS – H. SCIURIE (eds), *Symbolwerte mittelalterlicher Kunst*. Leipzig 1984, 26-89.

122 F. MÖBIUS, *Basilikale Raumstruktur im Feudalisierungsprozeß. Anmerkungen zu einer „Ikonologie der Seitenschiffe"*, in: Krit. Berichte 7. 1979, nr. 2/3, 5-17; cf. ALw 23. 1981, 438.

123 H. M. TAYLOR, *The Positon of the Altar in Early Anglo-Saxon Churches*, in: The Antiquaries Journal 53. 1973, 52-58.

In one of his publications, TAYLOR reached the conclusion, based on the scanty information provided by structural remains and a few literary sources, that the altar in Anglo-Saxon churches before the Viking invasions was, as a rule, not at the east end of the church, but in a more central position.[124] The gradual movement of the altar from the end of the nave to the apse or the end wall of the chancel is confirmed by David PARSONS.[125] The development is finely charted, thanks to PARSONS' detailed observation of fittings whose position is determined by relation to an altar – which in most of the cases had itself disappeared –: ablution drains, piscinae, aumbries, squints, sedilia, etc.

As the altar stood at some distance in front of the apse, the apse itself generally served for the benches of the clergy, as TAYLOR also showed was probable for the Anglo-Saxon cathedral of Canterbury, analyzed on the basis of Eadmer's description and the parallels with St. Peter's in Rome, which to a certain extent served as a model.[126] Some remains of actual stone benches of the period have been studied by RALEGH REDFORD. The author concludes that a curved synthronon with a central seat for the bishop or abbot was a normal feature in English churches in the early Middle Ages, but that it had already disappeared before the 10th century.[127] The reason for the change in disposition might be the development of the cult of relics. The custom of raising reliquaries or shrines above the pavement behind the altar and the subsequent rise of the reredos makes the altar the visual and actual end point of the church space.[128] Whether the beginning of this process actually coincides with the early disappearance of the synthronon however, cannot be proven. It is noticeable that in England not only did the priest's benches in the apse disappear, but also the apse itself. RALEGH REDFORD has shown that in the centuries immediately preceding the Conquest the square east end already displaced the apse.

The liturgical functioning of Anglo-Norman Romanesque churches is the subject of two studies which were carried out simultaneously, but independently of each other: Jean-Yves CANOVILLE concentrates on the transept and the transept tribunes in Normandy, whereas Arnold William KLUKAS' theme is the upper altars in England as well as in Normandy.[129]

CANOVILLE's point of departure is an architectural category: the transept. After an analysis of its formal types, an inventory is made of what the customaries and ordinals tell us about its use. The author concludes that the transept functioned as „un espace de circulation et de transition"

124 Cf. ibidem 52: „The placing of the altar is crucial for studies of liturgical use of churches, and these in turn are the key to an understanding of the reasons for the shape of the churches themselves."

125 D. PARSONS,„*Sacrarium": ablution drains in early medieval churches*, in: L. A. S. BUTLER – R. K. MORRIS (eds), *The Anglo-Saxon Church*. London 1986, 105-120.

126 H. M. TAYLOR, *The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral Church at Canterbury*, in: The Archaeolog. Journal 126. 1969, 101-130. TAYLOR (1969), with the proposal to assign to bishop Augustine (597-604) the essential part of the church described by Eadmer.

127 C. A. RALEGH RADFORD, *The Bishop's Throne in Norwich Cathedral*, in: The Archaeolog. Journal 116. 1959, 114-132.

128 See the study by C. S. PHILLIPS, *The Archbishop's Three Seats in Canterbury Cathedral*, in: The Antiquaries Journal 29. 1949, 26-36, based on written records, of the use of the bishop's throne in the post-Conquest cathedral of Canterbury: it was only used on special ceremonial occasions, but normally the bishop sat in a wooden chair on one side of the high altar.

129 J.-Y. CANOVILLE, *Architecture et liturgie en Normandie au 11e siècle: Les transepts*, in: Études Normandes 27. 1978, 75-120; A. W. KLUKAS, *Altaria superiora: The Function and Significance of the Tribune-Chapel in Anglo-Norman Romanesque. A Problem in the Relationship of Liturgical Requirements and Architectural Form* (Diss. Univ. of Pittsburg 1978). Afterwards KLUKAS published several articles on the theme: *The Continuity of Anglo-Saxon Liturgical Tradition in Post-Conquest England as Evident in the Architecture of Winchester, Ely, and Canterbury Cathedrals*, in: *Les mutations socio-culturelles au tournant des 11e – 12e siècles. Études Anselmiennes (4e session). Abbaye Notre-Dame du Bec, Le Bec-Hellouin 11 – 16 juillet 1982*. Paris 1984, 111-123, and the titles mentioned infra n. 131f.

(between nave and sanctuary, between convent buildings and church), as „un espace de séparation" (between clergy and laymen) and in special circumstances as a stage for processions and liturgical drama. The tribunes in the transept arms were of course a means of communication at first floor level and thus gave access to the upper of the two-storied transept-chapels. Moreover, they could contain altars and house singers on special occasions.[130]

Though some of KLUKAS' conclusions correlate with those of CANOVILLE (i.e. the function of the transept tribunes for altars and singing choirs), his method is quite different. KLUKAS starts by mapping the liturgical landscape in order to categorize churches by their liturgical observances. The result is striking: the liturgical categories coincide to a high degree with formal groupings. Characteristic of pre-Conquest and some post-Conquest buildings in England were an axial chapel in the west, tribune chapels flanking the choir and chapels flanking the nave (for example, in Deerhurst and the Ethelwoldian cathedral of Winchester). These features correspond perfectly to the liturgical legislation of the *Regularis concordia*, drawn up around 970 but still influential after the Conquest, which prescribed processions to a removed chapel, chanting from flanking chapels across the choir and „secret places of prayer".[131] Similar arrangements appear in continental churches of the Lotharingian Reform-movement (e.g. St. Wandrilie), that indeed was closely related to the Anglo-Saxon *Regularis concordia*. On the other hand, in houses following the *Decreta* of archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury (around 1070), functional tribunes and chapels in the west end are absent, in accordance with the austere ritual of Bec, advocated by Lanfranc.[132] However, KLUKAS himself observes that the correlation of liturgical and formal groupings is not perfect, which leads to the important qualification that a particular liturgical observance does not inevitably result in a specific architectural formulation.

The methodical differences are conspicuous. Whereas CANOVILLE first of all considers the similarities in church buildings, KLUKAS explores the divergences. Where CANOVILLE isolates an architectural part of the building, KLUKAS looks at a church as a comprehensive whole. CANOVILLE is looking to liturgy for answers to architectural historical questions, KLUKAS, on the other hand, takes architecture and liturgy together as a point of departure. The result is that CANOVILLE is able to give an inventory of liturgical actions taking place in the transept, but cannot clarify any specific relationship between the architectural form and a liturgical use: nearly all rituals described could just as easily be practiced in churches without a transept. In fact, the presupposition that the Norman transept is not only an architectural, but also a determined functional category, appears to be wrong. On the contrary, KLUKAS' approach leads to an identification of those formal features that have a specific functional significance. And while CANOVILLE can only suspect that the disappearance of the transept tribune in the late 11th century might be due to „un appauvrissement de la liturgie",[133] KLUKAS is able to relate the absence of the tribunes to the influence of the simplified ritual of Lanfrancian use, that did not provide for upper chapels and responsorial singing from tribunes.

5.3. Cathedrals and Monastic Churches
in the High and Late Middle Ages

Research on architecture and liturgy in the Middle Ages has at least one immense advantage in comparison with that of the Early Christian period: the extensive availability of the type of sources called ‚ordines', ordinals, ordinaries, ceremonials or customaries. These writings were meant as a

130 CANOVILLE's remarks (*Architecture* esp. 97) on the supposed Roman „model" of the transept tribunes, the ‚exedrae' of the transept of Old St. Peter's, contain grave errors.

131 A. W. KLUKAS, *Liturgy and Architecture: Deerhurst Priory as an Expression of the Regularis Concordia*, in: Viator 15. 1984, 81-106.

132 A. W. KLUKAS, *The Architectural Implications of the Decreta Lanfranci*, in: *Anglo-Normand Studies VI: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 1983*. Woodbridge, Dover USA 1984, 136-171.

133 *Architecture* 116.

directory for the actual executors of liturgy or as a model for others. In describing the practical procedure of the ritual, quite often in a particular church, they are an important source on the spatial implications of liturgy. All early-medieval ‚ordines' have already been published.[134] On the contrary, the extensive amount of texts from the High and Later Middle Ages is only partially accessible in modern editions, but there is intensive editing activity at present, such as the publication of papal ceremonials mentioned earlier, of Benedictine customaries in the *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum* and of various ordinals in the *Spicilegium Friburgense*. Some of these editions contain introductions and comments that present a topographical analysis of the ritual, but these cases remain exceptions.[135] Most ordinals of French and English cathedrals have been published without even a decent ground-plan of the church for which the liturgy described was intended.

Historians of architecture and art have in the meantime started to study the ordinals for their information on, and their implications and consequences for building, furnishing and decoration. It is astonishing that they profited so little from these sources in the past, but now several examples testify to the range of possibilities, whether pertaining to the history of the high altarpiece in Siena cathedral,[136] the performance of the royal coronations in Aachen,[137] or the folkloristic use of the „Scheitelring" in the vaults of Meissen and Halle.[138] The same type of source is fundamental to the spatial reconstruction of liturgical drama, but research on liturgical plays and dramatic offices is still predominantly text-historical, text-internal and exegetical in nature.[139]

One case of an architectural and art historical inquiry into ordinals may briefly be presented here. Renate KROOS' analysis of the ordinal of Bamberg cathedral appeared in 1976, and was republished in Von WINTERFELD's single-building monograph of 1981.[140] The oldest preserved

134 There are the well-known editions of Roman and Frankish ordines by ANDRIEU and the Romano-Germanic Pontifical of the Tenth Century by ELZE and VOGEL, see VOGEL, *Medieval Liturgy* (as n. 5), Ch. IV-V.

135 An early good example is the introduction by F. ARENS, *Der Liber Ordinarius der Essener Stiftskirche und seine Bedeutung für die Liturgie, Geschichte und Topographie des ehemaligen Stiftes Essen*. Essen 1901 (his edition of the ‚Liber ordinarius' of the church in Essen appeared in Paderborn in 1908). P. SÉJOURNÉ (ed.), *L'ordinaire de S. Martin d'Utrecht*. Utrecht 1919-1921, makes use of all too hypothetical reconstructions of the romanesque cathedral. More recent instances are the editions of cathedral ordinals by A. KURZEJA (ed.), *Der älteste Liber Ordinarius der Trierer Domkirche. London Brit. Mus. Harley 2958. Anfang 14. Jh. Ein Beitrag zur Liturgiegeschichte der deutschen Ortskirchen*. Münster 1970 (LQF 52), and by F. HUOT (ed.), *L'ordinaire de Sion. Étude sur la transmission manuscrite, son cadre historique et sa liturgie*. Fribourg 1973 (SpicFri 18).

136 C. VAN DER PLOEG, *Architectural and Liturgical Aspects of Siena Cathedral in the Middle Ages*, in: H. van Os, *Sienese Altarpieces 1215-1460*. Groningen 1984; cf. B. KEMPERS, *Kunst, Macht und Mäzenatentum. Der Beruf des Malers in der italienischen Renaissance*. München 1989, 114-136.

137 E. STEPHANY, *Der Aachener Dom, Liturgie und Kirchenraum*, in: ZAGV 84/85. 1977/1978, 825-851.

138 H.-J. KRAUSE, *„Imago ascensionis" und „Himmelloch". Zum „Bild"-Gebrauch in der spätmittelalterlichen Liturgie*, in: F. MÖBIUS - E. SCHUBERT (eds), *Skulptur des Mittelalters. Funktion und Gestalt*. Weimar 1987, 280-353

139 With important exceptions like E. KONIGSON, *L'espace théâtral médiéval*. Paris 1975, esp. Ch. I: *Les jeux dans l'église*; for the specific aspect of the Holy Sepulchre: P. SHEINGORN, *The Easter Sepulchre in England*. Kalamazoo 1987. (With thanks to drs. Marjoke de ROOS.)

140 R. KROOS, *Liturgische Quellen zum Bamberger Dom*, in: Zs. für Kunstgesch. 39. 1976, 105-146; D. von WINTERFELD, *Der Dom in Bamberg*. 1-2. Berlin 1979. Cf. R. KROOS, *Liturgische Quellen zum Kölner Domchor*, in: KDB 44/45. 1979/80, 35-202; R. KROOS, *Quellen zur liturgischen Benutzung des Domes und zu seiner Ausstattung*, in: E. ULLMANN (ed.), *Der Magdeburger Dom. Ottonische Gründung und staufischer Neubau*. Leipzig 1989, 88-97.

version of the ordinal dates from the years around 1200; a second version was made around the middle of the 13th century. As is usual with medieval ordinals, the more recent version is more precise and richer in details. Though there is only a short chronological interval between the texts, there is a great difference between the two stages in the building history of the cathedral, because it was precisely in this intervening period that the bishop's church was completely rebuilt. Yet there is no appreciable difference between the ritual of the first and the second version of the ordinal. KROOS, indeed, stresses that liturgy was not affected by the transformation and enlargement of its architectural setting. Not surprising, in her view, for: „die Liturgie fordert den ihr gemäßen Raum, nicht umgekehrt".[141] What emerges from Von WINTERFELD's study is that the 13th century cathedral was a formal repetition on a larger scale of the 11th century concept. Essential for its liturgical functioning was the existence of two choirs and apses, at the east and the west end of the nave: in this respect there was no change in the situation reflected by the two versions of the ordinal. Both liturgy and architecture appear to be conservative and KROOS' inference may be needlessly one-sided. The question remains unanswered whether the cathedral chapter wanted to preserve unshortened the traditional liturgical observance, and ordered the architects accordingly, or whether they and the builders were just sticking closely to the tried and tested architectural formula.

One of the intriguing functional features of the later medieval church interior is the choir screen in its different variants and denominations (,jubé', ,Lettner', ,rood screen', ,tramezzo' etc.). In older literature attention was mainly devoted to the typology and artistic qualities of the choir closure. The authoritative study in this tradition, in particular of German and French screens, is still that of DOBERER.[142] More recent contributions bear witness to the conviction that the effect produced by its iconographic programme cannot be perceived without a complete picture of the screen structure itself and its location and that this in turn can only be evaluated in the context of the liturgical functioning of the entire church building.

Interesting indications for the location of the original jubé in the 12th century cathedral of Laon were noticed by Éric FERNIE.[143] He connects the mention of a sanctuary of the Holy Cross in the nave by the ,ordinarium' of the cathedral with four distinct piers with detached colonnettes in the nave colonnades. The piers were obviously intended to differ from the others in order to mark the Cross sanctuary. This means that the eastern part of the nave served as the sanctuary for the laity and that the choir closure stood between the two easternmost pillars with detached colonnettes, that is, two bays west of the crossing. FERNIE argues plausibly that this disposition was not unique in the 12th century, considering examples of comparable piers in, among others, Norwich and choir stalls extending into the eastern bays of the nave in Wells, Noyon and several other cathedrals. Only in the 13th century were the canon's choirs concentrated in the enlarged chancel area and the jubé transferred to the crossing.

The form and function of Italian ,tramezzi' have been studied by Irene HUECK in an article on the ,pulpitum' in the lower church of Assisi and by Marcia B. HALL in her contributions on choir screens in Florence.[144] Both show that the elaborate rood screen type was not confined to transalpine countries, as was supposed by DOBERER. The Assisi screen (around 1254) was a closed transverse wall with a balcony that served for scriptural readings and, perhaps, for singers. The free-screen of S. Croce in Florence was closely related to the North European „Hallenlettner": a free-standing stage carried by a wall at the back and an open arcade at the front, thus forming a loggia for altars at floor level and a balcony for the rood. HALL demonstrates that the ,tramezzo' of S. Croce was coeval with that part of the church in which it was standing (14th century). She goes further in searching for the function of this and similar ,tramezzi' in Northern Italy and concludes that the structure divided the church so that the friars could move from cloister to choir without traversing the laymen's church. It also constituted a division between the sexes, as men were admitted behind the ,tramezzo'. Finally, it supported the ambo for the readings, in use probably only on high feasts.[145] Though convincing in many of its arguments, HALL's approach to the function of the Italian rood screen is still strongly object-directed. A history of the ritual practiced in the mendicant churches could lead to a deeper perspective.

A difference with the majority of the transalpine examples, according to HALL, is that the Italian ,tramezzi', though partitioning the space, do not really screen off the choir, which is further east. A real choir-screen/,tramezzo' would only be developed in Italy in the Quattrocento. The subsequent history of the Italian rood screens, that is, the removal of some important examples of these in the 16th century under the impact of the liturgical ideals of the Counter-Reformation and of the taste of the late Renaissance, is dealt with by the same author in a special monograph.[146]

Another approach to the same object underlies an essay by Christopher BROOKE.[147] He is not aiming at reconstruction of rood screen structures or liturgical practice, but of the underlying spiritual moods and ideas, and proceeds in a pragmatic variant of the „Geistesgeschichte". Rood screens, like other elements in liturgical practice and church design, are not only the products of whims of taste and fashion, „but also express widely felt sentiments and attitudes".[148] Discussing mainly English examples, BROOKE observes a shift from the open basilicas with a single focus of the eleventh and twelfth centuries to the divided interiors of the later Middle Ages, in which reredoses and rood screens broke the visual unity. A comparison is drawn with domestic building in which new notions like privacy and comfort appeared, leading to a partitioning into several rooms. Privacy and comfort certainly played a role in the screening off of monks and canons in their choirs, but BROOKE cannot believe that this alone caused the enclosing and wainscotting of the sanctuary. Besides function and fashion, there is always a third force at work without which medieval churches are wholly unintelligible. The deepest root should therefore be sought in religious sentiment and might be found in medieval sacramental theology and devotion. Late medieval theology „tended to emphasize the personal nature of the Eucharist as an individual approach by the priest to the central mysteries of the Church": „the natural counterpart ... was the enclosed sanctuary, the remote, invisible choir of northern Europe in the late Middle Ages".[149]

---

141 KROOS, Quellen ... Bamberger Dom 109.

142 E. DOBERER, Der Lettner. Seine Bedeutung und Geschichte, in: Mitt. der Ges. für vergleichende Kunstforsch. in Wien 9. 1956, 117-122. Concentrated on formal aspects also: C. EDSON ARMI – E. BRADFORD SMITH, The Choir Screen of Cluny III, in: The Art Bulletin 66. 1984, 556-573. On the basis of preserved sculptured fragments they propose a low stone barrier that could not form any impediment to a full view of the sanctuary, but have to conclude that a fuller hypothesis „must await a better understanding of the role played by the choir screen in the liturgical ceremonies of the period".

143 É. FERNIE, La fonction liturgique des piliers cantonnés dans la nef de la cathédrale de Laon, in: Bull. monumental 145. 1987, 257-266.

144 I. HUECK, Der Lettner der Unterkirche von San Francesco in Assisi, in: Mitt. des Kunsthist. Inst. in Florenz 28. 1984, 173-202. M. B. HALL, The „Tramezzo" in Santa Croce, Florence, Reconstructed, in: The Art Bulletin 56. 1974, 324-341; further: idem, The „Ponte" in S. Maria Novella: the Problem of the Rood Screen in Italy, in: JWCI 37. 1974, 157-173, and idem, The Italian rood screen: some implications for liturgy and function, in: Essays presented to Myron P. Gilmore. Florence 1978, 2,213-218.

145 Cf. KEMPERS, Kunst (as n. 136) esp. 50-77 for partly different interpretations.

146 M. B. HALL, Renovation and Counter-Reformation: Vasari and Duke Cosimo in Sta. Maria Novella and Sta. Croce 1567-1577. Oxford 1979. Cf. the study by C. A. ISERMEYR, Le chiese del Palladio in rapporto al culto, in: Boll. del Centro Internaz. di Studi di Architettura Andrea Palladio 10. 1968, 42-58, on the choir-disposition in Northern Italy in the same period.

147 Religious Sentiment and Church Design in the Later Middle Ages (1966), in: Ch. BROOKE, Medieval Church and Society. Collected Essays. London 1971, 162-182.

148 Ibidem 163.

149 Ibidem 181.

6. Theory and Methodology

Perhaps the first comprehensive theoretical discussion of the interrelationship between architecture and liturgy is a lecture by the archaeologist Friedrich Wilhelm DEICHMANN, given in 1951.[150] His thesis was a contribution to the debate on the genesis of the Early Christian basilica. According to him it should not be surprising that very different architectural types, all taken from existing antique Roman building genres, served the same, new, purpose: the regular eucharistic cult.

DEICHMANN advocates a clear discrimination between a church as a piece of architecture, a formal category („Formtypus") and as a sacred space, a functional category („Zwecktypus"), which also contains a certain meaning. Within the functional category of the Christian basilica, many formal solutions may be possible: there is an „unabhängige Variabilität" between the factors of purpose, meaning and form. In the process of designing an Early Christian church, according to DEICHMANN, the first factor was its functional purpose. This determined the general disposition, for example the sequence forecourt – congregational space – sanctuary: „Es ist ... die liturgische Handlung als Bewegung und räumliche Ausdehnung, die ein wichtiger Faktor für die Gestaltung eines Kultraums sein kann."[151] The second factor was meaning, for instance number symbolism, which might differentiate a design that was only in very general lines dictated by function. The third factor was form, evolving as a „freier Rest": the variability given in each building project, limited only in that it should not contradict the general disposition determined by purpose and meaning. DEICHMANN's formula thus constitutes a definite break with the theory inspired by ZESTERMANN (1847), that proclaimed liturgy as the very „Bauherr" of a church building.[152]

It is characteristic for that period that DEICHMANN tends to assign a considerable role to meaning: „Die symbolische Form kann ... viel eher entscheidend für die Gestalt des Gebäudes sein als der reine kultliche Zweck."[153] This dictum is indeed contemporaneous with the authoritative book Mittelalterliche Architektur als Bedeutungsträger by Günter BANDMANN, one of the godfathers of modern architectural iconography.[154] Though in a different perspective, the essential statement regarding the role of liturgy is similar: the influence of worship in the formation of architecture might take effect on the internal arrangement of the building, but liturgical purposes seldom produce specific, appropriate architectural forms. „Selbst bei der Frage der Raumordnung ... können wir in den meisten Fällen mit Sicherheit nur sagen, daß sich der praktische Zweck der

vorher aus anderen Gründen rezipierten Formen bedient, sie ausnutzt."[155] BANDMANN's aim is to demonstrate the dominant role of meaning in medieval architecture. Pre-Gothic medieval churches would be primarily bearers of meaning, largely determined by the patron. Gothic churches are initially excluded from BANDMANN's metaphorical view: in them, purely formal values, determined by the builder's lodge, prevailed. Maybe under the influence of SEDLMAYR, who in 1950 had launched his controversial idea of the Gothic cathedral as an intended actual representation of heaven, BANDMANN later shows an inclination to incorporate the Gothic period in his thesis.[156] Not the formal values of Gothic, but the liturgical exigencies of the Counter Reformation are now said to have put an end to the symbolical motive in church architecture: the Tridentine liturgical imperative of an acoustical and optical unity of the congregational space meant the end of the church building as an image of heaven.[157]

The iconographic dimension in church building is also central to Richard KRAUTHEIMER's Introduction to an „Iconography of Medieval Architecture".[158] Instead of a proposition on the dominance of the symbolic, this essay offers a sober consideration of the role which intentions like allegory or copying can play in the creation of a design, as well as many other factors, including the practical and liturgical requirements, to which KRAUTHEIMER ascribes greater importance than BANDMANN. The author exercises extreme caution with regard to the symbolical factor and stresses the difference between an interpretation of meaning ‚post festum' and symbolic ideas that demonstrably played a role in the stage of conscious planning.[159] When he regretfully announces that „a majority of scholars have preferred the perilous borderland of architectural iconography to the study of church planning in relation to its liturgical function ...",[160] it is as if he wants to put the genie of symbolical and iconographical interpretation back into its lamp.

Palpably anti-iconographical is the concise programme of Theodor KLAUSER, who in his numerous publications on late antique culture made several acute observations on the interplay of liturgy, architecture and art.[161] In his handbook on the history of liturgy, KLAUSER emphasizes the functional factor in the design process of churches. The fundamental commission to each church architect would have been: „Build us a church for the liturgy as we practice it and as we understand it."[162] In that way each period created for itself the kind of church building which best suited its own liturgical ideas. The historian should therefore establish the relationship between church buildings and people's understanding of the liturgy in a given period. This is an entirely different task from tracing subsequent symbolic explanations of churches. KLAUSER takes a firm stand against those who believe „that church buildings were always meant to express certain religious or religio-political ideas". On the other hand, the author admits that many forms were not determined

---

150   Zum Verhältnis von Zweck und Form in der frühchristlichen Architektur, published in F. W. DEICHMANN, Rom, Ravenna, Konstantinopel, Naher Osten. Gesammelte Studien zur spätantiken Architektur, Kunst und Geschichte. Wiesbaden 1982, 35-46. H. W. TURNER, From Temple to Meeting House. The Phenomenology and Theology of Places of Worship. The Hague, Paris, New York 1979, is not relevant for our subject. It shows no basic concern for practical liturgical functioning and its material setting, but in fact deals with theological concepts of sacred place. The whole approach is based on the disputable assumption that in the history of church building, two types of sacred place are locked in a continuous power struggle, in which the genuinely Christian meeting-house type erroneously became submerged by revived forms of the non-Christian temple type.

151   DEICHMANN, Zum Verhältnis 45, with the terms „Raumfolgen" and „Ausrichtung".

152   Echoes of DEICHMANN's approach: CHRISTERN and ANDRESEN in Actes du Xᵉ Congrès 202. 204. Elements of DEICHMANN's thesis have in the meantime been adopted by SÜSSENBACH in a more stringent formula, denying the influence of liturgy on the genesis of the architecture of the Early Christian basilica and stressing the personal role of the Emperor Constantine: U. SÜSSENBACH, Christuskult und kaiserliche Baupolitik bei Konstantin. Die Anfänge der christlichen Verknüpfung kaiserlicher Repräsentation am Beispiel der Kirchenstiftungen Konstantins. Grundlagen. Bonn 1977 (Abh. zur Kunst-, Musik- u. Literaturwiss. 241), Part II.

153   DEICHMANN, Zum Verhältnis 46.

154   G. BANDMANN, Mittelalterliche Architektur als Bedeutungsträger. Berlin 1951.

155   Ibidem 56; still quoted with approval and accepted as a directive in working method by A.J.J. MEKKING, De Sint-Servaaskerk te Maastricht. Bijdragen tot de kennis van de symboliek en de geschiedenis van de bouwdelen en de bouwsculptuur tot ca. 1200. Zutphen 1986, esp. 80.

156   BANDMANN, Altaranordnung (as n. 114).

157   Ibidem 411: „Die Forderung, daß das Bauwerk der Liturgie zu dienen habe, hat nunmehr den Vorrang vor der mittelalterlichen Möglichkeit, himmlische Verhältnisse darzustellen und zu vergegenwärtigen."

158   R. KRAUTHEIMER, Introduction to an „Iconography of Medieval Architecture", in: JWCI 5. 1942, 1-33, also in: Studies (as n. 25).

159   See KRAUTHEIMER's postscript in the German edition of his Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Europäischen Kunstgeschichte. Köln 1988, 191-196. Also in the recent statements of DEICHMANN more and more caution appears towards iconographical interpretations of architecture: the influence of symbolism on planning and design of Early Christian buildings would have been extremely limited: F. W. DEICHMANN, Einführung in die christliche Archäologie. Darmstadt 1983, Ch. VII.

160   Studies 67.

161   For example, Th. KLAUSER, Die konstantinischen Altäre der Lateranbasilika, in: RQ 43. 1935, 179-186.

162   KLAUSER, Short History (as n. 7) 140-152, esp. 142.

by liturgical requirements, but for example, by taste, technical means and artistic idiosyncracies of the architects.

Friedrich MÖBIUS' ideas are a reaction against both a pure functionalistic approach and a dogmatic iconology.[163] Like BANDMANN, he aims at finding the meaning of a church building, but for MÖBIUS „Bedeutung“ is a social category. Both architecture and liturgy are a product of the effort of man to master the world: a church is a place of social communication, which even sets limitations to the influence of the patron. An architectural topos, such as a copy of a Roman basilica or the Anastasis Rotunda of Jerusalem, can only work in this framework of human addressees. This approach to architectural semantics is evidently less static than BANDMANN's and assigns a more important place to the investigation of liturgical functioning: for MÖBIUS the church is a „funktionierende Struktur“ and no meaning can be detected without the actual liturgical usage of the building having been first established.[164]

Two recent methodological contributions are characterized by their concentration on liturgical space as a whole, comprising not only architecture and ritual, but also verbal liturgy, music and the pictorial programme.

In his book *Iconography and Ritual* Staale SINDING-LARSEN aims at establishing a „common methodological platform on which to develop systematic analysis“ regarding „rite-connected iconography and inscriptions within the Roman church“.[165] The author proposes a model of well-defined „empirical parameters“, in an attempt to bring art history as near as possible to „hard science“. Liturgy has a substantial role to play in his model, as liturgy constitutes the functional context for Christian iconography „and it was for the performance of liturgy that any church was ever built“.[166] Though SINDING-LARSEN's final object is the pictorial decoration, architecture figures in one of the parameters.[167] Assessment of the functional and the symbolical qualities of the liturgical space „is indispensable for decisions in the research process concerning priorities and ‚hierarchies‘ in an iconographical programme“, for example the position of a picture in relation to an altar and the viewpoint of the onlooker.[168]

Gerard LUKKEN makes a case for the application of the tools of the Parisian semiological school of GREIMAS, to liturgical space.[169] More specifically than SINDING-LARSEN focussing on architecture, he argues that the architectural space of a church forms an integral part of ritual and that architecture and furnishing are co-agents of ritual itself. LUKKEN's work purports to prove this thesis with the help of the meta-language of semiology. The built environment is a set of codes, which determines to a great extent the mutual and external communication of its users: the building is a ‚destinator‘ that manipulates and influences the visitors, for instance with the position of the altar and with the separation between sanctuary and lay department.

Both the art historian SINDING-LARSEN and the liturgiologist LUKKEN start by taking architectural design and liturgical use as inseparable phenomena. Indeed, the comprehensiveness of their goal is as striking as the defined precision of their method, which may help to overcome

163 MÖBIUS, *Buticum* (as n. 112) 5-20. Cf. *Ecclesia maior* (as n. 117) 42: „Beabsichtigt ist keine Erklärung der architektonischen Form aus der Liturgie, die sich längst als unmöglich erwiesen hat“, and *Frühmittelalterliche Basilika* (as n. 118) 4: „Symbolik bedarf in unserem Verständnis der Soziologie als ihrer historisch-materialistischen Begründung.“

164 *Buticum*, esp. 20: „Wir plädieren für eine wissenschaftliche Aufwertung der Zweckfrage und damit - auch - für den Vergleich der Architektur- und Schmuckformen mit schriftlichen Quellen, die eine Rekonstruktion des ursprünglichen Gebrauchs und der ursprünglichen Funktionen erlauben.“

165 St. SINDING-LARSEN, *Iconography and Ritual. A Study of Analytical Perspectives.* Oslo 1984, 8, resp. 6.

166 Ibidem 9.

167 Ibidem 88: Liturgical space, that is „a kind of electro-magnetic field [activated] by the interaction of human, architectural and iconographical ‚hardware‘ “.

168 Ibidem 89.

169 G. LUKKEN, *Die architektonischen Dimensionen des Rituals*, in: LJ 39. 1989, 19-36.

what SINDING-LARSEN calls the „anthology method“: „that of basing theory and analysis on scattered pickings from heterogeneous materials“.[170] Both methods, however, may profitably be employed only in an advanced stage of the research process, when a reconstruction of the liturgical space and liturgy itself at a certain moment has already been achieved. That is easier in the case of post-Tridentine churches, the object of LUKKEN's discussion, than of Early Christian or medieval monuments. In Marvin TRACHTENBERG's words: „Semiology tends towards ahistoricity, concerning itself primarily not with a sequence of artistic events set in a historically unique matrix, but rather with the symbolic dimension of such events as the embodiment of an ultimately ahistorical process of signification.“[171]

7. Conclusions and Prospects

In all the variety and range of research on architecure and liturgy a number of clear tendencies can be discerned. Most modern contributions concentrate on one specific church or place or a narrowly confined pattern of ecclesiastical influences. This reflects a common trend in historical scholarship.[172] Most researchers are either art or architectural historians. Liturgiologists and exponents of other disciplines are not strongly represented. The majority of the studies concentrate therefore on a material object: buildings and their contents. There is no theoretically crystallized methodological concept of research in the field. However, there are recognizable methodological similarities in those studies which can be called successful. In those, a drastically functional causality between architecture and liturgy is implicitly or explicitly rejected. The emphasis is on the accumulation of accurate data, with a thorough attention to detail. The interpretation is clearly divided from the presentation of data. This approach, therefore, would seem to show the way towards further progress in this field. Empirical research on local and specific circumstances has only just started, and the few generalizing and explanatory systems would seem to be premature. With the experience gained, however, it is possible to propose some points for a research programme which will do justice to the complex nature of the relationship between architecture and liturgy.

In theory, Christian worship could take place in any room sheltered by walls and a roof, or even in the open air. To cite PEETERS: „Form is soon good enough to meet content and function: good priests may be wrapped in rags and a sheep-stable is monumental enough to serve as a church.“[173] The connection of liturgy with a special structure is due to historical developments in Early Christianity. In the course of time this structure acquired the status of a sacred place, but from the liturgical point of view it was nothing more than a monumental shell. The modern

170 SINDING-LARSEN, *Iconography and Ritual* 179.

171 M. TRACHTENBERG, *Some Observations on Recent Architectural History*, in: The Art Bulletin 70. 1988, 208-241, esp. 238.

172 CROSSLEY, *Architecture* (as n. 15) 119; H. L. KESSLER, *On the State of Medieval Art History*, in: The Art Bulletin 70. 1988, 166-187, esp. 187; TRACHTENBERG, *Some Observations* 209.

173 C. PEETERS, *Monument en liturgie. Herstel en vernieuwing in de Sint-Servaas te Maastricht*, in: Bulletin KNOB. Tijdschrift van de Nederlandse Oudheidkundige Bond 83. 1984, 105-116, esp. 109.

church architect Rudolf SCHWARZ recognized that liturgical action does not make up a building programme, so that the architect has to contribute something else: „Sie [the church building] bedarf der Zutat aus dem Bereich reiner Poesie, dem Bereich der Gestalten und Bilder."[174] This building, with its „poétique surajoutée", has of course a visual and potentially also a spiritual effect on the actors and viewers of a liturgical gathering. But much of the church building remains neutral to liturgy in strictly functional terms. Only certain features, namely the furnishing and its disposition, have a direct liturgical purpose and might thus be determined by specific liturgical exigencies. All other elements of the building, including its special structural features such as arches and vaulting, and its extraordinary decorations and images, have an impact on the overall working of liturgy, but should not be dependent on liturgical needs and are incidental to the liturgical performance. Moreover, „purpose" cannot be expressed exclusively in practical terms, because the conveying of an abstract meaning is also a function of the architecture.

Hence, the configuration of architecture and liturgy is a multi-layered reality in which at least three levels may be distinguished. The first is contextual, the historical situation in which a liturgical service is enacted: with particular participants, in a particular building with its own appointments, decorations and traditions. The second is functional in a practical sense, concerning those parts of the building or elements of its interior that are specifically conceived to accommodate particular ritual actions. It includes the spatial implications of liturgy itself. This stratum of relationship has a causal or consequential nature. The third is the spiritual or abstract level, implying that both architecture and liturgy are expressions of certain contents, ideas, social and political values, conscious as well as unconscious. The relationship has the character of parallelism: architecture and liturgy are both visible manifestations of the invisible.

A clear discrimination of these different layers and relationships is a pre-condition for a sound working method. As an inductive scheme, the three levels could even determine the working order, though not its hierarchy: to reach the „highest" level is not necessarily the highest scholarly achievement. In fact, the exploration of the first stratum has the greatest urgency.

The contextual level is fundamental, but has been largely ignored in existing traditions of scholarship. The elementary condition for the establishment of the historical constellation is to ascertain whether a particular liturgy took place in a particular church at a particular moment. In other words, the object should be well-confined geographically and chronologically, or in MATHEWS' terms: liturgical sources and archaeological evidence have to coincide. Subsequently, both the architectural substance and the liturgical programme should be described. These two lines of investigation have to be followed independently, in order to avoid the risk of a circular argument if architecture is explained by liturgy and liturgy by

---

[174] R. SCHWARZ (1960), cited by PEETERS, *Monument* 109f.

architecture before both sides have been fully analyzed.[175] The only certainty on this level is that building and worship belong to each other's historical context. What is important is the total effect on the participants in the liturgy of all elements working together.

The point where architecture and liturgy meet each other in a direct way and where a direct relationship between form and function exists, can only be assessed at the second stage, which departs from the preceding two-fold synchronous description of a well-defined situation. Now the specific spatial requirements of liturgy and the typical functional aspects of architecture can be isolated.[176] The relationship is not necessarily a one-sided dependence of form on function. It is equally possible that a certain architectural situation exerts an influence on the development of liturgy; in Winston CHURCHILL's words regarding the Houses of Parliament: „We shape our buildings, and afterwards our buildings shape us."[177] A given space might become a co-agency in liturgical functions: divisions, traffic-directing channels. Other non-liturgical forms of use may also come out, for example devotional practices like the veneration of relics. If the first stage has been executed carefully, there is no risk of confounding formal and functional categories. Indeed, the formally similar nave precincts in Sbeitla, Constantinople and Rome appear to have had a very different function; the same is true of many other features, such as aisles, ambulatories around an apse, tribunes and lateral chambers.

Finally, it might be deduced from the foregoing, or from direct sources, what social, ideological and symbolical contents could have played a role in the architectural concept. A rigid discrimination between programmed factors in the design and subsequent explanations read into the finished buildings is a matter of course. There must also be a distinction made between intended message and an unconscious reflection of a world of sentiments, the latter being the original object of the „Geistesgeschichte".[178]

The three levels mentioned therefore set distinct tasks for the researcher. To summarize: in the first stage the elements constituting a liturgical event and its environment are inventoried and placed: ritual, words, music, architecture, furniture, imagery, decorations. Two levels of function are then established. Firstly, the practical function, or „lived reality":[179] liturgical use of space and eventually also other forms of use. Secondly, the abstract function, or „dreamed and hoped

---

[175] POST, *Liturgie* (as n. 42) 410. Cf. FÉVRIER, *Architecture et liturgie* (as n. 111) 271: „deux enquêtes au départ indépendantes".

[176] MATHEWS, *Early Churches* 3f: the „functional organization" of buildings.

[177] Cited by TURNER, *From Temple* (as n. 150) 3.

[178] Warnings against over-interpretation are always useful, for example those of the historian BROOKE, *Sentiment* (as n. 147) 172: „Much damage has been done to genuine historical enquiry by the romantic or idealist search for the ‚climate' of an age. It is often in diversity, in the range of possibilities open to men, that one finds a truer key to understanding."

[179] P. G. J. POST, *Bedevaart, liturgie en artes*, in: Jaarboek voor liturgie-onderzoek 3. 1987, 111-139, esp. 130.

idealizations":[180] the meaning, ideas and values conveyed, deliberately or not. In this perspective liturgy may indeed serve as a bridge between building and meaning.[181] The relationships may then become clear: the functional features of architecture, the connections between the practical and spiritual level of function. This is true not only for architecture, but with different emphasis, for decoration and imagery too.

Liturgy gives only a partial answer to the question of „why buildings look the way they do".[182] Even after an exemplary multi-layered scrutiny there will remain a good deal of architecture which does not fit into a functional or symbolical explanation. This might be what DEICHMANN called „freier Rest". It is only at this moment in the investigation when, apart from the other factors that might have influenced the design, this autonomous „Formwillen" or „a sheer enjoyment of a sophisticated architecture"[183] can be identified. The „rest" will appear not to be of secondary importance. And a very elementary factor, in this context, should never be discarded: simple architectural tradition. Seemingly functional features may, in fact, belong to the latter category, or may have been transferred from a functional to a non-functional constellation. The tribunes in Romanesque and Gothic architecture are a striking example.

It is the scholar's task to find the relationships between architectural design and liturgical requirements. But the isolation of functional causalities can only be a means to an end. In the knowledge that the overall interplay was not a strict causality between form and function, but the liturgical event which took place in an architectural and decorative setting, it should be the historian's aim to provide a glimpse of the overwhelming entity created by the working together of these elements, a whole that was experienced as a touch of paradise.

180 Ibidem.
181 CROSSLEY, *Architecture* (as n. 15) 118; a similar bridge-like view of liturgy shows MÖBIUS, *Buticum* 13ff.
182 TRACHTENBERG, *Some Observations* (as n. 171) 212. Cf. e.g. the discussion on the atrium supra n. 40.
183 KRAUTHEIMER, *Architecture* (as n. 33) 121.

BENEDIKT KRANEMANN

ZU GESCHICHTE UND BEDEUTUNG DES DEUTSCHEN BEGRIFFS „KIRCHENJAHR"

Entstehung und Inhalt des deutschen Begriffs „Kirchenjahr" schienen bislang fraglos zu sein: Mit Georg RIETSCHELS *Lehrbuch der Liturgik*[1] setzte man das Jahr 1589 als ‚terminus post quem' für das Lemma an[2] und nannte als Ort, an dem der Begriff erstmalig genannt wird, eine in Wittenberg gedruckte Postille des Magdeburger Pfarrers Pomarius.[3] Im Laufe der Forschungsgeschichte geriet aber immer mehr aus dem Blick, daß Rietschel seine Angabe mit der Einschränkung „vermutlich" versehen hatte und in seinen Bemerkungen zum Thema außerdem noch der Eindruck entstehen konnte, von der Postille des Pomarius existierten mehrere Auflagen.

Es muß darauf hingewiesen werden, daß auch die Anfänge einer Systematisierung der Festzeiten offensichtlich nur unzulänglich erforscht sind. Überlegungen dieser Art finden sich im 13. Jahrhundert bei Sicard von Cremona, *Mitrale* 5, prologus, und G. Durandus, *Rationale* 6,1,[4] aber auch schon im 12. Jahrhundert bei Joachim von Fiore, *De vita s. Benedicti et de officio divino secundum eius doctrinam*.[5] Bleiben diese Strukturierungsversuche aber immer noch unscharf, so findet man, was bislang unbeachtet blieb, einen ausgestalteten ‚anni circulus' im Prolog der *Legenda aurea*. Dieses Werk des Jacobus de Voragine[6] wird zwischen 1263 und 1273 datiert.[7] Der gesamte Prolog des lateinischen Textes charakterisiert zunächst die verschiedenen Abschnitte der Jahresordnung und systematisiert sie dann: „von dem Advent bis Weihnachten" – „von Weihnachten bis Septuagesima" – „von Septuagesima bis Ostern" – „von Ostern bis acht Tage nach

1 Vgl. G. RIETSCHEL, *Lehrbuch der Liturgik*. Bd. 1: *Die Lehre vom Gemeindegottesdienst*. Berlin 1900, 222; derselbe, *Lehrbuch der Liturgik*. Bd. 1: *Die Lehre vom Gemeindegottesdienst*. 2. neubearb. Aufl. von P. GRAFF. Göttingen 1951, 186.
2 Anders noch *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Hg. von J. und W. GRIMM. Leipzig 1873, Bd. 5, 804, wo sich neben einem Zitat aus einem Adventslied von Joh. Olearius („nun kommt das neue kirchenjahr, / des freut sich alle christenschar") ein Verweis auf Christoph Ernst Steinbach, *Vollständiges deutsches wörter-buch vel lexicon germanico-latinum*. Breslau 1734, 1,807 („annus ecclesiasticus"), und auf Joh. Leonh. Frisch, *Teutsch-lateinisches wörter-buch*. Berlin 1741, 1,416 („vom ersten advent beginnend") findet; nach freundlicher Auskunft von Prof. Dr. M. SCHLAEFER, Göttinger Arbeitsstelle zur Neubarbeitung des „Deutschen Wörterbuchs von Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm", kommt man mittels des Göttinger Belegarchivs über das Datum 1589 für die Frühbezeugung des Begriffs „Kirchenjahr" nicht hinaus (Brief vom 15.11.1990).
3 Wir nennen nur Hj. AUF DER MAUR, *Feiern im Rhythmus der Zeit*. 1: *Herrenfeste in Woche und Jahr*. Regensburg 1983 (GdK 5) 211 [224 fälschlich 1689]; K.-P. JÖRNS – K. H. BIERITZ, *Kirchenjahr*, in: TRE 18. Berlin 1989, 575-599, hier: 575; F. SCHULZ, *Die Ordnung der liturgischen Zeit in den Kirchen der Reformation*, in: LJ 32. 1982, 1-24, hier: 3 Anm. 5.
4 Vgl. AUF DER MAUR 223.
5 Vgl. schon in einer Randbemerkung von I. U[NDERBERG] in der Rez. zu: G. WENDELBORN, *Gott und Geschichte. Joachim von Fiore und die Hoffnung der Christenheit*. Wien, Köln 1974, in: ALw 17/18. 1975/1976 (429-432) 432; B. KRANEMANN, *Kirchenjahr*, in: LexMA 5. 1991, 1176 f.
6 Zum Verfasser: G. BARONE, *J. de Voragine*, in: LexMA 5, Lief. 2. 1990, 262.
7 Zum Werk: P. O[NNIS] / Redaktion Kindlers Literatur-Lexikon, *Legenda aurea*, in: *Kindlers Literatur-Lexikon* (Ausgabe Weinheim) 4,5561.