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Abstract

This dissertation examines the architecture and art of the early-thirteenth-century collegiate church of St. Kunibert in Cologne. Rebuilt completely from circa 1210 to 1247, St. Kunibert retains most of its original architectural fabric and an array of monumental images and liturgical furnishings from the time of the rebuilding. The latter include stained glass windows, frescoes, altars, a pavement, and reliquaries, all preserved in situ in the choir in the east end. One of medieval Cologne’s preeminent religious houses, St. Kunibert provides a unique opportunity to investigate both the different modalities and the significance of artistic integration in the medieval church.

Taking a synthetic approach to the building and its corpus of imagery, this study probes the relationship between high clerical artistic patronage and institutional identity in Cologne in the early thirteenth century. Part I examines the extended historical background of the rebuilding project, beginning with the foundation of the church by St. Kunibert (ca. 590–663?). This examination of the institution and the predecessor churches up to the rebuilding is followed in Part II by a detailed rereading of the chronology, design, and sources of the architectural fabric of the thirteenth-century church. The concluding chapter of Part II then situates the canonical community’s architectural patronage within the institutional and ecclesiastical political context of the contemporary Church of Cologne.
Part III analyzes the community’s visual construction of institutional identity through integrative readings of groups of images, objects, and furnishings in the space of the clerical choir. These final three chapters address numerous overarching topics and issues, including the staging of the past; art and the liturgy; the cult of saints and relics; pictorial narrative; materiality and spolia; and individual artistic patronage among the canons and elite members of the urban laity. But one of several renovatio projects in Cologne at this time, the enterprise at St. Kunibert illuminates art and architecture’s central role as active, integrated agents in the formation of identity among high medieval religious communities.
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Introduction

The late Romanesque collegiate church of St. Kunibert (fig. 56) has long occupied a special place in Cologne’s lengthy art historical narrative. Begun around 1210, and consecrated in 1247, one year before work began on Cologne’s great Gothic cathedral (fig. 216), St. Kunibert has become synonymous with the city’s reluctance to conform to the architectural developments of French Gothic. The collegiate chapter’s complete rebuilding of its church in the form of a majestic new basilica with an austere east choir and a monumental nave and west transept was one of the most important building projects in early-thirteenth-century Cologne. Paradoxically, St. Kunibert has been celebrated as a spectacular manifestation of an enduring local architectural tradition and yet relegated to the margins of scholarly discourse because it falls outside the canon and its models of stylistic development.

St. Kunibert’s claim to special status is twofold, residing not only its insistently retrospective architecture, but also in the exceptional ensemble of monumental art and liturgical furnishings preserved in its choir (fig. 35). Dating from the 1220s, these works include the largest group of stained glass windows to survive in situ from this period in the former imperial territories. Three monumental windows fill the central openings of the apse clerestory, with an axial Tree of Jesse (fig. 108) flanked by hagiographical windows devoted to the institutional patrons SS. Kunibert (fig. 122) and Clement (fig. 116). Five smaller windows with individual saints and clerical and lay donor figures occupy openings in the lower storey of the apse and east transept (figs. 128, 130, 132–134). Three altars survive, including the high altar in the

---

1 The church is now a parish church, having lost its status as a collegiate church in 1802 with the dissolution of the canonical community during the Napoleonic secularization of Cologne.
2 St. Kunibert has two transepts. The first is conjoined with the apse and forms part of the choir and the second is located at the west end of the church. The choir transept is known in German under two different names, Ostquerhaus and Ostchorhalle. In this study, the choir transept will be referred to as the east transept and the transept at the west end of the church as the west transept.
sanctuary in the apse (fig. 101) and two side altars in the east transept (figs. 137 and 138). An *opus sectile* pavement covers the full expanse of the sanctuary, its elaborately patterned polychrome marble fields framing the high altar (fig. 101). Frescoes depicting the Crucifixion, scenes from the lives of SS. Anthony and Nicholas, and two angels presenting a patriarchal cross adorn niches along the apse’s north flank (fig. 141). Four gilded and bejewelled treasury objects—a reliquary bust of St. Anthony (fig. 151), arm reliquaries of SS. Nicholas and George (figs. 153 and 155), and a pyx-shaped vessel (fig. 286)—are also preserved; the first three were originally displayed in the niche with the Crucifixion fresco. Several lost components of the original choir ensemble can be reconstructed from archival sources, including the reliquary shrine of St. Kunibert (ca. 1180–1190) and other reliquaries and altars from the 1220s. Finally, a small chapel dating from the 1260s with frescoes centering on the Crucifixion and the legend of the True Cross survives in the southwest corner of the east transept (fig. 161). The visual harmony of St. Kunibert’s stately architectural envelope prompted Hans Eric Kubach and Albert Verbeek to remark that it “is unified like no other of Cologne’s great churches.” And pointing to the unusually full range of imagery and furnishings in the choir, Hiltrud Kier observed that St. Kunibert presents “a medieval artistic ensemble such as is hardly preserved elsewhere.”

Both of these qualities guaranteed St. Kunibert a prominent place within the earliest local discourses on Cologne’s artistic heritage. In his pioneering 1833 survey of pre-Gothic architecture in the Lower Rhineland, the Cologne antiquarian and collector Sulpiz Boisserée (1783–1854) chose St. Kunibert as one of a select group of representatives of Romanesque architecture in Cologne. Whereas the elaborate trefoil choirs of the earlier churches of Groß St.

---

3 All four objects are currently displayed in vitrines in the modern Schatzkammer in the west transept.
4 Kubach and Verbeek, *RBRM*, vol. 1, 552: “einhheitlich wie bei keiner anderen der großen Kölner Kirchen.”
Martin (ca. 1150–1172; fig. 209) and St. Aposteln (ca. 1200; fig. 180) stood for its inventiveness, St. Kunibert stood for its remarkable tenacity. The first to observe that St. Kunibert was consecrated one year before the start of work on the cathedral, Boisserée noted that, “without this date, one would place the construction of this church some eighty or ninety years earlier,” thereby establishing an interpretative juxtaposition that has endured for nearly two centuries. Despite his thematic focus on the church’s architecture, Boisserée also described the stained glass windows, publishing not only the earliest ground plan and cross-sections of the church, but also a colour lithograph of the Tree of Jesse window, thus proving himself an early ancestor of integrative modes of inquiry.

By the opening decades of the twentieth century, the antiquarian interest in St. Kunibert of Boisserée and other nineteenth-century writers had given way to the first academic attempts at the study of the church. The need for documentation of the church’s history and art was met quickly by the publication in 1916 of Hugo Rahtgens and Wilhelm Ewald’s volume in the *Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Köln* series, which was a large scholarly project aimed at producing comprehensive inventories of Cologne’s ecclesiastical monuments. Responsible for St. Kunibert, Ewald catalogued each component of the church from the thirteenth century to the early twentieth, beginning with the architecture and proceeding through the art and furnishings, and appending extensive lists of bibliography, archival materials, and graphic renderings. Extraordinarily valuable as a historical document of the state of the church prior to World War II, Ewald’s survey of St. Kunibert, while nominally inclusive by virtue of its format, was

---

6 Boisserée, *Denkmale*, 7–8 (Groß St. Martin), 8–9 (St. Aposteln), and 39–41 (St. Kunibert).
7 Boisserée, *Denkmale*, 39: “wäre uns jene Zeitbestimmung nicht mit aller Gewissheit bekannt, so würden wir der Bauart nach die Errichtung dieser Kirche um 80 oder 90 Jahre früher setzen.” The impact of Boisserée’s thought on architectural historical discourse on the church is examined in full in Chapter 5.
8 KDM 6/4, 231–313.
concerned not with a cross-disciplinary method of historical interpretation, but rather with establishing a foundation for future inquiry.

Indeed, by the 1910s, the multimedia inclusiveness of Ewald’s inventory was an exception within the larger pattern of inquiry into the early-thirteenth-century church and its art. Informed by the expanding use of photographs of imagery and objects removed from physical space and by the divisions between artistic media of the art academy model, scholarship on St. Kunibert was already divided into independent sub-disciplines. 9 Thus, alongside Ewald’s survey, three publications on the history of different media with treatments of the examples at St. Kunibert appeared between 1912 and 1916 alone. Heinrich Oidtmann examined the stained glass windows in a broad study of that medium; Ernst Gall the architecture of the apse in a monograph on the Lower Rhenish apse; and Paul Clemen the frescoes in a compendium on Romanesque mural painting in the Rhineland. 10 A decade later, Joseph Braun studied the altars in his encyclopedic work on that topic. 11

The divisions between the media that emerged during this initial moment of discourse formation set conceptual parameters that have shaped approaches to St. Kunibert down to the present; the principal contributions fall into these sub-disciplinary recensions. 12 In her unpublished 1951 dissertation, Gertrud Scheuffelen examined the style of the stained glass

---

9 For larger contextualizations of these processes in late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century writing on medieval art, see Kathryn Brush, “Integration or Segregation among Disciplines? The Historiography of Gothic Sculpture as Case-Study,” and Willibald Sauerländer, “Integration: A Closed or Open Proposal?” in Artistic Integration in Gothic Buildings, ed. Virginia Chieffo Raguin, Kathryn Brush, and Peter Draper (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 19–40 and 3–18, respectively.
10 Oidtmann, Glasmalereien, vol. 1, 72–87; Gall, Apsidengliederungen, 98–104; Clemen, Monumentalmalerei, 589–600.
12 The following historiographical survey concentrates only on the major contributions of the past century and does not account for the numerous individual notices on the different media in handbooks, surveys, and exhibition catalogues, which largely derive from this central corpus of studies.
windows and offered preliminary readings of their iconography.\textsuperscript{13} The following year, Werner Meyer-Barkhausen provided in a seminal study on Romanesque architecture in Cologne the first comprehensive appraisal of St. Kunibert’s architectural sources, maintaining that St. Kunibert’s design was largely derived from the example of St. Aposteln.\textsuperscript{14} Hiltrud Kier investigated the place of the sanctuary pavement within the broader development of church pavements.\textsuperscript{15} Adopting many of Meyer-Barkhausen’s conclusions, Kubach and Verbeek refined his observations on the architectural fabric in their magisterial census of Rhenish Romanesque architecture.\textsuperscript{16} And in her unpublished 1984 dissertation, Mechthild Graf usefully reopened the issue of the architectural sources of the choir and began to broach questions of patronage for this part of the building.\textsuperscript{17}

Rather than reversing this postwar tendency towards the conceptual fragmentation of the building and its art, the major exhibitions and publications of recent decades deepened it. The catalogue to the epoch-making \textit{Ornamenta Ecclesiae} exhibition (1985) brought together illustrations of the edifice and most of the choir ensemble, providing readers with a glossy visual survey of the richness of the church and its ornaments. The building and the ensemble were then elucidated in entries written by specialists in the history of architecture, metalwork, pavements, and stained glass, with each summarizing the state of knowledge on the object from the perspective of the respective discipline.\textsuperscript{18} Likewise, the \textit{Festschrift}-style issue of essays devoted to St. Kunibert published in 1992 in \textit{Colonia Romanica}, the yearbook of the

\textsuperscript{13} Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster.” Scheuffelen undertook her dissertation at the University of Munich under the supervision of Hans Jantzen.

\textsuperscript{14} Meyer-Barkhausen, \textit{Kirchenbaukunst}, 54–58, 61–64.

\textsuperscript{15} Kier, \textit{Schmuckfußboden}, 117.

\textsuperscript{16} Kubach and Verbeek, \textit{RBRM}, vol. 1, 549–554.

\textsuperscript{17} Graf, “Ostchorbau.” The findings of the dissertation are published in summary form in \textit{eadem}, “Ostchorbau II.”

\textsuperscript{18} \textit{OE}, vol. 2, 95–96 (architecture; Ulrich Krings); 261 cat. no. E 52, 265 cat. nos. E 53, E 54, E 55 (metalwork; Jörg-Holger Baumgarten); 270 cat. no. E 57 (pavement; Hiltrud Kier); 271–273 cat. no. E 58 (stained glass; Ulrike Brinkmann). The frescoes, although illustrated, were not given entries.
Association of Friends of the Romanesque Churches of Cologne, contains separate contributions on the architecture of the lost cloister and other subsidiary spaces, the stained glass windows, and the frescoes. The most recent work on the church, two essays advancing diametrically opposed views on the architecture of the choir, both published in 1997, and an inventory of the treasury, has extended into the present this pattern of interpretive disintegration.

Building on this previous scholarship, this dissertation examines the early-thirteenth-century renovatio project at St. Kunibert as an instance of artistic integration. It seeks to engage with current debates about the forms and significance of artistic integration in major church building projects of the thirteenth century. Focusing largely on the paradigm of the Gothic cathedral, this body of work has adduced several different types of artistic integration, which reflects the fertile hermeneutic potential of the term. This case study of the rebuilding of St. Kunibert identifies and investigates three modes of integration that have also been found to be particularly salient in synthetic studies of other sites. The first is the dynamic process of integrating architectural structure over the course of a lengthy building project. The second is the aesthetic and conceptual integration of a new building project into a larger historical narrative (that is, the mediated relationship between innovatio and traditio). And the third is the

---

coordinated integration of monumental art, liturgical furnishings, and cult objects in space, through ritual, and in terms of their imagery.\textsuperscript{22}

Whereas previous work usually has considered these three modes of artistic integration separately, this study demonstrates how they worked together in the service of a fourth type of integration that has also attained critical importance in integrative studies: the integration of a building project into the discursive web of a local milieu. An examination of artistic integration at St. Kunibert thus serves as a platform for an analysis of the relationship between artistic patronage and institutional self-fashioning in high clerical circles in early-thirteenth-century Cologne.

The introductory Chapter 1 examines the extended historical background of the rebuilding project, surveying the development of the site, the spiritual institution, and the church building from Kunibert’s episcopacy (623–ca. 650/663?) through to the turn of the thirteenth century. The first section details the life and career of the church’s patron saint, Kunibert, down to his burial in the church that was later to bear his name. The following two sections then synthesize insights from recent excavations with the textual record in a critical review of the conflicting hypotheses on the origins and development of the collegiate church in the first, obscure centuries of its existence. The final two sections address the period immediately preceding the rebuilding. An examination of the recently discovered remains of the west end of the eleventh-century church, the immediate precursor of the thirteenth-century building, situates this structure within its contemporary architectural milieu and elucidates its important implications for understanding the rebuilding project. A brief survey of the internal constitution

\textsuperscript{22} To differing degrees, these three modes of integration are addressed in the studies cited in note 21.
of the canonical community and its spiritual and social functions in early-thirteenth-century
Cologne rounds out the chapter.

Part II turns directly to the built fabric, or fabrica, of the thirteenth-century collegiate
church. Although St. Kunibert has attracted considerable attention from architectural historians,
significant differences of opinion and many unresolved questions remain about the chronology
of the start of work and of the individual campaigns, and about the corpus of architectural
models. Additionally, the more focused recent work on the edifice has concentrated largely on
the well-preserved east end at the expense of the equally significant nave and west transept;
although it was destroyed in 1944 during the Allies’ bombing of Cologne, the west transept is
well documented. 23 A comprehensive examination of the building that could serve as a
foundation for posing more theoretical questions about the nature and aims of the canonical
community’s renovatio of its church has not been attempted heretofore.

Organized to mirror and chart the unfolding of construction, Chapters 2–4 aim to fill this
major lacuna and constitute a detailed, monographic exposition of the physical fabric.
Beginning in the east end with the apse (Chapter 2) and east transept (Chapter 3) and proceeding
through the nave and the west transept (discussed together in Chapter 4), these chapters
reexamine the building’s individual sections from the perspectives of chronology, plan, and
design, detailing the formal and structural decisions made during the conception and erection of
the edifice. The overarching issues of patronage, historical context, the chapter’s motivations
for the selection of specific architectural models, and the broader social and political
implications of the project are deferred in these preliminary expository chapters for the sake of

23 Left as a ruin, the west transept was rebuilt in slightly modified form from 1979 to 1992; it was the final project
in the postwar reconstruction of Cologne’s Romanesque churches. The pre- and postwar restorations of the
building and the various components of the choir ensemble have been examined in detail elsewhere (see
Bibliography) and are addressed in this study only insofar as they bear on its arguments. They will be signalled in
the relevant contexts below.
establishing a synthetic architectural historical narrative that will enable effective analysis of this critical nexus of concerns. In particular, these three chapters reevaluate the long-standing supposition that St. Kunibert’s design represents a more or less wholesale adoption of ideas and developments prefigured at Cologne’s St. Aposteln—often perceived as the pinnacle of Lower Rhenish architecture in this period—and instead position the church within a larger network of regional architectural models. Instead of reading St. Kunibert as fundamentally derived from any one model, these chapters emphasize the many innovative and unparalleled features that set it apart from St. Aposteln and the other structures that informed its design. The diachronic structure of these initial chapters on the architectural fabric also furnishes a framework for investigating the nature and methods of architectural integration in lengthy, large-scale building projects. Was architectural integration necessarily programmatic, the result of a single, binding initial conception produced before the start of work? Or was it the product of more dynamic, contingent processes in which patrons and their masons assimilated new models and forms over time?

Chapter 5 integrates the results of this close reading of the fabric and situates the rebuilding project within its wider historical and sociopolitical contexts. It analyzes the significance of the chapter’s selection of the architectural models for its new church, examining how the community used architectural imitatio as a means of establishing an institutional identity within the shifting ecclesiastical political atmosphere in early-thirteenth-century Cologne. Moving beyond the style-history approaches that have dominated discourse on the church, this chapter foregrounds the particular patronal and institutional frameworks that shaped its conception and construction. A manifestation of local knowledge, the rebuilding of St. Kunibert emerges as a pointed act of architectural and historical integration in which
architectural archaisms and modern elements connected the present with the institution’s exalted past, reasserting its status as a member of an elite group of capitular communities in the larger archdiocesan hierarchy.

Part III shifts the focus from the fabrica to the ornamenta of the choir ensemble. The building and the monumental imagery and liturgical furnishings that the chapter commissioned for its new church employ coordinated representational strategies. Both create time-collapsing bridges between the present and the past that work to insert the institution into larger frames of reference. Chapter 6 examines the ritual, conceptual, and ideological dialogue between the high altar, Kunibert’s shrine, the opus sectile pavement, and the narrative windows, which together comprised the central liturgical and visual axis of the new sanctuary. It reads this exclusive space as a theatre of collective clerical devotion and institutional memory, investigating how the chapter orchestrated Christological and hagiographical imagery, the semantically-laden shrine, and historicizing materials to produce a multilayered demonstration of the church’s place between the ecclesia Coloniensis and the ecclesia universalis.

Chapter 7 studies the canonical chapter’s artistic response to a major corpus of relics that it acquired from the Byzantine East in 1222, which included relics of the True Cross and SS. Anthony, Nicholas, George, and Barbara. The first section reviews the chronology of the initial display of the relics in the niche in the north wall of the sanctuary,devoting particular attention to the chronology of the frescoes, which has been much debated. The second section then analyzes the relic display’s functions, meaning, and institutional rhetoric, examining how the chapter’s multimedia pairing of sumptuous treasury objects with the monumental frescoes in and above the niche served to sanctify the community. The final section turns to the small chapel (ca. 1260–1270) in the east transept, which was designed as a new, immersive physical
environment for the display of the relic of the True Cross. It considers this space’s devotional and liturgical uses and explores the performative role of its mural paintings in structuring the viewer’s experience of the relic of the Cross.

Chapter 8, finally, moves from the realm of corporate patronage to instances of individual clerical and lay artistic patronage in the choir. The early thirteenth century marks a critical moment in Cologne in the area of lay artistic patronage; long the exclusive space of clerical and aristocratic patrons, the sanctum of the choir was progressively colonized by urban laypeople as a realm for securing their salvation. Through an analysis of the different modes of clerical and lay self-representation in the ritually charged space of the east end, this chapter examines the spiritual and social significance of these acts, focusing in particular on the meaning and function of donor imagery.

The new collegiate church of St. Kunibert was a comprehensive statement on the canonical community’s exalted spiritual and political position in the Church and the city. Sumptuously decorated, the magnificent new church stood not only as a witness to the faith of those who financed and built it, but also as a monumental discursive formulation of the chapter’s understanding of its place between the present and the past, the local and the universal, and the earthly and the divine. The *renovatio* of St. Kunibert entailed both the construction of the new church and the construction of an institutional identity within the increasingly diversified sociopolitical landscape of early-thirteenth-century Cologne. Occupying the interstice between Cologne’s glorious Romanesque past and the Gothic cathedral, St. Kunibert demonstrates that artistic integration, far from being an end in itself, stood at the very centre of high medieval processes of institutional self-definition.
Part I
Chapter 1
The Collegiate Church of St. Kunibert down to circa 1200

1. St. Kunibert, Bishop of Cologne: A Biography between Fact and Legend

The sources concerning the life of St. Kunibert are scant. The most important, if not always most reliable, source is the saint’s prose life, the *vita Cuniberti*. The original version of the *vita* has been lost, but the basic structure of the legend and much of the language of the original are preserved in the extant versions of the *vita* recorded in some three dozen manuscripts that range in date from the late tenth to the seventeenth centuries. The extant versions of the *vita* all fall into one of two distinct types, each of which is based on the lost original *vita* text and which can also be further subdivided into separate recensions. The first type of the *vita*, or Type 1, is a modest, spartan account and the second type, or Type 2, a more elaborate “literary reworking” of the legend. Although the two types of the *vita* vary somewhat in their style and diction, they both contain the same basic events, or chapters, in Kunibert’s life, all of which appear in the same chronological order.

It is not known definitively when the original *vita Cuniberti* was composed, nor do we know where it was written. The earliest manuscript that contains the Type 1 *vita* dates to the

---

24 Coens, “Vies,” 338–367. The citations from the *vita Cuniberti* in the following are taken from Coens’ edition of the text (363–367), which is the most recent and by far most accessible printed version of the *vita*. Although the version of the *vita* that served as the basis for Coen’s edition contains one very significant later interpolation, the remainder of the text is, as Coens indicates, likely closest to the lost original *vita*, or what Coens dubs the “vie primitive” (345). The interpolation is signaled below in the appropriate place. All translations of this and other texts in the following are, unless otherwise noted, my own.


26 Coens, “Vies,” 340. Coens describes the Type 1 *vita* as “un récit relativement sobre et peu développé,” and the Type 2 *vita* as “un remaniement littéraire proprement dit, plus long et plus orné.” The Type 1 *vita* is the basis for Coens’ edition of the *vita*. 

eleventh or early twelfth century, but this type of the vita is almost certainly much older. The earliest version of the Type 2 vita, for its part, is preserved in a manuscript that dates to the final decades of the tenth century. As Coens observes, this type of the vita, with its embellished literary reworking, displays close stylistic affinities with ninth-century hagiographical writings and was thus in all likelihood also composed in that century, perhaps even very shortly after the composition of the lost original version. It is indeed most probable that the lost original vita, as well as its derivatives Type 1 and Type 2, were all written in—and no earlier than—the ninth century, for it is in the earliest decades of that century that we also have the first pieces of evidence that attest to the formal, official veneration of Kunibert as a saint, both in the archdiocese of Cologne and elsewhere.

The picture of Kunibert’s life in both types of the vita Cuniberti is vague, schematic, and, on at least one major point, simply wrong. It is also riddled, as one might suspect, with the tropes of hagiography. Moreover, the vita’s documentary value is further compromised because it was most likely written roughly a century and a half after Kunibert’s death. Thus, while the vita remains the principal source of our knowledge about Kunibert, more precise, factual details about his life and career as bishop of Cologne must be inferred, and not infrequently conjectured, from other, often very indirect, sources of information.

---

28 Saint-Omer, Bibliothèque Publique, n. 791, from Saint-Bertin; Coens dates the book to the “very late tenth century” (Coens, “Vies,” 349).
30 See below, 64–65. As Coens (“Vies,” 362) observes, the fact that the account of Kunibert’s miraculous mass at the church of the Holy Virgins in Cologne (i.e., St. Ursula) in all of the recensions of the vita calls that church the basilica sanctuarum undecim milium virginum (church of the eleven thousand virgins) also undergirds the likelihood that the original vita was not composed any earlier than the ninth century. As Wilhelm Levison argued in a now classic study (”Das Werden der Ursula-Legende,” Bonner Jahrbücher 132 [1927]: 27), the idea that Ursula’s retinue included either eleven or eleven thousand virgins appears to have first emerged in the ninth century; before this point, the retinue was simply referred to as sanctae virgines and the exact number of Virgins not specified. The number eleven thousand, perhaps stemming from a misreading of XI (XI is the abbreviated form of eleven thousand), ultimately won out over eleven and became standard in the tenth century (Levison, “Ursula-Legende,” 39, 58–59). On Kunibert’s miraculous mass at St. Ursula, see below, 25–27.
The *vita Cuniberti* does not indicate when Kunibert was born. The earliest mention of Kunibert’s existence occurs in 626 or 627, when he is listed among the bishops in attendance at the Synod of Clichy; it is likely, for reasons examined in detail below, that Kunibert had already been made bishop of Cologne in 623. Assuming, then, that Kunibert most likely only became bishop of Cologne in his twenties or thirties, it can be relatively safely hypothesized that he was born either during or around the last decade of the sixth century. On the basis of this line of reasoning, Kunibert’s birth is generally placed circa 590.\(^\text{31}\)

Kunibert’s origins can be traced more or less securely to the landholding nobility in the area along the Mosel River. The *vita* says that Kunibert was born “of illustrious stock” (*fuit adolescens clara . . . stirpe*) and in the “Mosel region” (*ex provincia mosellense*), but is not specific about his birthplace within this general area.\(^\text{32}\) As Heribert Müller has argued, there are fragments of evidence that could potentially suggest that Kunibert came specifically from the lands to the east of the present-day French city of Thionville (German: Diedenhofen), which is located along the Mosel roughly halfway between Metz and Trier.\(^\text{33}\) The collegiate church of St. Kunibert, for instance, appears to have had some of its oldest land holdings in this area. In a charter that was purportedly issued by archbishop Bertolf of Trier (869–883) in either 873 or 874, Kunibert himself is credited with endowing the church that was later to become the collegiate church of St. Kunibert with properties in the town of Crellingon, which is identical with the town of Kerling-lès-Sierck (German: Kerlingen), situated some 15 kilometers to the east of Thionville.\(^\text{34}\)


\(^{32}\) The name *Chun(n)ibert* means “he who shines in his lineage or clan”; see Müller, “Staatsmann,” 170 n. 10.

\(^{33}\) Müller, “Kunibert,” 7.

\(^{34}\) Ennen and Eckertz, *Quellen*, vol. 1, no. 6: “. . . statuimus, ut in locis, in quibus proprias ecclesias legitimas haberent, sicut in Mellingon ecclesiam cum curti sancto Cuniberto a rege Dagoberto datam et in Crellingon ecclesiam hereditario iure sibi relictam et familie curtis et parrochiarum ad ecclesias pertinentium decimationem
by hereditary right, could, as Müller suggests, also possibly be related to the name of Kunibert’s
father in the *vita*: Crallo.\(^{35}\) The so-called Bertolf charter also indicates that the collegiate
church’s possessions in the town of Mellingon (French: Malling, German: Mallingen), itself
situated along the Mosel only a few kilometers away from Crellingon/Kerling-lès-Sierck, were a
gift to Kunibert from king Dagobert I (king of Austrasia, 623–629, of the Merovingian
kingdom, 629–639), and that these properties, by implication, had also been bestowed on the
collegiate church by Kunibert himself.\(^{36}\) The Bertolf charter is, however, problematic. Its text
is preserved only as a copy in the fourteenth-century cartulary from St. Kunibert.\(^{37}\) It is one of
two charters that were apparently issued together in either 873 or 874 to confirm the collegiate
church’s property rights outside the archdiocese of Cologne. The other charter, which confirms
the church’s possessions in the archdiocese of Mainz using virtually the same wording as the
Bertolf charter, was purportedly issued by archbishop Liudbert of Mainz (863–889).\(^{38}\) The
Liudbert charter, which has survived, was, however, clearly written in the twelfth century and
not the late ninth, and thus, on account of the verbatim wording and the identical dating of both
charters to 873 or 874, the Bertolf charter in the fourteenth-century cartulary was itself most
probably also written in the twelfth century.\(^{39}\) Strictly speaking, both these charters are
forgeries, but the indications concerning the property in them are nonetheless mostly genuine.\(^{40}\)
The indications in the Bertolf charter that the collegiate church had land holdings in Crellingon
and Mellingon are definitely truthful, for the church exchanged them in 1084 with St. Arnulf in

\(^{36}\) See note 34.
\(^{37}\) HASK, St. Kunibert, Repertorien und Handschriften 2, fol. 22ff.
\(^{38}\) HASK, St. Kunibert U 1/1.
\(^{39}\) On the long debate concerning these two charters, see Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 8–16.
\(^{40}\) Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 8–16.
Metz for other properties closer to Cologne, as an authentic charter confirming this transaction indicates. But because the Bertolf charter, while not a complete forgery, represents a much later attempt to fix apparently long-standing property rights in writing, it is ultimately not certain whether the specific claim in it that the properties in Crellingon and Mellingon had been conferred on the church by none other than Kunibert himself is also truthful or only an embellishment and/or a later tradition that was occasioned by Kunibert’s documented (in his vita) origins in the Mosel region. In view of the indication in the vita that Kunibert came ex provincia mosellense, this claim may indeed be rooted in fact, but it also remains completely uncorroborated beyond the problematic Bertolf charter.

After briefly detailing Kunibert’s origins in the Mosel region and his familial background, the vita indicates that his father, intent on providing his son with an education befitting his noble origins, took the youthful Kunibert to the court of king Dagobert, whom the vita styles as “the most Christian king of the Franks.” Rather than receiving an education in courtly virtues, letters, and military combat, however, Kunibert was instead “subjected to labour continuously in hard servitude,” seeing to such tasks as scrubbing shoes and maintaining straw beds. Kunibert’s servitude at Dagobert’s court did not last long. One night, as Kunibert and the rest of the king’s court slept, Dagobert, lying awake in his bed, beheld “a magnitude of light

---

42 See Kürten, Stift, vol. 1, 15–16.
43 The issue of the veracity of this tradition concerning Kunibert’s purported endowment of the collegiate church with property is also of importance in determining whether Kunibert himself actually founded a college of clergy at the church that was later to become St. Kunibert; see below, 61–62.
44 “Fuitque a supradicto patre suo ad Dagobertum christianissimum Francorum regem adductus, ut in ipsius curia posset iuxta saeculi honestatem erudiri ad perficiendum quaeque honesta; praecepiue tamen ut ad militaria abilitaretur exercicia.”
45 “[D]ura . . . servitute continue subiguabatur . . . ita ut eciam calciamenta abstraheret, lectorum stramenta ministret, immundicias eveleret . . . .”
above the spot where the adolescent Kunibert lay, shining with great brightness.”

Mistrustful of his weary eyes, Dagobert the next day asked his servants to identify the servant who had slept in the spot where he had seen the divine light. Upon hearing that it was Kunibert who had slept there, Dagobert, “with the pious adolescent having been summoned to him, addressed [Kunibert] calmly and kindly, and, kissing him warmly and gently, adopted him as a son.”

Dagobert subsequently wasted no time in having his protégé Kunibert educated in the liberal arts.

Although Kunibert was in historical fact closely allied with Dagobert later in his career, the *vita*’s claim that the adolescent Kunibert was raised and educated at that regent’s court is, to use Coens’s words, “un flagrant anachronisme.”

The chronological discrepancy between the *vita*’s claim and the historical record was noticed as early as the seventeenth century. Pointing to the facts that Kunibert is already attested as bishop of Cologne by the mid-620s (he was likely made bishop in 623 and is firmly attested as such at the Synod of Clichy in 626 or 627) and that Dagobert became king of Austrasia only in 623, none other than the great Jesuit hagiographer Jean Bolland (1596–1665) repudiated the proposition in the *vita* and correctly observed that Kunibert could not possibly have been raised and educated at the (younger) Dagobert’s court.

As far as the extant versions of the *vita* enable us to judge, the original *vita*...
text appears not to have claimed that Kunibert was raised at Dagobert’s court at all, but instead indicated only that Kunibert was sent by his father to be educated at the court of a “certain duke” (*quendam ducem*), before going on to detail how this unnamed duke also forced Kunibert into slavery before recognizing the boy’s merit on account of the miraculous ray of light that illuminated Kunibert as he slept.\(^{52}\) The proposition that Kunibert was raised and educated at Dagobert’s court and that it was Dagobert who witnessed the miraculous ray of light and adopted Kunibert as his own son seems to have first appeared in the literary reworking of the *vita* (Type 2) that was composed in all likelihood in the ninth century and to have passed from here over to the Type 1 *vita*, where it also appears by the eleventh century.\(^{53}\) The claim was thus likely added to the saint’s legend in the ninth century, perhaps only shortly after the composition of the original *vita*, and soon became a standard and essential component of the legend. The motivation for this interpolation likely lies in Dagobert’s exalted position among the Merovingian monarchs: numerous lives of other Merovingian saints, including ones that were written well after the seventh century, portray Dagobert as an ideal Christian king, “a defender of religion and of the clergy.”\(^{54}\) The *vita Cuniberti* fits well into this scheme. Indeed, the Type 2 *vita*, into which the Dagobert interpolation was first introduced, casts Dagobert as a “lover of religion, catholic in faith, and ready for all good work in the love of Christ.”\(^{55}\)

It is also unlikely that Kunibert was raised and educated at the court of Chlothar II (584–629), Dagobert’s father and immediate predecessor as king of the Merovingian kingdom. Chlothar’s *schola palatii* in Paris was a major centre of learning that hosted several important

---

\(^{52}\) See Coens, “Vies,” 360 (Type 1 *vita*, recension A). This version of the *vita* reads in full: “Unde [Cunibertus] ad quendam ducem ad erudiendum a supra scripto patre est commendatus.”


\(^{54}\) Coens, “Vies,” 361.

\(^{55}\) “[R]eligionis amator, fide catholicus et ad omne opus bonum in Christi dilectione paratus.”
Merovingian prelates, but Kunibert does not figure among the names of its members as preserved in the sources. Instead, and contrary to the indication in his vita, Kunibert was in all likelihood raised not far from his ancestral homelands at the Austrasian royal court of king Theudebert II (596–612) in Metz, alongside Trier the most important Merovingian centre along the Mosel. Like Chlothar’s schola palatii in Paris, the royal court in the Austrasian capital of Metz served as a training ground for an aristocratic youth that was earmarked for later service as spiritual officials within the Merovingian kingdom as a whole. At Theudebert’s court, Kunibert most likely would have known such major figures from the Frankish aristocracy as Arnulf, later bishop of Metz; he may also have had occasion to meet Columban or other representatives of his Iro-Frankish monastic familia, but any potential connections here are entirely hypothetical.

According to the vita, after completing his education at Dagobert’s court (or, in historical rather than legendary terms, likely at Theudebert II’s court), Kunibert was elected to the post of archdeacon in Trier, before ultimately becoming bishop of Cologne. It is not known when Kunibert was made archdeacon of Trier, or, because the vita and the problematic Bertolf charter constitute the only mentions of Kunibert’s serving in this capacity, even if the indication is rooted in historical fact. But in view of Kunibert’s origins in the Mosel region and the likelihood of his upbringing at the court of Theudebert II in Metz, it is entirely plausible that he

59 Müller, “Staatsmann,” 174; idem, “Kunibert,” 11. Müller (“Staatsmann,” 174) rightly stresses that any such contacts are purely conjectural and not indicated anywhere in the textual record: “Einschränkend ist allerdings zu betonen, daß die Kontakte Kuniberts mit diesen columbanisch inspirierten Hofkreisen auf Grund des örtlichen und zeitlichen Rahmens zwar als wahrscheinlich zu gelten haben, ines in den wenigen Quellen nicht direkt bezeugt sind.”
60 “... in brevi litteris est liberalibus sufficienter eruditus et morum probitate exigente tandem archidiaconus Treverensis ecclesiae effectus est.”
did in fact occupy this office. Kunibert is then securely attested as bishop of Cologne in 626 or 627 at the Synod of Clichy, where he is listed among the participants as “Kunibert, bishop from the city of Cologne”—*ex civitate Colonia Honoberthus episcopus*. The various recensions of the medieval list of the bishops and archbishops of Cologne indicate that Kunibert was either the sixth or seventh bishop of Cologne. The dates of Kunibert’s immediate predecessors Solatius, Sunnovaeus, and Remedius are not given in either the earliest or the later lists, but Solatius is securely attested as bishop of Cologne at the Synod of Paris in 614. Therefore, even if the date of his death is not known, it is certain that Solatius’s episcopacy preceded Kunibert’s by roughly a decade. Given that the lists indicate that two further bishops came before Kunibert, it is unlikely that Kunibert’s election as bishop occurred much earlier than the mid-620s. And there are numerous indications that suggest that Kunibert did, in fact, attain the *cathedra* of Cologne specifically in 623. Kunibert’s *ordinatio* as bishop is recorded in the *Memorienbuch* as falling on September 25. Because the investiture of a bishop had to

---

61 It is generally accepted in the literature that Kunibert was actually archdeacon in Trier before his election to the post of bishop of Cologne; see, for instance, Stefan Weinfurter, “Cunibertus,” in *Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae occidentalis ab initio usque ad annum MCXCVIII. Series 5: Germania. Tomus 1: Archiepiscopatus Coloniensis*, ed. Odilio Engels and Stefan Weinfurter (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1982), 9: “verisimile est.”

62 Concilium Cliquiacense, in CCL 148A, 297.

63 The earliest list of the bishops of Cologne, likely composed in the late ninth century, omits the second bishop of Cologne, Euphrates (d. ca. 345?), who was considered a heretic (see *REK*, vol. 1, 17–18), and thus Kunibert appears in it as the sixth bishop of Cologne. Later lists, the earliest of which likely dates to the episcopacy of archbishop Philipp von Heinsberg (1167–1191; *REK*, vol. 1, 18), include Euphrates, and hence Kunibert is listed in them as the seventh bishop. Thus, Catalogus I and II in the *Catalogi archiepiscoporum Coloniensium*, in MGH SS 24, 337: Catalogus I: “Quartus Solacius. Quintus Synoveus. Sextus Remedius. Septimus sanctus Kunibertus”; Catalogus II: “Quarto loco successit Solacius. Quinto praededit Sinoveus. Sexto praefuit Remedius. Septimus erat sanctus Kunibertus.”


65 HAStK, Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 27a: “VII Kal. Octobris. Ordinatio sancti Kuniberti.” Structured around the liturgical calendar, the earliest *Memorienbuch* from St. Kunibert (three in total survive) contains both obits and entries concerning *memoriae* and *anniversaria* (hence the name). The book was produced around 1239, doubtlessly using an older exemplar. Containing numerous scattered notices on individual donations and deeds, the *Memorienbuch* is our principal written source for the thirteenth-century rebuilding project at St. Kunibert. For a description of the book, see Anne-Dorothee van den Brincken, “Die Totenbücher der Stadtkölnischen Stifte, Klöster und Pfarreien,” *JKGV* 42 (1968): 148.
occur on a Sunday, only the years 617 and 623 come into question for Kunibert’s investiture, and 617 would, given the fact that bishop Solatius (614) was succeeded by two further bishops, seemingly fall by the wayside, leaving only 623. In 623, moreover, Dagobert, to whom Kunibert served as advisor beginning in 629, was placed on the throne of Austrasia by his father Chlothar II. The Edict of Paris, passed under Chlothar II at the Synod of Paris in 614, had granted royal authority a hand in the selection and confirmation of bishops, and Chlothar and/or Dagobert might very well have handpicked Kunibert as his/their candidate for the position of bishop of Cologne upon Dagobert’s assumption of the throne in the eastern reaches of the Merovingian kingdom. The likelihood that Kunibert’s investiture coincides with Dagobert’s accession is suggested not only by other examples in which Chlothar and Dagobert installed bishops in the wake of the Edict, but also by the passage in the vita concerning Kunibert’s election as bishop of Cologne, which the vita indicates was effected “by the Holy Spirit and synodal council and at the king’s [in the vita, Dagobert’s] command.”

The early years of Kunibert’s episcopacy indeed are marked by his extremely close ties to the Merovingian court, and to Dagobert in particular. The main source concerning these relations is the so-called Chronicae Fredegarii (ca. 650). According to the Chronicae, Dagobert made Kunibert and the maior domus Pippin the Elder his principal advisors in 629, following Arnulf of Metz’s retirement from the position and subsequent withdrawal to Remiremont.

---

66 As Müller (“Staatsmann,” 172 n. 17; idem, “Kunibert,” 9) reasons.
68 “[P]er Spiritum sanctum et synodale concilium ac praeecepto regis, successit licet invite in episcopatu, urbis Agrippinae praesul factus . . . .” See Müller, “Staatsmann,” 180–181, and idem, “Kunibert,” 12–13. As Müller observes, this passage in the vita needs to be treated with caution, because it could reflect the episcopal election practices common in the period of the composition of the (likely ninth-century) vita and not necessarily the original circumstances of Kunibert’s investiture in the 620s.
69 Chronicarum quae dicuntur Fredegarii scholastici liber IV, MGH SS rerum Merovingicarum 2, 150: “Post dicessum beati Arnulfi adhuc consilium Peppino maiorem domus et Chunibertum pontificem urbis Coloniae utens et ab ipsis fortiter admonetus, tantae prosperitatis et iustitiae amore complexus universas sibi subditas gentes, usque
Dagobert then called upon Kunibert to govern, with duke Adalgisal, the kingdom of Austrasia for his infant son Sigibert III (633/34–656), whom Dagobert had elevated to co-regent at the tender age of three, endowing him with the royal court in Metz. Following Dagobert’s death in 639, Kunibert and Pippin renewed a pact of friendship and ensured that the boy-king Sigibert received the portion of the royal treasure that was due him. Then, following Pippin’s death in 640, Kunibert also forged a strong friendship with Pippin’s son Grimoald. Charters of the 640s indicate that Kunibert and Grimoald continued to play a leading role in the government of (the still relatively young) Sigibert III well into that decade, and thus they seemingly corroborate Fredegar’s picture of the bishop’s involvement in the affairs of the royal court from the reign of Dagobert onwards.

Apart from Kunibert’s deep-seated ties to Merovingian court circles and his involvement in the the young Sigibert’s government, very little is known concretely about his deeds as bishop of Cologne. There can be no doubt, given Kunibert’s extensive connections with Dagobert and Sigibert, that his episcopacy was crucial in drawing the diocese of Cologne, previously a relatively isolated outpost, firmly into the Merovingian kingdom—a development that foreshadows the diocese’s ascent to its later preeminence in the Carolingian and Ottonian

---


71 *Chronicarum quae dicuntur Fredegarii scholastici liber IV*, 163–164: “Cum Pippinus maior domi post Dagoberti obetum et citiri ducis Austrasiorum, qui usque in transito Dagoberti suae fuerant dicione retenti, Sigybertum unanemem conspiracionem expetissent, Pippinus cum Chuniberto, sicut et prius amiciciae cultum in invicem conlocati fuerant, et nuper, sicut et prius, amiciciam vehementer se firmeter perpetuo conservandum oblegant, omnesque leudis Austrasiorum secum uterque prudenter et cum dulcedene adtragentes, eos benigne gobernantes, eorum amiciciam constringent semperque servandum. [. . . ] Chunibertus et Pippinus hoc tinsaurum, quod pars fuit Sigyberti, Mettis facint perducre; Sigyberto praeuentatur et discretion.”

72 *Chronicarum quae dicuntur Fredegarii scholastici liber IV*, 164: “Grimoaldus cum Chuniberto pontifice se in amiciciam constringens, cepet cogitare, quo ordine Otto de palacio aegiceretur, et gradum patris Grimoldus adsumeret.”

73 Müller, “Kunibert,” 16.
periods, and beyond.\textsuperscript{74}

There are also vague and oblique indications concerning Kunibert’s involvement in missionary activity at the borders of his diocese. Thus, in a letter addressed to Pope Stephen II and dated to 753, Boniface notes that bishop Hildeger of Cologne told him that Dagobert had given the bishop of Cologne a \textit{castellum} with a destroyed church in Utrecht on the proviso that the bishop attempt to convert the Frisians to Christianity; the bishop, much to Boniface’s chagrin, was utterly unsuccessful.\textsuperscript{75} Although Boniface does not name the bishop, it is almost certain on account of the mention of Dagobert as the promoter of the mission that he can be identified as Kunibert. Kunibert likewise appears to have played a role in Sigibert III’s plans to found a royal monastery in Cugnon in the Ardennes, perhaps in 644, and in St. Remaclus’s foundation of the much larger double monastery of Stavelot-Malmédy, also situated in the Ardennes, circa 646–650. Sigibert III sought out the council of Kunibert, two other prelates, and three noblemen in devising the plans for the foundation in Cugnon, where Remaclus was to be appointed as abbot, but these plans were never brought to fruition.\textsuperscript{76} In the case of Stavelot-Malmédy, Sigibert granted Remaclus, at the latter’s behest, a large swath of land on which to found the double monastery. Whereas Stavelot lay within the diocese of Liège, Malmédy lay within that of Cologne. Sigibert thus had to obtain consent for the foundation of the double monastery from the heads of both dioceses. Kunibert proved a willing participant in the plan

\textsuperscript{74} Müller, “Staatsmann,” 179; idem, “Kunibert,” 21.
\textsuperscript{75} \textit{S. Bonifatii et Lullii epistolae}, MGH Epistolae Selectae 1, no. 109, 235–236: “Et refert, quod ab antiquo rege Francorum Dagobercto castellum Traiectum cum destructa ecclesia ad Coloniensem parrochiam donatum in ea conditione fuisse, ut episcopus Coloniensis gentem Fresorum ad fidem Christi converteret et eorum praedicator esset. Quod et ipse non fecit. Non praedicavit Fresos ad fidem Christi, sed pagana permansit gens Fresorum.”
\textsuperscript{76} MGH Diplomata regum Francorum e stirpe Merovingica. Diplomata maiorum domus regiae, no. 21 (here ascribed incorrectly to Sigibert II): “Ideoque sub devotione anime nostre cum consilio magnificorum apostolorum Chuniberti, Memoriani, Godonis, vel inlustrium virorum Grimoaldi, Bobonis, Adalgisili, monasterium regulare in honore patroni nostri Petri, Pauli, Johannis, vel ceterorum martyrum, in terra nostra Silva Ardenense, in loco qui dicitur Casecongidunus . . . et ex nostre largitatis munere iuxta patrum traditionem cenobium construere volumus, et ibidem Christo auspice Remaglum abbatem constituimus . . . .”
and accordingly granted his approval. Although Kunibert’s consent to, and possible participation in, the foundation of Stavelot-Malmédy—the seat of Remaclus, a former monk of Columban’s abbey in Luxeuil—and Boniface’s letter to Pope Stephen are suggestive of connections with Iro-Frankish monasticism and Church mission, it is difficult to define the bishop’s own position within these currents. Certainly, to extrapolate from these two sources that Kunibert was himself a type of missionary bishop who “stood particularly close to the traditions of Columban and Iro-Frankish monasticism” or was even an “Iro-Frankish reformer,” one who himself actively pursued a program of “mission politics,” is to put too much pressure on what is at best an extremely slim batch of vague and very indirect sources. The textual record is simply too meager and the level of conjecture accordingly far too great to seriously substantiate such broad claims, even if they are plausible. At the very least, Boniface’s indirect account of Kunibert’s role in Dagobert’s attempt to convert the Frisians and Kunibert’s apparent participation in the foundation of Remaclus’s double monastery of Stavelot-Malmédy do point to some involvement in missionary activity and to some intercourse with figures who had strong connections with the Iro-Frankish monastic milieu. But any claims beyond this about Kunibert’s own supposed deep connections to Columban’s and Iro-Frankish

---

77 MGH Diplomata regum Francorum e stirpe Merovingica. Diplomata maiorum domus regiae, no. 22 (again ascribed incorrectly to Sigibert II): “Quapropter pro consensu fidelium nostrorum, videlicet domni Chuniberti Coloniensis episcopi, necnon et Atellani [bishop of Loan], Theudofridi [bishop of Toul], Gislochardi [bishop of Verdun] episcoporum . . . concessimus supradicto patri [i.e., Remaclus] . . . .”

78 Müller, “Kunibert,” 14–15, and at 18: “der columbanischer und irofränkischer Tradition nahestehende Bischof.”

79 Müller, “Kunibert,” 15: “Wenn das Unternehmen [Kunibert’s attempted conversion of the Frisians] . . . auch keine Folgen und Erfolge zeitigte, so ist der Brief [i.e., that of Boniface] doch für die Missionstätigkeit des irofränkischen Reformers [i.e., Kunibert] von Bedeutung.”

80 Thus Müller’s interpretation of Kunibert’s agreement (the term used in the charter is consensus) to the construction of Stavelot-Malmédy partly on his diocese not as a simple legal formality but as reflective of Kunibert’s “connection” with “mission politics” (“Leben und Werk,” 12): “Und wenn Kunibert um 646/650 an der Gründungsversuch einer königlichen Abtei zu Cugnon in den Ardennen ebenso wie bei der erwähnten Einrichtung von Stablo-Malmedy . . . beteiligt war, so hatte das wohl weniger seinen Grund in kirchenrechtlichen Zuständigkeit als in der Verbundenheit mit Königum und Hausmeierfamilie und eben in dieser—hier von Remaclus getragenem—Missionspolitik.”
monastic reform remain purely conjectural.

If these were actually important aspects of Kunibert’s episcopacy, then they were ones that the author(s) of the *vita* either chose to ignore completely, or, by the time the *vita* was written in the ninth century, they had been forgotten entirely. Significantly, the *vita* makes absolutely no mention of any involvement in either church missions or Iro-Frankish monastic circles on Kunibert’s part. A passage that occurs in several recensions of the *vita* does indicate in very vague terms that Kunibert “founded numerous churches in order to instigate the Christian religion and, when his own means had run dry, he encouraged other lords and the wealthy to do so too.”

But this passage does not name any one specific foundation by name, and is thus almost certainly more a hagiographical trope than a summation of actual historical circumstances, occurring as it does squarely in the context of a much longer *laudatio* extolling the manifold virtues and deeds of the saint (such as his charity towards the poor and oppressed, the spiritual renewal in the diocese ushered in by his episcopacy, etc.).

In fact, apart from detailing in very generic terms the manifold virtues that Kunibert displayed as bishop of Cologne, the *vita* knows of only one concrete “act” during his episcopacy. The *vita* records how

One day, when Kunibert was celebrating mass, as was customary, at the church of the Eleven Thousand Virgins on their feast day and offering the sacrosanct mysteries of Christ, namely his body and blood, with a throng of his clerics and a large number of the people standing around him, a dove whiter than snow appeared in the church, flying about everywhere. And after some time, the dove, seeking rest, landed on the head of the blessed bishop. Then, a short while later, the dove came to rest in the middle of the church on the tomb of a certain virgin . . . and then suddenly disappeared from the tomb.

---

81 “. . . ac eciam pro christianae religionis instincetu loca sacrosancta instituit et, cum sumptus propii non sufficerent, ad hoc alios principes et divites hortabantur.” Cf. the similar passage in the Type 1, *vita* B¹ (Coens, “Vies,” 342), printed in *Catalogus codicum hagiographorum Bibliothecae Regiae Bruxellensis* (Brussels: Polleunis, Ceuterick and Lefebvre, 1886) 1: 245: “Quis enim digne enarrare potest quantam ecclesiae sanctae venerandus vir profuit, quantasque sanctorum instituit ecclesias fabricando?”

in a radiant cloud of light, before the eyes of all.83

Besides the appearance of light over Kunibert’s bed as he lay sleeping at Dagobert’s court, this is the only other miraculous occurrence during Kunibert’s lifetime in the *vita Cuniberti*. And not surprisingly, the miraculous happening at the church of the Eleven Thousand Virgins in the *vita* was particularly open to later interpolations. Strictly speaking, the oldest recensions of the *vita* say only that the dove, after landing on Kunibert’s head, flew to, and rested on, the tomb of a *certain virgin* (*super sepulchrum cuiusdam virginis quievit*) before miraculously disappearing, and nothing more. This *sepulchrum*, however, was later interpreted as being the tomb of none other than St. Ursula, and Kunibert therefore credited with the discovery of Ursula’s tomb.

The earliest trace of the legend of Ursula’s tomb occurs in a single version of the *vita Cuniberti* that is preserved in a fifteenth-century manuscript from the Carthusian monastery of St. Alban in Trier (Brussels, Bibl. Royale, Ms. 8515). According to Coens, this recension of the *vita* (Type 1, *vita C*), which is nonetheless closely based on the lost original text despite containing the Ursula interpolation, is “without doubt contemporaneous with the manuscript that has passed it down to us, [and] this form of the story appears to have enjoyed no diffusion at all.”84 This late medieval version of the *vita* modifies the passage concerning the tomb of a “certain virgin” at the church of Eleven Thousand Virgins found in all the earlier recensions thus:

---

83 “Quandam igitur die, cum iuxta morem in basilica sanctuarum undecim milium virginum in solemnitate annua earum missam celebraret et sacrosancta Christi mysteria, corpus videlicet ipsius et sanguinem immolaret, circumstante eum agmine cleri sui ac numerositate populi, apparuit columba nive candidior infra ecclesia volitans ac circumquaque girando. Quae tandem requiem petens super caput beati antistitis insedit. Deinde post paululum in medio ecclesiae super sepulchrum cuiusdam virginis . . . quievit . . . et subito de sepulcro cum lucida exalans nebula ab oculis omnium evanuit.” The ellipsis in the final sentence represents the omission of the later, likely fifteenth-century interpolation that the tomb on which the dove landed was that of St. Ursula. On this interpolation, see below with note 86.

84 Coens, “Vies,” 345: “Contemporaine sans doute du manuscrit qui nous l’a transmise, cette forme du récit ne semble avoir joué d’aucune diffusion.”
Then, a short while later, the dove rested in the middle of the church on the tomb of a certain virgin, as is said, on that of the blessed Ursula, revealing to the previously unknowing that this was her tomb [my emphasis], and then suddenly disappeared from the tomb in a radiant cloud of light, before the eyes of all.\(^{85}\)

The legend of Kunibert’s discovery of Ursula’s tomb appears to be a very late development both in the legend of St. Ursula and in that of St. Kunibert himself. Levison, who wrote the canonical study on the development of the legend of St. Ursula, was only able to trace the legend of Kunibert’s discovery of her tomb back to the aforementioned version of the \textit{vita}, which, as indicated above, Coens places in the fifteenth century (as does Levison).\(^{86}\) This does not rule out the possibility that the legend of the discovery of Ursula’s tomb by Kunibert circulated as an oral tradition in Cologne and elsewhere (hence the later compiler’s note: \textit{ut fertur beatae Ursulae}) before finally being incorporated into the \textit{vita}. Yet, the fact that such a striking and important part of the legend of St. Ursula as the miraculous discovery of her tomb is not recorded anywhere or in any form (textual or visual) before the first mention of it in the fifteenth-century Type 1 \textit{vita} recension C must be regarded as highly suspicious and very likely indicates that this legend did in fact emerge only in the very late Middle Ages.\(^{87}\)

Kunibert is last attested in sources from the late 640s. As with his immediate predecessors on the \textit{cathedra} of Cologne, the dates of Kunibert’s successors are not known, such that an approximate date for his death cannot be generated on this basis. For its part, the

\(^{85}\) “Deinde post paululum in medio ecclesiae super sepulchrum cuiusdam viriginis, ut fertur beatae Ursulae, quievit, quibusdam prius ignorantibus quod ipsius haec fuisse tumba monumenti, et subito de sepulchro cum lucida exalans nebula ab oculis omnium evanuit.”


\(^{87}\) The scene of the miraculous appearance of the dove at the church of the Eleven Thousand Virgins is, in fact, one of the five scenes in the Kunibert window in the presbytery of St. Kunibert. The problems with, and implications of, reading this scene as an illustration of the legend of the discovery of \textit{Ursula}'s tomb, which has been the exclusive understanding of the panel in the scholarly literature since the early twentieth century, are examined in detail in Chapter 6.
vita indicates that Kunibert’s episcopacy lasted forty years. If Kunibert did in fact assume office in 623, which is the likeliest scenario, then he would have died, if one takes the indication in the vita at face value, in 663. The number of years given in the vita for Kunibert’s episcopacy, however, is a conspicuously round number, one with thoroughly symbolic significance, and could accordingly also simply be a trope without any real documentary value. For lack of a solid alternative, Kunibert’s death is commonly placed in 663, but the absence of his name in the sources after circa 650 may very well suggest that he died around mid-century instead.

The final section of the vita Cuniberti concerns the circumstances surrounding Kunibert’s death and burial. The vita indicates that “[Kunibert] migrated to the Lord on November 12. His body, however, [was] buried on December 1 in the church of the blessed Clement, which he himself constructed, [and] is greatly venerated [there].” Although the vita does not say as much, there can be little doubt that the church dedicated to St. Clement was the predecessor of the collegiate church that later came to bear St. Kunibert’s name. The dedication to Clement was overtaken by Kunibert by 866 at the latest, for then we already hear—indeed, for the first time—of the existence in Cologne of a monasterium sancti Cuniberti. Nonetheless, Clement was still listed as a patron saint alongside Kunibert and the two SS. Hewalds in a charter that was purportedly issued by Anno II in 1074 (the charter is a forgery of 88 “[C]athedram pontificalem sanctae Coloniensis ecclesiae . . . gubernavit quadraginta annis.”

89 As Müller stresses. The number forty frequently designated the time span of spiritual pilgrimage to God (e.g., the quadragesima, or period of forty days of fasting before Easter, among other examples); see Müller, “Staatsmann,” 201–202, and idem, “Kunibert,” 20.

90 Müller, “Staatsmann,” 201; idem, “Kunibert,” 20.

91 “. . . migravit ad Dominum idibus novembris. Sed kalendis decembris in ecclesia beati Clementis, quam ipse construxit, corpus suum digna cum reverencia tumulatum magnum habet venerationem.”

92 MGH Diplomata Lotharii II, no. 25: “monasterium quoque sancti Cuniberti.” On the implications of this crucial document, which constitutes the first mention of the collegiate church, see below, 57–58.
the twelfth century). Clement also appeared with Kunibert before the figure of the judging Christ on one of the small ends of the now lost reliquary shrine of St. Kunibert from the 1180s. And, finally, Clement’s vita was itself monumentalized in a stained glass window alongside the window with the legend of St. Kunibert in the clerestory of the presbytery when it was glazed in the early 1220s. All this points back to the original dedication of the church building in which Kunibert was buried and to Clement’s continued veneration as a co-patron of the collegiate church into the early thirteenth century. This is certainly also what the late medieval compilers of local Chronicles thought. Thus, the fourteenth-century Chronica presulum et archiepiscoporum Coloniensis ecclesiae records that “he [i.e., Kunibert] erected a church outside the city walls of Cologne in honour of the martyr St. Clement . . . , which, its name having changed, is called the church of St. Kunibert.” Likewise the account in the so-called Koelhoffsche Chronik, an anonymous chronicle published in Cologne by Johann Koelhoff the Younger in 1499 that clearly drew, for this passage, on both the vita Cuniberti and the Chronica presulum: “He [i.e., Kunibert] made a beautiful church in honour of St. Clement. And this church was called St. Clement’s church until Kunibert was buried in the same church. Then the

---

93 See KDM 6/4, 242. The Anno charter is examined in more detail in note 141. The Hewalds were followers of St. Willibrord. Inspired by their master’s missionary efforts in Frisia, they attempted to convert the Saxons in the late seventh century. They were martyred by the Saxons in the area of present-day Dortmund around 695 and their relics brought to the church that was to become St. Kunibert shortly thereafter. Their legend and the various traditions concerning the arrival of their relics at the church are examined in detail below, 43–51.

94 According to the (demonstrably quite accurate) description of the shrine composed in 1715 by Adolf Bingen, dean of St. Kunibert (see Appendix C, no. 3). The shrine of St. Kunibert, its figural program, and its dating are addressed in Chapter 6.

95 See KDM 6/4, 242. The Clement window is examined in Chapter 6.

name of the church changed and was [henceforth] called St. Kunibert, as it still is today."97

2. The Church of St. Clement and the so-called Kunibertbrunnen: The Archaeological and Textual Evidence

No aspect of the history of the collegiate church of St. Kunibert is more contested than the interrelated triad of questions concerning the date and background of the church of St. Clement in which Kunibert was buried, the function of this church building before and/or under Kunibert (which depends on one’s view concerning its date and background), and the date at which a community of clergy and/or college of canons first emerged at it (which largely depends on one’s view of its function under Kunibert). Put baldly, apart from the indication in the *vita* that Kunibert built the church of St. Clement himself and was buried there, the textual record for the church that was to become the collegiate church of St. Kunibert is a vacuous hole until the aforementioned charter of 866, in which the church is already said to be a “monastery” dedicated to St. Kunibert (*monasterium sancti Cuniberti*). Almost needless to say, the lack of textual sources before 866 and the very limited amount of archaeological data for the church and its immediate vicinity for the period before circa 1000 have given rise to extensive scholarly speculation in an attempt to answer this triad of questions. Because these three issues are of seminal importance for understanding the later collegiate church down to, and including, the *renovatio* of it in the thirteenth century, it is essential to outline here, in a way that has yet to be done, exactly just what is known about the church of St. Clement mentioned in the *vita* before drawing any conclusions, however tentative.

97 *Die Cronica van der hilliger Stat Coellen* (Cologne, 1499); printed in *Die Chroniken der niederrheinischen Städte: Köln*, Die Chroniken der deutschen Städte vom 14. bis ins 16. Jahrhundert 13–14 (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1876), 394: “He dede machen eyn schoin kyrchen in die ere sent Clemens. Ind was genant sent Clemens kyrche bys he in die selve kyrche begraven wart. In dae wart der name verwandelt ind hiesch tzo sent Cunibertus, als noch hude des dages.”
Beyond a series of intermittent and mostly small-scale digs that were conducted between 1978 and 1993 and that concentrated exclusively on the west transept and western half of the nave of the thirteenth-century church building (fig. 1), there have not been—in marked contrast to such sites as St. Severin and St. Gereon—any comprehensive, systematic excavations of the former collegiate church of St. Kunibert and its immediate vicinity. In the present context, it must be stressed emphatically from the outset that, apart from foundations that very clearly belong to a west end of the mid-eleventh century, the aforementioned excavations did not uncover remains that, at present, can be securely identified as having belonged to a predecessor church earlier in date than that one. In 1992, an empty Roman sarcophagus and a stretch of foundation running on a north-south axis, as well as a second, shorter segment of a foundation, positioned on an east-west axis and roughly perpendicular to the other foundation, were found in the second bay of the nave of the thirteenth-century church building (figs. 2 and 3).

Schütte has recently hypothesized that the Roman sarcophagus and the two portions of foundations of walls that appear to have enclosed it may represent either 1) the remains of an early Christian memoria, that is, a funerary structure erected in late antiquity that would have later given rise to the church of St. Clement (what Schütte labels “Phase I”) or 2) the remains of the church of St. Clement mentioned in the vita itself (what Schütte labels “Phase II”). Schütte has gone so far as

---

98 Occasioned by the reconstruction of the west transept and, in the case of the later digs, the installation of heaters in the floor of the second bay of the nave, these excavations did not aim at producing a comprehensive picture of the early history of the site—hence the lack of excavations in the east end—but instead were limited only to the immediate areas where construction or renovation work was being done. St. Kunibert—at least the east end and nave—escaped World War II relatively unscathed, and thus the opportunity for wide-ranging excavation of the church—and again, the eastern half of the church in particular—did not present itself here in the way that it did at St. Severin and St. Gereon, where the heavy damage from the war enabled large-scale archaeological investigation. For summaries and interpretations of the finds from the excavations at St. Kunibert between 1978–1993, see Seiler, “Ausgrabungen,” in Die romanischen Kirchen von den Anfängen, 298–305; idem, “Neue Erkenntnisse,” 44–49; idem, “Die Ausgrabungen im Westbau der Kirche St. Kunibert,” Archäologie in Köln 1 (1992): 91–95; and Schütte, “Baugeschichte,” 9–16.

99 On the eleventh-century west end, see below, 67–76.

100 Schütte, “Baugeschichte,” 10–11. Unfortunately, Schütte does not provide a date for the Roman sarcophagus or a description of it beyond noting that it was “fragmentiert.”
to argue that the empty Roman sarcophagus was possibly used for the burial of either the late antique patron of the hypothetical memoria and/or even of Kunibert himself; in the latter case, the saint’s remains would then have been located in this sarcophagus until the translation of his body into a reliquary shrine (between 889/90 and 924).  

On account of its potential importance for our understanding of the early history of the site, Schütte’s argument needs to be assessed carefully here. It is certain from the discovery of four very modest Roman cremation and inhumation burials dating to the third and fourth centuries in the west transept of the thirteenth-century church (fig. 4), as well as from several further Roman tombs that were discovered during the excavations in the nave, that the church of St. Clement stood on land that originally belonged to the extreme eastern edge of the northern necropolis of the Roman city of Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium (fig. 5). These Roman burials at St. Kunibert roughly parallel the situation at the collegiate churches of St. Gereon and St. Severin, themselves also originally located extra muros and on the grounds of Roman necropolises that lay outside the northwestern and southern stretches of the ancient city walls, respectively. The churches that were later to become St. Gereon and St. Severin ultimately emerged from sizeable late antique memoria that were erected in these extramural necropolises, and both of these memoriae have been extensively excavated and firmly dated (figs. 199 and 212). Thus, both the existence of these memoriae and their role as the core of the later

---

101 Schütte, “Baugeschichte,” 10–11, and 15, where Schütte expresses his opinion that it is “probable” (“ist m[eines] E[rachtens] wahrscheinlich”) that this tomb was Kunibert’s. According to the charter (HASiK, St. Kunibert U 1/2) purportedly issued by Anno II in 1074, but which is certainly a forgery of the twelfth century (which is not to say its contents are not truthful; see note 141), Kunibert’s remains were translated from a tomb “in the ground” (corpore effoso) at some point between 889/90 and 924. Schütte was apparently unaware of this information, which would accord, at least theoretically, with the idea that the sarcophagus was used to bury Kunibert. On the first translation of Kunibert’s relics, see below, 64–65.

102 On these burials, see Seiler, “Ausgrabungen,” 304–305.

103 On these burials, see Seiler, “Erkenntnisse,” 45, and Schütte, “Baugeschichte,” 16 n. 15.

collegiate churches at these sites have been ascertained beyond all possible doubt.\(^\text{105}\) Pointing to the Roman tombs on the site of the later collegiate church of St. Kunibert and drawing an analogy with the situation at the church of St. Severin, Schütte has argued that it is likely that a late antique memoria was also located on the site of the later collegiate church and that this hypothetical late antique memoria would then have served as the core of the church of St. Clement, with Kunibert either expanding the (hypothetical) preexisting memoria or rebuilding it completely as the church of St. Clement. The meagre remains uncovered in the nave in 1992, Schütte concludes, thus belong either to such a late antique memoria or to the church of St. Clement that he argues would have replaced the hypothetical memoria.\(^\text{106}\)

Schütte’s hypothesis that the remains uncovered in 1992 are either those of a late antique memoria erected on the grounds of the Roman necropolis or even those of the church of St. Clement at the moment neither can be proven or disproven. On the one hand, as Schütte rightly points out, the fact that the eleventh-century church building (or at least its west end; fig. 6) appears to have followed the orientation of the north-south foundation wall and the empty Roman sarcophagus (fig. 3) could argue for the importance of both the tomb and the building enclosing it and thus for their potential role as the core of the later collegiate church and therefore, at least hypothetically, also for an identification of these remains as either a memoria and/or a subsequent Merovingian church put up by St. Kunibert.\(^\text{107}\) To judge from its position relative to the eleventh-century west end, the Roman sarcophagus does seem to have possessed some sort of significance, because it lies on the central axis of that church building when one projects from the axis of the west end.

\(^{105}\) The most recent and comprehensive assessment of the late antique memoriae at these two sites is Sebastian Ristow, *Frühes Christentum im Rheinland. Die Zeugnisse der archäologischen und historischen Quellen an Rhein, Maas und Mosel* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007), 116–122 (St. Gereon) and 130–144 (St. Severin).


\(^{107}\) Schütte, “Baugeschichte,” 11.
On the other hand, it is highly debatable whether the apparent axially of the sarcophagus vis-à-vis the eleventh-century west end alone can be treated, as Schütte does, as evidence that the sarcophagus was significant before this point and in the “Phase I/II building” in particular. The extant remains of the west and south foundation walls as uncovered by the excavations, for instance, do not enable us to determine the position of the north wall of the building that Schütte labels “Phase I/Phase II” and identifies as a late antique memoria and/or the church of St. Clement (fig. 3). Schütte simply assumes from the apparently axial location of the sarcophagus relative to the eleventh-century church building that the sarcophagus must have been located on the central axis of the “Phase I/Phase II building,” and he thus uses the sarcophagus itself to generate the position of the north wall of the “Phase I/Phase II building” (fig. 3). However, if we cannot securely locate the course of the north wall in relation to the south wall on the basis of actual physical evidence, we cannot ultimately say if the Roman sarcophagus was, in fact, even located in the middle of the “Phase I/Phase II building.” To impute its importance solely from its relationship to the axis of the eleventh-century west end is methodologically unsound. Furthermore, to judge from fig. 2, several other burials were also found within the foundation walls of this structure, and there may well have been others to the north and east of the Roman sarcophagus, such that the apparently “central” tomb might not have been as “central” and significant as Schütte suggests. It is, moreover, quite possible that the apparently axial location of the empty Roman sarcophagus relative to the eleventh-century west end actually stems only from the burial of the high-ranking bishop Rudolf von Schleswig, who was demonstrably buried in precisely this area of the church building in 1047 and then reburied in

---

109 Unfortunately, Schütte does not provide a description of, or a date for, the other burials in fig. 2.
the same area, but perhaps in a different, adjacent sarcophagus, circa 1247 (fig. 2 [A]). As Sven Seiler and Marianne Gechter have observed, Rudolf could very well have been buried first in the Roman sarcophagus (B) in 1047 before being reburied nearby in a different sarcophagus (A) in 1247 (figs. 2 and 6). Rudolf was a major patron of the church in the mid-eleventh century and likely played a leading role in the rebuilding of its west end circa 1040; his burial in the Roman sarcophagus directly before the Cross altar in the eleventh-century church would therefore represent a logical explanation for the axially of the sarcophagus relative to that building, just as his reburial in a different sarcophagus in the same area (in eodem loco) but now on the axis of the thirteenth-century church building in 1247 would offer a logical explanation for the lack of remains in the Roman sarcophagus. In short: it is possible that the Roman sarcophagus was significant within what Schütte calls the “Phase I/Phase II building,” but this is by no means certain and simply cannot be proven at present.

More problematic than the uncertain role of the empty sarcophagus in the “Phase I/Phase II building” is the fact that the 1992 excavation did not, at least according to Schütte’s brief published report, produce any stratigraphic finds that would have furnished even a general dating of the two foundation walls to either the late antique and/or Merovingian periods. Nor does Schütte indicate whether the foundation walls occupied a lower stratum than the firmly datable foundations of the west end of circa 1040; if they did, then they obviously must be older than the latter, but just how much older is impossible to say due to the lack of any datable finds

110 Rudolf’s obit in the Memorienbuch indicates that he was buried before the altar of the Holy Cross in the eleventh-century church and then reburied “in the same place” (in eodem loco)—likely meaning in the same area (i.e., before the new altar of the Holy Cross) and not necessarily in the same tomb—after his grave had been uncovered two hundred years later (i.e., in or around 1247). On Rudolf’s tomb, see further below, 76–80.
112 On Rudolf’s patronage of the west end of ca. 1040, see below, 79–83.
113 I assume here that, had any such finds been made, Schütte would certainly have reported them in his article.
from the immediate archaeological context surrounding these two walls. Nor, for that matter, does Schütte indicate whether the (reused?) Roman sarcophagus and the foundation walls belong to the same stratum; were both positioned the way they were found at the same time, or was the sarcophagus only placed within the walls at a later point, or was it possibly even present before the erection of the foundation walls? Because associated finds are lacking, it cannot even be said whether these walls ever formed part of a *Christian memoria* at any point in time; as the numerous Roman tombs on the site suggest, they could also be the fragmentary remains of one of perhaps several pagan Roman funerary structures on the site.\textsuperscript{114} In short, several fundamental questions about the foundations and the sarcophagus remain open, and apart from the fact that the recently unearthed eleventh-century west end generally appears to follow the orientation of the two foundation walls and the empty Roman sarcophagus, the current body of archaeological evidence is far too slim to know with the requisite amount of security whether these finds in the middle of the nave of the thirteenth-century church building represent the remains of either a late antique *memoria* (whether Christian or not) and/or the Merovingian church of St. Clement, much less whether the empty sarcophagus was actually Kunibert’s tomb. In view of the extremely limited nature of finds themselves and the lack of either datable material and/or a larger archaeological context in which to situate them, one can only err on the side of caution as far as the two foundation walls and sarcophagus are concerned and side with Sebastian Ristow in stating that Schütte’s hypothesis concerning these ambiguous remains is precisely that—only

\textsuperscript{114} It is, for instance, not certain if the *memoria* out of which the later collegiate church of St. Severin developed was, in fact, originally a Christian funerary structure; older scholarship simply assumed that it must have been. See, on this point, Ristow, *Frühes Christentum im Rheinland*, 136–137. Multiple late antique funerary structures have been found on the site of the later collegiate church of St. Severin, and it is conceivable that several such structures were also erected at the cemetery on which the churches of St. Clement and, later, St. Kunibert stood. The 1978–1980 excavations in the west transept of the thirteenth-century church (fig. 4) uncovered multiple isolated foundations of Roman date that could, as Seiler suggests, be the remains of Roman funerary buildings; see Seiler, “Ausgrabungen,” 304.
a hypothesis that is currently incapable of being tested and therefore presently impossible either to prove or disprove. Whether these are the remains of either a late antique *memoria* and/or the church of St. Clement and the sarcophagus the tomb of Kunibert are ultimately questions that only future, much more extensive and comprehensive archaeological investigation of the collegiate church is capable of answering.

The significance of the site of the later collegiate church during the Merovingian period also remains fundamentally unclear, despite the modest upswing in the amount of archaeological material concerning the history of the site in recent years. The chance discovery in the nineteenth century of a Frankish tomb in the vicinity of the thirteenth-century collegiate church could possibly point to the existence of a Frankish cemetery near the church of St. Clement, but this remains an isolated find and the recent excavations did not produce any further finds that would corroborate the presence of a sizeable Frankish cemetery either on or near the site. Likewise, Hugo Borger’s contention that Kunibert was spurred to found a church to the north of the Roman city walls by the (hypothesized) presence here of a Frankish settlement that would then have made the foundation of the church in this area necessary for pastoral reasons as yet has not been confirmed by any corresponding archaeological finds that would attest to the

---

115 Thus, most recently, Sebastian Ristow, “Kunibert,” in *Biographisches-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, ed. Traugott Bautz (Nordhausen: Bautz, 2008) 29: col. 799: “Bei den Ausgrabungen unter der heutigen Kirche St. Kunibert konnten keine Befunde einer vermuteten Bautätigkeit Kuniberts zugewiesen werden, ebensowenig ist sein Grab entdeckt worden.” Here, Ristow—in my view, rightly—stresses that Schütte’s thesis concerning, and reconstruction of, the supposed *memoria* and/or church of St. Clement is entirely conjectural: “nicht nachprüfbare Hypothesen bei Schütte.” It is emblematic of the high degree of uncertainty concerning these finds that Ristow (*Frühes Christentum im Rheinland*, 145), himself an archaeologist and certainly aware of the finds at St. Kunibert, passed over them completely in his recent, comprehensive study of the archaeological and historical evidence for early Christianity in the Rhineland.

116 The excavation reports of the digs between 1978 and 1993 are held at the Römisch-Germanisches Museum in Cologne (Schütte, “Baugeschichte,” 9). It must be stressed here that the present overview of the finds is intended only as a summary representation of current state of knowledge concerning the earlier church buildings on the site and is based solely on the very brief published reports of the excavations cited in note 98 above, which (it is assumed here) contain the essential information. A comprehensive assessment and complete appraisal of the finds made at St. Kunibert between 1978 and 1993—certainly a desideratum—would far exceed the scope of the present work, focused as it is on the thirteenth-century church rather than the earlier churches on the site.

existence of such a settlement in the immediate vicinity of the site.\footnote{Borger, \textit{Abbilder des Himmels}, 234–235. Borger’s hypothesis is repeated by Machat, “Bauwerk,” 306. The excavations that were conducted in the west transept in 1978 and 1980, as well as those in the nave in 1992/1993, failed to turn up any evidence that would point to the existence of a Frankish settlement or settlers in at least these areas; see Seiler, “Ausgrabungen,” 305. Both Müller, “Staatsmann,” 197, and Ernst Gierlich, \textit{Die Grabstätten der rheinischen Bischöfe vor 1200} (Mainz: Verlag der Gesellschaft für Mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte, 1990), 263 n. 41, while not rejecting it outright, also stress that Borger’s hypothesis concerning the role of a Frankish settlement in stimulating the foundation of the church is not supported by any archaeological finds.} According to a tradition first recorded in the mid-seventeenth century by the Cologne historiographer Aegedius Gelenius, Kunibert, contrary to the account in his \textit{vita}, did not found the church of St. Clement, but rather only expanded a preexisting church building dedicated to St. Clement that Gelenius claims had been erected by local shipmen (owing to his death by drowning, St. Clement was patron saint of sailors).\footnote{Gelenius, \textit{De admiranda magnitudine}, 278. On Gelenius (1595–1656), canon at St. Andreas and the preeminent early modern historiographer of Cologne’s ecclesiastical history, see August Franken, “Gelenius, Aegidius,” \textit{Neue Deutsche Biographie} (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1964) 6: 173ff.} Gelenius, however, does not name his source, and it is impossible to know whether this tradition has any historical basis or even when or where it originated. It is, then, simply not known at this point whether a church dedicated to St. Clement, or even a church building at all, existed on this site at any point before Kunibert, or whether there was a Frankish settlement either here or in the immediate vicinity that would have driven Kunibert to found a church in this particular location.

Most problematic among the several explanations for the origins of the church of St. Clement is the hypothesis that the site of the later collegiate church was originally a pre- or early Christian cult site and that this either formed the basis for the construction of a church in this particular location before Kunibert (which he would then have rebuilt) or compelled Kunibert himself to found the church of St. Clement here. This hypothesis centers on the so-called \textit{Kunibertbrunnen}, which has not infrequently been characterized as the “zygote of the entire
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complex” (“Keimzelle der ganzen Anlage”). The Kunibertbrunnen, also known in the local Cologne dialect as the Kunibertspütz, is a well shaft that is located almost directly in the centre of the east transept of the thirteenth-century church building, perfectly on axis with the apse and the high altar (figs. 3, 7, 8, and 9). Fed by the ground water from the nearby Rhine, the well shaft is housed in the western wall of the vaulted, crypt-like substructure that stands directly under the sanctuary of the thirteenth-century church and that was erected contemporaneously with it (figs. 8 and 10). Despite its clear importance within the thirteenth-century church building and its potential significance (or, as the case may be, non-significance) for the predecessor churches on the site, the body of archaeological and textual evidence bearing on the Kunibertbrunnen has never been studied in depth—which, however, has not deterred scholars from making sweeping statements about the well’s (presumed) significance for both the church of St. Clement and the thirteenth-century collegiate church (hence the designation of the well as the “Keimzelle der ganzen Anlage”).

While the well shaft clearly must, given its inclusion in the substructure under the presbytery of the thirteenth-century church, date to at least the first decades of the thirteenth century as the “zygote of the entire complex” was first suggested (in the scholarly literature), but not insisted upon, in 1976 by Kubach and Verbeek (RBRM, vol. 1, 551: “vielleicht die Keimzelle der ganzen Anlage”), and, as will become evident below, has been recapitulated frequently in more recent scholarship on the collegiate church, with several scholars opting to see it as the originary core of the sacral complex.

The potential significance of the Kunibertbrunnen as the “zygote of the entire complex” was first suggested (in the scholarly literature), but not insisted upon, in 1976 by Kubach and Verbeek (RBRM, vol. 1, 551: “vielleicht die Keimzelle der ganzen Anlage”), and, as will become evident below, has been recapitulated frequently in more recent scholarship on the collegiate church, with several scholars opting to see it as the originary core of the sacral complex.

The crypt-like substructure housing the well was made accessible from the inside of the church building (via two stairs in the east transept) only in 1933–1934 (Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 158 n. 305; Cornelia Müller, “Der Kunibertspütz und die Kinderbornlegende,” CR 7 [1992]: 177); before this, the space was likely originally only accessible from outside the church through an opening in the east wall of the substructure (Müller, “Kunibertspütz,” 177). This opening was walled in after the dismantling of the medieval city walls of Cologne in 1880 and only “opened” again (in the form of the present stained glass window with the figure of the Virgin) after 1934 (fig. 10; the altar in front of the window is also modern); see Müller, “Kunibertspütz,” 177. As Müller notes (178 n. 19), in the early decades of the twentieth century such scholars as Ewald knew of the well primarily through the mentions of it in earlier literature, as the crypt was only accessible via the well shaft itself. The lack of easy physical access to the crypt and well until 1934, that is, until well after the publication of Ewald’s formative publications on the art and architectural history of the collegiate church (published in 1911 and 1916, respectively), doubtlessly contributed to the relatively late emergence—only in 1976—of the hypothesis that the well might have played a role in the foundation of, or was perhaps even the “zygote” of, the church of St. Clement. On the substructure and its structural role for the thirteenth-century east end, see Chapter 2.
century, it is not known definitively just how old it is. Cornelia Müller, the most recent
commentator, observes that “it is generally accepted that the well is much older than the seventh
century.” Writing in 1992, Müller cited the then-parish priest of St. Kunibert, Franz
Schneider, as saying that a dendrochronological examination of the wooden planks at the bottom
of the well shaft indicated that it dates to “Roman times”; however, as Müller noted, this
apparent examination does not seem to have been documented anywhere and thus this dating
remains hearsay and cannot be confirmed. Accordingly, the well might have stood on this
site long before the seventh century and could even be a Roman well (something that is not
unlikely given the documented presence of a Roman necropolis here), but this dating is, as yet,
not absolutely certain.

Even granting its existence before the seventh century, determining what, if anything, the
well meant both before and during Kunibert’s episcopacy is an entirely different matter.
According to a local oral tradition that can be traced back only to the nineteenth century, the
newborn children of Cologne reside in the well before being brought to their parents. The
children, the legend holds, sit at the bottom of the well with the Virgin Mary, who plays with
them and nourishes them with porridge. In line with this legend, in the early nineteenth
century it was also believed that drinking the well’s water would increase female fertility.

122 Müller, “Kunibertspütz,” 176: “Nach allgemeiner Annahme ist der Brunnen weitaus älter als der Gründungsbau
des 7. Jahrhunderts.” Despite her statement, Müller is, to my knowledge, actually the only scholar who has
explicitly addressed the question of the date of the well; otherwise, it has simply been assumed that the well is
ancient, and thus that it existed before the construction of the church of St. Clement.
123 For the sake of absolute clarity, I cite Müller (“Kunibertspütz,” 178 n. 11) in full here: “Im Gespräch erwähnte
Prälat [Franz] Schneider eine dendrochronologische Untersuchung der Eichenbretter, die den Brunnenfuß
auskleiden und eine Datierung in römische Zeit ergeben hätten; leider ist dieser Befund nicht dokumentiert.”
124 For articulations of the legend, see, for instance, Friedrich Everhard von Mering and Ludwig Reischert, Die
Bischöfe und Erzbischöfe von Köln nach ihrer Reihenfolge, nebst Geschichte des Ursprungs, des Fortganges und
des Verfalles der Kirchen und Klöster innerhalb der Stadt Köln, mit besonderer Bezugnahme auf die Kirchen und
Klöster der Erzdiözese (Cologne: Lengfeld, 1844) 1: 37, and, further, Johann Wilhelm Wolf, “Der
125 Müller, “Der Kunibertspütz,” 175.
The tradition of the potently fertile waters of the Kunibertspütz as a home for the newborn children of Cologne has parallels, as Müller observes, in the figure of Holda/Frau Holle from German folklore. According to the legend, Holda’s kingdom is accessible via wells and ponds. Here, under the water, Holda receives the souls of the dead in a luscious garden and sends them back into the world as reincarnated children. Although the popular local legend associated with the Kunibertbrunnen is clearly somehow related to this German folklore tradition, it is impossible to say whether this legend, which is first attested in the nineteenth century, ultimately stems directly from the ancient Germanic inhabitants of Cologne themselves, as Müller argues it does. Müller suggests in this connection that the folkloric Holda is identical with the nebulous figure of Hulda from Germanic mythology, thereby reasoning that the well always possessed an association with Hulda/Holda and was therefore a Germanic cult site that was then Christianized, either abruptly or gradually, through the replacement of Hulda/Holda with the figure of the Virgin Mary. Indeed, Müller has gone so far as to argue that the dedication of the church to St. Clement, whose prayer in the arid marble quarry in Cherson in the Crimea resulted in the appearance of the agnus Dei and the miraculous opening of a water source and thus the conversion of the local pagan residents, “could indicate that Kunibert’s building of the church [of St. Clement] was a consciously political act intended to make reference to the well miracle and missionary success of the pope Clement at a pre-Christian cult site.”

Certainly, the vitae of western saints, beginning in the Merovingian period and extending into the twelfth century, contain accounts of wells that were pagan cult sites and that

---

126 Müller, “Der Kunibertspütz,” 175–176.
were subsequently “Christianized” by saints who founded churches over them. Whether such analogies alone enable us to presume a similar process with the well shaft under the east transept of the thirteenth-century collegiate church of St. Kunibert is, however, questionable. First, the *vita Cuniberti* (or any other source for that matter) notes no such well or pagan cult site on the site of the church of St. Clement, much less one that Kunibert “Christianized.” Even more problematic is the fact that the legend of the newborn children is first attested in the nineteenth century and appears nowhere in the collegiate church’s own textual record (as opposed to popular belief) at any point in time. It is, moreover, quite uncertain, as several folklorists have observed, whether the Holda/Frau Holle of more recent German folklore is even identical with the obscure figure of Hulda from Germanic mythology. It cannot simply be presumed from the existence of this popular legend in the nineteenth century and its more than uncertain ties to Germanic myth that the *Kunibertbrunnen* was, in fact, part of a pagan cult site either before or during the seventh century. And although possible and perhaps a neat fit with the water miracle in Clement’s *vita*, the suggestion that Kunibert associated the well with Clement on account of the water miracle and the pope’s own death by water is simply impossible to prove and may be more a product of a search for meaning on the part of modern scholars than it is a cogent explanation of actual historical circumstances. As Heribert Müller observes, there are analogous cases, such as the parish church connected with the Benedictine abbey church in Essen-Werden (consecrated in 957) or the cathedral in Aarhus in Denmark (begun in 1197), in which churches dedicated to St. Clement were built over wells, and these later examples theoretically also could

---


speak for the possibility that Kunibert founded a church here on account of the presence of the well, which led to the dedication of the church to St. Clement. Yet, there is absolutely no indication from any period—whether textual or an indirect record of an oral tradition—that would connect the Kunibertbrunnen with St. Clement, and thus this hypothesis, while plausible, rests solely on the saint’s imputed connection with water and analogies with the wells in other (in the case of Aarhus, much) later structures.

There is, however, another, firmly documented tradition concerning the Kunibertbrunnen that can be traced back in its full scope at least to the first decade of the seventeenth century and in its core to the early twelfth. And unlike the popular legend of the newborn children, this tradition was demonstrably current among, and even promoted by, the college of canons at St. Kunibert. This legend has nothing to do with either the newborn children of Cologne or St. Clement. Instead, it focuses squarely on Hewald the Black and Hewald the White (so called on account of their differently coloured hair), brothers and missionary saints from Northumbria. As Bede recounts in his Historia Ecclesiastica (Book V, Chapter 10), the Hewalds followed the example of their teacher Willibrord (658–739) in Frisia and set out on their own to convert the Saxons but were martyred in Westphalia around 695. Following their martyrdom, the Hewalds were likely first buried at St. Suitbert’s foundation at Kaiserswerth, near Düsseldorf (although Bede does not say this). Then, as Bede indicates, the Hewalds’ bodies were brought to Cologne by Pepin of Heristal (ca. 640/650–714), and to the (later) church of St. Kunibert in particular, where their relics have since remained down to the present (fig. 11). The Hewalds were almost certainly venerated as

---

saints soon, if not immediately, after their martyrdom, for their names already appear on the day of their martyrdom (October 4) in a calendar from Echternach (one of Willibrord’s foundations) in 721. Bede, whose account provided the starting point for all succeeding versions of the Hewalds’ legend, recounts all of these events thus:

Their [i.e., the Hewalds’] martyrdom was not unmarked by heavenly signs; for when their bodies were thrown into the Rhine by the heathen, as I have described, they were carried upstream against the current for nearly forty miles to the place where their companions were. And a great ray of light reaching high into the sky shone all night above the spot where the bodies had arrived, and was also seen by the heathen who had murdered them. Moreover one of the two appeared by night in a vision to one of their companions, a distinguished man of noble family called Tilmont, a soldier turned monk, and told him that their bodies would be found at the spot where he saw the light shining from heaven to earth. This happened as he said: their bodies were found and buried with the honour due to martyrs, and the day of their death, or of the finding of their bodies, is observed in those parts with fitting respect. When Pippin, the most illustrious duke of the Franks, later heard of these events, he directed that the bodies be brought to him, and buried them with great splendour in the church of the city of Cologne on the Rhine. It is said that a spring bubbled up at the scene of the martyrdom, which affords a plentiful supply of water to this day.  

Although Bede’s account clearly indicates that the Hewalds’ relics were brought “to the church in the city of Cologne next to the Rhine,” a church which can only be St. Kunibert, on Pepin’s orders after they had been found elsewhere by the monk Tilmont, by the first decade of the seventeenth century both the canons of St. Kunibert and the residents of Cologne believed that the Kunibertbrunnen marked the very spot at which—indeed, even through which—their bodies were found.

133 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, ms. lat. 10837 (October 4): “natale sanctorum martyrum heuualdi et heualdi.” See Flaskamp, “Die beiden Ewalde,” 333. The Hewalds’ feast day—or, the day of their martyrdom—is given (erroneously?) as October 4 in the Willibrordian calendar; it is listed as October 3 in most other calendars and sources, including both Bede and the extant liturgical calendars from St. Kunibert.


135 There is no reason to doubt the veracity of Bede’s indication that the Hewalds’ relics were brought to Cologne in the late seventh century and that the otherwise unspecified “church of the city of Cologne next to the Rhine” (“in ecclesia Coloniae civitatis iuxta Rhenum”) that Bede mentions actually refers specifically to the later church of St. Kunibert, which, unlike all of the other churches in the city by that point (see fig. 22), was located directly on the left bank of the Rhine, literally iuxta Rhenum. The Hewalds’ relics are securely attested at St. Kunibert in 965, for archbishop Bruno (959–965) bequeathed three pallia to them in his will (Vita Brunonis auctore Ruotgero, MGH SS 4, 274: “Sanctis Ewaldis duobus pallia tria”). See further KDM 6/4, 243.
bodies of the Hewalds had washed up on shore and upon which the ray of divine light that
Tilmon saw had shone. Thus, in his Sacrarium Agrippinae of 1607, Erhard Winheim records
that “there is [contrary to Bede, whom he cites] another opinion from the traditions of the
residents of Cologne (ex Coloniensium traditionibus) that the Ewalds were carried to the spot . . . .
where in the choir of St. Kunibert the well is now seen.”136 This traditio is laid out in even
more explicit terms by Gelenius (1645), who writes: “Then the basilica of St. Kunibert became
greater through the munificence of the Austrasian rulers Pepin and the blessed Plectrudis, when
the bodies of the blessed Hewalds, escorted by the divine light and by its will, and swimming
upstream, came to land here and were raised up, with the clergy and people present, from the
spot where the bronze well stands in the choir . . . .”137 At the end of the preceding sentence,
Gelenius notes that the well shaft in the east transept was, by his time, either encircled in bronze
or covered with a bronze cover (puteus aereus) that bore the following inscription: “With a
violent surge, the Rhine carried the Hewalds ashore. Whom the light from on high led here, to
where the well gushes” (APPULIT EVVALDOS VIOLENTO GURGITE RHENUS / QUOS
LUX ALTA VEHIT HUC, VBI FONS SCATURIT).138 The intimate association of the well
with the Hewalds is borne out further by a previously unknown indication in a list, composed at

---

136 Erhard Winheim, Sacrarium Agrippinae, hoc est designatio ecclesiarum Coloniensium praecipuarum
reliquiarum (Cologne: Bernhard Gualterus, 1607), 62: “Altera ex Coloniensium traditionibus opinio est. Ewaldos
hos, eo loci, vbi nunc in Choro S. Cuniberti Puteus conspicitur, quem in perpetuam rei memoriam ad sanitatem
languentium superstitem ferunt.”

137 Gelenius, De admiranda magnitudine, 279: “Sumpsit deinde Cunibertina basilica incrementum Austrasiorum
Principum Pipini & B. Plectrudis munificantia, cum beatorum Evvaldorum Corpora coelesti face comitata sponte
sua adverso fluimine natantia huc appulerunt & Clero populoque praesente elevata sunt, vbi nunc aereus in choro
puteus cum hac inscripstone . . . .” Likewise, Gelenius (at 288): “. . . et in Imscharum fluvium proiecti [i.e., the
Hewalds] inde illati Rheno miraculose adverso amne vel amne refluo (inquit vita S. Annonis lib. 1 c. 37) cum
prodigioso lumine Coloniam ad natarunt, vbi a B. Tilmanno collega suo divina revelatione agniti, per Pipinum & B.
Plectrudem atque Clerum & populum Agrippinensem sunt honorifice excepti eo loco quem in choro puteus
designat.”

138 Gelenius, De admiranda magnitudine, 279. The orthography of the inscription follows that given by Gelenius.
Winheim (as in note 136) also recorded the inscription on the well in 1607, but unlike Gelenius said nothing about
the material used for it.
St. Kunibert in 1688, of the relics held at the collegiate church that records that the church possessed a “reliquary encased in silver for the holy water from the well or font of the Holy Hewalds” *(itemque reliquia una argento inclusa pro benedicenda aqua benedicta ex putoe seu fonte sanctorum Ewaldorum).*” By the early seventeenth century, then, the canons of St. Kunibert and the inhabitants of Cologne appear to have associated the well exclusively with the Hewalds and with the miraculous arrival of their bodies at St. Kunibert in a conflation of the original legend as recorded by Bede.

But when, exactly, did this *traditio Coloniensium* concerning the well, so explicitly articulated in these seventeenth-century sources, emerge? And when, exactly, was the bronze fitting for the well mentioned by Winheim and Gelenius—it was lost in the eighteenth century when the church was refitted to suit late Baroque tastes—added? For its part, the core of the legend—that the Hewalds’ martyred bodies were carried by the Rhine to the city of Cologne and not somewhere else, nor brought physically to Cologne on Pepin’s command, all contra Bede—is demonstrably much older than these seventeenth-century utterances (something suggested by Winheim’s particular formulation *ex Coloniensium traditionibus*). According to the *vita Annonis maior*, composed in 1104–1105 by an anonymous monk at the Benedictine abbey of Siegburg, archbishop Anno II (founder of the abbey in Siegburg), whilst seeking to escape Cologne after an uprising of the citizenry in 1074, fled his assailants through the north of the city. As Anno passed St. Kunibert (then still located outside the Roman city walls; fig. 22), he implored St. Kunibert, St. Clement, and the two Hewalds for their assistance. After returning

---

139 HASiK, St. Kunibert Akten 1, fol. 118v.
140 KDM 6/4, 289.
141 This specific aspect of the archbishop’s escape is not detailed in the *vita Annonis*. However, the aforementioned charter (HASiK, St. Kunibert U 1/2; printed in Lacomblet, *Urkundenbuch*, vol. 1, no. 218) that Anno II himself purportedly issued on October 3, 1074, in order to confirm the collegiate church’s property rights in Soest, among other places, refers to Anno’s imploration of the patron saints at St. Kunibert as he exited the city: “... gloria autem
to Cologne and successfully quashing the rebellion, Anno repaid his spiritual debt to his heavenly helpers by translating the bodies of the two Hewalds into a reliquary shrine. Anno’s translation of the Hewalds is recorded in the archbishop’s vita in the following terms: “And in addition to these things, Anno, instructed by a revelation of those two martyrs, elevated [i.e., translated] the precious bodies of the two Hewalds from their tombs in the earth, those whom, martyred some time ago in Saxony, the Rhine carried, against the current, to Cologne to be buried [my emphasis].” The implications of this passage from the vita Annonis in the present context are clear. In the first decade of the twelfth century, the anonymous author of the vita Annonis believed—in spite of Bede’s indications to the contrary—that the bodies of the Hewalds had been carried by the Rhine to Cologne and not brought there by Pepin. By this point, the idea that the bodies of the Hewalds washed ashore in Cologne was believed elsewhere, as its presence in a vita composed in Siegburg suggests. It stands to reason that this idea was also current in Cologne and thus at St. Kunibert itself, where the relics of the Hewalds had been kept since circa 695. The idea is also likely older than this first mention in 1104–1105, for the author of the vita Annonis presents it as if it were a well-established fact. Just how much older is now impossible to say for lack of earlier sources, though this legend almost certainly emerged only at some point after the early decades of the eighth century, for Bede was firmly of the opinion that the bodies of the Hewalds had washed up elsewhere and that Pepin had their

virtutis sanctorum Cuniberti, Clementis et Ewaldorum ad quorum intercessionem et suffragia tunc temporis specialiter confugeram propalanda est quia ut indubitabiter novi intercessione eorum timor meus in sperm, tristicia mea in gaudium.” The charter also references Anno’s translation of the bodies of the two Hewalds into a reliquary shrine (cf. note 142): “Post non multum temporis sanctos Ewaldos quamvis indignus presumpi transtrei.” Although it, like the Bertolf charter, is a clear forgery in the diplomatic sense, the content of the Anno charter is, as Kürtén has recently reiterated, truthful, for the land holdings mentioned in it (such as the property in Soest) and the translation of the Hewalds are corroborated elsewhere. See Kürtén, Stift, vol. 1, 14–16.

142 Vita Annonis archiepiscopi Coloniensis, MGH SS 11, 482: “Inter haec et duorum Ewaldorum preciose corpora, revelatione eorum martyrum instructus, de tumulis sublevavit, quos olim in Saxonia passos Renus amne reflu Civoniam sepelendios advexerat.”
relics brought to Cologne—information that Bede theoretically, given the chronology, could have received firsthand from eye-witnesses to these events (Bede completed his Historia Ecclesiastica by 731, that is, only some forty years after the Hewalds’ martyrdom). Even though the anonymous author of the vita Annonis does not, like Winheim or Gelenius, say explicitly that the Rhine carried the bodies of the Hewalds to the church of St. Kunibert (or St. Clement) or that they landed at the site of, or through, a well there, he was definitely aware of their presence at that church.143 Thus, while the author does not say it expressis verbis, it is nonetheless likely that both he and his early-twelveth-century contemporaries in Cologne at least believed that the church of St. Kunibert in general was where the Hewald’s bodies—having been carried, as the vita Annonis says, against the current of the Rhine to Cologne—had washed up.

The liturgical chants for the Hewalds represent a further, previously unconsidered body of material bearing on the development of the legend of the arrival of their bodies at St. Kunibert and shed additional light on the account in the vita Annonis.144 The three earliest chants for the Hewalds—their officium, a hymn, and a sequence—are preserved in various liturgical manuscripts from St. Kunibert, all of which date to the fourteenth century. Because earlier manuscripts are lacking, it is uncertain exactly when each of these various chants was composed and thus how they fit together chronologically. Taken together, they point, like the vita Annonis, to the parallel existence in fourteenth century of differently articulated notions as to how the Hewalds’ bodies arrived at the church. Thus, the account of the arrival of the bodies in the saints’ officium clings closely to Bede’s account in noting that Tilmon saw the ray of light

---

143 As implied by the fact that the author of the vita also recounts Anno’s translation of the Hewalds’ relics at St. Kunibert after his return to the city in 1074.
144 These texts are collected in Appendix A.
and that Pepin was responsible for having the Hewalds’ relics brought to St. Kunibert once they had washed up elsewhere.\textsuperscript{145} The hymn, found in the same manuscript as the officium, names neither Bede nor Tilmon by name, but instead only generally describes how the Hewalds’ bodies were cast into the Rhine and miraculously illuminated by heavenly rays, without elaborating on the circumstances under which they arrived at St. Kunibert.\textsuperscript{146} The sequence, for its part, also records the miraculous journey of the Hewalds’ bodies in the waters of the Rhine under the divine light, but adds cryptically that, once in Cologne, the river and the ray of light “places them in holy edifices.”\textsuperscript{147} Here, no mention of Pepin is made, and the arrival of their bodies in the city is instead attributed to miraculous forces, in line with the vita Annonis.

Rounding out the liturgical chants for the Hewalds is a second sequence, which is preserved in several sources from the second half of the fifteenth century, both in manuscript and print.\textsuperscript{148} Presumably, it was composed at some point after the aforementioned liturgical chants and possibly between the later fourteenth century and the late fifteenth, for it does not occur with the other chants in the original contents of the fourteenth-century manuscripts, but was instead, in at least one case, added at the end of a manuscript of circa 1330 by what is undoubtedly a later fifteenth-century hand. Clearly borrowing from the first sequence in both content and diction, it elaborates the legend thus:

\begin{quote}
Thrown in, the Rhine carries them [the Hewalds] in the waves on high against the current, in the accompanying raised light.

They are placed in the holy edifice, of the new well, where they suffered, flows the brook of the ground.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{145} Appendix A, no. 1.
\textsuperscript{146} Appendix A, no. 2.
\textsuperscript{147} Appendix A, no. 3.
\textsuperscript{148} Appendix A, no. 4.
The “new well” mentioned here is somewhat ambiguous, but in citing the Hewalds’ suffering, the verse seemingly refers to the miraculous spring of water that Bede says issued from the site of the Hewalds’ martyrdom and not to an actual, physical well that had recently been made (that is, the well in the church building). But implicit in this sequence, as with the *vita Annonis* and the first sequence, is the idea that the bodies were brought to Cologne via the Rhine and somehow “placed” in the holy edifice (that is, St. Kunibert) without the agency of Pepin.

Thus, while both the *vita Annonis* and the two sequences accord closely with the seventeenth-century version of events by indicating that the Rhine carried the Hewalds’ bodies to Cologne, none of these earlier sources explicitly mentions the well at St. Kunibert or the idea that the bodies came to rest on the site of, or through, the well shaft there. The two sequences, however, may possibly allude to the well legend when they state that the river “placed” the bodies of the Hewalds “in holy edifices.” Yet, the very concordance between the *vita* and the sequences and the legend as recorded in full in the seventeenth century on how the bodies arrived in Cologne via the Rhine at least raises the possibility that the *traditio Colonensium* concerning the well at St. Kunibert that Winheim mentioned in 1607 has much older, possibly even high medieval, roots.

What can be said for certain is that, by the first decade of the seventeenth century at the very latest, the well was regarded by the canons of St. Kunibert as the spot at which the martyred bodies of the two Hewalds had miraculously washed up on shore and that, in the first decade of the twelfth century, it was at least believed by some that the bodies of the Hewalds had been carried by the Rhine to Cologne. In the latter case, as with the liturgical sequences, it is likely that the connection with St. Kunibert was made on account of the presence of the relics of the Hewalds there since the late seventh century, but whether the connection with the well
was also drawn by this point ultimately remains uncertain. It is also now impossible to know when the lost bronze fitting for the well mentioned by Winheim and Gelenius was made, that is, whether it was added in the early thirteenth century during the rebuilding of the church or only later. It must nonetheless be stressed that, in contrast to the legend of the newborn children, an oral tradition that is first recorded in the nineteenth century, and the purely conjectural association of the well with St. Clement in modern scholarship, the association of the well with the Hewalds not only is the oldest textually documented legend concerning the well, one that possibly could have been current in the oral tradition as early as the first decade of the twelfth century, but also is the only legend recorded in the collegiate church’s own textual and monumental record (if we include the lost bronze fitting for the well). 149 These two points alone do not, de facto, exclude the possibility that the well was a pre-Christian cult site, but the fact that canons should have associated the well so closely with the Hewalds by the turn of the seventeenth century at the very latest (so much so that they then called it the puteus sive fons sanctorum Ewaldorum), and the possibility that this association could be as old as the early twelfth century, if not even older, should force us to reconsider seriously whether the so-called Kunibertbrunnen only became significant at some point after the bodies of the two Hewalds were brought, circa 695, to the church that was later to become the collegiate church of St. Kunibert. Alternatively, if Kunibert did, in fact, associate the well with Clement, it is also possible—given the firmly documented later association of the well with the Ewalds—that the well underwent a change in meaning at some unknown point after the arrival of the bodies of the two Northumbrian martyrs at the church in the late seventh century.

149 Müller’s statement (“Staatsmann,” 199 n. 121) that the “Hinweis, an der Stätte des Brunnens seien die Gebeine der Brüder Ewaldi angelandet worden, findet sich durch keine Quelle belegt” is thus misleading. Exactly the opposite is true: this tradition is the only tradition concerning the well that is attested in both textual and monumental sources, and in ones issuing from the collegiate church itself at that.
The major problem concerning the hypothetical role of the well in the seventh century and with seeing it as the “zygote of the entire complex” before or under Kunibert is, however, even more rudimentary than its slippery semantic significance. While its placement on axis with the high altar and apse and its central position under the crossing of the east transept clearly indicate that the well was important to the builders of the thirteenth-century church, we are currently in no position to say if the well was even located within the much earlier church of St. Clement, nor can we determine its precise or even general spatial relationship with either that church building or, for that matter, with any of the several earlier church buildings on the site. It is emblematic that the thesis concerning the well as the “zygote” of the collegiate church was largely propagated before the first publication, in 1992, of the results of the first excavations at St. Kunibert, when speculation concerning its potential role could be given free reign and archaeological evidence that could refute the thesis was completely lacking.

As indicated above, remains that can securely be said to belong to the church of St. Clement have yet to be found, much less ones that would enable us to determine the ground plan, extent, and disposition of that church building. The limited archaeological work that has been undertaken at St. Kunibert has focused solely on the west end of the thirteenth-century church down to the second bay of the nave; the east end and, most important in the present context, the area around the well, by contrast, have never been excavated. The excavations that have been conducted up to this point have produced sufficient evidence to indicate that the longitudinal axis of the eleventh-century church building lay approximately five degrees to the north of the longitudinal axis of the thirteenth-century collegiate church (fig. 6). Although it is not fully clear if the east end of the predecessor church—whether also eleventh-century or

---

150 See below, 84–85.
even earlier—also lay on the same axis as the west end because the east end has not actually been uncovered, the fact that all of the (now lost) cloisteral buildings, including the east range, also followed the axis of the eleventh-century west end makes it almost certain that the pre-thirteenth-century east end did too (fig. 30).  

If the eastern reaches of the predecessor church did, as it most likely, follow the axis of the remains of the eleventh-century west end and the lost cloisteral buildings, then the well was almost certainly not located, as it currently is in the thirteenth-century church building, on axis with the high altar and the apse (provided there even was an apse) in any of the earlier church buildings (fig. 6). In fact, because we do not know how far to the east the presbytery of the predecessor church building(s) extended in either the eleventh century or before, we cannot even say definitively if the well was actually located inside the collegiate church at any point before the thirteenth century (fig. 6). If Schütte’s conjectural identification of the remains found in 1992 as those of the church of St. Clement does indeed ultimately find corroboration through further archaeological investigation and this identification is someday securely established, then it would seem, to judge from those remains, that the church of St. Clement was not built over the well at all (fig. 3). And as just indicated, the well was perhaps not even included inside the—presumably much larger—eleventh-century church building some three or four centuries later (fig. 6). Given the virtual certainty that the Merovingian church of St. Clement was nowhere near as large as either the eleventh-century church or the present, thirteenth-century church, it is likely that the well was actually located

---

151 That the cloisteral buildings, demolished in 1821, align perfectly with the eleventh-century west end indicates that they definitely stood before the rebuilding of the church in the early thirteenth century; on account of their demolition and the complete lack of detailed graphic renderings beyond the ground plan in fig. 23, there is no way to date them more precisely other than to say that they predated the thirteenth-century church. On the relationship between the cloister and the eleventh-century and thirteenth-century churches, see further below, 84–85.

152 On east end of the church in the eleventh century, see below, 75–76.
outside the church of St. Clement.\footnote{Cf., in contrast, Müller, “Staatsmann,” 198 n. 117a: “ursprünglich aber könnte dieser Brunnen sehr wohl in die Altarhausarchitektur des vorromanischen Baus [meant here is the church of St. Clement] einbezogen gewesen sein.” Müller made the above statement in 1987, before it was determined that the eleventh-century west end (of the existence of which he was necessarily unaware) was positioned on a different axis than that of the thirteenth-century church building. According to Schütte’s purely hypothetical reconstructions both of the church of St. Clement (his “Phases I” and “II”; figs. 2 and 3) and what he describes, on the scantiest of remains, as the earliest collegiate church (“Phase III,” before 866), none of the predecessor churches would have been positioned on axis with the well, nor would their east ends presumably have encompassed the well. Schütte’s reconstructions of the east end of the predecessor churches in the above figures, and of the church in the eleventh century in fig. 6, need to be approached with extreme caution, for they have no basis in archaeological finds.} In the seventh century, the well might have been a (possibly Roman) well that just happened to be on the site and that was still used (or not used) to obtain water and that was without any symbolic import at all for the church of St. Clement.

Thus, the hypothesis that Kunibert elected to found and dedicate a church to St. Clement here on account of the presence of the well, plausible given the later analogies in Essen and Aarhus, is ultimately pure speculation and will remain just that until the church of St. Clement is definitively identified and its contours—and specifically, its spatial relationship with the well—securely established on a firm archaeological basis. All this is not to dismiss the possibility that the well was a pre-Christian cult site or that Kunibert did, in fact, “Christianize” it by erecting a church dedicated to the “water saint” Clement over or even near the well, but only to suggest that, at this point, we would do well to exercise extreme caution in considering the Kunibertspütz as the “zygote of the entire complex” or as the factor that motivated Kunibert to found a church here and to dedicate it to St. Clement. The firmly documented textual tradition concerning the miraculous arrival of Hewalds’ bodies at St. Kunibert—a legend whose roots can be traced back at least as far as the beginning of the twelfth century in the vita Annonis—suggests that the well possibly became important only at some point after the arrival of the relics of the Hewalds at the later collegiate church of St. Kunibert in the final decade of the seventh century and that it was incorporated into the church for this reason instead.
The foregoing survey of the current state of knowledge (or, perhaps better, lack of knowledge) about the church of St. Clement mentioned in the *vita Cuniberti*—the point of origin for the later collegiate church—paints a sobering picture. Each of the multiple hypotheses concerning the origins of this church building and the significance of the site both before and under Kunibert—a hypothetical, preexisting late antique *memoria*, the hypothetical presence of a Frankish settlement, or the hypothetical role of the so-called *Kunibertbrunnen* as either a pre- or early Christian cult site—is problematic in its own way. None can, at the moment, be dismissed outright, privileged above the others, or confirmed on account of the almost complete lack of relevant and unambiguous archaeological material that would allow us to begin to form a clear picture of the history of the site both before and during the seventh century.

For the moment, all that can be said for certain is that the *vita* 1) credits Kunibert with building the church of St. Clement and 2) indicates that Kunibert was buried there. The aforementioned lack of knowledge notwithstanding, the claim in the later *vita* that Kunibert built the church himself *de novo* cannot simply be dismissed out of hand. It is, after all, the sole piece of evidence concerning the church of St. Clement, and it clearly indicates that Kunibert *built* the church *himself* (*ipse construxit*), as opposed to rebuilding another, preexisting church. The later medieval chronicles, including both the *Chronica presulum* and the less valuable *Koelhoftsche Chronik*, likewise credit Kunibert with building a church dedicated to St. Clement and know nothing of a preexisting church or Christian *memoria* on this site. For its part, the *vita*’s second claim—that Kunibert was buried at the church of St. Clement that he had built—could also indicate that Kunibert founded the church of St. Clement. That Kunibert was buried at St. Clement may be indicative of a particular attachment to that church that would be
commensurate with his (hypothetical) founding and construction of it. Unlike Trier or Mainz, where communal burial sites for bishops were established as early as the third and fourth centuries, respectively, Cologne did not possess anything like a communal burial site for its bishops until the later ninth century, when, beginning with archbishop Willibert (870–889), several (but not all) succeeding archbishops were buried at the cathedral. 154 Before then, several bishops and, later, archbishops of Cologne appear, as far as the patchy extant evidence indicates, to have been buried at sites other than the cathedral. The first archbishop of Cologne, Hildebald (784/87–818), was buried at St. Gereon. 155 Two successive bishops at the turn of the eight century, Giso (692/694–ca. 711) and Anno I (ca. 711–ca. 715), were buried at the church that was ultimately to become the collegiate church of St. Severin (like St. Gereon and St. Kunibert, St. Severin is first attested as a monasterium in 866), but the evidence is too slim to indicate whether this church can be regarded, either in the period before or after, as a site for the communal memoria of the bishops of Cologne. 156 Kunibert’s burial at St. Clement seemingly indicates that St. Severin was not such a site for communal episcopal memoria, at least in the period before the turn of the eighth century. Kunibert, at least theoretically, could have been buried anywhere in Cologne. That he should have been buried at the church of St. Clement could suggest—but does not prove—that the pontiff did actually found the church of St. Clement, with his burial there stemming from his role as fundator. In view of the lack of evidence that would indicate definitively that there was either a preexisting memoria (that is, beyond the uncertain remains discovered in 1992) or a church building on this site before Kunibert, the founding and construction de novo of the church of St. Clement here by

Kunibert—for whatever reason—is the only thesis that is capable of being maintained on the basis of the current body of evidence. This picture, however, could very well change with a comprehensive excavation of the site. All other claims concerning a preexisting church on the site or the postulated role of either a Frankish settlement and/or a pre- or early Christian cult site centered on the so-called Kunibertbrunnen as explanations for the emergence of the church here are nothing more than speculation at this point.


The problems that vex any attempt to unravel the background of the church of St. Clement—the paucity of archaeological material for site for the period before circa 1000 and the lack of textual sources—also vex attempts at understanding the emergence of a college of canons at this site. The first mention of the existence of an organized religious community at the church of St. Kunibert occurs in 866 in the so-called “Guntharsche Güterumschreibung,” in which the church is already called a monasterium and is already said to be dedicated to Kunibert. This charter lists the four monasteria (apart from the cathedral) then in the city of Cologne, beginning with St. Gereon and continuing with St. Severin, St. Kunibert, and the Church of the Holy Virgins. Although it is called a monasterium in the charter, it is likely that the monasterium sancti Cuniberti was, by 866, home to canons rather than monks and was thus already a collegiate church, or Stift, in the full sense of the word. The two types of communal religious organization—collegiate (canons) and monastic (monks)—had already been clearly separated in 816 at the Synod of Aachen and a conversion of the church from a monastic

---

157 MGH Diplomata Lotharii II, no. 25. This crucial document, a charter issued by emperor Lothar II, confirmed the (by then deposed) archbishop Gunthar’s assurance of stable, inviolable income for the cathedral chapter and the major monasteria not only within Cologne, but within the diocese as a whole.
158 “... monasterium martyris Christi Gereonis et sanctorum sociorum eius, sed et monasterium sancti Severini Christi confessoris, monasterium quoque sancti Cuniberti, monasterium beatarum virginum...”
church to a collegiate church after this point, and probably even before it, is unlikely.\textsuperscript{159} By 866, then, the church of St. Clement had clearly become the church of St. Kunibert and that church was very likely already a collegiate church with an organized community of canonici.

Essentially, there are three camps of opinion on the issue of the origins of the collegiate church in the period before 866. The first, typical of the early twentieth century, but still with several more recent adherents, either believes that the issue simply cannot be resolved or, alternatively, does not address it at all.\textsuperscript{160} It is perhaps emblematic that, when faced with the question of the origins of the college of canons at St. Kunibert, Kürten, the most recent authority on the history of the institution, ultimately elected to leave the issue open, and deferred to Heinemann’s 1932 opinion in noting that “any attempt to shed light on the dark hole surrounding the origins of the collegiate church runs up against insurmountable difficulties.”\textsuperscript{161}

The second camp was founded, as it were, by Eugen Ewig in the mid-twentieth century, when, in 1960, he suggested off-handedly that Kunibert might have founded the church of St. Clement as an Iro-Frankish monastery.\textsuperscript{162} Reasoning that it is “surprising, given Kunibert’s important role in the founding of Stavelot-Malmédy, that he should not have founded a monastery of the Iro-Frankish type at his own episcopal seat of Cologne,” Friedrich Prinz pursued this same line of thought a few years later, and hypothesized in line with Ewig that the church of St. Clement was a “benediktinisch-columbanisch organisiert[es] Kloster” that would have supported

\textsuperscript{159} On the Synod of Aachen and its implications for the development of the collegiate church in the medieval Holy Roman Empire in general, see Peter Moraw, “Über Topographie, Chronologie und Geographie der Stiftskirche im deutschen Mittelalter,” in \textit{Untersuchungen zu Kloster und Stift}, ed. Max-Planck-Institut für Geschichte (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 11.

\textsuperscript{160} Carl Heinemann (\textit{Die Kollationsrechte des Stifts S. Kunibert zu Köln} [Bonn: Hanstein, 1932], 31) raised the issue, but proposed that it was impossible to answer the question satisfactorily. More recently, Amberg (\textit{Gottesdienstordnung}) and Graf (“Ostchorbau”) sidestepped the question of the origins of the collegiate church.

\textsuperscript{161} Kürten, \textit{Stift}, vol. 1, 6: “Es bleibt . . . bei der von Carl Heinemann getroffenen Feststellung, daß jeder Versuch, Licht in das Dunkel um den Ursprung des Kunibertstiftes zu bringen, auf unüberwindliche Schwierigkeiten stößt.”

Kunibert’s (presumed) missionary activity. Neither Ewig nor Prinz was able to produce any evidence whatsoever (beyond Kunibert’s imputed role in the founding of Stavelot-Malmédy) to substantiate the hypothesis that the church of St. Clement was a monastery, much less one based on the tenets of Iro-Frankish monasticism—a fact that rightly garnered Prinz, at least, harsh criticism. In line with his thesis of Kunibert’s (presumed) extensive missionary activity and (hypothetical) ties to Columbanic and Iro-Frankish monasticism, Müller has recently resurrected Ewig and Prinz’s thesis in several publications. Müller bases his argument on two points. The first is the hypothesis suggested by Prinz concerning Kunibert’s involvement in church missions and his supposedly deep ties to Iro-Frankish monastic circles. The second is the Kunibertbrunnen, which Müller interprets, using Hrabanus Maurus’s commentary on Genesis, as a fons vitae emblematic of baptism and conversion and thus as a symbol for both church mission in general and for Kunibert’s (purported) missionary activity in particular. As an Iro-Frankish monastery, the church of St. Clement, built around the symbolic well as fons vitae, would, Müller argues, have functioned as a base for Kunibert’s (presumed) missionary aims.

The hypothesis that Kunibert founded and built the church of St. Clement as an Iro-Frankish monastery and as a centre for his (presumed) missionary activity is extremely problematic on several levels. The Kunibertbrunnen can neither be securely located in the church of St. Clement (nor in any of the predecessor churches, including the eleventh-century one), nor can its significance either before or during Kunibert’s episcopacy be ascertained, to


164 Thus Josef Semmler’s categorical rejection of Prinz’s thesis that St. Clement was an Iro-Frankish monastery in his review of the latter’s book (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung 84 [1967]: 406): “... das bedeutende Kölner monastery St. Kunibert hat als Seelsorgsstation für die nach Sachsen hin gelegenen Gebiete der Kölner Diözese keine Chance, den Mönchsklötern zugezählt zu werden.” Borger, Abbilder des Himmels, 234, also rejected Prinz’s (and by implication, Ewig’s) thesis.

say nothing about the problems inherent in employing a mid-ninth-century, Carolingian text to explain the “meaning” of the well as a *fons vitae* suggestive of mission and conversion in the seventh century. And beyond the fact that it largely depends on conjectures concerning Kunibert’s own relationship to missionary activity and supposed ties to Iro-Frankish monasticism, by far the biggest impediment to this thesis is the complete lack of any textual or archaeological corroboration that the church of St. Clement, as founded by Kunibert, was a monastery, much less an Iro-Frankish one. It is extremely difficult to believe that, if Kunibert had in fact founded St. Clement as an Iro-Frankish monastery of the type suggested by Ewig, Prinz, and Müller, this act and the existence, even temporary, of the monastery would not have been recorded at least somewhere, either in the seventh century or later, and especially in the record at the later collegiate church itself. As Kürten rightly stresses, there is not a single reliable source, whether contemporary or later, from St. Kunibert or elsewhere, that indicates that Kunibert either founded a monastery or even instituted a community of clergy or monks at the church of St. Clement.  

The *vita Cuniberti* is aware that Kunibert built the church of St. Clement, but it does not credit him with establishing a monastic community, or any other type of religious community, at that church. The silence on this point in the *vita* is significant. Although the aforementioned *Chronica presulum* of circa 1370 indicates that Kunibert both built the church of St. Clement and “instituted a convent of brothers” (*conventum fratrum ibidem instituit*) at his foundation, the historical validity of the latter statement is, as has been repeatedly pointed out, highly dubious at best. Thus, the same source, in an analogous manner and using virtually the same language, also credits St. Severin, who was bishop of

---

166 Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 1–6.  
Cologne around the year 400 [!], with establishing a monastic community (conventum fratrum) at the church dedicated to Cornelius and Cyprian that was later to assume Severin’s own name—a claim that can hardly have any historical basis. The absence in the vita, or anywhere (apart from the dubious Chronica), of a claim that Kunibert established a religious community at St. Clement and the appearance of such a claim, for the first time, in the late-fourteenth-century Chronica presulum suggests that the indication in the Chronica is a fabrication, much like the fabrication in the Chronica’s account of the deeds of St. Severin. One must also ask how, if the church was indeed a monastery with Iro-Frankish monks living according to the Benedictine rule, we are to explain its later status as a collegiate church that was almost certainly populated by (secular) canons in 866? And if the remains that Schütte has attempted to argue are those of the church of St. Clement do turn out to be from that church (cf. fig. 3), then that building’s apparently tiny scale would also likely argue against the church of St. Clement being a monastery and more for a small chapel. Unless archaeological investigation on the site can turn up any evidence that the church of St. Clement possessed features that would enable us to postulate the existence of a monastic community at that church under Kunibert, one can only side with Semmler and Borger in rejecting the argument that Kunibert founded an Iro-Frankish monastery at the church of St. Clement.

Yet, if the indication in the aforementioned Bertolf charter, itself a twelfth-century forgery, that Kunibert himself endowed the church in which he was buried with property in Crellingon/Kerling-les-Sierk and Mallington/Malling along the upper Mosel (that is, in his hypothetical ancestral homelands) is actually truthful (and both sites were indeed in the church’s

---

168 Chronica presulum et archiepiscoporum Coloniensis ecclesiae, in Fontes adhuc inediti, ed. Eckertz, 4: “... beatus Severinus... instituit in Colonia ecclesiam et conventum fratrum in honore sancti Cornelii et Cipriani que nunc mutate nomine dicitur et vocatur ecclesia sancti Severini.” The claim that Severin founded a monasterium at the church that was later to become the collegiate church of St. Severin already appears in a forged charter from St. Severin that was (purportedly) issued in 948 by archbishop Wichfried (924–968). See Finger, “Memoria,” 300.
possession until 1084\textsuperscript{169}, then this could, as Gierlich suggests, argue for the possibility that Kunibert established at the church of St. Clement a religious community of some type, perhaps a group of clerics and not necessarily a community of monks.\textsuperscript{170} The presence of even a small community of clerics at the church of St. Clement under Kunibert would, theoretically, also possibly explain why Kunibert chose to be buried there, as a resident community of clerics established by Kunibert and supported with funds drawn from property given by him could very well have attended to the bishop’s \textit{memoria} following his death (something that ultimately proved superfluous, given Kunibert’s accession to the ranks of the saintly). However, this thesis likewise hinges on extrapolations from the very uncertain “evidence” of the tradition in the later, forged Bertolf charter that these two properties were given to the church by none other than Kunibert himself, and it is thus also far from infallible.\textsuperscript{171} Moreover, it too runs up against the fact that not a single source, whether contemporary or later, from St. Kunibert or from elsewhere (beyond the dubious \textit{Chronica presulum}), knows of a monastery or a religious community established at St. Clement by Kunibert.

For its part, the translation circa 695 of the bodies of the two Hewalds to the church that was later to become the collegiate church of St. Kunibert seemingly presupposes the existence of some sort of religious community at the church by at least this point (not necessarily an organized college of canons), because it is unlikely that these relics would have been brought to the church without at least a small community to venerate (and oversee) them there.\textsuperscript{172} That the Hewalds’ relics were brought to the church at the end of the seventh century cannot, however, be projected back in time and understood as indicating that there was a religious community

\textsuperscript{169} See above, 14–16.
\textsuperscript{170} Gierlich, \textit{Grabstätten}, 262.
\textsuperscript{171} See above, 14–16.
\textsuperscript{172} Gierlich, \textit{Grabstätten}, 262–263.
there during Kunibert’s lifetime. But it suggests that there was possibly a community at the church toward the turn of the eighth century, that is, at least some forty years after Kunibert’s (presumed) death in 663 (or even ca. 650). It is very possible that a community of clergy, or Klerikergemeinschaft, either formed on its own or was formally established by a later (arch)bishop as a small, organized body of canons at the church of St. Clement only after the pontiff’s death, precisely because Kunibert was buried there. This constitutes the position of the third camp.

Borger has thus conjectured that a college of canons was probably established at the church only at some point after the middle of the eighth century. Borger, however, does not provide any reasoning for this particular date beyond noting that a foundation of a religious community by Kunibert himself in the first half of the seventh century is “unlikely,” and he also neglects to take into account the fact that the bodies of the Hewalds were brought to the church in the last decade of the seventh century. More convincingly, Kürten has observed that “the origins of the Stift likely do go back much farther” than the first unequivocal mention of the collegiate church in 866, suggesting that the presence of both Kunibert’s tomb and that of the bodies of the two Hewalds at the church led to the formation, perhaps “at a very early date,” of a community of clerics that would have “celebrated the liturgy and attended to pastoral duties in

---

173 As Müller, “Kunibert,” 15, intimates.
174 On the gradual emergence of Klerikergemeinschaften at martyria and saints’ tombs in the seventh and eighth centuries and their role as the basis for the later, formally organized communites at German collegiate churches, see Moraw, “Stiftskirche,” 14, esp. n. 17. Such a process, namely the formation of a group of clergy at the martyrium of St. Gereon, perhaps in the late seventh or eighth century, is, for instance, usually offered as an explanation for the origins of the later collegiate church at this site, and the same may also be true of St. Severin, where a group of clergy might have congregated at that bishop’s (purported) burial church, perhaps by the turn of the eighth century. The aforementioned burial of bishops Giso and Anno here in the years around 700 seemingly presupposes the existence of a community of clergy, if not necessarily an organized community of canons, at St. Severin by this date. See Finger, “Memoria,” 300.
the northern suburb of Cologne."

That the bodies of the Hewalds were brought to the church possibly could indicate that such a community of clerics had either formed or was formally founded there even relatively soon after Kunibert’s death in the course of the second half of the seventh century.

The only obstacle to this thesis is that the first pieces of evidence attesting to the veneration of Kunibert as a saint date to the early decades of the ninth century. The earliest extant mention of Kunibert as a saint occurs in the so-called Domlitanei, a litany found in a miscellany of circa 810 (Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek, ms. 106). Although long thought to have been produced in Cologne, the codex that contains the litany was likely written instead in Essen-Werden; it is not certain when the codex arrived at the cathedral library. Dated with the codex to circa 810, this litany contains the exhortation “Sancte Chuniberte ora [pro nobis] (fig. 12).” Kunibert’s name also appears in slightly later litanies from Corvey (827–840) and Mainz (second half of the ninth century), and a verse dedicated to him also occurs in the Martyrologium that Wandelbert of Prüm composed in 848. His vita was likely also composed in the ninth century, and his remains appear to have been translated into a reliquary shrine only at the very end of the ninth century or in the first quarter of the tenth, for the aforementioned (forged) charter of Anno II indicates that archbishop Hermann I

---

178 On fol. 74r. See Maurice Coens, “Anciennes Litanies des Saints,” Analecta Bollandiana 54 (1936): 13. Coens worked under the (then prevalent) assumption that the litany was written in Cologne.
(889/890–924), seeking to demonstrate that Kunibert had acquired property in the city of Soest for Cologne cathedral, exhumed the saint’s relics from a tomb in the ground (*effoso corpore sancti Cuniberti*) and took them (presumably in a shrine) with him to Soest to buttress his claim. It was likely during this first translation that Kunibert’s relics were wrapped in the sumptuous Byzantine silk of the late eighth or early ninth century that was found inside the saint’s reliquary shrine when it was opened in 1898 (fig. 13).

Thus, it is not certain when, exactly, Kunibert became a saint. Of course, the silence of the textual record before the early ninth century does not necessarily mean that Kunibert only achieved saintly status at the beginning of that century. Kunibert could have been, and likely was, venerated at least as a holy figure and perhaps even as a saint well before the first mentions of his sanctity in the above litanies, perhaps even, at least in Cologne, in the period immediately following his death in the mid-seventh century. But in the absence of textual sources attesting to Kunibert’s sanctity in the stretch of time between his death and the first record of his saintly status in the *Domlitanei* of circa 810, the postulated emergence of a community of clerics at Kunibert’s tomb very shortly after his death can also only remain a conjecture and rests largely on the hypothesis that the Hewalds were brought to the church of St. Clement (perhaps then already St. Kunibert?) because there was already some kind of religious community there. Nonetheless, because Kunibert is firmly attested as saint in the *Domlitanei* by 810, there can be no doubt that there was already a community of clerics at his burial church by the turn of the ninth century at the latest.

---
180 On the date of the *vita*, see above, 12–13. The text of the charter (HASTK, St. Kunibert U 1/2 [printed in Lacomblet, *Urkundenbuch*, vol. 1, no. 218]) records the translation thus: “Et iuxta consilium suum [i.e., of Hado, provost of St. Kunibert] tradidi [i.e., archbishop Anno II] fratribus quinque libras solvendas de areis vel de curticulis Susacie quod eam sanctus Cunibertus sancto Petro [patron of Cologne cathedral] acquisivit et quod pius archiepiscopus Herimannus postmodum effoso corpore sancti Cuniberti et Susatiam translato ab iustis et inopportunis heredibus eam duello defendit et obtinuit.”
The strength of the thesis of the third camp—the emergence of a community of clerics at the church at some point after Kunibert’s death, whether soon after or perhaps only in the course of the eighth century—ultimately lies in its accordance with the textual tradition, which does not credit Kunibert with founding a monastery or with instituting any type of religious community at the church of St. Clement. This is also more likely than the thesis that Kunibert himself established a religious community at his burial church, which rests on the “evidence” of extrapolations from the problematic Bertolf charter and also runs against the textual tradition, which does not indicate anywhere that Kunibert founded a monastery or established a community of clergy or monks at the church of St. Clement. Nonetheless, the fact that Kunibert was buried at St. Clement could possibly point to his having established at least a small community of clerics there that would have been charged with maintaining his *memoria*. Thus, despite the silence of the textual record on this point, the thesis that Kunibert established a small religious community at St. Clement still remains remotely possible and cannot be definitively rejected. The argument that Kunibert founded an Iro-Frankish monastery at St. Clement as a type of missionary base, however, should be dispensed with altogether: there is no evidence that would suggest this was the case, and the thesis itself is speculation based on further conjectures about Kunibert’s role as a “missionary” bishop and his imputed ties to Iro-Frankish monastic circles. Barring the emergence of material (beyond the Bertolf charter) that would suggest that Kunibert did, in fact, establish a religious community at St. Clement, the present body of evidence, meager as it undoubtedly is, points more towards the emergence, whether on its own or through formal foundation, of a community of secular clerics at the church at some point after Kunibert’s death and certainly before the first decade of the ninth century, at which point Kunibert is securely attested as *sanctus Kunibertus*. 
4. The Eleventh-Century Church Building, the Tomb of Rudolf von Schleswig, and the Church Building in the Twelfth Century

Apart from the remains that Schütte has argued might have belonged to St. Clement, concrete material evidence for the collegiate church building is lacking until the eleventh century, for which the recent excavations have unearthed a multitude of material that is both important in its own right and of immediate relevance for understanding the thirteenth-century rebuilding project. In addition to the two fragmentary foundation walls and the empty Roman sarcophagus that were discovered in the second bay of the nave (figs. 2 and 3), the 1978–1993 excavations uncovered a series of foundations in the area of the first nave bay (from west) and crossing of the west transept. The foundations in the crossing of the west transept were unearthed in 1978 and 1980 (fig. 4); Seiler, the lead excavator, speculated that these foundations could have belonged to one of the earlier churches on the site, but the lack of further finds made it impossible at that point to ascertain either the date of these foundations or their wider architectural context. Clarity on both these points came with the excavations conducted between 1985 and 1991, which uncovered an extensive network of foundation walls to the east of those that had been uncovered in 1978/1980 (fig. 14). Positioned immediately adjacent to each other, both groups of foundations lie on the same axis and are very similar in scale, and

---

182 Two fragmentary segments of foundation walls (marked 4 and 6 in fig. 14) uncovered in the excavations may possibly be earlier than the eleventh century. Both of these walls differed in material composition from the foundations found to the west of them, which undoubtedly belonged to the eleventh-century west end (see Seiler, “Neue Erkenntnisse,” 45). On account of the isolated position and fragmentary state of preservation of wall 6, it is not certain whether it formed part of a predecessor church earlier in date than the eleventh-century one. Schütte has suggested that it might have formed part of a (hypothetical) Carolingian church building; see Schütte, “Baugeschichte,” 11 (with hypothetical reconstruction in Abb. 4 “Phase IV”). It is also not certain if wall 4 is much older than the eleventh-century west end; it could very well be part of the south side aisle wall of an eleventh-century nave. On it, see below, 68, with note 188.
183 Seiler, “Ausgrabungen,” 305.
184 For a detailed report of these excavations and the first interpretation of the finds, see Seiler, “Erkenntnisse,” 44–49.
thus, though the actual juncture between them was not uncovered, they in all likelihood belonged to the same structure (fig. 6).\footnote{For his part, Seiler (“Neue Erkenntnisse”) does not connect the two sets of foundations (see my fig. 1). Schütte (“Baugeschichte,” 12, with Abb. 5; see my fig. 6) sees them as contemporary and part of the same structure. This seems the most likely scenario in view of the scale, context, and orientation of the foundations.}

The sum of all of these excavations was the discovery of the foundations of a sizeable west end measuring some seventeen meters in width from north to south (fig. 6).\footnote{Measurements here and in the following (unless otherwise indicated) are those provided by Seiler, “Erkenntnisse,” 47.} The foundations indicate that the structure consisted of a square central space (interior width 6.5 x 6.2 meters) that was flanked on its north and south sides by two smaller and likewise nearly square spaces or wings (interior width of the fully uncovered south space 3.7 x 3.4 meters) that were set back slightly from the foremost western plane of the central space. To the west, another nearly square wing similar in size to the north and south wings (3.85 meters wide\footnote{As Seiler (“Neue Erkenntnisse,” 45, 47) indicates, wall 4 (in fig. 14) differs from the foundations of the west end in material composition and does not interlock with the adjacent wall 3 (the east wall of the south arm of the west end), but rather is separated from it by a small but nonetheless clear gap. He also notes that wall 4 appears to have been partly demolished to make way for wall 3, and thus concludes that the side aisle wall most likely stood before the construction of the west end, but does not speculate on how much older it might have been. By contrast, Schütte (“Baugeschichte,” Abb. 5) indicates, at least implicitly in his reconstruction of the plan of the west end (see my fig. 6), that the south side aisle wall was put up with the west end. The physical evidence seemingly speaks for the existence of the south side aisle wall before the construction of the west end rather than for contemporary construction, but it is conceivable that the nave was erected only shortly before the west end (and thus also in the first half of the eleventh century) and that the difference in material and the gap stem from this rather than from a lengthy chronological interlude separating the construction of the nave and the west end.} fronted the central space. A further segment of foundation (wall 4 in fig. 14), found abutting the southeast corner of the south wing and aligned on the same axis, most likely formed the outer wall of an adjoining south side aisle (fig. 6), but it is not certain whether the side aisle wall and the west end were erected (near) contemporaneously or whether the aisle wall is older.\footnote{Seiler, “Ausgrabungen,” 302.}

The west end can be securely dated to the first half of the eleventh century on various grounds. The physical manufacture of the foundations, composed of hand-sized tufa bricks, points to the eleventh century (or earlier); beginning in the early twelfth century in Cologne,
foundations were constructed exclusively using ashlar blocks of columnar basalt stone.\footnote{Seiler, “Erkenntnisse,” 44 (on the composition of the foundations) and 48 (on the dating of the foundations to before the twelfth century).} In the southwest corner of the central space, moreover, the surviving portions of the lowest reaches of the walls (that is, not just the foundations) indicate that this space originally featured a series of concave recesses (German: *Muldennischen*) along its interior walls (fig. 15).\footnote{Seiler, “Erkenntnisse,” 48.} Common within Ottonian and later eleventh-century architecture as a whole, comparable *Muldennischen* occur specifically in the context of several extant west ends from this period, including the westwork at St. Pantaleon in Cologne (St. Pantaleon II, ca. 984–1000, inner walls of porch; fig. 18 no. 5) and the west end of the convent church in Essen (1039–1058).\footnote{See Seiler, “Erkenntnisse,” 48 (on the prevalence of *Muldennischen* in the period ca. 960–1070); and, for the reference to the *Muldennischen* at Essen, Dorothea Hochkirchen, “Die Spolien von St. Kunibert. Neue Erkenntnisse über einen Vorgängerbau des 11. Jahrhunderts,” in *Architekturgechichten. Festschrift für Günther Binding zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Udo Mainzer and Petra Leser (Cologne: Bachem, 1996), 24–25 (hereafter “Spolien”), and eadem, “Die Spolien von St. Kunibert. Neue Erkenntnisse über einen Vorgängerbau des 11. Jahrhunderts,” *CR* 12 (1997): 30 (hereafter “Vorgängerbau”).} A final, even more precise, chronological anchor comes in the form of a series of fragments of limestone pilasters, mouldings, and three fine foliate capitals (figs. 16 and 17) that were discovered by chance in 1986 during the demolition of the southeast crossing pier of the west transept (PII in fig. 14), where they had been reused in the 1230s as filler during the construction of the pier.\footnote{Hochkirchen, “Spolien,” 11–12; eadem, “Vorgängerbau,” 21–22. The original eastern crossing piers of the west transept (PI and PII in fig. 16), still mostly thirteenth-century substance, were demolished and rebuilt with stronger foundations and further reinforcement in order to safely support the reconstructed west transept with its monumental central tower (completed in 1992), which had been destroyed in World War II. On the dating of the thirteenth-century west transept to the 1230s, see Chapter 4.} Traces of weathering on the outer faces of the pilasters and capitals indicate that they adorned the exterior rather than the interior of a building.\footnote{Hochkirchen, “Spolien,” 11; eadem, “Vorgängerbau,” 21.} That they were discovered in PII in the immediate context of the foundations of the west end argues convincingly for a provenance...
from the exterior of that structure (fig. 14). The capitals and pilasters can be more or less securely dated to the period circa 1040 on the basis of their close formal similarities with the capitals and system of pilaster decoration on such firmly dated structures as the west stair towers at the cathedral of Trier (ca. 1042/1043) and the octagon crowning the west end of the minster in Essen (1039–1056; fig. 172). The capitals in particular have their closest parallels in capitals dating from the first half of the eleventh century, such that a date much later than mid-century is unlikely. Dorothea Hochkirchen’s general date of circa 1040 for the capitals and pilasters not only strengthens the already strong likelihood that they stem from the west end, itself generally datable to the eleventh century on account of the Muldennischen and the construction technique and material of the foundations; it also offers a further, solid terminus for the construction of the west end, which can now be fairly firmly dated, most likely in its entirety, to the years around 1040.
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194 Hochkirchen, “Spolien,” 24–25; eadem, “Vorgängerbau,” 30–31. Schütte’s attempt (“Baugeschichte,” 12) to cast doubt on the provenance of the capitals from the west end and his contention that they come from either the nave or the east end instead are unconvincing.
197 Hochkirchen, “Spolien,” 24–25 and 29 nn. 59 and 60; eadem, “Vorgängerbau,” 30 and 34 nn. 60 and 61. Schütte (“Baugeschichte,” 12) has attempted to distinguish two separate phases in the construction of the west end (he has since been followed by Hochkirchen, “Vorgängerbau,” 29–30, who accordingly amends her conclusions as presented in “Spolien,” 26). Pointing to the fact that the foundation walls of the south wing do not interlock with the foundation wall of the central space (fig. 14), he has suggested that the central space may “theoretisch auch ein halbes Jahrhundert älter” than the north, south, and west wings, and that these were only added later, even if slightly, as annexes (cf. his Abb. 4 and 5). But as Schütte himself indicates, a lack of interlocking foundations by no means proves that the west end was erected in successive stages (indeed, the juncture between the north and west arms and the central space could not be investigated for similar signs, and thus confirmation as to whether that was also the case here is lacking). Schütte also intimates briefly that the “material and masonry” of the central space differs from that of the wings, and offers this as further evidence of a hypothetical division of phases; cf., however, the excavator Seiler’s description of the foundations (“Neue Erkenntnisse,” 48–49), which, in indicating that the foundations are “zusammengehörig” and that they were all erected with the same technique and materials, appears to say precisely the opposite. One would also have to ask why, if the central space is indeed slightly earlier than the three wings, it was modified again so quickly after its initial construction; the meagre textual record for the period before ca. 1200 offers no clues in this regard. While not inconceivable, the scenario of two phases for the construction of the west end remains extremely hypothetical at this point.
Any reconstruction of the original appearance of the west end at St. Kunibert must be made with extreme caution. At least in terms of its ground plan as partially recovered in the excavations, the west end would fit comfortably within the sizeable group of eleventh-century three-tower west ends from the Lower Rhineland and the Meuse valley.\(^{198}\) The three-tower west end, consisting of a combination of a large, most often square, central space with smaller flanking wings, either square or circular and usually set back behind the western edge of the central space, represents by far the most common form of western termination in this particular cultural landscape in this period, and the recently uncovered west end at St. Kunibert seemingly constitutes yet another example.\(^{199}\) With its square north and south wings appended to a larger, projecting square central space, the plan of the west end at St. Kunibert is close in conception to the plans of a handful of documented eleventh-century three-tower west ends, including the west ends at Kornelimünster (Phase II; ca. 1000–1025) in the Lower Rhineland, Saint-Trond (Phase III, ca. 1034/55–1055/82) in the Meuse Valley, and, within Cologne itself and probably only slightly later in date, St. Maria im Kapitol (ca. 1049–1065) (fig. 18).\(^{200}\) As with the latter example in particular, the outer walls of the north and south wings of the west end at St. Kunibert also apparently ran perfectly flush with the outer (older?) side aisle walls of the nave, to judge from the disposition of the south wing in relation to wall 4 (fig. 14). The central space may also, as the tiny fragment of foundation in the southeast corner of this space suggests, have been partially closed off to the central vessel of the nave at either side by a narrow strip of wall,

\(^{198}\) The general affiliation of the west end’s ground plan with those of the Lower Rhenish-Mosan three-tower west ends of both the eleventh and twelfth centuries has already been briefly pointed out by Seiler, “Neue Erkenntnisse,” 48.

\(^{199}\) For an overview of the three-tower west end and its geographic distribution in the eleventh century in the Lower Rhineland and Meuse valley, see Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 4, 143–147.

\(^{200}\) See Seiler, “Neue Erkenntnisse,” 48, who cites as comparanda both Saint-Trond and Kornelimünster. On the individual buildings, see Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 636 (Kornelimünster) and 558–560 (St. Maria im Kapitol); vol. 2, 1029–1030 (Saint-Trond; west apse likely later).
as was the case in all of the above examples. The position of the two east walls of the north and south wings relative to the east wall of the central space—namely, slightly to the west and not flush with it—appears to have been, at least within the group of known eleventh-century three-tower west ends with square wings, unique to the west end at St. Kunibert. This is also true of the additional, third wing to the west, which finds no parallels among this group of monuments, whether those with square or round wings.

With the exception of the relatively well-preserved west end at St. Maria im Kapitol (preserved up to nave level; fig. 173), however, most of these eleventh-century three-tower west ends with square wings are either documented solely in (reconstructed) ground plans, or their elevation is, at best, only incompletely known. Making extrapolations about the elevation of the west end at St. Kunibert—itself likewise known only in a fragmentary ground plan—on the basis of pure analogy with these structures is susceptible to falling into a rehearsal of preconceived notions about the “standard” appearance of “the three-tower west end” as this has been (re-)constructed from the very few examples preserved above ground. Even the plans of
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201 As Seiler, “Neue Erkenntnisse,” 48, notes vis-à-vis the west ends at Saint-Trond and Kornelimünster. The disposition of the square north and south wings at St. Kunibert along the central north-south axis of the central space does, however, parallel the placement of the stair turrets in several examples of the eleventh-century three-tower west ends with round stair turrets, which are often disposed in precisely this fashion; cf. the ground plans in Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 4, 144 Abb. 122.

202 See Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 4, 145, with n. 191.

203 In this connection, it is instructive to recall the recent scholarly debate about the notion of the “westwork” in Carolingian and Ottonian architecture. As with the group of three-tower west ends from the eleventh century, the corpus of extant, well-documented westworks from both of these periods is very small, with many known only fragmentarily in plan and only a handful preserved above ground, and then often only in an altered state. The notion of the “standard” Carolingian “westwork” as formed by early scholarship (ca. 1900–1950) using primarily the examples at Centula (not even preserved and possibly not even a “westwork” at all) and, especially, Corvey, has proved extremely tenacious within subsequent scholarship, with this conception of the westwork—itself a scholarly construct based on reconstructions—often used as the basis for reconstructing the elevation—and function—of other supposed “westworks” found in excavations, the contours of which are at most known only in ground plans. The most recent scholarship on the westwork has questioned this monolithic, constructed view of the “westwork” and has stressed instead their diversity in both plan and function, while also pointing up the problems involved in extrapolating, for the purposes of reconstruction, from such a fragmentarily preserved corpus of monuments. See, for instance, Dagmar von Schönfeld de Reyes, Westwerkprobleme. Zur Bedeutung der Westwerke in der kunsthistorischen Forschung (Weimar: VDG, 1999), 19–113, and, most recently, Charles McClendon, The Origins
the few examples cited above (fig. 18) show numerous variations, not only in terms of the function of the flanking wings, which could serve as stair turrets (e.g., St. Maria im Kapitol) or as independent spaces (e.g., Kornelimünster), but also in their particular spatial relationship to the side aisles and central space, that is, whether they were closed to the aisles and open to the central space (e.g., St. Maria im Kapitol) or closed to the central space and open to the aisles. The foundations at St. Kunibert do not allow for this latter question to be decided, much less permit us to know whether the flanking wings did actually serve as stair turrets. Certainly, many of these structures likely did, in fact, consist of a grouping of three towers, with a square (or sometimes rectangular) central tower flanked by two towers, the latter often serving as stair turrets. But even granting that, because so few are preserved above ground, it is problematic to assume that these towers, especially the flanking ones, adhered either to a consistent form or height. Thus, it is now impossible to say what shape the (hypothetical) flanking towers would have taken at St. Kunibert—that is, whether they were square in the lower storey, only to transition into octagonal towers, as at St. Maria im Kapitol (fig. 173)—or whether the towers (central or flanking) rose much higher than the nave, or, indeed, whether the flanking north and south arms were actually bases for fully-fledged, free-standing towers at all. Likewise, it is completely uncertain whether the interior of the square central space was originally divided into multiple stories, with a gallery level in the upper (as is again the case at St. Maria im Kapitol, where the gallery served as a nuns’ choir), or took the form of an unbroken vertical shaft of space placed before the nave and almost fully open to it via a large diaphragm arch (similar, for instance, to the core of the westwork at St. Pantaleon).


204 See Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 4, 145–146.

The same uncertainty applies to the enigmatic third, western arm positioned before the central square. This arm may possibly have served as a porch in the manner of the western arm of the westwork at St. Pantaleon (figs. 18 and 174), in which case it would have been considerably smaller (a mere 3.85 meters wide to St. Pantaleon’s ten meter-wide porch), and thus almost certainly devoid of a second, upper storey like the one found in the latter structure. For its part, the west end’s thirteenth-century replacement, the massive west transept (fig. 87), was fronted by just such a single-storey porch, and thus, if one assumes continuity in function from the old west end to the new, there is reason to suppose that the third arm in the predecessor fulfilled a similar function as a porch and that the eleventh-century west end as a whole served, as did its replacement, as the western entrance to the church building for the laity.\textsuperscript{206} Whether the eleventh-century west end also functioned, in analogous fashion, partly as parish church, as the much larger thirteenth-century west transept did (both the baptismal font and parish altar were located here; fig. 31), simply cannot be answered for lack of textual sources and further archaeological information. It is possible that beyond serving as an elaborate entrance to the church and/or bell towers, many of the three-tower west ends did not have a particular ritual or liturgical function at all, and this may well have been the case at St. Kunibert as well.\textsuperscript{207} Although very fundamental questions remain about the actual elevation and inner divisions of the eleventh-century west end, to say nothing of its possible functions or lack thereof, its ground plan does situate it clearly within the class of contemporary Lower Rhenish-Mosan three-tower west ends.

\textsuperscript{206} Cf. Schütte, “Baugeschichte,” 12, who automatically labels the third arm of the eleventh-century west end a “Vorhalle,” presumably in view of the function of the later porch in front of the thirteenth-century west end. That the eleventh-century west end did not serve as the clerics’ entrance is clear from the presence of the cloister along the north flank of the building (figs. 23 and 30), which itself also predates the thirteenth-century church (see below, 84–85). Presumably, in all of the the pre-thirteenth-century church building(s), the clerics entered the church from the cloister through a door along the north flank and near the east end.

\textsuperscript{207} See the perceptive comments on this issue in Kubach and Verbeek, \textit{RBRM}, vol. 4, 146–147.
It is not clear from the present, limited archaeological picture whether the rest of the church building was rebuilt along with the west end in the eleventh century; fragments of evidence, however, suggest that it might have been. Thus, in addition to the west end itself, the excavations also uncovered a short segment of foundation that abuts and aligns with the west end (wall 4 in fig. 14). Although it is not certain if this foundation is contemporary with or earlier than the west end (the material differs and the foundations do not interlock, which suggests that it is probably earlier), its disposition indicates that it in all likelihood belonged to the south side aisle wall of a nave, perhaps one built only slightly before the west end of circa 1040. For its part, the textual record contains an indication that points to building activity at the turn of the eleventh century in the east end of the church. This comes in the form of a brief notice in Gelenius’s historical account of the church, which records that the choir was “expanded” (moderni chori accessio facta sit) in 999. Because Gelenius’s indication is not corroborated by any extant textual source, previous scholars—all working before the excavation of the west end—unanimously rejected it as fabricated. The recent discovery of the west end of circa 1040, however, provides a new context for Gelenius’s notice, and suggests that it may be rooted in historical fact, even if there is at present no way to verify archaeologically a rebuilding of the east end around the year 1000. Ultimately, only more expansive archaeological investigation will be able to resolve the present uncertainty as to whether the east

---

208 See above, 68, with note 188.
209 Gelenius, De admiranda magnitudine, 279: “Etenim Procerum liberalitate tot torques & monalia oblata sunt, vt eorum impensa fluio coedere coacto, moderni chori accessio facta sit: verum sub annum 999.”
210 Ewald (KDM 6/4, 243–244, 255) was the first to cast doubt on Gelenius’s notice, noting that there was (at least according to the state of knowledge at the time he was writing) no evidence for the rebuilding of the church around 999. Ewald decided to reject it outright, and argues, without any textual or material evidence whatsoever, that the church was expanded in the twelfth century and that Gelenius must have been describing this instead (see note 233). Ewald’s judgement on the veracity of Gelenius’s indication has been followed by all subsequent scholars (e.g., Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 549; Machat, “Bauwerk,” 306–307).
211 Schütte’s reconstruction of the east end of the church ca. 1040 in fig. 6 as a tripartite choir with staggered apses is purely conjectural and not supported by any archaeological finds.
and nave of the collegiate church were also rebuilt, either in whole or in part, in the eleventh century.

The second major find made in the framework of the 1978–1993 excavations was the discovery, in 1992, of the tomb of Rudolf, bishop of Schleswig (1026–1043/47?). Rudolf’s tomb, a fine late Merovingian limestone sarcophagus (fig. 19), was found in the second bay of the nave of the thirteenth-century church and on axis with that church building (fig. 20). In addition to the bishop’s remains and fragments of a wooden staff, a short sword, and silk vestments, the sarcophagus contained a lead plaque (fig. 21) that, despite some moderate damage, left no doubt as to the identity of the deceased male in the tomb:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ANNO INCARNATIONIS DOMINICE} \\
\text{MXLVII OBIIT RVDOLFVS} \\
\text{SLESWICENSIS ECCLESIE EPISCOPUS HVIVS} \\
\text{ECCLESIE AMATOR FIDEISSLIMUS II NONAS} \\
\text{NOVMEBRIS.}
\end{align*}
\]

Rudolf was elected from the ranks of the Cologne clergy to the post of bishop of Schleswig in 1026. It is not certain if he was a canon at St. Kunibert before his election, but his burial at that particular collegiate church would suggest that he was. In fact, there is ample reason to suppose that Rudolf may have been more than just a canon at St. Kunibert before taking up the mitre: the textual record for the tenures of the provosts of St. Kunibert, which is fragmentary for the eleventh century, displays a gap precisely for the interval between Provosts Werinzo (1000–


\[\text{214}\] Transcription based on the reconstruction of the plaque offered by Gechter, “Grablege,” 18. The inscription translates: “In the year of the lordly Incarnation 1047, November 4, Rudolf, Bishop of the Church of Schleswig, most faithful lover of this church, died.”


\[\text{216}\] As Gechter, “Grablege,” 18, speculates.
1021) and Udelolphus (1027–1036), and the name of the provost(s) during the intervening period is unknown. In view of the concordance between the date of Rudolf’s accession as bishop of Schleswig (1026) and the date of the first mention of Udelolphus as provost of St. Kunibert (1027), it is quite possible that Rudolf was provost of St. Kunibert before being selected, de Coloniensi clero, for the post of bishop of Schleswig. This particular scenario would offer a compelling explanation for the fact that Rudolf later chose to be buried expressly at St. Kunibert, and it accords well with eleventh-century episcopal election practices, in which bishops were chosen almost exclusively from the upper echelons of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, often from the ranks of the provosts. Rudolf is then attested in Cologne twice after becoming bishop of Schleswig, first in 1040 and again in December 1043, when he attended the consecration of the church of St. Severin. The latter was a momentous year, for the Slavs invaded Schleswig-Holstein in early summer of 1043, and it is likely that Rudolf had already fled to Cologne even before December. Rudolf probably did not return to Schleswig at all after this point and likely remained in Cologne until his death in 1047, for it is more than unusual that, contrary to customary practice, he should have been buried outside his own diocese.

Rather, Rudolf made St. Kunibert the sole site at which his memoria was to be maintained: he not only chose to be buried there, but also endowed the collegiate church with property in Lachem, from the incomes of which the community of canons was to fund a special annual memorial service in his honour. Thus the bishop’s obit and the accompanying anniversarium in the Memorienschluss states:

217 See the lists of provosts, with dates, compiled by Kürten, Stift, vol. 1, 277 nos. 2 (Werinzo) and 3 (Udelolphus).  
November 4. Rudolf, Bishop of Schleswig in Denmark, who gave us the property in Lachem, died. On this day, a *denarius* is given to each brother who is a priest and two *denarii* to each canon. On whose anniversary a wax candle a half pound in weight shall be placed and left to burn overnight before the cross, where he was buried in the year of the Lord 1047. With two hundred years having elapsed, he was discovered and venerably buried in the same place. The provost shall provide these incomes to our treasurer from the property in Lachem.\footnote{HASIK, Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 31b: “Obiit Rudolfus episcopus Sleswicensis in Dacia qui dedit curtam in Lacheim. Hic datur cuilibet sacerdoti fratri denarius et cuilibet canonico ii denarii. In cuius anniversario ponetur cerea candela de dimidia libra per noctem arsura ante crucem ubi tumulatus fuit. Anno domini m xl vii. Postea elapsis ducentis annis inventus et effossus venerabiliter repositus est in eodem loco. Hos reditus solvit prepositus camerario nostro de curte in Lacheim.”}

As the obit indicates, Rudolf’s original tomb was unearthed “two hundred years” after his death and burial at St. Kunibert in 1047 (the discovery of the tomb was obviously occasioned by the rebuilding of the church, completed in 1247, or exactly two hundred years later). Taken literally, the obit says only that Rudolf was buried *ante crucem*, or “in front of the cross” and that, after his tomb had been uncovered, he was “venerably buried in the same place” (*in eodem loco*). Although the obit does not say it *expressis verbis*, the first indication, *ante crucem*, almost certainly refers to an altar of the Holy Cross in the eleventh-century church, for the often monumental cross located above, behind, or near the Cross altar, itself usually in the middle of the nave, occurs frequently in medieval textual sources as a designation for the Cross altar itself.\footnote{See, for instance, the assembly of sources in Braun, *Altar*, vol. 1, 403. On the customary location of the Cross altar in the middle of the nave, see Friedrich Oswald, “*In medio ecclesiae. Die Deutung der literarischen Zeugnisse im Lichte archäologischer Funde,*” *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 3 (1969): 313–326.} The second indication, that Rudolf was reburied in the “same place,” should likely be taken as meaning in the same general area, that is, before the Cross altar in the new, thirteenth-century church, and not necessarily as meaning in the exact same tomb or in the exact same spot.\footnote{Gechter, “Grablege,” 18; Schütte, “Baugeschichte,” 13–15. Schütte lists numerous potential scenarios for Rudolf’s initial burial in 1047.}
What is certain from the obit is that Rudolf, formerly of the clergy of Cologne and after 1026 bishop of Schleswig, was buried in front of the altar of the Holy Cross at the collegiate church of St. Kunibert in 1047 (fig. 6). That Rudolf should have been buried before the Cross altar is significant, especially in view both of the indications concerning his memoria in the Memorienbuch and the information on the lead plaque that was found inside his sarcophagus. Burial in front of the Cross altar was common for major patrons and was often explicitly tied to the desire for secure liturgical commemoration after death. The closest parallel in the present context is the tomb of archbishop Anno II (d. 1075), also located in front of the altar of the Holy Cross, at the Benedictine monastery of St. Michael in Siegburg, which Anno had founded circa 1064.

Rudolf’s exalted status is not only evident in the location of his tomb. The lead plaque (fig. 21), for instance, casts Rudolf as a “most faithful lover” of the church of St. Kunibert (HVIVS ECCLESIE AMATOR FIDELISSIMUS), an epithet that would seemingly imply patronage on a level well beyond the donation of the single property (Lachem) that is recorded in the bishop’s obit in the Memorienbuch and which is, moreover, fully commensurate with the idea advanced here that he had formerly been provost of St. Kunibert in the early 1020s before occupying the office of bishop of Schleswig (1026–1043/47?). The fact that Rudolf’s death and burial in 1047 coincide with the securely documented reconstruction of at least the west end of St. Kunibert around 1040 is likely more than pure coincidence. Not only does the chronology fit, but the prominent position of Rudolf’s tomb before the Cross altar, the epithet amator huius ecclesiae on the lead plaque, the lengthy obit in the Memorienbuch, and the fact that he was even reburied in the new church in the mid-thirteenth century could indicate, as Gechter has
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224 The plaque appears to have been fastened to an unknown object (perhaps Rudolf’s original tomb of 1047?) and then damaged when it was removed and deposited in Rudolf’s new tomb around 1247. On this point, see Schütte, “Baugeschichte,” 14.
225 Gechter, “Grablege,” 19. Gechter lists several other contemporary and earlier examples of elite burials before the Cross altar in the Empire, a practice that reaches back to St. Boniface’s (d. 754) tomb in Fulda.
convincingly suggested, that Rudolf was a major patron in the rebuilding of the collegiate
curch in the first half of the eleventh century.226 This is suggested, moreover, by the very
medium of the lead plaque: the burials of two major ecclesiastical figures from Ottonian
Cologne, archbishops Heribert (999–1021) and Pilgrim (1021–1036), also contained lead
plaques of precisely this kind.227 Is it purely accidental that both these figures initiated and
financed major building projects in Cologne in the form of the rotunda at the Benedictine
monastery in Deutz (Heribert; ca. 1002–1020) and the complete construction of the collegiate
church of St. Aposteln (Pilgrim, ca. 1021–1030)?228 Rudolf’s burial within the eleventh-century
church building fits neatly into this larger pattern of burial for elite, episcopal patrons of
building projects in eleventh-century Cologne. When the evidence is taken as a whole, it is very
likely that the rebuilding of at least the new west end at St. Kunibert in the years around 1040—
a time when Rudolf, moreover, was demonstrably in Cologne on at least two occasions (1040,
1043)—is attributable directly to Rudolf’s initiative and financial support.

The likely involvement of bishop Rudolf in the construction of the west end at St.
Kunibert around 1040 throws the significance of that building project into sharper relief and
allows us to situate it firmly within the larger context of architectural patronage dynamics in
eleventh-century Cologne. Paralleling the situation throughout the Empire, church building in
Cologne in this period was, as it had been already under archbishop Bruno (953–965), driven

227 Heribert’s tomb, opened in 1147 for the translation of his relics, contained two such plaques, now lost; one
styled him as “Heribertus Coloniensis archiepiscopus, constructor huius ecclesiae” and the other mentioned his
financing of the new foundation with his own funds: “Heribertus sanctae Coloniensis ecclesiae archiepiscopus, qui
de suo proprio sumptu hoc monasterium fecit.” On these, with the full inscriptions, see KDM 7/3, 222. On the
plaque from Pilgrim’s tomb, see KDM 6/4, 150–151. Several of the imperial tombs at Speyer also contained lead
plaques (see Gechter, “Grablege,” 19)—a further indication of Rudolf’s elite status as patron.
St. Aposteln under Pilgrim, see, most recently, Gottfried Stracke, Köln: St. Aposteln, Stadtspuren. Denkmäler in
largely by episcopal or, in select cases, imperial, initiative. The chronological list of the major architectural undertakings in Cologne between circa 1000 and 1075 reads like a roll call of archiepiscopal succession, intermingled with imperial connections: the foundation, construction, and, after a calamitous collapse, reconstruction, of the Benedictine monastery in Deutz under archbishop Heribert (1000–1021); the full construction of St. Aposteln under archbishop Pilgrim (1021–1036); the foundation and plans for the construction of the collegiate church of St. Maria ad Gradus under archbishop Herimann II (1036–1056), grandson of Otto II and empress Theophanu; the construction of St. Maria im Kapitol under Herimann and his sister, abbess Ida (1030–1060); the realization of St. Maria ad Gradus, the foundation and construction of the collegiate church of St. Georg, and the erection of a new long choir at St. Gereon under archbishop Anno II (1056–1075). The majority of these projects consisted of new foundations, and, accordingly, unmediated episcopal involvement is unsurprising. But as the new choir at St. Gereon indicates, building at even the older, existing collegiate churches in the eleventh century was not necessarily driven primarily or exclusively by the institution itself—that is, by the provost, dean, and chapter functioning as an independent corporation and patrons of architecture—so much as it was through the patronage of the archbishop and other prelates.

The recently uncovered west end at St. Kunibert represents a further instance of elite, episcopal architectural patronage in eleventh-century Cologne. The genesis of the project was very likely tied directly to the patronage of Rudolf, who, even as an “external” bishop and not archbishop of Cologne, bestowed his largess upon the institution, erecting—at least—the west end and having

---

himself interred before the Cross altar. In this instance, architecture, as much as burial before the Cross altar, was an instrument of episcopal *memoria*, just as it had been for Heribert and Pilgrim and as it was to be for Herimann and Anno II.

Even in their highly fragmentary state, the diverse material vestiges of the west end at St. Kunibert (figs. 6, 16, and 17) provide an idea of the ambition of the project, pointing as they do to participation within broad, contemporary architectural currents that stretch from the westwork at St. Pantaleon through to the monumental west end at St. Maria im Kapitol, both structures with thoroughly imperial pretensions.\(^{230}\) While the west end at St. Kunibert was more modest than either of these structures in physical scale, it was an ambitious undertaking nonetheless, as evinced by the elaborate system of pilaster decoration and the fine limestone foliate capitals on its exterior, which, though the exact disposition of these elements on the edifice is not known, parallel the extant systems of exterior articulation on such major contemporary structures as the west choir at Trier and the west end of the convent church in Essen. The pilasters and capitals from St. Kunibert also display traces of reddish-brown pigment—perhaps a distant reference, like the western porch, to the unique (for the Lower Rhine) reddish-brown limestone pilasters and capitals on the westwork at St. Pantaleon (fig. 174).\(^{231}\) In the absence of even the most rudimentary textual record that would inform us about historical developments at the collegiate church of St. Kunibert in this period, the recently uncovered west end assumes particular

---

\(^{230}\) The textual record from St. Pantaleon contains no record that expressly connects Theophanu with the construction of the westwork there, and thus her exact role in the building project has been much debated. There are, however, numerous indications that point to close ties between her and the abbey (including a gift of the relics of St. Albinus, which Theophanu had acquired in Rome), and contextually there is much to commend the idea that the structure was erected with her (and possibly her son Otto III’s) financial assistance with the ultimate prospect that she would be interred at St. Pantaleon (as she indeed was). See the overview of the issues in Helmut Fußbroich, *Die Ausgrabungen in St. Pantaleon zu Köln* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1983), 230–241, esp. 238–241. Begun under abbess Ida and her brother, archbishop Herimann, the rebuilding of the entire convent church at St. Maria im Kapitol between ca. 1030 and 1065 was certainly very intimately associated with members of the (by then former) imperial house.

\(^{231}\) On the traces of polychromy and the potential ties with St. Pantaleon, see Hochkirchen, “Vorgängerbau,” 26–27.
importance as an historical document of the institution’s position at this point. Even if erected primarily under the aegis of episcopal self-representation, the new west end cannot but have reflected the high status enjoyed by the spiritual institution itself: the construction of what originally must have been a monumental and lavishly adorned west end positioned St. Kunibert as a major participant within the larger archdiocesan ecclesiastical landscape, one whose edifice could take its place comfortably alongside the examples of contemporary elite architectural production cited above.

Apart from the west end, there are no other documented phases of construction between circa 1040 and the rebuilding of the entire collegiate church building during the first half of the thirteenth century. The most important development in the twelfth century concerning the church building was the inclusion of the collegiate church compound within the first set of medieval city walls in 1106 (fig. 22).\textsuperscript{232} Previously located well outside the northern course of the Roman city walls, St. Kunibert was now firmly situated within the urban fabric of the medieval city, where it henceforth formed the spiritual centrepoint of the northern quarter of the city known as Niederich. Although there was, as elsewhere, undoubtedly an increase in population in this area of the city over the course of the twelfth century (hence the construction of a further, even larger ring of fortifications around the city beginning in 1180; fig. 22), there is no evidence whatsoever to suggest, as Ewald attempted to argue, that this occasioned an expansion of the east end of the collegiate church in this period.\textsuperscript{233} Nor is there any material or

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{232} Kubach and Verbeek, \textit{RBRM}, vol. 1, 549.
\item\textsuperscript{233} \textit{KDM} 6/4, 243–244, 253. Even Ewald himself had to admit that there was no textual record of such an expansion of the east end, but argued that it was likely given the increase in population in Niederich in the twelfth century. His sole evidence that the east end was expanded consisted of his rejection of the aforementioned notice in Gelenius that the choir of the church was expanded in 999 (see note 210). Ewald believed that this indication was entirely false and that Gelenius had to have been mistaken, and he thus attempted to connect it instead with the (hypothetical) expansion of the east end that he thought was occasioned by the increase in population. Ewald, writing some 80 years before the discovery of the foundations of the eleventh-century west end, was naturally
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
textual basis for the idea that any part of the church building, be it the east end, nave, or west end, was modified or expanded in the twelfth century. The argument, initiated by Ewald and subsequently taken up by Meyer-Barkhausen and Graf, that the thirteenth-century church, including the nave and both the east and west ends, was built using portions of the walls or the foundations of either a twelfth-century predecessor church or some other, unspecified “Vorgängerbau” can now be categorically rejected in view of the discovery of the eleventh-century west end.\textsuperscript{234} As the west end indicates (fig. 6), the predecessor church both lay on a different longitudinal axis and was much smaller than the thirteenth-century collegiate church.\textsuperscript{235} It is thus now absolutely certain that the thirteenth-century west end, the walls of which Ewald argued stemmed from an “older” structure, cannot possibly have used the foundations or walls of its predecessor.\textsuperscript{236} And one can only conclude the same for the thirteenth-century nave, the interior width of which is approximately a third wider than the entire eleventh-century west end. It is also clear from a very accurate aerial view of the church compound of circa 1820 (fig. 23) that the lost cloister and cloistral buildings, including the eastern range of the cloister closest to the east end of the predecessor church, were also aligned on the same longitudinal axis as the eleventh-century west end. The cloister, then, also certainly predated the thirteenth-century church; the sole exception is its south range, which followed the longitudinal axis of the new church building and was erected in tandem with the north side aisle.

\textsuperscript{234}Ewald in \emph{KDM} 6/4, 253; Meyer-Barkhausen, \emph{Kirchenbaukunst}, 54; and Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 85–87, eadem, “Ostchorbau II,” 148–149, and, even after the conclusive results of the excavations, eadem, “Neue Forschungen,” 114, 125 n. 23, 125 n. 47. Already in 1976, that is, before the first excavations at St. Kunibert, Kubach and Verbeeck (\emph{RBRM}, vol. 1, 553) had begun to seriously doubt the prevalent assumption that the thirteenth-century church building was rebuilt using older walls or foundations, but were obviously unable to furnish any concrete evidence for this supposition.

\textsuperscript{235}See, on these points, Kosch, “Anbauten,” 105 n. 39.

Therefore, even though vestiges of the eastern reaches of the predecessor church themselves have yet to be physically uncovered, the common longitudinal axis shared by the eleventh-century west end and the pre-thirteenth-century cloistral buildings indicates that the eastern end of the predecessor church, whatever its date, was itself also almost certainly oriented along this same axis—that is, on an axis divergent from that of the new thirteenth-century church. In fact, during the rebuilding of the church in the early thirteenth century, an additional vaulted corridor had to be installed to enable access to the new east transept from the older cloister and to bridge the space between the south wall of the eastern range of the older cloistral buildings and the north wall of the new east transept, which now lay on a different axis (fig. 30). The new east end was, furthermore, not only located farther east than its predecessor, as its position relative to the east range of the older cloister and the very need for such a connecting corridor suggest, but also was surely a great deal larger, to judge from the comparatively diminutive scale of the eleventh-century west end. Even if final certainty on the question of the contours and scale of the east end of the predecessor church must await further archaeological work, all of these divergences in orientation, location, and scale between the parts of the predecessor church and those of the thirteenth-century church make it virtually certain that no part of the new, thirteenth-century church building was rebuilt using the walls or even foundations of the immediate predecessor church.

237 On the date of the cloister, see Kosch, “Anbauten und Nebenräume,” 81. As Kosch observes, the old cloistral buildings and associated ranges were most likely retained after the completion of the new church as a cost-saving measure. On the relationship between the south range of the cloister and the north side aisle wall, see, further, Chapter 4.

238 See Kosch, “Anbauten und Nebenräume,” 81 and 105 n. 39. This very fact undermines Graf’s unsubstantiated assertion (“Neue Forschungen,” 114) that the “old core of the walls of the predecessor church certainly served as the core of the walls of the new east transept” (“Als Kernmauerwerk [for the new east transept] diente sicher dasjenige des alten Querhauses der Vorgängerkirche”).


240 As Kosch (“Anbauten und Nebenräume,” 81 and 105 n. 39) has noted.
Likewise, there is not a single textual source that attests to a building campaign at St. Kunibert in the twelfth century. The historian Kürten, for his part, reads the obit of the archbishop Arnold II von Wied (1151–1156) in the *Memorienbuch* as indicating that Arnold “bequeathed a large sum for the building of the collegiate church,” but his reading is surely incorrect, for both the grammar and the internal evidence of the passage clearly indicate that the large sum of money for the building fabric (*fabrica*) mentioned here was given not by archbishop Arnold in the mid-twelfth century, but instead by Christian, dean of St. Kunibert (1245–1247), upon his death (*reliquit*) in 1247. Thus, although only its west end has been uncovered so far, the recently discovered church building of the eleventh century, which was perhaps built entirely (that is, including the nave and east end) over the first half of that century, appears to have been the immediate predecessor of the thirteenth-century collegiate church.

5. The *Stift* at the Turn of the Thirteenth Century: Internal Constitution and Spiritual and Social Functions

As the German word *Stift* implies, the chapter of the collegiate church of St. Kunibert was composed of canons—likely, as we have seen, since its uncertain beginnings before 866. St. Kunibert thus formed one of eight communities of male secular clergy in Cologne by 1200.

---

241 Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 87. The portion of the obit in question reads: “III idus iunii. Obiti Arnoldus archiepiscopus Coloniensis pro quo dantur singulis iii denarii. Hic datur maldrum tritici de domo Walrami dividendum inter fratres presentes in choro ad anniversarium decani Christiani qui hodie obit et fabrice ecclesie reliquit multa” (for the full text of the obit, see Appendix B, no. 11). This passage translates as follows: “June 13. Arnold, archbishop of Cologne, died [today], for whom [i.e., in return for liturgical commemoration] three *denarii* are to be given to each [canon]. On this day [hic] is [also] given a measure of wheat from the estate of Walram that is to be divided among the brothers who attend choir services for the anniversary of the death of dean Christian, who died on this day and [who] bequeathed much [*multa*] to the fabric of the church [*fabrica* here meaning the pool of funds for construction].” It is clear from second sentence that it was dean Christian who, as the relative clause directly following his name indicates, died and bequeathed “much” to the church fabric and not archbishop Arnold. Dean Christian is first attested in that capacity in 1245 and last in 1247, when he likely died; his successor as dean, Bernerus, is first attested in 1248. See the list of dates in Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 294 nos. 23 and 24. Walram, moreover, from whose estate the measure of wheat was to be taken on the anniversary of Christian’s death, is securely attested as a contemporary of dean Christian in 1239; see Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 319 no. 71.
including the cathedral, whose chapter, comprising a total of seventy-two canonries, also consisted of secular canons (cf. fig. 22). 242 Although it was not as large as those of the church of St. Gereon or the church of St. Aposteln, each with forty canons, the chapter of St. Kunibert, with thirty canonries in the thirteenth century, was certainly sizeable. 243 Both before and throughout the thirteenth century, St. Kunibert counted among the most important collegiate churches in the archdiocese of Cologne. Among the collegiate churches in Cologne itself (excluding the cathedral), St. Kunibert was third in rank behind only St. Gereon and St. Severin, an order already attested in 866 in the “Guntharsche Güterumschreibung” and likely tied to the relative age, and thus venerability, of these three spiritual institutions. 244 This same hierarchy of status was retained in succeeding centuries and rehearsed and reinforced in manifold ways, ranging from the position of the provost of St. Kunibert as witness in archiepiscopal charters through to the order of the chapter relative to others in ecclesiastical processions. In each case, St. Kunibert occupied its customary position behind St. Gereon and St. Severin but ahead of the several other remaining collegiate churches in the city. 245

Unlike the cathedral or St. Gereon, where the chapters selected canons exclusively from the ranks of the high nobility, the canons of St. Kunibert were recruited from different social strata. 246 While the paucity and character of the sources precludes a study of the social origins of the clergy at St. Kunibert in the period before circa 1250, Helga Johag’s painstaking study of


244 Diederich, Stift – Kloster – Pfarrei,” 22; Kürten, Stift, vol. 1, 7. For the text of the charter, see above, 57–58.

245 On the order of the provosts in archiepiscopal charters of the twelfth century, see Kürten, Stift, vol. 1, 7; on the rank of the institutions as manifested in the order of clerical processions, see Diedrich, “Kloster – Stift – Pfarrei,” 76 n. 15.

246 On the necessity of high noble birth for admittance to the chapters at the cathedral and St. Gereon, see Johag, Beziehungen, 33.
the names of the canons at the church in the much fuller range of documents from the later
decades of the thirteenth century has revealed that of the forty-three canons mentioned in the
sources, seven belonged to Cologne patrician families and a further fifteen to affluent
merchant/craftsmen families from the city; three canons came from outside the city, while the
remaining eleven cannot be securely assigned to a particular social class.\(^{247}\) By this point, at
least roughly half of the chapter of St. Kunibert (and logically much more given the unknown
contingent) consisted of canons who came from the city of Cologne, with about twenty percent
from the patrician class and forty percent (and perhaps upwards of some sixty percent when the
unknowns are included) from merchant and craftsmen families; by contrast, foreign clerics of all
classes probably comprised only about fifteen percent of the total number of canons.\(^{248}\) These
numbers were likely not drastically different in the first half of the century, although the rapid
development of a money economy in the thirteenth century certainly could have caused the
number of canons from wealthy merchant and craftsmen families to grow at the expense of the
patrician class over the course of the century.\(^{249}\)

The canonries at St. Kunibert, as with those at all of the city’s collegiate churches, were
highly coveted by the patrician and rapidly expanding merchant classes alike, so much so that in
1248 the “waiting list” for the next vacant canonry at St. Kunibert numbered no less than thirty-
four candidates.\(^{250}\) The guaranteed and significant income of a prebend combined with the high
social status that went along with being a canon made a canonry extremely attractive, to the

\(^{247}\) Johag, Beziehungen, 46.
\(^{248}\) Johag, Beziehungen, 47–48.
\(^{249}\) Johag, Beziehungen, 25.
\(^{250}\) The name of each of the thirty-four candidates is listed in an extant charter of 1248 (HASStK St. Kunibert U
Festschrift für Wolfgang Petke zum 65. Geburtstag, ed. Sabine Arend and Daniel Berger (Bielefeld: Verlag für
extent that by the thirteenth century the collegiate church as an institution in many ways largely
served the well-to-do citizenry of Cologne as a secure and convenient means of providing for its
sons. All of the collegiate churches in Cologne, St. Kunibert included, maintained schools
that were presided over by a scholasticus chosen from the ranks of the chapter; the principal
function of these schools was to educate child students (scholares) from the patrician and
merchant classes in such subjects as Latin, theology, and choral chant, that is, in all of the skills
required to produce qualified youth that would later fill the vacant canonries at the city’s
collegiate churches. Part of the attractiveness of the canonry also stemmed from the
comparatively lax requirements for admission to the chapter of a collegiate church (when seen
against the more stringent forms of monasticism). Although they were required to take vows of
celibacy and obedience towards their superiors, and also had to display the requisite skills in
Latin and chant (as well as obtain the degree of at least subdeacon), the secular canons of St.
Kunibert, unlike monks, could possess their own property, and often amassed considerable
fortunes. Once fully admitted to the chapter, a canon was assigned a stall in the canon’s
choir, given the right to vote in the meetings of the chapter, and bound to observe the residency
requirement and attend all of the chapter’s choir services, including the canonical hours, the
conventual mass, and the numerous commemorative services for clerical and lay donors
(anniversaria and memoriae).

251 Kürten, Stift, vol. 1, 124.
252 A scholasticus, Albero, is already attested at St. Kunibert between 1135 and 1140; cf. Kürten, Stift, vol. 1, 301,
no. 1. As Kürten (111) observes, the scholastici at St. Kunibert, including those in the first half of the thirteenth
century, were undoubtedly themselves very highly educated individuals and thus more than capable educators. For
instance, the scholasticus Franco (attested at St. Kunibert 1219–1242), later scholasticus at the cathedral (1243–
1247), is regarded as one of the most important figures in medieval music theory.
253 On the social role of the schools at the collegiate churches in Cologne, see Johag, Beziehungen, 147; on the
school at St. Kunibert in particular, Kürten, Stift, vol. 1, 111.
255 Kürten, Stift, vol. 1, 95.
By the early thirteenth century, the originally very strict, virtually monastic lifestyle that both the *regula* of Chrodegang (mid-eighth century) and the Synod of Aachen (816) had prescribed for canons was a distant memory.\textsuperscript{256} Although the tenets of the *vita communis*, or communal life, including sleeping in a shared dormitory, taking meals in a common refectory, and perhaps even manual labour, had likely been observed at St. Kunibert in the earliest centuries of the collegiate church’s existence (perhaps evident in the designation *monasterium* in the “Guntharsche Güterumschreibung”\textsuperscript{257}), the *vita communis* was largely abandoned at collegiate churches throughout the Empire by the end of the eleventh century, if not earlier.\textsuperscript{258}

While the older and now lost cloistral buildings at St. Kunibert still included a dormitory in thirteenth century (fig. 23), it was likely used then only by the resident *scholares* of the collegiate church’s school.\textsuperscript{259} That the canons themselves did not sleep here is manifestly clear from a collection of statutes that provost Bruno von Ahrberg issued in 1236. According to them, the vacant prebend for the caretaker of the dormitory was not to be conferred until the canons and dean began to sleep in the dormitory again—a clause that indicates that they were not using it all by that point.\textsuperscript{260} The canons lived instead in separate residences; a list of the church treasury’s incomes (the so-called *Kämmereiverzeichnis*) written in 1239 together with

\[\text{\textsuperscript{256} On the Synod of Aachen, see Moraw, “Stiftskirche,” 11, and Diederich, “Stift – Kloster – Pfarrer,” 19. The main concern of the Synod was drawing a clear distinction between, and establishing standard regulation for, the communal life of canons (*canonici*), who were permitted to own modest amounts of property even then, and that of monks (*monachi*), who were not.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{257} Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 79.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{258} On the dissolution of the *vita communis*, see Johag, *Beziehungen*, 37, and Diederich, “Stift – Kloster – Pfarrer,” 19; on St. Kunibert in particular, see Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 79.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{259} The dormitory is mentioned in several documents of the first half of the thirteenth century and was located above the chapterhouse; see Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 80.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{260} HASIK, St. Kunibert U 1/40: “[p]rebenda eius, qui procurat dormitorium ecclesiae, cedat, cum vacaverit, quousque decanum et frates communiter in dormitorio dormire contigat . . . ;” printed in Ennen and Eckertz, *Quellen*, vol. 2, no. 157. See, on this point, Kosch, “Anbauten und Nebenräume,” 87. The hope expressed here that the canons and dean would ultimately return to the dormitory did not bear fruit. In 1260, the provincial synod of the archdiocese of Cologne attempted to reinstate the *vita communis* in collegiate churches, but the proposal met with no success. See Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 80.}\]
the *Memorienbuch*, as well as the *Memorienbuch* itself, contain multiple mentions of these canonical residences, which were located both within and outside the collegiate church compound.\(^{261}\) The *vita communis* had eroded to such an extent that even the canons’ attendance at the daily choir services was no longer a given in the first half of the thirteenth century. The canons were encouraged to attend the hours, the conventual mass, and, especially, memorial masses through the practice of distributing monies and/or naturalia such as grain (so-called *presentiae*) only to those canons who were present in the canons’ choir for the full duration of the services in question.\(^{262}\) The *Memorienbuch* is replete with very explicit stipulations concerning the distribution among the canons of such *presentiae* in return for their attendance at memorial masses, which doubtlessly formed a welcome supplement to the regular prebend that each canon received.\(^{263}\)

Likely only very few of the canons at St. Kunibert were ordained priests.\(^{264}\) Although exact numbers are lacking for St. Kunibert for the thirteenth century, the situation there was in all likelihood little different from that at the collegiate churches of St. Severin or St. Maria ad Gradus in Cologne, where circa 1250 and in 1255, respectively, five of the thirty total canonries

\(^{261}\) Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 80. To cite only one of many examples from the *Kämmererverzeichnis*: “De claustrali domo decani Constantini v. solidos de quibus pertinent xxx denarii ad Crucem” (HASTK, Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 39a); dean Constantine died in 1222. See, too, note 241, where the grain that was to be given to the canons present in the choir for the memoria of dean Christian was to be taken “de domo Walrami,” and note 263, where two further canonical residences are mentioned.

\(^{262}\) On the practice of distributing *presentiae* in general in the thirteenth century, see Johag, *Beziehungen*, 38; on the situation at St. Kunibert, see Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 29, 80–81, 85–86.

\(^{263}\) Thus, as one of many examples from the 1220s through 1240s recording the distribution of *presentiae*, the obit of the canon Vogelo (d. 1226; HASTK, Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 8a; see Appendix B, no. 7): “Obiit Vogelo subdiaconus pro quo dantur ii maldrum tritici presentibus in choro de decima Piperwalt;” or the conclusion of the aforementioned obit of dean Christian (d. 1247/1248; see note 241): “Iste [i.e., Christian] dedit vineam in Hunefe ecclesie et domum super platea que solvit sex solidos et sex denarios dividendos inter presentes in choro. Huius memoria agitur sexies in anno et ad singulas memorias dividitur maldrum tritici inter presentes in choro quorum quinque solvuntur de domo Wichenadi et unum de domo Henrici de Lothmer et Richolfi.” On *presentiae*, see, further, Johag, *Beziehungen*, 42.

\(^{264}\) Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 44.
were reserved for canon priests. As elsewhere, the doubtlessly low number—but not complete absence—of canon priests at St. Kunibert was balanced out in part by the introduction of chaplains into the collegiate church who could supplement the resident canon priests and serve as officiants for the conventual mass. The co-existence of canon priests and chaplains at St. Kunibert is already attested in 1222 in the statutes that provost Bruno issued concerning the parish liturgy, in which it is stated that either a canon priest or a chaplain may only celebrate private masses for his own spiritual benefit after the saying of the Sanctus of the parish mass.

Theoderich von Wied, former provost of St. Kunibert (ca. 1196–1212/1216) and then archbishop of Trier (1212–1242), established a prebend for a further chaplain at St. Kunibert in 1227; apparently not connected with any specific altar in the church (contrary to custom), this chaplain, as the representative of the archbishop of Trier, resided at the collegiate church. A further chaplain is attested at the altar of the Virgin in the east transept (consecrated 1226) in 1229. The rest of the collegiate church’s chaplains—thirteen in total by 1525—were all appointed in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, in each case at a specific altar that had been founded and endowed either by a clerical or lay donor.

The primary function of the collegiate church as an institution was the communal celebration of the liturgy by its canons. Whether in the form of the canonical hours, masses on feast days and for the memoria of deceased benefactores, or the manifold processions through

---

265 Johag, Beziehungen, 39. Unlike the majority of collegiate churches in Cologne, St. Kunibert does not appear to have fixed the number of canonries for canon priests until 1326, when it was required that at least two of the canons be fully ordained. By this point, however, the church had several chaplains at various altars throughout the church, many of whom were also required to serve as the weekly officiant for the conventual liturgy.  
266 For the later thirteenth century, see Johag, Beziehungen, 38–39.  
267 HASiK, St. Kunibert U 1/37: “Post sanctus misse parrochialis canonicus aut vicarius sacerdos celebrat si velit ad quodcumque altare preter quam ad altare parrochie et sancti Kuniberti.”  
268 HASiK, St. Kunibert U 1/33. Theoderich’s obit in the Memorienbuch (Appendix B, no. 1) says: “Hic et statuit perpetuum sacerdotem in ecclesia qui habet prebendam integrum absque mensa.”  
269 HASiK, Geist. Abt. 144a, fol. 1r: “Mariae, Fundata anno Domini MCCXXIX.”  
270 On these later foundations, see Kürten, Stift, vol. 1, 150–154. A comprehensive list of the church’s chaplaincies in 1525 is found in HASiK, Geist. Abt. 144a, fol. 1r.
the city within the framework of the stationary liturgy, the collective celebration of the liturgy by
the chapter was the spiritual and social raison d’être of the collegiate church of St. Kunibert,
even if the theory was not always followed stringently in practice (witness the need for
presentiae).²⁷¹ The fundamental importance of the liturgy within the collegiate church cannot
be underestimated: precisely on account of the dissolution of the vita communis, the liturgy, as
Andreas Odenthal has recently stressed, had itself become a principal point of communal
identity within collegiate churches in Cologne in the thirteenth century.²⁷² The conventual
liturgy was the glue that bound the heterogenous body of canons together both spiritually and as
a social group, thereby providing one of the primary bases for the chapter’s collective identity as
a corporation.

The celebration of the conventual liturgy was not, however, the collegiate church’s sole
spiritual and social function, nor the conventual liturgy the only liturgy within its walls. In
addition to its status as collegiate church, St. Kunibert also served as a parish church. The
origins of the parish at St. Kunibert are unclear, but it is likely that a parish was established here,
perhaps together with the emergence of the first community of clergy, relatively soon after
Kunibert’s death and burial in the church of St. Clement, where it formed one of four parishes—
along with those at St. Severin, St. Gereon, and St. Ursula—that were arranged in a ring outside
the Roman city walls (fig. 22).²⁷³ In its double status as collegiate and parish church, St.
Kunibert was something of an exception: whereas the vast majority of the collegiate churches

²⁷¹ Kürten, Stift, vol. 1, 79. See, too, Diederich, “Stift – Kloster – Pfarre,” 19, 22, as well as Wilhelm Janssen, Das
²⁷² Andreas Odenthal, Der älteste liber ordinarius der Stiftskirche St. Aposteln in Köln. Untersuchungen zur
Aufgabe der vita communis anscheinend der einzige Bereich, an dem die Identität des Stiftslebens festgemacht
werden kann. [. . .] Nur im Gottesdienst bleibt die ‘vita communis’ erhalten; sie wird geistlicher Art.” See, too,
Johag, Beziehungen, 37.
and the two Benedictine monasteries in Cologne, responding to reforms concerning the relationship of parishes to their mother churches, erected separate church buildings in which to accommodate their parishes in the twelfth century, St. Kunibert, like the collegiate churches of St. Aposteln and St. Severin, retained its status as both collegiate and parish church, and accommodated both “churches” (and thus the two separate liturgies) in the same church building.\textsuperscript{274} At St. Kunibert, the parish stood under the immediate authority of the collegiate church, not only spatially, but also administratively. The provost had, from the beginning, overseen the \textit{cura animarum} within the parish; but in the statutes of 1222, provost Bruno transferred all responsibility over, and administration of, the parish to the dean.\textsuperscript{275} The church of St. Kunibert, then, was collegiate and parish church in one—a church that served two very different social constituencies.

One of several major religious institutions in Cologne, St. Kunibert was but part of a much larger spiritual whole (fig. 22). Cologne, already figured on the first civic seal of 1114–1119 (fig. 24) as \textit{sancta Colonia}, or “Holy Cologne,” was one of only four cities in the Middle Ages that bore the epithet “holy” (Rome, Jerusalem, and Trier being the other three).\textsuperscript{276} This perceived holiness was rooted in the age, number, and importance of the city’s spiritual institutions and not least in their extraordinarily extensive relic holdings.\textsuperscript{277} Not only did the cathedral possess relics of the staff and chain of St. Peter and, after 1164, the relics of the Three

\textsuperscript{276} Diederich, “Stift – Kloster – Pfarre,” 17. The full inscription on the seal reads: SANCTA COLONIA DEI GRATIA ROMANAE ECCLESIAE FIDELIS FILIA. The designation \textit{sancta Colonia} ultimately goes back much further than the first civic seal; coins minted in the reign of Louis the Child (900–911) already bear the inscription SANCTA COLONIA AGrippina, which was in turn shortened to SANCTA COLONIA on those minted under Henry II (1002–1024).
Magi, but collegiate churches such as St. Gereon and St. Ursula (a convent of canonesses) housed the relics of the multitudes of early Christian martyrs of the Theban Legion and Ursula’s retinue, respectively. Such was Cologne’s fame that in 1121 Norbert of Xanten, founder of the Premonstratensian Order, visited all of the city’s major churches, petitioning each one for a relic of its patron saint(s) for his own foundations. Pilgrimage to Cologne on account of the many relics to be seen and venerated there had thus begun well before the acquisition of the relics of the Magi in 1164. With the relics of its patron saint Kunibert, one of an extensive series of holy bishops to have sat on the cathedra of Cologne, and the martyrs Hewald the Black and Hewald the White, the collegiate church of St. Kunibert staked a major claim in the city’s sacral economy, and was itself demonstrably also a goal of pilgrims in the first half of the thirteenth century. Just as much as the liturgy, the church’s considerable relic holdings were a major component of the institution’s identity in the thirteenth century.

The collegiate church’s status as a member of a larger family of churches was, finally, further underscored through the extensive system of stational liturgy in Cologne. The canons of St. Kunibert not only processed to other institutions in the city to attend the archiepiscopal masses there, sometimes taking the shrine of their patron Kunibert with them, but, as a notice in

---

278 *Vita Norberti Archiepiscopi Magdeburgensis*, MGH SS 12. 682. Norbert received relics of the two Hewalds from the church of St. Kunibert, which he then gave to his foundation in Cappenberg. On Norbert’s relic collecting in Cologne, see Diederich, “Stift – Kloster – Pfarre,” 18.

279 On the holy bishops of Cologne, see Militzer, “Selbstverständnis einer Stadt,” 20–21. By 1200, a total of seven bishops and archbishops of Cologne were venerated as saints: Maternus (d. ca. 328), Severin (d. ca. 400), Eberigisil (d. before 594), Kunibert (ca. 590–663?), Agilolf (d. after 748), Bruno (959–965), and Anno II (1056–1075, canonized in 1183).

280 Thus, a clause in the statutes concerning the parish liturgy that provost Bruno issued in 1222 explicitly indicates that the officiating parish priest, if someone other than the dean himself, may not usher pilgrims (peregrinos) or penitents (penitentes), among other groups, either in or out of the church unless expressly asked to do so by the dean: “Idem [i.e., the priest] tam neque corpus Domini det neque inungat neque baptizet neque sepeliat parrochianum neque anniversarium neque tricesimum neque septimum perigat neque nuptias neque peregrinos aut penitentes neque feminas de puerpio inducat aut educat sua auctoritate nisi rogatus a decano” (HAStK, St. Kunibert U 1/37).

the earliest processional from the collegiate church (ca. 1160) indicates, the collegiate church was itself a station for different ecclesiastical communities on three consecutive days during the minor Rogation Days, with the entire clergy of Cologne congregating there on the final Rogation Day (the Wednesday before the feast of the Ascension). The church was also the \textit{statio} for the entire clergy of Cologne on the feast of St. Kunibert on November 12.

Thus, although very much a legally independent corporation, the collegiate church of St. Kunibert was nonetheless an integral component in a much larger spiritual \textit{familia}, part of one of the densest and most complex urban aggregates of spiritual institutions north or south of the Alps. The ways in which the chapter of St. Kunibert articulated its position within this \textit{familia} in architecture, images, and objects while structuring its new church building and its decoration in accordance with the building’s different liturgical functions and cultic topography comprise the focus of the following chapters.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Wolff, “Stationskirchenwesen,” 40 (with table on 41).
\item On St. Kunibert’s legal status as an independent corporation, see Kürten, \textit{Stift}, vol. 1, 79.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Part II. *Fabrica*

Chapter 2
The Apse

1. Revisiting the Start Date of Construction at St. Kunibert

March 26. [. . . .] Theoderich of good memory, archbishop of Trier and formerly provost of this church, died. [. . . .] He laid the first stone in the foundation of our church that now exists in the year of Christ 12 [left blank] in the month of [left blank]. He also later consecrated two altars in the church, namely the altar of the blessed Mary and [the altar] of the blessed John in the year of the Lord 1226. Hereafter, he consecrated the altar of the blessed Anthony and [the altar] of the blessed Katherine.\(^{285}\)

Tantalizingly precise and yet so painfully incomplete, the obit of Theoderich von Wied, provost of St. Kunibert (ca. 1196–1212/1215 or 1216?) and later archbishop of Trier (1212–1242), represents the sole piece of direct evidence, textual or material, concerning the start date of construction on the new collegiate church. Whether out of sheer forgetfulness, or because he had entered the community of canons well after construction had commenced, or for some other reason, the scribe charged with entering Theoderich’s obit in the *Memorienbuch*, likely more or less immediately after the archbishop’s death in 1242, made no effort to hide his uncertainty about the date on which the former provost Theoderich had laid the cornerstone for the new collegiate church.\(^{286}\) He was certain enough that it occurred at some point after 1200, and accordingly provided the first two digits for the century (MCC); uncertain of either the exact year or the month in which it happened, he left a blank space after the 12 for the second half of

\(^{285}\) HASiK, Geist. Abt. 143, fols. 4a–4b: “V. Kal. Aprilis. [. . . .] Obiit venerande memorie Theodericus archiepiscopus Treverensis huius olim ecclesie prepositus. [. . . .] Iste posuit primarium lapidem fundamenti nostre ecclesie que nunc extat anno XPI M CC [left blank] mense [left blank]. Hic etiam postea consecravit duo altaria in ecclesia videlicet altare beate Marie et beati Johannis anno Domini M CC XXVI. Postea consecravit altare beati Antonii et altare beate Katherine.” The full text of the obit is is given in Appendix B, no. 1.

\(^{286}\) Paleographically, Theoderich’s obit hardly differs from the earliest set of entries in the *Memorienbuch*, which was almost certainly begun in 1239.
the date and a second blank space for the month—spaces that, unfortunately, neither he nor one of his colleagues later bothered to fill.287

As the passage concerning the laying of the cornerstone by provost Theoderich indicates, the rebuilding project at St. Kunibert began at some point in or after the year 1200. Deducing a more precise date than this for the start of work depends wholly on extrapolations from other, indirect sources of information. The first of these is the career of Theoderich von Wied. A member of the family of the counts of Wied,288 Theoderich first appears in the historical record in 1190, when he witnessed, already as a canonicus, a charter issued by Philipp von Heinsberg, archbishop of Cologne (1167–1191).289 Theoderich next appears as provost of the collegiate church of St. Mary in the Lower Rhenish town of Rees (archdiocese of Cologne; fig. 25) in 1194, a position that he might have attained as early as 1190.290 He is still attested in this capacity in 1205.291 It is not certain when Theoderich resigned from his provostal office in Rees, and although a provost by the name of Theoderich is mentioned there in 1223, he is likely a different person altogether.292

It is also not certain when, exactly, Theoderich acquired the much more important office of provost at St. Kunibert in Cologne. He is already attested as such in a charter dated 1196, and his predecessor, Rudolf, is last mentioned in 1194.293 Accordingly, Theoderich could have

287 Ennen and Eckertz (Quellen, vol. 2, 102 n. 2) first recognized that the spaces behind the indication for the century MCC and the word mense are actually blank spaces and suggested that they were left blank because the scribe no longer knew the date.
289 Paul Brewer Pixton, “Dietrich von Wied: Geistlicher Ehrgeiz und politischer Opportunismus im frühen dreizehnten Jahrhundert,” Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte 26 (1974): 50. Theoderich sometimes appears in scholarship under the name Dietrich, the German equivalent of Theoderich; as the designation Theoderich is the more common of the two appellations in the scholarly literature, it has been adopted here. Theoderich appears in the Latin sources under two names, Theodericus and Tirricus (sometimes spelled Thiricus).
become provost at any point within this time bracket. Theoderich’s tenure as provost of St. Kunibert is then well documented from 1196 through to 1212. As provost of St. Kunibert, he witnessed several dozen archiepiscopal charters in Cologne between 1196 and 1211. That he was provost until at least 1212 is suggested by a passage in the *Chronica regia Coloniensis* that implies that he still held the office when he was elected archbishop of Trier late that year.

It is not fully clear if—and if so, for how long—Theoderich remained provost of St. Kunibert beyond 1212. In 1218, we hear, retrospectively, of a bitter conflict over the office of provost at St. Kunibert in a charter sent by Pope Honorius III (1216–1227) to archbishop Engelbert I of Cologne (1216–1225). According to the charter, two canons from the cathedral chapter had been recommended for the position, Hermann von Jülich by the dean and his adherents and Konrad von Boppard by the remainder of the chapter. Unable to agree on a candidate, the chapter had been enjoined by Engelbert to reach a decision before a deadline of his choosing; the archbishop’s measure was for naught, as Hermann von Jülich died before the deadline.

---

294 Pixton, “Dietrich,” 53. As Pixton observes, whereas Theoderich witnessed charters for archbishops Adolf I von Altena (1193–1205) and Theoderich I von Hengebach (1208–1212), he did not witness a single charter for archbishop Bruno IV von Sayn (1205–1208). This led Karl Pellens (“Der Trierer Erzbischof Dietrich II von Wied, 1212–1242,” Ph.D. diss., University of Freiburg [Switzerland], 1957, 14, 17) to postulate the existence of two different provosts with the same name and to conclude that Theoderich von Wied held the office only between 1208 and 1212. Pixton (60–61), however, convincingly traces Theoderich’s absence in Bruno’s charters to the political situation surrounding Bruno’s controversial election as archbishop of Cologne in 1205. Bruno’s predecessor, Adolf, had been deposed and excommunicated by Pope Innocent III in early 1205 for withdrawing his support of the Guelph Otto IV (the papal favourite) and siding with the Hohenstaufen Philipp von Schwaben, each of whom had, since 1198, claimed the title of king for himself. Bruno was subsequently elected by the entire body of clergy (that is, including the lesser clergy) of Cologne, not, however, without major protest from most of the collegiate and monastic churches in the city and archdiocese as a whole, the majority of which still supported Adolf. Given his demonstrable ties to Adolf, Theoderich can, as Pixton argues, likely be counted among those who resolutely opposed the election of Bruno as archbishop, which plausibly explains why Theoderich’s name does not occur in that archbishop’s charters.

295 The following series of events is neatly summarized in Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 22–23.
deadline. The chapter, clearly unswayed by Engelbert’s admonition not to act further before he had passed his judgment on the situation, elected on its own initiative a different provost from the ranks of the cathedral chapter, Bruno von Ahrberg. Following a series of further disputes between the various parties involved, the dean and chapter ultimately succeeded in making Bruno provost of St. Kunibert, an office that he occupied from 1218 until his death in 1236. This conflict over the provostal office at St. Kunibert appears to have already begun by 1216, making that year the latest possible *terminus ante quem* for Theoderich’s resignation. It is thus possible that Theoderich continued to hold the office of provost at St. Kunibert between 1212 and some point in or shortly before 1216, despite having been elected archbishop of Trier in late 1212. Theoderich’s formal consecration as archbishop of Trier occurred in either March or April 1213; but he appears to have entered Trier in his new capacity as archbishop only in January 1215. As Pixton has suggested, Theoderich may have possibly retained the office of provost at St. Kunibert until 1215/1216 as a fallback option, should he encounter opposition in Trier. Theoderich’s sole securely documented stay in Cologne during the period 1213–1215, however, occurs in August 1215, when, already as archbishop of Trier, he participated in the election of Engelbert I and petitioned the citizens of Cologne to recognize Frederick II as

---


298 For provost Bruno’s dates, see Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 282–283.


302 Pixton, “Dietrich,” 63 n. 73, speculates that Theoderich likely did retain the office of provost of St. Kunibert until late 1215/1216 on account of the uncertain political situation after 1212, suggesting that he might have resigned only once Frederick II, to whom Theoderich had close ties, had been recognized as king by the citizens of Cologne (August 1215) and Engelbert had been installed as archbishop there (in 1216). Though conjectural, this series of events would accord chronologically with the aforementioned conflict concerning the successor for the vacant office of provost between 1216 and 1218 (Pixton himself appears to have been unaware of this conflict).
Theoderich is otherwise unattested in Cologne between 1213 and 1215, but he could have been there, among other places, in this period. Nor is there any charter or other textual source that attests to his continuing to function as provost at St. Kunibert between 1212 and 1216. It is, therefore, an open question as to what extent Theoderich was resident in Cologne after being named archbishop elect in late 1212, even if he was possibly still formally provost of St. Kunibert until late 1215/1216.

In view of the course of his career and the incomplete notice in the *Memorienbuch*, Theoderich theoretically could have laid the cornerstone for the new church at any point between 1200 and 1216. Faced with such a broad span of time, scholars have attempted to pinpoint a more likely date for the start of work at St. Kunibert within this period. To this point, two widely divergent suggestions have been made. Both of these suggestions, however, are problematic, each for different reasons.

The first, oldest suggestion was advanced by Ewald, who looked to the other recorded dates for the east end of the church and attempted to use them to establish a date for the start of construction. Ewald pointed primarily to the passage in Theoderich’s obit recording his consecration in 1226 of two altars, one dedicated to the Virgin and one to John the Baptist. Still *in situ*, these two side altars are located in large niches in the east walls of the east transept (figs. 31, 100, 138). Whereas the obit provides the clear date of 1226 for the consecration of the first pair of side altars, the obit indicates only that the consecration of a second pair of altars, those of

---

303 *Die Regesten der Erzbischöfe zu Trier von Hetti bis Johann II. 814–1503*, ed. Adam Goerz (Trier: Lintz, 1861), 32. Theoderich is also attested in the so-called Schreinsbücher (records for property transactions in Cologne) for the general period 1209–1215, but because these are not precisely dated beyond this broad range, it is uncertain from them whether he was actually resident in Cologne after 1212. See Klaus Militzer, *Kölner Geistliche im Mittelalter. Band 1: Männer*, Mitteilungen aus dem Stadtarchiv von Köln 91 (Cologne: Historisches Archiv der Stadt Köln, 2003), 686–687.

304 Thus, Theoderich is recorded as being in the retinue of Frederick II in Metz in December 1214 and January 1215; see Pixton, “Dietrich,” 67 n. 98.

305 *KDM* 6/4, 244–245.
St. Katherine and St. Anthony, originally located in the easternmost bays of the north and south side aisles (figs. 31, 139, 140), took place “hereafter” (*postea*). Observing that Theoderich was in nearby Aachen in 1227, Ewald reasoned that Theoderich probably came to Cologne in this same year and thus that he likely consecrated the second pair of side altars in the side aisles in 1227.306 Having established dates of 1226 and 1227 for the four side altars in the east end of the church and proceeding from the premise that the church was not wholly rebuilt but only “updated” using older substance, Ewald argued that the east end, including the apse, the east transept, and the eastern bays of the side aisles, must have been reworked within a short span of time and that Theoderich could not possibly have laid the cornerstone during his tenure as provost, which Ewald mistakenly believed to have encompassed only the years 1200–1210.307

Ewald thus attempted to connect the record of the laying of the cornerstone in Theoderich’s obit specifically with his aforementioned stay in Cologne as archbishop of Trier in August 1215, suggesting that “the cornerstone was likely barely set during Theoderich’s tenure as provost of St. Kunibert (ca. 1200–1210)” and concluding instead that “likely only the year 1215 could come into question for the laying of the cornerstone.”308

Though based on an incomplete body of textual, material, and stylistic evidence and incorrect dates for Theoderich’s tenure (though all this is hardly a fault of Ewald’s given the state of knowledge when he was working), and premised on the supposition that older substance

306 KDM 6/4, 245.
307 KDM 6/4, 244.
308 KDM 6/4, 244: “Jedoch ist der Grundstein wohl kaum schon während der Amtszeit Theoderichs als Propst von St. Cunibert (etwa 1200–1210) gelegt worden. [. . .] Als Zeitpunkt der Grundsteinlegung dürfte vielmehr wegen der anderen Baudaten und der Einweihung der Altäre 1226/1227 nur das Jahr 1215 in Frage kommen. Theoderich war damals bereits Erzbischof von Trier. Er weilte gerade im August 1215, also zur Zeit der Erledigung des Kölner Bischofsstuhls, in Köln.” Ewald also preferred the date “probably 1215” for the beginning of construction—or, for him, renovation of what he considered to be existing substance—at St. Kunibert in his earlier, much briefer treatment of the collegiate church (“Bau und Kunstschätze,” 47), which was published in 1911: “Der Trierer Erzbischof Theoderich von Wied legte wahrscheinlich im Jahre 1215 den Grundstein zum Umbau der Kirche.” Ewald, however, did not provide any reasoning for this particular date here; presumably the same chain of reasoning that he articulated in 1916 also underpinned the date of “1215” in this earlier piece.
was used to rebuild the church, Ewald’s conclusions concerning the start date of construction have proven formative for subsequent scholarship on St. Kunibert. Whether taken at face value or modified with the words “circa,” “likely,” or “perhaps,” the notion that Theoderich laid the cornerstone in 1215 has since been recapitulated frequently as the “default date” for the start of work at St. Kunibert, so much so that it almost seems as if it were a well-established fact rather than a scholarly extrapolation made from the incomplete assembly of material that was available to Ewald in the early 1910s.

The widely-held notion that construction began either in or around 1215 has only been seriously challenged by Graf. In her dissertation, Graf produced what she considered groundbreaking evidence concerning the start and course of construction in the east end of the church. This consisted of the fragmentary remnants of a wooden tie beam that Graf had found lodged in the impost block of the central support in the upper storey of the south flank of the east transept (fig. 49). A dendrochronological examination of the beam, which was not preserved to the extent that the precise date at which the tree was felled could be determined, produced an approximate date of “1190 +/- 5 years or possibly later.” With this information,

---

309 The recently excavated eleventh-century west end, in tandem with the axis of the lost claustral buildings, indicates that older substance was not used in the construction of any part of the new church; see Chapter 1.
311 Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 86–88, 120, 123, 140 n. 134a, and Anlage I and II.
312 Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 87, 140 n. 134a, and Anlage II. Thus, Graf’s summation of the findings on 87: “Dating on the basis of the tree rings resulted in the determination that the most recent ring dates to 1169, and thus that the tree
Graf proposed a radically new chronology for the east end, making several sweeping conclusions about the dating and design of the apse and east transept that she has since maintained in a series of subsequent studies. Proceeding like Ewald from the unsubstantiated supposition that the new church was built in part using the walls of a predecessor church, Graf argued that the east transept only represented a reworking of older walls through the addition to them of Muldennischen in the lower storey and walkways in the upper, concluding that the tie beam, located just below the springing of the vault, indicated that work had reached this point by around 1200 because it could have progressed quickly on account of the use of older walls. Accordingly, Graf reasoned on the basis of the imprecise date of this tie beam that work must have begun in the east transept, and on its north and south flanks in particular, and possibly even before 1200. Connecting the fragmentary beam with the documented start in circa 1196 of Theoderich’s tenure as provost, she claimed further that Theoderich “must” have initiated the rebuilding of St. Kunibert more or less immediately after his accession to the office of provost. Faced with the seemingly insurmountable contradiction to her thesis presented by the indication in the Memorienbuch that Theoderich laid the cornerstone (literally, “the first stone in the foundation”—primarium lapidem fundamenti) at some point in or after the year 1200, Graf attempted to relativize its importance, arguing with no evidence that, unlike the east transept, the apse was completely rebuilt and work on it began only after work on the east

---

could hardly have been felled before 1190 +/- 5 [years]; it could, however, also have been felled some years later (“Die Jahrringdatierung hat ergeben, daß der jüngste Jahrring in das Jahr 1169 gehört, der Baum also kaum vor 1190 +/- 5 gefällt worden sein dürfte, jedoch auch einige Jahre später geschlagen worden sein kann”). The examination was conducted at the Institut für Ur- und Frühgeschichte at the University of Cologne; see Graf’s Anlage II.

transept had reached an advanced stage.\textsuperscript{316} The cornerstone, she maintained, was therefore laid only after work on the east transept had begun and at some point after 1200, once work on the apse was to begin.\textsuperscript{317}

The idea that work on the new collegiate church began before or around 1200 and on the north and south flanks of the east transept—and the related arguments that the apse was erected after the east transept, and that the laying of the cornerstone after 1200 only refers to the apse—is highly problematic. First, this argument depends entirely on the assumption that the east transept (but supposedly not the apse?) was rebuilt using the walls of the immediate predecessor church, thereby enabling rapid construction.\textsuperscript{318} The west end of the eleventh-century predecessor church—the precursor of the current structure—has, however, since been found (fig. 30), and it not only lies on a different axis than the thirteenth-century church building, the east end included, but is also barely half its size.\textsuperscript{319} The eleventh-century west end and the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{316} Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 88, 120.
\item \textsuperscript{318} Graf (“Ostchorbau,” 76 and 85) presents two pieces of “evidence” for the supposed use of the walls of an unspecified predecessor church in the construction of the east transept. The first is her observation that the north arm of the east transept on the interior is around 20 cm wider than the south arm (6.65 m to 6.47 m; Graf’s measurements), which Graf then took to mean that the new east transept had to have been erected on older walls—hence, the divergence in the width of the two arms. In a building this size (and constructed with limited, premodern technical means), what is by all accounts a minor divergence of 18 cm is, however, hardly significant and does not in itself constitute evidence for the use of older walls for the construction of the east transept. Graf’s second piece of “evidence” (“Ostchorbau,” 71, 85) consists of the lintel in the doorway of the western bay of the north flank of the transept. This door leads to the corridor that originally linked the east transept with the cloister (fig. 30). Pointing to the way in which left end of the lintel disappears into the adjacent corner pier, Graf argued that the door “definitely belongs to the fabric of the predecessor church” (“Gewiß gehört die Türöffnung an dieser Stelle zum Baubestand der Vorgängerkirche”). To conclude from the lintel alone that this door a) belongs to a predecessor church and b) that it thus also proves that the older walls of a predecessor church were reused for the new east transept tests credulity. Shouldered lintels—that is, “asymmetrical” lintels with one half tongued into, and thus partially hidden by, the adjacent masonry—were a common technique in the construction of doorways in the Middle Ages and the occurrence of such a doorway here is hardly unusual. This same technique, in this case with a console, was, for instance, employed in the doorway leading to vestibule of the sacristy in the same arm of the east transept. See, for further examples, Jill Lever and John Harris, \textit{Illustrated Dictionary of Architecture, 800–1914} (London: Faber and Faber, 1993), s. v. “Shouldered Lintel.”
\item \textsuperscript{319} See Chapter 1. While Graf could not possibly have known about the existence of the eleventh-century west end in the early 1980s (only fully uncovered and published by 1992), she was aware of the foundations by the time of
\end{itemize}
evidence furnished by the orientation of the lost pre-thirteenth-century cloister, which is positioned on axis with the old west end, make it clear that the new, much larger east transept was not built using walls from the east end of the predecessor church.

Equally problematic is the supposition that the fragmentary tie beam’s approximate date of “circa 1190 +/- 5 years or possibly some years later” indicates that the north and south flanks of the east transept must have stood to the height of the impost blocks around 1200 and that work on them therefore must have begun before or around 1200. It is essential to realize that this tie beam was, as its location and form indicate, used solely for the purposes of stabilizing the (then) freestanding support in the upper storey walkway before the east transept was vaulted and is therefore not to be confused with wooden anchors that were placed inside walls in order to buttress or reinforce them permanently. Unlike substantial anchors embedded in walls, or roofing beams, both of which usually (but not always) were of freshly felled wood and thus provide fairly secure dates (but only when an adequate range of tree rings is preserved), tie beams and scaffolding used for temporarily stabilizing freestanding columns and piers could consist of less valuable recycled wood or fresh wood that had been felled earlier, stockpiled, and only employed later by a workshop of masons. This compromises their utility as tools for

---

her 1997 article (“Neue Forschungen,” 114) and even cites Seiler’s work on the west end (at 125 n. 25), which convincingly placed it in the eleventh century. Despite this knowledge, however, Graf claims without providing any corroborating evidence that the recently uncovered west end is not the immediate predecessor church and asserts that excavations in the future will “certainly uncover one or several other predecessor buildings or at least additions or reworkings whose walls were definitely used as far as possible for the new church” (“Es ist anzunehmen, daß der bei der Grabung von 1989–1991 teilweise aufgedeckte und ergänzte Dreizellengrundriß nicht dem unmittelbaren Vorgängerbau der spätstaufischen Stiftskirche zugehörte. Weitere Grabungen dürften sicher noch einen oder mehrere Vorgängerbauten oder zumindest An- oder Umbauten zutagefördern, deren Mauerwerk zweifellos so weit wie möglich für den Neubau genutzt wurde”). Here, Graf downplays the existence and implications of the eleventh-century west end, but in undermining the idea that older substance was used for the east transept, its discovery undercuts her larger thesis and conclusions about the chronology and design of the east end of the thirteenth-century church.

320 Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 86, herself acknowledges this function, calling the remains of the beam part of a temporary “Hilfskonstruktion” that served to steady the pier before the south arm of the transept was vaulted; see further Kosch, “Einzelbeobachtungen,” 39.
generating firm, binding dates for construction and requires that whatever indications that they
might provide be measured carefully against the full body of textual, material, stylistic, and
circumstantial evidence bearing on the chronology of a building, especially when a single
sample is involved.\textsuperscript{321} In the course of restoration work at St. Kunibert in the early 1990s, traces
of several other such stabilizing tie beams were also found in the outer wall of the upper storey
of the apse.\textsuperscript{322} These beams originally aligned with the capital/impost block zone of the
freestanding column bundles in the upper storey of the apse (fig. 35) and likely also functioned
as part of a temporary scaffolding construction used to stabilize these precarious elements
before the apse was vaulted in the same way as the tie beam that Graf found wedged in the
impost block of the freestanding support in the upper storey of the east transept.\textsuperscript{323} A
dendrochronological analysis of a sample taken from one of the extant beams from the apse
likewise returned a very approximate date of “with some probability slightly before 1200.”\textsuperscript{324}
Although this rough date of “circa (or slightly before) 1200” for the beams in the apse
potentially could be taken to mean that construction here began around this time or even be
construed to indicate that work had reached the upper storey of the apse by the year 1200 (as
Graf does with the beam from the east transept), the possibility that the wood used for this beam
consisted of older wood that was reemployed for a temporary scaffolding construction makes
any such conclusion problematic. At the very least, the discovery of a series of tie beams in the

Gegensatz zu den stets fällfrisch verarbeiteten Balkenankern im Mauerwerk—natürlich auch bereits Jahre zuvor
eingeschlagenes oder von älteren Abbruchbauten stammendes Material verwendet bzw. wiederverwendet.” On the
limitations of dendrochronology for dating, and the problems posed by fragmentary samples and stockpiled wood
in particular, see Stephen Murray, \textit{Notre-Dame, Cathedral of Amiens: The Power of Change in Gothic} (Cambridge:
\textsuperscript{322} See Kosch, “Einzelbeobachtungen,” 39–40.
\textsuperscript{323} Kosch, “Einzelbeobachtungen,” 39–40.
\textsuperscript{324} Kosch, “Einzelbeobachtungen,” 39 with n. 31 (“die von uns 1995 sichergestellte Holzprobe aus dem Apsis-
Mauerwerk [kann] mit einiger Wahrscheinlichkeit in die Zeit kurz vor 1200 datiert werden”).


apse and the approximate dendrochronological dating of the fragment of the extant one to “circa (or slightly before) 1200”—that is, to the same “period” as the fragment of the tie beam that Graf found at the same height in the east transept—seriously undermine the notion that the east transept was begun and erected before the apse. At the very most, these fragmentary temporary tie beams in the apse and the east transept suggest that construction on the east end of the collegiate church could have begun anytime “around 1200” very broadly understood (that is, in the early thirteenth century), but it would be reckless in view of the above considerations and the only very approximate dendrochronological dating of both beams to insist that they mean that work had definitely begun in the year 1200—and not a few years or even a decade later—or that work had certainly progressed up to the upper levels of the upper stories in both the apse and the east transept by “circa 1200.”325 That the latter is not the case is clear from the indication in Theoderich’s obit that the cornerstone for the foundation (fundamentum) was laid only at some point in or after the year 1200 and from the records, examined in detail below, of the roofing of the apse itself towards 1222 (fig. 76), the depositing of relics in a niche in the apse beside the high altar around 1222 (fig. 141), and, finally, the consecration of the high altar in the apse (fig. 101), which can also be placed in 1222.326 All this evidence for the completion of the apse and east end around 1222 indicates that the east end was not more or less complete—that is, standing up to the level of the upper stories of the apse and east transept but without


326 See below, 110–112.
vaults—by “circa 1200,” a scenario that would require a span of some twenty years for the vaulting of the apse and east transept. A date of around 1200 for either the apse or the east transept up to the level of the vault springing is, moreover, not only stylistically improbable,327 but also a virtual impossibility in light of the dates of the monuments that served as their architectural models, which are firmly datable to the period encompassing circa 1200–1210 and which were themselves only complete or nearing completion towards 1210.328

Finally, it is also unlikely that Theoderich would have laid the cornerstone in the apse after work had already begun on the conjoining east transept and had reached such an advanced stage. Such a scenario would run counter to everything that is known—as far as the extant medieval textual accounts enable us to judge—about the custom of the ceremonial laying of the cornerstone, a ritual that appears to have always marked the start of a construction project.329

Theoderich’s obit thus remains the only piece of direct evidence concerning the start date of construction at St. Kunibert, and it explicitly indicates that he laid “the first stone in the foundation [my emphasis]” (primarium lapidem fundamenti) for the new church either in or at some point after the year 1200. The two suggestions that have been made to this point for dating the start of work, the “default date” of “in/circa 1215” formulated by Ewald and Graf’s redating of “before/circa 1200,” are both problematic for different reasons. Is it, then, even possible to arrive a more plausible date for the start of the rebuilding project at St. Kunibert and to form a clearer picture of the chronological contours of the east end?

---

327 See Kosch’s comments in note 325 above.
328 See below, 116–117.
Three separate indications point uniformly to 1222 as the *terminus a quo* for the completion of the apse. Because the date of the laying of the cornerstone is unknown, the year 1222 represents the earliest unequivocal chronological anchor for the east end. It therefore provides the firmest foothold for reconsidering the east end’s general chronology and for deducing a date for the start of work in particular. The first of the three indications is the obit of dean Constantine in the *Memorienbuch*, which reads in part:

December 30. Constantine the deacon and dean died, for whom are given six solid measures of wheat from the heath in Heimersheim for the purposes of making large loaves of bread for feast days. One loaf on the feast of St. Kunibert. The other on the feast of the two Hewalds. The third on the feast of St. Clement. He had the first [or main] apse of the church, which we call the mitre, roofed with lead. [. . .]³³⁰ Constantine, then, had the “first [or main] apse of the church” roofed with lead. On account of the designation of the apse as the “first [or main] apse” (*prima absida*) and the intriguing contemporary description of it as the “mitre” (*mitra*), the roofing of the apse mentioned here most likely refers to the pitched roof of the apse (there is only one apse at the church; fig. 76), which, with its flattened conical triangular form, bears a loose resemblance to a bishop’s pointy headgear.³³¹ Constantine is first attested as a canon at St. Kunibert in 1215 and became dean in 1219.³³² The last mention of Constantine as dean occurs in a charter that is dated 1222; he likely died that same year, for his successor, Wenemar, appears to have already assumed office in 1222 and signed as dean in three charters of 1223, one of which was issued in July of that

---


³³¹ The term *mitra* in medieval Latin does indeed translate as “pitched roof” and was also employed to describe those on belfries; s. v. “mitra” in *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, ed. Charles Du Fresne Du Cange et al. (Nort: L. Favre, 1883–1887) 5: col. 426b.

³³² See Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 315 no. 30. The date of 1219 for Constantine’s accession to the office of dean is given in a list of the provosts and deans of St. Kunibert for the years 975–1751 (HAStK, Geist. Abt. 143a, fol. 6r). Although compiled in the mid-eighteenth century, the list’s accuracy is underlined by the fact that Constantine’s predecessor as dean is last attested in an archiepiscopal charter of 1219; see Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 293 no. 17.
The year 1222 emerges from all this as the *terminus ante quem* for the roofing of the apse with lead.\(^{334}\)

The second and third indications corroborate that the apse was essentially complete by 1222; both are examined in full detail in the relevant contexts later and are only summarized here for what they tell us about the chronology of construction in the east end. Thus, another obit in the *Memorienbuch* records the acquisition in 1222 of a hoard of “relics from overseas” (*reliquias transmarinas*) by Theoderich (not to be confused with the provost of the same name), a deacon at St. Kunibert.\(^{335}\) The textual, contextual, physical, and stylistic evidence of the frescoes suggests that these relics were placed in the painted niche on the north flank of the sanctuary beside the high altar upon their arrival at the church in 1222 (fig. 141).\(^{336}\) That this hoard of relics should have been deposited in this niche in the apse also indicates that work on

\(^{333}\) The last charter that names Constantine as dean is HASTK, St. Kunibert U 1/21; see Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 293 no. 18. According to the eighteenth-century list of provosts and deans (HASTK, Geist. Abt. 143a, fol. 6v), Wenemar was dean of St. Kunibert between 1222 and 1236; see Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 293–294 no. 19. Constantine’s obit indicates that he died on December 30, but, as is the case throughout the *Memorienbuch*, does not provide the year. There is every reason to think that Constantine did in fact die in 1222, given that his successor Wenemar is listed as dean for 1222 in the aforementioned list and witnessed three charters as dean in 1223 (see below). It should be remembered here that in the Middle Ages, the New Year (usually) began not on January 1, but rather on a different date depending on the particular geographic region. Cologne adopted the system commonly employed in France—the so-called *mos gallicus*—in 1222, with the New Year beginning on Holy Saturday (and thus falling, depending on the date of Easter in any given year, between March 22 and April 25); see Hermann Grotefend, *Taschenbuch der Zeitrechnung des deutschen Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, 12th ed. (Hannover: Hahn, 1982), 12. Because the New Year (i.e., 1223) began several months after December, there was ample time for Wenemar to have been elected to the post of dean in 1222 following Constantine’s (presumed) demise in December of the same year. Wenemar then appears as dean in three charters of 1223: HASTK, St. Kunibert U 1/22 (July 1223), U 1/23 (1223), U 1/24 (1223); see Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 26 n. 112, and 293 no. 19.

\(^{334}\) Ewald (*KDM* 6/4, 245), working with collection of sources published by Ennen and Eckertz in the 1860s (*Quellen*, vol. 2, 94 nr. 85), followed the latter in indicating that dean Constantine died before 1224 and accordingly dated the roofing of the apse to “before 1224.” The date of “before 1224” has since been taken up by subsequent scholarship as the *terminus a quo* for the roofing of the apse, but this date is incorrect.

That Constantine’s beneficent act of having the apse roofed with lead was not executed as a bequest but instead occurred during his lifetime and thus in or before 1222 is clear from the use of the word “*fecit*” in his obit. Although few in number, the obits in the *Memorienbuch* that contain information on financial donations to, and other forms of sponsorship of, the church building distinguish carefully between bequests, which are signaled with the expression “*moriens, reliquit . . .*” or simply “*reliquit*,” and donations to the *fabrica* made or deeds done during a canon’s lifetime, which are signaled with the verbs “*dedit*” (in the case of financial contributions to the fabric) and “*fecit*” (in the case of a deed such as Constantine’s). See the specific wording of the various records compiled in Appendix B.

\(^{335}\) For the text of deacon Theoderich’s obit, see Appendix B, no. 6.

\(^{336}\) The relic niche and its frescoes are examined in Chapter 7.
the latter was complete by the acquisition of the relics in 1222. Completion of the apse in or around 1222 is also suggested by the third indication, the high altar itself, which is still preserved in situ in the apse (fig. 101). On the basis of the sepulchre with relics (fig. 103), the consecration of the high altar can also be placed in 1222.\footnote{The high altar sepulchre and its dating are examined in detail in Chapter 6.} Not only does the sepulchre contain relics that were partitioned off from the hoard of “relics from overseas” that deacon Theoderich had brought to the collegiate church in 1222, but an inscription on the outside of the chest and a parchment note that was found inside it indicate that a Constantinus commissioned the sepulchre and assembled the relics that were enclosed in the chest. This Constantinus is most likely identical with the aforementioned dean Constantine, who had the apse itself roofed with lead and who died in December 1222, meaning that the high altar in the apse was also dedicated in 1222, at some point between the acquisition of the “relics from overseas” and the death of dean Constantine.

Though restricted to the apse, these three indications also imply that the contiguous east transept was most likely largely complete by 1222. It has generally been supposed that the consecration of the side altars of the Virgin and the Baptist in 1226 (fig. 31) marks the completion of the east transept on the assumption that these two altars were installed immediately following the completion of the surrounding architectural fabric.\footnote{This general supposition ultimately stems from Ewald (KDM 6/4, 244–245), who cited the consecration of these side altars as the terminus ante quem for the completion of the entire east end, including the apse: “Das Jahr 1226 bezeichnet also wohl den Abschluss der Bauarbeiten an der östlichen Apside und am östlichen Querschiff.”} There are, however, several pieces of evidence that argue against the completion of the transept only in 1226 and for its completion somewhat in advance of the consecration of the side altars and together with the apse. First, while the presence of these altars was certainly planned during the design and execution stages of the lower east walls of the east transept, the conspicuous and
careless removal of the protruding bases of the pair of engaged columns and the base mouldings on the piers to either side of each altar, in each case to accommodate the altar, seemingly indicates that the altars were installed not as construction progressed but rather only after the east wall of the east transept had already stood for some time (fig. 137).\textsuperscript{339} Moreover, and in contrast to the high altar, the side altars were not essential for the conventual liturgy but instead only served lesser private masses, meaning that they could conceivably have been installed and consecrated only a few years after the east transept stood complete.\textsuperscript{340} This scenario is strongly suggested by the documented consecration of the high altar in 1222, which has never been taken into consideration for the chronology of the east end, primarily because the sepulchre was first published in the early 1980s.\textsuperscript{341} Though one cannot be absolutely certain whether the high altar was taken into use in 1222, the fact that it was installed and consecrated suggests that it likely was. It is unlikely that the high altar, as much as the lavish \textit{opus sectile} pavement that surrounds it (fig. 101), would have been installed and consecrated had the interior of the east transept, from which it is separated by a mere two meters, still been a full-fledged construction site and not yet vaulted.\textsuperscript{342} The apse alone would not have offered sufficient space to accommodate the entire convent of 30 canons, chaplains, and \textit{scholares} at the conventual liturgy, even temporarily as work continued on the transept, which further buttresses the likelihood that the transept was

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{339} This conspicuous damage to the base mouldings and column bases to either side of these two side altars has, to my knowledge, gone unremarked.
\item \textsuperscript{340} Graf has also suggested that the east transept may have been completed several years before the altars were consecrated in it in 1226, but she does not provide any evidence for this assertion and makes it in reference to her thesis that work on the east transept had already reached an advanced stage by ca. 1200; cf. Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 169 n. 405: “Die späte Weihe der Altäre muß keineswegs bedeuten, daß der Bau als solcher nicht längst vorher fertiggestellt war.”
\item \textsuperscript{341} It had been discovered in 1945. Graf (“Ostchorbau,” 139 n. 132), who first called attention to the sepulchre in her dissertation, did not assess the implications of the consecration of the high altar in 1222 for the building chronology of the east end. Likewise, the lengthy entry on the sepulchre in \textit{OE}, vol. 2, 80–82, concentrates on the object and not on the implications of the high altar and the date of its consecration for the chronology of construction.
\item \textsuperscript{342} The high altar and the pavement are examined in Chapter 6.
\end{itemize}
complete by the consecration of the high altar in 1222. The deposition of the “relics from overseas” in the relic niche next to the high altar in the apse in 1222 and the decoration of that niche with frescoes at this same time (fig. 141) also corroborate this picture, for they too suggest that the east transept—but a meter away—was most likely vaulted by this date. The consecration of the side altars in 1226 (and 1227 at the latest for the second pair in the side aisles) only represents a *terminus ante quem* for the completion of the entire eastern half of the church, down to and including the first nave bay (figs. 30 and 31). The consecration of the high altar in 1222 furnishes a more important chronological anchor for the east end, one that suggests that the apse and the east transept were complete by this date.

The physical evidence corroborates the body of contextual evidence, for it too indicates that apse and east transept were designed and erected together as a unified structural whole, from the foundations upwards. The construction of the apse, which abuts against the east walls of the east transept up to the level of the lower storey of the towers and the crossing gable, entailed the construction of at least these portions of the east transept for purely structural reasons; these parts of the east transept were most certainly standing when the apse was roofed in or around 1222.343 Where they meet, the apse and east transept are fused by means of splayed walls (fig. 78); at the level of the dwarf’s gallery, the outer courses of tufa stone on the splayed walls and the east transept towers interlock seamlessly, suggesting that the walls of the apse and the east walls of the transept went up at approximately the same rate.344 Even if it cannot be

---

343 See, on this point, Machat, “Bauwerk,” 324. The crossing gable was damaged in 1666 when the church was struck by lightning and rebuilt—faithfully—in the 1860s.
344 See Kosch (“Einzelbeobachtungen,” 37–39), who was able to examine the crown of the walls at the junction of the splayed walls with the towers when the roof of the apse was replaced in the early 1990s. He observed that the outer courses of the splayed walls that link the apse and the towers are tongued together, while the upper courses of stone in the inner circumference of the dwarf’s gallery do not interlock with that of the towers. He also noted that the inner radius of the apse at the level of the dwarf’s gallery appears to have been mismeasured at first and thus that the walls of the gallery, which were too thick, had to be adjusted slightly afterwards so that their inner edges
proven from the extant fabric, this was probably the case with all four sides of the transept and not just its east walls, because it is unlikely that the east walls of the east transept were designed and built independently of its north, south, and west walls. The close overlap in the design of the elevation of the different walls in the east transept and their relationship to their architectural model support this reading and indicate that the east transept was designed as a single structural unit and not on a wall-by-wall basis as construction progressed from the apse westwards. Rather, the contextual and physical evidence indicates that the apse and transept were conceived together and erected in tandem and upwards.

The likelihood that the east end was complete upon the consecration of the high altar in 1222 suggests that the rebuilding of St. Kunibert probably did begin before the “default date” of “(circa) 1215.” But just how much farther should this date pushed back? Numerous factors—physical, art historical, and contextual—argue for a start date around 1210.

would align directly with the innermost corners of the two towers. As Kosch stresses, neither the slight misalignment of the inner radius of the apse with the inner corners of the towers nor the lack of interlocking stonework in this position can be construed as evidence of either a change in plan or of a major chronological cleavage between the towers and the apse. As he writes: “Derartige Ungenauigkeiten . . . lassen organisatorische Mängel des Bauhüttenbetriebes erkennen, bedeuten jedoch in diesem Fall keinen Hinweis auf Planänderungen oder zeitliche Divergenzen, zumal die äußere Arkadenwand der Galerie ihrerseits mit der Außenhaut der Türme verzahnt ist.”

On the the design of the east transept and its relationship with its architectural model, see Chapter 3. The issue of the chronological relationship of the apse and the east transept has only been subjected to serious scrutiny by Graf; her contention that the east transept predates the apse is, however, not supported by the evidence. Since the appearance of Graf’s dissertation in 1984, it has been generally assumed in the subsequent literature that the east end was planned and executed as a whole, but this major issue has not been addressed in any systematic fashion. Machat (“Bauwerk,” 324) suggests briefly that the apse and the east transept were planned and built together, noting that the use of splayed walls to connect the two suggests this and that the articulation of the walls of the apse and east transept is “unified” on the interior (“einheitliche innere Wandgliederung”). Beyond this statement, however, he does not pursue the issue of the contemporaneity of both parts of the east end in terms of their models, design, and execution. Machat’s assertion has since been restated by Kubach and Verbeek, who cite him (RBRM, vol. 4, 592: “[Machat] hält (entgegen Graf) an einheitlicher Planung von Querhaus und Apsis fest”), but they do not provide any additional reasoning for this supposition of contemporaneity in the planning and execution of the east end. See further Kosch, “Anbauten und Nebenräume,” 78, who likewise indicates briefly that the east end of the church was “einheitlich geplant.” In the present and following chapter, this crucial issue will be addressed systematically with a view to establishing the contemporaneity of both the design and execution of the two parts that comprise the east end of the church.
As the recent excavations have made clear, the new collegiate church was rebuilt *de novo*, using neither the walls nor foundations of the predecessor church.\textsuperscript{347} The laying of the foundations and the construction and vaulting of the apse and east transept alone likely would have taken around ten building seasons, possibly even slightly longer. Work on the decagon at St. Gereon (fig. 204), for instance, a building project of comparable scale and which is very well documented from start to finish, lasted eight building seasons (1219–1227), and here the entire lower storey from the late antique rotunda was retained and integrated into the new structure, obviating the need to lay foundations and thus saving at least two building seasons, if not more.\textsuperscript{348}

For their part, the churches that served as the architectural models for the east end of St. Kunibert, examined in detail below, are themselves all dated to the period from circa 1200 to circa 1210, which also suggests that work probably did not begin until around the end point of this time bracket.\textsuperscript{349} In the case of the west choir hall in Xanten in particular (figs. 220 and 223), whose upper storey—which quite obviously belongs to the latest phases of construction—provided the source for the design of the double-order arches in the arcades and the vaulting system used for the walkways in the apse of St. Kunibert and which was also the model for the plan and parts of the elevation of the east transept (figs. 26 and 48),\textsuperscript{350} the completion of construction can be securely dated to 1213, when a Marian altar was consecrated in the hall.\textsuperscript{351} While the architect responsible for the east end could have consulted this structure after its completion (that is, in 1215), the evidence indicating that the apse and east transept were built

\textsuperscript{347} See Chapter 1.
\textsuperscript{348} The start of work on the decagon at St. Gereon in 1219 is recorded in a charter dated to that year (printed in Ennen and Eckertz, *Quellen*, vol. 2, 77–78 no. 64; the decagon was vaulted in 1227, as a notice in the *Annales sancti Gereonis Coloniensis* indicates (printed in MGH SS 16, 733–734).
\textsuperscript{349} On the apse and its models, see below; on the east transept, see Chapter 3.
\textsuperscript{350} See Chapter 3 (east transept).
\textsuperscript{351} See below, 154–156, with note 423.
together and complete by 1222 suggests that he likely did consult both this and the other models from circa 1200 to 1210 somewhat earlier than 1215.

The historical context, finally, offers compelling grounds for placing the planning and start of construction around 1210. The end date of Theoderich von Wied’s tenure as provost can no longer be determined; he could have resigned from the post as early as 1212 upon being named archbishop elect of Trier, or he might possibly have retained the office until 1215/1216 in the event that he encountered problems in Trier. Whatever the precise circumstances may have been, it is unlikely that Theoderich, who laid the cornerstone for the new church and who as the highest dignitary undoubtedly played a major role in its initial conception, would have begun the vast undertaking that was the complete rebuilding of the church with his departure as archbishop of Trier imminent.³⁵² It is improbable that he laid the cornerstone after learning of his successful bid for the cathedra in Trier in late 1212, with the prospect of impending departure looming on the horizon. And it is even more unlikely that he did so in 1215—already as archbishop of Trier and possibly still nominally provost of St. Kunibert. Indeed, as an archiepiscopal charter dating from 1209 indicates, Theoderich was in Xanten in this year.³⁵³ Provost Theoderich thus had opportunity to see the west choir hall there—the architectural model for the east transept—first-hand and in a state of near completion (altar consecration in 1213). Given the other contextual considerations, this particular event may very well represent the moment of the genesis of plans for a new collegiate church at St. Kunibert.³⁵⁴

The full body of evidence strongly suggests that the rebuilding project at St. Kunibert began in the latter years of Theoderich’s tenure as provost, while he was still resident at St. Kunibert.

---

³⁵² Theoderich’s role in the conception of the east end is addressed in detail Chapter 5.
³⁵³ REK, vol. 3, no. 70. The charter was issued in Xanten: “Datum Xanctis 1209.” Theoderich’s name appears alongside that of the provost of St. Gereon: “Tirricus et Tirricus s. Gereonis et s. Kunibert prepositi.”
³⁵⁴ The larger historical context surrounding the genesis of the building project and Xanten’s role in this dynamic in particular are examined in full detail in Chapter 5.
Kunibert and before his election to the post of archbishop of Trier had become a reality (1212). Though final certainty cannot be attained on this point, a start date around 1210 for the new east end is the most plausible scenario. The completion of the east end, in turn, can be placed securely around 1222, when the apse was roofed, the transmarine relics deposited in the sanctuary, and the high altar consecrated.

2. The “Crypt”

Although it is not certain where, exactly, provost Theoderich laid the cornerstone, work must logically have begun with the construction of the crypt-like space below the apse, which serves as its foundation and which also extends partly under the east transept (figs. 9, 10, 27, 29). Its ground plan takes the form of an ovoid that tapers from the wider west end towards the east. The walls, some three meters thick, consist on all sides of courses of large, uncut stones of dark basalt; they were erected without a foundation, directly on the ground below. A single

---

355 Incidentally, Gall (Apsidengliederungen, 93, 110) had argued in 1915 for a start date of ca. 1210 for construction at St. Kunibert in his pioneering work on the group of late Romanesque Lower Rhenish apses. Gall did not produce any substantive evidence for this particular date beyond pointing to the roofing of the apse, which he, like Ewald, put “before 1224” (rather than 1222) and observing (like Ewald) that Theoderich’s tenure as provost of St. Kunibert spanned only the years 1200–1210 (rather than ca. 1196–1212/1216). From this, Gall concluded that the cornerstone at St. Kunibert was likely set only towards the end of Theoderich’s tenure as provost on account of the “otherwise unnecessarily long building period” that an earlier date would imply, and thereby arrived at the date of “circa 1210” for the beginning of work there. (It should also be noted here that Gall, in contrast to Ewald, correctly proceeded from the assumption that the entire church was built completely de novo and not simply renovated using older substance, an assumption that was then to be subsequently distorted through Ewald, only to be rectified by the recent excavations.) Gall’s date of ca. 1210 was then obscured the very next year by Ewald’s date of “1215” as articulated in KDM 6/4, 244 (published in 1916 but written in 1914). One suspects that Ewald’s date of “1215” achieved such wide currency in subsequent decades and became the almost universal “default date” for the start of work at St. Kunibert not because it is particularly satisfactory or well-argued, but rather because the specific forum in which it appeared—the series of catalogue-style inventories of the medieval monuments in Cologne initiated by Paul Clemen in the late 1800s, which are still widely cited and were even reprinted as recently as 1980—is easily accessible and carries an air of authority.

356 According to Karl Band, who in 1933 had been charged with making the crypt-like space accessible from the church building via stairs and was then able to examine the walls below floor level, the outer walls reached, at their deepest point, only some ten centimeters into the ground below floor level (then) and were not provided with their own foundations. These observations cannot be confirmed on account of the present floor, and thus on this point one must depend entirely on Band’s observations, as recorded in Graf’s personal correspondence with him before his death (“Ostchorbau,” 100–101, 158 n. 305, and 162 nn. 352–353).
column, composed of a shaft made of drums of sandstone and capped by a roughly hewn crocket capital with impost block, stands in the centre of the space and supports the four wide band ribs of the vault. Like the band ribs, the vault webs, arranged in circular, ring-shaped courses, consist of lighter tufa stone. A large rectangular opening in the west wall, positioned on the central axis of the space, provides access to the well shaft of the Kunibertbrunnen (fig. 9); the well shaft itself originally communicated with the east transept above (fig. 8).\footnote{The well shaft is now covered with a stone plaque (by Ellemar Hildebrand; it was added during the postwar restoration, led by Band, in 1955). As indicated in Chapter 1, the well shaft was provided with a bronze cover or encircled by some other bronze construction by the early seventeenth century, but it is now impossible to say when exactly this was installed (i.e., whether it was put in place in the early thirteenth century).} The east wall now features a small round-headed window, the sole source of light (save for the well shaft) in the entire space.\footnote{The stained glass window and the small block altar before it were both added during the 1950s restoration; see Chapter 1.}

This relatively modest, crypt-like space was not a crypt in the true sense of the term. Although the space itself might possibly have originally been accessible from the exterior of the church via the small opening in the east wall (fig. 10), which theoretically could have sufficed as an entrance, it was not accessible from the church building until 1933.\footnote{The opening in the east wall was walled in in the 1880s and then reopened by Band when the entrances to the crypt were installed in 1933 (see note 356 above). According to Band, the masonry below the window appeared—in the state in which he found it in 1933, which presumably was the original state—never to have been altered, and it is thus questionable whether the opening in the east wall was originally conceived as an entrance to the subterranean space at all but may possibly have served instead only to allow water from potential floods from the immediately adjacent Rhine into the raised substructure so as to prevent damage to the apse itself (on which function, see below, 120, with note 363). See Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 165 n. 352, who records this information from her correspondence with Band.} Nor was it conceived as a decorous cultic space, as the rough walls of basalt, itself typically used only for foundations, austere vaults, and lack of entrances from the church proper suggest.\footnote{Kubach and Verbeek, \textit{RBRM}, vol. 1, 551; see, too, Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 101.} Beyond the possible symbolic connection between the well and the legend of the Hewalds, which may very well explain why the new, thirteenth-century church building was even oriented along this
particular axis, there is not a single record in any of the extant liturgical manuscripts from the thirteenth through sixteenth centuries—or anywhere else—that would indicate that this subterranean space played a role, however limited, in the collegiate church’s liturgy or in another form of private or public devotional or cultic activity.  

The substructure was instead practical in function and its very existence a direct response to the topography of the building site. The land within the walls of the original collegiate church compound sloped off gradually towards the east (fig. 28), and the eastern reaches of the compound were, in the early thirteenth century, located precariously close to the left bank of the Rhine (fig. 85). With the decision to build a much larger church whose apse would nearly touch the east wall of the compound (figs. 23, 85), these topographical factors necessitated the erection of a substructure that would not only even out the terrain in the east vis-à-vis the rest of the building site, thus enabling the construction of the apse, but would also further elevate the apse and thereby make it less prone to damage from floods should the Rhine ever breach its banks.  

Perhaps even more important, a raised substructure was also necessary if the apse, in

---

361 The four extant processionals from the collegiate church, beginning with the earliest (Darmstadt ULB ms. 870; ca. 1300) and continuing through the three exemplars from the the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries (Darmstadt ULB mss. 513 [1458], 970 [ca. 1500], 1842 [ca. 1520]), which is where one would most expect to find an indication concerning a potential liturgical use of the “crypt,” make no mention of it.

362 While the exact distance between the apse and the east wall of the collegiate compound is not known on account of the loss of the compound walls in the nineteenth century, the earliest graphic renderings of the collegiate church, such as that in Anton Woensam’s panorama of Cologne (1531; fig. 84) and, especially, in the bird’s eye panoramas of Cologne produced by Arnold Mercator in 1571 (fig. 85) and Frans Hogenberg in 1572, all indicate clearly that the apse was positioned very close to the east wall of the compound. The accurate plan of the cloisteral buildings and collegiate church of ca. 1820 (fig. 23) likewise shows that the apse very nearly touched this wall.

363 The functional aspect of the space as a response to the physical topography of the site and to limit potential damage from flooding (a very real concern given the proximity of the Rhine) has been stressed repeatedly; see, for instance, Kubach and Verbeek, *RBRM*, vol. 1, 551; Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 100–101; and Machat, “Bauwerk,” 320. A similar substructure, also with a central column, was erected as a foundation under the apse at the parish church of St. Maria Lyskirchen (ca. 1220), also positioned precariously close to the left bank of the Rhine (fig. 22), which further underscores the pronounced utilitarian function of the “crypt” at St. Kunibert; see Kubach and Verbeek, *RBRM*, vol. 1, 554, 570, and Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 101. The decidedly functional, rather than cultic, character of the substructure under the apse at St. Kunibert is also evident in the techniques used for its construction, which have their closest parallels not in elaborate and extensive crypts (which themselves had already largely been abandoned in the Lower Rhineland by the mid-twelfth century), but instead in the modest and austere cellars of contemporary
line with its exalted liturgical and cultic role as the sanctuary, was to occupy the highest spatial and semantic plane in the church building. The substructure raised the apse above the east transept, the canons’ choir in the first nave bay, and the west transept (figs. 27 and 31).

Symbolic and mundanely practical considerations were, then, equally operative in the construction of the “crypt.”

3. The Apse: Plan, Elevation, Structure

With the completion of the substructure, construction turned to the apse and the east transept. Though the physical and contextual evidence indicates that the apse and east transept were designed and built together, the complicated historiography of the attempts to discern the architectural sources for their design prohibits treating the east end as a single structural unit within the space of a chapter. Thus, the apse and the east transept are examined here in separate chapters with a view to reconsidering their architectural sources and to assessing their relationship to these sources. The reciprocal influence of the two parts of the east end during the design process both in the interior and on the exterior, however, will be stressed throughout both chapters.

In the interior, the apse (fig. 35) is a perfect half circle, approximately 9 meters wide and 4.5 meters deep.\(^{364}\) Measuring 19.2 meters from floor level to the pointed apex of the semi-

---

\(^{364}\) The apse measures 8.65 m in width along the chord (author’s measurement). The presence of the high altar prevents detailed measurement of the inner radius of the apse from the chord to the east. The approximate measurement of 4.5 m cited above (from the chord of the apse to the outermost plane of the lower arcade—i.e., not to the rear wall) is derived from KDM 6/4, 257 fig. 135. Measurements taken by the author at St. Kunibert and elsewhere will be noted in the following; otherwise, they are based on the plans and cross-sections in the KDM volumes (see “List of Abbreviations”) and will be signalled accordingly.

---
dome, it consists of two stories of nearly equal height; the lower storey is approximately one meter taller than the upper when the semi-dome is excluded. Both stories feature an arcade of five arches of equal width. In the lower storey, the western ends of the two outermost arches rest on the moulded impost blocks of austere piers, while four elaborate freestanding column bundles support the rest of the arcade (fig. 36). The lightly tapered, monumental column bundles, which sit on Attic bases atop short socles and thin plinths, consist of three separate, three-quarter column shafts that are grouped together around a rectangular “core” (only visible from the rear) such that they appear from the front as a bundle (figs. 40, 41). The column shafts are composite creations: whereas the central shaft, emphasized with a shaft ring, is of polished black slate, the two flanking shafts and the rectangular core between them and to which the central shaft is attached are made of trachyte, a more common, light gray stone that was also typically used in the Lower Rhineland (as it was throughout St. Kunibert) for articulating such structural elements as piers and transverse arches. Like the shafts of the column bundles that they crown, the crocket capitals (fig. 42), hewn from a single block of stone, are also both very much independent, with each distinctly assigned to a column shaft, and yet fused into a bundle in such a way that their foliate decoration, in the manner of a frieze, wraps uniformly around each face, including the long, flat rear face (fig. 43). The form of the T-shaped impost blocks follows the disposition of the bases, shafts, and capitals below. From them spring the sprandrels

---

365 The height of the lower arcade from floor level to the intrados of the arches is ca. 7 m; the upper arcade measures around 6 m from the floor level of the upper walkway to the intrados of the arches. Hence, the difference of approximately one meter in the height of the column bundles: ca. 5.5 m (lower storey) and ca. 4.5 m (upper storey). Dimensions from KDM 6/4, Taf. XIX.

366 On trachyte as a building material in the Lower Rhineland, see Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 4, 547. The specific form of the column shafts in the lower apse arcade is consistently misrepresented in the published cross-sections of the church, including the standard cross-section published in KDM 6/4, Taf. XIX (my fig. 27), which shows shaft rings on all three shafts and depicts the columns as perfectly straight. In reality, only the foremost shaft of the bundles in the lower storey has a shaft ring, and the column shafts taper slightly but perceptibly from the base to the capital (cf. fig. 40). The polychromy on the column bundles, capitals, and arches has no basis in actual finds and stems, like all of the architectural polychromy in the church, from the postwar restoration.
of the lower arcade, executed entirely in finely dressed ashlar blocks of trachyte (figs. 36, 42).

The double-order arches in the arcade are stepped such that the wider projecting outer plane comes to rest on the wider front column shaft with its broader capital, while the intrados of the thinner recessed archivolts, each with a tube-like pendant keystone (trilobed on the central axis), sits on the two thinner flanking columns and their narrower capitals. The eminently logical arrangement of the various planes of the arches vis-à-vis the supporting column bundles below is counteracted to a certain extent by the robust nook rolls that line each arch, the ends of which rest somewhat inorganically on the remaining space of the impost with no apparent relationship to either the capitals or the column shafts below.

The freestanding lower arcade stands approximately one meter in front of the rear wall of the apse. In place of a single solid wall, the lower storey of the apse has thus been split into two distinct “layers” or “shells,” the freestanding, open arcade and the solid rear wall, which are separated from each other by a narrow, vaulted walkway (figs. 36, 43)—what German-language scholarship on late Romanesque architecture in the Lower Rhineland typically characterizes with the term Zweischaligkeit (literally, “two-layeredness” or “two-shelledness”) and what English-language scholarship, in other contexts, generally describes with the term thick-wall structure. The walkway is vaulted with abbreviated tunnel vaults, one per arch, that bridge the space between the rear wall of the apse and the rear face of the arcade (fig. 43); rather than aligning directly with the arches, the tunnel vaults are positioned in such a way that the

---

367 The width of the lower walkway, measured from the rear face of the rearmost shafts of the column bundles to the foremost plane of the niched rear wall, ranges from 89–99 cm (author’s measurements).

368 The are several English equivalents for the German term Zweischaligkeit (and the related adjective zweisehlig), including “thick-wall structure” or “thick-wall passage,” both derived from the French mur épais, or “double wall,” all of which are used in the context of Anglo-Norman architecture in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries as well as for Gothic architecture in Northern Europe. Of these, the conventional appellation “thick-wall structure” is employed in the following to refer to a walkway contained within the thickness of a wall. See the canonical study of the phenomenon by Jean Bony, “La technique normande du mur épais à l’époque romane,” Bulletin Monumental 98 (1939): 153–188.
intradoses of the arches hang down below them and thus largely conceal them when the arcade is seen head on (fig. 36). Behind the column bundles, the tunnel vaults are bisected by steeply pointed arches that run perpendicular to them, with the half of the arch nearest the arcade resting on the narrow ledge furnished by the rear of the impost block and the other half on a small console in the rear wall of the apse (fig. 43). Here, behind the column bundles, the rear wall follows the line of the half circle of the apse (fig. 26). The portions of rear wall between the column bundles, by contrast, are occupied by wide, flat niches in the form of a segmental arch \textit{(Muldennischen)}. Their outer edges follow the contours of the arches in the arcade before them, thereby engendering a complex succession of spaces leading from the plane of the freestanding arcade through the meter-wide walkway and into the large niches in the rear wall, which appear to billow out and away from the apse (fig. 36). A small round-headed window occupies the upper half of each of the five niches.

Separated from the lower storey by a string course moulding that circumscribes the entire apse, the upper storey (fig. 37) displays much the same structural and decorative system as the lower, but also introduces several important variations. The arcade again consists of five arches supported on column bundles with three shafts grouped around a rectangular core (again, only visible from the back), which likewise rests on slightly raised socles and which are also capped with a bundle of three distinct yet unified capitals and a T-shaped impost block that repeats their form. Here, however, the column shafts—now shorter and more slender than those in the lower storey—are all of the same material, namely trachyte, and are identical in form. The western ends of the two outermost arches, moreover, do not rest on piers as they do in the lower storey, but sit instead on the east edge of an impost block that crowns a pair of engaged columns. As in the lower storey, the arches of the upper arcade are double-ordered, with the
projecting outer face resting on the front column shaft and the intrados of the recessed archivolt resting on the two flanking column shafts in the same logical fashion. The arches are also lined with robust nook rolls whose ends rest equally inorganically in the corners of the T-shaped impost blocks. Here, however, the spandrels of the arcade are not only stilted and thus slightly taller than in the lower storey, but both the nook rolls and the outermost plane of the arcade have been pulled upwards from the round recessed archivolt to form slightly pointed, almost parabolic, arches that cut into the masonry of the semi-dome. The upper storey of the apse is also constructed with thick-wall structure (fig. 44), with the arcade separated from rear wall by a narrow walkway identical in width to that in the lower storey. It also features the same distinctive system of vaulting over the walkway, with a truncated tunnel vault linking the rear wall with the rear face of the arcade in each of the five arches. As in the lower storey, the intradoses of the arches also hang down slightly below the tunnel vaults, which are again bisected behind each column bundle by a steeply pointed arch that rests on the rear edge of the impost blocks and on consoles in the rear wall of the apse. The large niches of the lower storey have, however, been abandoned in the upper storey, giving way to massive round-headed stained glass windows that consume nearly the entire expanse of the rear wall (fig. 37). Thus, only minimal masonry is reserved between the windows behind the column bundles; the apex of each window not only extends upwards to reach the apex of the arch in the arcade in front, but its sill stands just above the floor of the walkway such that it is barely visible, and sometimes completely invisible, when seen from any vantage point. The outer edges of the chamfered

---

369 The form of the arches in both stories is grossly misrepresented in the standard cross-section of the church (my fig. 27). The outer faces of the arches in the lower storey are only very slightly, almost imperceptibly, pointed (fig. 36)—not fully pointed as they are in the cross-section—and the arches in the upper arcade (fig. 37) are in reality likewise nowhere near as steeply pointed as the cross-section shows them to be.

370 The upper walkway ranges in width from 76–97 cm (from the rear shafts of the bundles to the rear wall; author’s measurements).
window surrounds follow the contours of the arches of the arcade, which thus form a series of individual frames for the stained glass windows in the rear wall behind.

The apse is vaulted with a monumental, smooth semi-dome that springs unmediated from the stilted spandrels of the upper arcade and terminates in a pointed apex (fig. 38). To the west, the semi-dome runs up against a very narrow tunnel vault that serves to buttress it towards the crossing in the east transept (figs. 27, 38). Slightly taller than the semi-dome and terminating like it in a pointed apex, the tunnel vault itself forms part of the very narrow rectangular forechoir bay between the apse and the crossing (German: Vorchorjoch). Structurally, the forechoir bay effectively functions to link the apse to the crossing and east transept; its narrow tunnel vault buttresses the western circumference of the apse semi-dome and counteracts the thrust of the taller crossing vault to the west. Strictly speaking, this miniscule bay consists of the narrow section of recessed wall found between the eastern crossing piers to the west, which rise up uninterrupted to support the eastern transverse arch of the crossing vault, and the piers and pairs of engaged columns at the western edges of the lower and upper arcades of the apse, which, by dint of their inclusion within its elevation and within the circumference of the semicircle, belong to the apse proper. As in the apse, the string course moulding, running continuously from the apse into this small bay and breaking off abruptly once it reaches the eastern crossing pier, divides the forechoir bay into two stories. On the north flank (fig. 45), the relic niche occupies the lower third of the lower storey. Above it, a tall niche rises and terminates in a pointed arch with pendant keystone; here, the springing of the arch is marked on each side with a round, console-like protrusion that mimics the position and silhouette of an impost block. The upper storey of the forechoir bay (fig. 46) picks up on the lower, repeating the motif of the pointed arch with pendant keystone, here in the form of a blind arch with a flat,
as opposed to niched, rear wall and without the round protrusions at the springing of the arch (rendered moot by the presence of actual impost blocks at precisely this level to either side); the tiny pointed arch here cuts into the masonry of the narrow tunnel vault over the forechoir bay. The south wall (fig. 47) displays the same elevation, the sole difference being the lower third of the lower storey of the forechoir bay, which is here filled by a fifteenth-century tabernacle. 

Although they are narrower than the arches in the apse arcade and are technically blind arches, both the upper and lower arches in the forechoir bay terminate on approximately the same level as the latter. The lower arches, in particular, are constructed using the same fine ashlar blocks of trachyte with pendant keystones as in the apse, and thus directly parallel the form and material of the arches of the immediately neighbouring lower apse arcade, while their large niched walls mirror the broad niches in the rear wall of the lower storey of the apse (fig. 45). Though it is an independent bay in structural terms, the forechoir bay subtly replicates the elevation of the apse arcades, thereby establishing visual unity with the apse and functioning as a conceptual extension of it.\(^{371}\)

The apse at St. Kunibert stands firmly within the series of apses that was erected in Cologne and the Lower Rhineland in the second half of the twelfth century and the first four decades of the thirteenth. Its specific position within this tight group of monuments has long seemed clear-cut and well-defined. Since Gall’s pioneering study of the late Romanesque apses in the Lower Rhineland, the east apse in the trefoil choir of the collegiate church of St. Aposteln in Cologne (figs. 175, 178), usually dated to around 1200 but perhaps slightly earlier, has been

\(^{371}\) Meyer-Barkhausen (Kirchenbaukunst, 55) hinted at this aspect of the forechoir bay at St. Kunibert when he cast it—in thoroughly derogatory terms, however—as “nothing more than a dull continuation of the apse” (“. . . so stellt es [i.e., the forechoir bay] in St. Kunibert nur eine flaue Verlängerung der Apsis dar”).
regarded as the primary architectural model for the apse at St. Kunibert. With its two-storey elevation, nitched rear wall with small windows in the lower storey, and walkway with an arcade supported on pairs of columns set into robust trapezoidal piers in the upper, the east apse at St. Aposteln, it has been assumed, contained all of the features necessary for the design of the apse at St. Kunibert. The apse at St. Kunibert, scholars after Gall have reasoned, simply represents the “logical development” of ideas that are thought to be latent at St. Aposteln, above all the use of thick-wall structure. The two most salient divergences in the apse at St. Kunibert from St. Aposteln, the use of thick-wall structure in the lower storey and the freestanding column bundles composed of three shafts as supports in both stories, have thus been read as manifestations of immanent architectural “progress” in a teleological formal development. In this hermeneutic model, the walkway in the lower storey at St. Kunibert constitutes the “logical” next step: it was only a matter of time before the thick-wall structure in the upper storey at St. Aposteln would be extended to the lower storey in a Lower Rhenish apse as well. Likewise,
the freestanding column bundles with three shafts grouped around an (invisible) rectangular core
have been read as the “logical,” more advanced development of the earlier, “primitive” column
“bundles” of double colonnettes encased in trapezoidal piers found at St. Aposteln—the
masonry pier has simply been reduced and largely concealed with the additional, foremost shaft
at St. Kunibert.\textsuperscript{375} The occurrence of these same divergences—namely, thick-wall structure in
the lower storey and column bundles consisting of three shafts (here only in the upper storey)—
in the trefoil choir of the church of St. Quirinus in nearby Neuss (figs. 25, 229) apparently more
or less contemporaneously with their appearance in the apse at St. Kunibert seemingly only
confirms this picture of inexorable architectural “progress” from St. Aposteln. Positioned
beside each other, the apse at St. Kunibert and the trefoil choir in Neuss have, since the 1950s,
been figured as parallel but independent manifestations of the same “developmental” or
“stylistic phase” (\textit{Entwicklungsstufe, Stilstufe}) in this same teleology of progressive stylistic
development from St. Aposteln east.\textsuperscript{376}

That the trefoil choir at St. Aposteln has come to be widely regarded as the architectural
model for the apse at St. Kunibert is hardly surprising. With its centralizing plan of three

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{375}{\textsuperscript{Cf.}, for instance, Barbknecht, \textit{Fensterformen}, 136–137.}
\footnotetext{376}{\textsuperscript{Thus, for instance, Meyer-Barkhausen, \textit{Kirchenbaukunst}, 55: “Am deutlichsten zeigt sich die parallele
Entwicklungsstufe mit Neuß in der Apsisgliederung [at St. Kunibert], die ebenso wie in St. Quirin durch einen
Laufgang nicht nur im Ober-, sondern auch im Untergeschoß gekennzeichnet ist, also durch die konsequente
Ausdehnung der Zweischaligkeit auch auf das Untergeschoß . . . .”; Héliot, “Coursières,” 212–213: “A Neuß, à St.-
Cunibert [ . . . ] on evida le mur du rez-de-chaussée, en remplacant la ceinture de niches par un étroit portique
réservé dans la maçinerie, plus ou moins similaire de celui du dessus, mais limité à l’hémicycle et fermé à chaque
zweischaligen Wandaufbau die Dreikonchenanlage von St. Aposteln voraus, die jedoch hier folgerichtig
weitergebildet ist, in dem die Zweischaligkeit auch auf das Untergeschoss ausgedehnt und in dieser
Entwicklungstufe dem Chor des St. Quirinsmünsters in Neuß vergleichbar ist”; and, most recently, Kubach and
Verbeek, \textit{RBRM}, vol. 4, 417–418: “Man könnte es als innere Zwangsläufigkeit ansehen und dadurch in
Vorstellungen ‘logischen’ Entwicklungsablaufes bestärkt werden, wenn man beobachtet, daß mehrfach der
Laufgang vom oberen Geschoß der Apsis auf das untere übergreift. In St. Kunibert/Köln und in Neuß geschieht
erkennen kann, wird nicht weiter verfolgt.”}
\end{footnotes}
conches grouped around a crossing with an octagonal lantern and its harmonious proportions (fig. 178), the choir at St. Aposteln has long enjoyed exalted status within scholarship on late Romanesque architecture in the Holy Roman Empire. It is routinely characterized as “one of the most important architectural creations of the Middle Ages” and accordingly cast as the canonical “paradigm” or “epitome” of Lower Rhenish late Romanesque architecture, made, since the earliest decades of the twentieth century, a metonym for an entire era of architectural production both in Cologne (fig. 181) and in the Holy Roman Empire as a whole (fig. 182). Superlatives are, and have never been, in short supply in descriptions of St. Aposteln. In his formative study, Gall, working under the (incorrect) supposition that the trefoil choir of St. Aposteln predated that at Groß St. Martin (fig. 208), went so far as to label the east apse at St. Aposteln the *Urbild* of all later Lower Rhenish apses. Although he worked with the proper succession of monuments, with St. Aposteln coming after Groß St. Martin, Werner Meyer-Barkhausen did little to change this picture in his still highly influential monograph on the “great century of church building in Cologne” (*Das große Jahrhundert kölnischer Kirchenbaukunst 1150–1250*; 1952). In fact, he only concretized it further when he cast Groß St. Martin and St. Aposteln as proponents of two different, conflicting *Kunstwollen*, and

---


378 On the trefoil choir of St. Aposteln as the “epitome of Rhenish late Romanesque” in twentieth-century scholarship, see Overdick, *Architektursystem*, 34. It almost goes without saying that St. Aposteln was selected (by the mostly German-speaking organizers) to represent late Romanesque architecture in the Rhineland as a whole when this—to that point still largely unfamiliar—material was first presented to a broad, unspecialized Anglo-American audience at the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s seminal *The Year 1200* exhibition in 1970; see *The Year 1200*, ed. Konrad Hoffmann and Florens Deuchler, exh. cat. (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1970) 2: no. 19: “The church is an excellent example of Rhenish architecture around 1200.”

proceeded to discuss St. Kunibert, and not just the apse but the entire edifice from east to west, exclusively through the lens of St. Aposteln.  

While the importance of St. Aposteln’s trefoil choir as an architectural monument can hardly be denied, it is justifiable to ask whether the modern scholarly construction of it as the canonical “paradigm” or “epitome” of late Romanesque architecture in Cologne has attributed far more importance to it as the only “logical” or “conceivable” model than it actually possessed for the design of the apse at St. Kunibert. It does not automatically follow that, because St. Aposteln appears today to represent the most exciting and dynamic example of late Romanesque architecture in Cologne, it held a similarly powerful sway over contemporaries, directly shaping all architectural production in Cologne its wake. Even a cursory comparison of the apse at St. Kunibert with the east end at St. Aposteln suggests that the chapter at St. Kunibert was, if not wholly unimpressed, not particularly taken by the design of trefoil choir. Thus, beyond certain superficial commonalities, such as the broad, flat niches in the rear wall of the lower storey, the walkway in the upper storey, and the basic two-part elevation, the apses in the choir at St. Aposteln and the apse at St. Kunibert have very little in common. In fact, the manifest differences far outweigh any apparent similarities. Not only does St. Kunibert feature thick-wall structure in the lower storey in place of a solid rear wall and freestanding column bundles with three shafts in both stories instead of the pair of engaged colonnettes (lower) and two colonnettes inserted into a trapezoidal pier (upper) found at St. Aposteln, but it differs markedly from St. Aposteln in plan, with the arcades of St. Kunibert’s apse consisting of five narrow arches and those in the apses at St. Aposteln of only three much broader ones. Nor do the lower

---

and upper walkways at St. Kunibert replicate the highly idiosyncratic system of vaulting found in the upper walkway at St. Aposteln, where the walkways are not so much vaulted as the arcade and the solid piers that support it are hollowed out of the immense thickness of the rear wall of the apses, almost forming Muldennischen around the small clerestory windows (cf. figs. 44 and 179). Nor does the miniscule and unassuming forechoir bay at St. Kunibert (fig. 27) even remotely resemble the broad, expansive forechoir bay at St. Aposteln (fig. 177) with its plain, unarticulated wall in the lower storey and thick-wall upper storey composed of two freestanding arcades that have, as it were, been stacked one upon the other. Nor, finally, does the apse at St. Kunibert (fig. 35) replicate the carefully balanced, “classical” proportions of St. Aposteln (fig. 178). Although the apses in both are equal in width and depth (each approximately 9 by 4.5 meters), the upper and lower stories (excluding the semi-dome) are the same height at St. Aposteln, whereas the lower storey at St. Kunibert is perceptibly taller than the upper, as is evident in the differing heights of the column bundles.\footnote{The lower storey at St. Aposteln measures approximately 6.8 m (from floor level to the string course), and the upper storey 6.8 m (from the floor of the upper walkway to the apex of the arches); at St. Kunibert, the lower storey is approximately 8.8 m tall and the upper, at 7.8 m (also to the apex of the arches), a full meter shorter. Dimensions based on KDM 6/4, Taf. XIII (St. Aposteln) and Taf. XIX (St. Kunibert).} If the triconch at St. Aposteln does not adequately account for all, or even most, of the distinctive features in the apse at St. Kunibert, then what does?

The scholarly privileging of St. Aposteln has meant that other, equally important if less spectacular (to modern eyes) contemporary building projects in Cologne have receded in the background, resulting in a distortion of the picture of the larger architectural context in the city in the period leading up to the construction of the east end at St. Kunibert. The apse at St. Kunibert is only one of two apses that were erected in Cologne during the first two decades of the thirteenth century after the construction of the trefoil choir at St. Aposteln. The other is the
east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol, the collegiate church of a convent of canonesses (figs. 187–190). The building and restoration history of the east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol are complex and inextricably intertwined with the earlier construction phases in the east end of the convent church. Both need to be addressed here in detail in a brief excursus in order to grasp the full significance of the early-thirteenth-century apse at St. Maria im Kapitol, a structure that has, despite its importance, received scant scholarly attention, precisely because of the exalted status of St. Aposteln. In order to fully understand the development of the apse in late Romanesque Cologne and St. Kunibert’s position within these developments, we must understand not only the half of the picture represented by St. Aposteln, but also the second half represented by St. Maria im Kapitol.

The east end of St. Maria im Kapitol, a key work of eleventh-century architecture, is the earliest of the three extant trefoil east ends in Cologne, followed by Groß St. Martin and St. Aposteln. Begun under Abbess Ida (ca. 1027–1060) and complete by 1065, the trefoil choir (figs. 188 and 191) originally consisted of three identical conches arranged around a square crossing. The apses of the conches were each separated from the crossing by a forechoir bay and another rectangular bay positioned adjacent to the crossing. All three apses were two-storied in elevation, with the lower storey consisting of a freestanding arcade of monolithic tapered columns on short socles and with cushion capitals; the solid upper storey wall of each was originally pierced with round-headed clerestory windows. The arcade of the apses proper

---


comprised five arches in the lower storey, while the upper storey contained only three clerestory windows. The forechoir bay before the apse consisted in the lower storey of a true, open arch like those in the adjacent apses; the upper storey of this bay was left unarticulated. Each apse was vaulted with a semi-dome. Spacious ambulatories, vaulted with groin vaults like the side aisles of the slightly earlier nave (likely completed by 1049) and conceived spatially as an extension of them into and around the entire east end, encircled the lower storey of each of the three conches.  

The choir at St. Maria im Kapitol was subjected to a series of renovation campaigns beginning in the second half of the twelfth century. Work focused first on the crossing and north and south conches, which were modified circa 1150. The final, and in the present context most important, renovation campaign entailed an almost complete reworking of the east conch, which had been passed over during the mid-twelfth-century renovation campaigns. Here, the convent of St. Maria im Kapitol looked directly to the new trefoil choir at St. Aposteln (fig. 178) in seeking to update the mid-eleventh-century east apse with the most recent trends in apse design, namely, a clerestory zone with thick-wall structure in the interior and (fig. 189) and dwarf’s gallery on the exterior (fig. 192), most likely recruiting a workshop of masons from St. Aposteln for the project. On account of the close dependence of the design of the exterior and

---

384 The nave was in all likelihood complete by the consecration of the Cross altar, located in the easternmost nave bay directly before the crossing, in 1049 by Pope Leo IX; see Krings, “St. Maria im Kapitol,” 347.
385 Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 565; Krings, “St. Maria im Kapitol,” 357. In this first renovation campaign, the timber roof of the crossing was replaced with a dome and those of the three bays immediately adjacent to it with tunnel vaults, and the upper stories in both the north and the south apses completely rebuilt, each now with five windows and a blind arcade that extended into the upper storey of the forechoir bay. A second, minor, campaign, perhaps slightly later than the first, was directed at the exterior walls of the crypt and lower storey of the east conch, which were both shored up with substantial blind arcades (fig. 192).
386 Krings, “St. Maria im Kapitol,” 357. Only the exterior wall of the lower storey seems to have been reworked in the renovations around 1150 (see note 385).
387 Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbaukunst, 45; Krings, “St. Maria im Kapitol,” 357. Meyer-Barkhausen’s suggestion concerning the involvement of a master mason from the workshop responsible for the east end of St. Aposteln in the rebuilding of the east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol is very conceivable in view of the wide-reaching
interior of the upper storey of the east apse on St. Aposteln (choir usually dated ca. 1200), the renovation of the east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol is generally dated circa 1200–1210.\footnote{Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbaukunst, 44 (“in die Zeit um 1200 zu datieren”); Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 566 (“etwa 1200/1210”); Kriings, “St. Maria im Kapitol,” (“im ersten Jahrzehnt des 13 Jh.s”).} Textual or other evidence that would enable a more precise dating than this for the campaign does not survive.\footnote{The dating of the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol to “circa 1200–1210” depends on the date of the choir at St. Aposteln, which is itself not absolutely certain. As indicated above (see note 372), the choir at St. Aposteln is usually placed around 1200. The beginning of construction there is often tied to a fire that is supposed to have ravaged the collegiate church in 1192. As the account of the fire is questionable, it is possible that work at St. Aposteln began somewhat earlier than 1192, perhaps even in the 1180s. Nonetheless, the scale of the project, and the stylistic links between it and other firmly dated structures that appear to be based in part on aspects of it (such as the west choir hall in Xanten, ca. 1185/1190–1213), means that a date for its completion by around 1200 still remains likely. Accordingly, the reworking of the east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol could conceivably have begun somewhat earlier than 1200 while the choir at St. Aposteln was going up, but it is also plausible that the renovation campaign only began after the choir at St. Aposteln was fully complete (hence, too, the availability of a workshop of masons from there). At any rate, it is unlikely that the reworked east conch was complete much earlier than circa 1200, and thus the standard date of circa 1200–1210 still represents the most plausible range of dates for the structure, even if it is ultimately a scholarly construct.} Nor are the precise circumstances that occasioned the reworking of the east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol at this particular moment known.\footnote{To my knowledge, this question has never been raised as far as the east conch is concerned. For its part, the reworking of the crossing and north and south conches at St. Maria im Kapitol around the middle of the twelfth century is sometimes thought to have been occasioned either by the fire that ravaged Cologne in 1150 (the same fire which is also usually supposed to have brought about the construction of the choir at Groß St. Martin; see note 372) or, as is perhaps more likely, increasing structural damage arising from the erection of the massive trefoil choir on sloping and unstable land: see Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 565, and Kriings, “St. Maria im Kapitol,” 357.} Concerns about the stability of the original east conch were likely not operative here, for the addition of thick-wall structure in the upper storey, just as much as the daring decisions to erect a single cupola over the space occupied by the foreshoar bay and the bay next to the crossing (figs. 187, 188) and to support it with flying buttresses on the exterior (fig. 192), were certainly not conducive to ensuring that the east end would continue to stand.\footnote{Thus, Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 566: “Statische Gründe waren diesmal kaum der Anlaß, da der Umbau starke neue und nicht unbedenkliche Belastungen brachte.”} Whatever the exact case may have been, conscious

similarities both in the individual forms and the techniques used in the two apses. The exterior of the reworked east conch, for instance, followed St. Aposteln quite closely, down to specific details such as the way in which the dwarf’s gallery and the plate frieze that adorned it extended beyond the apse proper to encompass the (lost) flanking round tower on the north side of the conch as well, as at St. Aposteln. This aspect of the reworked east conch is clearly recorded in the representation of the east end of St. Maria im Kapitol in Woensam’s panorama of 1531 (fig. 194). See, on this point, Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbaukunst, 44–45, and Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 566.
imitatio of what was probably perceived as cutting-edge architectural design at St. Aposteln was likely a determinate factor in the convent’s decision to rework the east apse using this particular architectural model.

The reworking of the east conch brought about fundamental structural and aesthetic changes that set it apart from the other two conches that had been renovated circa 1150. Probably for reasons both economic and structural, the broad groin-vaulted ambulatory and the freestanding arcade of monolithic columns in front of it from the original conch were retained when the east conch was reworked, as they had been in the earlier renovation of the north and south conches (fig. 187). The structure of the lower storey of the east conch was, however, modified significantly in two ways. First, the two westernmost columns of the apse arcade in the lower storey were converted into substantial rectangular piers (figs. 187, 189). Whereas in the original east conch the division between the lower apse arcade and the slightly recessed forechoir bay was largely unclear because the last column of the apse arcade also doubled as the eastern support of the arch in the forechoir bay (fig. 191), the placement of a solid rectangular pier in this position now divided the apse proper, with its arcade of five arches, emphatically from the forechoir bay to the west (fig. 187). As a consequence, the forechoir bay itself emerged as a distinct bay as well, with its lower storey still consisting of the open arch from the original forechoir bay. A second consequence was that the western ends of the two outermost arches of the lower apse arcade no longer rested on round columns, but instead directly on the impost blocks on top of these two rectangular piers at the chord of the apse. The second modification to the original lower arcade stemmed directly from the decision to add thick-wall

392 Kubach and Verbeek, *RBRM*, vol. 1, 566, and Krings, “St. Maria im Kapitol,” 357. As both Kubach/Verbeek and Krings observe, this measure was probably taken on account of the decision to erect a single stone cupola over the forechoir bay and the bay next to the crossing (fig. 188).
structure in the upper storey of the apse. In order to provide a larger surface for the walkway than the crown of the narrow wall of the original arcade would have afforded, the lower arcade was made thicker through the addition of a projecting layer of masonry to its front face (figs. 187, 189, 190).  

The design of the new upper storey of the east apse both responded to the model furnished by St. Aposteln and departed from it in several respects on account of the parameters set by the decision to retain the original lower storey with its arcade and ambulatory (cf. figs. 178 and 190). That decision meant that the freestanding arcade in the upper storey of the east apse, following the disposition of the lower apse arcade, consisted of five arches rather than the three found at St. Aposteln.  

In the specific combination of pairs of colonnettes on tall socles, the supports in the upper apse arcade at St. Maria im Kapitol nonetheless closely followed those in the upper storey at St. Aposteln. Seriously constricted by the narrow crown of the arcade in the lower storey, the architect at St. Maria in Kapitol, however, omitted large piers behind the colonnettes like those at St. Aposteln in order to gain more space for the walkway behind them, and in so doing created column “bundles” of freestanding double colonnettes. Thus, through the particular confluence of old and new at St. Maria im Kapitol, both the lower and upper stories of the reworked east apse now featured walkways fronted by freestanding arcades of five arches supported on columnar supports, single (lower) and pairs (upper) (fig. 189).

The same strict division between the apse arcade proper and the forechoir bay encountered in reworked lower storey of the east conch is also evident in the upper. Whereas in the original east conch the division between the forechoir bay and the upper storey of the apse

---

393 Gall, Apsidengliederungen, 80–81; Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbautkunst, 44–45; Krings, “St. Maria im Kapitol,” 357.
394 Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbautkunst, 45.
395 Gall, Apsidengliederungen, 81; Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbautkunst, 45.
396 Gall, Apsidengliederungen, 81; Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbautkunst, 45.
proper was left almost totally undefined (fig. 191), a substantial pier clearly marked the junction between the apse and the forechoir bay in the upper storey of the reworked east conch, as did the new rectangular pier directly below it in the lower storey (figs. 187, 190). A pair of colonnettes, stepped back slightly from the front face of the pier and standing on tall socles like the column bundles in the apse, adorned the eastern and western sides of each pier, with the colonnette facing the apse serving to support the western ends of the outermost arches of the upper apse arcade and the other one half of the blind arch that spanned the width of the forechoir bay (fig. 187). A second, lone colonnette, on a tall socle like all the others, supported the other half of the blind arch in the forechoir bay, whose rear wall was also pierced with a large window with the same form and dimensions as those in apse clerestory. With the true, open arch in the lower storey (inherited from the original arcade) and the blind arch framed by colonnettes on tall socles in the upper with its window mirroring those in the rear wall of the apse, the elevation of the reworked forechoir bay replicated the elevation of the adjacent east apse, appearing like an extension of it, without, however, losing its status as an independent bay in both structural and spatial terms.

The reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol of circa 1200–1210 was, along with the rest of the trefoil choir, heavily damaged in the Allied bombing of Cologne (fig. 189). It was never rebuilt, falling victim not only to the ravages of war but also to the puricist tenets of Denkmalpflege in Cologne in the 1950s and 1960s, which sought above all to return damaged monuments to their “original” state, often bypassing the then negatively-perceived accretions of later centuries, both medieval and modern.397 In the case of the choir, these postwar paradigms

---

397 See the excellent historiographical essay on the reconstruction of Cologne’s Romanesque churches in Christoph Machat, Der Wiederaufbau der Kölner Kirchen, Landeskonservator Rheinland, Arbeitshefte 40 (Cologne: Rheinland Verlag, 1987), 9–25, here esp. 14–18. In addition to additions and renovations made in later building
of reconstruction meant that the extant remains of the reworked east conch (fig. 189) were, after suffering a further collapse in 1948 (fig. 193), razed down to the level of the eleventh-century lower arcade and the upper storey of the east conch reconstructed not as it appeared circa 1210, but instead entirely on the model of the well-preserved south conch in order to reflect, together with the other two conches, the interior and exterior of the putative “original,” eleventh-century triconch (fig. 195).\textsuperscript{398}

Literally erased from the monumental record in the 1950s, the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol has since been largely forgotten as an architectural monument in its own right.\textsuperscript{399} A direct, causal connection between the conscious deletion of the reworked east conch campaigns, both later medieval and early modern, much later but equally important (historically-speaking) additions, such as the extensive nineteenth-century historicist decoration or furnishings that were to be found in practically all of the Romanesque churches in Cologne before World War II, were not prized after the War and no effort was made to reconstruct these aspects of the churches either. Though profoundly traumatic, the extensive damage to Cologne’s Romanesque churches was, to a certain extent, almost “welcomed” in the sense that it represented an opportunity to purge them of what were considered, in the 1950s, to be the extremely intrusive and “tastless” historicist modifications to which these buildings had been subjected over the course of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

\textsuperscript{398} See Machat, \textit{Wiederaufbau}, 17. The church of St. Maria im Kapitol is the paradigmatic example of puristic postwar reconstruction practices in Cologne and the authority in charge of its reconstruction—Willy Weyres (1903–1989), Dom- und Diözesanbaumeister of the archicocese of Cologne—the main exponent of these practices. Despite plans presented by the consulting architects that recommended the reconstruction of the east conch as it had stood ca. 1200–1210, or a more or less historically accurate recreation of the lost prewar state of the east end, Weyres ultimately decided to take an entirely different course, electing instead to rebuild the entire choir to reflect the eleventh-century “original.” Weyres thus took the extant south conch as the basis for the other two conches, reconstructing them all according to it. Here, Weyres retained the pointed blind arches around the clerestory windows found in south conch (fig. 187)—themselves only added when the clerestory windows of the north and south conches were enlarged in the late Middle Ages—and used them in the reconstructed north and east conches.

In the east conch, however, these pointed arches had never been used, precisely on account of the rework of the east conch ca. 1200–1210, and thus Weyres, in his pursuit of the “original” trefoil choir, actually “recreated” a historical situation that never existed (fig. 195). In the case of the nave, Weyres chose not to rebuild the sexpartite rib vaults that had been added to it ca. 1240 and instead reconstructed the nave with a timber roof to reflect the appearance of the eleventh-century church. Thus, here, too, another major aspect of the \textit{longue durée} building history of the church—one of seminal importance as far as the reception of the sexpartite rib vault in the Lower Rhineland in the first half of the thirteenth century is concerned—was effaced. See the criticisms of the postwar rebuilding project at St. Maria im Kapitol in Dethard von Winterfeld, “Gedanken zum Wiederaufbau von St. Marien im Kapitol und St. Kunibert, Köln,” \textit{Kunstchronik} 38 (July 1985): 284: “Als der Lettner [at St. Maria im Kapitol, itself added in the early sixteenth century] ca. 350 Jahre vor der Vierung stand, war das Mittelsegment gewölbt und der Ostchor staufisch verändert, eine Epoche, die getilgt wurde [by Weyres] und nun als zeitliche Lücke in die Geschichte klafft. Ein völliges neues, museales Arrangement ist entstanden.”

\textsuperscript{399} Though the reworked east conch has sometimes been mentioned fleetingly since the 1950s (for instance, by Héliot [“Coursières,” 213], Kubach and Verbeek [\textit{RBRM}, vol. 1, 566, and vol. 4, 417], and Krings [“St. Maria im
from the monumental landscape for the sake of the new, “original” east conch and the scholarly neglect of the reworked conch from the early postwar period into the present is not unlikely. Nor did the reworked east conch fare well in the little scholarship that was devoted to it when it still stood in the first half of the twentieth century. Meyer-Barkhausen was hardly impartial in his assessment of its artistic merit vis-à-vis St. Aposteln, noting that, “[o]n the whole, it [i.e., the east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol] is a somewhat sober, flat repetition of the system of articulation at St. Aposteln that lacks the latter’s great movement and powerful effects of spatial depth.” Gall denigrated it even further, pointedly dismissing the reworking of the east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol as “artistically insignificant.” And yet, this “artistically insignificant,” lost, and now largely forgotten apse of circa 1200–1210 was not only the immediate chronological predecessor of the apse at St. Kunibert within the tight group of Lower Rhenish late Romanesque apses, but also possessed several particular features that indicate concretely that it and not the trefoil choir at St. Aposteln—or any other earlier apse in Cologne or elsewhere—furnished the primary model for the plan and elevation of the apse and the forechoir bay at St. Kunibert. Consigned to secondary status behind St. Aposteln, the lost reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol was, within the larger architectural context of early-thirteenth-century Cologne, anything but “insignificant.”


400 Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbaukunst, 45: “Im ganzen ist es eine etwas nüchtern wirkende flache Wiederholung des Gliederungssystems von St. Aposteln, ohne dessen großen Schwung und kraftvolle Tiefenwirkung.”

401 Gall, Apsidengliederung, 80: “. . der künstlerisch nicht sehr bedeutende Umbau der Ostapsis von S. Maria im Kapitol zu Köln.”
The fact that the lower and upper arcades in the apse at St. Kunibert consist of five arches in the interior to nine blind arches on the exterior (figs. 35, 76) cannot be downplayed when the apse is set beside St. Aposteln (fig. 178). Apart from the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol (fig. 189), there is no other extant apse from the second half of the twelfth century or early decades of the thirteenth in Cologne or even in the wider vicinity with an arcade of five arches in the interior to nine blind arches on the exterior (here only in the upper storey on account of the retention of the original ambulatory in the lower storey; fig. 192). Within Cologne, the three apses that preceded the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol—that at St. Gereon (ca. 1151–1156) and the apses in the choirs at Groß St. Martin (consecrated 1172) and St. Aposteln (ca. 1200)—were erected more or less in immediate succession, each with

---

402 The blind arcades on the exterior of the apse at St. Kunibert appear to have eleven arches when one includes the two splayed walls that link the apse to the transept and conceal the stair wells inside, but the lower and upper blind arcades on the apse proper—that is, strictly understood as the semicircle—have nine. In conception, the splayed walls at St. Kunibert are like half of the round stair towers that occupy the same position in the triconch at St. Aposteln (fig. 180), the only difference being that they are flat and do not take the form of towers. Functionally, however, they perform the same function as a means of housing stair wells (or subsidiary spaces on the north flank) while linking the apse and the east transept (which at St. Aposteln happens to take the form of two more apses). The use of such splayed walls to link round or polygonal apses with a rectangular structure also occurs at St. Andreas in Cologne (ca. 1220; fig. 238), in the triconch east end in Roermond (in the Meuse Valley, begun ca. 1220?), and even later at St. Severin in Cologne (consecrated 1237; fig. 212), and was therefore a general technique known around this time; see Machat, “Bauwerk,” 324, who points to the examples of splayed walls at St. Andreas and Roermond in reference to those at St. Kunibert.

403 Apses with five windows had, of course, also been erected in Cologne in the centuries before the apse at St. Kunibert; but none of these apses possesses a 5:9 ratio of inner arches to blind arches on the exterior, and thus these (mostly much older) apses do not come into question as the model for the apse at St. Kunibert. The east apse at the collegiate church of St. Georg (1059–1067), for instance, had five windows and interior arches to five blind arches on the exterior (Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 529), as did the lost apse of the west choir at the collegiate church of St. Maria ad Gradus (mid-twelfth-century; Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 566), which is recorded solely in a drawing by A. Quaglio that Boisserée published in 1833 (fig. 232). In the latter case, the exterior did not have blind arches, but rather a combination of pilasters and corbel tables.

The inner arcade of five arches would—probably beginning in the 1210s with the east transepts in Bonn—become standard in polygonal apses; but even here, the ratio remains 5:5, with five arches/windows on the interior to five blind arches on the pentagonal exterior. In any event, the Lower Rhenish polygonal apses, all of which are later than St. Kunibert with exception of Bonn (and even the polygonal apses here could actually be later than the beginning of work at St. Kunibert—the dates for the east transept arms and nave in Bonn are notoriously uncertain), are so different typologically and formally as to not realistically come into question as a potential model for the distinctive 5:9 ground plan of the round apse at St. Kunibert. On the group of late Romanesque polygonal apses in the Lower Rhineland, see Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 4, 406–409, 418–421.
direct knowledge of the previous structure. These three apses all display some variant of the ratio of three principal arches with windows in the interior of the apse to seven arches in the blind arcade on the exterior. At St. Gereon (figs. 202, 203), the interior of the apse features an arcade of seven arches in the lower storey and yet another arcade of seven arches in the upper, the latter with three windows. The arcades of seven arches in the interior are matched on the exterior by blind arcades with the same number of arches in both the lower and upper stories. In the conches at Groß St. Martin (figs. 208, 209), the arcade of seven arches was maintained in the interior in the lower storey and answered on the exterior by blind arcades of seven arches in the lower and upper storey. In the upper storey in the interior, now constructed using thick-wall structure, the arcade, however, was radically rearranged, with three wide arches framing the windows and four extremely slender arches positioned before the wider expanse of the solid rear wall behind. At St. Aposteln, finally, inner arcades of seven arches were dispensed with altogether; here, arcades of only three broad arches in both stories in the interior were paired with seven narrower arches in the blind arcades on the exterior (figs. 178, 180).

It would be easy to dismiss the apse at St. Kunibert as but a slight aberration from the 3:7 ratio were it not for the fact that the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol was erected immediately before it and with the particular ratio of five arches/windows in the inner arcades to nine arches in the blind arcades on the exterior (figs. 189, 192). At St. Maria im Kapitol the 5:9 ratio was predetermined by the decision to preserve the original lower storey with its arcade of five arches, which in turn set the parameters for the number of arches and clerestory windows in the upper storey and also for the number of blind arches—nine—on the exterior of the apse. St. Kunibert, on the other hand, was planned and rebuilt completely de novo. Theoretically, the

404 Meyer-Barkhausen, *Kirchenbaukunst*, 12–40, still provides the best overview of the network of relationships between these three structures.
path was clear there for the adoption of the 3:7 ratio of the St. Gereon–Groß St. Martin–St. Aposteln group of apses. In the distinctive 5:9 plan of its apse, however, St. Kunibert diverges completely from the 3:7 plans of the apses of the putative model St. Aposteln and the other late Romanesque Cologne apses that came before it, and this is concrete evidence that the plan of the apse was designed instead on the model of the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol, the chronological intermediary between it and St. Aposteln east. What was originally a by-product of the reuse of the original lower arcade at St. Maria im Kapitol thus became the basis for architectural invention at St. Kunibert.

Like the 5:9 ground plan, the source for the strikingly new interior elevation of the apse at St. Kunibert also has yet to be adequately explained. Reduced to the bare essentials, the elevation of the apse at St. Kunibert is similar to that of the earlier apses at Groß St. Martin and St. Aposteln in the use of two stories, with arcades in each storey, and a monumental, smooth semi-dome as the upper termination for the apse. The elevation of the apse at St. Kunibert (fig. 35) differs, again when reduced to the bare essentials (that is, excluding the particular form of the supports, vaults, and arches in each), from these earlier apses solely in the use of thick-wall structure in both the upper and lower stories. Scholars have attempted to explain the seemingly sudden appearance of thick-wall structure in the lower storey at St. Kunibert in two different and unrelated ways. The first, older explanation was initiated by Gall and has since been followed only by Graf. It posits that the thick-wall structure in the lower storey of the apse at St. Kunibert cannot have suddenly appeared on its own and holds that the idea to use it here can only have come from somewhere other than the Lower Rhineland. Gall pointed specifically to the use of thick-wall structure in multiple stories in the apses of late-eleventh and twelfth-century edifices in Normandy, northeastern France, and the Low Countries, but he was reticent
to identify a specific structure within this motley collection of monuments as the model for St. Kunibert and could speak instead only diffusely of “French influence.” Gall was at odds to explain just how this “French influence” could have come to St. Kunibert—or any other Lower Rhenish structure, for that matter; this thesis thus failed to gain sway.405

The second, and prevailing, explanation has already been mentioned. It sees the use of thick-wall structure in the lower storey of the apse at St. Kunibert as the “logical development” of St. Aposteln and considers the apse at St. Kunibert and the trefoil choir in Neuss (fig. 229), the apses of which also have thick-wall structure in the lower storey, to be exactly contemporary but unconnected examples of the same “Entwicklungsstufe” in an evolutionary genealogy of formal development, without positing any sort of chronological priority between St. Kunibert and Neuss. The use of thick-wall structure in the lower storey at both St. Kunibert and Neuss is presumed to have appeared on its own at the same time and independent of any direct model and apparently also of each other. Predicated on ahistorical notions of the “inner life” of forms that develop and evolve of their own volition and independently of patronal and artistic agency, this explanation is unlikely. Moreover, its primary basis—the widely-held conception that the trefoil choir in Neuss and the apse at St. Kunibert are exactly contemporary—is also open to serious question. On account of the complexity of this issue and its fraught historiographical trajectory, the relationship between St. Kunibert east and Neuss east is addressed here in Appendix D.406

405 Gall, *Apsidengliederungen*, 98–104, esp. 99. Gall’s thesis of the “Norman” origins of thick-wall structure in Lower Rhenish late Romanesque architecture had, by the 1950s, been seriously questioned by several scholars (cf. Meyer-Barkhausen, *Kirchenbaukunst*, 12–40, esp. 36–38), and it is now universally accepted that the use of thick-wall structure in Lower Rhenish apses, first in the choir at Groß St. Martin, was a purely indigenous development. See, for instance, the summary of the historiography of this issue in Kubach and Verbeek, *RBRM*, vol. 4, 350–352 (esp. 352: “Exkurs zu Ernst Gall”), and, further, Héliot, “Coursières,” 212–213. In her dissertation, Graf (“Ostchorbau,” 100–118) took Gall one step further, arguing that the apse at St. Kunibert was not based on Lower Rhenish models at all (at 104–105 with n. 363), but rather directly on the of the apse at the Church of Our Lady in Maastricht (ca. 1180), but the evidence that she adduces to substantiate this connection is not convincing.

406 See Appendix D.
There, new evidence is adduced that suggests that the design of the apses and forechoir bays in Neuss presupposes the (near) completion of both the apse and east transept at St. Kunibert, indicating that Neuss east, which is also based directly on both St. Aposteln and Groß St. Martin, is later than the east end of St. Kunibert, even if only slightly. Thick-wall structure occurs in the lower storey of the apses in Neuss because its architect consulted the east end of St. Kunibert along with these other two Cologne models when he designed the choir.

Lost in these two explanations is the fact that the apse at St. Kunibert was not the first apse in the Lower Rhineland—or even in Cologne—with walkways in both the upper and lower stories. This distinction, like that of being the first Lower Rhenish apse with a 5:9 plan, also belonged to the lost east apse at St. Maria in Kapitol (figs. 187, 189). As with its distinctive plan, the unusual elevation of the reworked east apse was a corollary of the retention of the original ambulatory and the lower storey arcade as the base for a new, narrower upper storey with thick-wall structure that was modeled on the upper storey of the choir at St. Aposteln. The same is true of the freestanding columns found in both stories here: whereas the lower arcade rested on the majestic monolithic tapered columns from the eleventh-century east conch, the design of the pairs of freestanding columns in the upper apse arcade arose from the lack of space for a robust pier behind them like the upper supports at St. Aposteln. Even if the result of a confluence of particular circumstances, the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol marked a major turning point within Cologne in terms of the elevation of the apse, one that cannot have been lost on architects and patrons alike. The combination of the old ambulatory with the new thick-wall clerestory on top proved that thick-wall structure—previously designed for, and restricted solely to, the upper storey in the apses at Groß St. Martin and St. Aposteln—was
structurally feasible in both stories. Because the unusual 5:9 ground plan of the apse at St. Kunibert is clearly derived from its immediate chronological predecessor at St. Maria im Kapitol, it stands to reason that the very decision to construct the lower storey with thick-wall structure here (fig. 35) was itself also stimulated by the unique elevation of the reworked apse at the latter church (fig. 189) and therefore also stems specifically from the collegiate chapter’s selection of this apse as the primary architectural model. The same may be said about the use of freestanding columns as supports for the arcades in both stories of the apse at St. Kunibert. This solution also occurs before exclusively at St. Maria im Kapitol and in none of the other earlier Cologne apses, St. Aposteln included—necessarily so, for none of these apses had a freestanding arcade in the lower storey. And apart from the east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol with its monumental, monolithic columns in the lower storey, none of the earlier Cologne apses (or Lower Rhenish apses outside the city) offers even a remote parallel for the use of the monumental, tapering columnar supports on short socles that we find in the lower storey arcade at St. Kunibert. The form of the supports may be different—bundles of shafts and smooth monoliths—but the conception is similar. Of course, the elevation of the apse at St. Kunibert does not replicate pedantically the broad and spacious eleventh-century ambulatory of the east apse at Maria im Kapitol, and instead features walkways of equal width that are contained within the thickness of the wall in each storey, or true thick-wall structure. But this difference does not preclude the likelihood that the elevation of the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol provided the direct stimulus for the introduction of thick-wall structure in the lower

---

407 Gall (Apsidengliederungen, 81), despite his general deprecation of the east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol as a whole, was well aware of the uniqueness of the placement of the new upper storey with thick-wall structure on top of the eleventh-century ambulatory there: “... it is, however, notable that this step was even taken here. For, as we know, the motif [of thick-wall structure in the upper storey] had originally been invented only for simple apses without ambulatories” (“... immerhin ist es doch bemerkenswert, dass man überhaupt diesen Schritt unternahm. Denn wie wir wissen, war das Motiv ursprünglich nur für einfache Apsiden ohne Umgang erfunden worden”).
storey into the design of the apse at St. Kunibert. As with the 5:9 plan, the particular confluence of the old, eleventh-century ambulatory with the new thick-wall clerestory at St. Maria im Kapitoll was taken up immediately at St. Kunibert and made the basis for the innovative design of the apse with its double-storied thick-wall structure fronted by freestanding arcades supported on superimposed screens of columns (figs. 35 and 189).\footnote{In their survey of Lower Rhenish apses, Kubach and Verbeek (\textit{RBRM}, vol. 4, 402–403), grouped the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol—a project that was fully rooted in Cologne traditions ca. 1200—not alongside the apses at Groß St. Martin, St. Aposteln, or St. Kunibert, but instead alongside the so-called “Umgangschöre” at Heisterbach (altars in the east end consecrated 1227) and Roermond (perhaps begun 1218, but possibly only after 1224), with their “true” ambulatories in the lower storey. Such strictly typological divisions as these, however, are artificial and in this case even obscure the ways in which architectural invention—such as the use of thick-wall structure in the lower storey at St. Kunibert—could have been occasioned across the set of typological “boundaries” that modern scholarship has chosen to impose on the monuments and that continue to shape to no small degree our interpretation of them. It is debatable whether the makers and users of the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol viewed it as anything other than a “Cologne apse” like all the others that directly preceded it and on which the renovation project itself was directly based (St. Aposteln).}

These lines of dependence are further suggested by other distinctive aspects of the elevation of the apse and forechoir bay at St. Kunibert that betray the architect’s intimate, first-hand knowledge of the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol and his extensive use of it as the immediate basis for his design. The first of these features are the plain, unadorned piers that form the outer termination of the lower apse arcade at St. Kunibert (fig. 39). They support the western ends of the two outermost arches of the apse arcade and also appear to support the eastern half of the slightly recessed blind arches in the neighbouring forechoir bay. At St. Aposteln (fig. 177), the western ends of the two outermost arches of the lower (blind) apse arcade rest on a single colonnette that is wedged into the eastern corner of the outer face of the solid rear wall of the apse, a solution based directly on the earlier apses in the triconch at Groß St. Martin (fig. 207) and that is even found at St. Gereon (fig. 201), the earliest apse of the group. The austere piers capped with moulded impost blocks in this position in the apse at St. Kunibert diverge from both St. Aposteln and its model Groß St. Martin and are instead directly
related to the outer supports in the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol (fig. 189), where the solid rectangular piers that replaced the original, eleventh-century columns mark the junction between the apse and the forechoir bay. As at St. Kunibert, these piers support both the western ends of the outermost arches of the freestanding apse arcade and—here directly—the eastern half of the open arches in the forechoir bay. Like their 5:9 ground plans, the use of a rectangular pier as the support in this position is unique to the apses at St. Maria im Kapitol and St. Kunibert.\footnote{\textit{Even the apses in the triconch at Neuss, which are based directly on Groß St. Martin, St. Aposteln, and St. Kunibert (see Appendix D), revert to the solution found at St. Gereon, Groß St. Martin, and St. Aposteln and use a colonnette in this position.}}

The conception of the elevation of the forechoir bay at St. Kunibert also has its closest parallel in the forechoir bay in the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol. In the choirs at St. Aposteln (fig. 177) and Groß St. Martin (fig. 207), the elevations of the apse and the adjacent forechoir bay bear little relation to one another. In both, the forechoir bay is stepped back drastically from the plane of the outer face of the apse wall and separated from it emphatically by a massive engaged column. Although the apse and the forechoir bay are divided into two stories of equal height by means of a common string course moulding that runs around the apse and through the forechoir bay, the forechoir bay in both of these structures does not take the arcades of the neighbouring apse as the basis for its elevation and instead features its own system of articulation (arcades and fan-shaped openings). The elevation of the forechoir bay in the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol (fig. 187), by contrast, took the elevation of the apse as its immediate point of departure. This was inevitable in the lower storey: here, the open arch of the original forechoir bay, identical to those in the apse arcade, was simply reused. In the upper storey, an attempt was made to align the elevation of the forechoir bay visually with
that of the neighbouring apse by circumscribing it with a blind arch equal in height to those in
the apse arcade and placing the blind arch on colonnettes with socles that are identical to the
supports used in the apse arcade proper. The rear wall of the forechoir bay was even provided
with a semi-circular clerestory window like those in the apse. Thus, even if clearly demarcated
from the apse and a fully independent bay, the forechoir bay still appeared like an extension of
the apse arcade, almost producing the impression that the lower and upper apse arcades
consisted of seven rather than five arches.

St. Kunibert displays the same conception of the forechoir bay as a conceptual and visual
extension of the elevation of the apse arcade (fig. 27). In the lower storey (fig. 47), the blind
arch replicates, down to the material (ashlar trachyte) and pendant keystone, both the height and
general appearance of the arches in the adjacent lower apse arcade, while the blind arch in the
upper storey (as at St. Maria im Kapitol), approximately equal in height to the arches in the
upper apse arcade, mirrors and plays on them as well. Thus, in conceiving the elevation of the
forechoir bay as a visual continuation of the elevation of the apse, the architect of the east end at
St. Kunibert clearly looked to the forechoir bay in the reworked east conch at St. Maria im
Kapitol; there are no other precedents for this in earlier Lower Rhenish late Romanesque
apses. But he was also forced to simplify drastically the solution he found there on account of
the need to include subsidiary spaces in the wall immediately behind the forechoir bay (fig.
26). This constriction negated the possibility of including an open arch in the lower storey of
the forechoir bay and a clerestory window in the upper, as at St. Maria im Kapitol; instead, the
walls in both stories were left solid to conceal the spaces behind. In place of the open arch in

410 The forechoir bays in the trefoil choir in Neuss are indebted to St. Kunibert in their conception of this bay as an
extension of the apse’s elevation (see Appendix D).
411 On the spaces behind the forechoir bay, and those on the north side of the church in particular (entrance
vestibule to the sacristy and a small, vaulted cell above), see Kosch, “Anbauten und Nebenräume,” 88–103, and
idem, “Einzelbeobachtungen,” 40–43.
the lower storey, a large niche was added that parallels the use of niches along the rear wall of the lower storey of the apse itself, while the rear wall of the blind arch in the upper storey remained flat and unadorned. Nor did the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol, with its oval stone cupola covering both the forechoir bay and the bay next to the crossing (fig. 187), offer a viable solution for vaulting the narrow forechoir bay at St. Kunibert (fig. 27). Here, the architect turned instead to the traditional solution—a tunnel vault that links the apse and crossing—as found at Groß St. Martin (fig. 207), St. Aposteln (fig. 177), and countless other earlier apses in the Lower Rhineland.

A final indication of the dependence of the design of apse at St. Kunibert on the lost east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol is found in their vertical proportions. At 8.65 meters in width and approximately 4.5 meters in depth, the apse at St. Kunibert displays the typical scale encountered in numerous late Romanesque apses in Cologne. 412 Here, St. Kunibert diverges from the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol, which preserves the monumental dimensions of the eleventh-century apse (approximately 11 meters wide and 5 meters deep). 413 Otherwise, the apse at St. Kunibert follows closely the vertical scale and proportions of the elevation of the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol and differs significantly in these respects from St. Aposteln and other late Romanesque Cologne apses. Thus, whereas the east apse at St. Aposteln measures 17 meters from the floor to the apex of the semi-dome, the apse at St. Kunibert and the renovated east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol measure approximately 19

412 Nine meters appears to have been a fairly standard dimension for the inner diameter of the apse in Cologne in the late Romanesque period. The diameter of the apse at St. Gereon, the earliest of the group, measures approximately 9 m, like St. Aposteln and St. Kunibert, whereas the diameter of the apses in the triconch at Groß St. Martin is around 8.5 m. Dimensions are those given in KDM 7/1, Taf. IV (St. Gereon) and 360 fig. 244 (Groß St. Martin), and KDM 6/4, Taf. XI (St. Aposteln).

413 KDM 7/1, 197 fig. 138.
meters (St. Kunibert 19.2 meters and St. Maria im Kapitol 18.8 meters). More important, the apses at St. Maria im Kapitol and St. Kunibert display the same distinctive proportions in the relative height of the lower and upper arcade supports. At St. Aposteln (fig. 177), the lower supports measure four meters (to the top of the impost block), while the piers with colonnettes in the upper storey (again to the top of the impost block) are, at five meters, one meter taller. At St. Kunibert (fig. 27) and St. Maria im Kapitol (fig. 187) this relationship is inverted—the columns in the lower arcade are in each case one meter taller than the upper arcade supports. The lower supports at St. Kunibert measure 5.5 meters and those in the upper storey 4.5 meters. The east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol presents the same approximate ratio: the lower columns measure 7 meters in height, while the supports in the upper arcade are 6 meters tall. The difference in height between the supports in the two apses is made up at St. Kunibert largely in the height of the semi-dome, which, rising some seven meters from the top of the impost blocks in the upper storey to its pointed apex, is approximately one and a half meters taller than the semi-dome at St. Maria im Kapitol—hence, the same approximate height of circa 19 meters in both apses. In every late Romanesque Cologne apse before the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol, the supports in the lower arcade are shorter than those in the upper storey; in fact, with upper supports that are only one meter taller than those in the lower arcade, St. Aposteln is quite conservative vis-à-vis its model Groß St. Martin, where the supports in the upper arcade, an astonishing 7 meters tall, tower over the diminutive 4-meter-tall columns in the
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414 KDM 6/4, Taf. XIII (St. Aposteln) and Taf. XIX (St. Kunibert), and KDM 7/1, Taf. XVII (St. Maria im Kapitol).
415 KDM 6/4, Taf. XIII.
416 KDM 6/4, Taf. XIX.
417 KDM 7/1, Taf. XVII.
418 KDM 6/4, Taf. XIX (St. Kunibert), and KDM 7/1, Taf. XVII (St. Maria im Kapitol).
lower storey (fig. 208). The use of moderately taller supports in the lower storey arcade—in each case, exactly one meter taller—is unique to the apse at St. Kunibert and the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol within the Lower Rhenish group of apses at this moment.

All of these common features in the apse at St. Kunibert and in the lost reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol indicate that both the plan and elevation of the apse and forechoir bay at St. Kunibert were based primarily and directly on the renovated east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol, St. Kunibert’s immediate chronological predecessor and the intermediary between it and the triconch at St. Aposteln. The implications of the dependence of the design of the apse at St. Kunibert on the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol for one major issue in the history of late Romanesque architecture in the Lower Rhineland—the emergence of thick-wall structure in the lower storey of the apse—is clear enough. Though St. Kunibert’s narrow lower walkway obviously does not copy the true, spacious ambulatory at St. Maria im Kapitol and is instead contained within the thickness of the wall like the upper walkway and the upper walkways in the apses at St. Aposteln and Groß St. Martin, the other connections between St. Kunibert and St. Maria im Kapitol indicate that the introduction of thick-wall structure in the lower storey of the apse at St. Kunibert was not a teleological stylistic development, but rather the direct result of human agency—that of the chapter of canons at St. Kunibert who selected this architectural model, and that of the architect who realized the idea.

The manifold connections between these two apses aside, it is clear from their extensive formal differences that the chapter and architect’s intention was never to copy the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol exactly and that the east conch provided only a set of general
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419 KDM 7/1, Taf. XXVIII (Groß St. Martin). The columns in the arcade in the upper storey in the apse at St. Gereon (fig. 202) are likewise taller than those in the lower blind arcade: 4 m (upper storey) to 3 m (lower storey). See KDM 7/1, Taf. VI.

420 For the important implications of St. Kunibert’s dependence on St. Maria im Kapitol as far as the trefoil choir in Neuss is concerned, see Appendix D.
parameters and a framework for the innovative design of the apse and forechoir bay at St. Kunibert. Certain general aspects of the apse at St. Kunibert, such as the small round-headed windows and broad niches in the rear wall in the lower storey of the apse, do not have parallels in the rear wall of the ambulatory in the renovated east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol, and thus other models were likely consulted on these points instead. These two features, for instance, were most likely taken over directly from St. Aposteln, where they occurred together for the first time and in much the same form (fig. 178).  

Other major features of the apse at St. Kunibert do not have any precedents in Cologne. The design of the double-order arches with nook rolls in the arcades in the lower and upper stories of the apse (figs. 36, 37) is unlike anything that had come before in the group of earlier Cologne apses, as a look at the simple, unprofiled edges of the lower and upper arcades at Groß St. Martin (fig. 208) and St. Aposteln (fig. 178) or the upper storey arcade at St. Maria im Kapitol (fig. 190) makes clear. For their part, the arches in the lower storey at St. Maria im Kapitol are, technically, double-ordered; but the design of the lower arcade here was not primarily the product of a desire to articulate the arches themselves as much as it was the inevitable result of adding a projecting layer of masonry to the front face of the narrow eleventh-century arcade for the purpose of providing a wider surface area for the new thick-wall upper storey. Purely decorative nook rolls, such as those found at St. Kunibert, are absent here. The apse arcades at St. Kunibert are much more complex constructions. The double-order
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421 Seven narrow niches already occur in the lower storey of the apse at St. Gereon (fig. 202), a motif that was, in turn, repeated in the triconch at Groß St. Martin (fig. 208). Although the use of niches in the lower storey of the apse was certainly a tradition within Cologne since at least the mid-twelfth century, the east apse in the triconch at St. Aposteln represents the first known example of an earlier apse in this cultural landscape that combines large niches with small round-headed windows in the lower storey, thus making it the likeliest source for the solution in the lower storey of the apse at St. Kunibert. Unlike the east apse, the north and south apses in the triconch at St. Aposteln do not have windows in the lower storey.

422 See above, 137.
The arches here consist of several different planes, each with a projecting outer face and a recessed archivolt lined with nook roll (fig. 36). The arches in the upper storey arcade present an even more complex variant, for both the outer face and the nook roll have been pulled upwards and away from the round recessed archivolt to form slightly pointed arches and the arches themselves are stilted and thus taller than those in the arcade in the lower storey (fig. 37). The archivolts in both stories also have a rear face, for the intrados is positioned below the level of the miniscule tunnel vaults that are located behind them, instead of aligning directly with their edge.

The source for the distinctive design of the apse arcades at St. Kunibert is not to be sought within Cologne or even in another apse. Instead, the double-order apse arcades at St. Kunibert have an immediate chronological precursor and a direct formal parallel in the arcades in the upper storey of the west choir hall at the collegiate church of St. Viktor in the Lower Rhenish city of Xanten (figs. 25, 223, 224). Begun around 1185/1190, the west choir hall in Xanten, at least in the interior, was most likely complete by the consecration of a Marian altar in the hall in 1213. In view of the lengthy period of approximately twenty years for its construction, the upper storey of the massive choir hall in Xanten was most likely erected only over the second half of the construction campaign, between circa 1200 and the consecration of

---

the Marian altar in 1213, an event which suggests that the hall was vaulted by that point. The overlap in the design of the arches in the gallery arcades in Xanten (fig. 223, 224) and in the apse arcades at St. Kunibert (fig. 35), and in the lower apse arcade in particular (fig. 42), is close and striking. Like those at St. Kunibert, the arches in Xanten consist of several distinct planes, with the same projecting face and recessed archivolt, and are likewise lined with nook rolls. As at St. Kunibert, the recessed archivolts in the arches at Xanten also have a rear face where the intrados of the archivolts is positioned below the level of the tunnel vaults over the walkways. The thick-wall passages in the upper storey in Xanten, moreover, feature the same, highly distinctive system for vaulting the walkway as in the apse at St. Kunibert. There, as at St. Kunibert, abbreviated tunnel vaults link the solid rear walls of the hall with the freestanding arcades. The tunnel vaults are also bisected behind the freestanding supports of the arcade by arches (here round rather than pointed), with the half of the arch closest to the support resting on its impost block and the other half on a console in the rear wall, exactly as in the walkway vaults in both stories of the apse at St. Kunibert.

The west choir hall in Xanten (fig. 220), as Graf demonstrated, constituted the primary model for the ground plan (fig. 26) and portions of the elevation of the east transept at St. Kunibert. The architect responsible for designing the east end of St. Kunibert, therefore, knew that building intimately and on a first-hand basis, just as he knew the east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol. But Xanten was not simply the source for the design of the east transept of
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424 Verbeek, “Westchorhallen,” 79; Weyres, “Zur Datierung,” 98; Kubach and Verbeek, *RBRM*, vol. 2, 1271; Overdick, *Architektursystem*, 42. It is now accepted that the west choir hall in Xanten was complete at least up to the level of the base of the two towers by the consecration of the Marian altar in 1213. It is not clear whether the present towers had also been begun before 1213 or whether they were begun only at some point after the consecration in 1213. On the issues surrounding the date of the towers in Xanten and their relevance for St. Kunibert, see Chapter 3.

425 Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 44ff. Xanten’s role as the model for the plan and elevation of the east transept is considered in detail in Chapter 3.
St. Kunibert alone, as Graf maintained. It also provided the immediate source for both the specific design of the double-order arches in the apse arcades at St. Kunibert and for the particular system of walkway vaulting used there.\(^{426}\) At St. Kunibert, the architect took up the arcade design and system of walkway vaulting from Xanten almost verbatim in the lower storey of the apse, modifying the arches here solely by adding a pendant keystone in each, a motif that is characteristic of the decorative repertoire of Lower Rhenish late Romanesque architecture in the 1210s and early 1220s.\(^{427}\) In the upper storey (fig. 37), he maintained the same system of walkway vaulting as in the lower, but he altered the design of the arcade significantly by pulling the outer face of the arches and the nook rolls up and away from the round recessed archivolts to form the aforementioned stilted arches with slightly pointed apexes, which cut into the masonry of the semi-dome in the manner of the unprofiled arcades in the earlier Cologne apses (figs. 178, 190). Despite the important modifications to the form of double-ordered arcade in the upper storey of the apse at St. Kunibert, its rootedness in the Xanten design is patently clear.

The adoption of the design of the double-order arcades in the west choir hall in Xanten for the arcades in the apse at St. Kunibert had immediate and quite profound consequences for the form and design of the arcade supports below (fig. 35). Because the arcades in all of the earlier Cologne apses with thick-wall structure were single-order and not profiled, the relationship between the arcade and the freestanding supports that carry it was not problematic.

\(^{426}\) On account of her emphatic chronological separation of the east transept from the apse in the design and construction stages and her suggestion that the design of the apse at St. Kunibert was based solely on the apse at the Church of Our Lady in Maastricht, Graf herself, apart from noting in passing that roll mouldings appear in both the apse and east transept at St. Kunibert ("Ostchorbau," 121), did not make the connection between the design of the apse arcades and the west choir hall in Xanten.

\(^{427}\) To cite only three of the best-known examples in which such pendant keystones occur: the arches in the galleries in the nave in Neuss, begun in 1209, the transverse arches in the north and south arms of the east transept at the Minster in Bonn, likely built over the course of the 1210s (the dating of Bonn’s transept and nave varies widely; the most recent review of the question is Overdick, _Architektursystem_, 105–116), and the arches in the third storey of the decagon at St. Gereon in Cologne (1219–1227; fig. 204).
In these apses, the freestanding arcade supports, whether in the form of single columns (fig. 208), pairs of columns housed in a trapezoidal pier (fig. 178), or pairs of columns alone (fig. 190), are simply topped with a capital and/or impost block that follows the square (Groß St. Martin) or slightly trapezoidal (St. Aposteln, St. Maria im Kapitol) form of the spandrels of the upper arcade. With the decision to use double-order arches with several different planes on the model of the arcades in Xanten, the architect of the east end at St. Kunibert confronted a very different problem on account of the T-shaped form of the spandrels that the particular design of these arches engendered. This problem was further compounded by the selection of freestanding columns as supports in both stories on the immediate model of the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol, the only earlier apse in the Lower Rhineland with this feature. The architect was thus forced to reconcile the form of the T-shaped spandrels in the apse arcades with the form of the freestanding columnar supports that carry them. He did so by multiplying the number of shafts in the column bundles to three in each storey in order that each face of the T-shaped spandrels in the arcades could be assigned to a column shaft. Thus, in the lower storey (fig. 42), the wider projecting front face of the arches aligns with the wider foremost shaft of the column bundles, while the narrower recessed archivolts rest on the two narrower flanking shafts. The T-shaped capitals (consisting of three distinct capitals fused into a single unit) and impost blocks follow the disposition of the T-shaped column bundles below and the T-shaped spandrels above, melding the arcade and the support into a unified structural whole. This same, highly logical system is repeated in the arcade in the upper storey of the apse (fig. 44). The apse arcades at St. Kunibert thus display a fundamentally different approach to the relationship between support and arcade than in the earlier apses: the column bundles of three shafts demonstrate, in a manner analogous to vault responds, how they support the different planes of
the arches above, and the forms of the arches, impost blocks, capitals, and supports are all harmonized into a unified, indivisible whole in a way that is completely unprecedented in the earlier apses in Cologne and in the Lower Rhineland as a whole. In this logical arrangement of columnar supports and double-order arches, the architect of the east end of St. Kunibert looked again directly to the model furnished by the arcades in Xanten, where every element of the arches, even down to the nook rolls, is logically assigned to a different, discrete supporting member, be it the projecting face of a pier or an inset colonnette (figs. 223, 224).  

Already in place several years before the completion of the apse in 1222, and thus by the later 1210s at the lastest, the freestanding column bundles with three shafts in the lower and upper apse arcades at St. Kunibert are the earliest securely dateable examples of this particular form of support in a Lower Rhenish apse. They are even some of the earliest examples of supports with three shafts, whether freestanding or engaged, within Lower Rhenish late Romanesque architecture as a whole. The related column bundles in the apses of the choir in Neuss (fig. 229)—which is, in contrast to the apse at St. Kunibert, not securely dated—are, in view of other indications of the structure’s direct dependence on parts of the east end of St. Kunibert, later and were therefore most plausibly derived, like the thick-wall structure in the lower storey of the apses, from the apse at St. Kunibert.
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428 On the logical arrangement of supports at Xanten, see Overdick, *Architektursystem*, 42–53.
429 On 1222 as *terminus ante quem* for the completion of the apse, see above, 110–112.
430 For its part, the “bundled” group of vault responds with three shafts emerges in Lower Rhenish architecture in the 1210s in the east transept and long choir in Bonn. But these supports, as perfectly straight, engaged “bundles” of shafts that run continuously from the floor to the springing of the vault, where they support ribs, are fundamentally different in conception, use, and form, and were, in case of Bonn, very likely derived directly from French Gothic models (witness the orientation of the capitals on the shafts on the angle of the diagonal ribs). Otherwise, vault responds with three shafts occur in the Lower Rhineland only in the 1220s and beyond. The massy, monumental tapered column bundles with three shafts in the apse at St. Kunibert are most likely not based on the three-shaft vault responds from Bonn or elsewhere.
431 See Appendix D.
As with the use of thick-wall structure in the lower storey, different explanations have been proffered for the possible sources for the use of column bundles with three shafts in the apse at St. Kunibert. In fact, the same two hermeneutic models that have been invoked for the emergence of thick-wall structure in the lower storey of the apse—immanent architectural progress from St. Aposteln and the foreign import—have also been used to explain the origins of the column bundles here. In the first model, the column bundles at St. Kunibert are figured as the logical next step from the supports in the upper walkways at St. Aposteln with their two colonnettes set before a pier (fig. 179). At St. Kunibert, the masonry pier, still visible in the back of the bundles at St. Kunibert (fig. 41), has simply shrunk and a third column shaft has been added to the front (fig. 40). The “import” model holds that the column bundles with three shafts were derived directly from a foreign model. Gall proposed that the form of the column bundles with three shafts could only have been stimulated by Gothic France, where freestanding columnar supports with three shafts, in some cases with shaft rings, occur in triforia and other openings in the wall. As with his explanation for the origins of the thick-wall structure in the lower storey of the apse at St. Kunibert, Gall could do little more than point to the parallel occurrence of superficially similar column bundles in other, distant cultural landscapes, and could offer no evidence—apart from his thesis that the use of thick-wall structure in the lower storey was also based directly on foreign, even French, models—that would indicate that the architect of the east end of St. Kunibert had direct, first-hand knowledge of edifices outside of the Lower Rhineland, much less French Gothic ones. Shaft rings were already a common element in the decorative repertoire of Lower Rhenish late Romanesque

---

432 See, for instance, Barbknecht, *Fensterformen*, 136–137.
architecture by the 1210s and early 1220s. And the tapering column shafts of the robust column bundles in the lower storey arcade at St. Kunibert—again, a corollary of the use of the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol as a model, with its tapering monolithic columns on low socles in the lower storey—are quite unlike anything in earlier or contemporary French Gothic architecture.

What these explanations share is a failure to examine the column bundles at St. Kunibert in relation to the distinctive form of the double-order arcades that they support, which results in an isolation of the column bundles as decorative elements rather than parts of a larger structural whole. Once it is recognized that the double-order arches in the apse arcades at St. Kunibert were derived from the west choir hall in Xanten and that the T-shaped form of the spandrels required a fundamental rethinking of the relationship of the arch to the freestanding columnar support below, the apparently sudden emergence of the T-shaped column bundles with three shafts in the apse at St. Kunibert becomes less puzzling and the need for theories of teleological stylistic development or unmediated adoption of French Gothic forms less pressing. The column bundles with three shafts at St. Kunibert should be seen instead as the architect’s practical response to the problem posed by the decision to employ the design of the double-order arcades from Xanten with monumental, freestanding columnar supports on the model of the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol. As with the thick-wall structure in the lower storey of the apse, the chapter’s patronal selection of models—Xanten and St. Maria im Kapitol—presented the architect with problems and possibilities to develop solutions and innovations. In fact, there were much older precedents for the very motif of the monumental,
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434 The columnar vault responds in the south arm of the abbey church of St. Pantaleon, for instance, also in polished black slate like the central shaft in the columnar supports in the lower storey at St. Kunibert, have shaft rings and were certainly in place by the recorded consecration of a side altar in the south arm in 1216; see Kubach and Verbeek, *RBRM*, vol. 1, 582, 586.
tapered column bundle with individual shafts assigned to soffits (here in the form of transverse arches) in the eleventh-century crypt at St. Maria im Kapitol itself (fig. 196). These were precedents that the architect of the east end at St. Kunibert certainly would have also known first-hand from his visits to that site. The column bundles at St. Kunibert are a logical, elegant, and innovative solution, a product of the process of design as the architect consulted and creatively combined and rethought elements derived from the two primary architectural models for the east end.

The apse at St. Kunibert (fig. 35) likewise represents a major break in terms of the palpable increase in verticality that it displays vis-à-vis the east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol (fig. 189) and the east apse at St. Aposteln (fig. 178), its immediate precursors. It is important to realize that, to a certain extent, amplified verticality was preprogrammed into its plan and elevation on account of the combination of a relatively short inner diameter for the apse (9 meters) with a markedly taller elevation based on the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol, which, like St. Kunibert, measures approximately 19 meters from floor level to the apex of the semi-dome. The adoption at St. Kunibert of visibly taller supports in the lower storey and arcades of five narrow arches, both on the model of St. Maria im Kapitol, introduced further elements into the design that emphasized vertical ascent rather than lateral expansion. The upward pull of the apse is further amplified by the strong vertical lines of the shafts of the column bundles themselves, which rise up to the arches of the arcades like responds. The verticality of the apse is particularly evident in the upper storey, where the architect employed various means in a concerted effort to heighten the sense of upward thrust. Transforming the
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435 At St. Aposteln, the inner diameter of 9 m is paired with a shorter elevation, only 17 m tall to the apex of the semi-dome—hence the effect of the earthbound, broad apse there (fig. 178). At St. Maria im Kapitol, the diameter of the Ottonian lower storey, at around 11 m in width, is two meters wider, and it thus largely counteracts the taller elevation, itself also roughly 2 meters taller than St. Aposteln (18.8 m). Thus, despite the taller supports in the lower arcade, the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol still appears relatively squat and broad.
design of the double-ordered arcade from Xanten, still employed very faithfully in the lower storey, he stilted the spandrels of the arches and drew their outer faces and the nook rolls up to form slightly pointed apexes that cut into the semi-dome, thereby producing a markedly vertical movement that leads the eye from the linear shafts of the upper arcade supports through the stilted spandrels and around the pointed arches and into the semi-dome. Furthermore, he increased the height of the semi-dome itself beyond the squat 5.5 meters of the round semi-domes at both St. Maria im Kapitol and St. Aposteln to a towering seven meters. He likewise drew its apex into a pointed arch, as he did the apexes of the narrow tunnel vault and the eastern transverse arch of the crossing vault. The steeply rising curves of all three underscore the already pronounced vertical orientation of the apse as a whole.

Finally, as with its overall verticality, the apse at St. Kunibert (fig. 35) also departs significantly from St. Maria im Kapitol (fig. 189), St. Aposteln (fig. 178), and, indeed, from all earlier Cologne apses (fig. 208) as well as Neuss (fig. 229) in the conspicuous reduction in the amount of masonry in the clerestory and in the concomitant increase in the size of its clerestory windows relative to the rear wall. Not only is the masonry between the stained glass windows whittled down to a minimum, but the sills of the windows also extend down to a point just above the floor level of the upper walkway in a way that is unparalleled elsewhere. While both of these measures could be read as tokens of stylistic “progress” or even taken as evidence of a desire to translate “Gothic” ideas of the diaphanous, dematerialized wall using what is still a completely late Romanesque stylistic vocabulary, there are other, thoroughly practical, reasons for the dissolution of the rear wall in the upper storey at St. Kunibert that strongly caution
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436 See Meyer-Barkhausen, *Kirchenbaukunst*, 55, and Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 121, both of whom stress the vertical pull created by the column shafts and arches here.

437 See above, 150–152.

438 See Meyer-Barkhausen, *Kirchenbaukunst*, 55.
against such a reading. On the one hand, the use of the 5:9 ground plan of St. Maria im Kapitol with five windows together with a much shorter inner diameter for the apse (only 9 meters to St. Maria im Kapitol’s 11 meters) made a reduction in the amount of masonry between the clerestory windows along the inner circumference of the apse at St. Kunibert inevitable. The comparatively short upper storey, again on the model of St. Maria im Kapitol, also set limits as to how much reserved wall would appear above and below the windows in the clerestory zone, regardless of the height of the clerestory windows. The inherent limitations set by the decisions concerning the plan and the elevation were thus at least in part responsible for the conspicuous dissolution of the rear wall in the upper storey.

Even if engendered by the particulars of the ground plan and elevation and not necessarily for stylistic reasons per se, the dissolution of the rear wall of the clerestory into large expanses of stained glass is still a very real, undeniable perceptual aspect of the apse at St. Kunibert. With the low window sills, invisible when seen from within the apse, and five monumental windows clustered almost side-by-side with minimal masonry between them, the clerestory emerges against the foil of the dimly-lit lower storey as a commanding corona of coloured light that draws the eye to the upper reaches of the apse and thereby complements its pronounced vertical thrust (fig. 35). Set off against the dimly-lit lower storey, the clerestory is cast as the visual focal point of the apse, with its three resplendent, multi-coloured, and multi-faceted narrative windows dominating the space.

4. The Apse: Conclusions

This chapter has suggested that the celebrated trefoil choir at St. Aposteln, long regarded as the architectural model for the apse at St. Kunibert, played only a marginal role in its design.
The features in the interior of the apse at St. Kunibert that were likely derived from St. Aposteln, such as the niches in the rear wall in the lower storey with their small round-headed windows, are relatively insignificant when seen in the context of the apse at St. Kunibert as a whole. The fundamental aspects of the apse and forechoir bay at St. Kunibert—their ground plan, elevation, and structure—were instead based on the lost and now largely forgotten east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol. Erected circa 1200–1210 on the model of St. Aposteln, the reworked east conch, and not St. Aposteln, was the immediate chronological predecessor of the apse at St. Kunibert. The lost reworked east conch contained several unique features that indicate that the architect of the east end at St. Kunibert knew the St. Maria im Kapitol structure intimately and used it as the primary model for the innovative design of the apse at St. Kunibert. The unusual 5:9 ground plan of the apse at St. Kunibert was taken from there, as was the distinctive pier for the outer termination of the apse arcade in the lower storey, both of which are otherwise unparalleled. The vertical proportions of the lower and upper stories at St. Kunibert, with taller supports in the lower storey arcade, likewise betray the rootedness of the design in St. Maria im Kapitol and not in St. Aposteln. The same is true of the conception of the forechoir bay as a continuation of the elevation of the apse at St. Kunibert, which also follows St. Maria im Kapitol, where the forechoir bay in the reworked east conch was designed as an extension of the adjacent apse arcades for the first time in a Lower Rhenish apse. These borrowings from the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol indicate, in turn, that the innovative introduction of thick-wall structure in the lower storey of the apse at St. Kunibert was itself most likely stimulated by the unique elevation of the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol with its true ambulatory from the original eleventh-century triconch and was thus neither an import from abroad nor the result of an evolutionary formal progression from St. Aposteln. The novel column bundles with three
shafts in the apse arcades at St. Kunibert, for their part, are the direct result of the combination of monumental freestanding columnar supports on the model of St. Maria im Kapitol with the double-order arcades from the west choir hall in Xanten. Like the use of thick-wall structure in the lower storey, these, the earliest securely dated column bundles with three shafts in a Lower Rhenish apse, are neither an import from Gothic France nor the “logical” development of the piers with inset colonnettes in the upper storey at St. Aposteln but rather represent a practical, but innovative, solution to the problem of reconciling the T-shaped spandrels of the double-order apse arcade from Xanten with purely columnar supports. The system of walkway vaulting with bisected tunnel vaults on continuous consoles likewise stems not from the Cologne apses in general, and St. Aposteln with its hollowed-out mass of masonry in particular, but rather directly from the galleries in the west choir hall in Xanten.

The interior of the apse at St. Kunibert is the product of an innovative bricolage of ideas and elements taken from three major contemporary building sites in and around Cologne—St. Maria im Kapitol, St. Viktor in Xanten, and, to a much lesser degree, St. Aposteln. It was in no way intended to be a strict copy of anything that came before it, and the architect creatively combined these three sources and pushed them in new directions. This is evident in the apse’s pronounced verticality, itself symptomatic of late Romanesque architecture in the Lower Rhineland as a whole in 1210s, and in the conspicuous reduction of masonry in the clerestory zone, a corollary of the unique parameters of the compressed 5:9 plan. Generally overshadowed by its more famous and canonical forerunner St. Aposteln, the apse at St. Kunibert, with its thick-wall structure in the lower storey and logical arrangement of double-order arcades on column bundles with three shafts, is a remarkably innovative structure—arguably even more innovative than the east apse at the much-fêted St. Aposteln itself.
Chapter 3
The East Transept

1. Introduction

As with the apse, the canonical status of the trefoil choir at St. Aposteln in pre- and postwar scholarship on Lower Rhenish late Romanesque architecture led to attempts to explain the design of the east transept at St. Kunibert (figs. 47–49) exclusively by reference to that structure. In marked contrast to the apse, which Gall and others had connected with St. Aposteln at an early date, investigation into the architectural sources for the east transept began comparatively late, only in the 1950s, presumably because there are no obvious parallels for it in Cologne itself. Meyer-Barkhausen’s fundamental study again proved formative here. Looking past the major differences in their ground plans and elevations, Meyer-Barkhausen attempted to fit the east transept at St. Kunibert into the mould of the trefoil choir at St. Aposteln, maintaining that it represented an attempt to translate the spatial dynamics of the trefoil into a rectangular east transept. Thus, the five-part rib vaults in the arms of the east transept at St. Kunibert, Meyer-Barkhausen contended, aimed to transform the rectangular arms into “apse-like” (apsisartig) and “conch-like” (konchenartig) spaces. Similarly, the walkways in the upper storey of the east transept represented a continuation of the thick-wall structure of the upper storey of the apse into the transept in a further attempt to replicate, here on a rectangular ground plan, the “circular” and “centralizing” movement—what Meyer-Barkhausen dubbed Kreisung—of the trefoil choir at St. Aposteln, with its walkways that encircle every interior wall.

439 Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbaukunst, 54: “… durch ihre [that is, the east transept arms] an der Stirnwand herabgezogenen Gewölbe als apsisartige Räume charakterisiert …”; and, at 56: “Der Mittelpfeiler der Nord- bzw. Südwand ist hier Stütze einer die äußere Gewölbeseite teilenden und in zwei Kappen tief herabziehenden Rippe, eine Konstruktion, die dem Gewölbe in erster Linie den konchenartigen, nach innen gewandten Charakter gibt;” and, also at 56, the description of the arms of the east transept as “querkonchenartig.”
of the upper storey. Kubach and Verbeek then adopted this argument in their widely-consulted catalogues, whence it has continued, as far as the idea of the “conch-like character” of the five-part vaults in the arms of the transept is concerned, to exert further influence down to the present.

Meyer-Barkhausen’s argument concerning the dependence of the east transept on the triconch at St. Aposteln has since been convincingly refuted by Graf, who demonstrated that the ground plan and the north and south interior walls of the east transept had no precursors in late Romanesque Cologne. Rather, as Graf showed, the true, hall-like rectangular east transept at St. Kunibert was based instead on the plan and elevation of the west choir hall at St. Viktor in Xanten. As a rectangular hall with a spacious, oblong crossing flanked by two narrower arms, the east transept replicates the spatial disposition of the ground plan of the west choir hall in Xanten (cf. figs. 26 and 220). The elevation of the north and south walls of the transept, with their deep, semi-circular niches in the lower storey and walkways fronted by freestanding arcades in the upper storey, likewise follows fairly closely the main outlines of the corresponding walls in Xanten, down to the articulation of the central arcade supports in the upper storey as piers with inset colonnettes (cf. figs. 49 and 222). Thus, as Graf has observed, at St. Kunibert a distinct building type with its own typology, the rectangular west choir hall
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440 Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbaukunst, 54.
441 Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 553–554, where the east end of St. Kunibert is described explicitly as a “dreikonchenartiger Raum.” See, further and in this same vein, Machat, “Bauwerk,” 324, and, most recently, Kosch, “Anbauten und Nebenräume,” 94, as well as idem, “Einzelbeobachtungen,” 35.
442 Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 44ff. The basic premise of Graf’s thesis—that the east transept at St. Kunibert was based on the west choir hall in Xanten—has been universally accepted in the scholarly literature that has appeared on the architectural history of St. Kunibert since the appearance of her dissertation in 1984. See, for instance, Machat, “Bauwerk,” 323–324; Machat, “Pfarrkirche St. Kunibert,” 76; Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 4, 592; Kosch, “Anbauten und Nebenräume,” 78, 103 n. 3; Kosch, “Einzelbeobachtungen,” 35.
(always, as its name indicates, located at the west end of a church\textsuperscript{445}), was transposed to the east end of a church to form an east transept and subjected to a major modification through the addition of a semicircular apse—always absent in the true west choir halls themselves—to the east wall.\textsuperscript{446} In the use of a plan taken from a west choir hall for an east transept and the innovative combination of that plan with an apse, the east end of St. Kunibert is unique, with no known precursors or successors.

Extrapolating from the rough date of the fragmentary tie beam that she found in the upper storey of the south wall of the transept, Graf maintained that work on the east transept at St. Kunibert, and its north and south walls in particular, began before or around 1200 and had reached the level of the springing of the vaults on these two walls before the construction of the apse. Thus, while she identified Xanten west as the model for the east transept at St. Kunibert, Graf separated the design and construction of the apse and the transept into two distinct phases, with the transept preceding the apse. But this chronology for the east end cannot be sustained; rather, the physical, contextual, and circumstantial evidence points to contemporaneous planning, design, and construction of the east end—that is, apse and east transept—as a whole and from the ground up.\textsuperscript{447}

And it is here that the dependence of the design of the apse at St. Kunibert on the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol takes on particular importance, for it provides a fresh and vital framework for rethinking the series of decisions that the architect of the east end made as he designed the east transept. Even if contemporaneity in the planning and execution of the east end has usually been generally supposed, the relationship between the apse and the east end


\textsuperscript{446} See Graf’s conclusions in “Ostchorbau,” 123–125.

\textsuperscript{447} See Chapter 2.
transept during the design stages has never been systematically investigated. Crucial aspects of the design of the east transept—including its elevation and structural system—therefore remain either unexplained or misunderstood. The manifold ways in which the designer of the east end tailored the east transept around the apse are evident in the significant modifications made to the Xanten model in the transept’s plan, its vertical proportions, the interior elevation of its various walls, the structure of its vault and arcade supports, and, lastly, its vaulting. Through a close reading of the design of the east transept vis-à-vis both the apse and its model Xanten, these aspects of the interior of the east transept are examined in the first section of this chapter with a view to retracing the various steps the architect took in the east transept in order to create a unified and harmonious east end for the new collegiate church. The architect’s efforts at integrating the two components of the east end are equally palpable on the exterior; its design is examined in the second section of this chapter. Consolidating the insights from the preceding and present chapters on the architectural models for the east end and their transformation at St. Kunibert, the final section considers the origins of the architect responsible for the design of the east end of the church.

2. The East Transept: Plan, Elevation, Structure

The combination of a plan from what had been an independent structural unit—the west choir hall in Xanten (fig. 220)—with an apse derived from Cologne models entailed in the east end at St. Kunibert several elementary but important changes to the original Xanten ground plan (fig. 26). These changes indicate that the architect drew up the ground plan for the east end as a single unit, and that the apse, rather than the east transept, provided the primary reference point

---

448 See note 346.
for the basic parameters of the design of the east end. Thus, the short chord adopted for the apse, slightly less than nine meters in length like those in the other late Romanesque apses in Cologne, accounts for the considerable reduction of the original scale of the massive west choir hall in Xanten at St. Kunibert; the interior dimensions were trimmed down significantly, from 27.3 by 9.3 to 22.6 by 6.5 meters.\(^{449}\) This reduction in scale at St. Kunibert was accompanied by a reduction in the thickness of the lower walls and, accordingly, the width of the walkways in the upper storey \textit{vis-à-vis} Xanten; whereas the lower walls in Xanten (fig. 222) are fortress-like and the upper walkways, some three meters wide, spacious, the lower walls at St. Kunibert (fig. 48) are much thinner and walkways narrower, ranging in width from a mere 52 centimeters at their narrowest point to 122 centimeters at their widest.\(^{450}\) The walkways of the thick-wall structure in the transept thus follow the width that the architect established for the upper walkway in the apse (range of upper walkway = 80–97 cm), a set of values that is derived from the customary width of the walkways in the other Cologne apses with thick-wall structure, including St. Maria im Kapitol (fig. 190) and St. Aposteln (fig. 179).\(^{451}\) The addition of an apse also made it illogical to place the stair-wells at the outer corners of the transept, as in Xanten.

\(^{449}\) Dimensions for Xanten based on the ground plan published by Verbeek, “Westchorhallen,” Abb. 54. Dimensions for St. Kunibert are the author’s own measurements. On the comparatively diminutive scale of the east transept compared to Xanten, cf. Graf (“Ostchorbau,” 45–46), who attributes the reduction of the scale of the west choir hall in Xanten to the use at St. Kunibert of walls from a predecessor church in the construction of the east transept. The recent excavations, however, have conclusively shown that the east transept was not erected on either the foundations or walls of the immediate predecessor church; see Chapter 1.

\(^{450}\) Dimensions for Xanten based on the ground plan published by Verbeek, “Westchorhallen,” Abb. 54. Dimensions for St. Kunibert are the author’s own measurements. The walkways in the upper storey of the west walls of the east transept (fig. 53) are narrower than those in the rest of the transept. The walkways here measure only 33 cm (south arm, to rear face of corner support) and 49 cm (north arm) (author’s measurements). Originally intended to be as wide as those in the rest of the transept, the western walkways were made narrower when these two walls were reinforced with additional masonry in course of construction of transept in order to provide more ample support for the adjacent first nave bay, which is slightly taller than the transept. See Chapter 4. On the width of the walkways in the east transept, cf., in contrast, Graf (“Ostchorbau,” 47) who attributes the thinner walls and narrower walkways at St. Kunibert \textit{vis-à-vis} Xanten to the resuse of walls from a predecessor church. The recent excavations have also disproven this supposition; see Chapter 1.

\(^{451}\) The upper walkway at St. Maria im Kapitol was approximately 80 cm wide (dimensions based on KDM 7/1, Taf. XVII); the upper walkway at St. Aposteln is approximately one meter wide (dimensions derived from KDM 6/4, Taf. XIII).
Looking to general precedents like St. Aposteln (fig. 175) and Groß St. Martin (fig. 206), the architect instead placed the stair-wells behind the forechoir bay at the junction of transept and apse (fig. 26), linking the apse and the transept on the exterior by means of splayed walls, a method that has numerous roughly contemporary parallels, including St. Andreas in Cologne (ca. 1220; fig. 238).\footnote{On the use of splayed walls and for the comparison with St. Andreas, see Machat, “Bauwerk,” 324. The north stair well, likely begun as such, was later converted (in the 1220s or 1230s) into an entrance to the sacristy (lower storey) and a small vaulted chamber (upper storey) of indeterminate function; see Kosch, “Anbauten und Nebenräume,” 88–103, and idem, “Einzelsiebachtungen,” 40–43.}

The decisive role that the apse played in the conception of the east transept is not only evident in these elementary modifications to the Xanten ground plan, but also in the vertical proportions employed in the transept. Like St. Maria im Kapitol and St. Aposteln, to much differing degrees the models for the interior of the apse, the west choir hall in Xanten also possessed a two-storey elevation (fig. 222). This feature probably commended it for use as a model for the east transept at St. Kunibert, for its elevation could be aligned easily with that of the traditional two-storied Cologne apse. The lower storey and blind arcades in Xanten, however, are markedly shorter than the upper storey with its soaring gallery arcades. The vertical proportions in the model for the east transept thus stood in direct opposition to the set of vertical proportions adopted for the lower and upper stories of the apse (fig. 35). The latter were devised according to the proportional system of the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol (fig. 187), where the lower storey, including the columnar arcade supports, was taller than the upper (excluding the vault zone).\footnote{See Chapter 2.} In order to compensate for the divergent heights of the lower stories in the two main architectural models for the east end, the architect elected to increase the height of the lower storey in the transept (fig. 48) to a point far beyond what it had originally been in Xanten, thereby bringing the height of the lower storey of the transept into
accordance with the height of the lower storey of the apse. Thus, the string course moulding that divides the two stories in the transept was placed directly below the string course moulding that circumscribes the raised apse and forechoir bay and divides them into two stories.\textsuperscript{454} That the architect oriented the height of the lower storey of the east transept around that of the apse, adopting a taller lower storey in the transept from the distinctive vertical proportions of the apse rather than adapting the elevation of the apse itself to fit the squatter lower storey of the Xanten model, suggests that the apse and not the east transept was regarded as the more determinate of the two parts of the east end as far as design was concerned and accordingly carried somewhat greater weight in its overall conception.\textsuperscript{455}

This is further suggested by the numerous changes that the architect made to the elevation of the Xanten model in its successor at St. Kunibert, in both the lower and the upper stories. In the west choir hall in Xanten (fig. 222), the lower storey walls in each arm feature

\textsuperscript{454} The string course and walkways in the east transept are slightly lower than those in the apse (about 20 cm lower; author’s measurement). Graf (“Neue Forschungen,” 114) presents this misalignment as evidence in support of her supposition that the east transept was built using older walls, reasoning that the string course and walkways in the apse and the east transept would otherwise align perfectly had the two been erected together. There are, however, numerous factors that argue against such a reading. First, the excavation of the predecessor church indicates that the east transept was not erected using older fabric; see Chapter 1. Second, a perfect alignment of the string course mouldings in the apse and the east transept would have proven difficult if the balanced relationship between the vertical proportions of the two parts of the east end of the church was to be maintained. The floor level in the east transept is four steps lower than the level of the apse, meaning that the lower storey in the east transept had to be even taller than that in the apse (fig. 27) (the stair to the apse now has three steps, but originally had four, as prewar cross-sections indicate). Had the string course moulding in the east transept been positioned directly on level with the string course moulding in the apse, the lower storey of the east transept would have been disproportionate both to its upper storey and to the proportions of the apse itself. The string course in the east transept was placed as high as possible, just under that in the apse, to maintain this balance. It is, then, more likely a practical solution and not indicative of a break in construction or an index of the chronological priority of one part of the building, whether the apse or east transept, over the other.

\textsuperscript{455} Here it should be noted that the use of a shorter lower storey and a taller upper storey in the apse, which would have aligned the apse with the particular proportions of the west choir hall in Xanten (lower storey shorter, upper taller), would have been by all means possible at St. Kunibert: this was precisely, beginning with with the apse at St. Gereon (fig. 201) and running through the apses at Groß St. Martin (fig. 207) and St. Aposteln (fig. 177), the solution used in every late Romanesque apse in Cologne before the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol (fig. 187) with its “inverted” set of proportions; see Chapter 2. That the apse with its particular proportions and not the east transept set the parameters for the vertical proportions of the interior elevation of the east end of St. Kunibert as a whole further undermines the Graf’s supposition (“Ostchorbaut”) that the design and construction of the east transept preceded the conception and erection of the apse.
deep, semicircular Muldennischen on all three sides, north, south, and west. Apart from such minor divergences as the presence or absence of windows in the niches, the elevation of the lower storey walls here is the same. The lower storey of the north and south walls of the east transept at St. Kunibert (fig. 48), both with pairs of deep, semicircular Muldennischen, follows the basic conception of the corresponding walls in Xanten, departing from the model principally in the reduction of the amount of reserved wall around and above the niches. Corresponding in placement to the west walls in Xanten, the east walls of the transept arms at St. Kunibert (fig. 100), however, diverge sharply from those in the model. Here, the architect retained the basic motif of the bipartite division of the wall into two niches, as in Xanten; the protruding round consoles at the springing of the arch in each arm, similar to those in the arches in Xanten, as well as the round-headed windows, positioned conspicuously off-axis like those in Xanten, also loosely recall the model. But the elevation of the lower east walls at St. Kunibert was transformed radically through the placement of a pair of engaged columns with tall and slender shafts in the position of what had been the unadorned, flat wall surface between the niches in Xanten. Thus, whereas the elevation of the lower storey in Xanten is marked by uniformity

456 On the niches in the north and south walls and their relationship to Xanten, see Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 62. The south wall originally had two semicircular Muldennischen, exactly as in Xanten; the lower reaches of the west niche were, however, transformed (from a semicircular niche to three flat walls) when the chapel of the Holy Cross was installed here in the 1260s (fig. 161); see Chapter 7. The lower reaches of the west niche in the north wall are flat on account of the door to that leads to the corridor that linked the transept to the (older) cloister; otherwise, both the upper half of this niche and the eastern niche in the north wall follow Xanten in their semicircular form.

457 On the derivation of the consoles from Xanten, see Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 55. Similar consoles were also used in the lower storey of the forechoir bay (fig. 39).

458 A different solution for the lower storey of the east walls—a single large niche rather than two separate ones—was possibly envisioned at first and then abandoned for the present solution, as a masonry scar in the northeast wall, made visible by war damage and subsequently plastered over in the 1950s, suggests. This possibility was first noted by Verbeek in 1976 in Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 553, who observed that “[a]uf einen Planwechsel an den Ostnischen deutet ein um 1950 sichtbarer älterer Zustand mit breiter Flachnische anstelle der Zweiteilung mit vorgestellten Zwillingssäulen in der Mitte.” Graf (“Ostchorbau,” 154 n. 267), who was able to personally discuss this find with Verbeek, notes that Verbeek found this trace of a plan change in the north arm of the transept, and it is thus not certain if the south transept arm also displayed similar evidence; this is not clear in the passage cited above either. Though impossible to verify, Verbeek’s observation concerning the plan change in the lower
on all sides, the lower storey of the transept at St. Kunibert presents considerable differences between the east walls and the contiguous north and south flanks.

It is significant that the pairs of engaged columns in the east transept at St. Kunibert are restricted to its east walls. In contrast to the north and south flanks, the east walls would be seen together with the apse from every angle, both head-on and obliquely (figs. 47, 89). Because there was no apse in the west choir hall in Xanten, the relationship between the west walls in the two arms and the wider, central west wall there was unproblematic (fig. 221): in the lower storey, the elevation with *Muldennischen* from all the other walls was extended into the central bay and transmuted slightly by the creation of a central axis with a taller central arch. At St. Kunibert (fig. 89), the area corresponding to the flat wall of the central bay in Xanten was to be occupied by a two-storied, semicircular apse with freestanding arcades supported on column bundles in each storey. A simple adoption of the elevation of the lower storey of the corresponding west walls in Xanten for the lower east walls in a manner analogous to the north and south walls of the transept, which do follow Xanten closely, would have resulted in a jarring visual juxtaposition between the apse, with its columnar supports, and the plain, unarticulated wall as it existed in this location in the Xanten model. Thus, at St. Kunibert, the architect recast the elevation of the lower storey of the east walls, designing it in direct relation to the elevation of the lower storey of the apse and melding it visually with the latter through the addition of
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east walls of the transept has since been taken up in the scholarly literature; see, for instance, Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 68; Machat, “Bauwerk,” 323; Kosch, “Anbauten und Nebenräume,” 91; Kosch, “Einzelbeobachtungen,” 41. Graf (“Ostchorbau,” 68) argues that the lower east walls were modified into their current form only very late, towards the 1226 consecration of the side altars, but this is highly unlikely, given that the east walls of the east transept had certainly already risen up to the level of lower storey of the towers by 1222, making any deep-reaching changes to the structure of these supporting walls in the lower storey perilous. See, on this point, Kosch, “Anbauten und Nebenräume,” 91, who more plausibly suggests that the change was made well before work moved to the upper storey and thus very early on.

459 The upper storey of the central bay in Xanten was fundamentally altered in 1517 through the addition of a tracery window that consumes the entire wall. The hypothetical reconstruction of the original appearance of the upper storey of the central wall in fig. 213 is that of Kubach and Verbeek, *RBRM*, vol. 4, 287 Abb. 220.
columnar supports that parallel those in the lower apse arcade (fig. 50). On account of the use of unprofiled (as opposed to double-order), blind arches throughout the lower storey of the transept, the number of shafts in the engaged columns on the east walls was necessarily reduced to two and the columns themselves accordingly engaged and not freestanding. This difference in form aside, the engaged columns in the transept were conceived as formal pendants to the column bundles in the lower apse arcade; they feature the same socles, plinths, and Attic bases, as well as the same conjoined yet distinct crocket capitals as their counterparts in the apse. The serpentine, intertwining leaves and ball-like crockets on the capitals in the transept indicate, moreover, that they were executed by the same workshop and contemporaneously with the capitals in the lower apse arcade (fig. 64).\(^{460}\) The capitals and impost blocks on these supports are also positioned on approximately the same level as those in the lower apse arcade (fig. 50), only slightly lower on account of the lower level of the string course in the transept, establishing a further visual link between the lower apse arcade and the lower east walls of transept arms.

Taking up the basic elevation with dual niches from Xanten, but transforming it through the addition of the columnar supports between the niches, the architect modified the model in the

\(^{460}\) The capitals at St. Kunibert have received very little attention in the literature. An in-depth or even summary study of them is lacking. Graf (“Ostchorbau,” 89, 121–122) provides brief descriptions of the capitals in the apse and the east transept, but does not profer thoughts on their dates relative to one another or their stylistic connections with contemporary regional examples. A systematic stylistic examination of the capitals at St. Kunibert, while certainly a desideratum, would far exceed the scope of this chapter. It is nonetheless clear from the common formal vocabulary of the capitals in the east end that, despite divergences in shape and minor differences in technique and motifs that one would expect to find within a workshop, the capitals in apse and east transept are contemporary with each other (fig. 64). The capitals here display no signs that would indicate a significant chronological cleavage between them and thus between these two parts of the church. For their part, Kubach and Verbeeck (\textit{RBRM}, vol. 1, 552) state—without, however, offering any evidence—that the capitals in the church display a “formal progression” (“Eine Formenentwicklung läßt sich im Blattwerk der Kapitelle ablesen”), but they do not indicate in which direction. Presumably, because they later observe that work began in the east end and moved progressively westwards, they meant that the capitals “develop” from the east end of the church westwards through the nave (no original capitals survive in the west transept). This statement would need to be reinforced through detailed scrutiny of the extant capitals themselves.
lower east walls with a view to integrating this section of the transept with the elevation of the contiguous apse.

As with the lower storey, the series of changes made to the Xanten model in the upper storey of the transept issues from the architect’s efforts to harmonize its elevation and its system of wall articulation and supports with those of the apse. This is especially apparent in the treatment of the north and south flanks of the transept (fig. 49), because these walls, as is the case in the lower storey, are the two walls in the upper storey of the transept that follow Xanten (fig. 222) most faithfully. The changes to the model here, therefore, are particularly revealing and directly indicative of contemporaneity in the planning and execution of the apse and east transept. The elevation of the upper storey of the north and south flanks clings closely to Xanten in the use of a walkway fronted by a freestanding arcade with two arches and illuminated by two round-headed windows in the solid rear wall; the derivation is also evident in the central arcade support, which in both structures takes the form of a T-shaped pier with a projecting front face and recessed lateral faces with two inset colonnettes.461 The staggered form of the impost blocks on the central supports, which trace the contours of the individual supporting members below, likewise follows Xanten directly, as does the thoroughly logical assignment of the discrete elements of the double-order arches to those supporting members, with the nook rolls assigned to the colonnettes and the archivolts to the recessed lateral faces of the pier.

At St. Kunibert, however, the conception of the upper central support, clerestory windows, and even the arches was altered drastically in view of the decisions made for the corresponding sections of the apse. Whereas the socles of the upper supports in Xanten, both in

461 On these aspects of the elevation of the upper storey of the north and south flanks, see Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 61–62.
the central supports on the flanks and throughout the west choir hall, are approximately the same height as the colonnettes themselves, at St. Kunibert the socles were cut down considerably and the height of the shafts of the colonnettes increased accordingly, bringing them directly in line with the height of the shafts in the column bundles in the upper apse arcade (fig. 47).\textsuperscript{462} This is the case both with the central support on the north and south flanks and with all of the other freestanding supports in the transept, including those in the corners and in the upper east walls.\textsuperscript{463} Likewise, the modestly-scaled clerestory windows in Xanten, surrounded on all sides by large expanses of masonry, were replaced at St. Kunibert with tall lights that extend to a point just above floor level and thereby consume the entire expanse of the freestanding arcades before them, as in the apse clerestory. In the transept, the upper edge of the socles in the freestanding arcade also aligns with the lower, outermost edge of the window sills in a repetition of the particular technique found in the apse clerestory.\textsuperscript{464} The design of the arches in the upper storey of the north and south flanks, moreover, replicates that found in the upper apse arcade. As in the apse, the arches here are both stilted and double-ordered with robust nook rolls, with both the nook roll and the upper, outermost plane of the arch drawn upwards to form slightly pointed arches that cut into the webs of the rib vault in a manner analogous to the arches in the upper apse arcade, which cut into the masonry of apse semi-dome. Therefore, in form and employment, the arcades in the transept at St. Kunibert differ markedly from the arcades in the same position in the west choir hall in Xanten (fig. 222). This point is significant, for it indicates with great clarity that the clerestory zones in the apse and east transept were designed

\textsuperscript{462} The shafts in the column bundles in the upper apse arcade are approximately 3.1 m tall; the colonnettes in the supports in the east transept are, at approximately 3.3 m tall, only slightly taller (dimensions are those given in \textit{KDM} 6/4, Taf. XIX).

\textsuperscript{463} The colonnettes in the corner supports in the western corners are slightly shorter on account of the elevated level of the walkway here, which runs over the tall arches to the side aisles. See Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{464} On the design of the apse clerestory, see Chapter 2.
and erected together. The design of the double-order arch with nook rolls in the east end at St. Kunibert, after all, came from Xanten, and was faithfully employed in the lower apse arcade (fig. 36), as suggested in Chapter 2. This design was then modified into the stilted and slightly pointed form found in the upper apse arcade. And it is also this altered, stilted and pointed form from the upper storey of the apse, and not the original form from Xanten, that is found in the upper storey of the east transept (fig. 47). The upper arcade in the transept at St. Kunibert, then, stands at a slight remove from Xanten: the architect of the east end took up the Xanten arch design in the lower reaches of the east end (lower apse arcade), and, after transforming it, applied the modified version in the upper storey of both the apse and the transept. The uniformity in the conception and execution of the entire clerestory zone in the apse and the transept indicates, as does the lower storey, that the upper sections of the east end were conceived and erected as a whole.

Contemporaneity in the design and construction of the apse and east transept also provides the most compelling explanation for the profound transformation of the structural system from Xanten in the transept at St. Kunibert. In the west choir hall in Xanten (figs. 222, 223), the ordering of the supports for the vaults and the supports for the various parts of the double-order arches in the freestanding arcades is patently rational and consistently applied. Here, the two groups of supports are rigorously separated. The groin vaults in the arms are

465 In spite of his attempt to derive the design of the east transept at St. Kunibert from the triconch at St. Aposteln, Meyer-Barkhausen (Kirchenbaukunst, 56–57) sensed the contemporaneity of the planning and execution of the apse and east transept at St. Kunibert and pointed precisely to the similarity in the form of the arches in the arcades in the upper storey of the apse and east transept as indicative of the unified plan for the east end, writing, “die Planeinheitlichkeit von Apsis und Turmräumen [i.e., the east transept] erhellt besonders auch aus den Arkadenbögen des Obergeschosses mit ihrem gesteltzen und gespitzten Rundstabbogen und dem gurtartigen, die tiefe Fensternische abgrenzenden Rundbogen dahinter.” Meyer-Barkhausen was himself unaware of the origin in Xanten of the design for the double-order arches in the east end at St. Kunibert and thus also of the actually quite remarkable transformation in the design from the arcade in the lower storey of the apse, where the arches in Xanten are followed very closely, to the stilted arches with pointed apexes in the arcades in the upper storey of the apse and east transept, themselves both a clear abstraction of the original Xanten design.
supported by true, continuous vault responds in the form of three-quarter, engaged columns that run uninterrupted from the floor through to the springing of the vaults, thereby traversing both the upper and lower stories; the string course moulding that divides the two stories thus terminates when it reaches the vault responds rather than wrap around them. In the corners of the hall, the vault responds are positioned at the junction of the two piers for the arcades that abut to form the corners of the hall. Next to the crossing, the vault responds for both the groin vault in the crossing and the groin vaults in the two arms run up the flanks of monumental, pilaster-like piers (fig. 221). Like the vault responds, these piers, which support the transverse arches separating the crossing vault from the vaults in the arms, rise continuously from floor level to the springing of the vaults. Each vault respond in Xanten carries three elements, namely, the two ends of the wall ribs that line the junction of the vault and the lunette-shaped transverse (north and south) and front (east and west) walls, as well as one of the ridges of the groin vaults. The vaults in the west choir hall in Xanten thus appear like baldachins on columnar supports that have been set into the rectangular spaces created by the inner walls of the hall (fig. 222). The freestanding arcades have their own system of supports independent of the vault supports (fig. 223). The central supports on the north, south, and west walls take the form of piers with inset colonnettes. The supports on the wider north and south flanks are T-shaped, with reserved masonry between the colonnettes; those on the west walls, on account of the narrower walls here, dispense with the projecting central strip of masonry and consist instead of two flanking colonnettes backed by a flat pier. The corner supports are formed by two abutting piers that meet to produce the ninety-degree corners of the hall. The face of these

466 The crossing vault in Xanten was replaced with a taller star vault in 1517. The responds in this bay, however, indicate that it was also originally vaulted with a quadripartite groin vault.

467 This “baldachin-like” aspect of the Xanten vaulting system has been excellently described and assessed by Overdick, Architektursystem, 42–53.
piers contiguous to the arches of the freestanding arcades houses a single colonnette identical to those in the central supports. In all of the arcade supports in Xanten, the colonnettes are assigned to the nook rolls, the foremost face of the pier to the projecting outer face of the double-order arch, and the lateral faces of the piers to the recessed archivolts in a logical, rationalized system of articulation.

The east transept at St. Kunibert presents what can only be described as a radical compression of the logical system of vault and arcade supports that had been developed at Xanten. And this radical compression is, again, expressly attributable to the problems posed by the innovative integration of the apse, with its particular elevation, with an east transept on the immediate model of the west choir hall in Xanten. At St. Kunibert, for instance, pilaster-like piers were also adopted as supports for the transverse arches that separate the crossing vault from the vaults in the north and south arms of the transept (figs. 35, 47). In sharp contrast to the solution in the transverse supports in Xanten (fig. 221), however, the three-quarter colonnettes that serve as the vault responds are not continuous, but rather confined to what is a clearly delineated upper storey. The transverse piers are divided into two distinct stories by the string course, which begins on them, wraps around the piers, and continues uninterrupted westwards through the east transept, where it terminates (fig. 47). As a result, the half of the transverse piers in the lower storey appears as a plain mass of masonry that projects into the space of the transept, while the upper half is flanked by the two inset columnar vault responds. The form of the upper half of the transverse piers (fig. 54), a pilaster between two colonnettes with capitals and staggered impost blocks that trace the contours of the separate members below, nonetheless faithfully reproduces the design of the upper reaches of the transverse supports in Xanten (fig. 222). When seen in the immediate context of the apse, it is clear that the use of continuous vault
responds and piers like those in Xanten for the transverse supports at St. Kunibert—which, in the east, are positioned directly adjacent to the apse and are thus seen with it (figs. 35, 47)—would have been dissonant vis-à-vis the strict division of the elevation of the apse itself into two clear stories, with its superimposed bundles of columns in each storey. The architect sought to maintain the division of stories on the transverse supports in the transept in order to harmonize the structural system of the transept with that of the conjoining apse, doing so by dividing these supports into two stories with the string course and thus limiting the vault responds to the upper storey. This design was applied in the transverse supports on both sides of the crossing, east and west (figs. 49, 53). As with all of the other supports in the upper storey of the east transept, the vault responds in the transverse supports are, moreover, assimilated visually to the column bundles in the apse through the use in them of low socles and the concomitantly tall colonnette shafts, which also accord with the height of the shafts in the column bundles in the upper apse arcade and feature the same Attic bases and capitals (fig. 47). The division of the transverse supports at St. Kunibert into two stories and the confinement of the vault responds to the upper storey are both measures that are clearly tied to the elevation of the contiguous apse.

The architect’s decision to divide the transverse supports into two stories and to replace the continuous vault responds from Xanten with ones confined to the upper storey had momentous implications for his conception and design of the other supports in the arms of the transept. The abandonment of continuous vault responds in the transverse supports necessarily worked against the adoption of continuous columnar vault responds like those in Xanten (fig. 223) in the four corners of the transept. Instead, and in a clear attempt to maintain aesthetic and structural symmetry with the transverse supports, the architect also confined the vault responds

---

468 See note 460.
in the corners of the transept to the upper storey (fig. 47). But because the responds in the corners were now restricted to the upper storey, a solution had to be found for the form of the corner supports in the lower storey. Xanten, with its continuous columnar responds in the corners offered no model here. Rather, in the lower storey of the corner supports, the architect repeated the motif of the projecting pier found in the transverse supports as the base for the vault respond above—a move that was intended to give the same appearance to both the transverse and corner vault supports and thereby unify the form of all of the vault supports in the east transept (figs. 47, 49). As in the transverse supports, moreover, the string course wraps around the corner supports, maintaining the strict division of the transept into two stories, even across the vault responds.

The transformation of the form of the vault supports in the four corners of the transept vis-à-vis the continuous columnar responds in Xanten, in turn, had immediate consequences for the design of the arcade supports on the north and south flanks. Whereas in Xanten the arcade supports in the corners consist of two abutting piers, each with a colonnette on the face toward the arches in the freestanding arcades, and the vault responds are placed separately in the corners (fig. 223), at St. Kunibert the columnar vault respond in the upper storey itself now took

---

469 The western corner supports differ in form from those in the east; here, piers in the lower storey were rendered redundant by the arches to the side aisles (fig. 53); see further Chapter 4. Graf (“Ostchorbau,” 64) speaks briefly of a “konstruktive Umwertung der Mittelpfeiler und Eckstützen” from Xanten at St. Kunibert, but she does not—because she puts the erection and design of the east transept before the design and erection of the apse—connect the profound series of changes to the Xanten support system in the east transept at St. Kunibert to the projected presence of the apse and its elevation. The use of a piers in the corner supports in lower storey also leads Graf to conclude that the architect at St. Kunibert knew the much earlier west choir hall in Maastricht (ca. 1180) in addition to Xanten, because in that structure a square pier (without a column) runs continuously from the floor to the springing of the vault in the corners of the hall. She thus concludes that the corner supports at St. Kunibert represent a fusion of the corner supports in Xanten with the corner piers in Maastricht. Graf, however, does not take into account the transformation of the transverse supports at St. Kunibert vis-à-vis Xanten, which provides a more ready and plausible explanation for the use of a square, projecting pier in the lower storey of the corner supports. There is, moreover, no feature in the east transept at St. Kunibert that indicates that the architect had any knowledge of the west choir hall Maastricht. Rather, the design of the transept is fully explainable through Xanten and—in the case of the major transformations made to the support system in the Xanten model—the projected presence of the adjacent apse and the desire to integrate the elevation of the two parts of the east end of the church.
the form of an inset colonnette within the pier (fig. 47). Rather than following Xanten and adding further colonnettes to either side to support the nook rolls in the adjacent arcades, the architect at St. Kunibert did away with additional colonnettes in the corner supports altogether, leaving only the single, columnar vault respond inside a very skinny L-shaped pier and compressing the separate vault and arcade supports from Xanten into a single, slender pier with one inset colonnette. This move necessitated still other modifications. In Xanten, the colonnettes in the corner supports are assigned to the nook rolls in the freestanding arcades (fig. 223). The radical reduction of the corner supports in the transept at St. Kunibert to a single colonnette/vault respond, by contrast, meant that the logical, consistent system of assignment of the different elements—vault ridges, wall ribs, and nook rolls—that had been developed in Xanten could not simply be followed here. The architect instead compromised in several ways with the reduced corner supports. He followed Xanten in using the lateral faces of the skinny L-shaped corner piers to support the recessed archivolts of the double-order arches to either side of the corner piers (fig. 47, 52). But because he had dispensed with the separate colonnettes here, the architect was forced to assign the nook rolls in the arcades on the north and south flanks and the two diagonal ribs of the vaults to the single vault responds in the corner supports. This meant, in turn, that the central arcade supports on the north and south flanks themselves also had to be drawn out into the space of the hall so that they and their arcades would align with the plane of the single vault responds in the corners, which are not flush with the wall, but rather stand atop the projecting square piers inside the plane of the wall, precisely like the transverse supports with which they were conceived. On account of this, the central supports on the two flanks, in marked contrast to the corresponding supports in Xanten (fig. 223), also had to be placed on a projecting, pilaster-like pier like those in both the transverse and corner supports
Thus, whereas in Xanten the central supports on the flanks had only been part of the upper arcade, at St. Kunibert they were assimilated into the larger structural system. They therefore take a similar form to the corner and transverse supports, not only in the use of the projecting supporting pier in the lower storey, but also in the way in which the string course continues over the support, as in the former supports, and in the treatment of the capital zone, which is left bare between the capitals, like the transverse supports and in contrast to Xanten (fig. 223), where a frieze unites the capitals on these same supports. And, most strikingly, just as with the transverse and corner supports, the central supports on the flanks were even treated as vault “responds”: the fifth rib of the vaults in the arms of the transept is assigned to this pier, in spite of the lack of a true, columnar respond on its front face.

Contrary to Xanten, then, all of the different types of support in the east transept, whether the transverse supports, the corner supports, and even the freestanding arcade supports on the north and south flanks, are integrated (figs. 47, 52). This fundamental reorganization and transformation—or reduction and tightening—of the Xanten structural system of vault and arcade supports issues from the clear intent to maintain the strict division of the two stories in the transept by confining the columnar vault responds to the upper storey in order to align the elevation of the transept that of the two-storied apse. This inflected the conception and design of the transverse and corner supports, whose columnar responds were now limited to the upper storey and set on projecting piers, which in turn led to the decision to do without further colonnettes in the corner supports. This had implications for the design and disposition of the central supports on the north and south flanks, which also had to be drawn out from the plane of the wall and placed on just such a pilaster-like pier so that they, and their arcades, would align
with the compressed corner supports. The integrated structural system of the east transept indicates the architect conceived and designed all four sides of the transept—east, north and south, and west—together, as a whole (figs. 49, 52). And this radical compression of the Xanten system of supports in the transept at St. Kunibert was also clearly planned from the outset. The very existence of the large, pilaster-like piers on the lower storey walls presupposes the existence, form, and scale of the vault and arcade supports above (nowhere more apparent than in the extraordinarily skinny corner piers, with their single colonnette responds, so divergent from the complex, multiform corner supports in Xanten). This also provides conclusive confirmation of contemporaneity in the conception and erection of the east end as a whole from the ground up.

470 Much has been made of the appearance of the pilaster-like piers that bisect the north and south flanks of the east transept. Meyer-Barkhausen (Kirchenbaukunst, 61), who was unaware of the transept’s dependence on Xanten, saw in these two piers an attempt to enliven the wall by giving it greater plasticity. Graf (“Ostchorbau,” 64 ff.), who proved the dependence of the transept on Xanten, adopts this line of reasoning as well, arguing that the projecting central piers aim to endow the flanks with plasticity and, further, that these two piers also had to be drawn out from the plane of the wall on account of the supposed thinness of the walls from the unspecified predecessor church whose walls, Graf supposes, were used to construct the walls of the new transept. The latter argument, however, has no basis, for the east transept was not built using older walls (see Chapter 1). The former argument is also spurious: instead of betokening a gesture towards “plasticity” for its own sake, the form and disposition of the central supports on the flanks are, when read in the context of the structural system of the transept as a whole, a necessary function of the entire range of transformations to the Xanten system of vault and arcade supports. The central piers in the north and south flanks are drawn out from the plane of the wall because the compressed corner and transverse vault supports are also drawn out into the space of the transept; there was no other alternative for the position of these two piers if they and their arcades were to align with the corner supports so that the arches and nook rolls of the arcade could be placed on top of the latter.

471 This is true even of the west walls, the upper storey of which was modified during the course of construction in view of the nave, which was slightly taller than originally planned (see Chapter 4). This change aside, it is clear, as the form of the supports indicates, that the west walls were conceived and designed with the other walls of the east transept. Cf., in contrast, the conclusions of Graf (“Ostchorbau,” 66ff.), who posits that the north and south flanks of the transept were designed first and independently of the east and west walls.

472 The physical constitution of the central supports on the north and south flanks in the lower storey alone indicates that work did not begin on the north and south walls of the east transept first and ca. 1200, as Graf argued (Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 66ff.). The elevation of these two walls, and the form of the central piers here in particular (and this is precisely where Graf found the tie beam that led her to suppose that these two walls were begun first), presupposes that the elevation of both the east and west walls of the east transept and the specific form and disposition of the transverse and corner supports in both stories on these walls themselves had already been worked out because the design and spatial disposition of the central supports along the north and south flanks of the transept respond to the design and the spatial disposition of the transverse and corner supports on its east and west walls.
As with the north and south flanks, the compression of the corner supports at St. Kunibert into skinny piers had major repercussions for the design of the freestanding arcade in the upper east walls (fig. 52). Here, the architect again followed Xanten (fig. 223), preserving the arcade of two arches, the lunette-shaped wall below the vault, and the wall rib, which lines the junction of the wall with the vault web, as it does in Xanten. But the compression of the corner support into a single colonnette made necessary a whole set of deep-reaching adjustments along this wall. The preservation of the wall rib on the east walls meant that its ends could only be assigned to the single vault respond in the corner support and, towards the crossing, to the vault respond in the adjacent transverse support. This led the architect to discard the motif of the nook rolls in the upper eastern arcades completely, as there was, by dint of the retention of the wall rib above, nowhere to support the ends of the nook rolls if he was to avoid creating an unsightly clump of four distinct elements atop the single vault responds. Had the nook rolls been retained on the east walls, each respond would have been required to support the nook rolls on both the east walls and north and south flanks, the diagonal ribs of the vault, and the wall rib (or, in the case of the transverse supports, another wall rib rather than the nook rolls of the north and south flanks, but four distinct elements nonetheless). The abandonment of nook rolls in the east arcades thus made superfluous the use of double colonnettes in the central, freestanding support like those in Xanten (fig. 223), where the dual colonnettes are assigned to the converging ends of the nook rolls. Instead, the architect employed a support consisting of a single colonnette set against an almost non-existent pier. Despite the absence of nook rolls in the arcade, the architect attempted to maintain symmetry with the other arches in the upper storey of both the apse and transept by using stilted, double-order arches and drawing the projecting outer face up to form a slightly pointed arch. In the two outermost arches, the
hanging, recessed round archivolts were retained and assigned to the lateral faces of the adjacent corner piers. The use of hanging archivolts was, in contrast, not possible in the innermost arches adjacent to the transverse supports, because the reduction of the Xanten model meant that, apart from the transverse support itself, there was, in marked contrast to the corresponding spot in Xanten, no additional pier on whose lateral face the archivolt could rest. The walkway here was vaulted instead with a tunnel vault that projects forward from the solid rear wall and whose outermost edge itself forms the lower edge of the simplified double-order arch, and the half of the tunnel vault closest to the transverse support placed on a continuous console. As in the east walls in the lower storey, the presence of the stair-wells behind the forechoir bay precluded the use of a window in the rear wall in the arches next to the crossing, unlike in Xanten. The solid rear wall here was instead provided with a door that furnishes access to the stair-wells behind. The rear wall behind the two outermost arches otherwise follows Xanten, and includes a clerestory window, designed, as with the tall clerestory windows on the north and south flanks of the transept, with a clear view towards replicating the design of the clerestory zone in the adjacent apse.

The refiguration of the Xanten structural system in the east transept, finally, was not without significant consequences for St. Kunibert’s transept vaults themselves (figs. 47, 52), which differ from those in Xanten in three respects. First, the vaults differ in type. Whereas the vaults in Xanten all originally took the form of groin vaults, all three at St. Kunibert are rib vaults. The ribs are doughy with a simple profile, round with a slightly pointed edge. In the arms of the transept, the ribs intersect at the apex of the vault without either a boss or a keystone; in the crossing, the ribs are joined by an annular keystone (fig. 51). The profile of the

473 The original crossing vault in Xanten is now lost, but it was most likely a groin vault, like those in the arms.
ribs and the use of intersecting ribs without keystones in the arms are similar to other extant examples of rib vaults in Cologne from the 1210s, such as those in the north and south arms of the upper storey of the west end at the collegiate church of St. Andreas (ca. 1210–1220).474 The second difference consists in the height of the crossing vault relative to the vaults in the arms. Although it was replaced in 1517 by a late Gothic star vault, the vault in the central bay in Xanten was the same height as the vaults in the adjacent arms, as the height of the original, thirteenth-century responds in this bay indicates (fig. 221).475 At St. Kunibert, the presence of the conjoining apse to the east meant that the apex of the eastern transverse arch for the crossing vault had to be positioned far above the apexes of the north and south transverse arches (figs. 27, 89).476 In the west, the transverse arch for the crossing vault is even taller than in the east on account of the nave, the high vaults of which are taller than both the crossing vault and the apse semi-dome; the taller transverse arch here is connected with the move towards a slightly taller nave than was originally envisioned when the east end was begun, and the change made during the course of work on the east transept.477 The presence at St. Kunibert of both the apse and the nave (even if the nave was originally projected to be the same height as the apse) thus meant that both the eastern and western transverse arches in the crossing vault, and therefore the crossing vault itself, had to be significantly taller than in Xanten, where there was no apse.

Here, again, the apse and its projected presence exercised determinate influence on the form and

---

476 The apex of the eastern transverse arch stands 19.2 m above the floor level of the presbytery; the arch is thus the same height as the apse vault (19.2 m). The apexes of the north and south transverse arches in the crossing stand approximately 15.3 m above the floor level of the east transept, which is itself approximately 65 cm lower than that of the apse. Even granting the different floor levels, the eastern transverse arch is nonetheless markedly taller—approximately 3.25 m when a common floor level is assumed. Dimensions based on *KDM 6/4*, Taf. XIX.
477 See Chapter 4. The apex of the western transverse arch in the crossing stands 21 m above the floor level of the east transept. It is approximately 1.15 m taller than the eastern transverse arch when a common baseline for both is assumed. Dimensions based on *KDM 6/4*, Taf. XIX.
design of the transept as the two were planned together, pushing the height of the crossing vault upwards *vis-à-vis* the vaults in the arms, which are approximately 3.5 meters shorter (fig. 89). The third and final divergence from the vaults in Xanten is the particular form of the vaults in the arms of the transept. Whereas the crossing vault at St. Kunibert, though a rib rather than a groin vault, follows Xanten (originally quadripartite) in the use of a quadripartite vault, the rib vaults in the arms (figs. 47, 52) diverge from the corresponding vaults in Xanten in the addition of a fifth, transverse rib to what is otherwise still a quadripartite vault. The additional rib in the vaults in the arms is assigned to the impost block on the central freestanding supports on the north and south flanks.

Much has been written about these additional ribs in the arms of the east transept. Meyer-Barkhausen, the first to address it, read the addition of a fifth rib as an attempt to make the arms of the transept into “conches,” turning the east end into a type of pseudo-trefoil choir patterned on the choir at St. Aposteln. This interpretation has proved tenacious. The east transept, however, was not based on St. Aposteln, but rather on Xanten, and it is therefore debatable whether the intention of the fifth rib in the vaults was to create a “conch-like effect” in imitation of that putative model. Meyer-Barkhausen also positioned the fifth rib next to the transverse ribs in the seven-part vaults in the west transept at St. Aposteln (fig. 186), arguing that the east transept at St. Kunibert, which he dated to 1226 on account of the consecration of the side altars, postdated the former, and thus that the idea to use an additional rib came from

---

478 The crossing vault is 21.70 meters tall, those in the north and south arms 18.24 and 18.09 meters, respectively (author’s measurements).
479 Meyer-Barkhausen, *Kirchenbaukunst*, 54, 56.
there.\textsuperscript{481} The east transept at St. Kunibert, however, was most likely already vaulted by 1222, and the west transept at St. Aposteln itself probably dates only to circa 1225–1230.\textsuperscript{482} And even if one were to disregard the chronology, the transverse ribs in the seven-part vaults at St. Aposteln are, when seen in the context of the system vault articulation and supports there, at best a superficial parallel for the single transverse rib in the vaults at St. Kunibert. At St. Aposteln, the transverse ribs are supported on their own columnar responds, while the wall ribs are assigned to their own responds, which flank the central respond to form bundles of three responds. At St. Kunibert, the single transverse rib does not have a columnar respond, but was instead placed unceremoniously on top of the impost block on the central freestanding support on the north and south flanks.

Rather than attaching the use of a fifth rib to St. Aposteln west or even the trefoil choir there, it is justifiable to ask whether the addition of the transverse rib in the vaults in the arms of the transept is not itself also connected with the compression of the Xanten system of vault and arcade supports and a direct function of it (fig. 52). The central supports on the north and south flanks, as indicated above, were brought out into the space of the transept, and thus assimilated into and harmonized with the system of vault supports in the form of the transverse and corner supports.\textsuperscript{483} Though this did not in itself mean that the architect had to treat this central pier on the flank as a vault respond like the other supports, the use of the fifth rib on this support strongly suggests that he sought to integrate it fully into the structural system, not only in the elevation of its lower and upper stories, but also in the vault zone. The design that the architect

\textsuperscript{481} Meyer-Barkhausen, \textit{Kirchenbaukunst}, 61–62.
\textsuperscript{482} On the date of the east transept to before/ca. 1222, see Chapter 2. Meyer-Barkhausen dated the west transept at St. Aposteln to 1219, suggesting that it was vaulted together with the nave, but more recent scholarship places its construction more convincingly after the nave and towards the end of the 1220s. See, for instance, Kubach and Verbeek, \textit{RBRM}, vol. 1, 516 (“ging wohl bis 1230”), and Schröder, “Rippengewölbe,” 213.
\textsuperscript{483} See above, 182–184.
adopted for the arcades in the north and south flanks, moreover, presented issues that also encouraged the addition of a transverse rib in this specific position. The vaults in the arms follow the corresponding vaults in Xanten closely in the use of wall ribs along the east and west walls and the transverse arches. Only two walls in the east transept lack the otherwise universally-employed wall rib—the north and south flanks. And it is precisely these two walls that feature nook rolls in the arcades, which are assigned, along with the diagonal ribs of the vault and the wall ribs on the east and west walls, to the single vault responds in the corner supports, bringing the number of ribs and rolls on each respond to three. With the corner supports already fully occupied by all of these elements, the placement of a further wall rib along the north and south flanks—and thus the use of quadripartite rib vaults over the arms—could not come into question if the nook rolls were also to be retained along the flanks, which, to judge from the fact that they were retained here, was considered paramount. A fifth, transverse rib offered an ideal solution here, as it would bisect the outermost web of the vault into two halves, allowing for the retention of the nook rolls in the arcade below, while the rib itself could be placed, neatly if somewhat unorganically, on top of the impost block of the central freestanding support. Rib vaults on irregular plans and with additional ribs wherever needed were themselves hardly uncommon in Cologne by the 1210s and early 1220s. At St. Kunibert, one need only compare the virtuoso, zig-zagging rib vault in the corridor that originally connected the east transept with the older cloister (fig. 74), itself erected in tandem with the east transept and therefore in all likelihood under the direction of the same architect.484

484 On the corridor, see Kosch, “Anbauten und Nebenräume,” 82–88. As Kosch observes (at 83–84), the first three consoles on the south side of the corridor were worked into the tracyhte piers of the transept as it was going up, indicating that the corridor was erected together with the transept. On the vault, see, too, Norbert Nussbaum and Sabine Lepsy, *Das gotische Gewölbe. Eine Geschichte seiner Form und Konstruktion* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1999), 217, who note that the modestly-scaled vault in the corridor represents
Or the irregular, seven-part rib vaults in the sacristy (fig. 75), which was added to the east end in
the 1230s. Rather than representing an attempt to create “conch-like” arms in the transept
(fig. 47), the transverse rib was most likely an *ad hoc* solution occassioned by the architect’s
compression and reorganization of the Xanten structural system and is explainable as part of the
suite of modifications in the assignment of ribs, nook rolls, and wall ribs that the tightening of
this system entailed in the east transept.

As with the apse and its relationship to its primary model St. Maria im Kapitol, it is clear
that the intention was never to copy the west choir hall in Xanten exactly in the east transept at
St. Kunibert. Rather, this architectural model served as a stimulus for a different, innovative
plan that saw it combined with an apse. The deep-reaching changes that were made to the
Xanten model in the east transept at St. Kunibert were done so to integrate its interior elevation
with that of the apse as the two components that comprise the east end of the church were
conceived and erected together. The two primary architectural models used as the basis for the
design of the east end of St. Kunibert—the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol and the
west choir hall in Xanten—stood in a reciprocal relationship from the beginning of the planning
and design stages. The projected elevation of the apse exerted profound influence on the design
of the east transept, shaping its elevation and structure; and the model for east transept, in turn,
provided the source for the distinctive design of the double-order arches and walkway vaults in
the lower and upper stories of the apse.

---

485 On the sacristy, which cannot be examined in any detail here, see Chapter 8, note 1153. The dwarf’s gallery at
St. Kunibert (apse roofed in or before 1222) also features a complicated groin vault with trapezoidal webs (fig. 80)
that is without parallel in Cologne or elsewhere, raising the number of vaults on irregular plans in the east end of St.
Kunibert alone to four. On it, see below, 197.
3. The East End: The Exterior

The design of the exterior of the east end (fig. 76) also points to contemporaneity in its conception, for the reciprocal relationship between the architectural models for the east end and the attempt to fuse harmoniously these sources with their different pedigrees—an apse rooted in Cologne traditions and an east transept based on the west choir hall in Xanten—are apparent here as well. As with the interior elevation, moreover, the identification of the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol as the primary model for the apse at St. Kunibert furnishes a new framework for understanding several unparalleled features of the appearance of the exterior of the east end of the church.

With two principal stories crowned by a dwarf’s gallery and a flat, conical roof that leans against the eastern gable of the crossing, the elevation of the exterior of the apse at St. Kunibert stands firmly, as has long been recognized, within the canon of forms that had been developed for the exterior of the apse within the group of earlier late Romanesque apses in Cologne, beginning with St. Gereon (fig. 203) and continuing with the choirs at Groß St. Martin (fig. 209) and St. Aposteln (fig. 180). Even the exterior of the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol (fig. 192), despite the retention of the eleventh-century ambulatory in the lower storey (and the crypt below it), adheres to this scheme, combining the projecting lower storey from the older conch with the by-then commonplace upper storey with dwarf’s gallery. Because the walkway in the lower storey of the apse at St. Kunibert is contained within the thickness of the wall like that in the upper storey, the apse of necessity follows the traditional exterior elevation of the apses at St. Gereon, Groß St. Martin, and St. Aposteln more closely than St. Maria im Kapitol.

---

486 See, for instance, Meyer-Barkhausen, *Kirchenbaukunst*, 54; Machat, “Bauwerk,” 324; and Kosch, “Einzelbeobachtungen,” 35. Cf. Graf (“Ostchorbau,” 93–94), who contended that the exterior elevation of the apse at St. Kunibert is based directly on the apse at the collegiate church at St. Servatius in Maastricht (ca. 1180) and not on the earlier Cologne apses, but there is no evidence to support this supposition.
Kapitol in the common plane of the exterior walls in both stories. The vertical proportions used for the exterior of the apse, with a lower storey that is roughly equivalent in height to the upper storey including the dwarf’s gallery, also look back to these particular Cologne precedents, as does the articulation of both stories with blind arcades, supported on pilasters in the lower storey and, in the upper, on engaged columns.\textsuperscript{487} The pilasters and the arches in the lower arcade are executed in finely dressed ashlar blocks of trachyte (fig. 77), which had typically been used for exterior articulating elements in Cologne for decades beforehand and also in the lower arcades of the apses at Groß St. Martin and St. Aposteln, while the expanses of wall between the arches, in keeping with even longer-standing local building traditions, are composed of small bricks of less costly tufa.\textsuperscript{488} The upper storey and dwarf’s gallery (fig. 78), as in all of the earlier Cologne apses, are both constructed of tufa, save for the columns and capitals.

Though the basic conception of its elevation is indebted to such earlier Cologne models as Groß St. Martin and St. Aposteln, the apse presents several key differences that connect it specifically with the east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol. The most conspicuous divergence from St. Aposteln and the other earlier Cologne apses is, of course, the amplified number of arches and windows in the apse at St. Kunibert (fig. 76), which features arcades of nine arches and five windows in each storey—or a 5:9 plan—rather than the seven arches and three windows—the 3:7 ratio—found in the earlier examples with the exception of St. Maria im Kapitol, the first Cologne apse with this distinctive 5:9 ratio (fig. 192). An immediate function of the decisions made for the interior elevation of the apse, this particular divergence in the exterior elevation

\textsuperscript{487} Meyer-Barkhausen, \textit{Kirchenbautkunst}, 54. The lower storey of the apse (to the base of the cornice and measured from the upper edge of the foundations) is approximately 10.5 m tall; the upper storey (from the base of the cornice to the top of the upper cornice) measures approximately 11 m. Dimensions based on \textit{KDM} 6/4, fig. 136.

\textsuperscript{488} On the use of these materials on the exterior of churches in the Lower Rhineland in the Romanesque period, see Kubach and Verbeek, \textit{RBRM}, vol. 4, 547 (on trachyte) and 546–547 (on tufa). The outer tufa shell at St. Kunibert was restored between 1898 and 1901.
and its origins in the east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol need not be belaboured here.\textsuperscript{489} The adoption of the 5:9 ratio of arches and windows at St. Kunibert, combined with the use of a comparatively short chord for the apse (just over 8.6 meters in the interior, as opposed to the 11 meter-wide chord of the apse at St. Maria im Kapitol), however, is significant in the context of the exterior because it also accounts for several other important changes in the system of exterior articulation on the apse at St. Kunibert vis-à-vis the earlier apses, including St. Maria im Kapitol. These divergences reach from the lower storey of the apse to its uppermost level and can be subsumed under three points: verticality, compression of the arcades, and the design of the dwarf’s gallery.

The most prominent characteristics of the exterior elevation of the apse (fig. 76) are its pronounced verticality, especially compared to the horizontal expansion of St. Aposteln (fig. 180), and the tight compression of the blind arcades that circumscribe it. Of the two, it is the heightened sense of vertical orientation that has attracted considerable attention from scholars, who have read the verticality of the apse as the stylistic end-point of a teleological development towards greater verticality for its own sake.\textsuperscript{490} But both the apparent verticality of the apse and the compressed form of its arcades can be read as direct functions of its 5:9 ground plan. The adoption of a 5:9 ratio from St. Maria im Kapitol entailed the addition of two arches to the arcades and two further windows to an apse that is the same width and approximately the same height as its counterparts at St. Gereon, St. Martin, and St. Aposteln. Narrower and—accordingly—more vertically-oriented arches on the exterior at St. Kunibert were thus an inevitable corollary of the plan, as in the interior.

\textsuperscript{489} See Chapter 2.
The compressed 5:9 plan also necessitated a significant tightening of the relationship of the arcades to the wall and its openings, particularly in the clerestory zone (fig. 78). In the 3:7 apses (figs. 180, 203, 209) and even at St. Maria im Kapitol (fig. 192), expanses of masonry occupy the interstices between the arches of the upper arcade and the clerestory windows. On account of the constrictions of the 5:9 plan, the architect at St. Kunibert, by contrast, dispensed with masonry around the windows, positioning the engaged columns of the upper arcade flush with the window surrounds and thereby melding arcade and window surround into one unit, with the arches doubling as the upper reaches of the surrounds. This space-saving measure resulted in a reduction in the width of the flanking arches between the clerestory windows, which are slightly narrower than those that frame the windows and thus appear “pinched.” The architect also stilted the arches in order to further compress the width of the individual arches in the upper arcade. The latter two aspects of the upper arcade—narrower, “pinched” arches between the windows and the use of stilted arches—also occur in the clerestory zone at St. Maria im Kapitol (figs. 192, 197), further suggesting that the architect of the east end was not only thoroughly familiar with the interior and plan of the apse there, but also had taken a sustained look at its system of exterior articulation and applied it in the context of the even more compressed plan at St. Kunibert.

The use of the 5:9 plan from St. Maria im Kapitol on a short chord, finally, also explains one of the most striking departures from the other Cologne apses in the apse at St. Kunibert—its

491 At St. Gereon, all three clerestory windows are framed by individual arches on colonnettes. At St. Aposteln, only the central clerestory window in the east apse has an arch with colonnettes. Here, there is a hierarchical arrangement that moves from the central axis outwards; the flanking windows on the east apse have simple roll mouldings, while all three windows on the north and south apses display unarticulated window surrounds. The window surrounds at Groß St. Martin and St. Maria im Kapitol are all unarticulated.
492 The stilted arches at St. Maria im Kapitol and the slightly narrower width of the arches between the clerestory windows are clearly recorded in the many extant photographs of the east conch taken before its destruction, as well as in an accurate and detailed drawing of a section of the exterior of the clerestory produced by an anonymous draughtsman in 1860 (fig. 197).
comparatively austere dwarf’s gallery (figs. 78, 79). This gallery at St. Kunibert has no immediate parallels within Cologne, both in terms of its unusual vault, a complex zig-zagging groin vault (fig. 80) consisting of interlocking trapezoidal tufa webs, and the design of the balustrade and freestanding arcade. The dwarf’s galleries in the Cologne group of apses from St. Gereon (fig. 203) through to St. Maria im Kapitol (fig. 192) all feature a balustrade adorned with a plate frieze and a richly elaborated arcade composed of strong supports in the form of four colonnettes arranged around a square pier set diagonally (or without the diagonal pier at St. Maria im Kapitol) and weak supports in the form of a pair of colonnettes around a central diagonal pier (or, at St. Gereon, a group of three colonnettes). The dwarf’s gallery at St. Kunibert (fig. 78) is exceptionally plain in comparison, as numerous scholars have stressed. Not only does it lack the plate frieze along the balustrade, but the arcade is equally spartan, with strong supports formed by a slender pier flanked by two colonnettes and weak supports by groups of two colonnettes, producing an alternating rhythm of a-b-a-b, or strong-weak-strong-weak. Like the form of the supports, this alternation also contrasts with the early Cologne apses, where the strong supports are separated not by two arches, but rather by three and, at St. Gereon, even four.

As Günther Kahl and others have observed, the reduction of the number of arches between the strong supports in the dwarf’s gallery arcade at St. Kunibert to two is connected...
with the narrower width of the arches in the arcades on the apse below, with the columns and pilasters of which the strong supports in the arcade align, as is the case in all of the other Cologne apses.\textsuperscript{498} What has gone unobserved, however, is the ultimate origin of the compressed arcades on the apse at St. Kunibert: the dependence of its plan on the 5:9 plan of the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol. The dependence is particularly significant in the context of the design of the dwarf’s gallery, because it not only explains the particular rhythm of the arcade supports, but also helps clarify why the architect adopted a much simplified form for the dwarf’s gallery itself. The form of supports in the arcade has parallels both in much earlier dwarf’s galleries of the mid-twelfth century, such as those in Schwarzrheindorf (ca. 1151; fig. 230) and St. Castor in Koblenz (ca. 1160; fig. 231), both without the plate frieze, and in other dwarf’s galleries and galleries in general in Lower Rhenish ecclesiastical and secular architecture of the 1210s and 1220s, such as the dwarf’s gallery on the apse in Limburg-an-der-Lahn (1220s; fig. 233), which display a return to simple arcade supports, sometimes, as at Limburg, without the plate frieze on the balustrade below.\textsuperscript{499} The lost west apse at St. Maria ad Gradus in Cologne (ca. 1150–1180; fig. 232) likewise had a dwarf’s gallery without a plate frieze and with supports consisting of columns and simple piers, and the crossing tower at St. Aposteln (fig. 180) also features a gallery with basic piers as strong supports and weak supports of double colonnettes.\textsuperscript{500} Because the reduced form of gallery arcade was clearly widespread, it is difficult to know whether the design of the dwarf’s gallery at St. Kunibert was stimulated by any one of these

\textsuperscript{499} On the parallels between the dwarf’s gallery at St. Kunibert and the examples in Schwarzrheindorf and Koblenz, see Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 94–99. On the examples from the 1210s and 1220s, see Kosch, “Einzelnbeobachtungen,” 38, who, in addition to Limburg, enumerates several other examples from both ecclesiastical and secular architecture.
\textsuperscript{500} On the west apse at St. Maria at Gradus, see Kubach and Verbeek, \textit{RBRM}, vol. 1, 556.
But in view of the parameters of the 5:9 plan as adopted from St. Maria im Kapitol, it can be said that the architect’s decision not to employ the by-then standard Cologne variant of the dwarf’s gallery with plate frieze and massy bundles of strong and weak supports (e.g., figs. 180 and 192) and to use instead a streamlined arcade without a plate frieze (fig. 78) most likely resided in the exigencies of the unparalleled compression of the plan with its increased number of narrow, vertical arches. The spatial constrictions of the plan precluded the use a dwarf’s gallery with substantial bundles of supports and a markedly top-heavy, horizontal emphasis and encouraged the employment of a simpler, lighter, and reduced form of dwarf’s gallery in its place.

Whereas the exterior elevation of the apse looks to and modifies Cologne precedents, the system of articulation on the exterior of the east transept (figs. 76, 78) is, like its interior elevation, rooted in that of the west choir hall in Xanten (fig. 227). For all of the changes in the number, scale, and disposition of the arches and windows on the various walls at St. Kunibert vis-à-vis Xanten, the dependence is immediately apparent in the specific technique of clothing the exterior walls of the transept using what might best be termed an “all-over” treatment of ashlar blocks of trachyte. In both structures (figs. 78 and 228), the blocks are used not only for the corner and central pilasters and the blind arches, but also throughout the spandrels of the arcades, creating a virtual stone “cage” through which which the recessed walls between the arches, executed in tufa, appear. This distinctive method of articulating exterior walls was

---

501 Thus, the twelfth-century examples in Schwarzenrheindorf and Koblenz, while quite similar in the use of a pier flanked by columns as the strong support, differ from St. Kunibert in the use of single as opposed to double colonnettes; see Kosch, “Einzelbeobachtungen,” 38.

502 See Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 48–51, who usefully describes the effect as that of a “cage” ("Gitter") and points to Xanten as the point of origin for this technique on the transept.
first developed in the lower stories of the west choir hall in Xanten, and passed from there to a host of other structures that stand at various removes from Xanten, such as the west end of the Church of Our Lady in Andernach, which is based very closely on the exterior of Xanten, and the west end at St. Andreas in Cologne, which likely took this system of exterior articulation from Andernach and not directly from Xanten itself. At St. Kunibert, the architect employed the Xanten system of blind arches down to the smallest details, including the use, here only in the arcades in the upper storey on the north, south, and east walls, of the characteristic semicircular protrusions at the level of the springing of the arches, a motif that occurs in the arcades in both the lower and upper stories of the exterior in Xanten.

Though the systems of exterior articulation on the east end are ultimately based on different models (Cologne apses and Xanten), the architect took several steps to unify them. The pilasters and arches in the lower apse arcade (fig. 77), for instance, are executed in trachyte, a tradition anchored firmly in Cologne precedents. Here, however, and unlike the earlier Cologne apses (figs. 180 and 209), the spandrels are also composed of trachyte in an application of the Xanten system of “all-over” trachyte wall articulation (fig. 228) as employed on the transept to the lower apse arcade. In the lower storey, this “cage” of blind arches in trachyte continues around the entire apse and over the two splayed walls that connect it to the east transept before merging with the blind arcade on the east walls of the transept itself, whence it extends further onto its north and south walls, thereby fusing the east end visually into an

---

503 This same technique also occurs at approximately the same time as at Xanten in the lower two stories of the west end in Neuss (usually dated to the last decades of the twelfth century), but the exterior of Neuss does not come into question as a potential model for the exterior of St. Kunibert, for the interior of the transept at St. Kunibert indicates clearly that Xanten was the primary model here. See further Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 50–51.


505 On the dependence of St. Andreas on Andernach, see Overdick, Architektursystem, 77–85.

506 On these protrusions, see Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 55.

indivisible whole. The application of the Xanten system of trachyte articulation in the lower exterior apse arcade represents the reverse side of the reciprocal relationship between the two primary models for the east end found in the design of the lower arcade in the interior (fig. 36), the double-order arches with nook rolls and walkway vaults of which are themselves also based on the arcade design and vaulting system in Xanten. The architect’s concerted effort to integrate the two components of the east end on the exterior (fig. 78) is also apparent in the way the prominent cornice that divides the lower and upper stories of the apse and east transept also extends across the splayed walls, tying, so to speak, the apse and east transept together. The same applies to the upper cornice, which serves as the cornice for the balustrade on the dwarf’s gallery before continuing across the splayed walls to merge with the cornice atop the upper storey of the east transept.

The uppermost reaches of the east end (fig. 78)—namely, the crossing gable and the flanking choir towers, as well as the corpus of motifs used to articulate both—have numerous precedents, both much earlier and contemporary, both within Cologne and its immediate environs. Thus it is difficult to assign the architect’s use of them to any particular model, in contrast to the lower stories. The form of the monumental crossing gable, in tufa with five massive Muldennischen, recalls not only the niched gables in the mid-twelfth-century east ends at St. Gereon (ca. 1151–1156; fig. 203) and Bonn (ca. 1150; fig. 234), but also the more recent eastern crossing gable at St. Aposteln (fig. 180), all examples that themselves hark back to earlier, Ottonian forms, such as the gables of the westwork at St. Pantaleon (fig. 174). It is

---

508 On this point, see Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 51, who writes in this regard that the trachyte decor in the lower storey “melts” (“verschmelzen”) the east end together.
509 See Chapter 2.
510 On these points, see Kosch, “Einzelbeobachtungen,” 35.
511 See Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbauten, 54, who draws the comparison between St. Kunibert and St. Gereon, and Machat, “Bauwerk,” 324, who draws the comparison between St. Kunibert and both St. Gereon and Bonn.
clear that the architect could not have looked to Xanten for this particular motif, for the west choir hall Xanten originally lacked a gable between the towers, and he most certainly would have known all of the local precedents listed above. 512

The flanking towers, constructed of tufa like the gable and set directly on the solid walls of the east transept below, also recall both the towers on the so-called choir façades of the mid-twelfth-century at St. Gereon and Bonn and the towers on the west choir hall in Xanten itself (fig. 227). The motif of the trefoil arch used in the lower storey of the towers was common in ecclesiastical and secular architecture in Cologne (figs. 236, 237) in the 1210s and 1220s, and the slightly pointed blind arches with plate frieze in the upper storey have numerous parallels in the 1220s and 1230s throughout the Lower Rhineland. 513 Though Xanten, as the model for the east transept, would seemingly represent the most logical source for the decision to employ flanking choir towers at St. Kunibert, the chronology of the towers there is unclear, and thus the derivation of the towers at St. Kunibert from that model is uncertain. Physical evidence indicates that the west choir hall originally was to be crowned by two recessed towers set back several meters from the plane of the lower outer walls, and that such towers had even been begun before the plan was abandoned for the present solution with massive cubic towers set directly on the outer walls. 514 There is considerable disagreement in the literature whether work on the present towers began before the consecration of the Marian altar in 1213 or only

512 On the lack of a gable at Xanten, see Verbeek, “Westchorhallen,” 72.
513 The south arm at St. Pantaleon dates to slightly before 1216; see Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 582, 586. The façade of the Overstolzenhaus is generally dated to the 1220s; on it, see Anita Wiedenau, “Form, Funktion und Bedeutung romanischer Wohnbauten in Köln und im Rheinland,” WRJB 41 (1980): 7–25.
514 The presence of an additional, short vaulted passage as a third storey hidden within the thickness of the walls and directly below the towers in Xanten indicates that the towers here were originally to be stepped back some two-and-a-half meters and positioned on the inner wall of the vaulted passage, as is the case in the west choir hall at St. Servatius in Maastricht (ca. 1180), the model for Xanten. Traces of the recessed walls of the tower on the south side indicate that at least the south tower was begun on this plan. See Verbeek, “Westchorhallen,” 70–72; Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 2, 1270; and Overdick, Architektursystem, 42.
afterwards. The altar consecration of 1213 certainly implies the existence of the vaults by this
point. It is therefore possible that the plan change had already taken place before the
consecration and that work on the present towers was already underway, because it is unlikely
that the chapter would have tolerated leaving the vaults exposed for a prolonged period of time.
It is, however, also conceivable that a temporary roof was installed over the vaults, and that the
towers were only begun after the consecration. Thus, it is not certain whether the architect
looked directly to Xanten for the use of flanking choir towers for the east end at St. Kunibert or
to earlier examples instead, such as the choir façades at St. Gereon and Bonn. Whatever the
source of the towers, their addition made the new east end into a majestic, imposing structure—
the most prominent physical landmark in the entire northeast corner of the city (fig. 84).

4. The Architect of the East End: Xanten or Cologne?

Little is known concretely about the identities and itineraries of the architects and master
masons who worked in Cologne in the early thirteenth century. That there were practicing,
professional lay architects in the city in the period of the rebuilding of St. Kunibert is clear from
a handful of records from circa 1200–1250 that attest to their existence. A “Theodericus

515 Verbeek (“Westchorhallen,” 72), who first pointed to the original plan for the recessed towers, did not assign
much importance to the issue of the chronology of the plan change, assuming only that the present towers were
begun sometime after the completion and vaulting of the hall below in 1213. Weyres, accepting the evidence of the
plan change, implies that the plan change had already taken place before 1213 when he suggests that the present
towers were built “in the years after” the completion of the lower part of the west choir hall in 1213, but he likewise
does not explicitly indicate whether they were begun immediately in, or only some years after, 1213. Thus,
Weyres, “Zur Datierung,” 98: “in den folgenden Jahren.” More recently, Kubach and Verbeek (Kubach and
Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 2, 1271) have preferred a general date of “1220/1230” for the current towers in Xanten, citing
the repertoire of forms used on them. These motifs, such as the trefoil arches in the lowermost storey, are,
however, as typical of the 1210s (cf. fig. 236) as they are of the 1220s, and thus do not provide a solid
chronological anchor that would decide the issue.

516 Kubach and Verbeek, for instance, have suggested that a wooden roof was used for upwards of a decade, in line
with their general dating of the towers to ca. 1220–1230. This, however, can only remain a supposition, and, as
indicated above, the forms on the towers could just as well point to a date in the 1210s.

517 Cf. Machat, “Bauwerk,” 323–324, who, adopting Kubach and Verbeek’s general date of “1220/1230” for the
towers in Xanten, concludes on this basis that the towers at St. Kunibert are likely not based directly on Xanten but
rather on the use of flanking towers in the traditional storied choirs as represented by St. Gereon and Bonn.
magister artis cementariae,” for instance, lived in the immediate proximity of the choir of Groß St. Martin in 1206–1211. The celebrated plaque from St. Quirinus in nearby Neuss informs us that a magister Wolbero, possibly also from Cologne, laid the cornerstone for the new convent church there in 1209, though there is debate as to whether Wolbero actually was a master mason and not simply one of the clerics at the church. In 1238, the Premonstratensians in Witte Werum near Groningen in distant Frisia contracted Everard, a master mason from Cologne, to design and build their new abbey church. And a “Heinricus lapicida de Koldenbech” and a “Gerhard lapicida de Riehl” are attested in Cologne in 1230–1240 and 1247–1248, respectively.

No such name survives for St. Kunibert. While the Memorienbuch and isolated charters inform us partly about the financing and, in the case of the celebrated obit of the canon Vogelo in the Memorienbuch, the internal administration of the rebuilding enterprise, they have nothing to say about an architect responsible for designing the east end or, for that matter, any other part of the church. Nor has this issue received attention in the literature on St. Kunibert. Mention has been made repeatedly throughout the preceding and present chapter of the “architect of the east end.” But what might be said about him? Was a single architect responsible for designing the east end? And if so, where might he have received his training?

---

519 Bader, St. Quirinus, 85–97, like all scholars before him, accepted that Wolbero was the master mason. Magister, however, was also the title conferred on clergy with formal academic training (and numerous magistri who had studied in Paris and elsewhere are attested in the Lower Rhineland at this time), which has recently prompted Matthias Untermann (“Grundsteinlegung,” n. 11) to question the long-standing identification of Wolbero as a master mason and suggest that he may have been a cleric instead (male clerics being a standard and necessary component of female conventual churches like Neuss).
520 Claussen, “Kölner Künstler,” 372.
522 On finances, Vogelo’s role as administrator, and the larger institutional framework of the rebuilding project, see Chapter 5.
The testimony furnished by the built fabric suggests strongly that a single leading architect designed the east end and that this architect most likely came from Xanten rather than Cologne. The physical evidence indicates that the east end was erected as an integral structural unit from the foundations upwards; and the reciprocal relationship between the two primary models operative in the design of the east end, St. Maria im Kapitol and Xanten, indicates that the apse and transept were conceived and designed together as an integrated whole. Both points argue for the existence of a single architect charged with designing and overseeing the construction of the east end. Although the recurrence of specific features from the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol and the west choir hall in Xanten in the east end indicates that its architect had a deep, intimate knowledge of both these structures, the consistent application throughout the east end of several distinctive features from Xanten suggests that the architect had prolonged, intensive exposure to that structure commensurate with on-site work there. The design of the double-order apse arcades and the equally characteristic system of walkway vaulting from Xanten (fig. 224) that he employed in the apse (fig. 42), for instance, have no precursors in the earlier Cologne apses, including St. Maria im Kapitol (fig. 189); nor does the logical assignment of the various planes of the double-order arcades to the shafts of the column bundles below, a method that also has a direct parallel in the assignment of the planes of the double-order arcades to the supporting members in Xanten. The use of these motifs and methods in the apse presupposes a complete grasp of the details of the west choir hall in Xanten on the part of the architect. Although the architect plausibly could have studied these facets of the choir hall on visits to the site, the radical refiguration of the Xanten structural system (fig. 223) in the east transept (figs. 47, 49, 52) further suggests that he thoroughly understood that
structure through practical experience, certainly well enough that he could subject its structural system to a profound transformation.

This need not mean that the architect who designed the east end at St. Kunibert also designed the west choir hall in Xanten. The striking differences between the east transept and Xanten make such a scenario highly unlikely, as does the approximately twenty-year-long gap separating the beginning of work at both sites. Though located well north of Cologne (fig. 25), St. Viktor in Xanten, one of the three most important collegiate churches in the archdiocese after Cologne cathedral, was, however, a major building site at the turn of the thirteenth century and, as such, undoubtedly had a sizeable workshop with numerous masons and apprentices. In the 1200s and 1210s, ideas from the project in Xanten spread down the Rhine, not only to St. Kunibert itself, but even farther south, to Koblenz and Andernach.\footnote{On the links between Xanten and the Church of Our Lady in Koblenz, see Michael Christian Müller, “Köln – Koblenz – Xanten. Die Koblenzer Liebfrauenkirche und die niederdeutsche Sakralbaukunst um 1200,” \textit{CR} 15 (2000): 150–166. On the west end at Andernach and its dependence on Xanten, see Overdick, \textit{Architektursystem}, 61.} It stands to reason that, as the major work in Xanten drew to a close towards 1213 (altar consecration; work on the towers continued afterwards), members of the workshop there would have sought work elsewhere. For St. Kunibert, such a scenario fits chronologically: work on the east end here most likely began in the years around 1210, contemporaneous with the completion of the west choir hall in Xanten. It also fits historically. Theoderich was demonstrably present in Xanten in 1209, as indicated in Chapter 2. It seems very likely that he and the chapter at St. Kunibert not only looked to Xanten as a model for the east transept, but also entrusted the design of the new east end to a member of the workshop at that major building site.\footnote{The full scope both of these dynamics and of Theoderich’s ties to Xanten are elucidated in Chapter 5 from the perspective of patronage. The main point here is that historical channels existed for the contracting of an architect from Xanten, and that this is also borne out by the fabric of the east end itself.}
5. The East End: Conclusions

Perched on the left bank of the Rhine, the imposing east end of St. Kunibert with its apse flanked by two robust towers (fig. 76) clearly stands in the tradition of the Lower Rhenish “choir façade,” a genre of monuments that encompasses not only the canonical early examples at St. Gereon (fig. 203) and Bonn (fig. 234), but also the ornate choirs at Groß St. Martin (fig. 209) and St. Aposteln (fig. 180) and numerous other, later examples. The general affiliation of the east end with this heterogenous group of monuments has been recognized since the earliest decades of the twentieth century and reaffirmed into the present; the east end’s “status” as a representative of the choir façade thus hardly needs to be belaboured here. But the east end of St. Kunibert, in its combination of an apse melded onto a transept modeled on a west choir hall, represents an innovative version within this genre. Graf’s work on the east transept’s general dependence on the west choir hall in Xanten laid the groundwork for this important recognition. The reassessment of the architectural sources for the apse at St. Kunibert presented here, however, suggests that the prevailing picture of the east end at St. Kunibert as a whole should be revised on several counts, not only in terms of its chronology, but also in terms of the corpus of structures that served as its architectural models and their relationship to one another during the processes of design and execution.

In the case of the apse, modern scholarly canon formation coupled with the postwar politics of reconstruction in Cologne with its pursuit of the “pure original” conspired to occlude

---

525 On the group of Lower Rhenish late Romanesque choir façades, see the overview in Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 4, 400–402. This class of monument would continue to grow in the 1220s in the form of polygonal apses with flanking towers, such as those at at St. Severin in Cologne (1220s–1237; fig. 214) and St. Severus in Boppard, among other examples.


527 See Graf’s conclusions in “Ostchorbau,” 123–125.
the set of direct relationships between the apse at St. Kunibert and the lost (or, deleted) reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol. The creative use of the latter structure as the primary source for the conception of the apse at St. Kunibert explains all of those features that the east apse at St. Aposteln does not, from the apse’s 5:9 ground plan and its elevation through to its vertical proportions and numerous other details in the interior and on the exterior. Though certain minor features of the apse point to the architect’s knowledge of St. Aposteln (and other Cologne apses, such as Groß St. Martin), the designation “secondary model” captures more effectively the role that the choir there played in the conception of St. Kunibert’s apse and the east end as a whole. Based fully on Xanten, the east transept responded in several fundamental ways to the parameters established by the apse—in the general modifications to the plan and elevation of Xanten west, and, especially, in the complete refiguration of its structural system. The reciprocal relationship between the two primary models for the east end at St. Kunibert both in the interior and on the exterior points to contemporaneity in the design and execution of the east end as a whole, from the foundations upwards. Though clearly intimately familiar with St. Maria im Kapitol, other Cologne apses, and Xanten, the architect’s deep knowledge and transformation of several of the characteristic features of the west choir in Xanten suggest that he likely worked in some capacity on that structure before the chapter at St. Kunibert contracted him to work on the new east end at St. Kunibert.

Chronologically, the use of the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol and the west choir hall in Xanten, the former dated generally circa 1200—1210 and the latter firmly to 1185/90—1213, as the models for the east end at St. Kunibert suggests that work on the east end most likely began around 1210, probably right after Theoderich’s documented stay in Xanten in
1209, and neither circa 1200 (Graf) nor only “in/circa 1215,” the default date found in the literature since Ewald.

Rising like a beacon to greet the busy marine traffic approaching Cologne from the north, the east end of St. Kunibert is certainly a representative of the Lower Rhenish choir façade. But in its creative fusion of an apse based primarily on the lost reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol and a transept based on the west choir hall in Xanten to form that imposing towered façade, it is an innovative *Einzelgänger* with neither true precursors nor successors.
Chapter 4
The Nave and the West Transept

1. Introduction

This chapter examines the further progression of construction through the nave and the west transept of the collegiate church (figs. 26, 27, 56) from the perspectives of chronology, design, and architectural models. Its intent and contents are threefold. Through a reassessment of the physical and circumstantial evidence combined with insights from recent archaeological finds made in the nave, the first section offers a revised chronology for the construction of the nave, placing the design of its first bay and some of its construction before the completion of the east transept and within a first building phase focused on the eastern half of the church building. Building on this armature, the second section reexamines the design of the nave, which has usually been regarded as representing a break from the east end on account of its larger physical scale. A re-reading of the structure and design of the nave vis-à-vis the east end indicates, however, that both responded to the structural and aesthetic parameters set by the east end, even if the nave is disproportionately larger. A new explanation for the nave’s divergent lateral and vertical mensuration is also adduced, as are numerous architectural models for its design, which, like the east end, has customarily been explained solely by reference to the nave at St. Aposteln. The third and final section of this chapter examines the west transept, the original fabric of which has been obliterated by a multitude of disasters, both natural and man-made, but which can still be reconstructed through a comprehensive set of graphic representations made before the first major catastrophe in 1830. A new model operative in the design of the west transept—also long considered to be derived exclusively from St. Aposteln—is identified and, on this basis, a revised chronology for the design and construction of the west transept proposed.
2. The Nave and the West Transept: Chronology

The east transept and the first bay of the nave represent a clear physical and conceptual juncture within the course of construction on the new collegiate church. With its amplified vertical and horizontal dimensions, the towering and expansive nave appears as if it has outgrown the comparatively diminutive east end. Thus, in the interior (fig. 27), the high vaults and the string course in the nave rise to a point well above that of the vaults and string courses in the east end: at 23.17 meters in height, the high vault in the first nave bay is approximately one meter taller than the crossing vault in the east transept, which measures 21.70 meters, and the string course in the nave stands approximately 1.5 meters above those in the apse and east transept.\footnote{The vertical dimensions of the vaults cited here are the author’s own; those for the string courses are derived from \textit{KDM} 6/4, Taf. XIX. The height of the vaults and string courses between the nave and east end differs by approximately one meter when the difference of roughly fifty centimeters in the height of the floor levels of the east transept and nave is taken into account. The high vault in the first nave bay was destroyed in World War II and subsequently rebuilt; thus, its present height does not necessarily correspond exactly with that of the original and may diverge by several centimeters. However, it is clear from prewar cross-sections of the church (fig. 27) that the high vaults in the nave were all around 23.3 m tall; this is also confirmed by the height of the extant, original high vault in the second nave bay, which measures 23.64 m from the floor to the intrados of the annular keystone (author’s measurement).} The width of the nave (fig. 26) between the flat planes of the side aisle walls—approximately 23.5 meters in the first bay—likewise exceeds the width of the east transept, which measures approximately 22.5 meters between the flat planes of the north and south flanks (cf. figs. 32 and 33). On the exterior of the edifice, the contrast in vertical scale is apparent in the elevated level of the eave cornice on the central vessel of the nave, which is positioned far above both the cornice on the upper storey of the east transept and the cornice along the dwarf’s gallery on the apse (figs. 28, 81).

As has long been generally recognized, the dissonance in physical scale between the nave and the east end points to a change in plan for a somewhat taller and broader nave than the
The primary issue, therefore, is not whether there was a plan change, but rather the specific chronological relationship between the east transept and the nave, and between the east transept and the first nave bay in particular. Was the east end completed and work on the nave begun only afterwards? Or did work on the first nave bay commence while work on the east transept was still underway? Because the chronology of this particular juncture is of seminal importance for understanding not only the design of the nave itself, but also the broader issues of planning and patronage addressed in Chapter 5, it must be addressed here. A consensus on the chronological and structural relationship between the east end and the nave, moreover, has yet to be reached. In their formative treatments of the building history, Ewald and Gall, for instance, pointed generally to the consecration of the side altars of SS. Anthony and Katherine in the side aisles in 1226/1227 as evidence, by implication, that the first nave bay had at least been begun at some point relatively soon after the east end and that work on it may have even begun before the east end was complete. But beyond providing this important terminus ante quem, neither scholar probed in detail the relationship between the east transept and the first nave bay in terms of design, proportions, or structure. The general supposition of Ewald and Gall that the start of work on the nave is fairly close to the east end chronologically was subsequently adopted with little further elaboration. Most recently, Graf sought to overturn the longstanding assumption that the nave was begun in relatively close chronological proximity to the east end, arguing that the

---

529 See, for instance, Kubach, *Triforium*, 34, and Meyer-Barkhausen, *Kirchenbaukunst*, 59, both of whom note the change in plan between east end and nave in terms of the increased height of the high vaults in the central vessel. Most recently, see Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 70–77 and 155 n. 277; eadem, “Ostchorbau II,” 149; eadem, “Neue Forschungen,” 121–124; as well as Kosch, “Einzelbeobachtungen,” 35.


taller nave was only begun after the east end—that is, the apse and east transept—stood totally complete and placing the start of work on the first nave bay circa 1230.\(^{532}\) The complete body of physical, textual, contextual, and circumstantial evidence bearing on the juncture of the east end and the nave, however, has never been taken into account. And the excavations in the nave in the 1980s and 1990s have also produced important new material that is crucial for unraveling its chronology. A comprehensive reexamination of the chronology of the nave that pulls together all the evidence is not only necessary, but also overdue.

In terms of the larger architectural context, it should be stressed from the outset that when work on the new east end at St. Kunibert began around 1210, the vaulted nave as an architectural type in general had no contemporary representatives in the city of Cologne and only very few in the much wider vicinity, none of which—with the benefit of hindsight—was adopted as a model at St. Kunibert.\(^{533}\) The most recent fully-constructed naves in the city by this point (all but two of which were timber-roofed) had all been erected around a half-century earlier, either before, around, or slightly later than 1150.\(^{534}\) Moreover, as will be seen in more detail below, work on the monumental rib-vaulted naves at St. Aposteln (fig. 183) and St. Andreas (fig. 239) in Cologne, which ultimately would serve as architectural models for the

---


\(^{533}\) The naves of the Church of Our Lady in Andernach and the collegiate church of St. Georg in Limburg an der Lahn may both have been begun as early as the later 1190s, but neither exerted any direct influence on the nave at St. Kunibert. On the dating of the naves at Andernach and Limburg, see, most recently, Overdick, *Architektursystem*, 58–85 (Andernach) and 85–88 (Limburg). The earliest nave in Cologne for which vaulting was foreseen from the start was that at the parish church of St. Mauritius (now lost), which was provided with groin vaults. It is customarily assumed that the nave was complete by the consecration of the church in 1141 (Kubach and Verbeeck, *RBRM*, vol. 1, 580–581). Slightly later, around 1150, the timber-roofed nave at the collegiate church of St. Georg (consecrated 1067) was refurbished with groin vaults like those at St. Mauritius (Kubach and Verbeeck, *RBRM*, vol. 1, 529–530, 532). Otherwise, the majority of twelfth-century naves in Cologne adhered to the time-honoured form of the timber-roofed basilica, sometimes with groin-vaulted side aisles (e.g., St. Ursula [second quarter of twelfth century], the reworked nave at St. Pantaleon [ca. 1150], St. Caecilia [ca. 1160], and Groß St. Martin [ca. 1185] in its original incarnation). See, further, below, 246–247.
nave at St. Kunibert, was likely only just getting underway in the early 1210s or possibly even somewhat later, for they were fully complete and vaulted only by circa 1220. St. Viktor in Xanten, the model for the east transept, was also of little help as far as a model for the nave at St. Kunibert was concerned, because the nave there was still an Ottonian timber-roofed basilica and remained this way until 1263. There may well have been a preliminary and now unrecoverable plan for a different nave in St. Kunibert when work started on the east end, and this plan, whatever it may have been, was then abandoned for the present solution. It is also possible, though impossible to prove, that work on the east end began without the chapter and its builders necessarily having a binding, fully-formed conception of the concrete models for, or specific proportions of, the nave. Because the architect was on site directing work on a constant basis, it is conceivable that these particular decisions were deferred and worked out between the architect and the chapter only once work on the east end had advanced to a stage where they became truly pressing issues.

Whether a different plan was in place from the start or not, the physical evidence along the west walls of the east transept and in the western reaches of the crossing indicates that the move towards a somewhat taller and slightly broader nave had been forged as the east transept itself was still under construction. It is clear that the design of the west walls of the east transept (fig. 53) was drawn up together with that of the other three sides of the transept and using

535 See below, 243–249.
536 The west choir hall in Xanten was originally built onto an older nave that had been subjected to numerous building and rebuilding campaigns between the later tenth and early twelfth centuries. The placement of vault responds for all three vessels of the nave on the eastern faces of the eastern piers of the new west choir hall indicates that the original intent was to vault the older nave in Xanten after the completion of the west choir hall. However, work on the west choir hall, and on its massive towers in particular, continued towards the mid-thirteenth century, and the older nave was thus never vaulted as planned and was replaced instead only by the Gothic nave, itself only completed in 1517 after some two and a half centuries of work (the Gothic east choir had been begun in 1263). See Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 2, 1267–1269, 1272.
Xanten as the model. Thus, the interior elevation of the west walls looks back directly to the elevation of the corresponding walls in Xanten (fig. 225), replicating the tall, semicircular arch that leads into the side aisles in the lower storey and the expansive, flat wall with a pointed apex in the upper. The form of the corner supports in the upper storey of the west walls, with the vault responds and the supports for the freestanding arcade conflated and reduced to an ethereal pier with a single inset colonnette, repeats the system developed in the eastern corners of the transept, as do the western transverse supports, bisected into two stories with two flanking inset columnar vault responds, as in the east.\footnote{538} The principal difference \textit{vis-à-vis} Xanten resides in the employment of a walkway along the west walls, here providing access to the crawl spaces under the lean-to roofs over the side aisle vaults, which attests to a greater desire to integrate these walls more firmly into the elevation than was the case in Xanten, where these same walls display little relation to the other walls in the choir hall.\footnote{539}

Though clearly conceived with the other walls of the transept, the physical fabric of St. Kunibert’s west walls indicates that, by the time work reached them, the plan for the present nave was already in place and that the architect had altered the design of these walls slightly to accommodate it. First, the foundations for the western crossing piers, which are carefully tailored to the scale, form, and disposition of the supports on all four faces of the pier above, clearly anticipate the specific system of supports—vault responds and the supports for the main nave arcade—that would be used on the western faces of the crossing piers, that is, on the side

\footnote{538} See Chapter 3. 
\footnote{539} The western walkway in the north arm is 51 cm wide (measured from the rear wall to the edge of the string course moulding, at the northwestern corner support); at 60 cm in width (measured from the rear wall to the edge of the string course moulding, at the southwestern corner support), the western walkway in the south arm is slightly wider. Both measurements are the author’s own. There is evidence to indicate that the walkways along the west walls, now perilously narrow, were originally to be as wide as those in the rest of the transept and were initially executed as such, but then reduced to their present width when the upper west walls were bolstered with additional masonry in view of the adjacent nave. This change to the upper west walls was executed during the course of the east transept’s construction and before it was vaulted. See, further, note 541.
facing the nave (figs. 49, 66). Likewise, the supports for the north and south transverse arches on the eastern faces of the western crossing piers are much more robust than their eastern counterparts, with an additional layer of masonry added behind the supports (fig. 49). The increased mass along the eastern faces of the western crossing piers was likely devised expressly as a means to buttress the added load that the rib-vaulted high vault in the adjacent first nave bay would exert on these two piers, which also receive the thrust of the crossing vault—a problem not encountered in the eastern half of the crossing—hence, the much skinnier transverse supports there. This additional layer of masonry on the eastern face of the western crossing piers runs from the base of the piers through to the springing of the crossing vault, which presupposes, as do the scale and disposition of the pier foundations, that concrete plans for the nave and its system of supports had been devised before work began on the western crossing piers. Already in the lower storey of the west walls of the east transept, moreover, the builders compensated for the discrepancy in interior widths between the east transept and the nave by running an additional arch with a longer radius over the back of the narrower arches that mediate between the arms of the east transept and the side aisles (fig. 67). In this way, they effected the transition between the plane of the north and south flanks of the east transept and the plane of the wall in the slightly wider side aisles (the flat plane of the interior wall in each aisle stands roughly half a meter behind the flat plane of the interior wall in the adjacent arm in the east transept—hence, the difference of approximately one meter in interior width between the transept and the nave; cf. figs. 32 and 33). The broader arches spring directly from the core of the western crossing piers and are coursed in neatly both with them and with the narrower arches below, indicating all three were erected contemporaneously as a single unit. This indicates that the divergent lateral dimensions of the nave had also been settled upon before
work began on the west walls of the east transept and the western crossing piers. The form of
the arches to the side aisles (fig. 53)—clean, austere single-order arches executed in finely
dressed trachyte, thereby differing from the double-order arches in this position in Xanten (fig.
225)—seems, finally, to anticipate directly the form of the arches used throughout the main nave
arcade. The physical evidence thus indicates that both the proportions and even design of the
nave already had been established before work on the east end had reached the lowest levels of
the west walls and western crossing piers of the east transept.

This is also confirmed by the upper storey. Thus, the western crossing piers and the
crossing vault anticipate the divergent vertical proportions of the nave, both the height of its
central vessel and the height of parts of its elevation. The western transverse arch, for instance,
was made approximately 1.1 meters taller than the eastern one to accommodate the height of the
taller high vault in the first nave bay (figs. 27, 49).\(^{540}\) The raised abaci on the western transverse
arch, moreover, align not with any element in the east end, but rather were conceived in relation
to the specific height of the vault responds for the high vaults in the nave, with the abaci
continuing, uninterrupted, from the western transverse arch into the nave to crown the
westernmost vault responds in the first nave bay (figs. 49, 55). As much as the modification to
the height of the western transverse arch, this measure indicates that the elevation of the nave
had been worked out in some detail by the time work had reached the western crossing piers.
And, finally, in order to effect the linkage between the crossing vault and the taller high vault in
the first nave bay, the builders raised the western web of the quadripartite crossing vault itself so
that it would reach up to the height of the taller western transverse arch, thereby producing a

\(^{540}\) The apex of the western transverse arch rises 21.0 m above the floor level of the east transept; the apex of the
eastern arch stands approximately 19.3 m above the floor level of the apse. When the divergence of ca. 60 cm in
floor level height between the apse and the east transept is taken into account, the western transverse arch is
approximately 1.1 m taller than its eastern counterpart. Dimensions derived from *KDM 6/4*, Taf. XIX.
crossing vault that slopes gently upwards from east to west (fig. 27). Analogous to the adjustments in the lower storey of the west walls and the western crossing piers, each of the above three measures in the upper reaches of the western half of the east transept presupposes that the specific height of the high vault in the conjoining first nave bay and the details of its elevation had already been determined before the erection of the upper reaches of the crossing piers and before the east transept was vaulted with the crossing vault.\textsuperscript{541}

Seen within the larger architectural context in Cologne and the surrounding area in the 1210s, the physical evidence along the junction of the east transept and the first nave bay suggests the following scenario. Work on the east end began first, most likely around 1210,\textsuperscript{541}

\textsuperscript{541} The plan for the upper west walls (fig. 53) between the supports appears to have been modified during the course of their construction. As Graf has noted (“Ostchorbau,” 53–54 and n. 245, and 70–76; “Ostchorbau II,” 149; “Neue Forschungen,” 122–124), the presence of large, circular recesses on the exterior of the west walls (fig. 81) indicates that the original plan for these walls foresaw oculi like those in the corresponding walls in the west choir hall in Xanten (fig. 226), and the walkways here were also to be as wide as those throughout the rest of the transept. The upper walls appear to have been first constructed with thin walls with oculi and with the wider walkways, but then reinforced with additional masonry, resulting in a reduction of the width of the walkways and the abandonment of the oculi. The reduction in the width of the walkways also meant that the L-shaped western corner piers, which had been erected as such, were subsequently altered, and the portion of the pier towards the west walls removed to permit access to the thinner walkway (in the north arm, the solid rear wall even had to be hollowed out behind the support to permit passage around it).

For her part, Graf argues that these changes to the upper west walls were made only after the east transept was fully complete and vaulted. She places the completion of the east transept around 1226/1227 and proffers the completely arbitrary and uncorroborated date of ca. 1230 for the changes to the upper west walls, arguing that the nave was only begun ca. 1230 and that these changes were occasioned by it. These suppositions, however, cannot be sustained. First, it is clear that the plan for the nave was already in place before these changes were made: the lower storey walls of the transept and the design of the crossing piers in the lower and upper stories both anticipate the existence of the nave and its specific elevation. Second, the east transept was vaulted only after the plan for the nave had been devised—witness the adjustment of the western web of the crossing and western transverse arch to accommodate the taller high vaults in the nave (fig. 27). Third, it is also improbable, for purely structural reasons, that the builders would have dared remove the western portion of the corner supports with the vaults already in place. Fourth, the physical, archaeological, contextual, and circumstantial evidence for the chronology of the first nave bay (see below) indicates that work on the first nave bay had already begun \textit{while} the east transept was still under construction and not only after it had been completed. And, finally, the very consecration of two side altars in the side aisles in 1226/1227 (fig. 31) indicates that work on the first nave bay was already complete by this point and the nave not begun only ca. 1230. Rather, the likeliest scenario is that the original plan for the oculi and wider walkways and the correspondingly thinner upper west walls that this would have entailed was ultimately abandoned out of concern for the structural stability of thin, perforated walls in a position directly adjacent to the tall central vessel of the nave. Such \textit{ad hoc} changes—hardly an uncommon occurrence in medieval construction—could just as well have been made \textit{during} the course of construction of the east transept: the first solution—with the wider western walkways and thinner walls with oculi—was executed, and then doubts about its structural viability \textit{vis-à-vis} the contiguous nave arose, and the decision was then struck to make the walls thicker and without the oculi, but before the transept was vaulted.
using St. Maria im Kapitol (ca. 1200–1210) and Xanten (complete by ca. 1213) as primary models. At this point, there may have been a plan, rough or otherwise, for the nave. But if this plan existed, it was soon abandoned for the present solution, with a nave that was both taller and wider than originally envisioned. (Witness especially the lower level of the eastern transverse arch [figs. 27, 49], which presupposes that the original plan did not foresee a nave as tall as the one that was ultimately built). The two Cologne naves at St. Aposteln and St. Andreas that ultimately were to serve, to differing degrees, as the architectural models for the nave at St. Kunibert were themselves most likely only begun in the early 1210s at the earliest, for both were completed only towards 1220 (the vaulting of the nave at St. Aposteln is very firmly documented as falling in the year 1219).\textsuperscript{542} The chapter of St. Kunibert and its builders thus would have had occasion to consult those naves as they went up over the course of the 1210s and, as work on the east end progressed, to incorporate the plan for the nave at St. Kunibert into the east end as it had already been designed and begun. The physical fabric in the western half of the east transept corroborates this picture, because it indicates that during the course of construction of the east end, and before the erection of the west walls of the east transept, the specific lateral and vertical proportions of the nave and the details of its elevation were decided upon and this plan then worked into the design of the western half of the east transept. This is evinced by the measures taken in the lower and upper stories of the west walls, in the western crossing piers, and in the vaults in the transept in direct anticipation of the first nave bay.

The manifold ways in which the west walls and western crossing piers of the east transept anticipate the nave suggest strongly that the plan for the nave had not only been firmly

\textsuperscript{542} The specific grounds for the dating of the completion of the naves at St. Aposteln and St. Andreas to ca. 1220 and their relationship to the nave at St. Kunibert on the levels of design and proportion are examined in full detail below, 243–251.
established while work on the east transept was still ongoing, but also that progress had already been made on the construction of the first nave bay itself as work continued on the transept. The moulding profiles of the pier bases in the nave indicate that this was most likely the case. The types of pier bases used throughout the church building point to a significant chronological juncture not between the east end and the first nave bay from east, but rather between the first nave bay and the two other bays of the three-bay nave to the west of it, suggesting that the first nave bay belongs to a distinct first building phase focused on the eastern half of the church (fig. 30). As Gall and Ewald recognized, the simple moulding profile employed in the pier bases in the lower storey of the east end, including the eastern crossing piers (N 1/S 1; figs. 30 and 65) and the piers throughout the rest of the east transept (N1 1–3/S1 1–3), recurs in the first three pairs of freestanding piers in the nave—that is, in those piers comprising the first nave bay (N 3–5/S 3–5; figs. 30 and 66). 543 This same, simple profile—encompassing a plinth, torus, fillet, and scotia—was also employed for all of the bases below the pilasters along the two side aisle walls, down to and including the final two pilasters before the west transept (N1 4–8/S1 4–8; figs. 30 and 68). 544 Beginning with the pair of weak nave piers in the second nave bay (N 6/S 6), the moulding profile of the pier bases changes and takes the form of a more complex profile consisting of a plinth with a large torus and fillet, a scotia and a further fillet, and an additional, smaller upper torus with a final fillet (figs. 30 and 69). This more ornate base then occurs in all of the remaining freestanding nave piers in the two western bays of the nave (N 6–N 9/S 6–S 9; fig. 30), down to and including the westernmost nave piers, which double as the eastern crossing

piers of the west transept. As Gall and Ewald argued, the alternation in the moulding profiles for the pier bases in the freestanding nave piers between the first and second nave bays suggests that the first nave bay, at least at the level of the piers in the lower storey, is close chronologically both to the east end and to the two walls of the side aisles, with which it shares the common moulding profile. When seen against the more ornate moulding profile of the bases in the piers in the two western bays of the nave, the use of the simple profile from the east end in both the first nave bay and the side aisle walls down to the west transept is conspicuous and constitutes solid physical evidence indicating that these two particular parts of the nave were likely planned and erected near-contemporaneously with the east end itself and thus within a first building phase encompassing the eastern half of the church.

Timely construction of the side aisle walls and the first nave bay is not only suggested by the pier bases but also likely on a purely logistical level. The need to construct the side aisle walls quickly and in their full length down to the west transept must have been great, for the north side aisle wall doubled as the outer wall of the south range of the older, pre-thirteenth-century cloister to the north of the new church building (fig. 30). All of the pilasters along the exterior of the side aisle wall here were purposely cropped because the wall was erected to accommodate the lean-to roof over the south range of the cloister, which was itself constructed in tandem with the north side aisle wall in order to connect the other three ranges of the older cloister (positioned on a different axis) to the new church building, as Kosch has demonstrated (fig. 82). The dual function of the north side aisle wall as the southernmost termination of the

545 Ewald, “Bau und Kunstschätze,” 46–47; Gall, Apsidengliederung, 93; KDM 6/4, 253–254. The nave piers N 9 and S 9 were demolished and rebuilt during the recent reconstruction of the west transept. Thus, the bases here are modern replacements, but it is clear from the extant nave piers to the east (i.e., N 6–N 8/S 6–S 8) that the moulding profile for the bases of these two piers was also originally of the more elaborate type.
547 Kosch, “Anbauten und Nebenräume,” 78–82.
cloister adequately explains why the two side aisle walls would have been run all the way down
to the west end of the church within a first building phase and before the construction of the
central bays of the nave. The simple base profile in the two side aisle walls thus ends precisely
where the south and west ranges and vestibule of the cloister converge and terminate in the west
along the north flank of the building (N1 8/S1 8; figs. 30 and 68). Indeed, the dimensions of the
cloister inherited from the pre-thirteenth-century collegiate church precinct appear to have set
the very parameters for the length of the new nave, for the nave terminates and the west transept
begins exactly along the line created by the west wall of the west range of the older cloister as
documented in the detailed plan of the compound executed before the demolition of the cloister
in 1821 (cf. figs. 23 and 30).548 This indicates that, even if the builders of the new church
building did not make use of the foundations or walls of the much smaller eleventh-century
predecessor church for the new structure, they still took some aspects of the preexisting
topography of the site into consideration, in this case for generating the dimensions of the new
nave. The length of the new nave, in turn, necessarily conditioned the location of the new west
transept, which was thus positioned far to the west of its more modestly-scaled eleventh-century
predecessor.

Expeditious construction of the first nave bay also must have been particularly
paramount for the chapter, for the central vessel in this bay was designed from the outset to
house the canons’ choir (figs. 30, 31). Hence, the builders had the columnar vault responds on
the corners of the strong piers here (N 3/S 3, N 5/S 5) begin only some two meters above floor

548 To this point, there has been no speculation in the scholarship as to why the three-bay nave should be as long as
it is; as will be seen below, it is a full bay longer than the two-bay nave at St. Aposteln (cf. figs. 26 and 175), its
primary model. The aerial view of the collegiate church compound made shortly before the demolition of the
cloister, only brought to the attention of scholarship in 1992 by Kosch (“Anbauten und Nebenräume,” 79),
however, provides valuable new evidence that indicates that the specific length of the new nave was not simply
devised freely, but rather was shaped directly by the existence of the older cloister.
level in order to leave an even surface on the lower faces of the piers for the insertion of large masonry screens for a choir enclosure (figs. 30 and 66). The canons’ choir was dismantled in 1827, but a textual description of it composed shortly before its demolition records that the choir was then still enclosed towards the side aisles by monumental masonry screens and that its floor level was on the same level as the east transept, and thus slightly higher than the rest of the nave and the side aisles. It is not certain how the east transept was closed off from the two side aisles, but presumably some form of barrier (be they grills or tall masonry screens like those originally spanned between the nave piers for the choir stalls) would have existed to secure the clerical choir in the east end. On account of the practical necessity of accommodating, as soon as possible, a sizeable college of thirty canons for the celebration of the conventual liturgy focused around the high altar in the new east end, it is likely that the chapter turned more or less immediately to the construction of the first nave bay as the east end was nearing completion and that it also belongs within the first building phase. This is what the common moulding profile found in the pier bases in the first nave bay and the east end suggests.

The use of a different, more ornate moulding profile in the bases in the four remaining nave

---


550 The parish assumed full control of the church building in 1802 upon the dissolution of Cologne’s monastic and collegiate churches under Napoleon, but continued to use the west transept for its liturgy, as indeed it had done since the thirteenth century. The parish, however, was forced to relocate to the—by then, deserted—east end of the former collegiate church after the tower on the west transept had been deemed structurally instable in the later 1820s, thus necessitating the dismantling of the canons’ choir. The circumstances surrounding the parish’s adoption of the east end are nicely summarized by Machat, “Bauwerk,” 309.

551 Johann Peter Mertens, Die letzten fuenfzig Jahre der Kirche St. Cunibert in Köln. Festschrift zum fuenfundzwanzigjahrigen Jubiläum des geselligen St. Cuniberts-Bau-Vereins (Cologne: Commissions-Verlag von J. & W. Boisserée, 1870), 24. Traces of this raised floor level are still clearly visible along the inner faces of the weak piers N 4 and S 4; here, the base moulding was omitted, for the raised floor level made it superfluous.

552 This question has been addressed solely by Kosch, “Anbauten und Nebenräume,” 86, who suggests the use of masonry screens (“Schränken”) at the top of the stairs to close off the arms of the east transept towards the side aisles; cf. his Abb. 5 (at 82). Though plausible, there is no physical or other evidence that would suggest specifically that masonry screens served as barriers.
piers in the two western nave bays, in turn, suggests that these two bays of the nave (excluding the adjacent walls of the side aisles) were erected, from the bases of the freestanding piers up to the vaults over the side aisles and the high vaults in the central vessel, somewhat later than the first nave bay and in a distinct, second building phase that also encompassed the entire west transept (fig. 30).

The picture of two distinct building phases finds further reinforcement in a change in building materials in the upper storey of the nave that is also located precisely along the divide between the first and second nave bays. Although the tufa shell on the exterior of the church was resurfaced extensively at the turn of the twentieth century, the section of the upper storey walls of the nave on the exterior above the side aisles, corresponding roughly to the height of the blind triforium on the interior, escaped untouched, for the lean-to roofs over the side aisle vaults had shielded the masonry here from the elements, making unnecessary a refacing of these walls.\(^{553}\) As Ewald noted already in 1916, and as is still clearly visible along the well-preserved south flank, the upper storey walls in the first nave bay were composed using courses of tufa bricks with additional courses of basalt stone (fig. 70).\(^{554}\) This particular masonry technique ceases at the junction of the first and second nave bays, with the final basalt block positioned immediately to the west of the (modern) brick buttress that marks the threshold between these two bays. The upper storey walls in the second and third bays of the nave, by contrast, were constructed exclusively using tufa bricks; this technique is still visible in both these bays along

---

553 See KDM 6/4, 253.
554 KDM 6/4, 253–254, as well as Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 553: “Eine deutliche Baunaht ist hinter dem Ostjoch des Mittelschiffs kenntlich, dessen Mauerwerk im Dachraum der Seitenschiffe . . . aus Säulenbasalt zwischen Tuftschichten besteht.” See further Machat, “Bauwerk,” 322; Machat, “Kirche St. Kunibert,” 281; Machat, “Pfarrkirche St. Kunibert,” 82; and Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 4, 592. In contrast to the upper storey wall in the first nave bay along the south flank, that along the north flank is very poorly preserved and appears to have been refaced several times. Basalt blocks are no longer visible here.
the south and north flanks of the building (fig. 71).\textsuperscript{555} Corresponding exactly with the shift in moulding profiles in the bases of the nave piers between the first and second nave bays (N 5/S 5 and N 6/S 6; fig. 30), the change in building materials in the upper storey of the nave between these same two bays provides further evidence for associating the first nave bay with a first phase of construction and for distinguishing it clearly from the second and third bays of the nave.\textsuperscript{556} It is particularly significant that the change in building materials occurs in the upper storey of the nave, for this strongly suggests that not just the lower storey of the first nave bay (as evinced by the pier bases), but also its upper storey belongs within a first phase of construction with the east end and side aisle walls. That is to say, the entire first bay of the nave, from the lowest reaches of the piers through the upper storey walls and up to the high vaults, was most likely erected as a whole unit together with the east end and separately from the two nave bays to the west of it. This is further suggested by the occurrence of the same combination of building materials used to construct the upper storey walls of the first nave bay—namely, tufa with courses of basalt—in the walls of the lower storey of the east towers, which themselves date to around 1222, the year in or before which the conjoining apse was roofed with lead.\textsuperscript{557}

The important new information about the predecessor church provided by the recent excavations in the second and third bays of the nave, finally, further concretizes the picture of the building chronology afforded by the changes in the pier bases and building materials in the nave and furnishes further evidence for two discrete construction phases localized in the eastern

\textsuperscript{556} See KDM 6/4, 254.
\textsuperscript{557} This combination of building materials in the east towers was recorded by Verbeek in the immediate wake of World War II; see Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 553.
and western halves of the church. In the course of the installation, in 1992, of a subterranean heater in the nave, a segment of foundation wall composed of large blocks of basalt with a thin course of tufa stone was discovered in the south side aisle in the second nave bay (fig. 30). Uncovered only as far as the trench for the heater would allow (its full extent thus remains unknown), the stretch of foundation runs perfectly perpendicular to the side aisle walls of the thirteenth-century church building and for this reason most likely does not stem from one of the predecessor churches on the site, all of which appear to have been oriented on the divergent axis of the eleventh-century west end and the pre-thirteenth-century cloister. Both the location of the foundation—positioned immediately behind the first nave bay from east—and its orientation—perpendicular to the axis of the nave of the thirteenth-century church such that, if extended, it would have bisected the eastern and western halves of the building—are conspicuous. This foundation wall also marks the spot in the nave where the base profile in the freestanding nave piers changes from the simple profile (N 5/S 5) to the more ornate one (N 6/S 6) and where the building materials used to compose the upper storey walls shift from tufa and basalt (first nave bay) to tufa alone (second and third nave bays). In view of some of the above considerations, Seiler recently has made the plausible suggestion that this foundation supported a temporary partitioning wall that would have separated the eastern half of the church, down to and including the first nave bay from east, from the western half of the church during the thirteenth-century rebuilding project.

558 The circumstances surrounding the find are recorded by Seiler, “Neue Erkenntnisse,” 49 n. 9.  
559 See Chapter 1.  
560 Seiler, “Neue Erkenntnisse,” 49 n. 9: “Offensichtlich handelt es sich bei diesem Mauerwerk um das Fundament einer Zwischenwand. Es scheint sich damit um eine Wand zu handeln, die einen bereits errichteten Bauabschnitt provisorisch auf der Westseite schließen sollte. Somit könnte hier die Trennwand verlaufen sein, die den vermutlich 1227 fertiggestellten Ostteil der Kirche von der Baustelle des Westteiles absonderte, der erst bei der feierlichen Einweihung der gesamten Kirche vollendet war.” Seiler points only to the change in base profiles in the
Seiler implied that such a provisional partitioning wall would have been erected only after the completion of the new eastern half of the church, in order to make it available for liturgical use while work on the remaining half of the new church continued to the west of the wall. While this scenario is possible, it is more likely that a temporary dividing wall of some sort was erected well before the completion of the east end and first nave bay to close off part of the eleventh-century church from what must have been the full-fledged building site to the east (fig. 30). The erection of such a provisional partitioning wall would have had the practical advantage of allowing the chapter to continue using the remaining portion of the old church to the west of the dividing wall during the rebuilding of the east end, side aisle walls, and first nave bay in order to prevent an unduly long disruption, or even physical relocation, of its liturgical services. There are ample analogous cases from major building projects of the early- and mid-thirteenth century, above all the cathedrals of Cologne (begun 1248; fig. 217) and Beauvais (begun ca. 1225), of the retention of the western reaches of a smaller and much older predecessor church to circumvent the interruption of the conventual liturgy that the wholesale rebuilding of a new, much larger choir entailed. This scenario also accords with the use of the simpler moulding profile from the east end in the pilaster bases in the side aisle walls all the way down to the west transept, which suggests that the new side aisle walls may have been erected in their full length around the much smaller eleventh-century west end and the part of

561 On the preservation of the western reaches of the mostly Carolingian cathedral building during the construction of the new, Gothic choir in Cologne, see Willy Weyres, Die vorgotischen Bischofskirchen in Köln (Cologne: Verlag Kölner Dom, 1987), 221–225. On the retention of the Basse–Œuvre at Beauvais, a church building of the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, see Stephen Murray, Beauvais Cathedral: Architecture of Transcendence (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989), 9–12. For a further contemporary parallel of just such a division between two main construction phases, the first encompassing the presbytery, transept, and the first nave bay with canons’ choir, and the second the remainder of the nave and west façade (i.e., precisely those areas of the church not needed for the conventual liturgy), exactly as at St. Kunibert, see Martina Schilling, “Victorine Liturgy and its Architectural Setting at the Church of Sant’ Andrea in Vercelli,” Gesta 42 (2003): 121–122.
the nave of the predecessor church located to the west of the dividing wall (fig. 30).\footnote{562} Indirect corroboration of the continued existence of the western half of the predecessor church during the construction of the eastern half of the new collegiate church, moreover, comes in 1222 statutes concerning the parish, which imply the existence of both a parish altar and an altar of the Holy Cross in that year.\footnote{563} In 1222, neither of these two altars could have been located in the new eastern half of the church to the east of the dividing wall, and thus their mention in the statutes could very well pertain to parish and Cross altars that still stood in the western half of the older church.\footnote{564} The parish altar and the Cross altar in the new collegiate church building (fig. 31) were both ultimately located in the western half of the edifice, close to (Cross altar) or far to the west (parish altar) of the foundation found in 1992 (fig. 30). This supports the likelihood that these two altars continued to exist in the western half of the predecessor church before its demolition, suggesting as it does that they were replaced by new altars with the same dedications in the new church building upon its completion. It is thus likely that the western half of the old church and some of its altars were retained when the east end was begun and used for the conventual liturgy while the east end and first nave bay were erected.

\footnote{562}{As Barbknecht has suggested on the basis of archaeological evidence, the outer walls of the nave of the new convent church in Neuss, begun in 1209, were likely first built around a much smaller predecessor church in precisely this fashion so that the older church could be used for as long as possible until services could be relocated to the new east end; see Barbknecht, \textit{Fensterformen}, 128–29. This was also likely the case in Limburg an der Lahn; see Dethard von Winterfeld, “Zum Stande der Baugeschichtsforschung,” in \textit{Der Dom zu Limburg}, ed. Wolfram Nicol (Mainz: Selbstverlag der Gesellschaft für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte, 1985), 71.}

\footnote{563}{HASiK, St. Kunibert U 1/37: “Post sanctus misse parrochialis canonicus aut vicarius sacerdos celebret si velit ad quodcumque altare preterquam ad altare parrochie . . .” and “[p]rima missa in altari sancte crucis erit custodis in festo sancti Kuniberti dedicationis.”}

\footnote{564}{It is significant in this context that the tomb of Rudolf von Schleswig (d. 1047), which his obit explicitly locates before the Cross altar in the older church, was found but a few meters to the west of the foundation of the presumed partitioning wall (fig. 30), suggesting that the Cross altar in the eleventh-century church building was in fact located just to the west of this wall. See Chapter 1. See further Schütte, “Baugeschichte,” 13, who postulates (without citing the 1222 statues, however) that the Cross altar in the predecessor church could have functioned as the high altar for the conventual liturgy during the construction of the eastern half of the new church.}
The recently uncovered foundation wall, therefore, possibly represents the remains of one of what might have been several different provisional partitions in this area, with a much smaller partition erected first to close off the western half of the old church, which was then widened and raised as needed to seal off the eastern half of the new church as it neared completion (fig. 30). Spanned between the side aisle walls directly behind the first nave bay, this latter temporary dividing wall would, in turn, also have been retained for some time after the completion of the east end and first nave bay so that the new, completely rebuilt eastern half of the church could be given over to the chapter for the celebration of the conventual liturgy when construction turned to, and continued with, the completion of the two nave bays to the west of the dividing wall, as Seiler has suggested.565 This second building phase, encompassing the two western nave bays (save for side aisle walls) and the entire west transept, would then have required the demolition of the remainder of the predecessor church down to its foundations. And it is precisely in the core of the final two, westernmost piers of the new nave (N 9/S 9; fig. 30) that the capitals, bases, and pilaster fragments from the exterior of the directly adjacent eleventh-century west end (fig. 16) were discovered in 1986, having been recycled as rubble filler for the construction of these two piers by the thirteenth-century masons.566

The physical and circumstantial evidence, combined with the critical new insights provided by the recent excavations in the nave, thus indicates that the entire first nave bay belongs chronologically with the east end rather than with the other two nave bays. It should therefore be placed within a firmly definable overarching first building phase that encompassed the eastern half of the church building as well as the full course of the side aisle walls down to

565 See note 560.
566 On the discovery of the fragments of the capitals and pilasters in these two piers, see Machat, “Pfarrkirche St. Kunibert,” 87, and Hochkirchen, “Spolien,” 21.
the west transept (fig. 30). The east end of the church, possibly begun with or without a fully-formed plan for the proportions or design of the nave, represents the first discernible building campaign at St. Kunibert. The entire first nave bay and the side aisle walls, fully conceived and executed only after work on the east end had already begun but themselves already planned and going up while work on the east transept was still underway, is the second discernible campaign. Though begun at different intervals, both of these building campaigns in the eastern half of the church building, however, belong together, as the evidence indicates, within a single, overarching building phase. The second building phase encompassed almost the entire western half of the new church building with the exception of the side aisle walls. There is, as will be seen below, no longer sufficient evidence to distinguish between separate campaigns within this larger second building phase or, indeed, to know with certainty whether this second phase began relatively soon after the first phase or only somewhat later. In any event, there is concrete physical, archaeological, and circumstantial evidence for a chronological break of some sort between the first and second nave bays, be it only for a few months or possibly even several years.

A *terminus ante quem* for the completion of first building phase at St. Kunibert is provided by the obit of Theoderich von Wied in the *Memorienbuch*, which records Theoderich’s consecration of a pair of side altars dedicated to St. Katherine and St. Anthony in the easternmost bays of the two side aisles, most likely in either 1226 or 1227 during one of his two documented stays in Cologne over these two years (cf. figs. 30 and 31). The consecration of these two side altars at the extreme eastern ends of the two side aisles suggests not only the completion and vaulting of the side aisles in the first nave bay, but likely also the completion of

---

567 See Appendix B, no. 1.
the high vault over the adjacent central vessel of the first nave bay itself.568 In terms of the start of work on the nave (fig. 56), the recorded date of 1219 for the vaulting of the primary model, St. Aposteln (fig. 183), suggests that work likely began on the first bay in the late 1210s and then extended until the consecration of the side altars in the aisles in 1226/1227.569

Whereas the chronology of the first nave bay and its approximate date of completion are clear from the consecration of the side altars in 1226/1227, the chronology of construction in the second and third nave bays and the west transept, or the second building phase, is not. The murky situation in the west has been compounded not only by the postwar application of white plaster to the interior walls and the refurbished tufa shell on the exterior, which has sealed the masonry of the nave to the eye, but also by the repeated destruction and rebuilding of the west transept, or parts thereof, in 1376, 1830 (fig. 88), and again in 1942–1944 (fig. 98). This has almost completely decimated the original fabric in this part of the building while also drastically reducing the amount of original fabric in the upper storey of the contiguous third bay of the nave. Investigation of the extant fabric in the western half of the church for signs of chronological breaks or campaigns within the second building phase is now impossible. The evidence for the chronology of the second building phase, therefore, is almost exclusively textual in nature, and it is the ambiguity of these texts, themselves hardly numerous to begin with, and the problems inherent in attempting to relate them to a fabric that is itself largely depleted, that accounts for the uncertainties surrounding the beginning, progression, and completion of work in the western half of the collegiate church.

569 For St. Aposteln’s date of 1219, see below, 243–246.
It has sometimes been supposed that a 1227 charter recording provost Bruno’s motion to annul a prebend for a lay carpenter indicates that construction ceased for some time after the consecration of the side altars in the side aisles in 1226/1227, but the value of this charter as a chronological indicator is dubious at best. Bruno had already attempted to redirect the funds from this prebend as early as 1223 in a charter that reads virtually verbatim, and even if his efforts were finally successful in 1227, it is questionable whether the lay carpenter mentioned in these two charters would have ever assisted the hired contractual labourers in construction operations on the new church building. Such prebends for skilled maintenance and other types of lay workers (carpenters, bakers, etc.) were commonplace at collegiate churches, including St. Kunibert, and both of the charters concerning the lay carpenter, after all, state that the very reason for the dissolution of the lay carpenter’s prebend was that it brought “moderate to no advantage to the church”—hardly a statement commensurate with engaged involvement in the rebuilding project on the lay carpenter’s part. And although at least three canonical bequests to the *fabrica* are recorded either in or after 1226, namely, in 1226, 1238, and again in 1247/48, none of these donations can be related to a specific part of the church, whether the two western bays of the nave or the west transept, even if it is clear from the chronology that these monies were most likely applied to work executed in the western half of the building. It is thus ultimately uncertain whether the second building phase began relatively soon after the completion of the first nave bay or only several years later (fig. 30).

---

570 This line of reasoning was initiated by Ewald (*KDM* 6/4, 246), and has since been adopted by Machat (“Bauwerk,” 307; “Kirche St. Kunibert,” 281; “Pfarrkirche St. Kunibert,” 76). For the text of the charter, see Appendix B, no. 8.
571 Appendix B, no. 5.
572 Wilhelm Kisky, “Geschichte des Stiftes und der Pfarre St. Kunibert,” in *Pfarre und Kirche*, 18. Indeed, the charters indicate expressly that the prebend for the lay carpenter had long been bestowed by former provosts of the collegiate church—that is, probably well before the rebuilding project began.
573 Appendix B, nos. 7, 10, and 11.
Whereas the start date of the second phase is uncertain, its end date can be placed fairly securely around 1247, when the new church building was officially consecrated by Archbishop Konrad von Hochstaden (1238–1261). This event is documented in a series of indulgences issued in conjunction with the consecration by the some 14 prelates in attendance. It is generally presumed that the dedicatio ecclesiae in 1247 marks the completion of at least the nave and the west transept, save for the crossing tower over the west transept. The specific expression ecclesia sancti Cuniberti de novo constructa in the charters, with its use of the past participle, seemingly confirms that much of the edifice had indeed been “constructed” by the time of the formal archiepiscopal consecration in 1247.

There is some room for doubt whether work on the new collegiate church was fully complete by 1247. All of the prelates in attendance at the 1247 consecration issued indulgences for visitors to the newly consecrated church on its days of dedication. A second indulgence was issued in 1251, this time aimed at visitors on the feasts of the patron saints Kunibert, the Hewalds, and Clement. It has usually been supposed that the primary intent of this series of indulgences was to raise funds for the completion of the church, even if the texts of these charters themselves do not articulate this aim explicitly. Thus, it is possible that work continued on the church after the 1247 consecration, but it must be stressed that this supposition rests on inferences from the indulgences, which themselves nowhere mention funding the building per se and could equally have been issued for purely spiritual and not economic

---

574 On these indulgences, three of which survive, see see Christiane Neuhausen, Das Ablaßwesen in der Stadt Köln vom 13. bis zum 16. Jahrhundert (Cologne: Janus, 1994), 224 nos. 33, 34, and 35.
575 Thus, for example, Ewald, “Bau und Kunstschätze,” 46; KDM 6/4, 246; Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbaukunst, 54; Verbeek, Kölner Kirchen, 50; Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 553; Machat, “Bauwerk,” 307.
576 Neuhausen, Ablaßwesen in der Stadt Köln, 224 nos. 33, 34, 35.
577 Neuhausen, Ablaßwesen in der Stadt Köln, 225 no. 42.
reasons. It is also conceivable that the indulgences were not intended to draw in funds for continuing building activity, but rather to generate income to pay off debt incurred by the almost forty years of construction work that preceded the 1247 consecration. Likewise, the aforementioned bequest to the fabrica in 1247/48, made by dean Christian (1245–1247/48), could imply that substantial construction work was still ongoing in or after 1247/48; yet, a donation to the fabric in itself need not mean that work was still underway, for the money equally could have been reserved for future maintenance.579

Ewald, citing an 1882 article which in turn cited an undated and “lost note” in the parish archives composed by the parish priest Mertens, claimed that the crossing tower on the west transept (fig. 87) was only completed in 1261.580 This date for the completion of the west tower has usually been followed since in the scholarly literature, even if there is no certainty concerning the nature, identity, and/or reliability of Mertens’s source.581 The date of 1261 for the completion of the west tower is suspect insofar as it overlaps with the final year of Konrad of Hochstaden’s episcopacy (1238–1261), and it is quite possible that Mertens’s date for the

580 *KDM* 6/4, 248.
581 A date of 1261 for the completion of the west tower, or the supposition that the west tower was erected only after the 1247 consecration, is proffered, following Ewald, by Verbeek, *Kölner Kirchen*, 50; Amberg, *Gottesdienstordnung*, 14; Machat, “Westbau,” 87, 88; Machat, “Bauwerk,” 307; Machat, “Kirche St. Kunibert,” 280, 285; Machat, “Pfarrkirche St. Kunibert,” 76; Krings, “Kriegsschäden und Wiederaufbau,” 57; and Otmar Schwab, “St. Kunibert – Sicherung und Wiederherstellung des Westquerhauses,” *CR* 7 (1992): 68. Schwab (“Wiederherstellung des Westquerhauses,” 68–70; idem, “St. Kunibert: Wiederherstellung und Sicherung,” in Ulrich Krings and Ottmar Schwab, *Köl. Die romanischen Kirchen: Zerstörung und Wiederherstellung*, 333), the consulting physical engineer in the reconstruction of the west transept at St. Kunibert between 1979 and 1992, has argued that foundations for the west transept (which were uncovered and rebuilt for the recent reconstruction) were insufficient for a central tower and has thus suggested that the tower over the west crossing was likely not part of the original plan for the west transept but was instead only added as an afterthought; a similar line of reasoning had already been advanced by Ewald in 1916 (*KDM* 6/4, 248), who, however, was unable to inspect the thirteenth-century foundations. The lack of adequate foundations could possibly be taken as corroboration that the west tower, as an afterthought, was constructed only after the archiepiscopal consecration of 1247 and up to 1261, as Machat has suggested (“Kirche St. Kunibert,” 285), but in the absence of the original west tower itself (lost—only partially?—to fire in 1376, and then completely in 1830), there is simply no way of testing this hypothesis.
completion of the west tower, or that in his unknown source, was ultimately predicated on error or confusion about Konrad’s role in the rebuilding (which was, apart from the act of archiepiscopal consecration, non-existent as far as the sources enable us to judge).⁵⁸² Owing to the repeated destruction of the west tower, first by fire in 1376 and then through storm-induced structural failure in 1830 (fig. 88), dating the west tower on stylistic grounds to either 1247 or 1261 is impossible.⁵⁸³ Potential, though very indirect, corroboration of the later date for the completion of the west tower may come in the form of the tabernacle for the parish altar (located directly adjacent to pier S1 9), itself originally located in the south arm of the west transept (figs. 31 and 72). With its crocketed gable and tracery quatrefoil, the tabernacle, even if highly restored, fits stylistically into the 1260s or even well beyond. The installation of a Gothic tabernacle for the parish altar in the west transept would be consistent with a completion of the west tower in 1261, suggesting, as the forms and existence of the tabernacle do, that the west transept was only taken into use as the parish church sometime after the archiepiscopal consecration of the edifice in 1247.⁵⁸⁴ On the other hand, it is impossible to exclude the possibility that the Gothic parish tabernacle replaced an earlier one. It seems reasonable to presume, as has long been done, that at least the nave and the west transept were fully complete by the consecration of the church in 1247 (fig. 30). Whether the central tower crowning the west transept was also complete by 1247 or only finished somewhat later, as the Gothic parish tabernacle and the information in Mertens’s mysterious lost note could suggest, must ultimately remain an open question.

⁵⁸² Before the publication of the obits from the Memorienbuch in the later nineteenth century, Boisserée, for instance, had erroneously supposed, by virtue of extrapolation from the account of the archiepiscopal consecration in 1247, that Konrad von Hochstaden was himself responsible for the rebuilding of St. Kunibert; thus, Boisserée, Denkmale, 39: “Sodann baute Erzbischof Konrad von Hoesteden die jetzige Kirche . . . .” Mertens’s indication concerning the date of the west tower, or its unknown source, may well have rested on some such faulty premise.

⁵⁸³ On the damage to the west transept, see below.

⁵⁸⁴ As Amberg, Gottesdienstordnung, 14, has plausibly reasoned.
Despite the uncertainties surrounding the chronological contours of the second building phase, a fairly clear picture of the chronology of the construction of the eastern and western halves of the collegiate church can be formed (fig. 30). Most likely in the years around 1210, construction began with the apse and the east transept. At some point during the course of construction of the new east end, the decision was taken to erect a slightly taller and broader nave than the east end would have permitted originally. The physical fabric along the west walls of the east transept and the other evidence bearing on the issue nonetheless indicate that the first nave bay was constructed near contemporaneously with the east end. This bay was probably complete by the consecration of the two side altars at the eastern end of the side aisles in 1226/1227. It is not certain when, exactly, work on the two western nave bays and west transept began, but the evidence indicates that this occurred only at some point after the completion of the entire first nave bay, from which these parts of the church were likely separated by a provisional partition. Below, new evidence is adduced that suggests that the west transept was only designed and constructed beginning in the early to mid-1230s, and that at least it, if not the two western nave bays that link it to the first nave bay, was begun well after the first nave bay had been completed. Because this evidence depends extensively on the design of the west transept, it will be presented in that particular context.\textsuperscript{585} The two western nave bays and the west transept were both most likely complete by the 1247 archiepiscopal consecration. The lost west tower may have been as well, but it also might have been completed only somewhat later.

\textsuperscript{585} See below, 275–276.
3. The Nave: Plan, Proportion, Design

Particular emphasis has been placed here on ascertaining the chronological relationship between the east end and the first nave bay to demonstrate that both were constructed together within the first building phase. Although it has often been generally supposed from the change in moulding profiles in the bases of the nave piers that the first nave bay was erected in fairly close chronological proximity to the east end, scholars have nonetheless cleaved the entire nave from the east end on a conceptual level and considered its design in isolation rather than in the immediate context of the east end onto which it was built. This is probably due in part to the difference in scale between these two parts of the church, which makes the broader and taller nave appear like a radical break; conceptual separation of the east end and the nave seems natural and logical on a purely physical level. A second reason resides in the disjointed relationship between these two parts of the church in terms of their architectural models: the junction of the east transept and the first nave bay marks not only a change in dimensions, but also, as we shall see, a shift within the corpus of architectural models that the architect consulted while designing these two parts of the church. Yet this artificial conceptual divide between the east end and the first nave bay runs counter to the evidence (fig. 30). In figuring the nave generally as a point of rupture and considering its design separately from the east end, scholarship has paid little attention to the numerous ways in which the architect of the nave, in the first nave bay in particular, worked to integrate it within the set of aesthetic and structural parameters that had already been established by the design of the east end of the church. And

---

586 See, for instance, the discussions of the nave in KDM 6/4, 253–257; Kubach, Triforium, 33–35; Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbaurkunst, 54–62, esp. 62; Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 549–554; Machat, “Bauwerk,” 320–324; Overdick, “Rippenwölbung,” 44–46; and Overdick, Architektursystem, 142–143. In arguing, against the evidence, that the nave was only begun in the 1230s and its construction even necessitated a partial rebuilding of the already completed east transept, Graf (“Ostchorbau,” 75 and “Neue Forschungen,” 122) posited an even more radical division between the east end and the nave than that maintained in the scholarship cited above.
while long cognizant of the dissonance in dimensions between the east end and the nave, scholars have yet to offer a plausible explanation for it. The following aims both to redress these two issues and to situate the design of the nave at St. Kunibert within a much wider pool of architectural models than heretofore.

The nave at St. Kunibert is of the three-vessel, basilican type and comprises three bays (figs. 26, 56). In the central vessel, the boundaries of each bay are delineated by two pairs of strong piers; intermediate weak piers subdivide each bay visually and rhythmically into two notional halves. The spacious rectangular bays of the central vessel, approximately 10 meters wide and 12 meters long, are each flanked in the side aisles by two smaller, equally regular rectangular bays (fig. 33). At slightly more than 5 meters wide by 6 meters long, the side aisle bays are, for all intents and purposes, perfect fractional modules of the central vessel, with each bay in the side aisle measuring half the width and half the length of the adjacent central bay. Thus, harmonious proportions—central vessel to side aisle = 2:1—are built into the ground plan of the nave through elementary geometric schematism.

The particular numerical units and ratios employed to generate the ground plan of the nave also underlie its system of vertical proportions (fig. 34). In the side aisles, the pendant keystones of the rib vaults stand approximately 10 meters above the pavement; in other

---

587 The width of the central vessel measured between the plane of the core of the nave piers, that is, excluding the applied transverse supports and vault responds, which project into the space of the central vessel. Cf. fig. 33 (width between the weak piers). The length of the first nave bay (measured from the centrepoint of the transverse supports along the strong supports) is 12.22 m (measurement taken along main nave arcade on north side). Measurements are the author’s own.

588 Again, the width measured from the plane of the core of the nave piers facing the side aisle (i.e., without the appended pilaster that projects into the aisle) to the flat plane of the aisle wall (i.e., without the Muldennischen in the wall); the length measured from the centrepoint of the strong piers. The side aisles all range in the area of 5.3–5.4 m in width (cf. fig. 33). Measurements are the author’s own.

589 Of the vaults in the side aisles, solely those in the first three aisle bays (from east) in the south aisle survived World War II completely intact. The rest were rebuilt, either fully or partly, after the War. The three original vaults in the south side aisle measure (to the pendant keystones) 10.35 m (first bay from east); 10.27 m (second bay from east); and 10.49 m (third bay from east). Measurements are the author’s own.
words, the side aisles are twice as tall as they are wide (around 5 meters). In the aisles, then, a variant of the 2:1 ratio that serves as the basis for the ground plan of the nave as a whole was projected upwards in space. The same basic unit of 10 meters and a 2:1 ratio also appear to have been determinate as the architect devised the vertical proportions of the elevation in the central vessel. Here, the upper edge of the string course moulding that divides the lower and upper stories of the nave stands just over 10 meters (10.1 meters) above floor level. The height of the lower storey up to the string course thus corresponds closely to the width of the central vessel between the supports (in the realm of 10.1 to 10.3 meters in each bay), suggesting that the architect took the width of the central vessel and projected it upwards to generate the total height of the lower storey, thereby figuring the lower storey of the nave as a notional square compartment of space 10 meters wide by 10 meters tall. The distance from the string course to the apex of the wall ribs along the lateral walls—the tallest point in the elevation of the upper storey walls—is, in turn, also close to 10 meters (10.1 meters), thus producing a second notional square compartment of space in the upper storey. In abstract spatial terms, then, the central vessel of the nave excluding the billowing space of the high vaults consists of two equal, square parcels of space—corresponding to the lower and upper stories—that have been stacked one upon the other, making the central vessel without the vaults twice as tall (20 meters) as it is wide (10 meters). At around five meters in width and ten meters tall including the vaults, the side aisles are essentially a reduction of the horizontal and vertical mass of the central vessel by

590 The height of the string course in the nave cannot be measured accurately without scaffolding (there is no walkway), and thus I defer here to the vertical dimensions as recorded in KDM 6/4, 262 fig. 138 (cf. my fig. 34).
591 The width of the central vessel in the first nave bay ranges from 10.1 to 10.3 m between the core of the nave piers (i.e., minus the responds and transverse supports): between piers N 3 and S 3 = 10.27 m; between piers N 4 and S 4 = 10.19 m; and between piers N 5 and S 5 = 10.16 m (cf. fig. 33). The second and third nave bays present the same range of values for the width of the central bay. Measurements are the author’s own.
592 Again, accurate measurement without scaffolding is impossible in this instance; the above dimensions are based on KDM 6/4, 262 fig. 138 (my fig. 34), which indicates that the apex of the wall ribs in the nave stand approximately 10.1 m above the upper edge of the string course.
half. This highly balanced vertical disposition of space creates an inherently tight, harmonious linkage between the upper and lower stories of the nave and endows each part of the elevation in the central vessel with equal visual weight.

It is through the treatment of the high vaults, however, that the central vessel breaks with the scheme of balanced square ratios found in the ground plan and in the vertical massing of space between the supports and walls in the central vessel and side aisles of the nave. With keystones positioned well above the level of the transverse arches and strongly hunched webs that billow upwards (figs. 27 and 56), the high vaults ultimately tilt the balance of space in the central vessel markedly towards the vertical. Rising from highly stilted ribs to peak at around 23 meters above floor level (to the intrados of the keystone), the high vaults establish a total height-to-width ratio of 2.3:1 in the central vessel (ca. 23 meters by 10 meters) and the same ratio for the total height of the central vessel to the height of the side aisles (ca. 23 meters to 10 meters) (fig. 34).593 But even with this more attenuated vertical ratio in the central vessel, the architect attempted to maintain a harmonious balance in the proportions of the nave as a whole. Thus, he appears to have derived the very height of the nave high vaults—23 meters—from the total interior width of the nave, which also measures in the range of 23 meters between the flat planes of the two side aisle walls (figs. 33 and 34).594 The total width and height of the interior

---

593 Of the three high vaults in the nave, only that over the second bay survived World War II intact. As with the majority of the vaults over the side aisles, the high vaults over the first and third nave bays were both rebuilt after the War. The high vaults in the nave measure (each to the intrados of the annular keystone): 23.17 m (first bay); 23.64 m (second bay); and 23.46 m (third bay). The height of the original high vault in the second nave bay indicates securely that the nave high vaults all originally stood 23 m (or slightly more) above floor level. Measurements are the author’s own.

594 As with all of the other dimensions, minor divergences are observable from bay to bay and from one set of piers to the other in the total interior width of the nave between the side aisle walls, but these values all range around 23 m. Thus, the width of the nave along nave piers N1 3 to S1 3 = 23.55 m; along piers N1 4 to S1 4 = 23.49 m; along piers N1 5 to S1 5 = 23.32 m; along piers N1 6 to S1 6 = 23.06 m; along piers N1 7 to S1 7 = 22.86 m. The modern organ prevents measurement of the width of the central bay along nave piers N1 8 to S1 8, and measurement of the width of the nave along piers N1 9 to S1 9 is redundant, as the nave piers N 9 and S 9 are modern replacements that are much thicker than the thirteenth-century originals. Measurements are the author’s own.
of the nave are therefore structured around the figure of an isosceles triangle inscribed within a square whose sides measure 23 by 23 meters. Although the total width and height of the nave are perfectly equated in this way, the amplified dimensions of the upper storey of the central vessel with the high vaults nonetheless produces a pronounced vertical pull in the central vessel that draws the eye upwards from the harmoniously balanced lower and upper stories of the elevation through to the apex of the soaring vaults.

The particular spatial economy of the ground plan (fig. 26), laid out according to the precepts of the so-called “bound system,” with one large unified bay in the central vessel to two smaller, separate side aisle bays, is given plastic expression in the nave elevation both in the system of wall articulation and in the vaulting (figs. 57–59). The elevation of the central vessel is three-part, with a main nave arcade in the lower storey and a blind triforium surmounted by clerestory windows in the upper. The nave arcade in the lower storey, executed in ashlar blocks of trachyte, is composed of austere, monumental square piers with equally spartan round arches whose clean, crisp lines are devoid of all profiling. Narrow pilasters flanked by single three-quarter columnar vault responds, also entirely in trachyte, traverse the front face of the strong piers. Both the pilaster and the vault responds on the strong piers run continuously from the level of the pier bases at floor level through to the springing of the high vaults, where they are crowned by a staggered abacus that traces their disposition (fig. 60).

The pilaster is assigned to the pointed transverse arches—conceived as a bent, pilaster-like strip of trachyte masonry with pendant keystone—that divide the high vaults of the three nave bays,

---

595 For an overview of the widespread use and long history of the “bound system” (or gebundenes System) in German Romanesque vaulted naves, inaugurated with Speyer II (1082–1106) and continuing through to late Romanesque structures in first half of the thirteenth century, see Overdick, Architektursystem, 17–33, as well as Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 4, 241–253.
596 The sole exception is encountered in the first nave bay, where the vault responds begin only some two meters above floor level on account of the masonry screens of the choir enclosure.
while the vault responds support the diagonal ribs of the sexpartite rib vault that crowns each bay. In addition to the diagonal ribs of the vault, the single columnar responds support substantial wall ribs that line not only the junction of the vault webs and the lateral walls, but also the flanks of the transverse arches themselves. The front faces of the weak nave piers, in contrast, are left completely unarticulated in the lower storey. Directly above, in the upper storey, a single three-quarter colonnette rises from the string course to support the transverse rib of the sexpartite vault and the two converging ends of the wall ribs along the lateral walls. This intermediary columnar respond bisects the blind triforium of four arches, thereby producing two groups of two arches. The triforium arcade rests on pairs of colonnettes, each of which is assigned to the thick nook rolls that line the intrados of the blind arcade. The clerestory windows above the triforium take the form of massive, round-headed lights, one to each side of the transverse rib. Thus, through the single, overarching sexpartite high vault, each bay in the central vessel preserves its status as a unified spatial unit while subtly drawing attention, by means of the weak pier, intermediary respond, and transverse rib in the sexpartite vault, to the subdivision of the space in the side aisles into two smaller, independent units.

In the aisles (fig. 59), this division between the two bays is marked on the outer walls and the rear faces of the nave piers by means of pilasters that rise to support substantial round transverse arches that further divide the side aisle bays into discrete spatial units at the level of the vaults. A quadripartite rib vault composed of doughy ribs with a simple, slightly pointed profile and a pendant keystone covers each side aisle bay; the diagonal ribs of the vault spring directly from the abaci atop the pilasters without any system of individual responds, as do the wall-ribs that line the four edges of each side aisle vault, producing a floating, canopy-like effect. The side aisle walls are likewise cast as individual units, each with a billowing, broad
Muldennische punctured by a large octofoil window measuring approximately two meters in diameter.

Neither in its “bound system” ground plan, nor in its three-part elevation, nor even in its sexpartite rib vaults was the nave at St. Kunibert a new departure in Cologne. All three of these aspects of the nave, as has been recognized and reiterated since first being generally adduced by Ewald, are undoubtedly indebted directly to the model furnished by the nave at the collegiate church of St. Aposteln (figs. 175, 183). Like the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol, the nave at St. Aposteln was not the product of a complete rebuilding, but rather a multi-phase, large-scale renovation project that sought to retrofit with stone vaults the older, timber-roofed nave that Archbishop Pilgrim had erected around 1030. Preserving the slender main nave arcade and the side aisle walls from the old basilica, as well as the older fabric in the upper storey walls, two separate generations of builders transformed the previously unarticulated basilican nave into a two-bay, “bound system” nave with a three-part elevation. The first phase of the reconstruction encompassed only the side aisles, where pilasters were added to the walls and robust engaged columns to the rear faces of the main nave piers to produce individual bays, each further separated by a round transverse arch and vaulted with groin vaults (fig. 184). This work, as the forms of the simple cushion capitals atop the columns and the use of groin vaults indicate, was executed in the later decades of the twelfth century or at the turn of the thirteenth, along with or immediately after the construction of the new triconch east end. In a second phase, the old main arcade in the lower storey was shored up with a thick layer of additional


masonry towards the central vessel, thereby enabling the builders to install a system of strong and weak piers and transverse arches while affording a ledge in the upper storey upon which the various supports for the vaults and a blind triforium of four arches per bay could be placed (fig. 183). Rather than employ continuous columnar vault responds for the diagonal ribs of the sexpartite vaults along the strong piers, the builders confined both these and the robust intermediary columnar respond for the transverse rib to the upper storey, placing them on the wide ledge produced by the bolstered main arcade. The intermediary respond bisects the blind triforium, an austere construction consisting of an unprofiled arcade on single colonnettes, and the transverse rib separates two round-headed clerestory windows. Highlighted by a frieze of arches under the string course, the substantial ledge furnished by the main arcade also made it possible to back the columnar vault responds with thin dosserets with their own capitals (fig. 185). Whereas the columnar vault responds carry the diagonal and transverse ribs of the sexpartite vault, the pilasters behind the responds are assigned to substantial masonry envelopes that house the wall ribs along the lateral walls. The ponderous transverse arches sit on monumental engaged columns that run continuously up the strong piers from the floor level to the springing of the vaults. Through the substantial ledge (originally provided with narrow passages behind the supports), the grouping of robust vault responds backed by dosserets, the protruding masses of the wall ribs with their envelope of masonry, and the hollow spaces within the blind triforium, the upper storey of the nave at St. Aposteln is marked by a strong element of

600 On account of the complete removal (1822–1828) and reconstruction (1872–1891) of the nave high vaults at St. Aposteln, which had nonetheless been documented in their general details by Boisserée before their demolition, it is not certain whether the round wall ribs that are presently embedded in the masonry envelopes along the lateral walls were also present in the thirteenth-century vaults, but this seems likely given the occurrence of similar solutions in near contemporaneous structures, such as the nave in Bonn. On this point, see Schröder, “Rippengewölbe,” 213; Overdick “Rippenwölbung,” 49–50; and Overdick, Architektursystem, 142.

601 The passages behind the clusters of supports have since been walled in; on them, see Kubach, Triforium, 30; Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbauten, 60; and Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 520.
plasticity and relief, an effect that is only amplified by the use of the massive engaged columns along the front faces of the strong piers across both stories.

The date for the completion of the second phase of the renovation of the nave at St. Aposteln—that encompassing the central vessel—is firmly documented as falling in 1219, when the sexpartite vaults were most likely installed.\(^{602}\) Whereas the date of completion of the nave is secure, the date at which work began on the second phase of the renovation is not known. It is clear that the reworking of the nave into a “bound system” nave with sexpartite vaults postdates the construction of the new east end in the form of the celebrated triconch, but the date at which the triconch was itself complete is likewise only generally presumed, on the basis of style and other considerations, to lie roughly around the year 1200.\(^{603}\) The same applies to the groin-vaulted side aisles (fig. 184), which were most likely renovated when, or only shortly after, the triconch was built and thus probably stood complete for some time before work turned to the central vessel. Given the account of the vaulting of the central vessel only in the year 1219 and the reuse of significant portions of the old nave in its rebuilding, including the entire main arcade and the upper storey walls, the renovation of the central vessel at St. Aposteln most likely began only sometime during the 1210s.\(^{604}\)

---

\(^{602}\) This date is recorded in a copy (in a cartulary) of an original charter, found by Gelenius in the reliquary shrine of SS. Felix and Adauctus at St. Aposteln, that mentioned the “roofing” of the church in 1219: “Anno incarnationis dominicæ MCCXIX, mense marcio reliquie XI milium virginum deposite sunt in hunc sarcophagum cum alius pluribus reliquis, que hic continentur, que etiam prius fuerant in hac ecclesia sanctorum apostolorum in diuersis locis recondite, presidente Colonie venerabili archiepiscopo Engelberto, quo tempore hec ecclesia testudinata est, Alberone laico viro religioso cum multa solicitudine hoc procurante” (printed in Ennen and Eckertz, Quellen, vol. 2, 78 no. 65). Although the charter does not explicitly mention the nave, it is the only part of the building, both stylistically and contextually, to which the passage concerning the vaulting—which is how the phrase “testudinata est” is usually understood in the literature—can reasonably apply. See, on this point, KDM 6/4, 117–118; Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 513, 516; Werner Schäfke, “St. Aposteln: Vom spätstaufischen Ausbau bis zum Zweiten Weltkrieg,” in Die romanischen Kirchen von den Anfängen, 200–201; Overdick, “Rippenwölbung,” 41–43; and Overdick, Architektursystem, 139.

\(^{603}\) See Chapter 2.

\(^{604}\) The scholarly literature on St. Aposteln (see, for instance, the publications in note 602 above) generally cites only the date of completion of the nave (1219) but does not, to my knowledge, proffer a possible or likely start date
On account of overlap between the two structures in the fundamental aspects of ground plan, general elevation, and vaulting, as well as the set of recorded dates for both (nave at St. Aposteln done by 1219, first bay of the nave at St. Kunibert complete by circa 1226/1227), the tendency within scholarship has been to read the design of the nave at St. Kunibert exclusively by reference to that at St. Aposteln, with the nave at St. Kunibert considered as an instance of more or less faithful architectural *imitatio* (figs. 56 and 183). Ewald went so far as to suggest that the two naves might possibly have been designed by the same architect, so close did they seem to be to him in the basic tenets of their design. While the fundamental features of the nave at St. Kunibert unquestionably are inconceivable without direct, immediate knowledge of the nave at St. Aposteln on the part of the architect, previous approaches to the nave have concentrated unduly on adding the broad commonalities that link it to St. Aposteln at the expense of registering and explaining the equally significant differences.

One corollary of this focus on St. Aposteln has been the exclusion from the discourse on the nave at St. Kunibert of several other, major local monuments, both much earlier and contemporary, that the chapter and its builders likely consulted for the configuration of several of the nave’s more specific aspects (that is, beyond its ground plan, general elevation, and sexpartite vaulting). It is important to note that, as an architectural type, the vaulted nave had enjoyed very little diffusion in Cologne and the immediate vicinity over the course of the twelfth century before its almost unheralded emergence there in the form of the full-blown rib-

---

605 See the fundamental literature on the nave cited in note 597.
vaulted nave in the early decades of the thirteenth. Although important examples of groin-vaulted naves, in the bound system and sometimes even with three-part elevations with blind triforia, had been erected towards the mid-twelfth century at the parish church of St. Mauritius in Cologne (ca. 1141), the Premonstratensian monastery of Knechtsteden (ca. 1151–1165), and the Benedictine abbey in nearby Brauweiler (ca. 1140), timber-roofed naves with elevations of varying complexity continued to be erected well into the later decades of that century, particularly in Cologne. This was the case with the naves at St. Ursula (second quarter of twelfth century) and St. Cecilia (ca. 1160; fig. 215), and it also appears to have been the original plan for the nave at Groß St. Martin, where the main arcade in the lower storey (clearly planned for a timber roof) likely had been begun before, and then interrupted by, a fire in 1185 (the upper storey of the nave and the quadripartite rib vaults date to the later 1220s and 1230s; fig. 210).

Only around 1200 did the vaulted nave, and specifically the rib-vaulted nave, begin to become standard within elite building projects in the Lower (and Middle) Rhineland, undoubtedly, in some instances, through direct contacts with examples of early Gothic architecture in northeastern France (such as at Limburg an der Lahn, which looks directly to Laon). In Cologne, the nave at St. Aposteln, vaulted by 1219, was but one of the two earliest examples of rib-vaulted naves in the city. The other was the nave at the collegiate church of St.

---


608 On St. Mauritius, see Kubach and Verbeek, *RBRM*, vol. 1, 580–582, and Overick, *Architektursystem*, 28. St. Mauritius was demolished in 1859, but the appearance of the nave had been recorded some two decades earlier in a series of detailed watercolours by Weyer. For Knechtsteden, see Kubach and Verbeek, *RBRM*, vol. 1, 472–476. On Brauweiler, see Kubach and Verbeek, *RBRM*, vol. 1, 144–145.

609 See Kubach and Verbeek, *RBRM*, vol. 1, 603, 607 (St. Ursula), 526 (St. Caecilia), and 577 (Groß St. Martin).

610 On the emergence of rib vaulting in the Lower Rhineland, see Kubach and Verbeek, *RBRM*, vol. 4, 453–454. This major issue is addressed in depth in Chapter 5 in the context of patronage dynamics.
Andreas (figs. 238, 239), which was itself also most likely complete by circa 1220. Also constructed in the “bound system,” with a three-part elevation featuring a blind triforium of four arches per bay and a clerestory, here originally with three graduated windows rather than two of equal size, the central vessel of the two-bay nave at St. Andreas is covered by quadripartite rather than sexpartite rib vaults. In this latter regard, the nave at St. Andreas, like its west end, looked to the nave at the civic church of Our Lady in the wealthy Lower Rhenish town of Andernach, itself probably under construction between 1189 and 1212, which further underscores the likelihood that the construction of the nave at St. Andreas falls in the 1210s.

In the context of the design of the nave at St. Kunibert, then, it is useful to recall that in Cologne during the decade preceding the erection of the nave at St. Kunibert (the 1210s), not one, but two major building projects involving rib-vaulted naves were underway. It is certain...

---

611 It is widely supposed that the nave at St. Andreas was fully complete by 1221, in which year the adjacent crossing tower was struck by lightning and set ablaze; see, most recently, Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 513; Barbara and Ulrich Kahle, “St. Andreas,” in Die romanischen Kirchen von den Anfängen, 159; and Ralf Eschenbrücher, Helmut Köhren-Jansen, and Norbert Nussbaum, “Das staufische Langhaus von St. Andreas in Köln. Untersuchungen zu seiner Baugeschichte,” JRhD 38 (1999): 1–30.

612 The clerestory at St. Andreas was heavily reworked in the Baroque period, when the windows were altered to form one large rectangular light per bay; this modification caused extensive damage to the triforium below, which was partially demolished to make way for the new, taller windows (the remaining portions of the triforium adjacent to the new windows were walled in and covered over with plaster). Despite the extensive damage to the original substance, enough remained to permit a faithful reconstruction of both the triforium and clerestory windows, which were restored to their original form in 1876–1878. See Kubach, Triforium, 21–25; Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 506; and Eschenbrücher, Köhren-Jansen and Nussbaum, “Langhaus von St. Andreas,” 1–30.

613 On the dependency of the nave vaulting and west end at St. Andreas on Andernach, see Overdick, Architektursystem, 74–85.

614 A further major building project involving a nave was also to come in nearby Bonn, where work on the new nave was possibly underway in the 1210s. The dating of the nave in Bonn is, like the east transept there, notoriously fraught. Proposed dates for the nave, which depend exclusively on style and inferences from other monuments, have ranged from circa 1200 to as late as 1250. The recent literature tends towards a date in the 1210s, but even here there is disagreement as to whether work began in the early or only later years of that decade; cf., for instance and most recently, Heiko K. L. Schulze, “Das Langhaus des Bonner Münsters: Hinweise zur Datierung,” Bonner Geschichtsblätter 35 (1984): 7–19, who concludes that work on the lower stories of the nave began as early as 1210/1215 and had progressed up to the clerestory by ca. 1220, and Overdick, Architektursystem, 125–131, esp. 130–131, who argues that the lower stories of the nave were only begun “shortly before 1220.” Of the two arguments, Overdick’s is the more convincing.

In any event, this prestigious building project, though potentially—but by no means certainly—also earlier than the nave at St. Kunibert appears, to judge from the design and repertoire of forms used in the nave at St. Kunibert itself, to have exercised no immediate, direct influence on the nave at St. Kunibert. Though the form of
that the chapter at St. Kunibert and its architect would have known the nave at St. Andreas on the basis of its proximity and the prestige of this monumental project alone. When the east end at St. Kunibert had been begun in the early 1210s, these two new rib-vaulted naves in Cologne were most likely only in the earliest stages of construction. It is thus all the more probable that, as work on the east end at St. Kunibert progressed over the course of the 1210s and the decisions concerning the design of the nave became more pressing, both of these local building projects attracted the chapter’s attention and were consulted and considered as potential models.

That the nave at St. Aposteln with its sexpartite vaults ultimately won this competition is clear. Yet, even if the chapter at St. Kunibert did not opt for the quadripartite vaults of St. Andreas, other features of the design of the nave at St. Kunibert point to selective appropriation of several characteristic forms from the nave there. This is evident in the design of the interior of the side aisle walls at St. Kunibert, with their broad Muldennischen running all the way down to the west transept (figs. 26 and 59). Standing in marked contrast to the flat side aisle walls at St. Aposteln (fig. 175), the use of Muldennischen in the side aisles at St. Kunibert finds a direct parallel and immediate precursor in the nave at St. Andreas. Though the addition of private chantry chapels along the side aisle walls at St. Andreas over the course of the first half of the fourteenth century has erased much of the fabric here, the single preserved bay of the original, early-thirteenth-century side aisle wall in the northwest preserves a similarly conceived

---

the strong supports is superficially similar in both naves (a pilaster flanked by two columnar vault responds), this particular feature in the nave at St. Kunibert, as is argued below (252–253), finds a direct precursor in the transverse supports in the east end (even down to the treatment of the capital zone, which, moreover, diverges from that in Bonn), so that dependence on Bonn for this single feature of the nave is questionable and, in view of the fact that other commonalities beyond this are lacking in the two naves, ultimately unlikely. Nor can it be argued from this that the nave in Bonn must necessarily postdate the nave at St. Kunibert. Rather, the flattened strong supports in both naves most likely represent separate, independent solutions.
Muldennische (figs. 238, 241), indicating that the interior of the aisle walls here originally featured a series of broad Muldennischen, one per side aisle bay.\textsuperscript{615} That the design of the side aisles at St. Kunibert with Muldennischen was most likely based directly on St. Andreas and does not represent the use of what was a common decorative element that had Ottonian roots, as has sometimes been supposed,\textsuperscript{616} finds confirmation in the distinctive design of the blind triforium at St. Kunibert (fig. 60), which has frequently been read, like the elevation as a whole, as a “literal” derivation from St. Aposteln (fig. 185).\textsuperscript{617} Though both triforia do feature four arches and are bisected into two halves by the intermediary support, the design of the triforium at St. Kunibert is much closer to the triforium at St. Andreas (fig. 240) than it is to the austere, unarticulated construction at St. Aposteln. Common to the triforia at St. Andreas and St. Kunibert is the use of double, rather than single, colonnettes as supports and, especially, the application of thick nook rolls to the intrados of the blind arcade. While the triforium at St. Kunibert dispenses with the additional thin pier between the colonnettes found at St. Andreas (where it was likely used as a spacer on account of the proportionately long bays here), the likelihood of the derivation of the particular design of the blind triforium at St. Kunibert from the nave at St. Andreas, and not from St. Aposteln, is evident, particularly when taken together with the common use of Muldennischen along the side aisle walls.

These two divergences from the nave at St. Aposteln are significant, for they provide important evidence of the ways the architect used the nave at St. Aposteln as the primary

\textsuperscript{615} On the fourteenth-century chapels, see KDM 6/4, 32–34; on the use of Muldennischen along the original side aisle walls, see Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 510, and Barbara and Ulrich Kahle, “St. Andreas,” 163.

\textsuperscript{616} Cf. Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 1, 554 (and following them, Machat, “Bauwerk,” 324), who observe generally that the Muldennischen in the side aisle walls at St. Kunibert “erinnern wie die von St. Andreas in Köln und St. Kastor in Koblenz an ottonische Vorformen.”

architectural model for the nave at St. Kunibert and swapped out certain parts and replaced them
with elements that were derived from the nave at St. Andreas in order to integrate the model
within its new architectural context that had already been established by the east end. It is not
coincidental that these two parts of the nave at St. Kunibert—that is, precisely those that diverge
conspicuously from the corresponding sections of St. Aposteln and accord closely with the nave
at St. Andreas—pick up on and repeat the dominant repertoire of decorative elements that had
already been used extensively throughout the east end (fig. 47), where the outer walls and
arcades in both the apse and the east transept teem with *Muldennischen* and nook rolls, the latter
derived from Xanten.

Other sections of the nave look neither to St. Aposteln nor to St. Andreas. This is true of
the main nave arcade (figs. 57, 58), which dispenses with all articulation in marked contrast to
the nave arcades at St. Aposteln and St. Andreas that feature either prominent horizontal
articulation in the form of a frieze of arches or a richly worked foliate band (figs. 183, 239).
The form of the simple, single-order nave arcade itself also diverges sharply from these two
models, with the nave arcades at St. Aposteln (by dint of the addition of masonry to the front
face of the arcade) and St. Andreas both double-ordered. The weak pier likewise differs in form
and conception, figured as it is as an unadorned, rectangular mass of trachyte masonry capped
by an abacus. Rather, the austere main nave arcade at St. Kunibert parallels those found in
many of the much earlier timber-roofed Cologne naves cited above from the mid-twelfth
century (St. Ursula; St. Caecilia, fig. 215; St. Pantaleon, fig. 242; Groß St. Martin, fig. 210).
The use of such a form of main nave arcade in the nave at St. Kunibert is significant, for it
indicates that the chapter and its architect did not simply consult and copy the newest building
projects in the city but also looked to naves that were by then more than a half century old, incorporating this type of nave arcade derived from older models into the design.

Of all the sections of the elevation of the nave at St. Kunibert that differ from St. Aposteln, however, the design of the transverse, or strong, supports is the most apparent (figs. 60 and 185). To the extent that differences have been registered between the naves at St. Kunibert and St. Aposteln, these have centered on the apparent “flatness” of the nave at St. Kunibert, emblematized by the simplified, sleek transverse supports consisting of a thin pilaster between two columnar vault responds, vis-à-vis the plastic, almost textured, mural surface at St. Aposteln, encapsulated in the rich, sculptural interplay of columns found in the transverse supports there. Customarily, the reduction of the transverse supports in the nave at St. Kunibert to an extremely pared down and flat unit has been explained as the end product of a teleological stylistic evolution from St. Aposteln: St. Kunibert is not only more vertically oriented, but the transverse supports and upper storey wall were streamlined and flattened in an effort to emphasize that vertical thrust.\textsuperscript{618} Though increased verticality over the primary model was no doubt a major intention in the nave at St. Kunibert—its high vaults stand over 23 meters above floor level while those at St. Aposteln are only some 18.8 meters\textsuperscript{619}—it is questionable whether this alone can account for the strikingly divergent design of the transverse supports, not only from those in the nave at St. Aposteln, but also from the profoundly plastic compound piers in the nave at St. Andreas (fig. 239). Likely more determinate for the architect’s conception of the transverse supports was the template provided by the design of the transverse supports in the east end itself, and by the north-south transverse supports in the east transept in particular (figs.

\textsuperscript{618} This line of reasoning was initiated by Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbautkunst, 62; see, further and in this same vein, Machat, “Westbau,” 90; Machat, “Bauwerk,” 324; Schröder, “Rippengewölbe,” 213; Overdick, “Rippenwölbung,” 44–46, esp. 46; and Overdick, Architektursystem, 142–143.

\textsuperscript{619} Dimensions derived from KDM 6/4, Tafel XIII.
35, 47). Even though the transverse supports in the nave make use of continuous rather than truncated vault responds, a feature that could also derive from the example of the strong piers in the nave at St. Andreas (fig. 239) rather than St. Aposteln (fig. 183), they follow very closely in both their general form (a pilaster flanked by two columnar vault responds) and details the design of the upper storey of the transverse supports in the crossing in the east transept, a design that ultimately goes back to the east transept’s dependency on the west choir hall in Xanten (fig. 221). This is especially apparent in the architect’s handling of the capital zone in the transverse supports in the nave, where the front face of the pilaster is left bare between the capitals and the abacus traces the disposition of the unit below, precisely as in the transverse supports in the east transept (cf. the nave and transept supports in fig. 57). The striking flatness and simplicity of the transverse supports in the nave at St. Kunibert is more likely the result of the architect’s attempt to develop a form of transverse support in the nave that would engender structural and aesthetic continuity with the east end than it is the end product of an inherent stylistic development towards “simplification” or “flatness” for its own sake (fig. 57). The use of continuous, as opposed to truncated, vault responds along the transverse supports may betray a desire for a sense of amplified verticality in the nave at St. Kunibert; but the very form of the transverse supports—flattened and simplified—resides in the architect’s efforts to integrate the design of the nave within the particular set of aesthetic and structural parameters that had already been established in the east end.

This motivation also underlies the significant divergences from St. Aposteln in the treatment of the nave high vaults at St. Kunibert. Just as the transverse supports in the nave follow those in the east transept in conception and detail, so too do the transverse arches, which,

---

620 As Overdick, “Rippenwölbung,” 45, has suggested.
621 See Chapter 3.
as a slightly pointed, pilaster-like strip of masonry with a pendant keystone, take the same form as their counterparts in the east end (cf. figs. 49 and 56). Again, with the exception of the keystone, the form of the transverse arches in the east end also ultimately goes back to the use of the west choir hall in Xanten as the model for the east transept (fig. 222). This move, namely, the modelling of the transverse supports and transverse arches in the nave on those already present in the east end, necessarily obviated the need to place a massive engaged column along the front face of the transverse support for an equally robust transverse arch, as is the case in the naves at both St. Aposteln (fig. 183) and St. Andreas (fig. 239)—hence, the apparent “flatness” of both the transverse supports and the transverse arches in the nave at St. Kunibert vis-à-vis those in its architectural model(s). The same applies to the particular handling of the wall ribs that line the junction of the lateral walls with the webs in the nave high vaults. While the sexpartite vaults and the profile of the ribs—a central torus surrounded by two further tori, with an annular keystone—in the nave at St. Kunibert were adopted from St. Aposteln, the architect of the nave at St. Kunibert (fig. 61) dispensed with the masonry envelope along the junction of the webs and the lateral wall as found in the high vaults in the nave at St. Aposteln (fig. 185). Instead, in the high vaults at St. Kunibert, wall ribs with no masonry envelope were run along both the lateral walls and the transverse arches in a clear repetition of the distinctive system that had already been employed throughout the rib vaults in the east transept (figs. 51, 52). The form

---

622 The rib profile and annular keystones at St. Kunibert were most likely adopted from St. Aposteln given the other borrowings from the nave there, but owing to the demolition of the nave vaults at St. Aposteln in 1822–1828, it is not certain whether the present profile of the ribs with the annular keystones (the nave vaults were rebuilt again after World War II) reflects the original profile. Boisserée’s cross-section of the nave at St. Aposteln (Boisserée, Denkmale, Tafelband), executed before the demolition of the vaults, seemingly indicates that the vaults did, in fact, feature ribs with a profile consisting of a central element flanked by two other elements and annular keystones, but the cross-section is not detailed enough to allow for complete certainty as to the original appearance of either the ribs or the keystones. As Schröder (“Rippengewölbe,” 214) notes, it is also conceivable that the vaults at St. Aposteln were reconstructed in the late nineteenth century on the model of those at St. Kunibert and that the overlap in rib profiles and annular keystones stems from this.
of the high vaults in the nave—now sexpartite rather than quadripartite or quinquepartite—may have changed under the influence of the new primary model, but the treatment of the vault is still very much the same as it is in the vaults in the crossing and the two arms of the east transept.

The abandonment of the masonry envelope behind the wall ribs at St. Kunibert, finally, also had important consequences for both the design and placement of the corner and intermediate vault responds (fig. 60). In sharp contrast to St. Aposteln (fig. 185), the vault responds at St. Kunibert no longer needed to be backed with dosserets to support the system of wall ribs enclosed within a masonry envelope above. The vault responds, which at St. Kunibert carry both the vault ribs and the wall ribs, instead could be placed tight against the upper storey wall, thereby producing the oft-noted “flatness” of the transverse supports and upper storey wall in the nave at St. Kunibert. It is the architect’s refiguration of the transverse supports and high vaults in the nave to harmonize them within the structural and aesthetic system established in the east end, and not an evolution of forms or “stylistic change,” that accounts for the conspicuous flatness of the upper storey wall and the transverse supports in the nave at St. Kunibert vis-à-vis St. Aposteln (and St. Andreas).

The aesthetic and structural parameters of the east end exercised substantial and significant influence on the design of the nave at St. Kunibert. The major divergences from the nave at St. Aposteln can be attributed to the desire to harmonize this particular architectural model with the east end, whether in terms of decorative vocabulary (Muldennischen in the side aisle walls and nook rolls in the triforium, both likely borrowed from the nave at St. Andreas) or in structural terms (the design of the transverse supports and transverse arches, the treatment of the wall ribs and thus the placement of the vault supports below and their relationship to the
upper wall). In view of the chronology of the nave, the architect’s manifold efforts to integrate its design with the east end should come as no surprise. The evidence indicates that the first nave bay was both designed as the east end was still in progress and constructed at least partly in tandem with the east transept during the first building phase (fig. 30). And though the two western bays of the nave were most likely erected only sometime after the completion of the first nave bay in a second building phase, they too were nonetheless constructed ultimately according to the template furnished by the first nave bay (fig. 57). As much as the physical and circumstantial evidence, the design of the nave indicates that the first bay was conceived, planned, and erected in close conjunction with the east end and not much later, so palpable and numerous were the architect’s attempts to align it with the formal and structural framework established by the design of the latter. The architectural models may have shifted from the east transept (Xanten) to the nave (primarily St. Aposteln), but the nave, rather than representing a radical break from the east end, displays manifold signs of continuity with it in terms of its design, if not in terms of its slightly larger physical scale.

Ewald speculated that the nave at St. Kunibert might have been the later, more refined work of the architect responsible for the nave at St. Aposteln, and he thereby implicitly severed the nave from the east end in supposing the existence of two different architects, one for the east end and one for the nave. 623 Though in less explicit terms, this same conceptual cleavage of the nave from the east end has continued to underwrite discourse into the present, which has considered the nave’s design in isolation and only in light of St. Aposteln rather than directly from the perspective of the east end onto which it was built. The design of the nave and the chronology of the first bay, erected with the east end in the first building phase, suggest

623 See note 606.
precisely the opposite of Ewald’s conclusion, however: the architect and workshop responsible for designing the east end most likely continued, now using the new primary model of St. Aposteln, with the design and construction of the first nave bay while work on the east transept was still underway. Whether this same architect or a younger member of the same workshop of masons ultimately oversaw the construction of the whole nave after the completion of the first bay, however, is impossible to answer either archaeologically or stylistically. At any rate, the design that the first architect established in the first nave bay was, despite the clear evidence for a break in work after the first bay, taken up as the binding paradigm for the rest of the nave in a further gesture of continuity with established precedent.

For all the continuities with the east end, the bare fact of the slightly amplified vertical and lateral dimensions of the nave vis-à-vis the east end remains (figs. 26, 27, 28). More than anything, it is this divergence in scale, and the taller high vaults in the nave in particular, that has prompted scholars to separate the nave and the east end conceptually, aesthetically, and even chronologically. Yet, to a certain extent, the east end also set concrete limits on the potential height of the high vaults in the central vessel and the width of the nave as a whole. Even if taller, the high vaults in the nave could not be positioned much higher than the crossing vault for obvious structural and aesthetic reasons; and the potential breadth of the nave was limited to no small degree by the width of the east transept. Precisely because of these internal limitations, it seems significant that the step was taken in the first place to increase not only the width of the interior of the nave (23.32–23.55 meters in the first bay; fig. 33) beyond the width of the east transept (22.47–22.57 meters; fig. 32), but also, and especially, the height of the high vaults in the nave (23.17–23.64 meters) over that of the crossing vault (21.70 meters). The high vaults at St. Aposteln, after all, were themselves only some 18.8 meters tall, and the high vaults in the
nave at St. Kunibert easily could have been made to the same height as the crossing vault and no
taller. This would have spared the builders the need to modify the height of the western
transverse arch and even the pitch of the crossing vault, the western web of which had to be
elevated above the others in order to accommodate the taller central vessel of the nave (fig. 27).
The competitive dimension of this gesture is as unmistakable now as it undoubtedly was in the
1220s. At over 23 meters in total interior height, the nave at St. Kunibert was by far the tallest
vaulted nave in Cologne at this particular moment, whether rib-vaulted or not, surpassing both
St. Aposteln (circa 18.8 meters) and St. Andreas (circa 17 meters) by some four and even six
meters, respectively.624 This fact was likely not lost on the chapter, the architect, or other
viewers alike. In mid-1220s Cologne, solely the rib-vaulted decagon at St. Gereon (complete by
1227; fig. 204) could claim greater height; at an astonishing 34.5 meters, it was the tallest
vaulted domical structure erected in the West since late antiquity (and only to be outdone in the
fifteenth century by Brunelleschi’s crossing dome in Florence).625

But even with high vaults around 22 meters in height, or the approximate height of the
crossing vault, the nave at St. Kunibert still would have far surpassed both of the earlier rib-
vaulted naves in Cologne. This suggests that the increased height of the central vessel of the
nave over the east transept may not be attributable solely or even primarily to the competitive
ambitions of the chapter and its architect in the face of recent local precedents or, as has usually
been supposed, a sheer desire for increased verticality for its own sake.626 Rather, practical
design considerations, and specifically the establishment of a set of ideal proportions in the

624 Dimensions for St. Andreas based on KDM 6/4, Taf. II.
625 Dimensions based on the cross-section of St. Gereon in Schäfke, “St. Gereon,” in Die romanischen Kirchen von
den Anfängen, fig. 115.
626 Thus, for instance, Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbaukunst, 62; Graf, “Neue Forschungen,” 122; and Overdick,
Architekturystem, 142–143.
nave, may stand behind the decision to put the high vaults in the central vessel at the specific height of 23 meters instead of aligning them with the lower crossing vault.

In this context, it is significant that the interior of the nave at St. Kunibert measures around 23 meters in width (23.32–23.55 meters in the first bay; fig. 33) and the high vaults in the central vessel stand around 23 meters tall (23.17–23.64 meters) to the intrados of the annular keystones, thus establishing a perfect balance between the total breadth and the total height of the nave (fig. 34). The interior of the squatter nave at St. Aposteln, for its part, also measures around 23 meters in total width (23.12–23.18 meters in the first bay), with the specific width here inherited directly from the dimensions of the reused Ottonian basilica (fig. 176). The width of the first bay of the nave at St. Aposteln thus diverges by an average of only some thirty centimeters from the first bay of the nave at St. Kunibert—a remarkably narrow margin of difference. Most of this margin of difference, moreover, stems from the width of the side aisles at St. Kunibert, which are each approximately 10 centimeters wider (on average) than those at St. Aposteln. Otherwise, minor differences between the two naves occur in the thickness of the nave piers and, as a corollary, the width of the central vessel. At St. Aposteln, the nave piers are comparatively slender, despite the addition of a layer of masonry towards the central vessel; the core of the weak piers here (cf. N 2 and S 2; fig. 176), for instance, averages slightly over one meter in width, and the central vessel is correspondingly wide, measuring 10.38 meters between these same two piers. By contrast, the weak supports at St. Kunibert (piers N 4 and S 4 in fig. 33) are, at around 1.2 meters in width (on average), slightly thicker than those at St. Aposteln, and the central vessel, accordingly, slightly narrower (10.19 meters between N 4 and S 4). Even with these divergences of ten to twenty centimeters in the different vessels and supports, the

---

627 The measurements cited here and in fig. 176 are the author’s own.
close concordance in the total interior width of the two naves and in the lateral proportions of the individual vessels remains striking.

Whereas the dependence of the ground plan and elevation of the nave at St. Kunibert on St. Aposteln has long been observed, the near overlap in the lateral mensuration of the two naves has hitherto gone unnoticed. Given the manifold connections between the naves at St. Aposteln and St. Kunibert, the concordance in interior width in both naves is likely not coincidental. Rather, it stands to reason that the architect at St. Kunibert based the lateral dimensions of the nave directly on those at St. Aposteln along with the basic components of the design. For the sake of comparison, the interior width of the other recently constructed rib-vaulted nave in Cologne at St. Andreas is approximately 19.5 meters (fig. 238). 628 This throws the near overlap of the widths of the naves at St. Kunibert and St. Aposteln into particularly sharp relief. The dimensions of the west transept at St. Kunibert (fig. 27)—the design of which is also based closely on that at St. Aposteln (fig. 175)—likewise appear to have been derived from the dimensions at St. Aposteln, again with divergences of only some twenty or thirty centimeters (the total interior width of the west transept at St. Kunibert = 35.5 meters, at St. Aposteln = 35.8 meters; the interior length of west transept arms at St. Kunibert = 11 meters, at St. Aposteln = 10.8 meters). 629 That the architect at St. Kunibert took measurements directly from the nave at St. Aposteln for use in staking out the lateral dimensions of the ground plan for the new nave at St. Kunibert is, then, very likely.

Where St. Kunibert and St. Aposteln diverge is in height. Owing to the reuse of the side aisle walls, main nave arcade, and upper storey walls in the renovation of the nave, the architect
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628 Dimensions based on KDM 6/4, Taf. 1.
629 The dependence of the west transept on St. Aposteln is examined in further detail below, 268–270. Because the west transept at St. Kunibert has been lost and rebuilt, one must defer to Ewald’s ground plan (KDM 6/4, 257 fig. 135) for its approximate prewar dimensions, which are those of the original. The dimensions of the west transept at St. Aposteln here are those in KDM 6/4, Tafel XI).
at St. Aposteln was limited as far as the potential height of the nave was concerned and was forced to compromise with the existing edifice while devising the vertical proportions of the elevation and vaulting (fig. 183). Thus, the short main nave arcade of the Ottonian basilica (the intrados of the arches in the main arcade stands approximately 7.5 meters above floor level) allowed for a lower storey of about 9.2 meters total height (to the upper edge of the string course). Rather than repeating the dimensions of the lower storey, the upper storey is even more diminutive, measuring only 7.6 meters from the string course to the apex of the wall ribs. The additional two and a half meters in the central vessel is made up by the high vaults, whose keystones stand about 18.8 meters above floor level.

The nave at St. Kunibert, by contrast, was an architectural tabula rasa unencumbered by existing fabric, its vertical dimensions potentially constricted solely by the height of the east end. Its architect was relatively free to establish the vertical proportions of both the side aisles and central vessel according to a system of equal, balanced proportions in a way that simply had not been possible at St. Aposteln. The units and ratios that underlie the vertical massing of space in the nave indicate that the architect at St. Kunibert did precisely this, using close approximations of the particular units and ratios in the ground plan to generate the vertical proportions in both the side aisles and central vessel (fig. 34). Thus, the lower and upper stories in the central vessel are equal in height, both just over ten meters tall (10.1 meters), and each therefore as tall as the central vessel is wide (10.19 meters between piers N 4 and S 4, for instance), thereby forming two equally-sized notional squares of space below the high vaults.

630 All dimensions for St. Aposteln in the following paragraph are based on KDM 6/4, 127 fig. 63 and Taf. XIII.
631 In the nave at St. Andreas (fig. 239), built completely anew like St. Kunibert and unlike St. Aposteln, the lower storey (to the upper edge of the string course) and upper storey (to the apex of the wall rib) are also equal, each around 8 m tall (8.1 m; dimensions based on KDM 6/4, Taf. II). The architect of the nave at St. Kunibert, who looked to St. Andreas for other aspects of the nave (the side aisle walls, the design of the triforium), may well have been motivated by this model to achieve a perfect balance between the stories, for St. Aposteln, with its...
The high vaults bring the total height of the central vessel up to 23 meters (23.17–23.64), thus equating the total height of the interior of the nave with its total interior width between the two side aisle walls, also 23 meters (23.32–23.55 in the first bay). As suggested above, this particular figure for the interior width of the nave and the lateral dimensions of the bays that were generated from it were most likely derived, along with the bounded system ground plan and other aspects of the nave (elevation, vaulting), directly from the nave at St. Aposteln and made the basis for the ground plan of the new nave at St. Kunibert.

Here it becomes evident that, with the specific interior width of 23 meters as taken over from St. Aposteln, the system of balanced horizontal and vertical proportions as ultimately realized in the nave at St. Kunibert would not have been possible with nave high vaults set at around 22 meters—that is, to the approximate height of the crossing vault in the east end. The upper and lower stories in the central vessel could have each been made somewhat shorter (around 9.5 meters rather than 10.1 meters, for instance) to bring the nave high vaults down to the level of the crossing vault, but then the height of the individual stories in the central vessel would not have accorded closely with its width, nor would the height of the nave high vaults gained through this procedure (ca. 22 meters) have accorded with the total width of the nave (over 23 meters). The same would have applied had the lower and upper stories in the central vessel been kept at around 10.1 meters and the nave high vaults made roughly one meter shorter through a lowering of the keystone and flattening of the webs; even then, the height of the nave high vaults would not have equaled the total width of the interior. Rather, in view of the way the nave at St. Kunibert was actually built and the striking concordance between its total interior
disproportionate lower and upper stories, clearly did not offer a model for this particular solution. At St. Andreas, however, the width of the central vessel (circa 7.5 m) does not seem to have played a role in determining the height of the lower and upper stories (8.1 m)—in contrast to St. Kunibert, where the overlap between the width of the central vessel and the height of each storey in the central vessel is very close.
height and width, it seems more likely that the architect of the nave took the interior lateral width of the nave at St. Aposteln (ca. 23 meters) and, modifying the width of the core of the nave piers and the side aisles ever so slightly, used these dimensions as the basis for generating all of the vertical dimensions in the nave, developing a system of tightly balanced horizontal and vertical proportions in which the height and width of the nave would be exactly equal, even if this ultimately meant that the high vaults in the nave would be approximately one meter taller than the crossing vault and the width of the nave would be slightly disproportionate to the width of the east transept. The physical evidence in the crossing provides vivid confirmation of the architect’s attempt to accommodate the plan for the nave, with its set of balanced lateral and vertical proportions, within the existing parameters of the edifice as it had been independently planned and begun in the east end. The western transverse arch and the western web of the crossing vault were both shaped precisely to receive the one-meter taller high vault of the first nave bay (fig. 27); and the wider nave was accommodated at the junction of the transept arms and aisles with additional arches that compensate for the slight difference in width between these two parts of the church (fig. 67). The system of proportions in the nave also meant that the string course in the central vessel, with its height set according to the width of the central vessel (ca. 10 meters), would be elevated far above those in the east end (figs. 27, 49). But, as with the divergence between the heights of the high vaults in the nave and the east end, this also seems to have been accepted as an inevitable corollary of attaining perfectly balanced proportions in the nave.
4. The West Transept

Whereas the eastern half of the edifice has largely survived intact the ravages of natural disasters and war, its western half has had a much more turbulent fate, and no part more so than the west transept (fig. 62). The chain of disasters involving the west transept reaches back to 1376, when a fire in the parish of St. Kunibert gripped the church, melting the lead roofing on the west tower, nave, and east towers, and causing the bells in the west tower to collapse and puncture the webs in the crossing vault in the west transept below. With the west tower rebuilt by circa 1400 (its upper storey now with blind arches filled with Gothic tracery), the west transept and west tower were to stand unchanged for the next four hundred years before falling victim to a second, more devastating, disaster in 1830 (figs. 84–87). On April 28 of that year, gale-force winds caused the west tower to collapse for the second time, resulting not only in the obliteration of large portions of the west transept walls (and the west wall in particular), but also in the destruction of both the high vault in the adjacent third nave bay and the west porch that originally stood before the west portal (fig. 88). Rebuilt between 1836 and 1860 without the west porch, the west transept, west tower, and third nave bay were leveled yet again by Allied bombers in 1944, with only the east and south walls of the west transept and the walls of the third nave bay left standing (fig. 98). Whereas the third nave bay was included in the immediate postwar reconstruction program and was thus rebuilt quickly (work completed by 1955), the west transept, henceforth separated from the church by a wooden partitioning wall, was left in a ruinous state for the next forty years (fig. 99). Begun only in 1979, the reconstruction of the west transept and west tower—the last of the great postwar reconstruction projects involving Cologne’s Romanesque churches—was complete by 1992 (fig. 83).

For a detailed examination of the following events, see Machat, “Bauwerk,” 307, 313–317.
In its present incarnation, the west transept is thus a palimpsest of successive restoration projects spanning seven centuries. Though it faithfully recreates the general features of the ground plan, parts of the elevation (interior and exterior), and vaulting of the thirteenth-century transept as recorded in the extant graphic renderings and thereby gives a sense of the “original,” the reconstructed west transept also contains numerous additions and divergences, some quite significant.633 Despite the almost complete loss of the actual fabric, the original appearance of the interior and exterior of the west transept, with the exception of the later west tower, can be reconstructed accurately from the extensive series of graphic renderings executed between the 1376 fire and the 1830 collapse. Of these, the most valuable are the detailed cross-sections and ground plan of the collegiate church drawn by C. Bolle in 1828, which in turn served as the basis for the plates in Boisserée’s survey of pre-Gothic architecture in the Lower Rhineland, published in 1833, three years after the collapse of the west tower and west transept.634

Bolle’s ground plan (fig. 90) indicates that the west transept consisted of three bays, including a crossing bay that communicated with the central vessel of the nave and two arms, which led into the side aisles. In contrast to the arms of the east transept, the north and south arms of the west transept protruded well beyond the plane of the side aisle walls, producing a distinctive T-shaped disposition of space in the western half of the church (fig. 26). Bolle’s

633 In the latest reconstruction, for instance, major changes were made to the form of the crossing piers and the central bay of the west wall (the original appearance of which is well documented in Bolle’s drawings; see below) for structural reasons; the crossing piers (fig. 62) were made much thicker than the originals, while the design of the central bay of the west wall (fig. 63) was much simplified to ensure structural integrity. Likewise, the narrow lancet windows in the east walls—themselves likely given this form only during the post-1376 rebuilding and not in the thirteenth century—were extended to the north and south walls (fig. 62), even though these windows were almost certainly originally round-headed (see below). The west tower (fig. 83), too, was reconstructed in its documented post-1376 form, complete with Gothic tracery—necessarily so, as no visual record of its appearance before 1376 exists. Additional round-headed windows—again, running counter the documented appearance of the west transept before 1830—were also added in the lower storey of the west wall.

634 Boisserée, *Denkmale*, Tafelband.
ground plan further indicates that the crossing was covered by a quadripartite rib vault and the arms by seven-part rib vaults.

The east-west (fig. 91) and north-south cross-sections (fig. 92) of the west transept record that the interior elevation of the walls in the two arms of the west transept was, with the exception of the windows (scale adjusted depending on location), uniform on the east, north/south, and west sides. The wall was divided horizontally into two stories by a string course and vertically by the columnar vault respond for the intermediary ribs of the seven-part vaults. The vault respond in the centre of the wall ran continuously from floor level through to the springing of the vaults, partitioning the wall into four fields. The two fields in the lower storey contained blind arches, with each arch lined with a column (complete with bases on each end) that was bent to from a type of nook roll (cf. fig. 73). The ends of these nook rolls rested on individual colonnettes placed in the four corners of the arms next to the continuous vault responds for the diagonal ribs of the vaults and, in the centre of the wall, adjacent to the continuous vault responds for the intermediary ribs. The groupings of columnar elements were not conceived as tight bundles but rather were appended as distinct elements to dosserets belonging to the blind arcades. In the upper storey, the same structural system was applied, with colonnettes grouped with the vault responds in the corners and the centre of the wall; rather than support a blind arcade, however, the colonnettes here carried the pointed wall ribs. In the upper storey, moreover, the solid wall behind the intermediary group of supports on the east walls and
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635 Bolle/Boisserée’s east-west cross-section to the west, drawn along the line of the east walls of the west transept, records only the appearance of the west wall of the central bay; in place of the interior elevation of the west walls in the two arms of the west transept, it shows the exterior of the east walls. A graphic rendering of the interior elevation of the west walls in the two arms before the 1830 collapse does not exist. The form of the groups of supports along the west walls in the two arms (the same as on the east and north/south walls) in Bolle/Boisserée’s ground plan (fig. 90), however, indicates that the elevation of the west walls in the two arms was identical to that of the east and the adjacent north/south walls.
the north and south flanks was hollowed out slightly to produce a rudimentary passageway behind the supports.

The sole divergence from the otherwise uniform interior elevation in the west transept was found in the central bay of the west wall (figs. 93, 94). As Bolle/Boisserée’s east-west cross-section to the west indicates, the wall here was divided into two stories. In the lower storey, a blind arcade consisting of three pointed arches (the central arch slightly broader) rested on engaged colonnettes, singles in the corners and pairs towards the centre, and framed the centrally-placed west portal, shown here as a simple rectangular opening. The upper storey also featured an arcade, again with slightly pointed arches placed on single columns in the corners and pairs around the central window. The upper arcade, however, was steeply graduated, with a taller and broader central arch, and served to frame a group of three windows, also graduated, with a larger, round-headed central window between two shorter, narrower lancets.

Graphic renderings of the exterior of the west transept, including Bolle’s drawings (fig. 95) and the two earliest detailed representations of the west transept (figs. 86, 87), indicate that the two-storied division of the interior elevation provided the basis for the articulation of the

636 The single columns in the corners and pairs of two flanking the portal in the lower storey are corroborated in Bolle/Boisserée’s ground plan (fig. 90).
637 The two lancets in the central west wall and all of the other windows on the other sides of the west transept were most likely originally round-headed. The bare tufa masonry in the north and south walls as visible after the destruction of the west transept in World War II showed clear sutures around the windows that point to a subsequent alteration of these windows from broad round-headed lights to skinny lancets (fig. 73). In the case of the two lancets in the upper storey of the central west wall, Bolle’s detailed drawing of the exterior shows lines (probably masonry sutures) that indicate that these two windows were likely also originally somewhat broader and round-headed like the central window and only later made into narrow lancets (fig. 95). This aspect of the west transept was first observed by Machat, “Westbau,” 101; Machat, “Bauwerk,” 320; and Machat, “Kirche St. Kunibert,” 284. See, further, Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 4, 592. Before Machat, it had universally been assumed that the windows in the west transept took the form of lancets from the very beginning (cf., for instance, Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbaukunst, 62). As Machat has suggested, the collapse and subsequent reconstruction of the west tower in 1376 represents the likeliest occasion for the alteration to the form of the windows in the west transept; it is unlikely that the west transept originally featured tall, narrow lancets, which would have otherwise conflicted with the consistent use of broad round-headed windows throughout the rest of the edifice.
exterior elevation on all four sides of the transept. The system of articulation used on the exterior of the nave, namely, the traditional combination of pilasters and corbel table, long used in the Lower Rhineland to articulate the exterior of the nave, was extended onto the west transept and modified to reflect the divisions found in the interior elevation. Thus, the east walls as well as the north and south flanks of the transept (fig. 87) were divided not only horizontally into two stories but also vertically in a repetition of the interior elevation, producing the same division into four fields as found in the interior walls. These divisions were carried around onto the monumental west façade (fig. 95), where the two arms received the same division into four fields as on the other sides, while the central bay, in the upper storey and also in keeping with the inner elevation, was left as a single field punctuated by the group of three graduated lights. The lower storey in the central bay, originally fronted by the porch (fig. 87), featured a central portal with columns with shaft rings in the jambs and richly carved archivolts (fig. 95).

In the combination of a monumental west transept with strongly projecting arms and a three-vessel nave, the T-shaped ground plan of the western reaches of St. Kunibert looks directly to the spatial configuration of the west end of St. Aposteln, as Ewald first recognized (cf. figs. 26 and 175). The close overlap in ground plan extends to the dimensions of the west transepts at both sites, with the total interior width and length of the west transept at St. Kunibert diverging by only some twenty to thirty centimeters from the same set of measurements at St. Aposteln. There is every reason to suppose that, as with the nave, the dimensions for the west transept at St. Kunibert were taken along with the ground plan directly from the west transept at St. Aposteln and repeated with only minimal variation. The basic layout of the interior
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638 KDM 6/4, 258.
639 The total interior width of the west transept at St. Kunibert = 35.5 m, at St. Aposteln = 35.8 m; the interior length of west transept arms at St. Kunibert = 11 m, at St. Aposteln = 10.8 m. See above, 259–260.
elevation of the west transept at St. Kunibert (figs. 91, 92) is also, as has been recognized since Ewald, directly indebted to the elevation of the west transept at St. Aposteln (fig. 186). St. Kunibert faithfully repeats the quadripartite division of the walls of the arms into two stories bisected in the middle by columnar vault responds. The form of the blind arcades in the lower storey (fig. 73), with nook rolls in the form of a bent column, as well as the conception of the supports—vault responds and arcade supports kept as independent entities around a dosseret—likewise follows St. Aposteln closely, as do the vaults, with the seven-part vaults in the two arms and the quadripartite vault over the crossing at St. Kunibert finding immediate precursors at St. Aposteln (cf. figs. 26 and 175). Like the nave, the west transept at St. Aposteln was renovated using the existing walls of the timber-roofed Ottonian west transept erected under archbishop Pilgrim. This campaign began at some point after the reworking of the nave (itself vaulted in 1219), and the west transept most likely was erected circa 1225–1230. The chronology of the west transept at St. Aposteln thus fits well with the chronological parameters for St. Kunibert, where work on the western half of the collegiate church, including the two western bays of the nave and the west transept, probably began only after the completion of the first nave bay by circa 1226/1227 (fig. 30).

In a manner analogous to the nave, scholars, on account of the many commonalities between the two structures, have interrogated the west transept at St. Kunibert largely through the lens of St. Aposteln, using it as a foil for understanding the design of the transept at St. Kunibert. It has, for instance, often been acknowledged that the west transept at St. Kunibert is more vertically-oriented than St. Aposteln; not only are the vaults here physically taller (a

---


necessary corollary of the taller nave at St. Kunibert), but the architect at St. Kunibert ran the
vault responds at St. Kunibert continuously up to the springing of the vault (figs. 91, 92), in
contrast to St. Aposteln, where the string course bisects them, dividing the responds visually and
physically along the level of the two stories (fig. 186). In keeping with the greater tendency
towards verticality as evinced by the continuous responds, it has been supposed, the architect at
St. Kunibert also made the walls of the west transept flatter than that at St. Aposteln, precisely to
enhance the sense of vertical thrust through a radical reduction in the plasticity of the wall.

Much of the attention here has focused on the lack of a substantial walkway in the upper storey
of the west transept at St. Kunibert, where the true thick-wall structure used in the upper storey
of the west transept at St. Aposteln was reduced to rudimentary passages cut out of thickness of
the wall immediately behind the intermediary supports (see fig. 91).

But just as with the relationship between the nave and the east end, it is important to
consider the concrete ways the design of the nave might have shaped the architect’s approach to
the design of the west transept, particularly in terms of its oft-noted verticality and flatness vis-
à-vis the west transept at St. Aposteln. St. Aposteln only represents half of the picture of the
design of the west transept; the built fabric of the nave itself furnishes the other half, and
accounts directly for the differences between the model and its copy. In designing the north-
south transverse supports on the crossing piers in the west transept, for instance, the architect at
St. Kunibert followed the template of the transverse supports and arches already used
throughout the nave in the employment of a continuous pilaster flanked by two continuous
columnar vault responds (cf. figs. 91 and 57). The design of the transverse supports diverges

642 See, for instance, Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbaukunst, 62, and, following him, Machat, “Westbau,” 90;
St. Kunibert,” 281; Machat, “Pfarrkirche St. Kunibert,” 76.
significantly from St. Aposteln, where the same supports are fronted by a continuous engaged
column for the transverse arch (fig. 186). The architect’s adoption of the form of transverse
support from the nave for the crossing of the west transept had significant implications for the
rest of its elevation, for it meant that the vault responds for the transept would run continuously
not only towards the crossing vault, but also along the side of the support facing the transept arm
(fig. 91). This made the further employment of continuous responds for both the intermediary
and corner supports a logical solution. And it is precisely in the use of continuous vault
responds along all of the supports rather than ones bisected by a string course that the west
transept St. Kunibert diverges most conspicuously from St. Aposteln (fig. 186). It is thus
questionable whether the use of continuous responds in the west transept at St. Kunibert, when
set beside St. Aposteln, of itself necessarily betokens a greater desire for “verticality” *per se* and
is not rather more a concrete result of the architect’s attempt to integrate the design of the west
transept within the structural system established in the nave. The architect’s abandonment of
true thick-wall structure in the west transept at St. Kunibert, such a salient feature of the west
transept at St. Aposteln (fig. 186), is likewise not surprising given that mural plasticity—both in
the supports and behind the supports in the form of thick-wall structure and walkways—had
already been decisively renounced in the nave (fig. 57).

Given what has been deduced about the rest of the church, it is not surprising that other,
major parts of the interior elevation of the west transept at St. Kunibert were not prefigured by
the west transept at St. Aposteln. The elevation of the central bay of the west wall, as Bolle’s
cross-section indicates (figs. 93, 94), diverged from that of the other walls in the arms of the
transept, all of which were uniform and based on the corresponding sections of the west transept
at St. Aposteln. Though also two-storied, this bay featured a different system of articulation,
with a blind arcade of three arches in the lower storey and a further arcade, steeply graduated and framing three graduated windows, in the upper storey.\textsuperscript{644} Though well documented in Bolle’s cross-section, the original interior elevation of the central west wall has gone unremarked. Nor does the current, reconstructed west wall (fig. 63), beyond offering a faint repetition of the three windows in the upper storey, provide a faithful indication of the original appearance of this section of the west transept. The original solution for the elevation of the central bay as recorded by Bolle is significant, however, because this was the one wall in the west transept for which the west transept at St. Aposteln could not serve as a model, for there was no central west wall there, as the western half of the crossing opened directly into the single rectangular arm of the raised west choir (fig. 175).\textsuperscript{645}

As the only wall in the west transept that was fully visible from the nave (fig. 93), the central bay of the west wall was, in both conceptual and visual terms, very much the terminating wall of the nave itself towards the western end of the church. The solution chosen for the west wall suggests that the architect and his patrons conceived it in precisely these terms, for its elevation has immediate parallels in the so-called “basilican façade,” a single, monumental wall positioned at the western end of the nave and following its contours. The basilican façade gained particular currency in the 1220s and 1230s, as indicated by several examples from this period at both major and minor sites.\textsuperscript{646} Within this group, the basilican façade at Groß St. Martin in Cologne (fig. 211) offers the closest parallel for the interior elevation of the central bay.

\textsuperscript{644} On the original form of these windows, see note 637.
\textsuperscript{645} The core of the west choir dates from the initial foundation under archbishop Pilgrim (1021–1036); it was substantially reworked in the mid-1150s after a fire. See Kubach and Verbeek, \textit{RBRM}, vol. 1, 514, 516.
\textsuperscript{646} For a brief overview of the “basilican façade” in the Lower Rhineland in the late Romanesque, see Kubach and Verbeek, \textit{RBRM}, vol. 4, 426–427 and, in addition, Abb. 384 (Heisterbach and Sinzig) and Abb. 385 (Gerresheim and Heimersheim).
bay of the west wall in the west transept at nearby St. Kunibert (figs. 93, 94).\textsuperscript{647} Both St. Kunibert and Groß St. Martin have a blind arcade of three arches in the lower storey, in each case slightly graduated and furnished with nook rolls, and paired engaged columns as supports towards the centre and single engaged columns at the outer ends in both the lower and upper arcades.\textsuperscript{648} The scale and disposition of the windows in the upper storey is also identical, and both appear to have originally featured round-headed lights.\textsuperscript{649} The two differ only in details (such as the use of Muldennischen in the outer two arcades in the lower storey and shaft rings in the upper arcade at Groß St. Martin; St. Kunibert appears to have possessed neither feature\textsuperscript{650}) and in the use of thick-wall structure in the upper storey at Groß St. Martin, where the adjacent triforium is a “true” triforium with a narrow walkway. These divergences aside, the manifold parallels strongly suggest that the west walls at Groß St. Martin and St. Kunibert are not only closely, but directly, related.

But which structure had precedence? Though not clear-cut, the chronology of the two sites points towards Groß St. Martin as the source for the design at St. Kunibert. The west wall at Groß St. Martin most likely was erected in tandem with the renovation of the nave, which saw the erection of a new upper storey and quadripartite vaulting on the base of the older (likely pre-

\textsuperscript{647} The upper storey of the west wall at Groß St. Martin was badly damaged in World War II and reconstructed from 1965–1972; this is the state that confronts visitors today (fig. 211). The postwar reconstruction is faithful to the prewar—original—state, documented in various graphic renderings, but for three details. First, the Muldennischen in the outer two arches in the lower arcade, which originally rose only halfway up the arches, were extended to encompass their full height. Second, the three windows in the upper storey, documented as round-headed, were reconstructed with slightly pointed apexes. Finally, the height of the central window was decreased slightly in order to accommodate an anchor in the uppermost reaches of the upper storey. On the reconstruction of the west wall, see Ulrich Krings, “Groß St. Martin. Zerstörung und Aufbau,” in Ulrich Krings and Ottmar Schwab, Köln. Die romanischen Kirchen: Kriegszerstörung und Wiederaufbau, 502, 511–514.

\textsuperscript{648} Though schematic and much simplified, Bolle’s cross-section (fig. 93) appears to indicate that the lower arcade featured substantial nook rolls like those at Groß St. Martin.

\textsuperscript{649} The central window in the reconstructed west wall at Groß St. Martin was made slightly shorter than the original (see note 647).

\textsuperscript{650} Bolle’s ground plan (fig. 90), for instance, indicates that the outer arches in the lower storey had flat walls, while the shafts of the columns in the upper storey arcade in the cross-section (fig. 93) do not have shaft rings.
1185) main nave arcade and groin-vaulted side aisles. Stylistic connections between the nave at Groß St. Martin and those in Bonn (late 1210s/1220s) and Gerresheim (late 1220s–1236) suggest that the nave at Groß St. Martin was erected most likely in the 1220s and early 1230s.\(^{651}\) The repertoire of forms used on the exterior of the west portal in the lower storey of the west wall is found in several other Cologne portals of the mid-1220s, such as the portal in the decagon at St. Gereon and the northeast portal at St. Andreas.\(^{652}\) And the upper storey of the west wall shows close, likely direct, ties with that in Heisterbach (fig. 243), the construction of which is also securely datable to circa 1227–1237.\(^{653}\) The erection of the west wall at Groß St. Martin, it is now widely agreed, in all likelihood dates to the later 1220s and early 1230s.\(^{654}\)

The evidence for the chronology of the nave at St. Kunibert (fig. 30) suggests that work on the two western nave bays and the west transept here most likely commenced only at some point after completion of the first nave bay around 1226/1227, but it is not certain exactly when it commenced relative to the completion of the first nave bay.\(^{655}\) The recorded date of 1247 for the archiepiscopal consecration of St. Kunibert, which likely coincides with the full completion of the west transept, however, indicates that work in the western reaches of St. Kunibert as a whole, and in the west transept in particular, most likely lagged behind Groß St. Martin (nave renovation and new west wall 1220s–early 1230s) by several years at the very least. The
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\(^{652}\) As Kubach and Verbeek (*RBRM*, vol. 1, 578) observe.


\(^{654}\) Thus, for instance, Kubach and Verbeek, *RBRM*, vol. 1, 577–578, and Rolf Lauer, “Groß St. Martin,” in *Die romanischen Kirchen von den Anfängen*, 425–427. For his part, Zimmermann (“Baugeschichte von Groß St. Martin,” 124) put the construction of the west wall around 1235–1240, but this date is likely much too late in view of the portal in the lower storey, which has its closest parallels in those of the mid-1220s at St. Gereon and St. Andreas.

\(^{655}\) See above, 231–232.
chronology of Groß St. Martin and the date of 1247 for the consecration of St. Kunibert therefore suggest that the former served as the model for the latter.

The use of the monumental verso of the basilican façade from Groß St. Martin (later 1220s–early 1230s) as the basis for the interior elevation of the central bay of the west transept at St. Kunibert, coupled with the probable date of circa 1225–1230 for the renovation of the west transept at St. Aposteln, provides a valuable new chronological anchor for the western reaches of the church. The use of these models suggests strongly that the west transept at St. Kunibert was designed and work begun only in the early or mid-1230s—hence, too, the completion of the west transept only by 1247. This supposition has several important ramifications. First, a terminus in the early to mid-1230s for the design of the west transept at St. Kunibert means that the nave and the west transept there, though both based extensively on the corresponding sections of St. Aposteln, were most likely not designed together as a totality from the beginning. The first nave bay had been erected by 1226/1227 (fig. 30), and the period of its conception and design most likely lies in the late 1210s/early 1220s. The nave and the west transept were thus designed independently at different intervals separated by at least a half and possibly a full decade, even if the design of both ultimately made recourse to the same site—St. Aposteln—as primary model. This makes the structural and aesthetic unity between the nave and the west transept all the more remarkable and bears witness to the builders’ sustained efforts to maintain continuity throughout the church building. Second, a date in the early to mid-1230s for the start of work on the west transept sheds additional light on the hazy chronology of the second building phase, which encompassed the construction of the two western nave bays and the west transept to the west of the partitioning wall (fig. 30). There are two equally plausible scenarios here. The first possibility is that the remaining two nave bays and the west transept were
constructed together and work on the western half of the church—divided from the completed east end and first nave by the temporary partition—commenced only well after the completion of the first nave bay (1226/1227) and specifically in the early to mid-1230s. Or, work continued on the two western nave bays immediately or soon after the completion of the first nave bay (1226/1227) and the west transept was designed and built only afterwards, starting in the early to mid-1230s, and independently of the two western bays of the nave. The successive and substantial loss of the original fabric in the western half of the church has made it impossible to verify either one of these scenarios archaeologically. The west façade at Groß St. Martin thus furnishes not only the immediate architectural model for the central bay of the west transept at St. Kunibert, but also a terminus post quem in the early to mid-1230s for the design and construction of the west transept.

Though dependent on St. Aposteln for the interior elevation of its arms, the west transept at St. Kunibert is not simply a slavish repetition of that model. Rather, much as the design of the nave responded to the earlier east end, the design of the west transept, though designed after the nave, shows close ties to the structural and aesthetic system developed in the latter. And much like both the east end and the nave, the west transept is a consummate work of architectural bricolage. Its design drew not on one but two major contemporary models for the west end—the west transept at St. Aposteln and the verso of the west façade at Groß St. Martin—and combined them in an inventive fusion of a west transept with a central bay that recalls the basilican façade, thus offering a dramatic visual termination to the nave (fig. 93) while providing an expansive space for the parish liturgy in the west end of the church (cf. the parish altar in fig. 31). As indebted as it is to the west transept at St. Aposteln in plan and—partly—elevation, the west transept at St. Kunibert differed fundamentally not only in function
(a parish “church” as opposed to St. Aposteln’s west choir for canons), but also in conception, cast as it was as a monumental pendant to the east end, its crossing tower answering the pair of smaller but nonetheless commanding choir towers in the east and thereby establishing a reciprocal, if asymmetrical, massing of forms between the two ceremonial poles of the church (fig. 87).

5. Conclusions

The reconsideration of the chronology, design, and architectural models of the collegiate church presented in Chapters 2–4 permits several broad conclusions about the architectural enterprise that was the wholesale reconstruction of St. Kunibert. First and foremost is the recognition that there was no single original plan for the entire church building. Or, put differently, the recognition that, if such a plan did ever exist right before the start of work on the east end, it was decisively rejected very soon after construction had begun and replaced by an approach that was open to change and contingency. The rebuilding of St. Kunibert is a paradigmatic example of what Marvin Trachtenberg has characterized recently as “premodern regimes of architectural time” in which change and fluidity were accepted by builders and patrons alike as a natural corollaries of building projects whose final contours were rarely envisioned from the beginning and whose construction most often spanned long durations of time, whether nearly a half century as at St. Kunibert or sometimes centuries, as with cathedrals.

656 The harmonious balance between the east and west ends of the church on the exterior has been repeatedly stressed in the literature and need not be belaboured here; see, for instance, Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbaukunst, 66; Machat, “Westbau,” 91; Machat, “Bauwerk,” 324; Machat, “Kirche St. Kunibert,” 281; Machat, “Pfarrkirche St. Kunibert,” 86.
(Cologne cathedral being the example *par excellence*). St. Kunibert was designed and erected from east to west—first the east end, then the nave, then the west transept—and within a constantly shifting network of local architectural models. The east end took as its primary models the reworked east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol and Xanten west, both complete or nearing completion by circa 1210. The nave, by contrast, was conceived only at some point after the start of work on the east end and under the influence of two Cologne naves, St. Aposteln and St. Andreas, both completed towards 1220. Nonetheless, the first nave bay at St. Kunibert, with its different system of proportions and new corpus of architectural models, was carefully integrated into the east end while work on the east transept was still underway. Although the decision to use the west transept at St. Aposteln as the model for that at St. Kunibert may seem inevitable given that the nave also depends on St. Aposteln, the chronology indicates that this decision was most likely made upwards of a decade after the beginning of work on the first nave bay, in the early to mid-1230s, and thus in no way was simply the “logical” choice, as might be all too readily assumed. The planning of the west transept therefore was equally contingent, making use not only of the west transept at St. Aposteln, but also of the basilican façade at Groß St. Martin.

A second, related, and equally important conclusion concerns the boundaries of the pool of architectural models for the collegiate church of St. Kunibert. These need to be widened considerably. Since the earliest decades of the twentieth century, the design of St. Kunibert as a whole has been read largely—sometimes even fully—as derivative of St. Aposteln. Although important strides have been made towards questioning this line of reasoning in Graf’s

---

demonstration of the dependence of the east transept on the west choir hall in Xanten, scholarship, by and large, has continued to press St. Kunibert into the mould of St. Aposteln—that “paradigm” of Lower Rhenish late Romanesque—rather than regard the structure on its own terms and against the whole spectrum of contemporary architectural production in Cologne and the Lower Rhineland in the first half of the thirteenth century. The sources for the design of St. Kunibert are more wide-ranging and encompass several major building projects at elite spiritual institutions in the Lower Rhineland and, especially, Cologne, including not only St. Aposteln but also St. Maria im Kapitol, St. Andreas, Groß St. Martin and St. Viktor in Xanten. Elements from these diverse sources were mined and combined in innovative ways to produce three sections (east end, nave, and west transept) that are each un paralleled by, and unexplainable through, St. Aposteln alone. Despite this diversity of architectural sources and the separate planning stages for each section, the church displays remarkable structural and aesthetic continuity from east to west, a testament to the ways its builders sought to integrate each part with what had come before. There was, then, yet another model that was constantly operative in the design of the church once the cornerstone for the east end had been set: the built fabric of the church itself.

But why these particular architectural models at these particular moments? The answer to this question extends beyond the physical fabric of the collegiate church to encompass the institution itself and its place in Cologne, which is the subject of the following chapter.
Chapter 5
Building Institutional Identity in Early-Thirteenth-Century Cologne:
The Church Building in Context

If we examine the church of St. Kunibert from the perspective of art history and recall that it was consecrated in the same year in which the cornerstone was set for Cologne Cathedral, then we must admit that it offers one of the most conspicuous and informative examples of how long an older artistic style can coexist with a completely new one. For if we did not possess this definite chronological indication, we would date the construction of this church some eighty or ninety years earlier.—Sulpiz Boisserée, *Denkmale der Baukunst am Niederrhein vom siebten bis zum dreizehnten Jahrhundert*, 1833

1. Cologne and the Canon

When Sulpiz Boisserée made the first attempt at summarizing the significance of the church of St. Kunibert, it was the building’s insistent archaism that made it most stand out in his mind. Reading the newly consecrated church (fig. 56) against the foil of the embryonic Gothic cathedral (fig. 216), Boisserée saw St. Kunibert as a peculiar relic. For him, the church was the seminal example of a hybrid architectural style combining the *Rundbogenstil* and the *Spitzbogenstil*—that distinctive Cologne mode of building of the first half of the thirteenth century that was to be replaced, in 1248, by the ultra-modern, imported rayonnant Gothic of the cathedral.

In couching his assessment of St. Kunibert in the stylistic dyad of Romanesque and Gothic, Boisserée forged an interpretive framework concerned principally with classification, an approach that had much in common with the categorizing impulses of the contemporary natural

---

658 Boisserée, *Denkmale*, 39: “Betrachten wir nun die St. Kunibertskirche in Rücksicht auf die Kunstgeschichte, und bedenken, dass sie im selben Jahr eingeweiht wurde, in welchem der Grundstein zu der Domkirche in Köln gelegt worden, so müssen wir gestehen, dass sie eins der auffallendsten und lehrreichsten Beispiele darbietet, wie lange eine ältere Kunstweise neben einer ganz neuen fortbestehen kann; denn wäre uns jene Zeitbestimmung nicht mit aller Gewissheit bekannt, so würden wir der Bauart nach die Errichtung dieser Kirche um 80 oder 90 Jahre früher setzen.” Boisserée indicates incorrectly that St. Kunibert was consecrated in 1248, the same year that ground was broken for the new cathedral; the church was consecrated in 1247, though this hardly diminishes his point.
sciences. In so doing, he created a set of hermeneutic parameters that profoundly shaped subsequent approaches to early-thirteenth-century architecture in Cologne, which is a field that is still marked by overarching concerns with classification according to received paradigms of Romanesque and Gothic. Indirectly, Boisserée also posed a question—the question—that has haunted all later inquiry into the architectural history of Cologne in the thirteenth century: namely, why did Cologne, a thriving trading metropolis of some 40,000 inhabitants with extensive economic and other ties to France and England, not adopt “pure” Gothic architecture sooner than it did?

Because it has been perceived as being “not Gothic enough,” or not Gothic at all, Cologne’s early-thirteenth-century architectural heritage has been consigned to the outer margins of architectural historical discourse on account of a Francocentric architectural canon that privileges French Gothic above all other products of thirteenth-century ecclesiastical architecture. Seen within a pan-European picture, Cologne in the first half of the thirteenth century
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659 Though Boisserée does not employ the terms “Romanesque” and “Gothic,” his notion of a Rundbogenstil and a Spitzbogenstil points to a binary opposition of the two styles that later would be termed Romanesque and Gothic. Boisserée (Denkmale, 40–41) explicitly draws a parallel between his enterprise and that of “botany and other branches of the natural sciences,” citing the contemporary work of the Cambridge mineralogist William Whewell, who attempted to classify German architecture according to the precepts of natural evolution (Architectural Notes on German Churches [Cambridge, 1830]) and noting that his art historical investigation accords perfectly with the findings that Whewell made using the methods of scientific classification.


661 See Sauerländer, “Fallacies,” 11. Estimates of the population of medieval Cologne, the most populous city in the Empire, vary. Cologne likely had approximately 20,000 inhabitants by the twelfth century; by the turn of the fourteenth century, this number had likely doubled to 40,000. The erection of a massive new circuit of city walls between 1180 and ca. 1230 made Cologne the largest city in northern Europe at this time, larger in physical area than either Paris or London.

century has been regarded generally as an architectural backwater requiring explanation and justification—before emerging, triumphantly, on the Gothic architectural scene with the belated acceptance of “pure” French Gothic architecture at the cathedral. Faced with the seemingly hybrid appearance of structures like St. Kunibert, with its round and pointed arches, smooth apse semi-dome and sexpartite nave rib vaults, scholars after Boisserée devised numerous apologias to account for the reticence in Cologne towards building using a Gothic structural system and for the cultivation of what—from a Francocentric perspective—appears like a “bastardized style that is neither perfectly Romanesque nor perfectly Gothic.” Thus, architectural style in Cologne from 1200 to 1250 has been explained alternately as a snail-paced “transition” from Romanesque to the Gothic of the cathedral (the so-called Übergangsstil, a notion propagated by Georg Dehio around 1900); as characteristic of the later years of Hohenstaufen rule, or spätstaufisch, a label coined in the 1930s in a nationalist context and one that is still in widespread use today; as a “resistance” to French Gothic; as a “compromise style” that fuses Romanesque and Gothic; and, in the last major survey of this material, as the


664 Paraphrased after Sauerländers, “Romanesque Art 200,” 47.
architectural expression of a distinct, practically autonomous cultural landscape, or *Kunstlandschaft*.

Yet, none of these approaches has emerged as a truly cogent historical explanation for the character of building in Cologne in the first half of the thirteenth century. As Peter Draper has observed, “even a brief look at the literature on this period shows the difficulty that historians have had in accepting these very un-French combinations of features as constituting a coherent manner of building.” It is clear that the supposedly “transitional style” of a building like St. Kunibert (fig. 56) can never have led to the rayonnant Gothic of the cathedral (fig. 216). Nor were the Hohenstaufen emperors the least involved as patrons in church building in Cologne from 1200 to 1250; the eponymous appellation *spätstaufisch* is, historically, an egregious misnomer. Though the notion of a “resistance” to French Gothic architecture would appear to be more subtle and highly applicable to Cologne in the first half of the thirteenth century, the fact is that elements derived from French Gothic architecture, such as sexpartite rib vaults, flying buttresses, and even plate tracery clerestory windows that betray direct knowledge of sites like Laon, Noyon, and Soissons (the latter both in the decagon at St. Gereon, 1219–1227; fig. 204), were taken up eagerly in Cologne in this period. For its part, the idea of a “compromise” is inherently apologetic and further implies that the patrons and
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665 The historiography, with further references to the literature bearing on each of the previous approaches cited here, is collected in Sauerländer, “Fallacies of Classification,” 1–13; Norbert Nussbaum, *Deutsche Kirchenbaukunst der Gotik*, 2nd ed. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1994), 10–12, 26; and Nussbaum, “Anmerkungen,” 111–117.


builders of churches like St. Kunibert were aware of distinctions between “pure” Romanesque and “pure” Gothic styles and mixed them at will to form a “compromise” between the two, recognizing the resulting style as such.\textsuperscript{670} And though it adequately circumscribes the prevalence of a unique mode of building in Cologne and the surrounding region, the invocation of a “cultural landscape” (Kunstlandschaft) with determinate geographical contours does little as an actual historical explanation for why early-thirteenth-century architecture in Cologne looks the particular way it does.\textsuperscript{671}

It is becoming increasingly clear, as numerous recent studies of thirteenth-century architecture in England, Italy, and the Empire have stressed, that the purely style-history-oriented approaches of much twentieth-century scholarship on ecclesiastical architecture outside France were critically flawed.\textsuperscript{672} In taking French (High) Gothic architecture as a notional barometer and attempting to fit structures elsewhere into modern taxonomic categories like “Romanesque,” “Gothic,” “transitional,” or “compromise,” these approaches operated on an unhistorical plane; by their very nature, they flattened the enormous historical complexity of

\textsuperscript{670} As notes Sauerländer, “Fallacies,” 9–10.
\textsuperscript{671} See Nussbaum, “Anmerkungen,” 113.
church building in areas of Europe other than France in this period.\textsuperscript{673} Inverting the relationship between the canonical French Gothic “centre” and the “periphery,” the growing corpus of revisionist work on thirteenth-century architecture in England, Italy, and the Empire has begun to analyze the diverse local motivations—patronal, political, cultural, and economic—that encouraged the retention and foregrounding of traditional modes of building and the partial, highly selective assimilation of elements from French Gothic architecture. Within these developing interpretive frameworks, identity has emerged a key hermeneutic paradigm: as all these studies have demonstrated, ecclesiastical architecture in these regions was a charged site of broader and deeper discourses on identity, whether of a social group, an institution, a commune, or a kingdom.

The contextual, patronage-oriented approaches that have informed recent scholarship on other areas of Western Europe have been very slow in reaching early-thirteenth-century Cologne. The buildings here continue to be seen as posing seemingly insurmountable problems of stylistic classification, and the concomitant preoccupation with issues of a formalist kind has generally worked against the development of alternative methodologies and lines of inquiry.\textsuperscript{674} The general lack of historically-grounded, contextual approaches to architecture in Cologne in the first half of the thirteenth century is all the more notable given the status of the city and the surrounding region as one of the most active architectural centres in the West in this period, one that equalled northern France and England in the sheer volume of building activity.\textsuperscript{675}


\textsuperscript{674} See, most recently, the observations of Nussbaum, “Anmerkungen,” 111–117, as well as Sauerländer, “Fallacies,” 11, who claims that the study of architectural patronage in early-thirteenth-century Cologne and the Lower Rhineland is “still in the infancy of research.”

\textsuperscript{675} On the parallels between the amount of building in Cologne and the Lower Rhineland and northern France and England in the period 1150–1250, see Nussbaum, \textit{Deutsche Kirchenbaurkunst}, 12, as well as Draper, \textit{Formation of English Gothic}, 6.
Using the rebuilding project at St. Kunibert as a case study, the remainder of this chapter examines the particularized institutional and political framework that shaped high ecclesiastical architectural patronage in early-thirteenth-century Cologne. It moves away from the formalist approaches that have dominated the discourse and proposes instead that elite architectural patronage in Cologne in the first half of the thirteenth century cannot be divorced from the specific ecclesiastical political situation in the Archdiocese of Cologne at this time. This was characterized on the one hand by a dense web of personal and political affiliations among the high clergy of the archdiocese’s preeminent spiritual institutions, including St. Kunibert, and on the other by a protracted conflict between these select communities and the cathedral chapter for hegemonic control of archdiocesan affairs. When situated in these institutional and political contexts, the confluence of traditional and modern features in the new church at St. Kunibert emerges not as an assembly of disparate elements to be classified in a taxonomy, but rather as the product of the chapter’s studied selection of a corpus of architectural models and forms intended to affirm its affiliation with a select cohort of powerful capitular communities while stressing the church’s venerable age and exalted spiritual status. Within the highly specific patronal and political network of Cologne’s leading collegiate churches and monasteries in the first half of the thirteenth century, the adoption of full-blown French Gothic architecture would have been neither an effective vehicle for articulating institutional identity nor—for this reason—desirable.

2. Priors, Politics, and Patron Saints: The East End

The examination of the physical fabric has demonstrated that St. Kunibert was not built according to a single, originary plan but rather designed in distinct stages (though the execution
of the different sections overlapped partly, as is clearly the case with the east end and the first nave bay; fig. 30). In order to reflect adequately the diachronic planning process and, thus, the changing contextual contingencies that surrounded the community’s architectural patronage, this chapter will follow the armature established in Chapters 2–4. Therefore, the present section will examine the east end, which was planned first and begun around 1210, and the following section the nave and the west transept, for which planning began only later, most likely in the late 1210s in the case of the nave.

Unfortunately, very little is known about the internal affairs at St. Kunibert both around the time of the chapter’s decision to rebuild the church and during the first decade of work. Not a single charter from the church survives from 1184 to 1221, at which point the chapter began to document its resolutions with increasing frequency. The little that is known about the institution from circa 1200 to 1220 must be deduced from other sources, primarily archiepiscopal charters, but these sources likewise say nothing about the building project. And even when the documentary record from St. Kunibert begins to become denser in the 1220s and 1230s, it contains only very few notices about the enterprise. These consist of a handful of records of canonical bequests to the fabric fund (ad fabricam) and other brief mentions of personal financial patronage of the larger venture, like dean Constantine’s (1219–1222) funding of a lead roof for the completed apse. Such items as a record of the chapter’s initial deliberations about the necessity, parameters, and financing of the building project, if these matters were ever written down at the start of work, or something like the detailed fabric
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676 See, on this point, Kürten, Stift, vol. 1, 21, who observes that no charters have come down to us from the period of the tenure of provost Theoderich von Wied (1194/1196–1212 or 1215/1216?). The last extant charter issued before his tenure was under provost Rudolf in 1184 (HASTK, St. Kunibert U 1/15). The earliest extant charter from the tenure of Theoderich’s successor as provost, Bruno, dates to 1221 (HASTK, St. Kunibert U 1/20).

677 All of these notices are collected in Appendix B. Although apparently few in number and usually bequests of relatively modest amounts, individual canonical donations to the fabric fund are nonetheless attested throughout the rebuilding project: before 1220, in 1226, between 1223 and 1236, in 1238, and again around 1247/1248.
accounts of the sort that begin to emerge in the late thirteenth century do not survive for St. Kunibert.

Accordingly, we know little about the central issue of how this large-scale building project at St. Kunibert was financed. It is clear that the sporadic canonical donations to the fabric fund recorded in the *Memorienbuch* hardly sufficed as either a principal or reliable source of revenue to begin and sustain the project. It seems likely, as we know from other sites at this time, that several different means were used to fund the enterprise. As the list of the treasurer’s incomes from 1239 appended to the end of the *Memorienbuch* indicates, the church held a large number of rents in its own and other parishes in Cologne; the church also had extensive land holdings both in and outside the archdiocese. Some of these revenues may have been reserved for the project. As charters of 1236 and 1237 indicate, funds from fraudulently held prebends at St. Kunibert were confiscated and paid into a dedicated fund for the *ornatus*, which usually existed alongside the fabric fund (*fabrica*). Conceivably, prebends also may have been taxed for the fabric fund, which was another method of securing regular funding; this practice is attested elsewhere in Cologne at this time. It is difficult to know just how substantial small lay oblations to the project may have been; it is, at any rate, conspicuous that the *Memorienbuch* records several canonical financial donations to the fabric fund, but not a single such donation by a layperson. This may suggest that lay donations to the built fabric at St. Kunibert were never very numerous, and certainly not a reliable and regular source of

---

678 The list of rents is found in HASTK, Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 39a ff. See the comprehensive list of the church’s properties in Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 193–261.


680 On prebendal taxation for the fabric fund, see Schöller, *Organisation*, 237–240. This method was demonstrably employed at St. Gereon in 1219; see below.

681 Lay patronage of the project seems instead to have been directed at the stained glass and furnishings; this issue is examined in detail in Chapter 8.
income, and thus that the church building was largely financed in-house through the chapter’s revenues and prebendal taxation. The chapter’s attempt to sell off far-flung properties towards the mid-thirteenth-century when the building was essentially complete may also indicate a need to pay off debt incurred through the borrowing of money in the nascent money trade, which would also corroborate the chapter’s own, in-house financing of the building.682 The indulgence, finally, which was so central to financing building projects from the mid-thirteenth-century onwards, appears to have played little role in the financing of the rebuilding at St. Kunibert.683 The earliest indulgences issued in the archdiocese of Cologne were issued by Konrad von Hochstaden (1238–1261), who seems to have been very fond of issuing indulgences.684 Two indulgences were issued for St. Kunibert, one by Konrad (and many other bishops) in 1247 marking the consecration of the church, and one by the papal legate Hugh of St. Cher in 1251 for visitors to the church on the feasts of Kunibert, Clement, and the Hewalds, but neither mentions the fabric as the beneficiary.685 At any rate, the building was essentially complete by the consecration in 1247, and any funds so gained were probably also used to reduce debt rather than to fund a building in progress. It would appear, then, that the chapter itself bore most of the costs associated with the construction of the church building.

That all of these matters concerning the necessity of a project, its administration, and, not least, its financing were debated in Cologne’s chapterhouses at this time is evident from a famous charter of 1219 from St. Gereon, which provides a unique (for early-thirteenth-century

682 See Kubach and Verbeek, *RBRM*, vol. 1, 553, who suggest, without adducing evidence however, that the chapter was “stark verschuldet” at the end of the project. Kürten (*Stift*, vol. 1, 28) notes the sale of numerous land holdings in the Mosel region in 1252, and cites the difficulty of maintaining far-flung properties as the motivation for the sale. Both factors—debt from the building project and convenience—may have been operative in the sale of these properties.


685 See Chapter 4.
Cologne) snapshot of the discussions that the chapter there held about rebuilding the ruinous late antique rotunda (fig. 204).686 No doubt following a vigorous debate, the provost, dean, and the remainder of the chapter at St. Gereon reached an agreement concerning the necessity of the project and the terms of financing it (here in part by taxing canonical prebends), and further entrusted two members of the community, the dean and a chaplain, with supervision of the enterprise.687

The inner workings of architectural patronage at St. Kunibert at the start of work, by contrast, can only be glimpsed obliquely through two retrospective notices in the

Memorienbuch, which was compiled in 1239 when construction was already drawing to a close. Though hardly numerous and very brief, these notices nonetheless suggest that the culture of corporate collaboration documented so fully for St. Gereon was also operative at St. Kunibert. It may be assumed that the chapter at St. Kunibert also held discussions about the project in the chapterhouse, both prior to the commencement of work and as it unfolded.688 This is implicit in the first notice, the obit of the canon Vogelo (attested 1184–1226), which indicates that the chapter at St. Kunibert, like that at St. Gereon, deputized a member from its own ranks to supervise and report on the fledgling building project.689 Thus, Vogelo’s obit reads in part:

---

686 The charter is printed in Ennen and Eckertz, Quellen, vol. 2, 77 no. 64.
687 The charter was issued by the chapter as a collective: “Arnoldus dei gratia prepositus, H. decanus totumque capitulum sancti Gereonis in Colonia . . . .” The stipulation concerning the conferral of oversight of the project on the dean and the chaplain reads: “Ne autem eius quidem proceratio sine provisione delinquatur, eiusdem executionem michi decano et A. de Suelme sacerdoti duxerunt per triennium ab hac institutione commendandam.”
688 On the general practice of discussing building projects in capitulo, see Schöller, Organisation, 228.
689 A canon by the name of Vogelo first appears in a charter of 1184 from St. Kunibert and again in the early 1220s, when the next group of charters survives. Though it is not certain if the Vogelo of the 1184 charter is identical with the Vogelo of the charters of the early 1220s (or the Vogelo in the obit in the Memorienbuch) on account of the lack of a last name in the charters, he is likely the same individual; see the list of documents in Kürtén, Stift, vol. 1, 314 no. 25. It was not uncommon for young oblates to spend practically their entire lives at Cologne’s collegiate churches, and canonical tenures of forty or more years are well documented. Vogelo appears not only to have been one of the senior canons by the start of work around 1210, but also could claim elite social origins. As Klaus Militzer’s painstaking prosopographical study of Cologne clerics has revealed, Vogelo—as his last name, Hundertmarc, implies—was a member of one of Cologne’s wealthiest patrician families. His father, Heinrich, for
April 26. Vogelo, subdeacon, died . . . . With whose counsel [consilium] and supervision [magisterium] the new church building [nova fabrica ecclesiae] was begun and pushed forward, to which he, dying, also bequeathed more than sixty marks.\footnote{HASiK, Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 8a: “vi kal. Maii. Obiit Vogelo subdyaconus . . . . Huius consilio et magisterio inchoata et promota est nova fabrica ecclesie cui etiam moriens reliquit plus quam lx marcas.” For the full text of the obit, see Appendix B, no. 7. The phrase fabrica ecclesiae in medieval documentary sources is sometimes ambiguous and can refer either to the physical building itself or to the fabric fund; see Branner, “‘Fabrica,’ ‘Opus,’” 27, as well as Schöller, Organisation, 144–145. In the case of Vogelo’s obit, I have translated the phrase nova fabrica ecclesie as “the new church building” rather than “the new fabric fund” (as it has sometimes been translated or understood) on account of three factors. First, the occurrence of the modifying adjective nova is far more logical in reference to a “new church building” than to a “new fabric fund”: fabric funds for building and/or routine maintenance were not usually established “anew,” but had already been a constant of the treasuries at collegiate and monastic churches since the twelfth century. Second, the adjectival participle inchoata which follows, in “nova fabrica ecclesie . . . inchoata,” also suggests that the phrase nova fabrica ecclesie refers to the actual new church building and not to the fabric fund. The verb inchoare occurs frequently in medieval sources in explicit reference to the beginning of work on a new building; one might compare here Einhard’s famous account of Charlemagne’s building of palaces in Ingelheim and Nijmegen (MGH SS rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum 25, 20): “Inchoavit et palatia operis egregii.” Lastly, the final clause, which indicates that Vogelo bequeathed sixty marks to the nova fabrica ecclesie, need not mean that the antecedent phrase has to be understood as meaning the fabric fund per se. It simply may mean that Vogelo bequeathed the money for the purpose of the construction of the new church building in general, even if it is clear from the other mentions of canonical bequests to the fund that his bequest also would have gone to the fabric fund.}

Vogelo’s role as the chapter’s administrator of the works—as opposed to clerical architect—is indicated by the terms consilium (“counsel”) and magisterium (“supervision”) in his obit: both words occur frequently in other contemporary accounts of clerical (and lay) masters of works at collegiate churches and cathedrals. Vogelo’s duties may have encompassed several essential logistical tasks, such as managing the fabric fund (the existence of which at St. Kunibert is implicit in the canons’ donations ad fabricam); remunerating the masons and other hired labour; purchasing building materials (trachyte from the quarries in the Drachenfels and tufa from Andernach) and arranging for their delivery to the site; and generally serving as the liaison between the chapter and its builders (i.e., consilium).\footnote{Binding, “Kölner Baumeister,” 1–3; Schöller, Organisation, 132–144.}

\footnote{The extent of Vogelo’s duties has been debated. Several scholars, beginning with Johann Jakob Merlo (Kölische Künstler in alter und neuer Zeit. Nachrichten von dem Leben und den Werken kölnischer Künstler [Düsseldorf, 1895], col. 903) and Ewald (KDM 6/4, 244) and continuing into the present (e.g., Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 36; Binding, “Kölner Baumeister,” 1), have argued that Vogelo’s role was restricted to collecting and administering}
duties on Vogelo at the beginning of work (\textit{inchoata}), and it is probable, as the word \textit{promota} suggests, that Vogelo continued to supervise the project until his death in 1226.\textsuperscript{693}

The second, and more critical, notice about the beginning of work at St. Kunibert is the equally retrospective obit of the former provost Theoderich von Wied (d. 1242, as archbishop of Trier). It records his laying of the cornerstone for the new collegiate church in the following lapidary terms: “He laid the first stone in the foundation of our church that now exists in the year of the Lord 12[blank].”\textsuperscript{694} Inasmuch as provost Theoderich was the chapter’s highest dignitary, it is unsurprising that he should have had the honour of laying the cornerstone, which was an act customarily reserved for the highest-ranking member of a religious community.\textsuperscript{695}

But provost Theoderich’s setting of the cornerstone for the new edifice almost certainly also betokens his leading role in the genesis of the project, much like the earlier abbot Suger at Saint-Denis, whose laying of the cornerstone and overarching planning of the works at his institution are famously documented in his own self-laudatory account.\textsuperscript{696} Given the hierarchical but fully corporate structure of the chapters of Cologne’s collegiate churches by the early thirteenth century (witness the St. Gereon charter, where the names of the provost and dean are

\begin{footnotes}
\item[693] Vogelo certainly died in 1226, for a testamentary charter was drawn up that year in which it is stated of Vogelo that he was “in extremis laborans.” See Künten, \textit{Stift}, vol. 1, 26 with n. 111. Vogelo’s name also disappears from the charters after 1226; see Künten, \textit{Stift}, vol. 1, 314 no. 25.
\item[694] \textit{HASiK}, Geist. Abt. 143, fols. 4a–b: “Iste posuit primarium lapidem fundamenti nostre ecclesie que nunc extat anno xpi m cc [blank] . . . .” For the complete text of the obit, see Appendix B, no. 1.
\item[695] On the general restriction of the right of laying of the cornerstone to ecclesiastical dignitaries or high-ranking secular founders of new foundations, see Benz, “Grundsteinlegung,” and Untermann, “Grundsteinlegung.”
\end{footnotes}
emphasized before the collective body of the chapter\footnote{697}, it is reasonable to suppose that the provosts and deans of St. Kunibert, who were the church’s principal dignitaries, had the heaviest hands in steering the course of the rebuilding project throughout its duration. Around 1210, these were Theoderich von Wied as provost and Hermann von Jülich (1208–1219) as dean, both of noble lineage.\footnote{698} But as the charter from St. Gereon and Vogelo’s obit suggest, any decisions made at the top by the superiors had to be made within the framework—and with the approbation—of the corporate body of the chapter, and it therefore seems justifiable to speak generally of corporate architectural patronage in the case of St. Kunibert (and St. Gereon).

Here, as with other large-scale building projects, it is useful to think of a multifaceted constellation of individual agency, ranging from the prerogatives of the aristocratic superiors of the community to the logistical operations and counsel of a subordinate such as Vogelo, with all decisions subject to the electoral checks and balances of the chapter as a collegiate corporation.

In addition to the account of his laying of the cornerstone, there is a considerable amount of other evidence to suggest that provost Theoderich indeed was the single most instrumental institutional agent in the genesis of the rebuilding project at St. Kunibert. Graf, for instance, has already suggested that the use of the west choir in Xanten (fig. 222) as the model for the east transept (fig. 48) is most likely attributable to Theoderich’s agency.\footnote{699} For her part, Graf proposed a circumstantial scenario, suggesting that Theoderich might possibly have known Xanten west by dint of his tenure as provost of St. Mary’s in Rees near Xanten (fig. 25), an office which he held until at least 1205 and thus in part concurrently with his tenure as provost

\footnote{697} See note 687 above.
\footnote{698} Noble origins were a prerequisite for attaining the office of provost in Cologne’s collegiate churches, and this same stipulation appears to have applied to the deans as well; see Groten, \textit{Prior enkolleg}, 48–52.
of St. Kunibert (1194/1196–1212 or 1215/1216?). While this suggestion is plausible, other, previously overlooked documentary evidence allows us to tie provost Theoderich directly and much more firmly to the west choir hall in Xanten. Theoderich’s name occurs among the list of witnesses to a charter issued by archbishop Theoderich von Hengebach (1208–1212) in Xanten in 1209, which has three critical implications for the east end. First, in proving beyond a doubt that Theoderich was in Xanten, it fully concretizes the supposition that the use of the west choir hall there as a source for the east end at St. Kunibert stems from his personal provostial initiative and not from some other factor (such as an itinerant master mason). Second, the date of 1209 confirms that Theoderich saw the west choir hall in Xanten in a state of near completion, for it was consecrated in 1213. Given the stylistic and other evidence for a start date of around 1210 for the east end at St. Kunibert, this particular occasion in 1209 thus offers the likeliest moment for the germination of plans for the new church, with provost Theoderich returning to Cologne and drawing the chapter’s attention to the new, virtually complete structure in Xanten.

The third implication of the Xanten charter concerns the human agent responsible for the physical creation of the east end at St. Kunibert: the architect. Numerous details in the design of the east end, such as the distinctive double-order arches and walkway vaults used in the apse and transept, point to the work of a master mason who almost certainly had worked previously on the west choir hall in Xanten. In indicating direct connections with the project in Xanten on provost Theoderich’s part, the charter further suggests that it was most likely Theoderich

---

700 Graf connected this supposition specifically with her arguments that work at St. Kunibert started before or around 1200 and that the east transept and apse were designed and erected independently of one another, both of which do not stand up to critical scrutiny; see Chapter 2.
701 REK, vol. 3, no. 70: “Datum Xanctis 1209.” Theoderich was in Xanten along with the provost of St. Gereon, also named Theoderich: “Tirricus et Tirricus s. Gereonis et s. Kunibert prepositi.”
702 See Chapter 2. The west choir hall in Xanten, it will be recalled, had been begun around 1190.
703 See Chapter 3.
himself who recruited the master mason for the new east end, hiring him directly from the
workshop in Xanten. Whether Theoderich made arrangements with the mason when he was
personally on site in 1209 or shortly afterwards and by proxy, the personal channels for such
recruitment were demonstrably in place.\(^{704}\) That work on the west choir hall in Xanten was
drawing to a close around 1210 only strengthens this supposition, for the senior masons in the
Xanten workshop would have been keen to find work elsewhere with the impending conclusion
of the project.

The connection between provost Theoderich and the west choir hall in Xanten
immediately raises two questions that impinge directly on the critical issue of the limits of
patronal agency in the conception of the new east end, and thus on its meaning. First, why, in a
city replete with other building projects, did Theoderich and the chapter at St. Kunibert even go
outside Cologne and look to the west choir hall in Xanten as a model for the new east end?
Numerous impressive east choirs had been built in Cologne between 1170 and 1220, including
the trefoil east ends at Groß St. Martin (consecrated 1172; fig. 209) and St. Aposteln (complete
c. 1200; fig. 180), as well as the renovation work on the older trefoil choir at St. Maria im
Kapitol (c. 1200–1210; figs. 189, 192), which the chapter at St. Kunibert and its master mason
clearly consulted for the apse (fig. 35). The half-lost, trefoil-like east end at St. Andreas (c.
1210–1220; fig. 238), which combined a long choir and a transept with polygonal conches based
on the transept in nearby Bonn (c. 1210; fig. 235), was also erected at this time.\(^{705}\) It is thus

\(^{704}\) As a slightly later analogy, one might cite here the case of Jean Deschamps, architect of the cathedral of
Clermont-Ferrand (begun in 1248), whom Bishop Hugues de la Tour likely recruited when in Paris for the
consecration of the Sainte-Chapelle in 1248. See Michael Davis, “Guidelines: The Bishop’s Garden, A Mason’s
Drawings, and the Construction of Notre-Dame, Cathedral of Clermont,” in *Patrons and Professionals in the
Middle Ages. Proceedings of the 2010 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Paul Binski and Elizabeth A. New (Donington:
Tyas, 2012), 168.

\(^{705}\) Only the north arm of the early-thirteenth-century east end at St. Andreas survives; the south arm was
completely remodelled in the later fourteenth century. See Barbara and Ulrich Kahle, “St. Andreas,” in *Die
striking that Theoderich and the chapter not only looked beyond Cologne to the west choir hall in Xanten, but, in so doing, also turned away decisively from the clear trend towards the trefoil choirs that were so characteristic of elite building projects in Cologne around the year 1200. In fact, in the combination of a single apse with a rectangular transept, the east end at St. Kunibert was very much the architectural interloper among choirs in Cologne and the immediate vicinity at this time, as Kubach and Verbeek’s compilation of ground plans of major Lower Rhenish churches from 1170 to 1220 makes particularly clear (fig. 219). This latter point raises the second critical question bearing on the chapter’s patronage of the east end: was its unique design an innovation of the master mason, who simply added an apse based on the recent apse at St. Maria at Kapitol to the choir hall, or was the east end at St. Kunibert the product of a much more complex set of dynamics between the chapter, its master mason, and the surrounding spiritual and political context in Cologne around 1210?

A ready answer as to why provost Theoderich and the chapter might have looked specifically to Xanten as one source for their new east end is found in the particular position of the collegiate church of St. Viktor within the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the archdiocese of Cologne. Together with the collegiate churches of St. Gereon in Cologne and St. Cassius and Florentius in Bonn, St. Viktor in Xanten belonged to the exclusive triad of the most ancient and highest-ranking collegiate churches in the archdiocese behind Cologne cathedral. In fact, from 1138 onwards, Xanten and Bonn were the two most important collegiate churches after the cathedral, having managed to surpass St. Gereon, long the most preeminent of the three, by dint

\[\text{romanischen Kirchen von den Anfängen, 164–165.} \text{ Kahle and Kahle note as the main model for St. Andreas’ north conch the decagon in St. Gereon (1219–1227; fig. 204), but the connection with the conches in the transept in Bonn (usually dated in the late 1200s or early 1210s; fig. 235) in both plan and elevation is closer.}
\]

\[\text{706 The importance of the trefoil east end in Cologne and the Lower Rhineland at this time is stressed by Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 4, 411.}
\]

\[\text{707 Groten, Priorenkolleg, 55–71; Diederich, “Stift – Kloster – Pfarrei,” 25.}\]
of their provosts’ status as archdeacons. Historically, the collegiate churches of Xanten, St. Gereon, and Bonn emerged, probably in the seventh century, out of the *martyria* that had been erected on these sites in the fourth century for the martyrs of the Theban Legion. Beginning in the late tenth century, however, the chapters at all three churches began to embellish their historical pedigrees, tying the erection of the first churches on these sites to none other than St. Helena (fig. 205) and thereby locating the origins of their churches—and ultimately their communities—in the heroic age of the nascent official Christian Church under Constantine and the earliest ages of the Church of Cologne.

As one of the larger and most prestigious building sites in the Lower Rhineland around 1200, St. Viktor in Xanten, as one would expect, was influential. Isolated motifs or aspects of the west choir hall there travelled down the Rhine as far south as Andernach and Koblenz (fig. 25), whether via masons or patrons, or both. Despite the numerous modifications made to Xanten’s plan, elevation, and vaulting, however, no other structure in the Lower Rhineland copied the west choir hall in Xanten (figs. 220 and 223) as faithfully as did the east transept at St. Kunibert (figs. 26 and 48). This suggests that not only the basic act of turning to Xanten west as a model, but also the close replication of this structure were particularly paramount to

---

708 The official order of rank, with Bonn and Xanten before St. Gereon, was established by archiepiscopal decree in 1138; see *REK*, vol. 2, no. 357, as well as Groten, *Priorenkolleg*, 68–70.
709 The date at which communities of clerics emerged at these sites is unclear. The communities at St. Gereon and Bonn both seem to go back to the seventh century; see Diederich, “Stift – Kloster – Pfarrei,” 23. Xanten first appears as a *monasterium* in the sources in 863 and again in 866, but its foundation could also reach back farther; see Oediger, *Bistum Köln*, 40, who suggests a foundation in either the late eighth or early ninth century.
710 The legend of the erection of the churches under Helena is first palpable in the *Passio Gereonis*, which was composed in the late tenth century. On it, see Jean-Francoise Nieuw, “La passion de s. Géréon de Cologne (BHL 3446). Une composition d’époque ottonienne,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 115 (1997): 5–38. Helena’s feast day appears to have been introduced at all three sites during the late twelfth century, and she was likely already regarded as the *fundatrix* not just of the churches, but of the capitular communities themselves at this time; the legend was explicitly articulated by all three churches in a jointly-issued charter of 1236. See Oediger, *Bistum Köln*, 31.
711 The exterior of the west façade of the Liebfrauenkirche in Andernach (late 1190s–1200s) looks directly to Xanten west; see, most recently, Overdick, *Architektsystem*, 61. Connections between the capitals in Xanten and those in the Liebfrauenkirche in Koblenz (ca. 1200) have been noted by Müller, “Köln – Koblenz – Xanten,” 157–159, 160–161.
Theoderich and the chapter. In itself, close emulation of the ambitious edifice in Xanten would have allowed Theoderich and the chapter to claim participation in patterns of elite ecclesiastical architectural patronage through patronage of a comparably complex structure. And, even more important, their decision to adopt the west choir hall in Xanten as a source for the new east end at St. Kunibert most likely was prompted by the exalted historical, spiritual, and political connotations of St. Viktor as an institution. In taking up and emulating the new structure in Xanten, Theoderich and the chapter undoubtedly sought to draw associations between their collegiate church and one of the three most ancient and preeminent collegiate churches within the archdiocese.

Indeed, the rest of the high clergy in Cologne would have been acutely aware of the precise institutional significance of St. Viktor, and thus of the pointed institutional aspirations of the new project at St. Kunibert. Since the late 1130s, the provosts and deans of all eight of Cologne’s male collegiate churches (including the cathedral chapter) belonged, as did the provosts of Xanten and Bonn, to the so-called college of priores, a highly exclusive contingent of ecclesiastical dignitaries in the archdiocese of Cologne.712 Particular to the See of Cologne, this tightly-knit collective of superiors from the archdiocese’s foremost spiritual institutions exercised enormous influence on archiepiscopal affairs from its formation in the late eleventh century to its demise in the mid-thirteenth; as Groten observes, “next to the archbishop, the

712 The seminal study of the college of priores is that of Groten, Priorenkolleg. The institutions with membership in the college were, in order of rank, the collegiate churches of Cologne Cathedral, St. Viktor in Xanten, St. Cassius and Florentius in Bonn, St. Gereon, St. Severin, St. Kunibert, St. Andreas, St. Aposteln, St. Maria ad Gradus, and St. Georg (all in Cologne), followed by the Benedictine abbeys of St. Pantaleon and Groß St. Martin, also both in Cologne. The designation of the group of dignitaries as priores is contemporary and first occurs in a charter of 1090; it is attested countless times afterwards in the documentary sources. The exact point at which the college emerged as a distinct body is not known, but it had certainly formed by the later decades of the eleventh century. At this time, membership was likely confined to the provosts and abbot of the aforementioned institutions. The deans of Cologne’s collegiate churches had certainly become members by 1138.
priores embodied the Church of Cologne.”

Thus, in the immediate wake of the Investiture Controversy, it was the priores who claimed the right over the cathedral chapter to elect the archbishops of Cologne, filling that office with members from their own ranks with but two exceptions between 1079 and 1261. And it was the priores who served as the archbishop’s inner circle of advisors in matters both spiritual and temporal; their role at the archbishop’s court ranged from their presentia and testimonium as witnesses to archiepiscopal decrees through to their provision of consilium in, and consensus or assensus to, the archbishop’s decisions. In the event of vacancies—as, for instance, in 1206—the priores assumed administration of the archdiocese in the archbishop’s stead. Though not a formal legal corporation, the college was very much marked by a larger sense of corporate identity. Personal and institutional connections among the members of the college of priores were accordingly manifold. During his tenure as provost of St. Kunibert, Theoderich is attested together with the provosts of Xanten, Bonn, and St. Gereon at the archiepiscopal court in Cologne (and elsewhere) a total of 23 times; in fact, it was in the specific context of the college of priores that Theoderich was in Xanten—with provost Theoderich of St. Gereon—in 1209,

---

713 Groten, Priorenkolleg, 112: “Neben dem Erzbischof verkörperten die Prioren die Kölner Kirche.” As Groten notes (112 n. 10), the term ecclesia Coloniensis in the sources frequently refers explicitly to the college of priores.

714 On the priores and the archiepiscopal elections, see Erich Wisplinghoff, “Das Priorenkollegium in Köln und die Bischofswahlen des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts,” AHVN 159 (1957): 30–47, and Groten, Priorenkolleg, 118–122, esp. 121–122 (on the archiepiscopal candidates’ origins among the college of priores). The two exceptions were archbishops Friedrich I (1100–1131) and Rainald von Dassel (1159–1167). Their appointment was due to imperial initiative.

715 Groten, Priorenkolleg, 110–118.

716 During the imprisonment of archbishop Adolf I (1205–1208); see Groten, Priorenkolleg, 159.

717 Thus, newly elected provosts had to receive the approbation of the rest of the college, as, for instance, in 1228, when the new provost at St. Georg was “prioribus presentetur ad approbandum;” see Wisplinghoff, “Priorenkollegium,” 42 n. 52. See further Groten, 122–129, who adduces extensive evidence of corporate culture among the priores in the early thirteenth century, including diplomatic missions to Rome in the name of the Church of Cologne, as in 1206.
where they advised archbishop Theoderich as he resolved a conflict there.\footnote{REK, vol. 2, nos. 1502 (1196), 1535 (1198), 1562 (1199), 1580 (1200), 1585 (1200), 1586 (1200), 1587 (1200), 1588 (1200), 1589 (1200), 1615 (1202), 1627 (1203), 1628 (1203), 1636 (1203), 1648 (1204), 1657 (1205, in Aachen); vol. 3, nos. 56 (1208), 70 (1209, in Xanten), 72 (1209), 73 (1209), 76 (1210), 86 (1211), 89 (1211), 99 (1209–1212).} Throughout his
tenure, dean Hermann of St. Kunibert (1208–1219) also appears regularly in the documents among the priores.\footnote{REK, vol. 3, nos. 55 (1208), 64 (1209), 76 (1210, with Theoderich), 139 (1216), 172 (1217), 202 (1217), 215 (1218), 231 (1219).} And in several instances when the archbishop’s decisions pertained to matters affecting St. Kunibert, as for instance in 1199, 1200, and again in 1204, the entire chapter is attested at the archiepiscopal curia with the priores.\footnote{REK, vol. 2, nos. 1562 (1199); “Tirricus s. Cuniberti prep. et totus eius conventus”), 1588 (1200); “Theodericus et totus eiusdem eccl. conventus”), 1648 (1204).}

The thick web of institutional and personal connections linking provost Theoderich and the chapter not only with Xanten but also with St. Gereon and Bonn is of immediate relevance for understanding the distinctive plan of the new east end at St. Kunibert, which was unique for Cologne circa 1210 (fig. 219). It has sometimes been observed that the east end at St. Kunibert (figs. 26 and 76), in its combination of a rectangular east transept with bulky choir towers and a single apse with a niched gable, generally resembles the much older east ends at St. Gereon (early 1150s; figs. 200 and 203) and Bonn (late 1140s; figs. 219 and 234).\footnote{On the east ends at St. Gereon and Bonn, see, most recently, Thomas Werner, Die Gliederungssysteme der frühstaufischen Chorfassaden im Rhein-Maas-Gebiet (Cologne: Abteilung der Architekturgeschichte des Kunsthistorischen Instituts der Universität zu Köln, 2001), 73–91 (St. Gereon) and 92–105 (Bonn).} The basic similarity in plan and general elevation between the east end at St. Kunibert and the earlier ones at St. Gereon and Bonn, however, hitherto has been regarded as essentially coincidental, and all three east ends classed together loosely with the trefoil east ends as representatives of the larger category of the so-called Lower Rhenish late Romanesque “choir façades.”\footnote{Thus, already in the 1910s Ewald (KDM 6/4, 254) pointed to the general similarity between the east ends at St. Kunibert, St. Gereon, and Bonn (indeed, he even mistook St. Kunibert for a structure of the mid-twelfth century, dating it before Bonn and suggesting that it was only reworked in the early thirteenth), but saw no significance in it. The same is true of subsequent scholarship, which, though rightly placing St. Kunibert in the early thirteenth century,
of the chapter’s specific recourse to the west choir hall in Xanten as a source for the east end
and, especially, the manifold connections within the college of *priores*, it is hardly accidental
that the anachronistic form of the east end at St. Kunibert looks back past the trendy trefoil east
ends then current in Cologne (figs. 180 and 209) and instead directly recalls the archaic east
ends at St. Gereon and Bonn—precisely those other two members within the college of *priores*
that constituted an even more elite triad of ancient and prestigious male collegiate churches in
the archdiocese. Provost Theoderich of St. Kunibert knew fully, as did dean Hermann and the
rest of the chapter at St. Kunibert, of the exalted historical, spiritual, and institutional
connotations of both St. Gereon and Bonn. The monumental gable of the east end in Bonn and
the two choir towers (two additional stories were added) were reworked when the long choir
there was vaulted, most likely in the 1200s; this contemporary project no doubt also would have
attracted Theoderich and the chapter’s attention to the east choir in Bonn as they made plans for
their own.\footnote{There are therefore very compelling grounds for supposing that their brief to the
master mason was not simply to devise any type of east end using Xanten west, but specifically
to take the west choir hall in Xanten and make it look like the older east ends at St. Gereon and
Bonn by adding an apse. Much more than mere regional traditionalism, the archaism of the new
east end was a deliberately retrospective and focused gesture aimed at aligning St. Kunibert with
these exceedingly prestigious sites.}

It is difficult to say whether the chapter and its master mason thus turned to the
renovated east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol simply because it was then the most recently
completed apse in Cologne (fig. 189), but the particular historical connotations and status of that

\footnote{723 On the renovation of the east end and long choir at Bonn, see Kubach and Verbeek, *RBRM*, vol. 1, 115, as well as Werner, *Chorfassaden*, 98.}
church may also have made it equally attractive to the chapter as a prestigious source for the new east end. Though a conventual church of canonesses and thus not part of the college of priores, St. Maria im Kapitol was nonetheless an institution with very deep historical roots, and accordingly was the highest-ranking female collegiate foundation in the archdiocese of Cologne. Not only was the site itself Roman (hence the medieval name in capitolio, “in the Capitoline Temple”), but the foundation of the church of St. Maria im Kapitol had been attributed by the twelfth century to the Merovingian queen Plectrudis (d. 717), wife of Pepin of Heristal (d. 714). This tradition was advertised with particular force by the canonesses through their patronage of a tomb effigy (ca. 1150–1180; fig. 198) that cast Plectrudis as fundatrix and audaciously raised her to the ranks of the saintly. These were historical traditions that were no doubt also known to Theoderich and the chapter, who processed to St. Maria im Kapitol three times annually in the high clergy’s stational liturgy.

Theoderich and the chapter’s architectural patronage as manifested in the sites they selected as sources for the east end thus seems to have responded to two principal, but inseparable, concerns. First was the articulation of the place of their institution within the archdiocesan hierarchy and the college of priores through recourse to, and thus implicit affiliation with, the three most prestigious collegiate churches in the archdiocese after the

---

724 A dedicated monograph on the history of St. Maria im Kapitol is lacking; for a critical re-examination of the development of the institution up to ca. 1250, see Marianne Gechter, “Quellen zur Entstehungsgeschichte von Kirche und Stift,” in “Interdisziplinäre Beiträge zu St. Maria im Kapitol in Köln,” ed. Hiltrud Kier, special issue, CR 24 (2009): 31–48. The name “im Kapitol” (in capitolio), which points to the ultimate Roman origins of the site, is first attested (securely) in 1189, but it may have been current as early as the eleventh century.


726 Wolff, “Kirchenfamilie,” 39, 41. St. Maria im Kapitol appears to have corresponded to the Church of Sta. Maria Maggiore in Rome within Cologne’s highly Romanized stational liturgy.
cathedral, Xanten, St. Gereon, and Bonn. These were the oldest non-cathedral collegiate foundations, capable of tracing their origins as institutions back to a beatified benefactor (St. Helena) and to the heroic early ages of the early Christian Church of Cologne. It was precisely these factors that accounted for their prestige and status within the archdiocese in general and the college of *priores* in particular. There were six institutions in the college that could claim foundation in either the early Christian or Merovingian periods, with the rank of their dignitaries in the college tied to their relative age: the cathedral, Xanten, Bonn, St. Gereon, St. Severin, and St. Kunibert (in that order). The other institutions were much more recent foundations of the late tenth or eleventh centuries.\(^{727}\) This further suggests that the chapter’s consciousness of its specific place within the historical narrative of the Church of Cologne and the tradition of the ancient foundation of the church by the saintly Merovingian bishop Kunibert also shaped its selection of the architectural points of reference for the new east end. Around 1210, the cathedral workshop was dormant, nor was there any recent work at St. Severin. In looking to the choirs of the other three ancient representatives of the Church of Cologne and the renovated choir at the Merovingian foundation of St. Maria im Kapitol as the architectural sources for the east end, Theoderich and the chapter were simultaneously plotting the place of their institution in the college’s ranks and underlining, by association with these sites with extended ancient foundation legends, its own venerable *antiquitas* and divinely-ordained existence.

In the specific context of the college of *priores* around 1210, provost Theoderich and the chapter’s patronal turn to the collegiate churches of Xanten, St. Gereon, and Bonn for the new east end may have had a very pointed political edge, one that went well beyond a general demonstration of high ecclesiastical status and historical tradition for their own sake. Beginning

\(^{727}\) St. Andreas, St. Aposteln, St. Maria ad Gradus, St. Georg, St. Pantaleon, and Groß St. Martin (in order of rank).
with the episcopacy of archbishop Philipp von Heinsberg (1167–1191), the cathedral chapter, represented in the college of priores by its provost, dean, and other dignitaries, began to claim for itself alone the long-standing rights of the other members of the college to participation in archiepiscopal elections and the counselling of the archbishop. Though the cathedral chapter had already attempted (unsuccessfully) to curtail the powers of the college by contesting the priores’ candidate in the archiepiscopal election of 1156, its efforts at weakening the hold of the traditional members of the college on archiepiscopal elections and counsel took on programmatic form following archbishop Rainald von Dassel’s (1156–1167) acquisition of the relics of the Magi for the cathedral chapter in 1164.

Still very much nascent from the late 1160s through late 1180s, the struggle between the cathedral chapter and the other members of the college of priores for hegemonic control of archdiocesan affairs escalated in the period 1191–1225. The tenor of these years was already announced in the priores’ election in 1191 of archbishop Bruno III von Berg (1191–1193), which may have been contested by the cathedral chapter. Though the cathedral chapter managed to attain more influence at the archiepiscopal court over these three decades and, in so doing, began to destabilize the priores, the latter remained potent—if increasingly under threat. As long as the complete body of priores from the archdiocese’s leading collegiate churches and monasteries retained control of the course of archiepiscopal elections, the cathedral chapter’s

---

728 See Groten, Priorenkolleg, 152, who locates the beginnings of intensified conflict within the ranks of the college between the cathedral chapter and the other members specifically in the episcopacy of Philipp von Heinsberg.
729 On the contested archiepiscopal election in 1156, see Wisplinghoff, “Priorenkollegium und die Bischofswahlen,” 32–40, as well as Janssen, Erzbistum, vol. 2, pt. 1, 295. On the acquisition of the relics of the Magi as the impetus for the cathedral chapter’s increasing self-consciousness and attempts to control the archdiocese on itself and the archbishop alone, see Groten, Priorenkolleg, 149.
731 The sources do not allow full resolution of this point; see Wisplinghoff, “Priorenkollegium und die Bischofswahlen,” 40, and Janssen, Erzbistum, vol. 2, pt. 1, 295.
chances of wresting complete control of the archbishop’s court—and thus archdiocesan affairs—from them were held in balance.\textsuperscript{732} Thus, following the (possibly) contested election of 1191, the college of \textit{priores} succeeded in pushing through their candidate in four successive archiepiscopal elections, namely those of 1205, 1208, 1216, and 1225—a direct reflection both of their enduring authority in this period and their collective efforts to reassert their traditional dominance \textit{vis-à-vis} the cathedral chapter.\textsuperscript{733}

Provost Theoderich and dean Hermann of St. Kunibert, as much as the chapter they represented, were bound up inextricably in this contemporary contest in the sphere of high ecclesiastical politics; the college of \textit{priores} and its affairs constituted their primary social, political, and spiritual frame of reference. When situated in the context of current developments within the college and the increasing threat posed by the cathedral chapter to the electoral and advisory authority of its traditional members, their architectural patronage of the east end might have entailed not only a general display of belonging to a group of ancient and powerful collegiate churches, but also a performance of political affiliation and allegiance with the other members of the college whose traditional prerogatives were then also under attack. It seems clear that provost Theoderich and the chapter’s patronal decisions were not only thoroughly informed by this small, privileged social and political circuit of high clergy, but also likely intended primarily to be received within it.

It should thus be asked to what extent the decision to rebuild the church around 1210—in the immediate wake of the \textit{priores’} string of successful archiepiscopal elections in 1205 and 1208—was predicated not just on a desire to replace the diminutive Ottonian fabric, but on a deeper institutional compulsion among the superiors and the chapter at St. Kunibert to assert

their church’s traditional rights and privileges within the Church of Cologne.\footnote{734} As with Xanten, St. Gereon, and Bonn, the chapter’s main political currency was its \textit{traditio}—its ability to locate the origins of the institution in the formative early era of the Church of Cologne and to tie its foundation to the initiative of the saintly bishop Kunibert. One way that the chapter made such claims architecturally was to turn to and emulate a series of prestigious architectural models at sites boasting traditions of ancient and saintly foundation. But in this same politicized context, the patronal cultivation of highly traditional modes of building itself might have become a charged marker of institutional identity among Cologne’s major ecclesiastical institutions, in effect foregrounding institutional tradition through the “deeply historicizing” architectural language that we call Romanesque.\footnote{735} With its screens of round arcades on columns and pilasters, niches, semi-domes, and thick-wall structure, the east end (figs. 35 and 76) takes up and develops a repertoire of forms and methods—and building materials (tufa and trachyte)—that had characterized building in Cologne for centuries, from the Romans through the Ottonians to the more recent past. Such elements as the massive, marble-like polished slate shafts in the column bundles in the apse around the high altar (fig. 35), much like the use of Purbeck marble in England, may have been seen not only as sumptuous and befitting of the \textit{sanctitas} of this part of the church, but also as evocative of \textit{romanitas} and the past.\footnote{736} As Nussbaum has suggested, the continued deference to a profoundly “Roman-like” Romanesque mode of building in Cologne around 1200 was likely bound up generally with a shared sense

\footnote{734} The question as to why the church was rebuilt at all has been posed but once, by the historian Kürten (\textit{Stift}, vol. 1), who wrote before the discovery of the eleventh-century west end. He claimed offhandedly (at 147) that the church was rebuilt because the old one was “baufällig.” There is, however, no evidence to suggest that the eleventh-century church was in a state of disrepair.

\footnote{735} To use Trachtenberg’s (“Gothic/Italian Gothic,” 23) apt description of the retrospective character of Romanesque.

\footnote{736} See Draper, \textit{Formation of English Gothic}, 32, on the similar use of Purbeck at Canterbury and its possible Roman connotations. One also thinks here, of course, of the analogous example furnished by the ring of (spoliated) porphyry columns in the contemporary choir of Madgeburg Cathedral (begun 1209).
among the institutional members of the college of priores of the Church of Cologne’s long historical trajectory and its origins in Roman early Christianity.\textsuperscript{737} Emphatically retrospective and deliberate in its archaisms, St. Kunibert’s east end fits entirely into this scheme. In the context of the priores in Cologne in the early thirteenth century, there were very powerful political motivations for architectural retrospection.

At the same time, architectural patronage in early-thirteenth-century Cologne among the college of priores goes beyond traditionalism. The hallmark of architecture in Cologne from circa 1210 to 1250 is precisely its “hybrid” nature and thus its conflicted relationship with tradition and modernity, as manifested in the initial move away from purely Romanesque modes of building and towards the assimilation of features from French Gothic architecture (rib vaults, etc.) into existing architectural systems. How patronage within the ranks of the priores might have been bound up in the formation of this distinctive style is examined in detail in the following section in the context of the nave and the west transept. And as the east end at St. Kunibert suggests, the institutional, spiritual, historical, and political connotations of prestigious models appear to have been an equally important factor in high ecclesiastical architectural patronage in Cologne at this moment. It might be that the strong pull of the network of associations of certain prestigious sites among clerical patrons like Theoderich and the chapter also contributed partly to the enduring attractiveness of Romanesque itself.

The institutional and political contexts for ecclesiastical architectural patronage in Cologne furnished by the network of the college of priores and the internal power struggle therein should give us pause to reconsider the generally populist explanations that have customarily been invoked to account for the proliferation of church building projects in Cologne

\textsuperscript{737} Nussbaum, “Anmerkungen,” 111–117.
in the early thirteenth century. It has become axiomatic that the building boom in Cologne during the so-called “great century of church building” between 1150 and 1250, generally nourished by the city’s massive economic expansion at this time, reflects the collective desire of clergy and citizenry to manifest the holiness of sancta Colonia—the so-called “Kölner Heil”—through an unprecedented amount of church building. The cathedral chapter’s acquisition of the relics of the Magi in 1164 has been seen as the central stimulus, which then prompted the city’s other religious institutions to build in order to showcase Cologne’s extraordinary spiritual riches in a show of spiritual and political consensus as Cologne quickly became one of the principal pilgrimage centres in the West.

Yet, only very few of Cologne’s politically important spiritual communities actually built in the immediate wake of this event. In fact, the principal institutions like St. Gereon, St. Kunibert, and St. Severin all began to build much later—a full half century representing two generations. Rather than constituting a general spiritual and political consensus among the high clergy after the acquisition of the relics of the Magi, might not the numerous building projects begun from circa 1190 to 1225 at the institutions with membership in the college of priores represent a reaction to the emergence of the cathedral chapter as a legitimate threat to their control of archdiocesan affairs in precisely this period? It seems hardly coincidental that the beginnings and progress of the projects at Xanten (ca. 1185/1190–1213), Bonn (ca. 1200s–1220s), St. Gereon (1219–1227), St. Severin (ca. 1220s–1237), and St. Kunibert (ca. 1210–

---

738 Thus, as a recent example among many, Hugo Borger, “Zur Geschichte und Kultur Kölns,” in Chronik zur Geschichte der Stadt Köln. Von den Anfängen bis 1400, ed. Peter Fuchs (Cologne: Greven, 1994), 16–18. Nussbaum, “Anmerkungen,” 114–115, also proceeds from the idea of a collective desire to manifest the “Kölner Heil,” but provides a more nuanced picture and notes generally that the priores’ political power ca. 1200 also may have provided a further stimulus for building at this time.

1247)—to name only those collegiate communities with ancient and sanctified roots—all fall in the three decades in which conflict between the priores and the cathedral chapter intensified. Nor that the chapter at St. Kunibert looked to Xanten, St. Gereon, and Bonn for its archaizing east end (fig. 76); or that the chapter at St. Severin, in turn, looked for the renovation of its long choir and east end (fig. 213) to Bonn (fig. 235) and St. Kunibert (fig. 35).\textsuperscript{740} The east end at St. Kunibert suggests that there was more driving high ecclesiastical architectural patronage and production in early-thirteenth-century Cologne than a general sense of civic sacrality and parochial architectural conservatism. Architectural patronage among the priores was an act of immediate political significance, and church building a complex performance of institutional identity in an increasingly fragmented social and spiritual landscape.

3. Tradition and the “Stigmata of Modernity”: The Nave and the West Transept

By the time the chapter and its builders began to make plans for the nave (fig. 56), much had changed at St. Kunibert. Provost Theoderich had been elected archbishop of Trier in late 1212, and though he may have remained provost of St. Kunibert until 1215/1216, his involvement in the project likely ended with his formal departure from the community’s ranks. As archbishop of Trier, he hardly would have had the time to continue to be involved in the project; and after 1215, he is next attested in Cologne only in 1226 for the ordination of archbishop elect Heinrich von Müllenzark (1225–1238).\textsuperscript{741} By 1216, the office of provost at St.

\textsuperscript{740} On St. Severin’s dependence on Bonn, see Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbauten, 99–100. Connections with St. Kunibert’s apse, completed just a few years before, are evident in the use of thick-wall structure in the upper storey of the apse, column bundles with three shafts, and elaborately profiled shaft rings, which are all absent from the conches in Bonn.

\textsuperscript{741} Regesten der Erzbischöfe zu Trier, ed. Goerz, 36 (September 20, 1226). It was on this occasion in 1226 that Theoderich, as archbishop of Trier, consecrated the two side altars in the east transept, and possibly those in the first bay of the side aisles. Theoderich is attested in Cologne for the last time in 1227; at this time, he may have, if not in 1226, consecrated the two side altars in the nave. On this occasion, he established at St. Kunibert a prebend
Kunibert had definitely become vacant, and a new provost, Bruno von Ahrberg, was elected in 1218 after a two-year struggle. \(^{742}\) His tenure was lengthy, lasting until 1236. \(^{743}\) Dean Hermann’s tenure ended in 1219. \(^{744}\) He was succeeded by Constantine, whose tenure as dean (1219–1222) was as brief as provost Bruno’s was long. \(^{745}\)

While this flux within the ranks of the superiors and the lack of a detailed textual record for this period make it somewhat more difficult to assign agency in the planning of the nave than with the east end, there are very strong grounds for placing the start of work on the nave under provost Bruno shortly after his accession to office in 1218. The nave at St. Aposteln (fig. 183), the primary model for that at St. Kunibert, was vaulted in 1219, and we also possess a solid indication that the first nave bay at St. Kunibert itself was completed around 1227 through the record of altar consecrations in the first side aisle bays in either 1226 or 1227 (figs. 30, 31). This bracket of dates, in tandem with Bruno’s accession in 1218, suggests strongly that planning and work on the nave began under him in the very late 1210s. \(^{746}\)

But for all these changes in the ranks of the superiors in the late 1210s, the institutional and ecclesiastical political framework for architectural patronage at St. Kunibert was still very much the same. Like provost Theoderich before him, provost Bruno also sat among the college of priores, embroiled in the continuing struggle with the cathedral chapter for control at the archbishop’s court. And as is the case with Theoderich and the east end, Bruno’s membership

---

\(^{742}\) Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 21–22.

\(^{743}\) Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 228–283 no. 15.

\(^{744}\) Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 293 no. 17.

\(^{745}\) Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 293 no. 18.

\(^{746}\) Cf., in contrast, Graf (“Neue Forschungen,” 122), who has attempted unconvincingly to place the beginning of work on the nave under provost Heinrich (1236–1243) and dean Franco (1238–1242). Graf provides no archaeological, textual, or contextual substantiation for this assertion, and there is no evidence for such a late start of work on the nave; as the consecration of the side altars in the first side aisle bays by 1226/1227 itself indicates, the nave definitely had been begun before then. See, further, Chapter 4.
in the college of *priores* and the larger conflict with the cathedral chapter are both of critical importance, for they provide a new and vital contextual lens for understanding and interpreting the choices that Bruno and the chapter made in their patronage of the nave and, around 1230, the west transept.

Thus, it is surely no accident that these two parts of the church again make recourse to sites with institutional membership in the rarified patronal sphere of the *priores*. The nave’s plan and elevation (fig. 56) looks principally to the renovated nave at St. Aposteln (fig. 183); several details, such as the form of the triforium arcade and the niches in the aisle walls, recall features in the nave at St. Andreas (fig. 239). For the west transept (figs. 26, 91, 93), Bruno, the chapter, and their masons turned again primarily to the example of St. Aposteln (ca. 1225–1230; figs. 175 and 186) and to the west façade at Groß St. Martin (ca. 1225–1235; fig. 211) for the central western bay. In the late 1210s, there were other, impressive naves in the immediate vicinity, such as that in Neuss (begun 1209), to which Bruno and the chapter could have turned. Again, as with the east end, provost Bruno and chapter’s architectural patronage thus appears to have been informed fully by the parameters set by the current projects within their own small, high clerical sociopolitical orbit, and it should be seen primarily as a response to them.

Bruno certainly knew the superiors of all of three of these churches from the archiepiscopal court and is attested with them there repeatedly around the time when plans for both the nave and the west transept were devised. There is evidence to suggest, however, that Bruno and provost Gerhard of St. Aposteln may have been particularly close: in 1223, Pope Honorius III wrote them together, asking them to collaborate in lifting a ban that had been

---

747 With provost Gerhard of St. Aposteln: *REK*, vol. 3, nos. 224 (1218), 226 (1218), 400 (1223), 578 (1225), 639 (1227), 649 (1227), 685 (1229); with provost Theoderich of St. Andreas: *REK*, vol. 3, nos. 224 (1218), 400 (1223); with abbot Ludolf of Groß St. Martin: *REK*, vol. 3, nos. 400 (1223), 685 (1229).
As with the east end, these kinds of close personal ties among the dignitaries within the high clerical college of *priores* in Cologne deserve our attention and are worth emphasizing. The repeated turn at St. Kunibert to St. Aposteln as primary model, first for the nave and later for west transept, may very well stem in part from Bruno’s personal and political connections with Gerhard.

These high clerical ties are particularly critical for understanding the full scope of the architectural patronage dynamics at St. Kunibert, for the nave at St. Aposteln was a signally important structure in Cologne in the late 1210s. Together with St. Andreas, it was one of the two earliest rib-vaulted naves in Cologne, and the first nave in Cologne with sexpartite rib vaults. The sheer novelty, and thus attraction, that the renovated nave at St. Aposteln must have possessed for elite Cologne patrons like Bruno and the chapter at St. Kunibert in the late 1210s can hardly be overstated: until well into the later twelfth century, naves in the city had been provided with groin vaults and sometimes even timber roofs (fig. 215), and no new naves had been erected in Cologne between them and the erection of the naves at St. Aposteln and St. Andreas in the 1210s. An idea of St. Aposteln’s impact on Bruno and the chapter can be gauged in the rapidity with which its plan and elevation was taken up at St. Kunibert and integrated into the existing project (fig. 30), as well as in the fidelity with which it was followed, in both the nave and, later, the west transept.

Did Bruno and the chapter turn to emulate St. Aposteln simply because it was current and novel, and because Bruno had ties with Gerhard? Or might they have looked to St. Aposteln specifically because its sexpartite rib vaults were—as we recognize today—a form with (Early) French Gothic origins? Or might it have been because they considered the nave at

---

748 *REK*, vol. 3, no. 412.
St. Aposteln as both novel and possessing ties with French Gothic architecture? It is clear that the high clergy in Cologne at this time knew of French Gothic architecture: as Groten has shown, the number of *magistri* among their ranks who had studied in France, and probably in Paris in particular, rose sharply in the later twelfth and early thirteenth centuries; several *magistri* are attested among the canons St. Kunibert over the 1210s and 1220s. By the early 1200s, Caesarius of Heisterbach could claim that Paris was the preferred place of study among the Lower Rhenish clergy. And one need only cite the evidence of buildings like the decagon at St. Gereon (fig. 204), begun at this same moment (ca. 1219), which turned directly to French Gothic structures for its rib vaults, abbreviated flyers, and plate tracery windows—a move perhaps stimulated by the construction of the nave at St. Aposteln only shortly before. But what of St. Aposteln’s sources? There is substantial evidence to suggest that its nave looked to the collegiate church of St. Georg in Limburg an der Lahn (figs. 244 and 245) for the sexpartite nave vaults and seven-part transept vaults, as well as for parts of the elevation.

---


752 Dethard von Winterfeld, “Zum Stande der Baugeschichtsforschung,” in *Der Limburger Dom*, ed. Wolfram Nicol (Mainz: Selbstverlag der Gesellschaft für Mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte, 1985), 41–84; Overdick, “Rippenwölbung,” 43–44. It was long thought that St. Aposteln was the earliest Lower Rhenish nave with sexpartite rib vaults, which in turn led to extensive theorizing about the possible sources for its vaults. The recent emergence of dendrochronological evidence for the nave in Limburg, however, places its construction concretely in the late 1200s and early 1210s (triforium level datable to 1206), and thus before the nave at St. Aposteln (vaulted in 1219). Several features of the nave at St. Aposteln, in turn, suggest, as Von Winterfeld and Overdick have already intimated, that it looked to the nave at Limburg. We can strengthen this hypothesis even further by noting the recurrence in the west transept at St. Aposteln (ca. 1225–1230; fig. 186) of several features from the Limburg transept, which is also now dated to the later 1210s and early 1220s (triforium level by 1215) and thus before St. Aposteln. Not only do its arms replicate Limburg’s (fig. 245) seven-part transept vaults, but they also contain numerous details from Limburg’s elevation; compare the form of the central support for the lateral rib as a dosseret with three applied shafts and the way in which the central respond continues, bisected by the string course, into the lower storey in both.
connection is also significant because Limburg, as is well known, looked directly to the nave (and west façade) of the Early Gothic cathedral of Laon (nave ca. 1155/1160–ca. 1180, façade ca. 1180/1185–ca. 1200; fig. 246). The chapter at St. Aposteln thus appears to have followed the Laon-inspired project at Limburg closely and at repeated turns for its nave and west transept; and the chapter at St. Kunibert, in turn, followed the unfolding project at St. Aposteln. Presumably, Provost Gerhard and the chapter at St. Aposteln would have learned about the French Gothic origins of the new forms in Limburg through contact with that site, and perhaps even turned to Limburg for that very reason. Such information, in turn, could have passed very easily between Gerhard and Bruno in Cologne.

There is thus little reason not to think that Bruno and the chapter at St. Kunibert (fig. 56), as much as the other highly clergy in Cologne, were well attuned not only to the French origins of such forms as sexpartite and seven-part rib vaults, but also fully conscious of their modernity. Their patronal turn to St. Aposteln most likely was stimulated not by its novelty per se, but by a desire to participate in current trends in the ranks of the priores towards the incorporation of fashionable, modern forms from Gothic France, even if at a considerable remove—Gothic at third-hand, as it were. It is debatable whether high clerical patrons in Cologne and the Lower Rhineland adopted such French Gothic forms only because they regarded them as “French,” though they were well aware of their origins there. It is risky to project Burkhard of Hall’s late-thirteenth-century (ca. 1280) designation opus Francigenum back into 1210s and 1220s Cologne, for that term may have connoted both the style as such and the stone-working

---

techniques (*opus*), and Cologne masons emulated the forms only. Rather, it seems more likely that patrons considered them as cutting-edge, decorative, and particularly prestigious forms. From the 1210s through to circa 1250, such French Gothic borrowings as rib vaults, polygonal apses, and other isolated Gothic forms rapidly became modish within high patronal spheres in Cologne, sometimes via direct recourse to France, as in the nave at Groß St. Martin (ca. 1225–1235; fig. 202), with its true triforium, à *bec* abaci, and crocket capitals, no doubt all taken directly from France, and sometimes, as at St. Kunibert, mediated through other models. Within the patronal context of the *priores* in Cologne, and particularly during the initial formative moment of the assimilation of Gothic motifs in the 1210s and 1220s, it may be more appropriate to read French Gothic forms not as expressive of any of the immanent meaning that is frequently ascribed to Gothic (e.g., “Frenchness” *per se*, “spirituality,” etc.), but rather as signs of institutional belonging within a discrete patronal and sociopolitical coterie.

In this regard, the treatment of these features at St. Kunibert is highly revealing and suggests that these elements may have been taken up by patrons primarily as signs—as “the stigmata of modernity,” as Trachtenberg put it. As at St. Aposteln, the sexpartite and seven-part rib vaults at St. Kunibert are purely decorative, grafted (in the nave; fig. 56) onto the highly traditional bound-system plan with no hint of structural function. There is no attempt to articulate a logical assignment of each vault and wall rib to separate supporting shafts, as in

---

754 *Chronica ecclesiae Wimpinensis auctore Burcardo de Hallis et Dythero de Helmestat* (MGH SS 30, pt. 1, 666). The relevant passage is also printed, with an English translation, in *Gothic Art 1140–c. 1540: Sources and Documents*, ed. Teresa G. Frisch (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987), 56. While the precise signification of *opus francigenum* has been debated, it seems unlikely that the term refers solely to a “French” method of working stone, as suggested by Günther Binding, “*Opus Francigenum. Ein Beitrag zur Begriffsbestimmung,*” *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 71 (1989): 45–54. The consciousness of the French origins of Gothic as a style is equally clear in Burkhard’s account; see, most recently, Suckale und Schurr, “Kulturtransfer,” 385.

755 Beyond the features listed above, St. Martin’s direct dependence on French models is also evident in the assimilation of the transverse arch to the profile of the ribs, a step not taken before in Cologne, whether at St. Aposteln, St. Andreas, or St. Kunibert. See Schröder, “Rippengewölbe,” 217–218, as well as Nussbaum, *Deutsche Kirchenbaukunst*, 25–26 with 335 n. 67.

756 Trachtenberg, “Gothic/Italian Gothic,” 33.
France, at Limburg itself, or even partly at St. Aposteln, where separate pilasters carried the masonry envelopes of the wall ribs. Rather, vault and wall ribs alike are gathered as a massy conglomerate on single columnar responds.\textsuperscript{757} No attempt was made to harmonize the forms of the ribs and the transverse arches, again in contrast to French Gothic. Instead, and in a full departure from France, the ribs at St. Kunibert are composed of small shaped tufa stones that interlock with the surrounding tufa vault webs, which are arranged in billowing ring-like courses in much the same manner as the band rib vault in the crypt (fig. 10).\textsuperscript{758} The vaults, in effect, amount to a translation of a new, imported, and prestigious form into local materials using traditional techniques.

Indeed, beyond the adoption of cutting-edge sexpartite and seven-part vaults, the nave and west transept contain numerous highly retrospective features that point to an overarching paternal desire to embed these new, modernizing elements in a structure that would otherwise foreground the church’s extended institutional history and tradition. Thus, in the nave (fig. 56), the sexpartite rib vaults and their system of supports are applied to an extremely historicizing single order nave arcade that, in its combination of austere round arches and massive square piers, looks back to the nave arcades of the earlier Romanesque timber roofed basilicas in Cologne (fig. 215) and, ultimately, those of their Ottonian and Carolingian precedents, some of which were still standing at this moment (including the Carolingian Old Cathedral itself, ca. 870: fig. 218).\textsuperscript{759} Or consider the west transept, with its \textit{au courant} seven-part rib vaults in the interior (fig. 92) paired with an exterior (fig. 87) featuring a system of pilasters, cornices, corbel tables, and gables that barely move beyond two-hundred-and fifty-year-old precursors like the

\textsuperscript{758} On the physical constitution of the vaults, see Schröder, “Rippengewölbe,” 214.
\textsuperscript{759} This is not to suggest that the chapter at St. Kunibert and its architect looked specifically to the Carolingian nave at the Old Cathedral for the nave arcade, but solely to illustrate the extreme antiquity of this particular form of arcade in the local context.
Ottonian westwork at St. Pantaleon (ca. 984–1002; fig. 174). Might the chapter at St. Kunibert have encouraged its masons, like Suger did with his new west end at Saint-Denis, to create a new west end that would be both modern and recall the appearance of eleventh-century west end that it replaced, with its pilasters (fig. 17) and capitals and its tripartite plan with central space, wings, and a porch (fig. 30)? In this same vein, for Bruno and the chapter, the monumental historicizing nave arcade in the new nave may have conjured up retrospective associations with the nave of the predecessor church while simultaneously positioning its replacement in line with the most recent trends in vaulting.

While it will always be difficult to measure the exact limits of patronal input into these decisions, it would be to underestimate drastically medieval patrons’ profound historical consciousness were we to ascribe the retention of such traditional motifs and forms solely to the habitus of masons. The recent work on the seminal twelfth-century cases of Suger and Saint-Denis and Gervase and Canterbury has shown that linear, teleological models of stylistic development conflict with medieval patronal outlooks that were very sensitive towards the relationship between innovation and tradition and modernity and the past; this same work has also shown that patrons could discern carefully between modern and traditional features. But what of Cologne in the 1210s and 1220s, at this seminal moment when unambiguously modern Gothic elements were first introduced into the traditional local architectural economy? Though

---

760 See Nussbaum, “Anmerkungen,” 117, who draws the explicit parallel between the exterior of the west end at St. Kunibert and the Ottonian westwork at St. Pantaleon.

761 On Suger’s “new-old” west façade, see Eric Fernie, “Suger’s ‘Completion’ of Saint-Denis,” in Artistic Integration, ed. Raguin, Brush, and Draper, 86–87, as well as Roland Recht, Believing and Seeing: The Art of Gothic Cathedrals, trans. Mary Whitall (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 109–111. Schütte, “Baugeschichte,” 13, has also intimated that the west transept’s porch and wings may have been intended to recall the eleventh-century west end.

we lack contemporary texts, the evidence of the buildings put up in Cologne at this time indicates that similar concerns were operative among high ecclesiastical patrons here. One need only turn to the much-studied case of the decagon at St. Gereon (fig. 204), where provost Arnold de Burne and the chapter retained the late antique rotunda—considered to have been built by St. Helena herself (fig. 205)—as an “architectural relic” and had their masons clothe it in a new raiment of traditional, local forms and cutting-edge motifs derived directly from French Gothic. The same argument might be made for the nave and west transept at St. Aposteln itself (figs. 183 and 186), where provost Gerhard and the canons were also clearly reticent to discard their antiquated Ottonian fabric, in this case likely on account of its having been erected by the half-holy institutional fundator archbishop Pilgrim (1021–1036), whose remains lay in the middle of the west choir in the renovated west transept with its new seven-part vaults. But the collision of modernitas and antiquitas in the new nave and west transept at St. Kunibert also suggests that, even when structures were fully rebuilt, clerical patrons like Bruno and the chapter were equally concerned to cultivate architectural archaisms alongside pronouncedly modern features in order to establish a chain of continuity that would link the present with the all-important past.

There may be a deeper institutional subtext to the simultaneous assimilation of French Gothic elements and emphasis on traditional features that we find in the nave and west transept at St. Kunibert and in other patronal circles among the priores in Cologne in the late 1210s and 1220s. As Caesarius of Heisterbach tells us in his vita Engelberti, during his episcopacy, archbishop Engelbert (1216–1225) made the first move towards encouraging the cathedral chapter to rebuild the by-then 350-year-old cathedral, promising to sustain the project through to

completion with an annual subvention of 500 marks. The project, of course, never came to fruition, and the chapter was to begin building only later, but most spectacularly, in 1248 (fig. 216). Was it these discussions about a new cathedral that contributed to the rapid spread of Francophile elements among the priores in their building projects of these same years? That is to say, did these discussions about a new cathedral during Engelbert’s tenure raise the spectre of the cathedral chapter’s potential turn to French Gothic models for the new cathedral, as it obviously was to do later? Or was it the burgeoning building projects among the priores themselves that motivated the archbishop to attempt to spur the cathedral chapter into action?

The priores certainly would have been involved in these talks, for they were demonstrably involved in similar talks in 1248 when the cathedral chapter ultimately decided to embark on the new cathedral. By this time, however, the cathedral chapter had essentially disassembled the priores’ grasp on the archdiocese in a long, complicated process that spanned the later 1230s and 1240s; indeed, it is perhaps for this reason that the new cathedral was begun so late. If not the singular stimulus for the move towards assimilating Gothic elements, these discussions under Engelbert may very well have provided a powerful, reactionary impetus for high clerical patrons among the priores to pursue the integration of modern French Gothic forms within what are otherwise buildings that are insistently archaizing in appearance and, as such, redolent of institutional tradition and the past. With their impressive scale and spaciousness, the naves put

---

765 In this connection, it may very well be significant, as Groten (Priorenkolleg, 160) observes in a different context, that the cathedral chapter’s authority at the archbishop’s court generally increased under Engelbert, who thus appears to have supported its rise vis-à-vis the priores; as Groten writes: “Während seiner Amtszeit [i.e., Engelbert’s] nahm der Einfluß des Domkapitels stark zu.”
766 Thus, the Chronica regia Coloniensis (MGH SS rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum 18, 293): “Ipso anno [i.e., 1248], cum capitulo Coloniense pro omnimoda destructione maioris ecclesie antique et reparatione melioris structure de consensu archiepiscopi et priorum concordassent . . . .” For a discussion of this document, see Schöller, Organisation, 228–229.
767 See Groten, Priorenkolleg, 161–168, esp. 167, who connects the start of the cathedral chapter’s work on the new cathedral with the chapter’s new-found political supremacy over the other priores.
up at this moment by provost Bruno and the chapter at St. Kunibert (begun ca. 1219; fig. 56) and the Benedictine community at Groß St. Martin (begun ca. 1225; fig. 210) are, as is often remarked, “cathedral-like.”768 In view of the enduring struggle for power and influence at the archbishop’s court between the cathedral chapter and the priores in the late 1210s and 1220s, it might be asked whether there is not much more behind Bruno and the chapter’s turn to inflated, cathedral-like scale and French Gothic forms for their own church.

This section has emphasized the constellation of human agency and the contextual pressures operative in the process of importing, adopting, and transforming features from French Gothic in high clerical patronal circles in early-thirteenth-century Cologne in general and at St. Kunibert in particular. Too often these dynamics have been divorced from their institutional and historical contexts and explained using abstract, teleological concepts like “stages of reception” (Rezeptionsstufen), or subsumed under ahistorical stylistic labels like “transition” or “compromise.” Buildings and styles are products of people, circumstances, and attitudes: in early-thirteenth-century Cologne, clerical patrons among the college of priores made choices within quite delimited social and political horizons of expectations, and their locally-trained masons operated under certain technical and material constraints. Neither “transitional,” nor a “compromise,” nor even a “resistance to Gothic,” the nave and west transept at St. Kunibert suggest that the institutional and political structures of ecclesiastical architectural patronage in Cologne were crucial factors during this formative moment of cultural translation and assimilation.

768 For instance, Borger, “Zur Geschichte,” 18 (“kathedralhafte Attitüde”). See, too, Graf (“Neue Forschungen,” 124), who has also suggested generally that the nave at St. Kunibert may have responded to discussions about the cathedral. However, she places the start of work on the nave at St. Kunibert after 1230 and does not connect it with contemporary developments within the college of priores.
4. Conclusions

Among the member institutions of the college of priores in early-thirteenth-century Cologne, church building and architectural patronage were central venues for the articulation of larger sociopolitical discourses by a potent clergy at the peak of its spiritual and political authority. As patrons, the prelates and chapter at St. Kunibert looked at all turns to the most prestigious projects—both current and even older ones—within this cohort of preeminent spiritual institutions. More than a simple nod to decorum, their patronal gestures and the very act of church building constituted a performance of institutional belonging and a dynamic process of identity formation within the firmly circumscribed sociopolitical circumstances of early-thirteenth-century Cologne. These local circumstances were the result of the unique system of the college of priores and the struggle within the college between the upstart cathedral chapter and the other traditional representatives of the Church of Cologne. If this chapter has read the significance of the church largely through the lens of the archdiocesan high clergy and its affairs, it is because ecclesiastical architectural patronage in Cologne at this time was so fully conditioned by the particularized institutional and political orbit of this small group.

With their patronage, the superiors and chapter at St. Kunibert, like other religious communities in Cologne at this time, cultivated a highly distinctive mode of building that cannot be contained within our customary terminological binary of “Romanesque” and “Gothic.” The insistent foregrounding of traditional architectural modes, motifs, and materials in Cologne in the early thirteenth century exceeds rote conservatism and can be seen more productively as a reflex of these institutions’ profoundly retrospective orientation and institutional concern for tradition—stances that were tied directly to their political and spiritual claims at this moment. The architectural economy of St. Kunibert further suggests how patronal networks and
exchanges and, not least, the connotations of prestigious sites may have contributed further to
the promotion of this distinctive style that straddled past and present and shared as much with
Roman, Carolingian, and Ottonian architecture as it did with French Gothic. At St. Kunibert
and in early-thirteenth-century Cologne, ecclesiastical architectural patronage, while clearly
open to international developments such as French Gothic, operated within a powerfully binding
and profoundly local frame of reference, responding to particularized regional and urban
histories, architectural traditions, and institutional and political structures. Building in early-
thirteenth-century Cologne cannot be measured through its concordance or lack thereof with a
supposedly “superior” and dominant “central” contemporary style—that is, French Gothic; the
structures for ecclesiastical architectural patronage in the thirteenth century both here and
elsewhere, even during and after the adoption of opus Francigenum, were fundamentally
decentralized, particularized, and local. St. Kunibert and the other buildings put up in
Cologne among the institutional members of the priores are, as Draper has observed in
reference to England at this same time, “as political as anything in the contemporary Île-de-
France”—but in their own way and on their own terms.

---

769 See, especially, the pertinent remarks of Binski, Westminster Abbey, 7–8, and at vii: “high patronage and its
audience were essentially diverse and fragmented, or federal in character, possessing the character of a complex
system of local knowledge.” Though made in reference to the English royal court, much the same could be said
about high clerical architectural patronage and production in early-thirteenth-century Cologne. It also should be
noted here peripherally that the issue of Cologne Cathedral and the Brannerian “Court Style” is in dire need of
reappraisal.

Part III. Ornamenta

Chapter 6
The Sanctuary as Space of Collective Memory and Devotion

Propiciare nobis Domine famulis tuis
per sanctorum confessorum tuorum,
per intercessionem pontificum Kuniberti, Nicolai,
et sanctorum martyrum tuorum Clementis, Ewaldorum.
—Commemoratio patronorum, fifteenth-century collect
from St. Kunibert

The extant thirteenth-century monumental imagery, furnishings, and cultic accoutrements are concentrated entirely in the east end in the area of the former clerical choir. It is in the raised sanctuary in the apse (fig. 35) that one encounters the densest concentration of imagery and furnishings still in situ. The sanctuary ensemble includes the high altar (fig. 101), the surrounding *opus sectile* pavement, two frescoes along the north flank (fig. 141), and several body-part reliquaries (figs. 151, 153, and 155). Five stained glass windows are preserved in the apse: two small windows with the figures of SS. Cordula and Ursula and donor figures fill openings in the lower storey (figs. 132, 133); three monumental narrative windows—a central Tree of Jesse (fig. 108) flanked by windows with the lives of SS. Clement (fig. 116) and Kunibert (fig. 122)—survive in the clerestory.

All these works of art were installed together upon the completion of the east end, which can be placed in the early- to mid-1220s through the consecration of the high altar in 1222 and

---

771 “O Lord, be kind to us, your servants, through the intercession of your holy confessors Kunibert and Nicholas, and your holy martyrs Clement and the Hewalds.” The collect is found in Darmstadt ULB, ms. 876, fol. 428vb, as a fifteenth-century addition to the end of a missal dating ca. 1330.
772 Originally kept in the niche with the Crucifixion fresco, the reliquaries are now kept in a modern treasury chamber in the church’s west transept.
the side altars in the transept in 1226. The sanctuary frescoes and associated reliquaries form a discrete conceptual and iconographical unit and will be examined together in the following chapter. Likewise, the two windows with donor images in the lower storey of the apse are part of a larger circuit of small windows financed by lay and clerical donors that originally encircled the lower storey of the east end. Both they and the program of the lower-storey windows will be analyzed from the perspective of individual patronage in the final chapter of this study.

This chapter examines the visual, ritual, and ideological axis of the community’s new sanctuary: the high altar and the saints’ shrines that were originally displayed on it, the surrounding pavement, and the narrative windows in the clerestory, which appear above the high altar like a permanently opened altarpiece (fig. 35). It seeks to contribute to a growing body of integrative work on the visual and material structuring of thirteenth-century altar-shrine environments and the relationships between stained glass, the liturgy, and relics. Adopting a holistic approach, it analyzes the conceptual, liturgical, and ideological connections between the various parts of the core sanctuary ensemble. The goal is to examine how the chapter’s program

---

773 Because a full consensus has long been reached on the dating of the altar, pavement, and stained glass to the 1220s, the chronology does not need to be addressed in any detail or length here. The chronology of the frescoes, which is still contested, will be addressed in the following chapter. For the chronology of the high altar and pavement, see the most recent summaries in OE, vol. 2, 266–267 cat. no. E 56 and 271–273 cat. no. E 58. The chronology of the stained glass was first addressed extensively and the glass placed securely in the 1220s by Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 120–136. This chronology has since been confirmed by numerous other studies; see, most recently, Rüdiger Becksmann, Deutsche Glasmalerei des Mittelalters. Bildprogramme, Auftraggeber, Werkstätten (Berlin: Deutscher Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 1992) 1: 52–54, as well as Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 154–155, both with earlier literature.

for its central sanctuary ensemble responded to two fundamental concerns. First was the
liturgical function and meaning of this space, which was the exclusive site of the community’s
conventual mass; and, second, the contextual pressures examined in the previous chapter,
particularly concerns about the visual construction of institutional identity within the politicized
culture of the college of *priores*. This chapter is concerned with examining both the individual
objects as such and the global formation of an institution-specific, high clerical visual culture.
The core sanctuary ensemble is a tightly-coordinated artistic whole that expands on the
institutional message of the architectural envelope. Also marked by a concern for visually and
materially foregrounding the institutional past, the ensemble overlaid the fabric with furnishings
and images that emphasize themes of corporate liturgical devotion, the church’s exalted history
and status, and its place within the Church and the history of salvation.

1. Constructing the Holiest of Holies: The High Altar, the Shrines, and the Sanctuary
Pavement

Dedicated to Christ and the institutional patrons SS. Kunibert, Clement, and the
Hewalds, the high altar (figs. 101, 102) was the ritual and symbolic centre point not just of the
sanctuary, but also of the edifice as a whole. Originally shielded by a two-meter tall choir
enclosure around the canons’ choir in the first nave bay, it occupied the highest physical plane
of all the church’s thirteenth-century altars, standing above the side altars in the east transept
and the side aisles, the Cross altar in the nave, and the parish altar in the west transept (fig.

---

The dedication of an altar to multiple patrons was not uncommon; on this point, see Braun, *Altar*, vol. 1, 727–729.
The high altar’s exalted position within the building and its physical inaccessibility to all but the chapter reflect the exclusivity of its use. As elsewhere, the high altar was reserved for the celebration of the chapter’s conventual mass. In terms of its dedication, location, and ritual significance, the high altar clearly formed the conceptual point of departure for the chapter’s program for its new sanctuary.

The high altar is of the block altar type, with a solid masonry *stipes* that is nearly as large as the *mensa* it supports. The altar is articulated with an array of architectural elements: square piers form the four corners; six colonnettes with fully-“round,” faux-marble octagonal shafts line the front side, and three identical colonnettes each lateral side. The back side of the altar is unadorned. The colonnettes stand on plinths with elaborately profiled bases that merge with the base moulding and mirror the octagonal form of the shafts. Diminutive stiff-leaf capitals with octagonal necks crown the colonnettes. The *mensa* rests directly on the capitals.

Though primarily decorative, the strongly projecting colonnettes on the three visible sides of the altar produce the impression that they support the *mensa* in the manner of the

---

776 The presence of a monumental choir enclosure around the canons’ choir is clear from the raised level of the vault responds in the first nave bay. See further Chapter 4.
777 The installation of four side altars in the east transept and side aisles shortly after the consecration of the high altar in 1222 indicates clearly that the high altar was used solely for the chapter’s conventual mass. On the restricted use of the high altar for the conventual mass in collegiate and monastic churches in general, see Braun, *Altar*, vol. 1, 252, 375, 385, 400, 406, as well as Otto Nußbaum, *Kloster, Priestermönch und Privatmesse. Ihr Verhältnis im Westen von den Anfängen bis zum hohen Mittelalter* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1961), 136, 185–192.
778 For the general historical development and formal characteristics of the block altar, see Braun, *Altar*, vol. 1, 220–240. The *stipes* of the high altar at St. Kunibert is 2.60 m long and 1.57 m wide; the *mensa* is 2.65 m long and 1.71 m wide. The altar is 97 cm tall.
779 The shafts of nine of the colonnettes are of calc-sinter, a brownish-gray, marble-like sedimentary stone that was quarried in the Middle Ages from the Roman aqueducts around Cologne. Three of the corner piers are of trachyte. Three of the colonnette shafts (the right-hand colonnette on the north side and the two right-hand colonnettes on the front face) consist of a gray, veined marble; the same marble occurs in the southwest corner pier. These four components appear to be modern replacements.
780 Braun (*Altar*, vol. 1, 237) and Ewald (*KDM* 6/4, 276) both recorded the presence on the back side of the high altar of two deep recesses that were then closed with iron grills. Likely originally used to store liturgical vessels, these recesses were walled in during the restoration of the high altar in 1945; see *OE*, vol. 2, 266 cat. no. E 56.
781 The polychromy on the bases and capitals is modern.
freestanding legs of a table altar. The configuration of these colonnettes is not accidental: as with actual table altars (like the earlier example at Brunswick Cathedral, 1188; fig. 247), the altar’s appearance makes visual reference to its symbolic status as the biblical table of the Last Supper. Formally, the high altar ties in to a lengthy liturgical-allegorical tradition that, drawing on the Gospels and Paul’s Letter to the Corinthians, understood the altar as a replica of the table at which Christ and his disciples dined. Already formulated succinctly by Amalarius of Metz in the ninth century, the *topos* that the “altar is the table of the Lord at which he ate with his disciples” was recapitulated by twelfth- and thirteenth-century liturgists, from Honorius Augustodunensis through Durandus of Mende. The basic form of the plinths, bases, and shafts of the colonnettes on the high altar also resembles that of the legs of the table of the Last Supper in contemporary Cologne representations of the event, as in the miniature in the evangeliary from Groß St. Martin (ca. 1200–1210; fig. 249). It is reasonable to suppose that the chapter at St. Kunibert was aware of the widespread notion that considered the altar a copy of the table of the Last Supper, and that the design of the high altar was intended specifically to connote this idea. With its visual reference to the lordly table of the apostolic communion, the high altar stood not only as the site of the chapter’s conventual mass, but also as a symbol of a corporate liturgical identity anchored in apostolic precedent. In its daily ritual reenactment of

---

782 The table-leg-like effect of applied colonnettes on block altars in general is also noted by Braun, *Altar*, vol. 1, 319.


the Last Supper at the high altar, the capitular community simultaneously performed the mass and rehearsed its collective clerical lineage as successors of Christ’s disciples.\textsuperscript{787}

The form of the high altar also appears to respond to a second medieval understanding of the mass, namely, as a bloodless reenactment of Christ’s death on the Cross. Like several Lower Rhenish block altars of the 1220s, the high altar is not only table-like but also strikingly tomb-like, with its form and articulation recalling those of contemporary tombs like that of Ezzo and Matilda at the Benedictine Abbey in nearby Brauweiler (ca. 1200; fig. 248).\textsuperscript{788} As with the table of the Last Supper, the association of the altar with Christ’s tomb, though without biblical authority, was developed by Western liturgists beginning with Amalarius; it had become firmly established in liturgical treatises by the early thirteenth century, together with the related understanding of the corporal as Christ’s shroud.\textsuperscript{789} Given the wide currency of these notions, the chapter’s selection of a tomb-like form for the high altar was likely motivated by these symbolic associations. The close formal assimilation of the high altar to a tomb points to Christ’s death and thus highlights visually the sacrificial component of the Eucharist as a

\textsuperscript{787} The apostolic heritage of the secular clergy was reinforced in other liturgical performances beyond the mass, including the ritual foot washing and collective capitular meal on Maundy Thursday, which was a literal and solemn reenactment of Christ’s washing of the disciples’ feet and the Last Supper. These rites are recorded for St. Kunibert in a detailed rubric in the processional of ca. 1300 (Darmstadt, ULB ms. 870, fols. 19r–22v), which doubtless reflects long-standing practices: “Tunc ministri sint parati mittentes aquam in pedium. Et decanus vel sacerdos succintus lintho et alii sacerdotes sive dyaconi alter alterius lavent pedes et ministri subsequentes lintheis pedes teragant. [. . .] Finitis antiphonis scolasticus absque jube dominus benedicere legat hanc lectionem sequentem. Et interim ministri ferant aquam ad lavandas manus et manutergia et mansalia. Et fiat cena in memoriam domini in pane et vino et fructibus.”

\textsuperscript{788} On the Brauweiler tomb, see Walter Bader, \textit{Die Benediktiner Abtei Brauweiler bei Köln. Untersuchungen zu ihrer Baugeschichte nach dem hinterlassenen Manuskript von Erika Huyssen} (Berlin: Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, 1937), 244.

perpetual reenactment of Christ’s sacrifice for humanity. The intrinsic and elementary association between the tomb-like form of the high altar and Christ’s symbolic death in the Eucharist on the altar was likely hardly lost on the small group of educated high clergy who commissioned the altar and made up its exclusive community of users.

This visual construction of the high altar as lordly table and tomb may indeed have possessed particular significance for clerical viewers on account of the Church’s emphasis on Eucharistic real presence at this time, as reflected in the appearance of the word Transubstantiation in the first of the seventy-nine canons issued by the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. Wide-reaching in its ramifications for Eucharistic devotion, Lateran IV shaped the Church’s approach to the structuring of sacred space and its attitudes towards the role of art and church furniture in the spiritual edification of both the laity and the clergy. Most visibly, the decrees of Lateran IV accelerated an already increasingly rigorous partitioning of clerical choirs from the nave through the erection of monumental choir enclosures to ensure Eucharistic inviolability—a strategy also found at St. Kunibert, where just such an enclosure was installed at this time. And inwardly, this concern with real presence also led to an intensified focus on the physical and material elaboration of altars and their accoutrements in the decades following

---

790 For a similar and sensitive reading of the extended sepulchral symbolism of the later high altar at Cologne Cathedral, see Holladay, “High Altar in Cologne Cathedral,” 492–498.
Lateran IV. It is in this context that one should understand the chapter’s use of the elaborate faux-marble shafts for the colonnettes that ring the high altar, which lend the altar its table-like and tomb-like appearance and whose sumptuous, precious material signals the altar’s importance as the site of the transformation of the Eucharistic elements into Christ’s actual body and blood. And it seems plausible that the very popularity in the 1220s of table- and tomb-like block altars at St. Kunibert and elsewhere reflects the official emphasis on Eucharistic real presence, though it would be facile to ascribe the invention of the form itself to Lateran IV given the prior existence of table-like and tomb-like altars. In the context of this contemporaneous concern with real presence, however, the form of the high altar as table and tomb may have been intended and understood by the chapter as a coherent visual statement not only on the Eucharist as meal and sacrifice, but on the very nature of the Eucharistic species themselves.

Beyond the sacrificial aspect of the mass, the altar in general also possessed a concrete sepulchral dimension in the ancient practice of burying relics in the altar during the consecration ceremony. Literally turning the altar into a tomb, this rite carried obvious sepulchral connotations, as the medieval designation sepulchrum for the vessel containing the relics implies. The notion that the sepulchre made the altar into a tomb of the saints was a logical one, and accordingly this trope occurred in the antiphon that was commonly sung during the altar consecration ceremony: “Corpora sanctorum in pace sepulta sunt.” Still extant, the

---

794 Gardner, “Altars, Altarpieces, and Art History.”
795 These marble-like shafts were donated by a layman named Constantine; the significance of this act is examined in full detail in Chapter 8 in the context of individual patronage.
796 Block altars of the 1210s and 1220s similar to the high altar at St. Kunibert are preserved at St. Kunibert itself (the two side altars in the east transept), as well as at Brauweiler and the conventual church in Gerresheim near Düsseldorf. For the latter altars, see Braun, Altar, vol. 1, Taf. 46 (Brauweiler) and 322 (Gerresheim).
797 On the origins and development of the practice in general, see the still fundamental overview in Braun, Altar, vol. 1, 525–646.
798 First attested in the eleventh century, the designation sepulchrum was also known to liturgists of the thirteenth century, including Sicard and Durandus; see Braun, Altar, vol. 1, 553.
799 Braun, Altar, vol. 1, 553.
sepulchre from the high altar at St. Kunibert (fig. 103) indicates that the canons were familiar with the practice itself and probably also with this general line of symbolic thought, which may have further contributed to their choice of a tomb-like form for the high altar. A small lead chest, the sepulchre bears an etched inscription along its front side that reads: Constantinus sacerdos huius ecclesie canonicus me fieri iussit + (“Constantine, priest canon of this church, had me made”). Constantine’s name occurs again in an explanatory note that was originally placed on top of the swaddled bundle of relics in the sepulchre. Expanding on the inscription on the chest, it reads: “I, Constantine, humble canon priest of this church, collected these relics in order that they may lead me to eternal rest at the end of time. Amen. And that they may guarantee me a pure life here on earth.” This Constantine is almost certainly identical with the dean and deacon Constantine who is attested at St. Kunibert between 1219 and 1222 and who had the apse roofed with lead.

800 The sepulchre was removed from the high altar in 1945; it is now displayed (closed) in the modern treasury in the west transept. The circumstances of the find are detailed extensively in OE, vol. 2, 80. The sepulchre’s contents are listed and described fully in OE, vol. 2, 79 cat. no. D 61, which forms the basis for the following discussion. The photograph of the opened sepulchre in fig. 103 dates from the mid-1980s and is taken from OE, vol. 2, 79 cat. no. D 61.

801 “Ego Constantinus humilis sacerdos huius ecclesie canonicus has reliquias congregavi ut in novissimo die me perducant ad eternam requiem. Amen. Et vitam puram in hoc seculo present.” The hand is clearly of the early thirteenth century; see OE, vol. 2, 83, as well as Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 139 n. 132.

802 In his discussion of the high altar sepulchre (OE, vol. 2, 80–83, at 81–83), Jörg-Holger Baumgarten suggests two potential scenarios, positing that the Constantine of the sepulchre may be either dean Constantine (1219–1222) or the canon Constantine von Aducht, who is attested at St. Kunibert from 1243–1293 and who was undoubtedly an ordained priest (he is labelled “presbiter” in the Memorienbuch; HASTK, Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 35a). Here, Baumgarten points to the use of the word sacerdos in the parchment note, suggesting that this term is irreconcilable with dean Constantine’s rank as a deacon. Baumgarten reasons that the high altar may have been consecrated only in 1247 upon the official, archiepiscopal consecration of the church, and that it was possibly the canon Constantine von Aducht who assembled the relics and had them interred in the high altar. The weight of the evidence, however, points to dean Constantine. In the early thirteenth century, deacons and subdeacons, though not fully ordained priests, were still considered a sacred, priestly order, their rank having been fixed by Innocent III (1198–1216); cf. the terse but clear formulation of Durandus on this point (Rationale divinorum officiorum, CCM 140, 153) : “Ordo enim subdyacoatus sacer hodie secundum Innocentium tertium reputatur.” In calling himself a sacerdos . . . canonicus, dean Constantine, as deacon, was probably pointing to his belonging among the ranks of those who possessed a holy order; the term can but does not necessarily have to mean “ordained priest” in the strict sense. It is also unlikely that the four side altars, which were consecrated in 1226/1227, would have been consecrated and the high altar left unconsecrated for twenty years, leaving the community with no place to celebrate the conventual
In addition to Constantine’s note, the altar sepulchre contains an early-thirteenth-century Spanish textile fragment with addorsed falcons between palm trees and the hoard of relics.\textsuperscript{804} The latter are distributed across three pockets within a folded white linen cloth, which itself also recalls a shroud. The outer two pockets hold relics of the Holy Virgins of Cologne, with each pocket provided with an authentication reading \textit{de corporibus sanctarum undecim milia virginum}. The central pocket houses over fifty different relics, each wrapped in a small bundle of linen or silk and identified with a parchment authentication. The hoard includes relics of the following saints: Adrian; Agnes; Alexander; Anastasius; Anthony; Aredius; Barbara; Brice; Chrysanthus and Daria; Clement; Cosmas and Damian; Cyriacus; Denis; Erasmus; Fabian; Felix; Faith; George; Gereon; James; John the Baptist; Justin; Just; Kunibert (stole fragment; fig. 104); Lambert; Lawrence; Leonard; Lucy; Matthew; the Holy \textit{Mauri} of Cologne;\textsuperscript{805} Maurice; Nereus and Achilles; Nicholas; Pancratius; Pantaleon; Patroclus; Peter and Paul; Protus and Hyacinth; Quentin; Salvator; Sebastian; Servatius; Severin; Stephen; Vitus; and Willehad. The central pocket also contains a vial of blood from the Holy Virgins of Cologne, a fragment of Mary’s tunic, a relic of the Holy Sepulchre, a fragment of Moses’s rod, and a small vessel filled with the ointment that the Three Maries carried to the Holy Sepulchre.

The role that dean Constantine envisioned for this assembly of relics within his own personal economy of salvation could not be clearer; as he says in the explanatory note, he collected them in order to purify himself in this life to facilitate his attainment of eternal rest at mass. The contents of the high altar sepulchre also point to the early and not the mid-thirteenth century. This is true of the parchment note, which is written in an early-thirteenth-century hand, as well as of numerous relics, which were taken from a hoard of relics acquired in 1222. The fragment of a Spanish textile that was found on top of the relics also dates to the early thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{804} The textile fragment was found placed over the relics, together with the note. On it, see \textit{OE}, vol. 2, 79 cat. no. D 61.\textsuperscript{805} A legion of Christian soldiers from ancient Mauritania executed in Cologne in the early fourth century, shortly after the martyrdom of St. Gereon and the Theban Legion.
the end of time (in novissimo die). Institutionally, however, the composition of the corpus of relics that dean Constantine had housed in the sepulchre is informative. Four of the relics—those of Anthony, Barbara, George, and Nicholas—were likely derived from the hoard of “relics from overseas” (i.e., the East) that deacon Theoderich of St. Kunibert had brought to the collegiate church in 1222 and that were quickly made a central feature of the new church’s visual environment. The relic of St. Kunibert’s stole (fig. 104) was obviously long a part of the church’s own relic holdings; possibly dating to the seventh century, it may in fact have belonged to Kunibert. The chapter likely already possessed the relic of the other institutional patron saint, Clement, the original dedicatee of the church. The relics of SS. Gereon and the Theban Legion, Maurice, Pantaleon, Severin, and the Holy Virgins were all major Cologne saints, with churches dedicated to each in the city. This corpus of Eastern and local Cologne relics amounts to about one third of the ensemble. Of the other relics, approximately one third belong to martyrs of the apostolic and early Christian Roman Church, and the final third consists of a conglomerate of biblical figures, brandea, and Merovingian saints. Thus, while seemingly ecumenical in scope, the collection of relics in the high altar sepulchre displays a marked emphasis on saints of the early Christian Church in general and that of Rome in particular, and on saints of the early Church of Cologne, to which Kunibert himself belonged. In fact, as Baumgarten has observed, the saints’ relics in the altar sepulchre correspond almost  

---

806 The full significance of Constantine’s personal patronage of the high altar sepulchre is examined in Chapter 8.  
807 See OE, vol. 2, 81. Deacon Theoderich’s obit records the presence of relics of all four of these saints when describing the hoard; see Appendix B, no. 6. The “relics from overseas” and their artistic elaboration in the frescoes and the body-part reliquaries are examined in detail in the following chapter.  
808 As the entry in OE, vol. 2, 79–80, suggests.  
809 As Baumgarten (OE, vol. 2, 80–81) notes, 23 of the saints’ relics in the altar sepulchre correspond to relics that are listed by Gelenius in his 1645 inventory of the church’s treasury, and thus the church may already have possessed many of the relics before 1222. Baumgarten also observes that all of the saints in the sepulchre save for Salvator occur in Cologne relic inventories of the tenth through thirteenth centuries, making it conceivable that Constantine collected the other relics within Cologne itself.
fully with the saints listed in the calendar that structures the *Memorienbuch* of 1239.\(^{810}\) This overlap suggests that Constantine’s relic collecting was not unselectively voracious, but rather tailored around the institution’s own specific devotional universe. It seems that dean Constantine and the chapter sought to sanctify the liturgical and institutional heart of the new church not simply with any relics or traditions, but primarily with the interwoven traditions of the universal early Roman Church and the early Church of Cologne. The altar sepulchre is marked by the same self-reflexive and self-validating concerns as the architectural fabric of the east end, with its citations of sites with roots in the early Christian and Merovingian local church, and by the general conception of the early Christian and specifically Roman origins of the Church of Cologne, the ROMANAE ECCLESIAE FIDELIS FILIA, as it is called on the first civic seal of Cologne (1114–19; fig. 24).\(^{811}\) In the high altar sepulchre, Constantine and the community embedded their own institutional narrative—Kunibert and Clement—within a sacred pedigree that telescoped through the ancient local ecclesiastical past to the universal Church: to Early Christian Rome and the Apostles.

The strategies of institutional self-sanctification in the high altar sepulchre should be understood as a consistent application of discursive constructs that the chapter had begun to elaborate in the late twelfth century with the creation of a new reliquary shrine for its patron Kunibert. According to early modern textual descriptions that describe the shrine’s location as being “on” or “at” the altar, Kunibert’s reliquary shrine (and that of the Hewalds, made earlier after their translation by Anno in 1074) was most likely displayed in the new sanctuary behind the high altar on a raised shrine pedestal that was likely similar to the extant contemporaneous

---

\(^{810}\) *OE*, vol. 2, 80–81. 37 of the 52 saints’ relics occur in the calendar, which is incomplete between January 1 and March 5. As Baumgarten suggests, seven other saints represented in the sepulchre likely would have been found in the missing portion of the book, bringing the total to 44. The saints who do not appear (or likely did not appear) in the calendar are: Anastasius, Christopher, Chrysanthus and Daria, Just, Leonard, Salvator, and Willehad.

\(^{811}\) On the seal, see *OE*, vol. 2, 57–58 cat. no. D 58.
one at St. Severin (ca. 1237; fig. 250). Though Kunibert’s reliquary shrine is preserved only in a dozen non-figural fragments (fig. 105), its general appearance, figural program, and tituli are documented in a detailed description composed in 1715 by Adolf Bingen, dean of St. Kunibert from 1699–1721. Still contained in the silver reliquary made under archbishop Hermann I (899–924), Kunibert’s relics were translated into a new, larger reliquary shrine in 1168, four years after the arrival of the relics of the Magi in Cologne and no doubt with that event still fresh on the chapter’s mind. The close formal ties between the extant fragments from Kunibert’s shrine and the Shrine of the Three Magi (begun ca. 1181) suggest that Kunibert’s relics were first placed in a wooden chest that was decorated in the 1180s by the workshop of Nicholas of Verdun once the chapter had secured enough funding. Bingen records that the shrine was approximately seven feet long and a foot-and-a-half wide and thus likely similar in form to the Anno shrine in Siegburg (fig. 251). The two long sides of Kunibert’s shrine displayed fourteen seated figures, seven on each side, with central figures of Mary and Dagobert among eleven Apostles and John the Baptist. Ten Christological scenes in enamel roundels decorated the pitched roof, five per side. The two small ends displayed

812 The relevant textual accounts bearing on Kunibert’s shrine are gathered in Appendix C; on the location of Kunibert’s shrine at the high altar, see nos. 1 and 2. Though these texts about Kunibert’s shrine do not explicitly locate the Hewalds’ shrine at the high altar with Kunibert’s, there is little reason to doubt its location there, for Gelenius (De admiranda magnitudine, 288), writing in 1645, indicates that the shrines were positioned together at the altar. Otherwise well preserved, the sanctuary pavement displays extensive damage in the area immediately behind the high altar, which is also consistent with the removal of a shrine pedestal such as that at St. Severin. As with the shrine pedestal at St. Severin, the reliquary shrines of St. Kunibert and the Hewalds, both in metalwork, were likely secured inside compartments with grills.


814 The event was recorded in a charter that survived in the parish archive until its destruction in World War II; see Schäfer, “Bestände des Pfarrarchivs,” 126. Bingen, who clearly had access to the charter (see Appendix C, no. 3), cites it in full. The relevant passage reads: “anno ab incarnatione Domini MC sexagesimo octavo . . . translatum est venerabile corpus sanctissimi patris nostri et confessoris Christi Cuniberti archiepiscopi coloniensis et in sua theca repositum . . . .”

815 Sammlungen des Baron von Hüpsch, no. 25.
816 Sammlungen des Baron von Hüpsch, no. 25.
identical subject matter. One of the small ends, contemporary with the sides, showed the central figure of Christ in judgement flanked by the interceding figures of Kunibert and Clement. This representation was labelled with a titulus, still extant, that reads: + PAX URBE PATRIAEQE SALVS PRECESTAT PATRIS HUIUS + NEC MINOR EST CLEMENS DIVINO PNEUMATE POLLENS.\textsuperscript{817} Bingen records that the other small end showed “the same patrons, but of more recent constitution or in more solid work,” and without tituli.\textsuperscript{818} This small end of the shrine was adorned with a variety of precious stones, among which Bingen says was a large agate believed to have been given to Kunibert by either Dagobert or Sigibert III, to whom St. Kunibert served as advisor. If not already on the reliquary shrine in the 1180s, this gemstone was at least in the church’s possession, for the titulus above Dagobert on the earlier long side seemingly made reference to it: PLVRIMA DONA PIVS CVNIBERTO DAT DAGOBERTVS.\textsuperscript{819}

Thus, on the earlier reliquary shrine that was installed behind the new high altar, as in the sepulchre that was placed in it, the chapter set its patrons Kunibert and Clement into a framework that was at once historically specific and universalizing. Through the inclusion on the reliquary shrine of Dagobert, his titulus, and possibly the gemstone, the chapter tethered its patron Kunibert to the most exalted monarch of the Merovingian era. Whether historically factual or not, Kunibert’s foundation of the church of St. Clement and even the religious community itself was given a visual historical pedigree in the early ages of the Church of Cologne. The foundation of the institution was validated not only by the sanctity of Kunibert

\textsuperscript{817} Sammlungen des Baron von Hüpsch, no. 27. The titulus translates (slightly modified after the German translation by Anton Ditges, “Der Schrein des hl. Kunibert in Köln,” in Pfarre und Kirche, 92): “May the saint [i.e., Kunibert] guard the Church, peace, and the fortunes of the land; no lesser is Clement, exuding divine strength.”

\textsuperscript{818} Appendix C, no. 3. Unfortunately, it is now impossible to determine when this end of the reliquary shrine was decorated.

\textsuperscript{819} As recorded by Bingen (HASTK, Geist. Abt. 145, fol. 5). The titulus translates as “Pious Dagobert gave Kunibert many gifts.”
but also by the regal authority of Dagobert, who bestowed gifts upon Kunibert, who in turn gave them to the community. At the same time, the patrons Kunibert and Clement were inserted on the shrine into a larger narrative of Church mission and salvation beginning with the Baptist, Mary, and Christ (all represented by relics in the altar sepulchre), running through the Apostles (Peter and Paul also in the altar sepulchre), and culminating in the Last Judgement, where Kunibert and Clement, apostolic successors, intercede for the community. Both the altar sepulchre and the shrine program tap into what appears to have been a tight, consistent institutional imaginary about the church’s place within the local and universal Church formulated from circa 1180–1220. It is surely not coincidental that this period of intensified, self-reflexive institutional image-shaping coincides with the decades in which the cathedral chapter began to make significant inroads into the priores’ traditional sphere of power.

Indeed, though Kunibert’s metalwork reliquary shrine was not made with the rest of the ensemble, the chapter made it a key ideological component of its program for the new sanctuary. Like the relics in the altar sepulchre, the installation of the saintly founder’s shrine on a pedestal behind the high altar sanctified both the community’s liturgical celebrations and its very institutional existence. It was in the older shrines at the new high altar that the chapter’s collective institutional memory and claims to an unbroken chain of history reaching back to Kunibert himself were concentrated. Not only Kunibert’s remains, but also those of the Hewalds had a lengthy and hallowed history of discovery and translation that encompassed their initial deposition in the church by the Merovingian princeps Pepin circa 700 and culminated in their translation into a reliquary shrine by Anno, who had himself been canonized but a few

---

820 This conception already seems to be implicit in the forged Bertolf charter, purportedly of the late ninth century but probably a forgery of the early twelfth, which styles one of the church’s properties as a gift from Dagobert to Kunibert. See Chapter 1.
decades before, in 1183 (fig. 251). Already fixed in a forged charter of the early twelfth century, the translation of the Hewalds’ relics by Saint Anno was also recorded by the community in the *Memorienbuch* of 1239 for recitation on the anniversary of the occasion, as was Kunibert’s first translation under Hermann. There is also an indication in the *Memorienbuch* on the feast of the Hewalds that the community produced a new *historia* about the Hewalds in the 1230s or 1240s, but this work unfortunately does not survive. Both devotional objects and political capital, the older reliquary shrines from the predecessor church in effect consecrated the new east end, legitimizing the institution’s elite status, power, and privileges in the present ecclesiastical order by rooting them in an historical arc that ran back to the seventh century.

The liturgical and ideological core of the high altar-shrine ensemble is surrounded and framed by an *opus sectile* pavement that covers the entire sanctuary (figs. 101 and 106). With its various compartments arranged around the high altar as centre point, the pavement displays two sharply contrasting zones. A group of five richly patterned fields is clustered around the

---

821 Anno’s translation of the Hewalds is recorded in the so-called Anno charter; see Chapter 1. The record in the *Memorienbuch* reads (HASiK, Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 25a): “II idus Septembris. Obiit Ado prepositus ecclesie . . . huius suggestione sanctus Anno noster archiepiscopus . . . transtulit sanctos Ewaldos martires.” The first translation of Kunibert’s relics is noted in the *Memorienbuch*’s calendar on fol. 24b: “Translatio sancti Kuniberti.”


823 Apart from damage behind the altar and in the northernmost reaches of the walkway, the sanctuary pavement is very well preserved. Published by Ewald (*KDM* 6/4, fig. 139), the schematic, bird’s-eye rendering of the pavement in my fig. 106 diverges from the actual state by showing the majority of the walkway as unpaved. This area of the walkway, however, is paved and displays the same pattern of stripes and checkboard found in the southernmost reaches as shown in the rendering.

824 On the high altar as the basis for the general division of the pavement’s fields, see Kier, *Schmuckfußboden*, 53, 117, as well as eadem in *OE*, vol. 2, 270 cat. no. E 57. The high altar’s role as the physical centre point of the pavement (cf. fig. 106) is now less salient on account of the decision, made by the postwar restorers, to move the altar 1.5 meters to the west (cf. fig. 101). This decision appears to have been based fully on Ewald’s (*KDM* 6/4, 277) contention that the high altar was moved 1.5 m to the east around 1730. Ewald based this supposition on a note, recorded in a now lost source originally in the parish archive, that stated that the high altar “shall be made new in every respect and shall be moved two or three feet eastwards from its present position towards the canons’ choir” (“altare maius . . . fiet novum omnino atque ad pedes duos vel tres dimovetur a loco moderno versus chorum . . .”).
altar; the peripheral areas of the sanctuary and the walkway feature fields with a simple pattern of alternating bands of gray trachyte and black limestone. Partitioning bands of yellowish-brown calc-sinter and gray trachyte separate the different fields. A checkerboard pattern occurs in the intercolumnations.

The group of richly patterned fields around the high altar is structured according to a principle of symmetry in asymmetry: symmetrically disposed, these fields vary in the complexity of their patterns and in their coloristic and material composition. The large central field in front of the altar (fig. 102) features the most complex pattern. It consists of bands of rotated squares containing circles and groups of four squares. The rotated squares and circles are composed of a combination of white and black marble, trachyte, and black limestone; the smaller squares inside the rotated squares of white marble consist of black marble and limestone. The outer edges of the pavement vary the pattern slightly; here, triangles of black limestone line the two long sides of the field, and triangles of white marble with a square and two triangles of black marble the two short sides. The two vertically-oriented fields flanking the central field (fig. 106) display the same orientation and dimensions, but have different patterns and materials. The left-hand field contains a simple saw-tooth pattern in black limestone and trachyte; the right-hand field shows a complex pattern based on the rotated square, which is broken down into trapezoidal and triangular facets of black and yellow marble, black limestone,
and trachyte. Originally aligned with the sides of the altar (fig. 106), the two small square fields (fig. 107) feature an identical pattern consisting of a grid of nine squares, with each square containing a central square inside a larger rotated square; the whole is bordered by a saw-tooth pattern. Composed of the same repertoire of materials (black, white, and yellow marble; black limestone; trachyte), they are mirror images of one another, with the materials used in the one field replaced by the chromatic opposite in the other. The pavement also originally extended onto the narrow landing of the sanctuary stair (fig. 106).  It was decorated with a lattice of rotated squares in black limestone punctuated by limestone circles and half-circles on a lighter trachyte ground.

The disposition of the patterns and materials in the sanctuary pavement establishes a clear conceptual hierarchy that provides a meaningful commentary on the cultic and political significance of the high altar-shrine ensemble. The use of both ornament and material is “iconophoric,” to borrow Oleg Grabar’s formulation. On a basic level, the concentration of the diversely and richly patterned fields around the high altar and the contrast with the simply patterned peripheral areas of the rest of the sanctuary visually signals the high altar as the Holiest of Holies. Likewise, the use of a complex pattern on the sanctuary stair, which contrasts noticeably with the use of simpler patterns in the other peripheral areas, seems deliberately to call attention to its liminal status as the threshold to the sacred space of the sanctuary. This hierarchy of ornament is mirrored and reinforced by a hierarchy in the

---

825 This portion of the pavement, which is documented at the threshold of the sanctuary in all prewar graphic renderings, was reset in its present location between the western crossing piers during the postwar restoration of the church. See, further, Kier, *Schmuckfußboden*, 117.
827 The clustering of the more complex patterns around the high altar is noted by Ewald, *KDM* 6/4, 263, and Kier, *Schmuckfußboden*, 117.
828 Unfortunately, the original effect can no longer be judged fully on account of the loss of the original pavement in the east transept.
preciosity and luminosity of the materials used to compose the fields. Thus, the peripheral zones are executed in the more mundane and matte materials of trachyte and limestone, whereas the richly patterned fields next to the altar feature extensive use of glistening, polychrome marble in white, black, and yellow.

Among the group of richly patterned fields around the high altar, the large field in front of the altar and the two square fields beside it stand out by the complexity of their ornament, the high concentration of marble, and their location contiguous to the sides of the altar (fig. 106). The visual and material emphasis on these three fields suggests that they may have possessed a special significance within the overall conception of the pavement. In this regard, it is likely not accidental that the location of these three fields corresponds to the positions that the celebrant and the assisting deacon and subdeacon would have taken up at different moments during the conventual mass. The large field before the altar, which is by far the most elaborate in pattern and displays the densest use of marble, would have been occupied by the celebrant. As was customary in the West since circa 1000, he celebrated the mass with his back to assembled capitular community, and would have approached the high altar from the front during the *introitus*, passing over this field.829 It was likely also on this field that the celebrant genuflected before mounting the altar stair to celebrate, as a rubric in the processional of circa 1300 suggests.830 Identical in pattern but exactly opposite in colour, the two square fields flanking the altar’s short sides correspond to the positions from which the deacon and subdeacon traditionally read the Gospel and Epistle lections.831 Several rubrics in the processional of circa

---

830 Darmstadt ULB, ms. 870, fol. 29r: “Deinde expanso carpali in altari [sacerdos] superponat corpus Domini et calicem cum vino . . . . Et retrocedens inclinet se ante altare nichil dicens. Post hec erectus accedat ad altare cum summa devocione et cantet submissa voce Oremus . . . .”
831 See *RDK*, vol. 5, cols. 869–872, s. v. “Epistel- und Evangelienseite.”
1300 confirm that the deacon read the Gospel and intoned antiphons while standing “beside the altar” (*iuxta altare, in latere altaris*), and thus likely directly on these fields.\(^{832}\) It may be this function that accounts for the use of mirror-image panels for these two fields, with the differently coloured fields denoting the positions for the deacon and sub-deacon. As with Cosmatesque pavements, the ornamented fields in the sanctuary pavement at St. Kunibert appear to have been disposed not only as a meaningful visual frame for the altar generally, but also as a “liturgical map” with nodal points for the three officiants of the community’s conventual mass.\(^{833}\)

To this point, scholars have generally discussed the sanctuary pavement as a new creation of the 1220s.\(^{834}\) While the large fields of trachyte and black limestone in the peripheral zones and the calc-sinter partitioning bands were likely composed using new materials acquired from the local quarries, it is important to note that the marble plaques in the richly patterned fields around the altar, and in the three “liturgical fields” in particular, are spoliated, ultimately deriving from local Roman pavements.\(^{835}\) Already scarce in the city by the eleventh century, marble had become exceedingly rare in Cologne pavements by the early thirteenth, having been replaced by the ubiquitous clay tile during the twelfth century.\(^{836}\) As comparison of the pattern

---

\(^{832}\) Darmstadt, ULB ms. 870, fol. 32r (on Holy Saturday): “quod [i.e., the Gospel] iuxta altare sine benedictione presbiteri celebrantis legetur per dyacono et sine thurificatione;” and, on fol. 18r (on Maundy Thursday): “postea [i.e., after the communion of priest and chapter] stet dyaconus in sinistro latere altaris cum calice et incipiat . . . antiphonam . . . .”


\(^{835}\) On the spoliation of marble from Roman pavements in the North in general, see Kier, *Schmuckfußboden*, 11.

and materials in the two square fields (fig. 107) with a dislodged altar stair from St. Maria im Kapitol (ca. 1050; fig. 288) suggests, these two fields and probably the large field before the high altar were most likely taken directly from the Ottonian predecessor church, perhaps even from its sanctuary, and reset in whole or in part in the new sanctuary. Like the Ottonian field from St. Maria im Kapitol (erected on the site of the Roman Capitolium), the Ottonian pavement in the predecessor church at St. Kunibert, in turn, no doubt was composed of spoliated plaques from local Roman opus sectile pavements, as indicated by the central panel of a Roman pavement found in the vicinity of St. Maria im Kapitol (fig. 252).

On the one hand, the resetting of panels and materials from the pavement of the predecessor church likely entailed practical, liturgical, and aesthetic considerations. The reuse of material saved money; the lavishness of the marble befit the sanctity of the altar and of the liturgical action concentrated around it; and the canons probably regarded the chromatic and ornamental varietas engendered by the interplay of the different fields as aesthetically pleasing. Medieval commentators routinely singled out the latter quality of opus sectile pavements for praise, and it seems likely that the chapter was equally captivated by the pavement’s formal diversity and sheen.

On the other hand, the seeming deliberateness of the resetting of materials and possibly whole pavement fields from the predecessor church around the institutional heart of the new

---


838 On this pavement, see Kier, Schmuckfußboden, 16 and Abb. 269.

high altar-shrine ensemble suggests that this was a gesture that likely went beyond reuse for financial and aesthetic reasons. The pavement panels from the old church were “art with history,” a history that was both institution-specific and universalizing. For the first-generation canons familiar with the predecessor church, the resetting of the old pavement in the new sanctuary probably served as a powerful sign of continuity, functioning, like the shrines, as a material locus of collective institutional memory positioned at the core of the community’s new church. And for high clerical viewers versed in the local knowledge of the early Christian, Roman origins of the Church of Cologne (fig. 24), the marble opus sectile pavement most likely also carried broader connotations of antiquitas and romanitas (cf. fig. 252). The historicizing reuse of the old marble pavement at the heart of the new church accords fully with the institution’s visual and material imaginary as manifested in the altar sepulchre, Kunibert’s shrine, and the surrounding architectural fabric, all of which position Kunibert and the institution he founded under Clement’s name in relation to the early Church of Cologne and, through it, to the universal Roman Church.

When read as an artistic ensemble and a visual-material discourse, the lower strata of the core sanctuary ensemble display tightly interwoven threads of liturgical, material, and historical meaning. The grouping of the high altar, shrines, and opus sectile pavement must be understood as produced by and for the capitular community with its corporate liturgical and institutional knowledge. The dual themes of collective liturgical devotion and institutional memory are its central topoi.

---

2. Root of Redemption: The Tree of Jesse Window

The second visual focal point of the sanctuary is the assembly of three monumental narrative stained glass windows grouped in the clerestory above the high altar-shrine ensemble (fig. 35). In accordance with long-standing tradition, a Tree of Jesse window occupies the axial opening (figs. 108 and 109). It is flanked by windows dedicated to the two primary institutional patron saints, with a window with scenes from St. Clement’s life to the left (fig. 116) and one with scenes from St. Kunibert’s life (fig. 122) to the right. Conceivably, windows with scenes from the lives of the two Hewalds could have been placed in the final two openings, completing the chain of windows dedicated to the church’s patron saints. The chapter’s program for the clerestory glazing thus appears not only to have responded to general tradition with the use of an axial Tree of Jesse, but also to have been site-specific, with the subject matter

841 No record survives of how the outer two windows of the apse clerestory were glazed. Despite successive restorations and minor additions, the stained glass windows at St. Kunibert are all generally well preserved. In the case of the clerestory windows, we possess detailed watercolours made by Michael Welter (printed in Oidtmann, *Glasmalereien*, vol. 1, Abb. 89 and KDM 6/4, Taf. XXII; cf. fig. 110) that record the state of each window before the first restoration of the glass in 1839–1840. They provide a solid base for appraising the few later changes in details that have been made to the glass since the first restoration. The restorations to the Tree of Jesse and other windows before 1945 (in 1839–1840 and in 1917–1919) are documented extensively by Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster” (see her Catalogue, 157–174), who was able to examine the glass upon its removal for safe-keeping during World War II. The prewar state of the glass is also documented in clear visual detail in an extensive series of photographs in the Rheinisches Bildarchiv, Cologne (hereafter RBA). The most recent restoration of the windows was in the late 1950s; this is the state that confronts viewers today (see the report on this restoration in Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 157). The St. Kunibert glass has yet to be documented according to the rigorous standards of the Corpus Vitrearum and plans for comprehensive photographic and textual documentation are not yet foreseen. (My thanks are due here to Dr. Uwe Gast of the German Committee of the Corpus Vitrearum, Freiburg im Breisgau, for discussing the current state of the Committee’s efforts in Cologne with me.) Here, reference to restorations and additions to the windows will be made only as they bear on the arguments and on the combined basis of my on-site examination, Scheuffelen’s catalogue, the prewar photographs, and Welter’s watercolours.

842 This tradition, which ultimately goes back to the position of the Tree of Jesse window in the axial chapel at Suger’s St.-Denis, was established in the Empire early in the second half of the twelfth century and tenaciously maintained there for nearly a century, occurring in nearly every extant or documented choir glazing program before 1250. Extant or documented examples include: the Premonstratensian abbey in Arnstein an der Lahn (ca. 1160); St. Patrokli, Soest (ca. 1160), Minster of Our Lady, Freiburg (before 1218); St. Kunibert (early 1220s); Regensburg Cathedral (ca. 1230); the parish church in Legden (ca. 1230); St. Mary’s, Gelnhausen (ca. 1230–1240); the Barfüßerkirche in Erfurt (ca. 1235); St. Maternianus, Büchen an der Weser (ca. 1250); and Merseburg Cathedral (ca. 1250). See the survey of glazing programs in the Empire in this period in Rüdiger Beckmann, “Raum, Licht und Farbe. Überlegungen zur Glasmalerei in staufischer Zeit,” in *Stauffer*, vol. 5, 107–130.

843 There is no way of knowing if this was the case, however.
and disposition of the narrative windows carefully calibrated around the high altar-shrine ensemble below. The subjects of the clerestory windows mirror the dedication of the high altar, with its dedicatees Christ, Kunibert, and Clement, effectively announcing the high altar’s dedication on a monumental scale. And the disposition of the clerestory windows, with Christ in the Tree of Jesse flanked by Clement and Kunibert, also may have been guided by the visual and conceptual precedent set by Kunibert’s reliquary shrine, which showed Christ flanked by the two patrons as intercessors. Though they form a coherent semantic unit unto themselves, the clerestory windows were also bound spatially, visually, and conceptually into a larger monumental, performative, and imaginative complex.

With its axial position, the Jesse window forms the conceptual fulcrum of the clerestory program and thus commends itself as the logical point of departure for analysis of the clerestory windows (fig. 108). Though customarily labelled a “Tree of Jesse,” the window at St. Kunibert is the earliest extant example of a group of German Jesse windows from circa 1220–1250 that modify the customary iconography by showing Jesse’s Tree as filled not with Christ’s ancestors but with events from Christ’s life. The origins of this particular conception of the Tree of Jesse, which is also encountered in contemporary German manuscript illumination, are unclear and now likely unrecoverable on account of the decimated monumental record. Though they

---

844 The connection between the clerestory glass and the dedication of the high altar was first noted by Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 7.
845 Related windows survive, in whole or in part, at Regensburg Cathedral (ca. 1230), St. Mary’s in Gelnhausen (ca. 1230–1240), the Barfüsserkirche in Erfurt (ca. 1235), and Merseburg Cathedral (ca. 1250). On the origins and development of the iconography of the Tree of Jesse up to ca. 1200, see Arthur Watson, The Early Iconography of Tree of Jesse (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934).
846 See, on the question of origins, Rüdiger Becksmann, “Das Jesse-Fenster aus dem spätromanischen Chor des Freiburger Münsters. Ein Beitrag zur Kunst um 1200,” Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft 23 (1969): 30–32, who speculates that the fragmentary Freiburg Jesse window, which likely dates to the early 1210s, may represent an intermediary stage between the traditional iconography, which it still shows, and the modified iconography as represented by the St. Kunibert and other, later Jesse windows. The monumental evidence, however, is simply too thin to move this supposition beyond the realm of speculation and the origins of the later type still remain fundamentally unclear. For examples of the type in Lower Saxon manuscripts of the 1230s and
share the basic trait of replacing Christ’s ancestors with Christological scenes, the surviving examples of this type of Jesse window diverge markedly in the number and selection of the Christological scenes, the presence or absence and selection of the prophets, and the addition of other, subsidiary iconographical elements. Rather than seeking origins or elucidating parallel features found in the other windows of this type, this discussion will take the St. Kunibert Jesse window squarely on its own terms in order to understand the particular message that it constructs. Though it draws on a wide range of pictorial and textual sources for the scenes, figures, and tituli, the Jesse window cannot be explained through any single visual or written source. Some of the window’s visual and textual sources have been identified; others have not. The aim here, then, will be to examine how the window carefully builds up towards a cumulative message panel by panel, from the bottom to the top. This close reading of the window’s formal and narrative structure and content will then provide a bridge for assessing the overarching issues of its viewing contexts and functions within the chapter’s sanctuary program.

Visually dense at first glance, the Jesse window displays a clear structure that carefully guides the viewer’s visual and cognitive progress through the window from its base to its apex. Like other German windows of this period, it features a basic grid of intersecting iron armatures that form a central field with five compartments surrounded by a substantial floral border. The narrative medallions are confined to the central fields. Connected by the twisting stalk of the Tree and set on a red ground, they unfold vertically. The central narrative zone is surrounded by a second zone that contains prophets, angels, and other figures. Set on a blue

1240s, see Johannes Sommer, *Das Deckenbild der Michaeliskirche zu Hildesheim* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1966), figs. 31 and 40.

847 The fundamental discussion of the Jesse window is still that of Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 78–100.

848 On the persistence of traditional armatures in the Empire, which stands in such marked contrast to the development of complex geometrical armatures in contemporary French Gothic windows, see Becksmann, “Raum,” 121.
ground, this second zone operates on a horizontal axis, with the figures set in relation to the medallions that they flank. The window’s visual structure is one frequently encountered in typological art, and in typological stained glass in particular, in which a central narrative axis is set within a horizontally-disposed exegetical apparatus of prophecy, parallel, and commentary. \(^{849}\) The window’s structure is transparent and directly signals to the viewer how he or she is to construe the content.

The window begins in the lowest central panel with the traditional representation of the recumbent Jesse with a green stalk issuing from his loins. \(^{850}\) As in all other representations of the theme, the image of Jesse is a literal visualization of the prophecy in Isaiah 11:1–2: “And there shall come forth a rod (\textit{virga}) out of the root of Jesse, and a flower shall rise up out of his root. And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him.” \(^{851}\) Placed like footnotes in the exegetical border to either side of Jesse are personifications of the four Rivers of Paradise; labelled (left to right) IHEON, NIGRIS (Euphrates), TIGRIS, and FISON, they appear as half-clad, seated male figures with water jugs. \(^{852}\) The addition of the Rivers of Paradise at the base of the window conflates the Tree of Jesse with the Tree of Life of Paradise in Genesis 2:9 and 3:4, which is

---

\(^{849}\) On these visual structures in typological art in general and stained glass in particular, see Wolfgang Kemp, \textit{The Narratives of Gothic Stained Glass}, trans. Caroline Dobson Saltzwedel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), chapter 4, esp. 64–77. As Kemp puts it in reference to the typological windows at Canterbury Cathedral: “[t]he horizontal dimension is now defined as the dimension of biblical accord and theological argument . . . the vertical axis serves the narrative.” Though it does not make use of complex armatures, the Jesse window does make use of these same sophisticated systems of visual organization and thought.

\(^{850}\) The Jesse figure is entirely modern, save for the green stalk and a portion of the blue mantle, but accords generally with the original figure as recorded by Welter (fig. 110) and with the standard Jesse iconography; see Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 166.

\(^{851}\) “Et egredietur virga de radice Iesse et flos de radice eius ascendet. Et requiescet super eum spiritus Domini . . .”

\(^{852}\) The names NIGRIS and TIGRIS are modern replacements, as is the figure of Phison. The name NIGRIS is obviously an error; it should read Euphrates, in accordance with Genesis 2:14. See Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 80 and 166. For the general development of the iconography of the Rivers of Paradise, see Ernst Schlee, \textit{Die Ikonographie der Paradiesesflüsse} (Leipzig: Dietrich, 1937).
watered by the four Rivers. Thus, in the opening panels, Jesse’s Tree is immediately
signalled as belonging within a larger temporal and eschatological framework encompassing
God’s creation and humanity’s loss of grace. Temporally, the ultimate origin of the Tree of
Jesse is shown as reaching back beyond Jesse himself to Paradise and the initial moment of
creation. A contemporary parallel for this idea occurs in the painted ceiling at St. Michael’s in
Hildesheim (ca. 1225–1250; figs. 253 and 254), which explicitly juxtaposes Jesse’s Tree with
the Trees of Life and Knowledge. In the ceiling, Adam and Eve eat from Tree of Knowledge,
losing divine grace and engendering the need for redemption. The Tree of Life appears to the
left; inhabited by a bust of the blessing Christ, it stands as a precursor of the Tree of Jesse in the
field above. The Four Rivers of Paradise appear in the frame around the scene. In highly
compressed form, the initial panels of the window intimate these same core ideas: Jesse’s Tree
is part of a longer continuum of salvation history that begins in Paradise with humanity’s fall;
and the Tree of Jesse is not only Christ’s genealogical root, but is also identical with the Tree of
Life of Paradise, in which Christ himself resides.

The following central panel with the Annunciation (fig. 110) builds directly on the
notional base of the initial panels. Rather than presenting the genealogy of salvation in the
form of one of Christ’s ancestors as in conventional Jesse Trees (fig. 253), the Annunciation
medallion opens a series of five narrative medallions that visualize the unfolding of salvation

---

854 On the conflation of these ideas at Hildesheim, see Sommer, *Deckenbild*, 71–76. The same conflation of the Tree of Life and Tree of Jesse also occurs in the Tree of Jesse window at Legden, which is usually dated ca. 1230; on it, see Paul Pieper, “Das Fenster von Legden,” *Westfalen* 29 (1951): 172–189.
855 Sommer, *Deckenbild*, 74.
856 The entire central Annunciation panel was replaced in the restoration of 1917–1919, but its original appearance is corroborated by Welter’s watercolour (my fig. 110) and Boisserée’s lithograph (*Denkmale*, unpaginated), of which Welter’s image is the more reliable. See, further, Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 166. Apart from the central medallion with the representation of the Annunciation, the iconography of the replacement panel, which is still in the window, diverges completely from the original as recorded by Welter and Boisserée.
itself in Christ. Though it departs from the traditional Jesse iconography, this move to narrative Christological scenes is a logical development of the premise of the Tree of Jesse as it is articulated in the panels below. In depicting not the genealogy but the actual history of salvation through Christ, the narrative medallions meaningfully extend the idea of the Tree of Jesse as part of the full narrative of the fall and redemption and as the Tree of Life inhabited by Christ. The scene of the Annunciation visualizes the initial moment of God’s new plan for human salvation, made necessary by the implicit fall below.

In the medallion, Gabriel strides in from the right, announcing to the Virgin that she will conceive. His words are given visual form in the tituli on the banderoles held by the two angels that flank the central medallion: AVE MARIA (left) and GRATIA PLENA (right). Taken as a whole, the complex of Annunciation panels emphasizes both the incarnational and genealogical aspects of the event. The titulus of the prophet Habakuk in the outer right compartment of the exegetical border thematizes the incarnational dimension: DEVS AB AVSTRO VENIET (Habakuk 3:3: “God will come from the south”). It may be this idea that accounts for the unusual location of Gabriel, God’s messenger, on the right—that is, south—side of the Annunciation scene. Positioned in the outer left border, Isaiah’s titulus is derived directly from his prophecy (Isaiah 11:1): [EGREDIE]TVR VIRGA DE RADICE IESSE (“there

---

857 The angelic approach from the right is recorded by both Welter (fig. 110) and Boisserée.
858 Welter’s watercolour (fig. 110) gives the titulus of the left-hand angel as SALVE MARIA rather than the customary AVE MARIA, but this is most likely a misreading on Welter’s part.
859 The figure of Habakuk and his titulus are replacements of the 1917–1919 restoration, but both are recorded by Welter (fig. 110) and Boisserée and should thus be regarded as reflecting the original. The prophets in the outer exegetical border were inexplicably replaced incorrectly during the restoration of 1959–1964; this jumbled arrangement is the one that confronts viewers today (fig. 108). The original disposition of the outer prophets, recorded by Welter and Boisserée and in all prewar photographs and textual descriptions, is that in fig. 109, which should thus be consulted alongside fig. 108 for the correct order of the prophets in relation to the central scenes.
860 Most often, Gabriel appears at the left. On this uncommon form of Annunciation in general, see Don Denny, The Annunciation from the Right from Early Christian Times to the Sixteenth Century (New York: Garland, 1977).
shall come forth a rod out of the root of Jesse”\(^{861}\). As elsewhere, the designer’s choice of this *titulus* was no doubt tied in the first instance to the theme of the window.\(^{862}\) The juxtaposition of Isaiah with the scene of the Annunciation to Mary, however, also underscores Christ’s Marian ancestry through the word play of the VIRGA in the *titulus* and the *virgo* Mary in the medallion, who is positioned directly above Jesse, as if issuing from him as she often does in traditional Jesse Trees (cf. fig. 255). Pointing energetically downwards to Jesse while looking over to Mary and Gabriel, Isaiah’s pose and gaze reinforce the connection between Jesse, his *virga*, and the *virgo* who was of his lineage.

The following panels devoted to the Nativity (fig. 111) take up and elaborate these two central themes of the immaculate Incarnation of Christ through Mary and the arrival of Christ, the New Covenant, on earth. The seminal moment of the physical arrival of Christ receives particular emphasis in the deployment around the Nativity medallion of an extended exegetical apparatus that encompasses both the exegetical border outside the central frame and all the available space within the frame. The lower half of the medallion is dominated by the imposing figure of the recumbent Virgin, who tenderly caresses her infant son with both hands. Swaddled on an altar-like manger that simultaneously intimates his future sacrifice, the Christ Child is the physical and conceptual centre of the medallion. The Logos Incarnate, he is shown as both uniting and superseding all previous traditions, here represented by the ox and the ass behind the

\(^{861}\) Reading O V, the beginning of Isaiah’s *titulus* is an extraneous addition from one of the restorations; the rest of the *titulus* beginning with TVR is original. See Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 167.

\(^{862}\) As, for instance, at Hildesheim, where Isaiah appears next to Jesse with a banderole that reads *EGREDIETVR*; cf. fig. 253.
manger, traditional representatives of the Jews and Gentiles, and the figure of Joseph at its foot, whose pointed hat also draws attention to Christ’s Jewish ancestry.\footnote{On the ox and the ass, see LCI, vol. 4, col. 339, s. v. “Ochse und Esel.” On Joseph’s pointed hat as a sign of Christ’s Jewish ancestry, see Bernhard Blumenkranz, Juden und Judentum in der Mittelalterlichen Kunst (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1965), 64–68.}

Four half-length figures encircle the medallion in the reserved corners within the frame; carefully chosen, they supplement the main themes in the medallion. Above the medallion, two angels hold banderoles with tituli that read GLORIA IN E[X]CE[LSIS] DEO (left) and ET I[N] TER[R]A PAX OM[N]IB[US] (right). The angels’ tituli are derived from the Gloria of the mass, which is in turn based on the biblical account of the Angel’s Annunciation to the Shepherds in Luke 2:13–14; this explains their placement around the Nativity.\footnote{The Gloria text is: “Gloria in excelsis Deo et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis.” The titulus in the window reads omnibus rather than hominibus, but the source is still clearly the Gloria. Cf. Luke 2:13–14, “Et subito facta est cum angelo multitudo militiae caelestis laudantium Deum et dicentium Gloria in altissimus Deo et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis.” Boisserée (Denkmale, 40 n. 113) makes the connection between these tituli and the Gloria of the mass.}

The angels therefore add further precision to the central idea of the jubilant arrival of Christ with their exultant praise of God’s plan for salvation. The derivation of the tituli from the Gloria of the mass may also refer to the infant Christ’s body on the altar-like manger as a precursor of the mass sacrifice itself. Not identified by either tituli or names, the two figures below the medallion—an elderly man with beard and veiled head on the right and a noble woman with headdress on the left—have usually been read as prophets, but a plausible identification has yet to be made.\footnote{Oidtmann, Glasmalereien, vol. 1, 80, and Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 148, read the pair as prophets, but do not offer a more precise identification. Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 81, tentatively identifies them as Simeon and Anna (“eventuell Simeon und Hanna”). These two figures, however, would be highly unusual in the context of the Nativity with which they are paired; they normally occur together in the context of the Presentation in the Temple, in line with the account in Luke 2:25–38.} It seems likely that they represent Balaam and the Queen of Sheba. Both occur together frequently in Infancy scenes in general and in the Tree of Jesse in particular, Balaam on account of his prophecy that “a star shall rise from the house of Jacob” (Numbers 24:17) and the
Queen of Sheba on account of her statement, made to Solomon but applied to Christ, that “thy wisdom and thy works exceed the fame which I heard” (1 Kings 10:7). A close parallel for the St. Kunibert window is furnished by the slightly later Jesse window at Legden (ca. 1230; fig. 256), where the pair appears at the base of the window, Balaam as an elderly, bearded male with a titulus with the “star shall rise” citation and the Queen of Sheba as a noble woman with a titulus derived from 1 Kings 10:7. The presence of this tandem in the window at St. Kunibert and around the Nativity reinforces Christ’s Old Testament genealogy (Balaam) and arrival as the Logos Incarnate (Queen of Sheba) as depicted in the central medallion.

Beyond the general notion of prophecy implicit in their presence, the four figures in the exegetical border around the medallion explicate different aspects of the central Nativity. Positioned to the left of the medallion, John the Baptist points to Christ and holds a banderole that reads [ECCE AGNVS] DEI [CCE] Q[U]I TO[LLIT] (“Behold the Lamb of God. Behold him who taketh away [the sin of the world]”). Derived from John 1:29, the text of the banderole also forms the basis of the Agnus Dei of the mass. The Baptist announces not only the arrival of Christ generally, but points specifically to his future sacrifice as the Lamb of God, which is visualized in the medallion with the Child on the altar-like manger. To the right of the medallion stands Aaron, clothed in the garb of a Jewish high priest, with his flowering rod (virga) placed on a block-like ledge meant to recall the Ark of the Covenant, after the biblical

866 Balaam appears among the prophets in the Hildesheim ceiling (cf. Sommer, Deckenbild, Bildtafel B79). Balaam and the Queen of Sheba occur together in the miniature of the Tree of Jesse in the Mechthild Psalter (ca. 1240; cf. Sommer, Deckenbild, 45 fig. no. 33). The pair also appears under the infancy scenes in the vault frescoes at St. Maria Lyskirchen in Cologne (ca. 1250; cf. Goldkuhle, Lyskirchen, Tafel 6 nos. 11 and 12).
867 Pieper, “Legden,” 174–175. The tituli in the Legden window read ORIETVR STELLA EX (Balaam) and MAIORA SVNT OPERA TVA Q (Queen of Sheba).
868 The Baptist’s titulus is now highly abraded and only comprehensible from the word DEI onwards. Pre-1916 photographs (RBA 1.086.212), however, show the first half of the titulus as ECCE AGNVS, and Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 82, also lists the titulus this way. For its part, Welter’s watercolour of ca. 1840 (fig. 110) reads ECE AGNVS. The palm tree in front of the Baptist is an addition from the 1917–1919 restoration.
869 John 1:29: “altera die videt Iohannes Iesum venientem ad se et ait ecce agnus Dei qui tollit peccatum mundi.” Cf. the Agnus Dei: “Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi.”
account in Numbers 17:1–10. The typological association between Aaron’s rod and the Nativity was common among early medieval exegetes, who read Aaron’s flowering rod not only as a general Messianic prefiguration, but also as foreshadowing the Virginal birth of Christ.\^{870} Drawing on this tradition, the pairing of Aaron with the Nativity or with Mary alone was frequent in typological cycles from the mid-twelfth century onwards.\^{871} The typological comparison in the window serves in the first instance to emphasize the prefigured incarnational aspect of the Nativity through the close visual juxtaposition of the flowering rod on the Ark of the Covenant as a sign of the Old Covenant and its fulfillment in Christ, the New Covenant, in the manger. In line with the general exegetical conception, as evinced by Aaron’s frequent pairing with Mary, it also thematizes the virgo Mary’s own carrying within her womb of Christ, the virga prefigured in the Old Testament. The theme of Mary’s virginal conception is further developed by the prophet Ezekiel, who appears in the outer left compartment of the exegetical border. Reading DOMIN\[US\] SOLVS IN\[G\]REDIET P\[ER\] EAM, Ezekiel’s titulus is a paraphrase of his vision of the closed gate that was entered only by God (Ezekiel 44:2).\^{872} Ezekiel’s titulus is thus a meaningful commentary on Mary in the central scene as the “closed gate” (porta clausa) through which God incarnate—Christ in the manger—entered the world.\^{873}

\^{870} Thus, for instance, Bede’s clear formulation (Quaestiones super Numeros; PL 93, col. 402): “Alii virgam hanc, quae sine humore florem protulit, Mariam virginem putant, quae sine coitu edidit Verbum Dei.” For the exegetical and iconographical tradition, see LCI, vol. 1, cols. 2–3, s. v. “Aaron.”

\^{871} The pairing of Aaron’s rod with the figure of Mary in the Tree of Jesse already occurs in the fragmentary windows from Arnstein an der Lahn of ca. 1160 (the panel with Mary is not preserved, but her presence is most likely); see Lech Kalinowski, “Virga versatur. Remarques sur l’iconographie des vitraux romans d’Arnstein-sur-la-Lahn,” Revue de l’art 62 (1983): 9–20. The juxtaposition of Aaron with the Nativity is also prescribed by the the so-called Pictor in Carmine, a typological treatise composed in England around 1200. See M. R. James, “Pictor in Carmine,” Archaeologia 94 (1951): 151.

\^{872} “Et dixit Dominus ad me porta haec clausa erit non aperietur et vir non transiet per eam quoniam Dominus Deus Israhel ingressus est per eam” (“And the Lord said to me: This gate shall be shut, and it shall not be opened, and no man shall pass through it: because the Lord the God of Israel hath entered in by it”).

\^{873} On the association of this passage in Ezekiel with Mary, see LCI, vol. 1, cols. 716–718, s.v. “Ezechiel.” Ezekiel is also paired with the figure of Mary in the window at Legden, in which he holds a banderole with a titulus that likewise refers to the Virgin as the “closed gate”: PORTA HAEC CLAV; see Pieper, “Legden,” 178.
The prophet Amos, positioned at the extreme right, adumbrates further the idea of jubilation upon Christ’s arrival on earth, already intimated by the angels above the medallion. His *titulus* reads I[N] D[IE] [I]LL[A] STILLABVNT MONTES, which is a paraphrase from Amos 9:13.  

Whereas the angels above the medallion reflect the heavenly rejoice, Amos points to the exultation of the earth itself at the moment of the arrival of the Logos Incarnate.

Taking its cue from Christ’s foreshadowed sacrifice in the Nativity panels below, the following medallion moves immediately to the central salvific moment of the Crucifixion (figs. 112, 113), the consummation of the New Covenant. The designer singled out the Crucifixion as the pivotal moment on which the whole message of the window turns: not only is the window configured so that Crucifixion medallion physically occupies its centre, but the medallion is also set apart visually from the other narrative medallions with a differently shaped, square frame.  

His head sunken and his eyes closed, Christ is figured as the defeated Man of Sorrows type common in contemporary manuscript illumination, as in the miniature of the Crucifixion in the contemporary Groß St. Martin Evangeliary (fig. 257).  

Rather than hanging on a Cross, however, Christ hangs on the Tree of Jesse itself: his feet are nailed to its verdant stalk, which runs straight through the medallion rather than around it and also sprouts two fleshy tendrils that serve as a *suppedaneum*; and his hands are fastened to two pearled, white branches that fork off the stalk like the arms of a late medieval *Gabelkreuz*. Thus, in the Crucifixion panel, the window’s designer returned to the initial idea, articulated at the base of the window, that the

---

874 “Ecce dies veniunt dicit Dominus et comprehendet arator messorem et calcator uvae mittentem semen et stillabunt montes dulcedinem et omnes colles culti erunt” (“Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when the ploughman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed: and the mountains shall drop sweetness, and every hill shall be tilled”). The first two pieces of Amos’s banderole were replaced incorrectly during one of the pre-war restorations and should be reversed; cf. Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 167.

875 The formal emphasis on the Crucifixion is also noted by Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 97, and Becksmann, *Deutsche Glasmalerei*, vol. 1, 53.

Tree of Jesse is the very Tree of Life, hereby making recourse to an ancient exegetical and visual tradition (cf. fig. 257) that Christ’s Cross is also the Tree of Life (*lignum vitae*). The Crucifixion medallion unites both ideas in one clear visual statement: behind the Tree of Jesse and behind the Cross stands the Tree of Life and in it the eternal life regained through God’s redemptive sacrifice of Christ, his son and the bearer of the New Covenant.

The idea of the Crucifixion as the sacrificial consummation of the New Covenant receives additional visual emphasis through the appearance of Ecclesia and Synagogue rather than Mary and John to either side of the crucified Christ (cf. fig. 257). Standing on the side of the elect to Christ’s right, Ecclesia wears a golden crown, a white tunic with a patterned golden border, and a regal purple mantle. She holds a large golden chalice aloft in which she gathers the issue of bright red blood from Christ’s side, simultaneously underlining the initial sacrifice and pointing to the Eucharistic wine of the Church as the eternal, life-giving source of the divine grace of the New Covenant. Synagogue, as the representative of the Old Covenant, is placed on Christ’s left, the side of the damned, and turns away from Christ. Though traditional, the significance of Synagogue’s pose is amplified by the contrast not only with Ecclesia, but with the other figures in the window, all of whom are oriented around Christ as the central visual and conceptual axis. With her head cast downward and her eyes originally either veiled or closed, Synagogue is pictured through both her posture and her attributes as a concentrated embodiment of a superseded Old Covenant predicated on blind acceptance of the Law, symbolized by the Tablets of the Law that she holds in her raised left hand, and improper sacrifice, emblazoned

---

877 For the exegetical tradition, see Bauerreiss, *Arbor vitae*, 4–13; on the iconographic development of the Cross as Tree of Life, see *LCI*, vol. 1, cols. 258–268, s. v. “Baum, Bäume”; and *RDK*, vol. 1, cols. 1152–1162, s. v. “Astkreuz,” and vol. 2, cols. 100–106, s. v. “Baumkreuz.”

878 Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 149, also notes the deliberateness of the decision to place these two figures around the Crucifixion rather than Mary and John, but does not pursue the full implications of this gesture within the window’s larger program.

879 On Ecclesia and her attributes generally, see the entry in *LCI*, vol. 1, cols. 562–569, s. v. “Ecclesia.”
in the severed ram’s head that she clutches in her right.\textsuperscript{880} At the same time, just as Christ is shown in the Nativity panel as uniting Old and New, the Crucifixion panel also seemingly suggests that Christ, while replacing the Old Covenant, nonetheless folds it into the New. Thus, for all the damning differences in pose and attributes displayed by Synagogue, the designer of the window nonetheless assimilated her to Ecclesia in costume: both figures wear white tunics with purple mantles.\textsuperscript{881} This depiction of Synagogue as partly Ecclesia-like may refer to the broader exegetical notion that held that Synagogue, though a lost daughter, will return into the fold of salvation with Ecclesia as Christ’s second bride at the end of time.\textsuperscript{882} Through the figures of Ecclesia and Synagogue, the significance of the Crucifixion is shown as extending beyond its narrative place in the story of salvation to encompass all time and all traditions.

The typological and prophetic figures chosen for the exegetical border reinforce further the central medallion’s presentation of the Crucifixion as the sacrificial consummation of a New Covenant that is universal in its reach. To the immediate right of the medallion, Abraham sacrifices Isaac (Genesis 22). An ancient exegetical and pictorial tradition, and already known in twelfth-century typological cycles in Cologne, the pairing of Abraham’s sacrifice with the Crucifixion both prefigures the event and underscores that Christ on the Cross is God’s own son,

\textsuperscript{880} Synagogue’s current head, which shows her with closed eyes, is a replacement from the last restoration. The figure’s features are already entirely absent in prewar photographs of this medallion (RBA 56 023), and it is now impossible to judge whether Synagogue’s blindness was emphasized with the veil or with closed eyes. (Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 82, simply indicates that Synagogue’s eyes were veiled, but this is not evident in the prewar images). On Synagogue’s closed/veiled eyes as a symbol of her spiritual blindness, with reference to the Crucifixion at St. Kunibert, see Wolfgang Seiferth, Synagoge und Kirche im Mittelalter (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1964), 131, 151, as well as RDK, vol. 4, col. 1196, s. v. “Ecclesia und Synagogue.” The ram’s head is also devoid of features, which has sometimes led to its being identified as a bag of coins (e.g., Oidtmann, Glasmalereien, vol. 1, 81), but the form is clearly that of sleek ram’s head with horns. Identification as a ram’s head is proffered by Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 82. On the ram’s head as symbol of Old Testament sacrifice, see RDK, vol. 4, col. 1196; for the Tablets of the Law, RDK, vol. 4, col. 1196.

\textsuperscript{881} Seiferth, Synagoge und Kirche, 151, likewise points to the similarity in dress between the two figures (“ähnliche Gewänder”).

\textsuperscript{882} On this exegetical tradition and its visual articulation, see, most recently, Elizabeth Monroe, “‘Fair and Friendly, Sweet and Beautiful’: Hopes for Jewish Conversion in Synagoga’s Song of Songs Imagery,” in Beyond the Yellow Badge: Anti-Judaism and Anti-Semitism in Medieval and Early Modern Visual Culture, ed. Mitchell B. Merback (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008), 33–61.
offered up as a sacrifice for the redemption of humanity. The unnamed prophet to the left of the medallion forms a couplet with the prophet Joel, who stands behind him in the outer compartment of the exegetical border. The first prophet’s titulus is a continuation of Joel’s titulus, which reads DOMINUS DE SYON RUGIET ET DE ISL; the companion prophet’s titulus picks up the abbreviated ISL and expands it into IERUSALEM DABIT VOCE DVA. Together, these tituli form a paraphrase of Joel 3:16: “Et Dominus de Sion rugiet et de Hierusalem dabit vocem suam et movebuntur caeli et terra et Dominus spes populi sui et fortitudo filiorum Israel.” This extended titulus thus frames the historical moment of the Crucifixion on Golgotha in Jerusalem in the medallion as God’s sealing of the New Covenant through Christ on the Cross, who was sent as the “hope and strength” of his chosen people. Positioned at the outer right, the prophet Haggai, whose titulus reads EGO SVM DESIDERATUS CVNC TIBUS after Haggai 2:8, emphasizes not only the Messianic coming, but also, through the mention of “all nations,” the universality of the sacrificial deliverance pictured in the medallion, which also encompasses the two lay donor figures below.

---

883 On Abraham and Isaac in general, see LCI, vol. 1, cols. 23–30. Abraham and Isaac occur together typologically with the Crucifixion on the portable altar in Möchengladbach, a Cologne product of ca. 1160; see OE, vol. 2, 404.

884 The second prophet’s titulus is now entirely illegible. No doubt original on account of the use of abbreviations, it is documented as given above in prewar photographs (RBA 56 023). Working from the glass before the postwar restoration, Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 83, also lists this titulus thus.

885 “And the Lord shall roar out of Sion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem: and the heavens and the earth shall be moved, and the Lord shall be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel.”

886 “Et movebo omnes gentes et veniet desideratus cunctis gentibus et implebo domum istam gloria dicit Dominus exercitum” (“And I will move all nations: and the desired of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory: saith the Lord of hosts”). Haggai’s titulus now reads EGO SVM D DESIDERATUS CVNC TIBUS, with an additional D before DESIDERATUS. Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 168, observes that the EGO SVM diverges from the biblical veniet and notes that Oidtmann (Glasmalereien, vol. 1, 81) records the start of the titulus as ECCE VENIET. She suggests that the start of the titulus may be a foreign addition from one of the two previous restorations. Welter’s drawing of ca. 1840, however, clearly reads EGO SVM D in this position, and thus the start of the titulus, though divergent from the biblical text, should probably be regarded as original. The two lay donor figures are treated extensively in Chapter 8.
Issuing unbroken from behind the figure of the dead, crucified Christ, the twisted stalk of the Tree continues its ascent before bifurcating to enclose a medallion that shows Christ’s triumph over death in the Resurrection (fig. 114). As in contemporary miniatures, Christ, with cross-nimbus and making a blessing gesture, steps out of the tomb and over three sleeping soldiers.\footnote{Cf. the closely related miniature of the Resurrection in the Groß St. Martin Evangeliiary in Grimme, Evangelistar, 73, with commentary on 69.} Flanked by adoring angels, he bears a cross-staff with the flag of victory that symbolizes his conquest of death, thus articulating the central significance of the scene, which is thrown into further relief by the vertical juxtaposition between Christ’s energetically striding body and his immobile, defeated corpus on the Tree-Cross below.

As in the preceding medallions, the exegetical apparatus of figures around the medallion provides an extended commentary on multiple aspects of the central scene. To the right of the medallion, Jonah issues from the jaws of the whale. Already drawn by Christ himself in Matthew 12:39–41, the typological pairing of Jonah and the Resurrection is here not only the customary Old Testament type foreshadowing Christ’s triumph over death, but a closely coordinated visual analogy: Jonah is shown stepping out of the whale’s jaws with one leg as Christ does from the tomb, thereby formally underscoring the conceptual relationship of the two.\footnote{On the typological pair in general, see LCI, vol. 2, cols. 419–420, s. v. “Jonas.”} The prophets in the exegetical border narrate the Resurrection’s literal and spiritual dimensions and also forge a link between this scene and the final medallion above. To the left of the Resurrection, David gestures across his body to the central scene and holds a highly abbreviated\footnote{The titulus is now starkly abraded after the word TERRA. Prewar photographs, however, clearly record the presence of further letters after the ET symbol (RBA 56 022). The titulus here reads: TERRA T...IT ET Q D R I. Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 168, reads O for Q, but as will be clear below, the letter can only be a Q.} titulus reading TERRA T[...][E]T Q D R I.\footnote{This should be expanded as TERRA T[REMU]IT ET Q[VIEVIT] D[V]M R[ESURGERET] I[N] [IUDICIO].} Though
based on David’s Psalm 75:9–10, the *titulus*’s wording was instead taken directly from the offertory of the mass, which runs “terra tremuit et quievit dum resurgeret in judicio Deus alleluia.”  

David’s *titulus* points both to the Resurrection itself, providing a dramatic synaesthetic dimension to the scene in the medallion, and ahead to Christ’s judgement, which is one of the themes of the next medallion. Positioned next to David, the prophet Micah gestures towards Christ and holds a banderole with the *titulus* ECCE D[OMI]N[U]S EGREDIETVR DE LOCO SV[O]. A paraphrase of Micah 1:3, it makes obvious reference to Christ’s physical exit from the tomb. Standing at the extreme right, Nahum both points and looks up at the next medallion and carries a banderole with the words ECCE SVP[ER] MONTES PEDES EIVS, which are derived from Nahum 1:15: “ecce super montes pedes evangelizantis et adnuntiantis pacem . . . .” Like David’s, Nahum’s *titulus*, as suggested by his gesture and gaze, seemingly aims to lead the viewer’s attention from the Resurrection to the next medallion, which shows, among other things, a compressed representation of the Ascension, during which Christ’s feet left a trace “upon the mountains.”

After encircling the Resurrection medallion, the two tendrils of the stalk coil together again and rise into the final main panel (figs. 108 and 115). Here they terminate, sprouting into a bloom of four tendrils that form a foliate throne and *suppedaneum* for Christ, who sits atop the root within a quatrefoil mandorla. This final central panel of the window has generally been discussed under two main aspects, with some scholars electing to see it primarily as a

890 “The earth shall shake and be silent when the Lord rises in judgement, Alleluia.” Cf., in contrast, Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 83 and 168, who supplies instead TIMUIT (from the Psalm: “terra timuit et quievit cum exsurget in judicium Deus”) and suggests that rest of the *titulus* cannot be decoded.

891 “Quia ecce Dominus egredietur de loco suo et descenderet et calcabit super excelsa terrae” (“For behold the Lord will come out of his place: and he will come down, and will tread upon the high places of the earth”).

892 “Behold upon the mountains the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, and that preacheth peace.” (Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 83, incorrectly lists Nahum 2:1 as the source.) In changing “evangelizantis” to EIVS, the *titulus* modifies the meaning of the biblical passage slightly (see Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 83): “Behold upon the mountains his feet.”
representation of the Ascension or primarily as a *maiestas* image. The central panel, however, is polysemous: its message goes beyond these two basic readings, especially when it is read with the accompanying figures in the exegetical border, which are essential to its meaning. Taken as a coherent unit, the final panels of the window provide it with what Wolfgang Kemp in a different context has usefully termed “iconographic closure”: they close the Christological narrative of the central axis of medallions and then explicate the transcendental significance of the whole.

As in the rest of the window, Christ is the visual and conceptual centre point. Provided with the cross-nimbus and dressed in a white tunic and a purple mantle, he is perched on the summit of the Tree and surrounded by the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, as in conventional representations of the Tree of Jesse, such as that in the Groß St. Martin Evangeliary (fig. 255).

In the first instance, the final medallion presents Christ as the *flos*, the flower of Jesse’s rod, upon which the spirit of the Lord rests, as in Isaiah: “a flower shall rise up out of his root. And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him.” On the one hand, then, the final medallion closes out in traditional fashion the initial idea of Jesse’s Tree ending in Christ as the flower.

On the other hand, the central figure of Christ as *flos* is embedded within a group of other figures that expands the central panel into a notional representation of the Ascension. Thus, two clusters of disembodied Apostles’ heads at the bottom of the panel gaze up in rapture at Christ, as they do in contemporary representations of the Ascension. The heads on their own are ambiguous and only loosely convey the idea that the image represents the Ascension.

---

893 For a primary reading as an Ascension, see, for instance, Brinkmann in *OE*, vol. 2, 272 cat. no. E 58, and eadem, “Glasmalereien,” 149. For a primary reading as a *maiestas* image, see Oidtmann, *Glasmalereien*, vol. 1, 81, and Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 84.
896 Cf., for instance, the figures in the Ascension miniature in the Groß St. Martin Evangeliary: Grimme, *Evangelistar*, 76.
but the *titulus* on the banderole held by the right-hand angel in the exegetical border clearly identifies the scene as such. It reads Q[U]EMADMODV[M] VIDISTIS EV[M] A[LLELUIA?] and is derived from the account of the Ascension in Acts 1:11: “Qui et dixerunt viri galilaei quid statis aspicientes in caelum hic Jesus qui adsumptus est a vobis in caelum sic veniet quemadmodum vidistis eum euntem in caelum.” As with the representation of Christ as *flos*, the expansion of the final panel into an image of the Ascension provides a tidy conclusion to the narrative thread of the Christological medallions, begun with Christ’s Incarnation at the Annunciation, by showing his physical departure from earth.

At the same time, the final complex of images moves beyond the temporal-narrative logic of the central axis, moving seamlessly outwards from the immanence of the story to show its eternal eschatological significance. This is accomplished by specific features in the central representation of Christ in conjunction with the accompanying exegetical apparatus in the outer border. Thus, in the central medallion, Christ appears not only as the *flos* of the Tree, but also as cosmic ruler: he is framed by the mandorla of traditional *maiestas* representations (fig. 258) and holds aloft in his left hand the *globus mundi* that signifies his dominion over the cosmos. As the comparison with the closely related *maiestas* miniature in the Groß St. Martin Evangeliary indicates, the window’s designer appears to have sought to emphasize the aspect of Christ’s rulership, providing Christ with the *globus* rather than the codex that he typically holds in majesty images. Given the insistence in the image on the equality between the Tree of Jesse and the Tree of Life, the final image of Christ on the Tree was likely intended specifically to

---

897 “Ye men of Galilee, why stand you looking up to heaven? This is Jesus who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come as you have seen him going into heaven.” The left-hand angel’s *titulus* is completely illegible and likely already was by the time of Welter’s drawing (fig. 110), for he gives an incoherent jumble of letters in this *titulus*.

encapsulate the idea in Revelation 22:1–2, 14, and 19 that the Tree of Life—lost at the base of the window—will be made accessible again at the end of time, with Christ as its fruit and as eternal judge, an idea that is also implicit in the bust of Christ in the Tree of Life at Hildesheim (fig. 254). By picturing Christ unambiguously as ruler of the cosmos on the Tree, the designer returned to and closed the opening theme of the Tree of Jesse as Tree of Life, underlining the Tree’s apocalyptic dimension and relocating the final image concretely in the realm of the eschatological.

The two angels in the outer compartments of the exegetical border expand on the meta-theme of Christ’s eternal dominion and the impending judgement pictured at the centre. The left-hand angel bears a *titulus* that reads THRONVS TVVS D[EUS] I[N] SECVL[UM] [SECULI?]. The *titulus* derives from Hebrews 1:8, which recounts how God the Father bestowed command of his kingdom not on the angels, but on his son Christ: “Ad Filium autem thronus tuus Deus in saeculum saeculi, et virga aequitatis virgi regni tui.” Though brief, the *titulus* elaborates on multiple aspects of the central representation of Christ in majesty. In showing the angel speaking these words in deference to Christ, the image encapsulates the full sense of the relevant passage in Hebrews: God the Father has commended his kingdom not to the angels, but to Christ alone. Second, the mention of the throne and eternity signal that Christ in the medallion is indeed to be understood as an apocalyptic judge on his throne and that his rule from that throne is eternal. Finally, the designer’s choice of this particular *titulus* also seemingly constitutes a pointed play on the *virga* on which Christ sits and the *virga* in the

---

899 On the apocalyptic aspect of the Tree of Life in general, see *LCI*, vol. 1, col. 261, s. v. “Baum.”

900 The final part of the *titulus* following SECV reads P[ER]M. This latter piece was likely taken from the first half Nahum’s *titulus* (SUPER MONTES; the beginning is clearly a modern replacement) when it was restored and used to fill the end of the angel’s *titulus*, perhaps in the first restoration (the piece already appears here in prewar photographs). The end of the angel’s *titulus* likely originally contained an abbreviation of SECULI, in accordance with the biblical source (see below).

901 “But to the Son: Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of justice is the sceptre of thy kingdom.”
corresponding passage in Hebrews, transforming the *virga Jesse* finally into the *virga equitatis* on which Christ’s eternal kingdom is predicated. Reading TV SOLVS ALTISSIMVS, the *titulus* on the banderole held by the angel at the outer right is an excerpt from the extended text of the sung Gloria of the mass: “Quoniam tu solus Sanctus, tu solus Dominus, tu solus Altissimus, Jesu Christe, cum Sancto Spiritu in Gloria Dei Patris. Amen.” 902 This *titulus* also emphasizes Christ’s sole rule of the Kingdom of Heaven and further links him, as the panels themselves do visually, with the Holy Spirit and—above in the uppermost compartment of the exegetical border—God the Father.

Positioned at the apex of the window, the latter is pictured bust-length in a circle and unfurls a banderole that reads HIC ES[T] FILIVS MEVS DILEC[TUS]. This *titulus* is taken from the account of Christ’s Baptism in Matthew 3:17: “Et ecce vox de caelis dicens hic est filius meus dilectus in quo mihi complacui.” 903 Both the representation of the bust-length God the Father circumscribed within a medallion and the *titulus* occur frequently in representations of the Baptism of Christ in contemporary manuscript illumination, as in the miniature of the scene in the Brandenburg Evangeliary (ca. 1210; fig. 259). 904 In the window, this type of God the Father in the final exegetical panel is bound instead visually and conceptually to the image of Christ in majesty below. Together with the angels in the outer border with their *tituli*, the figure and the *titulus* adumbrate further that God the Father has given his kingdom to his son Christ, “in whom he is well pleased.” His presence directly above Christ and the Seven Gifts of the Holy Spirit also makes of the image of Christ in majesty an image of the Trinity itself, of

---

902 “For you are the only Holy One, the only Lord, the only Most High, Jesus Christ, with the Holy Spirit in the glory of God the Father, Amen.” Only Boisseréé (*Denkmale*, 40) appears to have recognized the mass as the source for this *titulus*.

903 “And behold a voice in heaven saying: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.”

904 On this page, see Josef Gülden and Edith Roth, *Das Brandenburger Evangeliar* (Leipzig: St. Benno Verlag, 1961), 37–38.
which Christ is an indivisible part, as intimated by the compressed Gloria titulus of the outer right-hand angel.\footnote{Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 148, also points summarily to the Trinitarian conflation of the three figures in the final panel.}

The placement of God the Father at the apex of the window, however, also figures him as the conclusion of the image as a whole. The window opens with the Tree of Jesse-cum-Tree of Life in Paradise in the lowest panel and closes with God the Father in the uppermost. God the Father thus emerges as the architect of the entire epic narrative stretched between these two points: the window comes full circle from the initial Creation to the Creator himself. The window visualizes in a single, economical system of narrative and prophetic and typological juxtaposition the whole sweep of time and God’s plan for human redemption, from the moment of the implicit fall in Paradise at the bottom through eternity at the top.\footnote{Cf., in contrast, Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 151, who suggests that the window’s “thematic arc” reaches from creation to the Ascension. The window’s temporal and thematic scope, however, clearly goes beyond the narrative of the individual medallions when the upper exegetical border is taken into account.} At the apex, God the Father appears as the mastermind of successive Covenants, first the Old and then the New in Christ, whom he sent into the world of creation and sacrificed in order to redeem humanity for all time. In the Tree of Life from the very beginning of time, Christ visually punctuates the root of redemption along the central axis in the key moments of the narrative of salvation before being reunited with the Father in his inherited kingdom, from which he shall judge humanity at the end of earthly time.

The visual message of the Tree of Jesse window is not reducible to any single guiding exegetical source or textual authority. Rather, its designer drew on an array of pictorial, textual, and liturgical sources, and widely diffused exegetical ideas. Comparison of the Christological medallions (fig. 115) with contemporary manuscript illumination (fig. 258) and parallels between the typological figures with those in earlier Cologne cycles indicate that the Jesse
window was most likely devised by a clerical designer from the church, perhaps one of the well-educated *scholastici*, working in close collaboration with a master glass painter using model books and probably a typological list similar to the so-called *Pictor in Carmine*, an English treatise of circa 1200 that prescribes hundreds of typological combinations for use in monumental art.\(^{907}\) A handful of the prophetic and other *tituli* have analogues in earlier cycles in Cologne and elsewhere, suggesting that the clerical designer likely selected some from lists or pictorial models (cf., for instance, figs. 108 [God the Father] and 259).\(^{908}\) He appears to have taken others, such as those of the four angels, the Baptist, and David, directly from the Bible and mass texts.

Yet, though pictorial and textual parallels for several of the window’s individual components can be found, the combination itself is unparalleled either before or after. The close horizontal and vertical coordination of each part of the window to build up towards a cumulative message points to a clerical designer who was concerned to work with the artist to create a tightly-structured visual *compilatio* from a variety of pictorial and textual sources. Rather than deriving from textual authorities, the structure and components of the Tree of Jesse window

---

\(^{907}\) On the *Pictor in Carmine*, see James, “Pictor,” 141–166. The preface to the treatise explicitly calls on clerical designers to select and combine types from the compendium as they see fit (translated by James, at 142): “For the rest, it was not my business to arrange for those who supervise such matters all that should be painted; let them look to it themselves as fancy takes each, or as he abounds in his own sense, provided they seek Christ’s glory and not their own.” The *Pictor in Carmine* does not appear to have circulated on the Continent, for all of the extant manuscripts are concentrated in England, but the existence of similar typological compendia here at this time is likely. For its part, the *Pictor* also prescribes, among other combinations, the common typological pairings found in the window (at 151): Aaron with the Nativity; Abraham and Isaac with the Crucifixion; and Jonah and the Whale with the Resurrection.

\(^{908}\) Thus, in addition to Isaiah’s “egredietur virga” *titulus*, common in the Tree of Jesse, the basic idea of Ezekiel’s *titulus* also occurs in the window in the later window in Legden (see above). The figure of Nahum on the Heribert Shrine (ca. 1160; see *OE*, vol. 2, 317) carries a *titulus* that overlaps with Nahum’s in the window: “Ecce super montes pedes evangelizant et annuntiatis pacem.” The figure of Haggai on the celebrated domed reliquary in Darmstadt, a Cologne work of ca. 1180 (see *OE*, vol. 2, 411), holds a banderole with a *titulus* that also mirrors Haggai’s in the window: “Veniet desideratus cunctibus gentibus.” This listing of parallels is not to suggest that the designer looked to any of these works, but rather to indicate only that lists and/or pictorial models featuring prophets with appropriate *tituli* likely existed in Cologne and were accessible to the window’s designer, who then combined them with the narrative scenes in new ways.
work together to “perform their own visual exegesis” on the theme of the Fall and God’s plan for humanity’s redemption.\(^909\) As in other cases, the window’s format creates simultaneous parallels, juxtapositions, and fusions in a way that no linear text—and few other visual media—can.\(^910\) Thus, it weaves the Tree of Jesse, the Tree of Life, and the Cross into an indivisible visual and conceptual whole that, while informed by certain basic exegetical ideas, has no parallel in exegetical writings. And in the final complex of panels, it shifts fluidly from an iconic mode (Christ as \textit{flos}), to a narrative mode (the Ascension), and back to an iconic image that is at once a majestic Christ in judgement on his throne and a Trinitarian image that serves as a visual commentary on the window as a whole.

Maximum visual density and conceptual complexity indeed seem to have been the guiding paradigms behind the clerical designer’s overall conception of the window.\(^911\) Figures, foliage, and frames compete for limited space, creating a thick weave of visual information. The window and its \textit{tituli} are best viewed, and can be easily read, from a position within the former canons’ choir in the first nave bay and from in front of the high altar, above which the window is placed and with which it was clearly meant to be seen in space (fig. 35). In Latin and often highly abbreviated, the extensive \textit{tituli} of the exegetical border are key components of the window’s cumulative message, serving to explicate the significance of each successive horizontal layer. Without them, the window as a whole system and statement does not work. In

\(^{909}\) See the useful recent overview of the relationship between textual and visual exegesis in Christopher Hughes, “Art and Exegesis,” in \textit{Companion}, ed. Rudolph, 173–192, from which I borrow the above formulation (at 181).
\(^{910}\) On image-text relationships in stained glass in general, see Kemp, \textit{Narratives}, esp. chapter 4, and, at 219, his statement that “Gothic stained glass probably contributed more than any other medium to a new textuality of the image.” Though made in reference to contemporary French Gothic windows with their complex systems of armatures, this statement is equally applicable to the visual complexity of the Jesse window.
\(^{911}\) The window’s visual density has sometimes been described as “confusing” (see, most recently, Becksmann, \textit{Deutsche Glasmalerei}, vol. 1, 53: “verwirrend”), but this assessment does injustice to the window’s carefully reasoned visual and conceptual organization: the density and complexity are intentional and essential components of the window’s function and message.
terms of its scale, location at the head of the clerical choir, and content, the Jesse window provides clear internal evidence for its intended primary audience: all these aspects suggest that this window, even if in the clerestory and thus generally visible to a broader public, was not only devised by, but most likely principally for the consumption of the chapter of canons.912

But how might the Jesse window have been seen and “used” by this small viewing community of educated clergy? Though traditional, the Jesse window’s axial position above the high altar engenders a main viewing axis that establishes a visual and conceptual relationship between image and altar, and it seems likely that the ritual framework of the daily conventual mass and the canonical hours provided one major viewing context for clerical consumption of the image. The window’s content displays numerous intersections with the sacramental and sung liturgy in image and text, and its extensive imagery would have corresponded with various aspects of the community’s liturgical celebrations during the conventual mass and at different points during the liturgical year. The medallions of the Nativity and Crucifixion, for instance, both use a central image in tandem with carefully chosen typological and prophetic juxtapositions to figure Christ’s body as redemptive sacrifice, and thus these panels likely offered their clerical viewers a visual commentary on the daily Eucharistic celebration at the high altar below. In the Nativity complex, Christ lies on the altar-like manger as the Baptist gestures over to him and speaks the words of Agnus Dei from the mass, signalling the redemptive power of Christ’s body in the Eucharist. In presenting the crucified Christ with Ecclesia and her chalice of blood, the pivotal central Crucifixion medallion visually foregrounds the Eucharistic celebration at the high altar as the perpetual source of divine grace within the

912 On ambitious works of monumental art, especially those with abbreviated Latin tituli, as providing internal evidence of their audience and use, see Herbert Kessler, “Gregory the Great and Image Theory in Northern Europe during the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries,” in Companion, ed. Rudolph, 151–172, at 158–159.
grand scheme of redemption. The pairing of the Crucifixion with Abraham and Isaac is not only
typological tradition in art, but was also part of the Eucharistic celebration in the *supra quae*
prayer of the Canon of the mass.913 The Christological medallions of the Jesse window also had
a general analogue in the Creed, with its commemoration of God’s creation and the central
stages of Christ’s life from the Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension through to
his judgement from his eternal kingdom. Like the prophets, whose *tituli* likely would have
taken on intensified meaning during Advent with its lections from the prophetic books and its
corpus of prophetic antiphons (including Isaiah 11:1, sung on the first Sunday of Advent), the
individual medallions also would have acquired special meaning on the respective feasts, as well
as in the framework of Gospel and other lections. It is not difficult to imagine the powerful
visual impact that the final image of Christ as part of the Trinity would have made on a daily
basis as the community sang the Gloria text, held by the adjacent angel, praising Christ as the
highest ruler imbued with the Holy Spirit and radiant with the glory of the Father. A visual
compendium of sacred history, the Jesse window was likely “performed” as much as it was
seen, its different parts being animated and cast into focus at turns during particular moments of
the community’s cycle of liturgical celebrations.914

Yet, though its individual parts may have interacted in different ways with the liturgy,
the Jesse window as a whole can hardly have been intended to be taken in all at once on these
occasions, as the canons’ glances alternated between their choir books, the high altar, and the

---

913 “Supra quae propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digneris, et accepta habere, sicuti accepta habere dignatus es . . .
sacrificium Patriarchae nostri Abrahamiae . . . .”
914 On the performative, acoustic dimension of textual components in monumental art, with reference to the Tree of
Jesse in particular, see Margot Fassler, “Mary’s Nativity, Fulbert of Chartres, and the *Stirps Jesse*: Liturgical
Innovation circa 1000 and its Afterlife,” *Speculum* 75 (2000): 423, “[t]he visual arts of the twelfth [and thirteenth]
century are, in case after case, made out of songs: their audiences would not only have seen the liturgical
resonances embodied in the visual arts—they would have ‘heard’ them as well.”
The Jesse window is a dense work of visual exegesis on the theme of God’s plan for human redemption and impending judgement. Its message reveals itself only through extended consideration of the visual, textual, and conceptual relationships between its constitutive parts.

The window’s exegetical structure and the carefully coordinated, cumulative layering of its content from bottom to top suggest that it was likely also conceived for use as a visual instrument for clerical contemplatio outside a ritual framework. Such a function is usually supposed for visually and conceptually demanding images in monastic contexts, but it is just as plausible in secular clerical settings given the clergy’s possession of an advanced apparatus of textual and biblical knowledge acquired through years of choir service.

Beyond the traditional Gregorian justification of images as “Bibles for the illiterate,” the preface to the Pictor in Carmine of circa 1200, for its part, expressly prescribes ambitious monumental typological cycles as effective tools for clerical (as opposed to monastic) spiritual edification.

It seems reasonable to suppose that a similar, extra-liturgical function was intended for the Jesse window, with its array of typological figures, prophets, purely associative visual cues (such as the Rivers of Paradise or the Tree-Cross), and textual triggers. The Jesse window’s content and structure likely invited its clerical viewers to engage in extended rumination on their own path to redemption, encouraging them to work their way upwards from the base of the window and through the root of redemption with its different levels and leading them to the final image of

---


Christ, where they were confronted with a transcendental vision of the Trinity and impending judgement. The window is simultaneously a consolation that extends the promise of eternal life through Christ and the Eucharist done in memory of him and an implicit admonition for proper spiritual comportment. Like the high altar below, the axial Jesse window ultimately points back to the church itself and to the clerical community’s collective service of the altar as the means to attaining the eternal life lost in Paradise.

3. Apostolic Simplicity: The Clement Window

Juxtaposed with the Tree of Jesse window, the hagiographical windows devoted to St. Clement (fig. 116) and St. Kunibert (fig. 122) appear reductive, even simplistic. The narrative scenes are confined to the central field of five compartments formed by the armatures; there is no exegetical border; Latin tituli and even name labels are absent; and the windows are physically easier to read, although they are still most easily and best read from the vantage-point of canons’ choir, which suggests that their intended primary audience was the canonical community itself, as with the central Jesse window. Yet, as discursive constructs, the hagiographical windows are equally, if not more, complex.918 Whereas previous contributions on the hagiographical windows have focused largely on questions of dating and the windows’ stylistic relationship to one another, little attention has been given to how these two windows

---

918 On pictorial hagiography as a visual discourse in general, see Kemp, Narratives, passim; Beat Brenk, “Le texte et l’image dans la ‘vie des saints’ au Moyen-Age: Rôle du concepteur et rôle du peintre,” in Texte et Image. Actes du Colloque international de Chantilly, 13 au 15 Octobre 1982 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1984), 31–39; Barbara Abou-el-Haj, The Medieval Cult of Saints: Formations and Transformations (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 1–60; and Cynthia Hahn, Portrayed on the Heart: Narrative Effect in Pictorial Lives of the Saints from the Tenth through the Thirteenth Century (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), passim. Methodologically, these studies have been generally formative in shaping the premises of the following arguments; in the following, they will be further cited only where they bear on individual points.
work as visual narratives.\textsuperscript{919} Like the axial Jesse window, the hagiographical windows generate their meaning by accumulation, with each successive episode disposed not as an isolated picture, but as a causal and conceptual link in a narrative chain that constructs a global message about each patron saint. The focus in the following will be not on reading the windows as simple and, to use Kemp’s words, “transparent” reflections of the written \textit{vitae} on which they are based, but rather on the cleavage between the source texts and the resultant images as context-bound visual “rewritings.”\textsuperscript{920} Pivotal episodes in both windows have been given questionable identifications; divergent readings that alter the narrative thrust of each window will also be proffered here. The clerical designer’s selection of scenes, the narrative devices, and the types of visual and episodic tropes employed by the designer and artist in the windows combine to present very particular pictures of Clement and Kunibert, their lives, and their relevance for the clerical community.

In the larger chronological scheme of the three clerestory windows, Clement’s window forms a meaningful extension of the central Tree of Jesse window, which ends, among other things, with Christ’s Ascension before the Apostles, who were Clement’s immediate precursors (Clement was Peter’s disciple). Chronologically, Kunibert’s window represents the end point of the ensemble of three clerestory windows. Thus, following the temporal armature suggested by the windows themselves, this analysis of the hagiographical windows will begin with the St. Clement window and proceed in the next section to the St. Kunibert window, and will then return to the question of the overarching program of the three clerestory windows as a whole.


\textsuperscript{920} Kemp, \textit{Narratives}, 129–130.
For the Clement window (fig. 116), the clerical designer appears to have worked exclusively from the saint’s much earlier, fourth-century passio while advising the artist. Though a manuscript with saints’ lives from St. Kunibert does not survive, the community undoubtedly would have possessed a version of the passio for recitation on its second patron saint’s feast on November 23. The chapter’s possession of the passio text is corroborated by the window itself, the content of which is structured chronologically entirely around the passio and which also does not go beyond it to include other elements that had accrued around Clement’s legend following the translation of his relics to Rome by SS. Cyril and Methodius in 868. The scenes in the window’s cycle likewise show no overlap with the other two extant pictorial cycles of Clement’s life in the late eleventh-century frescoes at the saint’s titular church in Rome and in the twelfth-century mosaics at San Marco, Venice. Clement’s life appears to have been illustrated even more rarely north of the Alps, with a single, isolated scene of the saint’s martyrdom extant. All of the evidence suggests that the passio itself likely comprised the chapter’s only source of information about Clement, and that the designer and artist constructed Clement’s window fully anew using the passio text and figures taken from other models rather than from an earlier pictorial version of Clement’s life.

---

921 The passio Clementis, first composed in Greek but already known to Gregory of Tours in a Latin translation in the sixth century, is printed in Patres Apostolici. Volumen II. Clementis romani epistulae de virginitate eiusdemque martyrium, epistulae Pseudeignatii Ignatii martyria, fragmenta polycarpiana Polycarpi vita, ed. Franciscus Diekamp (Tübingen: Laupp, 1913), 51–81. Subsequent references to the passio will be made by page number, followed by chapter and section, the latter in parentheses.


923 In the Zwiefalten martyrology (ca. 1137–1148). The depiction in the manuscript differs from that in the window. See Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 59.

924 The artist’s use of generic models for the figures in the Clement window has usually been supposed; see, for instance, Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 59; Brinkmann in OE, vol. 2, 272 cat. no. E 58; and Brinkmann,
The Clement window begins in the lowest medallion with not one, but two scenes (fig. 117). The general setting of the action of both scenes is signalled as taking place in a church through the presence in the background of an arcade of three arches surmounted by peaked and domed roofs and diminutive towers: one of the towers is inscribed with a cross, and an oil lamp hangs from the arcade. In the left half of the medallion, a bishop, dressed in a red chasuble and wearing a pearled mitre encircled by a large halo, baptizes a male neophyte in a barrel-like baptismal font as two youthful males hold cloths at the ready and a woman with noble headdress looks on. To the right, a solitary bishop, identical in appearance to the one on the left in both features and dress, stands before an altar furnished with a large golden chalice and cross and directs his gaze upwards, extending his hands in a gesture of prayer.

To this point, these two initial scenes have been identified as representations of St. Peter baptizing Clement (left) and St. Peter saying the mass (right). Neither Clement’s passio nor the image itself corroborates these readings, however, and one also has to ask why, in a window devoted to Clement, Peter would be shown saying the mass by himself? The passio makes no mention of Peter baptizing Clement, much less of a mass of St. Peter. On the contrary, the passio opens with Clement already installed as the third Pope, his spiritual prowess fully formed

---

“Glasmalereien,” 150. I cannot agree with these authors’ general supposition that the two hagiographical windows were in effect configured by the glass painter alone from stock types. Both windows display such a profound knowledge of the intricacies of the saints’ obscure Latin vitae that the conception of the individual scenes and the narrative chain as a whole presupposes a clerical designer.

925 The neophyte is a modern replacement, but his original appearance as a man with arms folded across his chest is corroborated by Welter’s watercolour of the window; see Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 165.

926 The reading of the left-hand scene as Peter baptizing Clement was initiated, without any justification, by Oidtmann, “Glasmalereien,” col. 207, and idem, Glasmalereien, vol. 1, 84. It has been adopted in subsequent discussions of the window: KDM 6/4, 272; Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 59; OE, vol. 2, 272; and Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 150. Oidtmann is also the source for the general conception that the right-hand scene shows a bishop other than Clement saying the mass; “Glasmalereien,” 207: “[rechts] bringt ein h. Bischof, wohl einer der Apostelfürsten, das h. Meßopfer dar.” This identification is also offered in idem, Glasmalereien, vol. 1, 84, and followed in KDM 6/4, 272. (OE, vol. 2, 272, and Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 150, do not identify the right-hand scene.) Scheuffelen (“Glasmalereien,” 60) suggests that the scene “likely shows Peter” (“wohl wiederum Petrus”) saying the mass, but likewise does not provide any substantiation for this supposition.
through his “having followed the teaching of St. Peter,” which makes him “exude strength with the ornaments of morals.”

The image, moreover, leaves the bishop in both scenes and the neophyte in the font unidentified. If the clerical designer of the window wanted the viewer to read the two bishops as Peter and the man in the font as Clement, he offered him or her very little visual assistance for making this identification.

Rather, it is clear and logical from the bishop’s identical physical appearance in the two scenes and the medallion’s placement at the beginning of a cycle of Clement’s life that he is supposed to represent Clement himself, not Peter. Reading through the passio Clementis, however, one searches in vain for episodes that correspond to the two scenes pictured in the first medallion, and thus the general confusion that these scenes have elicited is to a certain extent comprehensible. The opening three chapters of the passio refer generally to the high esteem that Clement enjoyed among people of all faiths, which enabled him to win converts among Jews and traditional Roman religionists, but they do not mention baptism explicitly. Chapter III notes Clement’s care of the already baptized poor and his admonition to middle-class and wealthy Christians not to allow poor Christians to accept alms from Jews or Gentiles in order that the pure life they gained through baptism not be besmirched, again without mention of the act of baptism itself. No mention is made in the passio of Clement saying the mass alone.

---

927 Passio, 51 (c. I, 1): “Tertius Romanae ecclesiae praefuit episcopus Clemens, qui disciplinam apostoli Petri secutus ita morum ornamentis pollebat . . . .” Clement, considered by various early ecclesiastical authorities to have been either the second, third, or fourth Pope, is now regarded as the fourth Pope, after Linus and Cletus. This debate exceeds the boundaries of the present examination and is a moot point on account of the community’s possession of the passio, which styles Clement as third Pope. This is likely what the community itself believed.


929 Cf. Passio, 53 (c. III).

930 Mention is made of Clement saying mass in the context of the spectacular Sisinnius and Theodora legend (cf. Passio, 55–57, c. V, 2). This event is shown in the cycles at San Clemente and San Marco with ample addition of other figures, including Theodora and Sisinnius. The right-hand scene in the window with its solitary figure of Clement, however, can hardly be construed as a representation of this event.
But the medallion presents us with two images of St. Clement: at left, baptizing a neophyte and at right saying the mass. In picturing Clement baptizing and servicing the altar in the first medallion, the window’s clerical designer and the artist already made a significant departure from the passio text, even if only by turning to common visual topoi for representing ministry in episcopal cycles.\textsuperscript{931} Though grounded in the general notion of Clement’s ministry and work of conversion in the first sections of the written life, the images of Clement baptizing and saying mass at the base of the window establish their own meta-textual narrative economy, both for this initial medallion and for the rest of window. This is true not only of the selection of two scenes that do not have corresponding episodes in the text, but also of their representation. For both scenes, the artist likely drew on stock models for the figures and episodes, as comparison of the mass scene with that in the Kunibert window (fig. 126) indicates. The baptism scene, however, is not only a general type encountered in bishops’ pictorial lives, but a type frequently found in illustrated Acts of the Apostles (figs. 260 and 261). In Clement’s case, it seems likely that the designer’s decision to encapsulate Clement’s ministry by using a scene of baptism that assimilated him visually with his apostolic forebears was intended specifically to emphasize Clement’s apostolic heritage as St. Peter’s disciple, of which the clerical designer was no doubt cognizant from the opening line of the passio.\textsuperscript{932} At the same time, these dual images of Clement’s ministry—baptism and the Eucharistic celebration—reinforced and validated the clerical community’s own apostolic lineage as ministers of the Church with clear images of the ancient and apostolic origins of the ritual actions that they themselves carried out; indeed, Lateran IV (1215) had made annual communion mandatory for

\textsuperscript{931} On pictorial tropes in episcopal lives in general, see Hahn, \textit{Narrative Effect}, 129–171, esp. 147–153 (on baptism and ministry).

\textsuperscript{932} On the use in episcopal lives of the visual trope of baptism as a means to stress apostolicity, see Hahn, \textit{Narrative Effect}, 143.
the laity, thus empowering the institutional Church and the clergy in fundamentally new ways.\footnote{On similar dynamics in the images of ideal apostolic liturgy and ministry at Chartres, see Colette Manhes-Deremble, \textit{Les vitraux narratifs de la cathédrale de Chartres. Étude iconographique}, Corpus Vitrearum France Études II (Paris: Léopard d’Or, 1993), 205–237, esp. 213–215. As Manhes-Deremble notes with regard to the Chartrain glass, the images of apostolic and episcopal liturgy (especially baptism and the mass) are concentrated largely in the area of the choir and the choir chapels; as she writes, these images in this clerical space made it into “un lieu de l’affirmation du pouvoir ecclésial.”} In a manner very different from the text, then, the opening medallion sets up Clement not only as faithful minister of the Church generally but also as an immediate apostolic successor, one who says mass and baptizes, thus providing an exemplum for the clerical community at St. Kunibert and a picture of the origins of its power.

Proper identification of the initial two scenes is also critical on a narratological level, for the first medallion plays an essential role within the narrative economy of the window as a whole, establishing in easily comprehensible visual terms the causal basis for the story of martyrdom that follows. Though the first two scenes are compressed into a single medallion, they do not amount to a continuous narrative. Rather, they stand as separate ciphers that articulate different aspects of Clement’s person, namely, his apostolic work of conversion and his Christian faith, the latter emblematized unambiguously by the large chalice and the golden cross on the altar at which he says the mass. The next medallion (fig. 118) then leaps directly from this joint picture of Clement’s Christian ministry and faith to its consequence: in the lower half of the medallion, Clement sits in a boat that is paddled away by two men. To the left sits an enthroned ruler, positioned under a canopy, with a golden crown and a scepter. This scene represents the conclusion of the episode in the \textit{passio} in which the emperor Trajan presents Clement with the option of sacrificing to the Roman gods or facing exile to the marble quarries near Cherson in the Crimea; Clement, not fearing but welcoming this test of his faith, eagerly...
accepts the latter option. In moving directly from the picture of Clement’s ministry and faith to his banishment, the window’s clerical designer omitted the protracted chain of spectacular causal events in the *passio* that bridge the opening picture of Clement’s ministry to Trajan’s judgement. Making up more than two-thirds of the entire *passio*, these events include the Sissinius and Theodora legend that is the actual reason for Trajan’s condemnation of Clement in the written life. In the window, then, the initial two scenes perform narrative double-duty: they not only provide an introduction to the cycle by showing Clement’s qualities, but also are made, after the viewer has moved to and read the abbreviated scene of consequence in the following medallion, to stand in as its causal root in a way that diverges sharply from the *passio* text.

Proceeding from the base of the first medallion, the window’s designer, though working with very limited space, put a premium in the remaining four medallions on creating a tight visual chain of cause-and-effect in continuous narration, drastically compressing and juxtaposing multiple moments from the *passio* in single medallions and using directionality and gesture to guide the viewer through the unfolding events. Thus, in addition to the scene of Clement’s exile in the lower half of the second medallion, the upper half presents a second scene, which is positioned in clear visual counterpoint to the first. Here, Clement addresses a large group of men who are identified as Christian clergy through their choir robes with red collars and the golden processional cross held by the foremost figure. Like the two scenes in the first medallion, this scene has also been subjected to a dubious identification: since Oidtmann, it has been read as a representation of “Clement bidding farewell to his clerics before

---

934 *Passio*, 73 (c. XVIII, 2): “Tunc imperator Traianus rescripsit, debere eum aut sacrificiis consentire aut trans Ponticum mare in eremo, quae adiacet civitati Chersoni, subire exilium.”
departure.” But again, such an identification is belied both by the image itself, which shows Clement’s departure as having already happened below in the lower half of the medallion, and by the passio text, which says nothing of Clement addressing clergy before his departure. Rather, the upper scene has an exact correspondence in the passio in the account of Clement’s arrival at the marble quarry, which the passio describes thus:

And when he arrived in the place of exile, he found there, enslaved as a chain-gang in the arid marble quarry, more than two thousand Christians condemned to lengthy banishment. And, seeing the holy bishop Clement, they all rushed forth weeping and lamenting in unison. And when St. Clement recognized that they that been banished there in the name of God, he said: it was not without reason that the Lord has brought me here so that I, having been made to share your suffering, may also be your consolation.

The scene, then, shows Clement already at the quarry—the location is indicated visually by the piles of multicolour colour rocks behind and before the Christians—addressing the “two thousand” enslaved Christians—shown as numerous, in high clerical choir robes, and with a prominent processional cross—who have been exiled into hard labour, like him, on account of their faith. Specifically, the scene seemingly represents the final aspect of the arrival episode, when Clement announces to the exiled Christians that the Lord sent him there deliberately in order that he “may share their suffering and be their consolation.” As with the baptism scene in the first medallion, the representation of Clement standing before the masses with his right hand raised in an ad locutio gesture recalls scenes of apostolic preaching in earlier pictorial cycles of Apostles’ lives (fig. 261), and the designer thus appears to have sought to develop further the

---


936 In the passio (73, c. XIX, 1–2), Clement speaks to a sole individual, the Roman prefect Mamertinus, before his departure.

937 Passio, 73–75 (c. XX, 1–3): “Cum autem pervinisset in locum exilii, illic erant in ergastulis ad secanda marmora amplius quam duo millia Christiani diuturna relegatione damnati. Qui videntes sanctum Clementem episcopum omnes una voce in fletu et gemitu proruperunt. Quos cum cognovisset sanctus Clemens pro Dei nomine relegates, dixit: Non immerito Dominus huc perduxit, ut particeps factus passionis vestrae etiam consolationis efficiar.”
visual thread of Clement’s apostolic succession. As with the initial scenes of Clement’s ministry, the depiction of the “Christians” as clergymen in choir robes—like those the canons themselves wore (fig. 131)—and with a processional Cross before Clement in this scene constitutes a visual interpolation that diverges significantly from the passio text. Analogous to those in the first scene, this interpolation further underscores the St. Kunibert clergy’s own apostolic heritage, visually situating the clergy in a sacred and authoritative narrative that proceeds from St. Clement himself as one of the apostolic fathers, who addresses the clerics as his disciples.

The clerical designer’s selection of this particular episode of the passio for pairing with the scene of exile is also crucial on a narratological level as an image of reversal: banished for his ministry in the lower half of the medallion, Clement is shown as continuing it in exile in the upper. Through the disposition of the figures and the narrative flow from left to right and then back in the opposite direction, the designer and artist underscore this dichotomy for the viewer in clear visual terms. Trajan and Clement, the largest figures, are positioned at opposite ends of the medallion as point and counterpoint. Trajan, representative of false gods, rules under the sign of the sceptre as he sends away Clement for not sacrificing to the gods, while Clement, now turned back towards Trajan, preaches from under the sign of the cross.

The designer’s decision to have pictured the moment of Clement’s announcement to Christian (that is, clerical) flock of its impending deliverance, moreover, has a narrative logic beyond the medallion itself, serving also to presage directly the following episode in the next medallion (fig. 119). The scene here begins with Clement at the lower left and runs upwards to

---

938 On the interpolation of figures in contemporary garb in historical narrative in general, see Kemp, Narratives, 220.

939 On the narrative significance of reversal in pictorial lives of martyrs, see Hahn, Narrative Effect, 60.
the right, continuing the zig-zag movement set in motion in the second medallion. Kneeling in *proskynesis* and surrounded by the exiled Christians, who are again shown as clerics dressed in choir robes and in prayer, Clement gestures with praying hands across the medallion to a lamb that stands on a hill of variously coloured rocks. A large stream of water issues from the ground before the lamb’s legs. This scene represents the deliverance promised by Clement in the upper scene in the previous medallion: thirsting in the arid quarry, Clement enjoins the Christians to pray “to the Lord Jesus Christ so that he might open by his confessors a water source so that we may enjoy its benefits.”940 Following Clement and the community’s prayer, the *passio* tells us, Clement sees a lamb with its right foot raised “as if it were showing Clement the spot.”941 Clement, who alone sees the lamb, recognizes it as the Lord, and instructs the others to dig on the spot where he sees the lamb. After the others fail to hit the source, Clement himself takes up a hoe, “striking with a light stroke the spot below the foot of the lamb, whence appeared a stream decorated with flowing veins, which by its force expanded into a rushing river.”942 Though it visualizes the elements of prayer, the lamb, and the water source of the *passio* text, the representation of the miracle in the medallion diverges from the textual narrative account by removing the element of physical work between the prayer and the appearance of the spring, with neither the Christians nor Clement shown digging for the source. Rather, it visually elides the initial prayer and the resultant miracle. By electing not to show Clement as revealing the source by the work of his hands but rather as effecting the miracle solely through his prayer and the lamb (of God), the designer and the artist of the visual narrative intensify the spiritual import.
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940 Passio, 75 (c. XXI, 1): “Tunc sanctus Clemens dixit ad eos: Oremus Dominum Iesum Christum, ut confessoribus suis fontis venam aperiat . . . ut de eius beneficio gratulemur.”
941 Passio, 75 (c. XXI, 2): “qui pede dextro erecto quasi locum sancto Clementi ostenderet.”
942 Passio, 75–77 (c. XXI, 3): “accepto brevi sarculo sanctus Clemens levi ictu locum sub pede agni percussit, unde fons affluentibus venis ornatus apparuit, qui suo impetu emovens fluvium fecit.”
of the scene. Clement is explicitly presented to the viewer as capable of summoning the assistance of the Lord by virtue of his holy person alone.

As in the preceding two scenes, moreover, the designer introduced a further interpolation in this scene by having the artist show the general Christians of the text again as clerics in choir robes, transforming the passio episode into a scene in which Clement is shown specifically as a holy helper of clerics. Arriving in the marble quarry after his banishment (fig. 118), Clement first speaks to the clerics, announcing to them that he shares in their suffering and promising to deliver them from their woes. Praying with the same group of clerics (fig. 119), he then delivers them with God’s assistance in the miracle episode in the following scene. With this interpolation to the textual narrative, the designer yet again emphasized the clergy’s (i.e., the clerical community at St. Kunibert’s) closeness to St. Clement, with the clerics not only shown as Clement’s disciples and successors but also as the preferred recipients and beneficiaries of his spiritual assistance.

As in the preceding medallion, the window’s designer coupled the lower miracle scene with a second scene in the upper half of the medallion, again positioning the two scenes in visual and conceptual counterpoint. Whereas Clement and the clerics’ prayer moves from left to right to the lamb, the upper scene turns the narrative flow back visually in the opposite direction. Here we see positioned next to the lamb two men who are identified as laymen by their secular garments. The foremost figure swings an axe, splintering a column shaft upon which stands an idol, shown as a diminutive gilded monster, which then topples to the left, continuing the pronounced right-to-left directional movement of the upper scene. Taken from the chapter of the passio (XXII) immediately following the miracle episode (XXI), the upper scene is also an abbreviation of a longer narrative unit in the textual account. The passio narrative reads:
And the whole province converged on the spot of the miracle, and, following St. Clement’s teaching, all were converted to the Lord, five hundred and more a day leaving him after being baptized. And within the space of a year, the believers there erected seventy-five churches and all the idols were smashed, all the temples throughout the province destroyed . . . .

Thus, what the textual narrative recounts as occurring distantly in time during the year after the miracle, the medallion shows as happening virtually simultaneously and in convincing cause-and-effect—the miracle occurs and the idol is toppled. The episode of the toppling of the idol, of course, also stands in generally for the whole idea of the subsequent conversion of the provincial populace in the narrative as intimated at the start of the passio chapter, but it is revealing that the designer of the window should have selected the falling idol specifically as the visual synecdoche of Clement’s conversion of the local population. As with the episodes of baptism and preaching in the two previous medallions, images of ineffectual idols are also a constant visual trope in pictorial cycles of apostolic conversions (fig. 262). Clement’s ministry is again figured as apostolic. Through carefully considered scenic juxtaposition, the medallion presents the viewer with an economical image of action-and-reaction that is further underscored by the contrapuntal arrangement of the essential metonymic signs: in the lower half, Christian faith works a miracle through the sign of the Lord in the life-giving lamb; in the upper half and opposite, the sign of the ineffectual false god tumbles.

In a repetition of the narrative strategy used in the previous medallion, the window’s designer also mobilized the upper scene of the falling of the idol as a conceptual and even visual bridge for the continuation of the narrative into the following medallion (figs. 116 and 120). From the falling idol, the viewer’s eye is led directly to the ruler figure positioned above in the
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943 Passio, 77 (c. XXII, 1–2): “Ad istam autem famam confluxit omnis provincia, et venientes universi ad doctrinam sancti Clementis convertebantur ad Dominum, ita ut in die quingenti et eo amplius baptizati recederent. Intra unum autem annum factae sunt ibi a credentibus septuaginta quinque ecclesiae et omnia idola contracta sunt, omnia templa per gyrum provinciae destructa . . . .”
outer left reaches of the medallion. Crowned and enthroned under a baldachin, he is made the visual starting point for the unfolding of the scene, thus extending the zig-zagging direction of the narrative chain back to the right, in which direction the figure points with his powerfully extended right arm. Holding a large sceptre in his left hand, the ruler addresses Clement, who is escorted to a waiting ship by two men in secular dress. This ruler figure has usually been identified as Trajan himself, but this identification is again belied both by the *passio* text and visually by the image. In the *passio*, Trajan, learning of Clement’s mass conversions in the eastern provinces, sends a certain duke Aufidianus to the region. Once there, Aufidianus killed many Christians by diverse tortures. And when he realized that all were eager to accept martyrdom, he stopped killing the multitudes and schemed instead to kill Clement. And when he saw that Clement was so firm in his faith in the Lord that he could hardly be changed, he said to his men: let him be taken out to the middle of the sea and, an anchor having been fastened around his neck, cast overboard where the Christians cannot revere him.

The scene therefore represents the moment when Aufidianus—Trajan’s representative and ardent defender of the false gods above which he sits and in which he tries to convince Clement to believe—condemns Clement to death by drowning, placing him in the custody of his henchmen. The presentation of Aufidianus as a royal figure like Trajan is a common visual formula for figures of secular authority; the designer and artist took pains to distinguish between the two by means of their costume, dressing Trajan in white and imperial purple garments lined with gold and Aufidianus in a green tunic with a yellow mantle. Beyond the figure of Aufidianus, moreover, the entire scene itself is strongly formulaic. Again, it recalls images in earlier and contemporary pictorial cycles of apostolic lives in which Apostles, like Clement’s
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944 Thus, Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 62; Brinkmann in *OE*, vol. 2, 272; Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 150.
945 *Passio*, 77–79 (c. XXII, 1–2): “Multos Christianorum diversis poenis occidit. Et cum videret omnes gaudentes ad passionem accedere, cessit multituni, solum sanctum Clementem cogens ad sacrificandum. Et cum videret eum sic fixum in Domino, ut penitus mutari non posset, dixit ad suos: Producatur in medio mari, et ligata ad collum eius ancora, praecipitetur, ut non possint Christiani hunc pro Deo colere.”
teacher Peter, are put before Roman imperial authority and condemned to death (fig. 263). The fourth medallion thus seemingly confirms what the preceding three medallions strongly suggest: that the window’s clerical designer and the artist, though not working with an illustrated life of Clement, likely based several elements of the cycle not just on pictorial types from episcopal lives in general, but specifically on illustrated cycles of Acts of the Apostles.946

In contrast to the preceding three medallions, the designer departed in this medallion from the system of multiple events and continuous narration, introducing instead a single scene that slows down the previously rapid narrative flow. Within the medallion, there is still a marked left-to-right movement that leads the viewer’s gaze from Aufidianus across Clement to the henchmen, who pull Clement to the right and into the boat, with the one in green striding powerfully to the right, intimating the impending movement of the boat out of the scene in that direction. But the figure of Clement appears as a strong visual caesura within the general directional flow of the medallion. Placed at the centre, he turns his head back towards Aufidianus, while his body faces the boat. Clement’s axial position and the sign of the Hand of God above create a pronounced vertical stop within the general left-to-right movement of the scene, focusing attention on Clement as if to encourage the viewer to pause briefly to consider Clement’s impending martyrdom before continuing on to the next medallion. As in other hagiographic cycles, the Hand of God is a crucial extra-textual interpolation that moves the significance of the scene beyond the immanence of the pictured event. It signals in one economical sign of God’s intervention in the world that, though taken physically into custody by
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946 On the availability of apostolic pictorial cycles in the North in this period generally, see Luba Eleen, *The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles in French and English Bibles of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982).
worldly powers at this moment, Clement’s spirit is simultaneously in God’s custody, his membership among the elect secured by his willingness to die as a witness to God’s name.

Picking up on the left-to-right directionality of the fourth medallion, the designer and the artist continue the narrative in the final medallion from the right half, turning back the narrative flow one last time and thus completing the zig-zag movement used to guide the viewer’s reading of the window from the second medallion onwards (figs. 116 and 121). In tandem with the directionality, the narrative itself also continues seamlessly from where it left off in the previous medallion. Having brought Clement out to the “middle of the sea,” the same two henchmen cast him overboard with a large purple anchor fastened around his neck. Returning to the mode of continuous narration within a single medallion, the designer couples Clement’s execution with a second scene, again establishing an easily comprehensible visual couplet of cause-and-effect.

Cast into the water from the upper right-hand corner of the medallion, Clement’s body is pictured a second time to the left at the bottom of the medallion, having “sunk” to the sea floor. Over the deceased pontiff, four angels erect a small church-like building replete with an arcade, tower, and shining white walls. The concluding episode of the window, this scene again stands as a compressed representation of a much longer series of events that follows Clement’s execution in the textual passio. The latter recounts how, after Clement’s execution, his disciples Cornelius and Phoebus, standing at the shore with the rest of the community, roused the masses to pray in the hope that God would reveal Clement’s place of rest.⁹⁴⁷ Upon the completion of the community’s prayer, “the middle of the sea receded for almost three miles, and, entering the path so opened, the people discovered a small dwelling made by God in the manner of a marble
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⁹⁴⁷ Passio, 79 (c. XXIV, 1).
temple and in it the body of St. Clement, placed in a tomb of stone.”\textsuperscript{948} The \textit{passio} then goes on to indicate that Clement’s disciples were told by God not to move Clement’s body, which was then made accessible by the same parting of the sea for seven days each year on the saint’s feast day, resulting in the conversion of the entire provincial population.\textsuperscript{949}

Though it points forward to all of these miracles when one has the \textit{passio} text to hand, on its own the final scene focuses the viewer’s attention squarely on the actual moment of God’s construction of Clement’s underwater dwelling through his angelic helpers, which is only mentioned \textit{post factum} in the \textit{passio} once the miracles have begun. On the one hand, the designer’s decision to show the angelic construction of the dwelling rounds out the tightly-spun pictorial thread of cause-and-effect: Clement is cast overboard and God then constructs a dwelling for his body. But in isolating and visualizing the moment of God’s construction of the dwelling, the designer also provides the viewer with “iconographic closure” to the visual narrative as a whole. The final scene conveys what the previous medallions intimate by the quarry miracle with the lamb and the insertion of the Hand of God in the penultimate medallion. Namely, the holy Clement not only enjoys God’s particular favour and is therefore capable of working miracles, but is also in the end a vessel through which God has worked and continues to work even after Clement’s physical death. The final scene both concludes the cumulative narrative of Clement’s sanctity and ultimately moves beyond it to point back to its source—God himself.

At the same time, the designer’s emphasis in the final scene on Clement’s deceased body and the unambiguous representation of the underwater dwelling as a church building with a

\textsuperscript{948} \textit{Passio}, 79 (c. XXIV, 2): “Orantibus autem populis recessit mare in sinum suum per tria fere milia, et ingressi per siccum populi invenerunt in modum temple marmorei habitaculum a Deo paratum et ibi in arca saxea corpus sancti Clementis positum . . . .”

\textsuperscript{949} \textit{Passio}, 79–81 (c. XXV, 1–4).
tower point right back to the church and clerical community of St. Kunibert itself. For the canons, the image of Clement’s deceased holy body in the window would have been particularly meaningful on account of the church’s possession of a relic of Clement, which was among those that dean Constantine had placed in the sepulchre in the high altar directly below the window (figs. 35, 103). The church was thus part of the narrative of Clement’s miracle-working body and profited directly from its powers. Likewise, the canons surely would have read the church building that appears over Clement’s body not only literally as the dwelling that God built for Clement in the textual narrative, but also as a direct visual reference to the very Church of St. Clement that Kunibert had built in Clement’s honour, which was the first church on the site and the point of origin of the institution. In not only focusing on the building of the dwelling over Clement’s body but also by showing the dwelling as a church building, the window’s designer and artist concluded the narrative of Clement’s life with an image of the ancient origins of the institution itself in Kunibert’s initial foundation.

While based on the passio for its basic structure and events, the St. Clement window is a visual remaking with its own system of emphases and elisions that transcends those of its textual source (fig. 116). Together, the designer and artist of the Clement window compressed a total of nine separate events within the limited space of five medallions, presenting the material in easy-to-read terms through careful selection and juxtaposition of events in cause-and-effect relationships and the use of direction and composition to guide the viewer, highlight the significance of the scenes within the individual medallions, and create visual and conceptual links between the medallions. In the window, events are sewn together in a way that diverges markedly from the passio to produce an entirely visually driven narrative with different foci. On a purely visual level, the recurrent use in the window’s narrative of pictorial and episodic
tropes—baptism, preaching, conversion, and condemnation—with close parallels in illustrated cycles of the Acts of the Apostles effectively makes Clement’s life more apostolic than the passio does, which only briefly mentions Clement’s following of Peter’s teaching in the first line. The use of tropes from illustrated Apostles’ lives as the basis for patterning Clement’s life in the window hardly seems accidental. It bespeaks a desire on the part of the window’s clerical designer and the larger canonical community at St. Kunibert to reinforce visually Clement’s status as Peter’s disciple, even if these tropes of apostolicity may have been recognized as such only by the community itself. This appears to be primarily how the canons imagined Clement: in the altar sepulchre, they placed Clement’s relic together with those of his teacher Peter and the Apostle Paul; and on Kunibert’s reliquary shrine, they had Clement pictured, together with Kunibert, at the head of the ranks of Apostles along the two sides, thus casting both as successors to the Apostles.

The picture of Clement’s apostolic life that the clerical designer constructed in the window, however, is not just about Clement. The window’s narrative is patently clerical in emphasis. Skipping over such miraculous events as the Theodora and Sisinnius legend, the window’s designer moved straight to fabricating an image of an apostolic Clement that would not only resonate with the window’s audience of canons, but also foreground the clerical community’s own apostolic heritage and the church’s history. Clement baptizes and says mass, pointing up the apostolic basis for the community’s liturgy and pastoral powers. Arriving in the marble quarry after his banishment, Clement promises to the save the clerics from their woes; praying with the clerics, he delivers them with God’s assistance in the miracle episode. Clement’s body was not only on the sea floor, but also in the high altar, his dwelling not only
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950 On the visual type’s power to construct a fundamentally different narrative dynamic than the text, see Brenk, “Le texte et l’image,” 37–39.
that built by God, but also that built by Kunibert. As on the shrine of circa 1180 with its figure of Clement as intercessor, the window’s visual narrative presents Clement precisely as the capitular community wanted him to be—as the apostolic patron saint of Kunibert’s initial foundation, an emblem of clerical power, and an intercessor of clerics *par excellence*.

4. **From the Sign to the Shrine: The Kunibert Window**

   Whereas Clement’s lengthy *passio* abounds with miraculous events and presented the clerical designer with the problem of deciding what to omit, Kunibert’s *vita* is short, vague, even impoverished—at least as far as the dramatic and the miraculous are concerned. To judge from the Kunibert window itself (fig. 122), with its five scenes to Clement’s nine, the designer’s problem in this instance was not what to exclude, but seemingly almost what to include. The meagre picture of Kunibert’s life in the ninth-century *vita*, in fact, appears to have been the community’s sole source of knowledge about its patron in the early thirteenth century; the slim textual and monumental record before this point, at any rate, contains nothing that would indicate that the chapter knew more about Kunibert than what the *vita* had to offer. The lack of a narrative cycle of Kunibert’s life on the earlier shrine suggests that the window may possibly have been the chapter’s first essay in presenting its patron’s life in a visual narrative. The occurrence in the window of certain stock figures and scenes with immediate parallels in contemporary manuscript illumination (cf. figs. 127 and 265) also suggests that the clerical designer worked from the *vita* and in close collaboration with a glass painter with a model book and not from an earlier pictorial life of Kunibert (in the predecessor church or an illustrated *libellus*, for instance).
Yet, it would be erroneous to assume that the clerical designer simply scoured the *vita* for five useable moments and had the artist present these moments according to well-trodden visual *topoi* for confessors’ lives. Though few in number, the moments selected from the *vita* are meaningful, both on their own and as components in a total visual narrative chain. As much as the Clement window, the Kunibert window is a context-bound visual retelling of a textual narrative. It presents a synthetic narrative that surpasses the *vita* text and the trope to offer a cumulative if compressed picture of Kunibert’s life and its relevance for the capitular community. Even on the very minimal basis of the *vita*, how did the community imag(in)e its patron Kunibert?

Like the Clement and Jesse windows, the Kunibert window features a central narrative field that is subdivided into five compartments by the horizontal iron armatures and framed by a broad border filled with *rinceaux* on a red ground. In contrast to the Clement window with its separate quatrefoil medallions in a subsidiary frame, the central narrative field of the Kunibert window, though truncated by the armatures, forms one continuous visual and conceptual unit. Here, a prominent red border formed from a combination of angled straight edges and circular lobes of the kind frequently encountered in German glass from circa 1220–1250 bounds in the central field on all sides. Set like vignettes against an expansive blue ground, the individual scenes are separated vertically solely by the armatures and scenic elements, such as the curtains swung around a rod in the first three compartments or the roof of the church in the fourth. The formal structure of the window creates a visual and notional narrative armature that encourages the viewer to understand the scenes as a successively unfolding and indivisibly connected sequence of events.
The first link in this chain is again found in the lowest medallion (fig. 123). Here, above two donor figures, two large male figures appear, one placed above the other. Positioned under a rod draped with a curtain and from which hangs an oil lamp, the uppermost figure lies in a bed with elaborately patterned sheets and wears a crown and regal purple vestments trimmed with gold. Awake, he gazes over to the second, youthful figure below, who is shown as sleeping on a yellow mass, probably meant to indicate straw, with his head encircled by a yellow halo. A ray of light enters the scene from the upper right-hand corner and illuminates the head of the sleeping youth.

This initial scene, as has long been recognized, represents the moment in the *vita* in which Dagobert, “lying awake at night while all his servants slept, saw a magnitude of light, shining with great brightness, above the place where the adolescent Kunibert lay in sleep.” The window thus opens immediately with the “sign”: already at Dagobert’s court, Kunibert’s special qualities are revealed to Dagobert by God through a light miracle. In beginning the cycle with the light miracle, the window’s designer tells us nothing about Kunibert’s origins, how or why he came to Dagobert’s court, or why he was forced to sleep among the servants on hay in the first place. All of this is detailed extensively in the first chapter-and-a-half of the five-chapter *vita*, which recounts how the noble Kunibert was brought by his father to Dagobert’s court to receive an education worthy of his rank, but was instead forced to do hard labour, which he humbly accepted and dutifully executed until Dagobert had his nocturnal vision. The designer moves instead directly to an unmistakable visual demonstration of Kunibert’s select status as one of God’s elect: Kunibert’s sanctity is signalled immediately for
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951 The donor figures are discussed in detail in Chapter 8.

the viewer through the motif of God’s light, which literally fills Kunibert’s head. Here, the clerical designer made recourse, possibly direct, to a *topos* and narrative strategy found in the earlier medallions on the Heribert Shrine (ca. 1160; fig. 264), whose designer also opened the narrative cycle of this confessor with a light miracle that shows Heribert as a baby filled with God’s light. More than a visual trope, the initial divine sign in both the window and the shrine is an argumentative device. As a confessor whose life was not sanctified by martyrdom, Kunibert’s sanctity, like that of Heribert and other confessors, had to be demonstrated visually. In keying in on the light miracle for the opening episode, the designer not only points immediately to Kunibert as a vessel of God, but also creates a notional base that invests the following sequence of events with the authority of divine inevitability.

In the first scene, the artist effectively conveys Kunibert’s inequality and humble servitude by means of his simple bed and costume and especially through a considered use of composition, placing Kunibert below the elevated, richly-clad figure of Dagobert. This initial discrepancy is then eliminated visually and notionally for the viewer in the following scene (figs. 122 and 124). Flanked by two groups of figures identified as courtiers by their swords and noble dress, Dagobert and Kunibert now appear on the same physical plane and locked in an embrace. Again dressed in regal garments and seated on his throne in the palace (further intimated by the rod draped with a curtain), Dagobert holds Kunibert’s head and left shoulder and presses the latter’s face gently to his own. This second scene has traditionally been identified as a representation of Kunibert departing from Dagobert’s court. In the *vita*,
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954 On this aspect of confessors’ pictorial lives, see Hahn, *Narrative Effect*, 129.
955 Thus, Oidtmann, “Glasmalereien,” 209; Oidtmann, *Glasmalereien*, vol. 1, 82; *KDM* 6/4, 271; Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 151. Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 34–38, believing the *vita* to be mistaken and the scenes to be historical rather than legendary in intent, understood the king in this and the other two scenes as a representation of
however, Kunibert’s departure from Dagobert’s court is only implied and not narrated.\textsuperscript{956}

Showing Kunibert not in the clothes of a courtier but still in a simple frock, the scene in the window accords instead much more closely with the second half of the account of the light miracle in the \textit{vita}. It records how

the next day at the break of dawn, Dagobert began to ask diligently which of his servants had slept that night in that particular part of his palace. And when his attendants told him that it was the boy Kunibert who had slept there, Dagobert immediately had the pious youth brought to him. Speaking to him softly and benignly, and kissing him gently and piously, he adopted him as his son.\textsuperscript{957}

As in the \textit{vita}, the second episode of adoption with Dagobert embracing Kunibert performs a pivotal narrative role within the window as a scene of role-reversal and as the fulfillment of the initial sign. With his attention having been drawn to Kunibert by God, Dagobert, previously neglecting the servant Kunibert, now makes him his own son, bestowing royal favour on his exceptional protégé as the courtiers look on.

In addition to completing the first scene, the second—when read as the adoption episode rather than a departure—also functions as the causal hinge for the further course of the visual narrative. After seeing the sign in the first scene and adopting Kunibert in the second, Dagobert rewards his adoptive son Kunibert in the third scene by elevating him from the position of archdeacon of Trier to the office of bishop of Cologne (fig. 125). Dressed in the same regal garments as in the previous scene and enthroned in his palace before a group of three courtiers, Dagobert again appears in the left half of the scene, extending the visual pattern established in

Chlothar II (584–629), but it is clear that the legendary \textit{vita} with Dagobert as regent was the basis for the window. This reading also occurs in \textit{OE}, vol. 2, 272–273.

\textsuperscript{956} The \textit{vita} says only that, after receiving an education at Dagobert’s court, Kunibert was made archdeacon of Trier; the departure from court is not developed in the text. Cf. Coens, “\textit{Vies},” 364.

\textsuperscript{957} Coens, “\textit{Vies},” 364: “Et mox diei crastinae orta luce, coepit interrogare diligencius quisnam ille esset familiarium qui eadem nocte praeterita in illo ipsius domus angulo quietis habuisset locum. Et ut a circumstantibus didicisset quod ibidem Kunibertus puer quievisset, mox ad se accersitum pium adolescentem blande benignique alloquitur, leniter pieque deosculus, coepit eum adoptare in filium.”
the previous two scenes. Kunibert likewise appears in the right half of the scene, as in the first two episodes. The recurrent placement of the two protagonists, and especially Kunibert, in the same general position over three scenes underscores the development of the narrative of Kunibert’s saintly rise by means of cumulative contrast. Asleep on a lowly straw bed in the first scene, Kunibert ascends in the second and is then dressed in choir robes before the king in the third. Grasping the sceptre with both hands, Kunibert is invested by a bishop, who, standing behind him, places his hands on Kunibert’s shoulders in accordance with liturgical practice. Four further clerics in choir robes round out the representatives of the Church in the right half of the scene.

While investiture scenes are a universal topos of episcopal lives that often serve to signal the confessor saint’s transition from the secular world to the Church, in Kunibert’s case the focus of the investiture scene is not on his transition from secular to sacred per se—the designer had Kunibert shown as an archdeacon in line with the vita—but rather on the circumstances of Kunibert’s investiture as bishop of Cologne. This is shown in the window as having been effected by Dagobert himself, who swears Kunibert into office with his sceptre. In showing Kunibert’s investiture as issuing directly from Dagobert, the window selectively exploits this angle of the written vita, which presents Kunibert’s accession to the office of bishop of Cologne as the result of not one but three forces, noting that “Kunibert was made bishop of Cologne by the Holy Spirit, synodal council,” and—lastly—“royal command.”
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959 On investiture scenes as moments of transition in confessors’ pictorial lives, see Hahn, Narrative Effect, 135–140.
960 Coens, “Vies,” 364: “... per Spiritum sanctum et synodale concilium ac praecepto regis, successit licet invite in episcopatu, urbis Agrippinae praesul factus...”
Though the final, “royal command” aspect of the written *vita* was no doubt easiest to translate pictorially, the clerical designer’s decision to have Kunibert’s investiture shown as issuing from Dagobert furthers the visual chain of close connections between these two figures in the window. In fact, the narrative of the window is marked by a pronounced emphasis on negotiating Kunibert’s relationship to Dagobert. Of the five total scenes in the window, three are given over to detailing the ties between these two figures. The window’s emphasis on the close relationship between Dagobert and Kunibert is all the more significant in view of the fact that the picture that the window presents is, historically, a (near-)complete fiction. Kunibert was neither raised at Dagobert’s court nor adopted by him, but rather spent his youth at the court of Theudebert II; and though perhaps rooted in fact, Kunibert’s accession as bishop of Cologne by means of Dagobert’s initiative is far from certain historically. All these discrepancies, however, had been ironed out by the anonymous author of the ninth-century *vita*, who made the court into Dagobert’s court, Dagobert into Kunibert’s adoptive father, and the investiture into Dagobert’s initiative (at least in part).

The picture inherited from the *vita* was what the community, ignorant of the actual historical circumstances surrounding Kunibert’s early life and investiture, believed. But as the inclusion of the figure of “pious Dagobert who gives Kunibert gifts” on the shrine of the 1180s suggests, the chapter was also quick to exploit Kunibert’s ties to Dagobert—imagined or real—for political ends. Working from the preformed imaginary construct of Kunibert and Dagobert’s relationship in the *vita*, the window’s early-thirteenth-century designer visually recast it with even greater insistence. In forcefully linking the patron and founder Kunibert to Dagobert, the window, like the shrine, unambiguously documented the church’s origins in the Merovingian
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961 See Chapter 1.
era and the early ages of the Church of Cologne. For the capitular community, the opening
three scenes would have constituted not only a moving account of the early stages of its patron’s
life, but a powerful visual retelling of the historical source of its current elite status and
privileges within the local ecclesiastical hierarchy, one which was digested on a daily basis
together with the patron’s shrine on the high altar below. Dwelling on Dagobert and Kunibert,
the first three scenes simultaneously document Kunibert’s ascent and the institution’s own.

Just as the investiture scene rounds out the sequence of Kunibert’s ties to Dagobert, it
also forms a causal springboard for next scene. Having been made bishop below, Kunibert is
shown in the fourth scene as a bishop saying mass in a church before an altar furnished with a
chalice and paten, cross, and candlestick (figs. 122 and 126). Framed by the trefoil arch of the
schematic church building in the background, Kunibert is assisted by a deacon, who stands
directly behind him, and is observed by a group of individuals from various social stations,
including a noble man (lowest), a common man in a purple travelling frock, a woman with noble
headdress, as well as others whose heads only appear behind these three figures.

The fourth scene is based on the only other miraculous episode in the vita beyond the
light miracle itself, namely, the miracle at the Church of the Eleven Thousand Virgins, later St.
Ursula. The vita’s account of this episode reads:

One day, when Kunibert was celebrating mass, as was customary, at the church of the
Eleven Thousand Virgins on their feast day and offering the sacrosanct mysteries of
Christ, namely his body and blood, with a throng of his clerics and a large number of the
people standing around him, a dove whiter than snow appeared in the church, flying
about everywhere. And after some time, the dove, seeking rest, landed on the head of
the blessed bishop. Then, a short while later, the dove came to rest in the middle of the
church on the tomb of a certain virgin and then suddenly disappeared from the tomb in a
radiant cloud of light, before the eyes of all.962

---

962 See Chapter 1, note 83.
The scene in the window, then, presents all of the basic elements of the *vita’s* account of the miracle. Kunibert celebrates the mass at the church before the “clergy and people” with a dove perched on his head. And in the lower left-hand corner, the dove comes to rest on a tomb. The representation of the miracle in the window has usually been discussed as a depiction of Kunibert’s reputed discovery of St. Ursula’s tomb rather than the “tomb of a certain Virgin” mentioned in the *vita*, but neither the scene nor the *vita* account bear out this reading. The legend of Kunibert’s discovery of Ursula’s tomb first appears as an interpolation in a single text of the *vita* in a Trier manuscript of the later fifteenth century and cannot be traced back before this point. For its part, the brief mention of this episode in a liturgical sequence for St. Kunibert, which is likely not older than the fourteenth century and which was doubtlessly composed at St. Kunibert itself, casts the dove that landed on Kunibert’s head as a token of his sanctity, but says nothing of the tomb or Ursula. While Kunibert’s discovery of Ursula’s tomb may conceivably have already been an oral legend, the window itself also does not seem to insist on this point. If the designer wanted to emphasize that it was Ursula’s tomb in an effort to reinforce an existing oral legend or even create one, it would have been an easy step to label the tomb with Ursula’s name.

Instead, the focus in the pictorial scene itself is not on whose tomb was discovered but on the character of Kunibert’s own sanctitas. While miracles at mass frequently occur in pictorial episcopal cycles as potent demonstrations in and of themselves of episcopal sanctity

---

and charisma, in St. Kunibert’s case this was doubly so on account of the motif of the dove with its latent symbolism. In the window, the designer both concentrated and capitalized on this particular motif, having the artist provide the dove on Kunibert’s head with a halo and leaving the second—in the *vita*, the same—dove on the tomb without one. In so doing, the designer and artist again departed slightly but significantly from the *vita*’s diachronic account of the event, which only afterwards presents the dove as being none other than the Holy Spirit. In the synchronic representation of the event in the window, Kunibert is visually marked out as a vessel of God, with his head again cast as a receptacle for the Spirit, as in the opening scene with God’s sign. The window’s dynamic is further underscored by the coupling of the unambiguous image of Spirit on Kunibert’s head with the extra-textual motif of the *dextera Domini*, which emerges from a cloud at the upper left-hand corner of the scene before Kunibert, whose gaze is trained on it. As in the Clement window, the addition of the Hand of God is a critical interpolation that further styles Kunibert as a human agent through whom God works. Almost tautological, the miracle scene compounds Kunibert’s sanctity by surrounding him with visual metonyms that highlight his potent spiritual efficacy and provide the demonstration and consummation of the initial divine sign at the base of the window.

As with the image of Clement saying mass at the base of his window, this scene of Kunibert’s miraculous mass at St. Ursula offered the clerical community an ideal picture of the saintly precedents for its own liturgy at the high altar directly below the window. The scene affirms not only Kunibert’s holiness but also the sacred basis for the canons’ own clerical authority—indeed, a deacon in contemporary clerical garb stands behind Kunibert as the bishop

---

966 On the narrative significance of mass episodes in confessors’ lives, see Hahn, *Narrative Effect*, 149, 156.  
967 Though not recorded in Welter’s watercolour of this window, the halo around this dove’s head appears to be original; see Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 39 and 164. As Scheuffelen notes, solely Kunibert’s head is a modern replacement.
says the mass from a position that would have corresponded to the position assumed by the clerical community’s own celebrant at the high altar below (fig. 35). Modelling itself after this exalted precedent in the window, the clerical community rehearsed its sacred clerical lineage in the celebration of its coventual mass and in the very presence of Kunibert’s holy body in the shrine behind the altar. In placing the deacon between Kunibert and a gathering of lay people, moreover, the scene both figures the canons as the inheritors of the holy clerical order emblematized by Kunibert and establishes a picture of the laity’s dependence on the clergy and its pastoral care for access to salvation.968

The penultimate scene’s visual emphasis on Kunibert’s body as marked by the sign of God is also critical within the window’s larger narrative economy, for the next scene moves seamlessly from this picture of the holy pontiff as a living divine agent to a concluding image that shows that same holy body being placed in a tomb (figs. 122 and 127). As in other episcopal cycles, the entombment scene as presented in the window is not simply a logical conclusion to the narrative that shows the saint’s burial and ascension to heaven, but a carefully-crafted visual construct that moves far beyond the source text in its significance and implications.969

In the final chapter of the written vita, Kunibert’s burial is described in very bald terms: “On December 1, his body was buried with dignified reverence in the church of the blessed Clement, which he himself built, and enjoys great veneration.”970

The general configuration of the burial scene in the window follows contemporary visual schemata for entombment episodes quite closely in showing the deceased bishop in the tomb at the bottom of

968 Again, for similar dynamics of clerical self-fashioning in the episcopal windows at Chartres, see Manhes-Deremble, Les vitraux narratifs, 205–237.
969 On the various dimensions of entombments in hagiographical cycles, see Abou-el-Haj, Cult of Saints, 49–55, which has been formative in shaping the arguments in this paragraph.
the scene and his youthful soul being borne up to heaven by two angels at the top, as
comparison with the miniature of St. Martin’s burial in the Großer St. Martin Evangeliary (fig.
265) indicates.\textsuperscript{971} In a divergence from both the textual account and the visual trope, however,
the window’s designer and artist show Kunibert being buried at the church of St. Clement not in
the presence of a bishop, an abbot, monks, and even laity, but by an exclusive group of six
secular clerics, with two canons in choir robes placing the body in the tomb and four further
clerics seeing to the liturgical rites of lections, asperging, and censing. Through this
interpolation in what is otherwise a generic scene, the concluding moment of Kunibert’s
entombment in the window’s narrative becomes a visual document not just of the event, but of
institutional origins and authority. Dispossessed of his soul, Kunibert’s holy body is shown as
passing into the possession of the clerical community itself. For the canons seated in the choir
stalls with full view of Kunibert’s shrine on the high altar and the window above, the
entombment scene coupled with the preceding miracle scene pointed directly to their custody of
a potent, miracle-working body that provided an intercessory portal for their salvation. At the
same time, the final scene with its clerical figures also would have provided the capitular
community with daily visual affirmation of a continuous chain of possession of the patron’s
body that spanned six centuries, beginning with Kunibert’s construction of the initial church of
St. Clement.\textsuperscript{972} Indeed, the placement of an exclusive clerical community in the entombment
scene seems to make a very pointed historical claim. In showing Kunibert’s body at St. Clement
surrounded by secular clerics, the window also points to the imagined existence at that church of
a community of secular clergy and thus seemingly to Kunibert’s foundation not just of the

\textsuperscript{971} On the miniature, see Grimme, \textit{Evangeliar}, 100. The front side of the tomb in the window was replaced with
blue ground during the last restoration; its original state as a stone chest is recorded in Welter’s drawing.

\textsuperscript{972} For a study of analogous dynamics in French windows of this period, see Mary B. Shepard, “Power Windows: Relic
church, but of a religious community of secular clerics. Whether historically factual or not (and the historical evidence strongly suggests the latter), the final scene makes the entombment into a visual demonstration of the capitular community’s ancient origins and sanctified pedigree. The climactic entombment scene is as concerned with recording Kunibert’s death as it is with fixing the institution’s birth.

With its set of interpolations and elisions, the Kunibert window as pictorial hagiography “transcends the logic of the text” (fig. 122). Kunibert’s written vita is not long; but the window’s version of events is compressed into an even tighter, more persuasive chain. Each of the five scenes is constructed in relation to the next as a point in an overarching conceptual sequence that documents Kunibert’s saintly becoming in a rapid unfolding from the initial sign through the recognition and installation to the miracle. After a penultimate demonstration of Kunibert’s sanctity, the window concludes abruptly with an entombment scene that both rounds out the narrative and moves its significance beyond the story itself to point to its enduring relevance for the canonical community in its own sacred space. With its visual emphasis on Dagobert and Kunibert’s relationship, Kunibert’s divinely-inscribed body, and the community’s possession of that body in the shrine, and its foundation by its holy patron, the window deftly exploits the vita to highlight both Kunibert’s efficaciousness as a holy helper and the institution’s divinely-sanctioned origins as the basis for its elite status in the present ecclesiastical order.

And the whole, both Kunibert’s life and the origins of the community, finally, plays out under divine approbation and guidance: positioned at the apex of the window above the final scene, the figure of the blessing Christ emerges as the architect of the narrative (fig. 122). Just

973 Kemp, Narratives, 92.
974 On the importance of sequences in narrative windows in general, see Kemp, Narratives, esp. 220–221.
as God the Father directs and oversees creation and Christ’s life in the central Jesse window (fig. 108), so Christ himself directs and oversees Kunibert’s life and the establishment of the church that bore his name. The insertion of Christ at the apex of the window invests Kunibert’s life and the institution’s very foundation with the authority of heavenly justification and divine inevitability. At the same time, the presence of Christ above the story of Kunibert and his church folds the saint and the institution he founded into the larger narrative of salvation history pictured in the central Jesse window, with its analogous figure of God the Father as architect at the top. Taken together, the clerestory windows create a synthetic, overarching narrative that maps out the course of salvation, the history of the Church, the history of the church of St. Kunibert, and, finally, the clerical community’s place within this grand narrative (fig. 35).

Opening with creation, the Jesse window presents Christ’s life and concludes with a scene that depicts both his Ascension before the Apostles, the founders of the Church, and his Second Coming as a majestic judge at the end of time. Presenting Clement as an inheritor of the apostolic mantle and as a representative of the early Church and clergy, the Clement window picks up on the Jesse window’s final scene and, after detailing Clement’s apostolic life, concludes with an image of Clement’s body in a church that evokes Clement’s relic in the altar and points to the historical origins of the church in Kunibert’s foundation of the Church of St. Clement. The chronological endpoint of the three windows, Kunibert’s window recounts his life as a later representative of the Church and the clergy and his ties to Dagobert and culminates in a scene that points alternately to his burial at the church of St. Clement, his body on the altar below, and, ultimately, to the origins of the canonical community at his initial foundation. The figure of Christ at the top of the Kunibert window closes the circle by figuring the church’s narrative as part of the full narrative of sacred history, which culminates in the central Jesse
window in Christ’s judgement at the end of time. And this whole picture of the church’s exalted origins, its ties to the ancient universal and local Churches, and, not least, the clergy’s own powers as successors to Clement and Kunibert, finally, is presided over by, and ultimately located in, the figure of God the Father at the apex of the axial Jesse window, the divine architect of all things—and, by implication, the divine architect of the community’s present power and privileges.

Relit—and thus reactivated—daily as the chapter of canons attended to its choir services and conventual masses, the clerestory windows presented a comprehensive narrative of the clerical community’s history, its sacred origins in apostolic and saintly precedents, and its prospects for salvation through the service of the altar and devotion to the patrons saints’ shrines, relics, and the Eucharist below. The core sanctuary ensemble of the high altar, saints’s shrines, _opus sectile_ pavement, and narrative windows constituted a monumental, integrated vision of the community’s high clerical concerns and power. Thematizing the church’s liturgy, its past, its status, and the clergy’s powers, the ensemble formed the artistic and ideological heart of a synthetic ritual space, one in which the canons could not only come closer to God and the saints through the liturgy, but also experience the core set of institutional values and narratives that united it and formed the basis for its preeminent place in the early-thirteenth-century Church of Cologne.
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975 On the performativity of glass as a medium and the role of light in activating and re-activating sacred narratives, see Caviness, “Stained Glass Windows and Feasts of the Saints,” 147.
Chapter 7
(Re-)Presenting Relics: A Relic Acquisition and Its Artistic Afterlife

1222 was a momentous year for the capitular community. By this date, the apse had been covered with a lead roof with the financial backing of dean Constantine (1219–1222). The high altar was consecrated; its sepulchre also bears the stamp of Constantine’s personal patronage. Both events indicate that the chapter’s new choir was largely complete, the high altar and the sanctuary pavement in place, and the stained glass windows either installed or nearing installation.

Shortly before the consecration of the high altar, in the midst of this work to complete the sanctuary, the chapter acquired a corpus of relics that provided its renovatio project with a dynamic new impetus. In the obit of Theoderich, deacon at St. Kunibert, one reads:

December 26. Theoderich the deacon died, in whose memory is given a solid measure of wheat from the granary of the lords to those canons who attend choir services. He brought the relics from overseas (reliquias transmarinas) that are kept in the niche (abside) beside the high altar. Namely, of the True Cross. St. Nicholas’s arm. St. George’s arm. The beard of the blessed Anthony. The femur of the blessed Barbara. In the year of the Lord 1222.  

Like the seminal cases of Halberstadt and Trier (fig. 271), the relic acquisition of 1222 at St. Kunibert represents an instance within the larger circulation of Eastern (that is, Byzantine) relics and objects in the West following the fall of Constantinople in 1204, a subject that has recently received intensified attention as a particularly salient moment of cultural transfer. What sets St. Kunibert apart from these two and many other examples of the reception of Eastern relics in

---


the West at this time is, first, the sheer diversity of the extant artistic vestiges in the church associated with this relic acquisition and second the acquisition’s enduring artistic relevance. As in Halberstadt and Trier, the chapter had reliquaries made for its Eastern relics, of which three survive, namely, a reliquary bust for the relic of Anthony’s beard (fig. 151) and two arm reliquaries for the arms of SS. Nicholas and George (figs. 153 and 155). The relic niche mentioned in deacon Theoderich’s obit also survives; located on the north flank of the sanctuary next to the high altar, it features monumental fresco decoration that thematizes the Eastern relics, particularly that of the True Cross (fig. 141). A small chapel, erected in the east transept around 1260–1270 as a new forum for displaying the True Cross relic, rounds out the ensemble of art associated with the relic acquisition (fig. 161). At St. Kunibert, Western artistic reaction to Eastern relics after 1204 can be gauged not only on the level of the small-scale, as is so often the case, but also on a monumental level and in church space—indeed, even through time.

This chapter examines this ensemble of images, objects, and space at St. Kunibert as an instance of artistic and cultural response to Eastern relics, analyzing in particular the relationship between the chapter’s staging of the relics and institutional identity. The first section systematically reviews the textual, material, and artistic evidence bearing on the formation of the initial display in the sanctuary, and the chronology of the two frescoes in particular, which is still unresolved; because the niche, its frescoes, and the reliquaries have been studied from media-specific perspectives, the full thrust of the chapter’s patronal shaping of this display has been obscured. The second section analyzes the relic display’s institutional rhetoric and meaning. After a consideration of the display’s different functions, this section examines the reciprocal relationship between image and relic in the display. The final section probes these

---

978 Here I am speaking largely of the imperial territories; the ensembles at San Marco in Venice and the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris represent incomparable exceptions.
same concerns in the later chapel of the Holy Cross. This chapter thus provides a broad platform for analyzing the performative functions of Romanesque wall painting, the role of the church treasury as a site of institutional discourses, and the spatial politics of relic display.

1. Collecting Relics, Creating an Ensemble: Chronology and Patronage

We know frustratingly little about either deacon Theoderich or the circumstances surrounding his acquisition of the corpus of Eastern relics. Theoderich is attested from 1176 to 1225 in charters from St. Kunibert and was thus a senior member of the community in 1222; beyond this, however, nothing is known about him. Likewise, it seems clear from the word *transmarinas* that Theoderich brought (*attulit*) the relics to the church directly from the East, but one can only speculate as to where he might have acquired them and under what pretext. It has been suggested that Theoderich possibly acquired the relics as a participant in the Fifth Crusade (1213–1222); in 1217, a large contingent from the Lower Rhineland joined the effort in the Holy Land, led by Oliver of Paderborn, *scholaster* at Cologne cathedral from 1202–1225 and an ardent local preacher of the mission. Deacon Theoderich, however, is attested at St. Kunibert in a charter dating from 1221, and his obit indicates that he brought the relics to the church in 1222, which excludes this scenario. The obit’s date of 1222 and Theoderich’s presence at the church in 1221 suggest other scenarios, including pilgrimage, acquisition via the relic trade, or even the possibility that the chapter sent Theoderich to the East in 1221–1222, and possibly to Constantinople, to acquire relics for use in the new project. The translation in 1208 of the skull
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979 See the list of charters and documents with mentions of Theoderich’s name in Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 313 no. 17.
980 This suggestion was advanced by Kosch, “Anbauten,” 110 n. 175. On Oliver, see Wolfgang Giese, “Oliver von Paderborn,” *Neue Deutsche Biographie* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1999) 19: 522–523.
981 HASI, St. Kunibert U 1/20 (dated 1221). Theoderich also appears in a charter dated 1222 (U 21). See Kürten, *Stift*, vol. 1, 313 no. 17. The lack of charters from the church from ca. 1200 to 1221 makes it impossible to chart Theoderich’s whereabouts before 1221.
of St. Pantaleon (and other Constantinopolitan relics) to the church of St. Pantaleon had alerted spiritual communities in Cologne to the spiritual riches to be had in the East after 1204. And there are other instances where Western communities sent members of their own eastwards to collect relics, particularly of the True Cross. Given the overlap between the date of the relic acquisition and the completion of the new choir, such a scenario is plausible, but the overlap also may be simply coincidental.

Whatever the exact source of this collection of Eastern relics, what seems most important to take from the notice of the acquisition in the *Memorienbuch* is the community’s very act of recording it. The chapter’s inscription of the event in its repository of communal memory points to the central institutional significance of these relics. The characterization of the relics as *reliquias transmarinas*, moreover, is particularly significant in the context of the increased circulation of Eastern relics in Cologne and the Rhineland after 1204. The St. Kunibert chapter not only itemized the individual relics but also took pains to document their provenance from overseas. After 1204, a relic’s Eastern origins, and a Cross relic’s in particular, were regarded by Westerners as a guarantee of authenticity and thus of particular spiritual efficaciousness.

In 1222, the community at St. Kunibert no doubt was aware that it counted among a small group
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982 *Chronica regia Coloniensis*, cont. III, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum 18, 228: “allatae sunt nobis reliquiae capitis beatis Pantaleonis patronis nostri, quae per Heinricum de Ulmene de Constantinopoli . . . translate . . . .” The record notes the presence of the Cologne clergy at the moment of the arrival of the Constantinopolitan relics in the city: “cum maxima veneratione tocius cleri et populi acceptae.” It was this same crusader Heinrich von Ulmen who acquired the True Cross reliquary in Limburg, which he donated to the Augustinian convent in Stuben an der Mosel and which was to have such a profound impact on the production of True Cross reliquaries in Trier. See the discussion of the context of the St. Pantaleon acquisition in Klein, *Kreuz*, esp. 264, 271–277.

983 This was the case at St.-Sernin in Toulouse in the final decades of twelfth century, when the monk Raymond Botardelli was dispatched to the Holy Land to acquire a relic of the True Cross, which was then housed upon his return in a Limoges reliquary decorated with narrative scenes recording the acquisition. The episode is detailed in Kelly Holbert, “Relics and Reliquiaries of the True Cross,” in *Art and Architecture of Late Medieval Pilgrimage in Northern Europe and the British Isles*, ed. Sarah Blick and Rita Tekippe (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 346–347.

of local institutions in possession of a particularly potent collection of relics—powerful not simply because they were relics, but because of their transmarine provenance.

The chapter’s artistic response to the relic acquisition in the space of its new sanctuary was swift and multipronged. First, the community appears to have partitioned the relics of the four saints, because relics of SS. Anthony, Barbara, George, and Nicholas are found among those that dean Constantine had housed in the high altar sepulchre. Dividing the new Eastern relics to include pieces among the coterie of saints in the high altar—the ritual and ideological heart of the new church—attest to their institutional importance and immediate impact on the chapter’s program for the sanctuary.  

At the same time, the chapter began work on a creating a physical space for displaying the Eastern relics in the sanctuary, namely, the niche in the north flank next to the high altar (figs. 141–143) that is mentioned in Theoderich’s obit. In addition to that in Theoderich’s obit, a reference to the relic niche occurs in the obit of dean Constantine, which records his establishment of an annual oblation of 30 denarii; this was to be paid from his estate to the treasurer on Good Friday in honour of the sepulchrum crucifixi, or the “sepulchre of the crucifix.” The crucifixum mentioned here is in all likelihood identical with the True Cross relic/reliquary, for the record of Constantine’s donation in the list of treasurer’s incomes at the

985 On the larger institutional rhetoric of the high altar sepulchre, see Chapter 6.
986 The niche displays a continuous history of use as a repository for reliquaries. Not only the Eastern relics, but also a number of other relics are mentioned “in the storehouse of relics on the north side of the choir” (“in promptuario reliquiarum in parte aquilonari chori”) in an inventory of the treasury drawn up in 1499 (HASiK, St. Kunibert, Akten A11a/III, fol. 66v–68v). By this time, the niche had been retrofitted with a wooden chest and shelves, a grill, and painted wooden doors with representations of saints whose relics were then stored in the niche, all of which were added around 1400. The doors and chest were removed after World War II and subsequently lost; the grill remains in situ. On this late medieval reworking of the niche, see KDM 6/4, 285–286.
end of the *Memorienbuch* records the gift as “to the Cross” (*ad Crucem*). Given the chronological coincidence of Constantine’s donation (d. 1222) with the acquisition of the Cross relic in 1222, this *sepulchrum crucifixi* most likely denotes the relic niche, which in form and function is a tomb-like space (*sepulchrum*) where the True Cross relic/reliquary (*crucifixum, crux*) was kept. Together, Theoderich and Constantine’s obits indicate that plans for the niche as a repository for the Eastern relics were forged as soon as they were acquired by Theoderich, most likely under dean Constantine himself, who not only placed some of the relics in the high altar sepulchre, but also tethered his *memoria* to the True Cross relic.

The physical evidence corroborates the textual evidence and indicates that this relic niche was retrofitted into the preexisting architectural fabric of the forechoir bay upon the acquisition of the relics in 1222. At the top of the niche (fig. 143), a horizontal slab of trachyte was tongued into the adjacent piers, forming an upper termination that divided the niche from the *Muldennische* above; the relic niche itself was made by hollowing out the masonry between the piers. A stone chest originally stood in the lower half of the niche and would have served as a pedestal for displaying the Eastern relics; its existence and height are evident from the ground-line of the Crucifixion fresco (fig. 145). Unfortunately, the reconfiguration of the
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988 HASiK, Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 39a: “De claustrali domo decani Constantini v. solidos de quibus pertinent xxx denarii ad Crucem” (printed in Ennen and Eckertz, *Quellen*, vol. 2, 198 no. 201). The word *Crucem* is capitalized in the manuscript, which further suggests that it refers to the True Cross relic/reliquary. The 1499 inventory records that the True Cross relic (*lignum sancte crucis*) was housed in a *crux magna*, which also aligns with the words *crucifixum* and *crux* in these texts; this record is examined in full detail below, 417. For the meaning in medieval Latin of *crucifixum* as a plastic cross, see *Glossarium*, ed. Du Cange et al., vol. 2, col. 629c.

989 The designation *sepulchrum* is also likely related to general medieval usage for a storage place for relics—hence, the use of the term *sepulchrum* for the container of relics that was placed in an altar upon its consecration.

990 The strategies of Constantine’s personal patronage are examined in Chapter 8.

991 On these physical changes to the fabric, see Kosch, “Anbauten,” 98. The niche proper is 173 cm tall, 165 cm wide, and 71 cm deep (at centre). The moulding around the niche appears to have been chiseled into the masonry around 1400 when the chest, doors, and grill were added. As the matching south flank indicates, the *Muldennische* was part of the original architectural disposition of the forechoir bay; see Chapter 2.

992 Kosch, “Anbauten,” 98, reaches a similar conclusion, without, however, citing the scale of the fresco. The current arrangement with the black marble slab stems from the postwar restoration, as does the stair in front of the
niche around 1400 destroyed any physical trace that might have indicated how the relic niche was originally closed. Given its function as a repository for precious reliquaries, the niche must have featured a security mechanism of some type, whether a lockable grill or doors, but it would be careless simply to assume that the later doors and grill replaced an earlier construction. The existence of the monumental Crucifixion fresco suggests that it and the reliquaries likely were intended to be visible through a grill, similar the current configuration (fig. 142). It is, however, also possible that doors were used and the fresco and reliquaries then revealed only on certain occasions.\footnote{993}

Following the installation of the niche, the chapter commissioned a team of painters to provide both the relic niche and the Muldennische with frescoes whose subject matter centers on the corpus of Eastern relics. In the niche, a Crucifixion (figs. 143 and 144), about half-life size and featuring Mary, Ecclesia, John, and Synagogue, was added to the rear wall; figures of prophets with banderoles appear on the two side walls (figs. 145 and 146).\footnote{994} Although very few examples of Cologne wall painting from before 1240 survive, the extant examples, combined with stained glass and manuscripts, indicate a date in the 1220s for the Crucifixion fresco, in line with the textual records and archaeological evidence of the niche.\footnote{995} The slender figures with their dainty hands and the large, swelling pools of drapery at their feet recall features in the Adoration of the Magi at St. Maria Lyskirchen, which dates from circa 1220–

\footnote{997} The different viewing contexts of the niche are considered in detail below.  
\footnote{992} The Crucifixion fresco was discovered in the mid-1950s behind the chest that was installed in the niche around 1400. The fresco was then restored in a fanciful reconstruction in the 1960s. These additions were removed in the late 1990s, returning the fresco to the state in which it was discovered (cf. figs. 143 and 157).  
\footnote{999} Made on the basis of iconographic features, Jakoby’s date of “um 1210–1220” in the sole publication on this work is too early given the building chronology, the textual evidence, and the context of the relic acquisition, which she does not take into account. See “Wandmalereien,” 167.
1230 (cf. in particular Ecclesia and the Virgin, figs. 144 and 266). The hairpin folds (Muldenfalten) in Ecclesia’s gown parallel those in the draperies in the stained glass windows with standing saints at St. Kunibert itself (fig. 131). Beyond Cologne, the fresco displays several features that have parallels in Saxon manuscript illumination of the late 1210s, which likely exerted influence on mural painting in Cologne in the early 1220s, as it did in the formation of the Zackenstil here in the later 1230s. This is particularly true of the fresco’s representation of Christ in the so-called three-nail type with a suppedaneum, which first emerged in Saxony and in the medium of manuscript illumination in the Psalter of the Landgrave Hermann of Thuringia (before 1217; fig. 267). The use of chrysography for the highlights on John’s mantle (fig. 147) is also paralleled generally by the dense webs of highlights that are typical of Saxon illumination in this same period (figs. 267 and 268). These correspondences in stylistic and iconographic features between the Crucifixion fresco, local works, and Saxon manuscripts point to a date in the early 1220s and indicate that the fresco was painted more or less immediately after the acquisition of the relics in 1222. They
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996 The fresco is located on the west wall above the portal. On it, see Goldkuhle, Lyskirchen, 16–23.
998 On the three-nail type, see LCI, vol. 1, cols. 552–553, s. v. “Dreinagelkruzifix.”
999 On these highlights in Saxon manuscript painting in the 1210s, see Demus, Wandmalerei, 100, as well as Hans Belting, “Zwischen Gotik und Byzanz. Gedanken zur Geschichte der sächsischen Buchmalerei im 13. Jahrhundert,” Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 41 (1978): 233–235. The patterned bands on Ecclesia’s gown (fig. 144) are also nearly identical to those on Mary’s mantle in the Magdeburg page (fig. 268), which further underscores these connections. The Crucifixion at St. Kunibert is the earliest known example of the use of chrysography in a fresco in Cologne. Chrysography highlights also occur in a series of ten painted slate panels with representations of seated Apostles from St. Ursula; see OE, vol. 2, 352 cat no. E 115. Here, these panels (possibly from a choir enclosure) are dated generally to the “mid-thirteenth century” as an example of the “mild Zackenstil” and associated with works of the period 1240–1250, but the comparanda proffered for this dating differ considerably. The St. Ursula panels may very well date to the 1230s (or even slightly earlier) and merit reconsideration in view of the discovery of the Crucifixion at St. Kunibert; comparison of these panels’ figures with the figure of John suggests that the panels may be significantly earlier than previously supposed.
also strongly suggest that the chapter’s painters combined elements taken from manuscript models with local precedents and styles, tailoring both to the space of the relic niche.\footnote{As Anna Skriver has demonstrated in a comparison of the frescoes in the baptistery at St. Gereon (ca. 1243–1245) and the miniatures in the so-called Aachener Königschronik (Cologne or Lower Rhineland; after 1238), the mural and manuscript painters either worked directly from the same manuscript model or the mural painters directly from the manuscript (both are possibly even products of the same workshop). See Anna Skriver, \textit{Die Taufkapelle von St. Gereon in Köln. Untersuchungen zur Wechselwirkung zwischen Architektur und Farbfassung spätstaufischer Sakralräume im Rheinland} (Cologne: SH-Verlag, 2001), 164–168.}

Whereas the remaining substance of the Crucifixion fresco is well preserved, the fresco in the \textit{Muldennische} showing SS. Anthony and Nicholas and two angels bearing a patriarchal cross (fig. 148) is in a very poor state of preservation. Whitewashed in the mid-eighteenth century, it was uncovered in 1839 and subsequently restored by Welter in 1865–1870, and again in 1955–1957 (fig. 158).\footnote{On the discovery and Welter’s restoration, see Clemen, \textit{Monumentalmalerei}, 591; on the postwar restoration, see Jakoby, “Wandmalereien,” 163.} Welter, however, made a detailed watercolour of the fresco before he restored it (1863; fig. 159), and both his work and the postwar overpainting have since been removed, returning the fresco to the state documented in the watercolour.\footnote{The fresco was restored in the late 1990s. On Welter’s watercolour, see Ursula Blanchecarbe, \textit{Michael Welter (1808–1892). Ein Kölner Dekorationsmaler im 19. Jahrhundert} (Cologne: dme-Verlag, 1984) 1: 72.} The fresco’s complicated restoration history has led to considerable differences in opinion on its chronology in previous discussions, which were undertaken when the fresco was in its overpainted state (pre- and postwar) and mostly without the benefit of the comparandum offered by the Crucifixion fresco, which was discovered only in the 1950s. Ewald, who was the first to note the connection between the fresco’s subject matter and the Eastern relics kept in the niche, proposed a date of circa 1250.\footnote{Ewald, “Bau und Kunstschätze,” 61; \textit{KDM} 6/4, 265.} Also working with Welter’s overpainted version, Clemen suggested that the fresco may have been painted in the 1220s or 1230s, but maintained that it was reworked in the late 1270s, citing the slender figures flanking the saints in the lower two
registers as harbingers of what he saw as “Gothic” tendencies.\(^{1004}\) Jakoby, finally, adopted Clemen’s thesis.\(^{1005}\)

The recent removal of the pre- and postwar accretions and the discovery of the Crucifixion fresco provide a solid new base for reappraising the upper fresco’s chronology (fig. 148). First, its palette and techniques accord with those of the Crucifixion fresco. In both, the majority of the figures (which are all the same scale) are dressed in the same purple/burgundy garments, set against an ultramarine blue ground (now faded in the upper fresco, but still visible in sections), and display chrysography (traces on Anthony’s hair shirt [fig. 149]).\(^{1006}\) The individual figures in the upper fresco also have numerous parallels in the Crucifixion fresco and in other Cologne works of the 1220s. The slender and gently swaying figures with high waistlines flanking Anthony (cf. especially the foremost figure at the right; fig. 150) recur in the figure of Ecclesia in the Crucifixion (fig. 144). For the figure of the ascetic Anthony (fig. 149), the fresco painters appear to have worked directly from the cartoon used by the stained glass workshop for the John the Baptist window in the east transept (fig. 129). The figures’ scale, pose (frontal, with a raised right hand with a swooping sleeve that traces the arm below), boxy tunics, and facial physiognomy are nearly identical.\(^{1007}\) The majuscule letters to the left of Anthony’s head spelling out the first four letters of his name (ANTO) also parallel the ductus of the tituli in the haloes in the windows.\(^{1008}\) With his compact triangular mitre and rigid frontal pose with both arms extended, the figure of Nicholas also conforms to Cologne pictorial models

\(^{1004}\) Clemen, Monumentalmalerei, 597.

\(^{1005}\) Jakoby, “Wandmalereien,” 166.

\(^{1006}\) The gold highlights on Anthony’s hair shirt are recorded in Welter’s watercolour (fig. 160) and are thus original.

\(^{1007}\) This correspondence runs counter to Jakoby’s supposition (“Wandmalereien,” 164) that the fresco painters used a Byzantine model for St. Anthony, who is also otherwise not depicted in the Byzantine type, in which he always appears with a headcovering; see LCI, vol 5, col. 207, s. v. “Antonius.”

\(^{1008}\) The second half of Anthony’s name to the right of his head is not preserved.
current from the 1210s through 1230s, as evinced by the representation of St. Bruno in a miscellany from St. Pantaleon (ca. 1212–1235; fig. 269).\textsuperscript{1009} Stylistically, the fresco does not display the rigid, highly expressive Zackenstil that was current in Cologne around 1250–1270, of which the Crucifixion fresco in the chapel of the Holy Cross at St. Kunibert is the paradigmatic example (ca. 1260–1270; fig. 163).\textsuperscript{1010} Despite the severe damage to the upper fresco, the evidence indicates that it was painted together with the Crucifixion around 1222 and by the same team of painters, who appear to have worked alongside the workshop of glass painters while the latter finished its commission.

Theoderich and Constantine’s obits, the physical evidence of the niche, and the two frescoes indicate that the chapter immediately set about working the Eastern relics into the visual and spatial environment of its new sanctuary with this monumental display (fig. 141). While this work in the church was being done, the chapter turned its attention to creating reliquaries for the new relics. Of the five relics listed in Theoderich’s obit, containers for three survive: St. Anthony’s beard was placed in a gilded copper bust (fig. 151) and the arm relics of St. Nicholas (fig. 153) and St. George (fig. 155) in two gilded copper arm reliquaries. As several scholars have observed, the snail-filigree technique on all three reliquaries, the use of Muldenfalten in the sleeves of the arm reliquaries, and the naturalism of the head of St. Anthony have immediate parallels in Cologne metalwork products from the 1220s, including the rear face of the Shrine of the Three Magi (ca. 1220–1230) and a pair of arm reliquaries from St. Gereon (ca. 1220–1230; fig. 270).\textsuperscript{1011} The stylistic connections between these works indicate that the

\textsuperscript{1009} On the miscellany, which was lost in World War II and is only known in black-and-white reproductions, see Legner, \textit{Romanik}, 197 cat. no. 486.
\textsuperscript{1010} On this structure’s date, see below, 440–441.
chapter commissioned the reliquaries from a leading Cologne workshop contemporaneously with the frescoes, and that they were completed quickly. Unlike the St. Gereon arm reliquaries, one of which features an enamel recording personal patronage of the reliquaries by provost Arnold de Burne, donor imagery does not occur on any of the reliquaries from St. Kunibert, which suggests corporate patronage. Notices in two charters issued in 1236 and 1237 by provosts Bruno (1218–1236) and Heinrich (1236–1243), respectively, indicate that the chapter maintained a separate body of funds for the purchase of treasury objects. As these charters state, funds from vacant or fraudulently held prebends were to be reserved “ad ornatum” and “ad emendum ornatum,” which suggests that the community continued to build its treasury even after the creation in the 1220s of these three reliquaries.  

Given that the chapter commissioned reliquaries for three of the Eastern relics, it stands to reason that it may have commissioned ones for the relics of the True Cross and Barbara’s femur from the same workshop. A record of the type or appearance of Barbara’s reliquary does not survive. For the relic of the True Cross, the image of the cross at the apex of the upper fresco (fig. 148) can be regarded as a representation of the relic/reliquary cross itself. This is suggested not only by its double-transverse form, but also by the specific way that the inner portions of the cross are rendered in an ochre tone to appear like wood bounded in on all sides.
by a golden frame.1015 The appearance of the painted cross accords both with Byzantine reliquary crosses, such as the small Cross relic preserved in the triptych from St. Maria ad Gradus in Cologne (ca. 1240; fig. 272), and with Western True Cross reliquaries made in imitation of Byzantine reliquary crosses, including the famous example from St. Matthias in Trier (ca. 1220; fig. 271). It is thus difficult to know whether the chapter acquired a True Cross relic that was already in a Byzantine container or had a reliquary cross made for the relic. That said, Theoderich’s obit seemingly suggests that the True Cross relic did not come in a Byzantine container, but as a fragment of wood; the other Eastern relics that the chapter at St. Kunibert acquired clearly did not come in Byzantine reliquaries, because the chapter had reliquaries made for them.1016 The description of the True Cross relic/reliquary in the 1499 inventory also indicates that it took the form of a cross of considerable dimensions; it reads: “crux magna cum ligno preciosissimo sancte crucis.”1017 It also seems unlikely that Theoderich would have been able to acquire a sizeable Byzantine reliquary cross (at least one commensurate with the description “crux magna”) as late as 1222.1018 Although the reliquary itself does not survive, the evidence suggests that the chapter at St. Kunibert probably commissioned a reliquary cross for its True Cross relic with the form of a patriarchal cross, analogous to the Trier cross (fig. 271) or

1015 Both these aspects of the representation of the cross are corroborated in Welter’s pre-restoration watercolour of the fresco and must be regarded as original.
1016 Theoderich’s obit describes the Cross relic simply as “de ligno Domini.”
1017 HAsTI, St. Kunibert, Akten 11a/III, fol. 67v. The inventory, however, indicates several lines later that the church possessed a second reliquary of the True Cross, and describes the other reliquary thus: “crux cum ligno preciosissimo de sancta crucis et alii diversis reliquiis cum sex rupturis in vitro sive cristallo.” The mention of a fractured crystal or glass on this cross, however, is incommensurate with the rendering of the Cross relic in the fresco, which suggests that the first Cross reliquary (the “crux magna”)—which occurs second in the list behind the monstrance for the Host—is in all likelihood identical with the True Cross relic acquired in 1222. Writing in 1645, Gelenius (De admiranda magnitudine, 288) likewise records two True Cross relics at the church. He lists them together as “Magna et notabilis pars de ligno S. Crucis, per ignem probata. Item parva particula eiusdem S. Crucis.” His description thus aligns with the 1499 inventory’s description. Again, it seems likely that the True Cross relic from 1222 is not what Gelenius calls the “parva particula” but rather the “Magna et notabilis pars de ligno S. Crucis, per ignem probata.”
1018 It is usually assumed that the Byzantine True Cross reliquary at St. Maria ad Gradus was acquired around 1204 and then reworked into a triptych around 1230–1240 on account of the unlikelihood of the availability of Byzantine containers at this late date; see Klein, Kreuz, 266.
the many other reliquary crosses made for True Cross relics in the Rhine and Mosan regions at this same time. And its motivations for doing so seem clear: as Holger Klein has shown, in the West after 1204, and in the Rheinland and Meuse Valley in particular, the form of the patriarchal cross itself had become synonymous with a Cross relic’s authenticity. In commissioning a cross reliquary with the form of a patriarchal cross, the chapter was simultaneously purchasing a container and a certificate of authenticity for its prized new possession.

2. Display and Devotion: Image and Relic in Dialogue

As Theoderich and Constantine’s obits indicate, the relic niche’s principal function was that of a permanent repository for the Eastern relics, chiefly the True Cross. The chapter’s act of assembling all five transmarine relics in one intimate space indicates that it did not consider these treasury objects disconnected items but rather a coherent group united by the narrative of the relics’ Eastern provenance. On a fundamental level, the installation in the clerical choir (fig. 141) of the True Cross and this cohort of Eastern saints in resplendent golden containers was designed to sanctify the canonical community by means of the new relics’ permanent physical presence in its liturgical space. From their place in the niche beside the high altar, the Eastern relics joined the bodies of the founder Kunibert and the Hewalds in the shrines behind the altar in presiding over the community’s every action, from the canonical hours through the conventual mass. The niche’s location next to the high altar was also practical, allowing for the

---

1019 Here, the Cross relic at St. Maria ad Gradus itself may well have served as a model.
1020 Klein, Kreuz, esp. 264–265.
easy transport of the individual reliquaries from the niche to the high altar for use in the chapter’s liturgy.

But the chapter’s addition of frescoes above and especially inside the niche indicates that its function exceeded that of a simple repository; this ensemble of images and objects was conceived as a true, multimedia display. Given the display’s location in the sanctuary, there can be no doubt that the canonical community constituted its primary intended audience. Because it is not certain how the side aisles were divided from the east transept (that is, whether by tall masonry barriers or only by grills), it is impossible to know whether the relic display was visible to lay viewers; if grills were used as a barrier, the display would have been generally visible through the grill from the top of the stair between the south side aisle and south arm of the east transept (fig. 141). It seems unlikely that the chapter would have made the display physically accessible to the local laity and pilgrims very frequently or easily on account of the display’s immediate proximity to the high altar. Rather, the laity’s principal contact with the reliquaries probably came through either processions or expositions of the reliquaries in the nave, perhaps on the two side altars at the end of the side aisles and the Cross altar before the choir screen (fig. 31).

How, then, might this relic niche have functioned for the community beyond its practical use as a repository? As the record of dean Constantine’s oblation to the Cross on Good Friday suggests, the display likely played a central role on the principal Cross feasts, including Good Friday and the inventio and exaltatio Crucis feasts. Use of the niche for displaying the Cross relic on these feasts is suggested directly by the chapter’s selection of the Crucifixion as the

---

1022 On the contours of the clerical choir and the enclosure, see Chapter 4.
theme for the monumental fresco inside the niche (fig. 143).\textsuperscript{1023} Although all five Eastern relics were stored here, the chapter focused in the niche solely on the Cross, which it undoubtedly regarded as the most significant of the Eastern relics, as the relic’s position at the head of the list of the Eastern relics in Theoderich’s obit and the second representation of the Cross relic in the upper niche indicate. Liturgical notices in the margins of the \textit{Memorienbuch} calendar indicate that the \textit{inventio} and \textit{exaltatio} feasts were indeed celebrated high feasts at St. Kunibert, with bell-ringing, liturgical readings, and chants, including, for the \textit{exaltatio}, homilies and responsories on the Cross; the relic acquisition appears to have left not only a visual and material but also a significant liturgical imprint.\textsuperscript{1024} On these three major Cross feasts, the relic niche likely was opened up—whether a grill or doors—and the True Cross relic displayed before the fresco over the course of the feast day, where it may not only have been in full view during the day’s cycle of liturgical services (fig. 141), but also venerated by the canons collectively or individually before being removed, as seems likely, for use on the high altar during the conventual mass.

Yet, it seems reasonable to suppose that the relic niche and its Crucifixion fresco were also meant to be seen and used more than on these three Cross feasts alone. A principal motivation of relic displays and gatherings in general was to stimulate meditation on Christ’s Passion and the lives of the saints, and one may also presume that this intimately-scaled, painted niche was intended to occupy a central place in the devotional life of the canonical community,

\textsuperscript{1023} See Legner, \textit{Kölner Heilige}, 246, who also generally supposes use of the niche for display of the Cross relic.
\textsuperscript{1024} These marginal notices are contemporary with the calendar. The notice for the feast of the \textit{inventio} reads (HASTK, Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 8b): “V Nonas Maii. Inventio sanctae Crucis. III lectiones et compulsabitur cum maiori campana;” that for the feast of the \textit{exaltatio} (fol. 25b): “XVIII Kal. Octobris. Exaltatio sanctae Crucis. Cornelius et Cypriani martyrum. Hic compulsabitur sollemniter et legentur VI lectiones de sanctis et omelia cum suis responsoriiis de sancta cruce.” Both feasts are red-letter days (i.e., entered in red ink). These notices on readings and bell-ringing occur in the calendar only on feasts of particular institutional importance.
serving as a devotional portal for the canons outside a liturgical framework.\textsuperscript{1025} The niche’s successor, the Holy Cross chapel (fig. 161), surely possessed such a function, and essentially used the same strategy of display, namely, a monumental Crucifixion fresco on the rear wall. Indeed, not just the Cross, but the other four Eastern relics were kept in the relic niche. However difficult it may be for modern eyes trained to seeing treasury objects isolated and contained in museum vitrines, it is essential to attempt to reconstruct in the mind’s eye the appearance of this coordinated display of images and treasury objects if one is to register both its extraordinary visual impact when the grill or doors were opened and its full spiritual and institutional significance (fig. 156).\textsuperscript{1026} In the niche, Christ and his Passion (the True Cross relic and the fresco) were united with the saints in one intimate space that was physically and visually accessible to the individual canon for extended contemplation on salvation and sanctity.

The formal properties of the niche and Crucifixion fresco, moreover, presuppose close viewing, for they discourage viewing the painted image either obliquely or from afar (fig. 141); rather, the fresco demands to be seen head-on from a position directly before the niche if one is to see all the figures and especially the two prophets on the side walls, which are integral components of its message (figs. 143, 145, and 146). Whether seen in private devotion or on the major Cross feasts, the intimate space of the niche engages the viewer, encouraging imaginary absorption in the scene of Christ’s death on the Cross. Through the placement of the relic of the True Cross on the pedestal before the image (fig. 156), the relic and its painted frame enter into

\textsuperscript{1025} On the purposes of relic displays and gatherings, see Hahn, Strange Beauty, chapter 11, esp. 205–208, as well as Holger A. Klein, “Sacred Things and Holy Bodies: Collecting Relics from Late Antiquity to the Early Renaissance,” in Treasures of Heaven. Saints, Relics, and Devotion in Medieval Europe, ed. Martina Bagnoli, exh. cat. (Baltimore: Walters Art Museum, 2010), 55–67. On the visual culture of relic displays in Cologne in the Middle Ages generally, see Anton Legner, Kölner Heilige, esp. 7–15.

\textsuperscript{1026} Of course, any reconstruction of how the different reliquaries were disposed in the relic niche is hypothetical. That said, a slot in the console below the painted Crucifixion in the Holy Cross chapel (fig. 169) indicates that the Cross was placed directly before the painted cross here, and it is therefore justifiable to assume the same for the earlier display. On the specifics of the console in the chapel, see below, 441–442.
a mutually informing dialogue: as the material witness to Christ’s death on the Cross, the Cross relic activates and animates the two-dimensional image of the Crucifixion behind; framing the relic, the fresco and its individual figures in turn explicate the Cross relic’s different meanings. The spatial and conceptual nexus established between relic and monumental image in the niche creates a material point of entry for the canon’s imaginative reliving of the moment of salvation.

The cosmic scope and eschatological import of the moment are immediately signalled for the clerical viewer through a deep ultramarine blue background punctuated by gilded stars, which appear above the arms of the cross next to angels who swing censers. The imposing figure of the crucified Christ and the cross on which he hangs are the visual and conceptual fulcra of the image. Dead and defeated with sagging arms and rivulets of blood issuing from his hands, feet, and side wound, Christ (fig. 144) is presented as the affective core of the scene. As comparison with the contemporary representation of the Crucifixion in the Tree of Jesse window (fig. 112) indicates, the fresco’s Christ is radically humanized. Not only is Christ presented in the three-nail type in line with such Saxon manuscripts as the Landgrafensalter (fig. 267), but he also wears a crown of thorns, which is here rendered as a thin, woven black band. Very rare before the mid-thirteenth century, the crown of thorns also begins to appear in Saxon manuscripts in the 1200s and 1210s; it also occurs as a thin band in the Crucifixion on the rear side of the Shrine of the Three Magi (ca. 1220–1230). With both these features, the

1027 Only the area above the right arm of the cross survives (fig. 146). The angel here is fragmentary, but remains of a head, halo, arm, hand, and a round object denoting a censer survive; the tip of the angel’s wing also appears at the top of the composition. Cf., in contrast, Jakoby, “Wandmalereien,” 167, who identifies this figure as Luna from the Sol and Luna pair.
1028 The right half of the crown of thorns is visible in the postwar photographs of the fresco and is thus original; cf. fig. 157.
1029 On the appearance of the motif in Saxony, see LCI, vol. 1, cols. 512–513, s. v. “Dornenkrone”; RDK, vol. 4, cols. 300–304, s. v. “Dornenkrone.” The crown and nails are held up by angels as instruments of the Passion in the Psalter of St. Elizabeth in Cividale (possibly as early as ca. 1201–1207), which is the earliest known occurrence of the motif in Saxony. The fresco at St. Kunibert and the Crucifixion on the Shrine of the Three Magi (in which Christ is alive and in the four-nail type) represent by far the earliest instances of this motif in Cologne.
fresco emphasizes Christ’s humanity and suffering to a degree that must have seemed striking in Cologne at this moment; even some two decades later, Lucas, bishop of Tuy (1239–1249/54), in a famous polemic reproached the Albigensians for employing the three-nail type because its intensified, painful contortion of Christ’s body conflicted with the time-honoured, serene, and majestic image of the four-nail type. In the functional context of the niche, this heightened humanizing of Christ seems a deliberate strategy aimed at eliciting full emotional involvement from the clerical viewer, who is led to contemplate the central meaning of the Cross relic as a material token of God’s consummation of the New Covenant through Christ’s painful sacrificial death on that very same Cross.

The inclusion of Ecclesia and Synagogue immediately adjacent to the crucified Christ sharpens this meaning by figuring Christ’s death on the Cross as the moment of transition from Old to New. By pointing to the arrival of the Messiah and the fulfillment of the Covenant that unfolds on the central Cross, the prophets with banderoles on the side walls supplement the meaning of Ecclesia and Synagogue. Through the presence of these four figures around the painted Cross, the Cross relic is presented as the material “seal” of the New Covenant. A parallel for both this idea and this strategy of display is found in several True Cross reliquaries themselves, such as the Mosan example from Tongres (ca. 1180–1181; fig. 273). In the reliquary, the relic of the True Cross itself stands in for the figure of the crucified Christ: Mary and John weep to either side of the relic, while Ecclesia and Synagogue appear just below. The central relic of the Cross is made into a physical emblem of the sealing of the Covenant through Christ, who appears over the “Crucifixion” at the upper edge of the central panel. What the

---

1031 On the Tongres reliquary, see Klein, Kreuz, 224–226.
Tongres reliquary does on the level of small-scale metalwork, the relic niche achieves through a conceptually immersive display that combines the Cross relic with a monumental painted frame featuring a carefully chosen and disposed group of figures.

As with the Tongres reliquary, moreover, Christ’s death on the Cross in the niche is shown as marking not only the moment of salvation and fulfillment of the Covenant, but also the birth of the Church. Through the contrasting dyad of Ecclesia and Synagogue, the Cross relic is also offered up in the display as a witness to the eternal pact between Christ and his Church in the Eucharist. The fresco dramatically reenacts the moment of Ecclesia’s mystical betrothal (*unio mystica*) to Christ, the bridegroom, on the Cross to the exclusion of the superseded Old Testament personified by Synagogue.\(^\text{1032}\) Turning to the crucified Christ, the crowned figure of Ecclesia (fig. 144) gathers his streaming blood in a chalice, balancing the staff with the *vexillum* of her victory with her left hand. Almost frontal, Synagogue is presented as if captured in the motion of turning away from Christ, her sunken head pointing to her defeat and her veiled eyes to her spiritual blindness. The overturned and broken banner in her left hand alludes to both her former glory and her present subjection in the wake of the mystical union of Christ and his Church. As with the figure of Ecclesia in the *Landgrafenpsalter* (fig. 267), Ecclesia’s ruby-coloured, gilded tunic styles her as the true queen and likely refers expressly to Psalm 44, which, together with the bridal imagery of the Song of Songs, was the basis for the originary Pauline idea of the mystical union of Christ and Ecclesia as man and wife: “the queen stood at thy right, in gilded clothing.”\(^\text{1033}\) The link between the image of Ecclesia and the Psalm’s imagery would not have been lost on the canons, who recited the Psalms cyclically in

\(^{1032}\) On the *unio mystica*, see Seiferth, *Synagoge und Kirche*, 26, 52.

\(^{1033}\) On the importance of Psalm 44 for the conception of Ecclesia in general, see Seiferth, *Synagoge und Kirche*, 52.
the canonical hours. The contrast with Synagogue is also made explicit, for Synagogue is the only figure in the main scene without applied gold leaf.\textsuperscript{1034} The figure of the triumphant Ecclesia with her Eucharistic chalice points the clerical viewer beyond the display to the high altar beside it (fig. 141). The Cross relic, the physical memento of the eternal pact between Christ and his Church sealed on the Cross, was in attendance every time the community renewed this pact in the conventual mass, and it was likely taken out frequently for use on the altar.

Ecclesia and Synagogue generate their meaning not only as a tandem, but also through meaningful juxtaposition with the other two figures in the main scene. Thus, Ecclesia stands in close proximity to the lost Virgin, who also embodies the Church.\textsuperscript{1035} The blind and defeated Synagogue is juxtaposed with John (fig. 146). While the pairing of these two figures is not unusual (cf. fig. 273), in the fresco it is exploited to reinforce Synagogue’s blindness by contrasting it with John’s vision. With his head raised and his eyes trained on Christ on the Cross, John provides a pointed visual and conceptual contrast to the veiled Synagogue, who turns her back on Christ and the Cross. John’s gaze and the gesture of his raised right hand direct the viewer’s own gaze from John back to the central image of the crucified Christ. The fresco casts John not only as Christ’s beloved disciple who was present at the Crucifixion, but also in his role as archetypal seer, which is further underscored by the Gospel book that he holds as a sign of his account of Christ’s life. Whereas Synagogue turns away blindly, John sees Christ and the Cross, physically and metaphorically. Draped in a mantle encrusted with gold highlights (more than any other figure in the fresco; fig. 147), John is exalted as a spiritual ideal.

---

\textsuperscript{1034} The garments worn by Ecclesia, Christ, and John all display chrysography. The garments of the fragmentary figure of the Virgin at the left also feature gold highlights. See Jakoby, “Wandmalereien,” 167, who likewise points to the absence of chrysography on Synagogue.

and exemplar, one who stands in for the possibility of the canon’s own spiritual perfection through visual contemplation of the Cross.\textsuperscript{1036} The fresco’s emphasis on John’s ability to see \textit{vis-à-vis} the negative example offered by Synagogue constructs looking as a key means of knowing and understanding Christ, the Crucifixion, and the Cross. John is presented as a behavioural model around which the clerical viewer can shape his devotional contemplation of the Cross relic and the image of the suffering Christ, just as his predecessor John himself did at the event.

The creative coordination of the painted image and the Cross relic in the niche stages the relic as an object with manifold meanings (fig. 156). The niche presented the Cross relic to the canonical community as the material witness of Christ’s painful death on the Cross, the central moment of salvation that absolved the Old and ushered in the era of grace and the Church. The intimate space of the niche with this theatrical fresco as backdrop provided a realm in which the clerical viewer could relive the Crucifixion in all its ramifications in the presence of the relic. Like the arrangements in contemporary True Cross reliquaries (fig. 272), the image of the Cross relic as a patriarchal cross flanked by angels in the upper niche (fig. 141) underlines the efficaciousness of the relic in the lower niche as a devotional aid to experiencing Christ’s death on the Cross by asserting its authenticity as the True Cross.\textsuperscript{1037} With this interactive display, the canonical community inserted itself into sacred history: literally through the creation of a display that permitted imaginative entry into the event of the Crucifixion; and ideologically through the ensemble’s emphasis on the church as a custodian of a genuine piece of the instrument of salvation. The True Cross relic at St. Kunibert was made a central site of


\textsuperscript{1037} Klein, \textit{Kreuz}, esp. 264–265.
institutional identity and a vehicle for the capitular community’s own salvation through its
devotion to the relic, analogous to the cases in Trier (fig. 271) and St. Maria ad Gradus (fig.
272).\textsuperscript{1038} Like these latter instances, in which Eastern Cross relics were inserted into local
discourses, the strategy for the display of the Cross relic in the clerical choir at St. Kunibert
represents a mediated, local response to this Eastern relic.\textsuperscript{1039} Apart from the exploitation of the
Eastern form of the Cross to demonstrate the relic’s authenticity in the upper fresco, the staging
of the Cross in the niche was entirely “Western”: the Eastern Cross relic was presented against a
fresco with the Western iconography of the three-nail type Christ with a crown of thorns,
Ecclesia and Synagogue, Mary and John, and prophets, endowing it with a range of different
meanings for the community. Like contemporary True Cross reliquaries, the relic display at St.
Kunibert indicates that Western response to Eastern relics after 1204 was both selective in what
it borrowed from the East and bound up with local institutional and devotional needs. And as
the ensemble at St. Kunibert demonstrates, this response was not restricted to the small-scale
and the medium of metalwork, but was also monumental and multimedia in scope.

As the image of the Cross relic at apex of the \textit{Muldennische} indicates, the upper fresco is
more than a simple, painted \textit{Schatzverzeichnis}; it meaningfully comments on the authenticity
and efficacy of the Eastern relics kept in the niche, underlining their spiritual potentiality (fig.
148). Significantly, although the relics of all four Eastern saints were kept in the niche together
with the True Cross, the chapter singled out two saints for representation in the upper fresco:
Anthony, who appears in the lowest of the three registers, and Nicholas, who appears in the

\textsuperscript{1038} On the centrality of True Cross relics in institutional discourses in the period ca. 1204–1230, see Belting,
208.
\textsuperscript{1039} The rear face of the reliquary container for the Trier Cross, for instance, features an extensive series of images
of historical benefactors of the church of St. Matthias, who are shown holding orbs symbolizing their gifts of
property to the church. As Toussaint (\textit{Kreuz und Knochen}, 207) argues, the Cross relic here was used to reinforce
the institution’s own divinely-ordained existence in the local ecclesiastical hierarchy.
middle register. The community’s visual focus on the ascetic monk Anthony and the bishop Nicholas rather than on the virgin Barbara and the knight George likely was the result of two principal considerations. First, the chapter’s choice of Anthony and Nicholas for monumental images in the clerical choir seems particularly apposite given that both saints were representatives of the Church, Anthony as the father of the monastic profession that formed the basis for all forms of communal religious life, and Nicholas as a representative of the clerical class. Like the figure of the gilded Evangelist in the relic niche, Anthony and Nicholas offered the clerical viewer paradigmatic behavioural models of spiritual virtue. Second, and more important, Anthony and Nicholas, unlike Barbara and George, boasted extensive and impressive traditions as miracle-working intercessors, making them particularly apt choices for a display of body-part reliquaries containing their relics.

Both the iconography of the scenes and the manner in which the saints themselves are represented are unusual and unparalleled at this moment in the Empire; both combine to figure Anthony and Nicholas as virtuous exemplars and potent intercessors. Drawing on the saints’ textual lives, popular tradition, and pictorial models for the individual figures, the chapter carefully crafted these two scenes to meet the needs of the community and to respond to the niche’s function as a display for these saints’ body-part reliquaries. As comparison of the figures of Anthony (fig. 149) and John the Baptist indicates (fig. 129), for the Anthony register the chapter and its painters turned to a general local pictorial type for an ascetic saint, building up the rest of the scene around the central figure of Anthony by adding two groups of figures and a generic architectural frame with a trefoil arch and dome.\textsuperscript{1040} This representation of

\textsuperscript{1040} Similar architectural frames with trefoil arches occur as backdrops to narrative scenes in the contemporary miniatures in the Groß St. Martin Evangeliary; see Grimme, Evangelistar, 74, 77, 78, 79. It is not certain when or for what purpose the small oculus above Anthony’s head was created in the wall, but it appears to postdate the
Anthony at St. Kunibert, in fact, is the earliest extant instance in the Empire in which Anthony appears in the guise of an ascetic hermit in a hair shirt, which points up the novelty of the image of the saint in this fresco.\textsuperscript{1041} By presenting Anthony in a self-mortifying garment with a Gospel book, the fresco emphasizes his asceticism and devotion to God, and thus his exemplary spiritual discipline. Displaying applied chrysography like the seer John (fig. 147), Anthony’s hair shirt—the very symbol of his modesty and self-mortification—is made in the fresco into a glistening emblem of his spiritual fortitude, one that casts Anthony as a resplendent exemplar of ideal spiritual comportment for the clerical viewer.\textsuperscript{1042}

Comparison of Anthony and John the Baptist is revealing in a second respect. Although the mural painter and the glass painter appear to have worked from the same model, rendering Anthony and John’s facial features in near identical fashion (both have a stern brow, a downturned mouth, and voluminous hair with curling locks running down the shoulders), the fresco differs markedly by showing Anthony with a very long, bushy beard.\textsuperscript{1043} Thus, in the image of Anthony in the fresco, the chapter explicitly thematized the relic of his beard kept in the reliquary (fig. 151) in the niche.\textsuperscript{1044} For its part, the bust reliquary that the chapter commissioned for the relic also puts pronounced visual and physical emphasis on Anthony’s fresco, for it partly destroyed the dome. The oculus led Kosch (“Anbauten,” 96–102) to speculate on several potential functions for the small chamber located behind the Muldennische (which is only accessible via ladder), including the suggestion that the Eastern relics were perhaps kept not in the relic niche below, but in this chamber, with the oculus serving to allow the power of the saints to “radiate out” of the chamber. This thesis, however, conflicts with both the textual and monumental record, which leaves no doubt that the relics were kept in the niche (mentioned here in 1222 [sepulchrum crucifixi], 1239 [reliquias in abside iuxta maius altare], 1400 [the painted doors], and in 1499 [the inventory]). The function of this small chamber is fundamentally unclear, but it may have been used for the secure storage of archival materials or the ringing of bells, which functions Kosch has also suggested.

\textsuperscript{1041} RDK, vol. 4, col. 1025, s. v. “Einsiedler.”
\textsuperscript{1042} The gold highlights are recorded in Welter’s watercolour (fig. 160) and must be regarded as original.
\textsuperscript{1043} The long beard is corroborated in Welter’s watercolour (fig. 160).
\textsuperscript{1044} On the underappreciated impact of relics in shaping local iconographies in general, see Renate Kroos, “Vom Umgang mit Reliquien,” in OE, vol. 3, 27.
beard, which it presents in the form of two prominent, curling spikes of hair.\textsuperscript{1045} As Birgitta Falk plausibly suggested, the emphasis on the beard in the reliquary may have been amplified further by the placement of the beard relic itself in the hollow recesses of the beard.\textsuperscript{1046}

The fresco, however, not only makes iconographic reference the beard relic/reliquary in the niche, but also embeds it visually—by dint of the whole figure of Anthony—within a scene that emphasizes Anthony’s efficacy as an intercessor. Anthony stands amidst a group of eight figures. Four well dressed men and women of various ages appear to the right, with the foremost two gesturing towards him in supplication. To the left, four men in various states of sickness appeal to Anthony for aid: three kneel and raise their arms in deference to the saint, namely, a man with both legs amputated, a bald man (connoting illness), and another man without hands; at the extreme left, a youthful male on crutches extends his half-amputated left foot towards Anthony. Now barely preserved beyond the underdrawing, the original appearance of these figures is recorded more clearly in Welter’s watercolour (fig. 160). The scene in the fresco can hardly be called “narrative;” there is no corresponding event in Anthony’s \textit{vita}. Rather, the chapter invented an iconography for Anthony that styles him as a general intercessor—for the healthy figures to the right—and, more critically, as a healer for the destitute and afflicted figures at the left. The latter figures’ loss of various limbs and body parts, however, are consistent not with just any illness, but specifically—as Veit Harold Bauer recognized—with the crippling and gangrenous effects of St. Anthony’s Fire, the \textit{ignis sacer} (“Holy Fire”) which came from consuming grains infected with the \textit{claviceps purpurea} fungus and which counted among the most common afflictions in the North from the early Middle Ages.

\textsuperscript{1045} This has been observed repeatedly; see, for instance, Ewald, “Bau und Kunstschätze,” 73; \textit{OE}, vol. 2, 265, cat. no. E 54.

\textsuperscript{1046} Falk, “Bildnisreliquiare,” 182.
through the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{1047} As Bauer observed, this little-known vignette at St. Kunibert is by far the earliest known representation of St. Anthony in his capacity as healer of this debilitating disease.\textsuperscript{1048} In the fresco, the chapter, drawing on lived reality outside and perhaps even inside the compound, framed the bust reliquary with the beard as potent vessel capable not only of intercession in general, but also of the healing of St. Anthony’s Fire in particular.\textsuperscript{1049}

In this latter regard, it is striking that of the three body-part reliquaries from the 1220s (figs. 151, 153, and 155), Anthony’s bust displays the most extensive damage: a gaping hole is found in the top and back of the head (fig. 152), numerous filigree plaques have been removed, and the beard itself displays several large fissures.\textsuperscript{1050} Falk has suggested that some of this damage, particularly that to the top of the head and the removal of filigree plaques, may have been occasioned by later despoliation of the piece for restorations to this and other reliquaries.\textsuperscript{1051} This explanation, however, does not account for the extensive damage to other areas of the object, especially the many fissures in and around the beard, as well as the loss of


\textsuperscript{1048} Bauer, \textit{Antonius-Feuer}, 38, 71. Bauer worked with the assumption that fresco dated from ca. 1270, following Clemen, \textit{Monumentalmalerei}, 597. The other examples of this theme adduced by Bauer all date to the fifteenth century or beyond.

\textsuperscript{1049} Here it should be recalled that the canons received a significant amount of their prebends in grain (cf. deacon Theoderich’s obit) in exchange for their attendance at choir services, which obviously made them especially prone to contracting the disease.

\textsuperscript{1050} See the exacting description of the current physical state of the bust in Falk, “Bildnisreliquiare,” 181–183, esp. 181, on the extensive damage to the beard, which (the right pendant) appears to have been soldered back in place at some indeterminable point.

\textsuperscript{1051} Falk, “Bildnisreliquiare,” 181. As Falk (182) observes, the reliquary already appears to have been repaired in the late Middle Ages; at this time (Falk writes “wohl noch in mittelalterlicher Zeit”), an opening (now welded shut) was added to the back of the reliquary to supplement the original opening in the base, the neck was repaired, and the two ornamental bands in \textit{repoussé} added to the shoulders.
the bust’s polychromy, which would have increased considerably Anthony’s already arresting
type-like facial features (both the eyes and lips display traces of black and white and dark red
pigment, respectively).\footnote{1052} The heavy damage to the reliquary is commensurate with extensive
use and veneration, and with repeated touching and perhaps kissing of the vessel in general and
of the beard in particular.\footnote{1053} It is not difficult to imagine the clerical viewer approaching
Anthony’s reliquary bust in the relic niche to touch the beard or kiss the vessel, whether in
private devotion or simply when ill with the hope of speedy recovery, with his eyes moving
between the numinous golden object before him and the visual demonstration of Anthony’s
efficacy as a healer and intercessor in the painted niche above.

There is, however, also evidence beyond the extensive damage to suggest that Anthony’s
bust was intended to, and did, spend considerable time outside the relic niche. Three of what
were originally four large rings on the base of the bust have led Baumgarten and others to
suggest that the bust reliquary was fastened periodically to a wooden base, likely for transport in
processions.\footnote{1054} Although we do not possess medieval texts, both Winheim (1607) and Gelenius
(1645) devote special attention to Anthony’s beard relic when discussing the relic holdings at St.
Kunibert. In describing Cologne’s principal relics, Winheim records that the beard relic at St.
Kunibert was displayed for veneration within the church on Anthony’s feast day (January
17).\footnote{1055} In the appendix to his catalogue, Gelenius noted a procession of the chapter to the fields

\footnote{1052} On the polychromy, see Falk, “Bildnisreliquiare,” 181.
\footnote{1053} On the haptic dimension of the veneration of body-part reliquaries in general, see Kroos, “Vom Umgang,” 25–
49.
(2007): 257. Baumgarten, Falk, and Cyzemmek indicate that the rings are original. Unfortunately, it was not
possible to examine the base of the bust on account of its fixed installation in the vitrines in the Schatzkammer in
the west transept, and I thus defer to these scholars’ judgement on this point.
\footnote{1055} Winheim, Sacramentum, 513–514: “Indiculus principalium sanctuarum reliquiarum urbis Coloniae, additis
singulis, quibus in ecclesiis asservatur et venerantur diebus . . . . Januarius 17. Portio manus s. Antonii apud
Antonitas, et barba eiusdem ad s. Cunibertum.” As Winheim indicates, the Antonines, who had established a
dependency in Cologne in 1298, also displayed their relic of Anthony’s arm on his feast.
around St. Ursula with St. Anthony’s beard relic at the head of the procession.\textsuperscript{1056} By this point, however, there appears to have been a new container for Anthony’s beard relic; the 1499 inventory describes Anthony’s reliquary as “a monstrance whose crystal is broken in places,” which is not reconcilable with the bust, and Gelenius also indicates that the relic was in this monstrance.\textsuperscript{1057} The bust nonetheless was repaired as late as the seventeenth or eighteenth century and was not melted down, both of which facts suggest continued use after the creation of the monstrance.\textsuperscript{1058} Whatever the case may be with the history of the reliquary bust after the thirteenth century, the original fastening rings and the extensive damage suggest that the chapter intended Anthony’s bust for use in processions from the beginning and likely used it thus; and the documented expositions of and processions with Anthony’s beard relic in the seventeenth century themselves may well point back to practices established by the chapter upon the arrival of the relic in the early thirteenth.

The extraordinarily early image of the sufferers of St. Anthony’s Fire in the fresco and the physical evidence of intense use of the reliquary bust (as much as the relic’s important afterlife) strongly suggest that the chapter attempted to create a cult around the beard relic as a vehicle for healing St. Anthony’s Fire immediately after acquiring it in 1222. The ground in Cologne for doing so was fertile: the Antonines arrived in the city only in 1298, leaving St. Kunibert with a monopoly in this area.\textsuperscript{1059} Carrying the bust in procession through the streets of Cologne (as the rings suggest), the chapter may have advertized publicly the church’s

\textsuperscript{1056} Gelenius, \textit{De admiranda magnitudine}, 289–290: “Notatio de barba s. Antonii. Inter enumeratas sanctorum reliquias barba s. Antonii cristallo et monstrantia preciosa inclusa, in annua huius ecclesiae theophoria cum caeteris sanctorum lipsanis Christo triumphatori praefertur, et quam primum Ursulani agri limites exeuntur, spectante populo copiosum sudorem et aquam emittit . . . .”

\textsuperscript{1057} HASTK, St. Kunibert, Akten A11a/III, fol. 67v: “Item monstrancia argentea deaurata cum barba sancti Anthonii cuius cristallum ab utraque parte est ruptum.” For Gelenius, see note 1056 above.

\textsuperscript{1058} On these repairs, see Falk, “Bildnisreliquiare,” 182.

\textsuperscript{1059} On the arrival of the Antonines in Cologne, see Büttner, “Antonius in Köln,” 268.
custodianship of the relic by writing it into the urban fabric outside the walls of the church compound.\footnote{On processions of body-part reliquaries in urban space, see Ellen M. Shortell, “Dismembering Saint Quentin: Gothic Architecture and the Display of Relics,” in “Body-Part Reliquaries and Body Parts in the Middle Ages,” ed. Caroline Walker Bynum and Paula Gerson, special issue, \textit{Gesta} 36 (1997): 32–47. At St. Gereon, processions with a reliquary bust of St. Gereon and a reliquary containing St. Helena’s crown are attested in the 1260s or 1270s in chapter statutes, but this procession appears to have been restricted to the collegiate compound; see note 1113.} In the church, moreover, the chapter dedicated one of the four new side altars to Anthony (figs. 31 and 140). Consecrated in 1226 or 1227, its dedication was conceived together with the fresco and bust reliquary and completed the ensemble by adding a place of special veneration for Anthony within the new building.\footnote{The dedication to Anthony is recorded in Theoderich von Wied’s obit (HASTK, Geist. Abt., 143, fol. 4b): “consecravit altare beati Antonii.”} The chapter’s positioning of Anthony’s altar seems especially strategic: located in the south side aisle, it was physically accessible to the local laity and pilgrims.\footnote{The altar was destroyed in the eighteenth century, but its location in this position is secure from a text of 1584; see note 1113. The current altar was installed in the early 1990s.} Given the altar’s dedication to Anthony, it seems likely that the chapter intended it not only for saying private memorial masses, but also as a site for the periodic exposition of the reliquary, whether on Anthony’s feast day or on other occasions, where those suffering from St. Anthony’s Fire, pilgrims, and others could have touched and/or kissed it.\footnote{Expositions of reliquaries on altars on high feasts is attested at the cathedral in the 1260s in the \textit{Memorienbuch} of the custodians of the sacristy and can be assumed for Cologne’s other churches, including St. Kunibert. At the cathedral, the reliquaries were also displayed overnight, under the watch of the custodians. See Kosch, “Anbauten,” 100. Again, Winheim’s notice concerning the display of the beard relic on Anthony’s feast (see above, note 1055) may reflect long-standing practices.} In presenting Anthony as a healer of the “Holy Fire” and general intercessor, the unparalleled iconography of the fresco suggests this intent.\footnote{For an analogous argument in a different cultural context, see Marcia Kupfer, \textit{The Art of Healing: Painting for the Sick and the Sinner in a Medieval Town} (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003).} In fact, if the side aisles were only separated from the transept by grills, the image of Anthony healing sufferers in the fresco would have been visible from the stair beside his altar (fig. 141).\footnote{Again, it is uncertain whether this was actually the case.} At the very least, the fresco spoke to the canonical community itself about its custodianship of this potent relic and its ability to both consume and dispense its powers. The chapter’s orchestration of art and furniture—the
image, the numinous reliquary, and the altar—bespeaks a desire to not only venerate this newly added relic within its own ranks, but also exploit a local need and establish a cult over which it could preside and, of course, from which it could hope to profit.

Like Anthony, Nicholas received an unusual iconographic treatment (fig. 148) that thematizes his general capabilities as an intercessor while underlining the efficacy of his arm reliquary (fig. 153). Also presented in iconic frontality, the figure of Nicholas was derived from generic local models for individual episcopal saints, as comparison with the figure of Bruno in the contemporary miscellany from St. Pantaleon (fig. 269) indicates; with both arms raised, Nicholas’ pose in particular stems directly from some such model. For the flanking groups of figures, the chapter selected two events from Nicholas’s life. Common in the West and Byzantium at this time, the left-hand scene depicts the legend of the three maidens; condemned to enter into prostitution on account of their father’s lack of dowries, the maidens’ virginal virtue, the legend holds, was saved at the last moment by Nicholas, who by the cover of night threw three bags of money into their bedroom through a window.\textsuperscript{1066} The right-hand scene recounts how Nicholas saved three unjustly condemned men from execution.\textsuperscript{1067} Uncommon in the North, this scene occurs frequently in Byzantine Nicholas cycles, in which Nicholas, beginning in the thirteenth century, grasps the blade of the sword directly (usually with his right hand; fig. 274), which may suggest that the chapter and its artists had access to some such pictorial cycle.\textsuperscript{1068} The chapter’s selection of these two particular narrative events for the

\textsuperscript{1066} On this legend, see Edward G. Clare, \textit{St. Nicholas: His Legends and Iconography} (Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1985), 15–16 and 66–70.
\textsuperscript{1067} On this legend, see Clare, \textit{St. Nicholas}, 15, as well as Nancy Ševčenko, \textit{The Life of St. Nicholas in Byzantine Art} (Turin: Bottega d’Erasmo, 1983), 105.
\textsuperscript{1068} On this scene in Byzantine cycles, see Ševčenko, \textit{Life of St. Nicholas}, 104–108. The earliest extant example in which he restrains the sword listed by Ševčenko is in Boljana and dates from 1259, but this type of representation probably had antecedents; in the late-twelfth-century hagiographical icon at St. Catherine’s, Mt. Sinai, Nicholas holds the executioner’s arm. An extensive cycle of eight scenes from Nicholas’s life occurs in the north transept
Nicholas register (fig. 148) is instructive, for both provided an opportunity to demonstrate visually Nicholas’s holy arms in action. In the left-hand scene, Nicholas does not throw bags of money through the window, as the legend says, but rather extends a golden ball to the waiting maidens with his right hand. In the execution scene, he stays the sword with his raised left hand, grasping its threatening blade. Nicholas’s hands and arms are figured in the fresco as the concentrated physical loci of his saintly power. With its carefully contrived iconography and composition, the fresco stages Nicholas’s arm reliquary as a charged dispenser of divine aid.\(^{1069}\)

As with Anthony, the rhetoric of the fresco-reliquary tandem (figs. 148 and 153) has multiple dimensions in Nicholas’s case. Contemplating or venerating the arm reliquary while it stood in the niche with the other reliquaries, the canonical viewer again had a powerful visual exemplum of the potentiality of the relic before his eyes. Gilded and encrusted with jewels, the arm reliquary as a material object was already a symbol of God’s power through the working of his saints; the sparkling arm was simultaneously the saint’s and God’s own dextera.\(^{1070}\) With its image of Nicholas’s living body performing miracles through his hands and arms, the fresco reinforced the reliquary’s own internal symbolism. As Hahn writes of the arm reliquary as an object: “Relic arms not only had the ability to act, they had acted in life. It was as if such relics

---

\(^{1069}\) Both Nicholas and George’s arm reliquaries originally had silver hands, but these were removed in the early nineteenth century during the secularization of Cologne; they were then replaced with wooden hands covered with silver leaf, which were in turn lost by the end of the nineteenth century. See Junghans, “Armreliquiare,” 179. The original appearance of the reliquaries with the hands likely corresponded to that of the contemporary arm reliquaries from St. Gereon (fig. 270).

\(^{1070}\) This appears to have been one of the fundamental meanings of the arm reliquary as an object, as the occurrence of tituli invoking the Hand of God on extant arm reliquaries indicates. See, for instance, Cynthia Hahn, “The Voices of the Saints: Speaking Reliquaries,” in “Body-Part Reliquaries and Body Parts in the Middle Ages,” ed. Caroline Walker Bynum and Paula Gerson, special issue, Gesta 36 (1997): 25–26, and Junghans, “Armreliquiare,” 95–98. This conception of the arm reliquary was demonstrably current in Cologne at this time; a Cologne arm reliquary dating from ca. 1175 bears an enamelled titulus that reads: DEXTERA DOMINI FECIT VIRTUTEM (Psalms 117:16). On it, see OE, vol. 2, 410 cat. no. F 52.
were marked by power transmitted through the hand in life that remained available in death."\footnote{1071} The St. Nicholas fresco-arm reliquary tandem at St. Kunibert provides stunningly direct confirmation of this high medieval conception of the fragmented body-part relic as a fundamentally vital entity and the body-part reliquary as an active, charged vessel that contains and channels the relic’s eternal power. The arm reliquary’s rock crystal oculus also permitted visual inspection of the holy arm bone (as did George’s; fig. 155); indeed, as in other Cologne reliquaries of this time, such as those from St. Gereon (fig. 270), the oculus can be opened and relic laid bare (fig. 154), enabling the canon to touch the relic inside the container.\footnote{1072} The reliquary offered the canon direct visual and physical access to the arm bone whose power was so forcefully demonstrated in the image of Nicholas’s holy arms above, offering a platform for the canon’s self-sanctification through sight and touch of the miracle-working relic. It also seems plausible based on well-documented analogies and the physical proximity of the niche to the high altar (fig. 141) that Nicholas’s arm reliquary (and perhaps also that of George) was taken occasionally from the niche and integrated into the conventual liturgy at the altar, where it may have been used to dispense blessings of the community at its own mass, in full view of the potentiality of Nicholas’s arms in the painted image; reliquary arms of bishops like Nicholas in

\footnote{1071} Hahn, “Speaking Reliquaries,” 26.
\footnote{1072} On the possibility for touch offered by these oculi, see OE, vol. 2, 261 cat no. E 52 and 263 E 53; Junghans, “Armreliquiare,” 81–82; and Toussaint, Kreuz und Knochen, 187–188. That the hinged oculi were not used for inserting the relics into the arms is clear from large openings on the bases; see Junghans, “Armreliquiare,” 82. As Toussaint (187–188) usefully stresses, touching of the relic through such apertures was likely restricted to small, clerical audiences: “mit einem Massenphänomen ist nicht zu rechnen.” This is not the place to examine the larger causes of the appearance of rock crystal oculi on arm and other reliquaries in the early thirteenth century, which have been much debated and tied, among other things, to prescriptions against removing relics from containers (Lateran IV, 1215), the increased traffic in Byzantine relics after 1204 (which often came as bare bones), and an increasing emphasis on seeing holy objects (such as the Host in the elevation); an extensive overview of the debate can be found in Toussaint, Kreuz und Knochen, 12–22, 139–163. What is most important here is the chapter’s patronal desire to enable visual and haptic access to the arm relic, especially in view of the fresco’s imagery.
particular appear to have been privileged for this use.\textsuperscript{1073} Although we do not possess texts attesting to this practice at St. Kunibert, the gilding on the sleeves of both arm reliquaries (fig. 153) is abraded, which indicates that they were in fact touched, whether in use for blessings, in the framework of clerical devotion inside and outside the niche, and perhaps also in expositions to the laity on the altars outside the clerical choir.\textsuperscript{1074}

The ensemble of frescoes and reliquaries at St. Kunibert demonstrates that reliquaries were not isolated objects but rather part of a larger network of images that supplemented and sharpened the vessel’s own, object-specific symbolism. Framing the reliquaries, the frescoes offered an interactive portal for the community’s veneration of the relics, shaping their meanings while also explicating the relic’s (and thus the object’s) efficacy, both when it was inside the niche and outside it. In gathering its new Eastern relics in one locus in the sanctuary and providing them with resplendent golden containers, the community sanctified itself by virtue of the saints’ physical presence in its ritual space (fig. 156). The placement of the niche in a position where it was essentially physically inaccessible and yet possibly still visible to the laity (fig. 141) was also a security measure and not least an instrument of social control. The custodian of these potent containers, the community carefully regulated the dispensation of their powers at select moments in its liturgy, in processions, and in expositions within the church.

This remarkable instance of preservation of frescoes and reliquaries at St. Kunibert also confirms the recent revaluation of the central place of the “minor” art of treasury objects in the

\textsuperscript{1073} On this practice in general, see Kroos, “Vom Umgang,” 38, and Hahn, “Speaking Reliquaries,” 26. Most of this discourse on the use of arms in blessings has concentrated on bishops using arms to bless their congregations, but the same use is equally applicable to a clerical community’s own liturgy and its pastoral care.

\textsuperscript{1074} I cannot concur with Junghans’s (“Armreliquiare,” 94) suggestion that the arm reliquaries’ form (extensive decoration and large bases) would have precluded their use in dispensing blessings; this does not seem a valid criterion for gauging an object’s possible uses, and the arms do show abrasion from repeated touching. Notably, Winheim (\textit{Saccarium}, 519) records in his circuit of principal relic expositions in Cologne that the arm of St. Nicholas—but not that of St. George—was, like Anthony’s beard, the focus of particular veneration on his feast: “December 6. Brachium sancti Nicholai ad s. Cunibertum.”
creation of institutional narratives. As Hahn remarked of Abbot Suger, “[he] recognized that it was as important to assemble a treasury as to build a magnificent building.” In constructing its new church and a treasury full of potent vessels to stage and use in the building, the chapter at St. Kunibert clearly thought much the same way. Nor was it alone in doing so in early-thirteenth-century Cologne. Commissioning arm reliquaries for its purported founder Helena and members of Gereon’s Theban Legion (ca. 1220–1230; fig. 270), and possibly a reliquary bust for Gereon himself, the community at St. Gereon coordinated the reconstruction of its late antique rotunda (1219–1227)—the building that Helena built for Gereon and his Legion—with the construction of a group of treasury objects designed to validate the church’s history by containing it in golden containers. As St. Kunibert and St. Gereon indicate, high clerical communities in Cologne were savvy as patrons when it came to networking the arts to write narratives about their institutions. These narratives cut across the different media, encompassing architecture, monumental art, and vasa sacra; self-reflexive and propagandistic, they were directed as much at the canonical communities themselves as at the larger world outside the church compound.


1076 Hahn, “Treasuries,” 17 n. 5.

1077 On the arm reliquaries, see OE, vol. 2, 242 cat. nos. E 35 and E 36. The relic of Helena’s arm no longer survives in the reliquary, but its existence at St. Gereon is secure through a mention of the celebration at St. Gereon of a feast marking the translation of the relic of Helena’s arm; see OE, vol. 2, 244 cat. no. E 36. A gilt silver reliquary bust of St. Gereon, now lost, is also recorded at St. Gereon in a document dating from 1244, but it is not certain when this reliquary was made (i.e., whether it was contemporary with the arm reliquaries); on it, see Falk, “Bildnissreliquiare,” 184–185. The interface between the rebuilding project and the treasury objects at St. Gereon is adduced here only as a contemporary analogy for the patronal strategies at St. Kunibert; its complexity deserves more space that can be devoted to it here.
3. Epilogue: The Chapel of the Holy Cross

In addition to the sanctuary frescoes from the 1220s, a group of mural paintings is found in a small chapel in the southwest corner of the east transept (fig. 161). Measuring 2.2 by 1.8 meters, this chapel was retrofitted in the Muldennische in this spot, which was a feature that had been taken over from Xanten when the east transept was designed around 1210. Around 1260–1270, the chapter had a team of masons square the concave niche and erect a quadripartite rib vault on four columns to create a baldachin-like space; a transverse arch was spanned between the piers to either side of the niche, closing off the chapel towards the east transept.

The profile of the ribs, the foliage motifs on the capitals, and the form of the column bases have parallels in the choir chapels at Cologne’s cathedral, which were complete around 1265 (fig. 162). Although the capitals are generally of lesser quality than those at the cathedral, they suggest that the chapter recruited masons from the cathedral workshop for the chapel; St. Kunibert was likely complete by the consecration in 1247 and the workshop of masons thus already long dissolved when the chapter had the chapel installed.

Frescoes cover every surface of the structure: two angels swing censers in the spandrels of the arch (fig. 161); inside the chapel, a Crucifixion (fig. 163) adorns the rear wall and four scenes from the legend of the True Cross—now fragmentary but still legible (figs. 165–168)—

---

1078 On the design of the flanks of the east transept, see Chapter 3.
1079 Although the importance of the Crucifixion fresco in the chapel has long been acknowledged, the chapel as an architectural structure has yet to be the subject of even a rudimentary architectural or archaeological investigation. A detailed exposition of these facets of the chapel exceeds the concerns of this chapter, and only the essential features of the chapel are adduced here with a view to elucidating briefly the process of the chapel’s construction and its date.
1080 Clemen, Monumentalmalerei, 595, also places the capitals ca. 1260–1270, without, however, providing comparanda. He is followed by Demus, Romanische Wandmalerei (Munich: Hirmer, 1968), 200 no. 224, and Jakoby, “Wandmalereien,” 171. On the chronology of the choir chapels at the cathedral, see the summary in Arnold Wolff, Der Kölner Dom (Cologne: Vista-Point Verlag, 1989), 13.
1081 See Chapter 4.
the two lateral walls. The vault, columns, bases, and capitals all display polychromy (much restored), and fictive textiles featuring a pattern of circles with alternating eagles and rosettes fill the dado. As has long been recognized, the figural frescoes, and the oft-cited Crucifixion on the rear wall in particular, represent the key example of the final phase of the Zackenstil in Cologne. On the basis of comparisons with other Cologne frescoes, such as the closely-related Crucifixion at St. Severin (ca. 1260; fig. 275), Paul Clemen, Otto Demus, and others established a date of 1260–1270 for the wall paintings, confirming the chronological picture offered by the chapel’s architecture.

In the context of this chapter, the principal significance of this small chapel lies in its function. Although the chapel has long been called a “Taufkapelle” on account of the baptismal font that it houses, the font was moved there only in 1839. Rather, as Jakoby recently recognized, this chapel was installed as a purpose-built structure for displaying the relic of the True Cross. This function is suggested not only by the themes of the frescoes, but also by the existence of a console at the bottom of Crucifixion. Contemporary with the capitals, the console (figs. 169–170) displays a recess (8 cm wide, 2 cm long, and 3.7 deep) into which the base of the Cross relic, perhaps with a metal tongue, would have been inserted for display before

---

1082 The side walls were damaged in the mid-nineteenth century; Ewald noted in 1916 (KDM 6/4, 266): “Auch an den übrigen Wandflächen kamen beim Entfernen der Tünche Reste alter Wandmalereien zum Vorschein, die jedoch durch die Unvorsichtigkeit der Mauerer teilweise zerstört wurden; die erhaltenen Reste sind kaum zu deuten.” Although the four scenes on the flanks are very abraded, they are mostly legible, contrary to Ewald’s assertion. The Crucifixion, which is very well preserved, was only lightly restored by Welter in 1858 after the discovery of the frescoes; see Blanchebarbe, Welter, 76.

1083 The polychromy on the architectural members, the fictive tapestry, and the angels on the arch were restored in 1880–1885 by Matthias Goebbels. On his work in the chapel, see Anke Twachtmann-Schlichter, Matthias Goebbels, Dekorationsmalerei und Kirchenrestaurierung im 19. Jahrhundert in Köln (Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: George Olms, 1994), 147–149.

1084 On the Zackenstil in Cologne in general, see Demus, Wandmalerei, 101.


1086 The font had previously stood in the north arm of the west transept. The relocation of the font to the chapel in 1839 is recorded by Mertens, Die letzten fünfzig Jahre der Kirche St. Cunibert in Köln, 34–35.

the image of the Crucifixion (fig. 171). While Jakoby established this identification of the chapel as a space for the display of the relic of the True Cross, she did not pursue the full implications of this important discovery. Critical questions about the chapter’s motivations for creating this chapel when it already had the relic niche, its range of uses, and the role and meaning of its frescoes remain. This epilogue examines these aspects of the Holy Cross chapel with the larger aim of analyzing the space’s institutional significance.

Unlike the relic niche, an indication as to why the chapter was motivated to create the Holy Cross chapel does not survive; the only evidence for assessing the chapter’s intentions and the uses and meaning of the chapel is the monument itself. This lack of supplementary sources notwithstanding, the chapter’s gesture of creating a new chapel for the Cross relic obviously points to an attempt to reactivate the relic. As a purpose-built structure for the display of a True Cross relic, the chapel at St. Kunibert is singular at this moment in the German-speaking lands, which points up both the site-specificity and the originality of the chapter’s enterprise.

The new chapel likely absorbed most of the functions of the niche. It is clear from the console that the True Cross relic was displayed in the chapel at least periodically, most likely on Good Friday and on the inventio and exaltatio Crucis feasts, as had been the case with the niche. The frescoes thematize these three feasts: in addition to the Crucifixion on the rear wall (Good Friday), two of the scenes from the legend of the True Cross recount the principal events associated with the inventio and exaltatio Crucis. In the upper scene on the left wall (fig. 166), Helena (at the left) looks on as a hunched-over Judas Cyriacus (at the right) raises a pick-

1089 Like other scholars, Jakoby did not discuss the damaged scenes from the legend of the True Cross, which, although fragmentary, are nonetheless essential to the chapel’s use and meaning.
1090 To my knowledge, a second example of such a structure in the imperial territories is attested only much later, at St. Matthias in Trier, where a chamber was built in the early sixteenth century for displaying the early-thirteenth-century True Cross reliquary (fig. 271); see Klein, Kreuz, 266.
1091 See above.
axe to dig for the Cross, which was the basis for the *inventio* feast; and in the upper scene on the right wall (fig. 168), the Byzantine emperor Heraclius (602–641), having recovered the Cross from the Persian king Chosroes II (590–628), restores the relic to Jerusalem, carrying it into the city through a gate, which was the event that formed the basis for the *exaltatio* feast. While a temporary use of the chapel for displaying the relic on the three Cross feasts seems certain, it is difficult to know if the relic was kept in the chapel permanently, for the reliquary cross likely was used regularly in the liturgy at the high altar. For its part, the 1499 inventory indicates that the *crux magna* was kept with the other reliquaries in the niche in the sanctuary at that time. Conceivably, the Cross may have been stored regularly in the relic niche for ease of access for use at the high altar and the new chapel used on the Cross feasts and for private devotion among the canons; the latter easily would have been able to place the relic in the chapel on an as-needed basis. The chapel’s intimate scale also indicates that it was designed for use by one individual at a time, which further suggests that the structure was intended to play an important role in the individual canon’s devotional life alongside its use on the Cross feasts. Expositions of the relic to pilgrims and other lay viewers in the chapel on occasions other than the Cross feasts and under tight clerical custodianship are perhaps conceivable given its location near the nave (fig. 140), but there is no evidence that would corroborate such a use.

---

1093 See note 986. An image of St. Helena holding the Cross also appeared on the (lost) painted doors that were added to the niche around 1400 and which visualized its relic holdings (see *KDM* 6/4, 285 fig. 152). This image of Helena in the context of the niche also suggests that the True Cross relic was kept here at this earlier date as well. For her part, Jakoby (“Wandmalereien,” 171) suggests that the niche may have lost its function as place for storing the relic upon the creation of the chapel, citing the installation of the wooden chest before the fresco, but the installation of the chest most likely stands in relation to the creation of the grill and painted doors around 1400.  
1094 Cf. Jakoby, “Wandmalereien,” 171, who simply posits lay access to the chapel on feast days (“an hohen Feiertagen”). Here, Jakoby suggests the existence of a grill at the entrance to the chapel, citing the presence of hinges. Found high up and only on the left wall (cf. fig. 164), these hinges, however, stem from a device that was installed in the chapel in the mid-nineteenth century to hoist the heavy metal lid of the font; cf. *KDM* 6/4, 268 fig.
While the chapel’s uses were generally the same as those of the relic niche, in the chapel the chapter employed a new artistic strategy *vis-à-vis* the earlier niche, coordinating an intimately-scaled physical structure, painted imagery, and the reliquary itself to offer an immersive, multisensory experience of the relic. In contrast to the niche (fig. 143), which provided the canonical community with a small conceptual portal for imaginative projection into the moment of the Crucifixion, the chapel (fig. 161) is predicated on the viewer’s bodily inclusion in both the space and its network of imagery, and thus on fully embodied viewing. The chapel is also insistently theatrical in how it stages the relic. Entering the chapel, the viewer first passes under the arch with the pair of censing angels, which signal that the viewer is crossing a threshold into a sacred space and which further endow the chapel with a synaesthetic dimension through the visual reference to incense.

Once inside the chapel, the viewer is confronted by the expansive image of the Crucifixion on the rear wall, which dominates the chapel’s interior (fig. 171). As in the niche, the placement of the Cross relic on the console before the Crucifixion creates an interactive dialogue between the material fragment and the painted image. Conceptually, the main purpose of the Crucifixion in the chapel is the same as in the earlier niche: the viewer is thrust into the central moment of salvation with the intent of facilitating a reliving of the event in the presence of the True Cross, with the fresco serving both to elucidate the relic’s meanings and to shape the

141. The entire archway to the chapel, however, does appear to have been closed with a grill with two doors in the early nineteenth century, as a watercolour of the interior of the church from ca. 1838 (i.e., before the conversion of the chapel to a baptistery) indicates; see Euler-Schmidt, *Kölns romanische Kirchen*, 121 no. 24e. It is, however, impossible to know when this grill was added. As early modern texts indicate, by the late sixteenth century the chapel served as a storehouse for many different relics, which may very well have led to the addition of a grill for security. Thus, a notice in the chapter minutes from 1584 (HASTK, St. Kunibert, Akten A11c, fols. 172v–173r; Aug. 11, 1584): “... ex armario seu promptuariu reliquiarum retro altare sancti Antonii confessoris ad latus australe situato reliquias infrascriptas ...” And a similar notice in the minutes from 1681 (HASTK, St. Kunibert, Akten A11h, fol. 112v; Mar. 12, 1681): “De reliquis retro altare sancti Antonii. Item proponente domino thesaurario quod annuerunt quatenus reliquie quae minus reverenter extant retro altare sancti Antonii decenter in capsula lignea collocenter et in loco congruo in ecclesia exponentur.” As the latter notice suggests, by this time the chapel probably was used only as a storage room for reliquaries.
viewer’s response. The meaning of the relic as the material witness of Christ’s suffering on the Cross is highlighted again by the specific rendering of the crucified Christ, who appears in the three-nail-type that by the 1260s had been universally established, in Cologne and elsewhere, as a sign of Christ’s painful death (cf. fig. 275). Additional details on the vertical axis above and below the Crucifixion-Cross relic tandem reinforce this significance of the relic as the instrument of salvation through God’s sacrifice of his son on the Cross. Thus, the Hand of God descends from heaven above the painted cross, making a blessing gesture over the scene; as the sign of God’s intervention in the world, the Hand of God figures the Crucifixion as God’s plan for the redemption of humankind, thus styling the relic as a physical testament to this plan and covenant. Supporting the relic and, as it were, the painted cross, the sculpted console (fig. 170) also points to the sacrificial meaning of the event and relic while underscoring their eternal relevance. Decorated with vine leaves and bundles of grapes, it presents the Crucifixion and the relic as the moment and site of the shedding of Christ’s blood and the establishment of the Eucharist, the sacrifice that is renewed perpetually on the altar in recollection of the dispensation of divine grace through Christ’s sacrificed body on the Cross.

While produced with somewhat different means, the range of meanings established by the juxtaposition of the relic and the image of Christ on the vertical axis is essentially the same as that in the earlier display. The chapel, however, strikingly removes the figures of Ecclesia and Synagogue and the two prophets, reducing the event to the triad of the crucified Christ, Mary, and John (fig. 171). This reduction in the number of figures seems to be not simply the result of a lack of space for supplementary figures, but rather a strategic gesture aimed at binding the viewer more fully into the event on an affective level. Thus, whereas the manifold

figures in the earlier Crucifixion (fig. 143) operate as “closed” system, with their gazes contained within the plane of the image, the Crucifixion in the chapel visually and physically construes the viewer as a witness to the event. John neither turns toward nor looks at Christ on the Cross, but rather appears frontally, confronting the viewer and gazing out of the scene directly at him or her, thereby integrating the viewer as a participant in the scene. Comparison of the fresco with the contemporary Crucifixion at St. Severin (fig. 275) is particularly instructive; in the latter, John, turning to the cross but not looking at it and resting his head in his hand in sorrow, is absorbed fully in his emotions. In both frescoes, John is still the favourite disciple, the privileged witness to the event, and the archetypal seer with his Gospel book. But in the St. Kunibert fresco, the Evangelist’s sight and status as an ideal spiritual exemplar are utilized instead to rouse the clerical viewer towards contemplation of the meanings of the Crucifixion and the relic by direct address. In a reversal of the roles found at St. Severin, where the Virgin looks out at the viewer and gestures demonstratively towards the cross and John is a paradigm of pathos, at St. Kunibert the Virgin assumes the role of an exemplar of affective response vis-à-vis the image-relic tandem. Gazing at Christ on the cross, Mary presses her mantle to her cheek with her left hand, drying her tears. The image places particular emphasis on Mary as the bearer of the logos: like John, Mary carries a Gospel book, which she holds against her mid-section, pointing to her womb as the place where Christ, the Word incarnate on the Cross, was born. The image thus foregrounds Mary’s status as the Mother of God, which not only underscores for the viewer the reason for Mary’s own powerfully emotional response to the vision of her dead son on the Cross, but also figures the Cross relic as the physical site from which Wisdom Incarnate saved humanity for all time.

Not simply a “mural painting,” the Crucifixion-True Cross relic tandem at St. Kunibert is part of a much wider trend in mid-thirteenth-century high clerical contexts towards the coordination of emotionally-charged monumental imagery, furnishings, and physical space to create inclusive, viewer-oriented devotional environments. The paradigmatic example is the west choir screen in Naumburg (ca. 1250; fig. 276), where the crucified Christ is framed by Mary and John, who stare out at the viewer with grimacing faces and gesture theatrically across their bodies and across the portal’s doors to Christ, whose bloodied, sacrificial body hangs before the altar in the choir behind. The Holy Cross chapel at St. Kunibert indicates that this movement towards eliciting affective response was not confined to the archetypically anthropomorphic medium of monumental sculpture, but also encompassed the creative, trans-medial combination of small-scale and two-dimensional media, as well as sculpture (the console) and microarchitecture (the chapel). With this theatrical relic-image grouping, the rear wall of St. Kunibert’s chapel offered an iconic portal through which the viewer, nestled within, became a corporeal witness to, and participant in, the Crucifixion. The relic, a fragment, became the centre of a totalizing environment that engaged the viewer’s sight, body, and emotions.

Not only does the viewer become embedded in the iconic image on the rear wall, but both the viewer and the image-relic tandem are further situated physically and conceptually within the network of narrative imagery centering on the legend of the True Cross on the chapel’s flanks (figs. 164–168). These scenes comprise one of only two extant monumental True Cross cycles from thirteenth-century Germany, but they have been passed over in previous discussions of the chapel (and of True Cross cycles) on account of their poor state of

---

enough remains, however, to identify securely at least three of the scenes and to proffer a tentative identification of the fourth one; and the physiognomy, palette, and technical features (especially the use of gilded dots on garments; fig. 168) accords with Mary and John (fig. 171), indicating, like the use of the Zackenstil in the underdrawing (cf. the sheets on the bed in fig. 167), that the True Cross scenes are contemporary with the Crucifixion on the rear wall.

Although the two scenes on the left flank (fig. 164) are very fragmentary, it is clear that they opened the cycle and focused on the discovery of the True Cross, for the scenes on the right wall—the testing of the Cross (fig. 167) and Heraclius restoring the Cross to Jerusalem (fig. 168)—represent events that occur after the inventio. In the lower register (figs. 164–165), two areas of legible remains are preserved. Three nobly dressed women stand at the extreme right. Moving leftwards, following an area that has been lost, remains of two soldiers’ heads and the rim of a halo survive. The area to the left of this group is now almost entirely lost, save for two intersecting lines (green and white) that form a cross-shape. This does not appear to be the Cross itself, however, because in the two scenes on the right wall the Cross is brown. The types of figures in the lower scene suggests that it originally depicted a haloed Helena arriving in Jerusalem, followed by her retinue of courtiers and surrounded by her armed guard, to interrogate the Jews (lost at the left) about the location of the Cross, which ultimately results in

---

1098 Only their fragmentary condition has been noted. Clemen (Monumentalmalerei, 597), however, cited an oral communication between him and the then-parish priest of St. Kunibert, Anton Ditges, who suggested identifications of the damaged scenes. Save for one scene, however, Ditges’s proposed identifications of the scenes do not align with the remains; they will be noted in the appropriate contexts below. The second extant monumental True Cross cycle from thirteenth-century Germany is an extensive cycle of frescoes in the south transept of Brunswick Cathedral dating from ca. 1240 (figs. 277–279). On it, see Stefan Brenske, Der Hl. Kreuz-Zyklus in der ehemaligen Braunschweiger Stiftskirche St. Blasius. Studien zu den historischen Bezügen und ideologisch-politischen Zielsetzungen der mittelalterlichen Wandmalereien (Braunschweig: Stadtarchiv und Stadtbibliothek, 1988).

1099 Clemen (Monumentalmalerei, 597) also supposed that the True Cross scenes were contemporary with the rear wall, citing the occurrence of the Zackenstil in the better-preserved areas.
the Jews offering up Judas Cyriacus to lead Helena to the place where the Cross lay buried. Common in Mosan True Cross cycles of the mid- and later twelfth century (cf. fig. 273), this episode also precedes the inventio scene in the Brunswick cycle (fig. 277), where Helena, as at St. Kunibert, interrogates the Jews with a retinue of noble women and soldiers, although here she is enthroned. An initial interrogation episode in the lower register would also mirror the narrative direction on the other flank, which reads from bottom to top. An identification of the lower scene as the interrogation is further suggested by the upper register, in which remains of two figures are preserved. At the right, a hunched-over figure swings what appears to be a pick-axe. A second figure stands at the left; a body and fragmentary head with eyes, nose, and a large circle denoting a halo remain, indicating that this figure is Helena. A parallel for the image of the figure at the right is found in the Mosan Tongres reliquary (fig. 273), which shows Judas (and a second figure) digging in a mound for the Cross with a raised pick-axe while an enthroned and haloed Helena watches from the other wing. Accordingly, this upper scene most likely represents an abbreviated inventio, as in the Tongres reliquary, although all trace of what might have been a mound of earth with a cross between Helena and Judas has disappeared;

---

100 The presence of soldiers at the interrogation occurs in the canonical inventio Crucis legend, which was probably first composed in Greek around 415–425 and then translated into Syriac and Latin, in the latter case by around 500 (on the formation of the legend, see the synopsis of the current state of thought in Baert, True Cross, 42–46); cf. the Latin edition in Stephan Borgehammar, How the Holy Cross was Found: From Event to Medieval Legend, with an Appendix of Texts (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1991), 258 (chapter 4): “[Helena] introuit in sanctam ciuitatem Jerusalem . . . cum exercitu maximo.”

101 In addition to the Tongres reliquary, the interrogation scene already occurs in the Stavelot Triptych (ca. 1156–1158), which is likely the earliest of the Mosan True Cross cycles; on it, see Klein, Kreuz, 206–219. Clemen (Monumentalmalerei, 597) records Ditges as suggesting that this lower scene represented the “division of the nails” (“Verteilung der Nägel”). This identification, however, goes against the logic of both the legend and pictorial True Cross cycles, for this event happens after the testing of the Cross (testing in chapter 10 and discovery and division of the nails in chapters 13–14; see Borgehammar, Cross, 267 and 269–271). The testing of the Cross is shown in the chapel on the right wall with the final event in the legend (Heraclius entering Jerusalem), and thus as happening temporally after the two initial scenes on the left wall. The division of the nails occurs in the lengthy Brunswick cycle, but again after the testing of the Cross.

102 The motif of the hunched-over Judas with pick-axe (raised or lowered) and mound of earth with a concealed cross (or crosses) occurs frequently in the mid-twelfth-century Mosan cycles, including the Stavelot Triptych and an enamelled processional cross from ca. 1160–1170; for the latter, see Staufer, vol. 2, Abb. 351.
the limited space of the lunette, however, would have precluded representing Judas digging for
the cross in a more expansive scene, and thus the existence of such a mound with the cross
seems likely. The scenes on the left wall, then, can be identified with a high degree of
likelihood as the interrogation (lower) and inventio (upper); this wall thus centres on the
circumstances surrounding Helena’s discovery of the True Cross.

The two scenes on the right flank are easily identifiable. The lower scene (fig. 167)
represents the testing of the Cross after the inventio: in order to determine the authenticity of the
True Cross, the three crosses found by Judas are laid upon a deceased male youth (or ill
patrician woman), who is then resuscitated (or healed) upon the touch of the True Cross.1103
This scene is dominated by a large figure that lies swaddled on a bed.1104 Apart from the bed,
which occurs in Mosan cycles, the swaddled, recumbent figure is close in conception to that in
the corresponding scene in Brunswick (fig. 278). At the left, at least two onlookers watch as the
foremost figure in the group of two at the right holds a monumental cross over the figure on the
bed, who reaches up to touch it. This figure wears a green garment with a burgundy mantle
punctuated by gold dots, like the figure of Helena in the inventio scene (fig. 166), and a crown,
the outline of which is visible. Both features indicate that it is Helena herself who tests the True
Cross. The upper and final scene depicts Heraclius restoring the True Cross to Jerusalem after
recovering it from Chosroes II, who had seized it when the Persians conquered Jerusalem in 614

1103 These two variants of the legend already occur in patristic sources; see Klein, Kreuz, 24. The canonical
inventio legend indicates that it was a deceased male youth; Borgehammar, Cross, 267 (chapter 10): “mortuus
iuuenis.” For his part, Ditges suggested to Clemen that this scene might represent the healing episode; see Clemen,
Monumentalmalerei, 597.

1104 The presence of the bed-like bier suggests that the figure, whose features are too abraded to determine its
gender, is probably supposed to be the deceased male youth of the canonical legend; a bed-like funeral bier is found
in the Stavelot Triptych, where the figure is labelled as “mortuus suscitatus,” and a normal bier, again with a
“mortuus suscitatus,” occurs on the aforementioned processional cross (see note 1102). Both variants—the
deceased male and ill patrician woman—do, however, occur in illustrated True Cross cycles, but the deceased male
is more common; see Brenske, Kreuz-Zyklus, 85 n. 34, who provides a comprehensive list of examples. For his
part, Ditges (in Clemen, Monumentalmalerei, 597) suggested that this scene may have represented the healing of
the ill patrician woman (“die Kranke”), but this is not borne out by the remains.
A crowned and barefooted Heraclius appears at the left, bearing the Cross in his draped hands; he is followed by a female figure with noble headdress and crown who probably is supposed to represent his empress rather than Helena in what would be an ahistorical conflation. The right half of the composition undoubtedly showed a tall city gate, on which sat an angel, whose wing is still visible at the apex of the lunette. The St. Kunibert scene has close thematic and compositional parallels in the rendering of this episode in Saxon True Cross cycles from circa 1240–1290, including the recounting of the event in Brunswick and in a miniature in a copy of Alexander of Bremen’s commentary on the Apocalypse dating from the final decades of the thirteenth century (figs. 279–280).

The chapel’s cycle of four scenes thus shows basic iconographic and formal relationships with earlier Mosan and contemporary Saxon True Cross cycles, which is not surprising given Cologne’s geographical location in the middle of these two areas. Nonetheless, in combining the *inventio* and Heraclius legends in one cycle, the St. Kunibert cycle diverges from twelfth-century Mosan cycles, which show these legends separately, and instead aligns with thirteenth-century True Cross cycles, in which the *inventio* and Heraclius legends first occur together.

In fact, apart from the cycle at St. Kunibert, only two other thirteenth-century True Cross cycles, both dating from the 1240s, combine the *inventio* and Heraclius legends; they are the cycle at Brunswick Cathedral (ca. 1240) and the stained glass at the Sainte-Chapelle (ca. 1244–

---

1105 On the historical circumstances of the loss and Heraclius’ recovery of the Cross, see Klein, *Kreuz*, 28–31. The legend of Heraclius’s recovery of the Cross had entered the West by the Carolingian era at the latest, for Hrabanus Maurus wrote a homily on it; see Baert, *True Cross*, 140.
1106 Although this figure is crowned, her garments—a pink tunic and blue mantle—do not accord with Helena’s garb in the *inventio* and testing scenes (green tunic, burgundy mantle) and she also clearly lacks a halo. To my knowledge, the sole instance in which Helena accompanies Heraclius into Jerusalem occurs in a panel from Martin Bernat’s retable for the Church of Santa Cruz de Blesa in Teruel (1481; Museo de Zaragoza).
1107 On these two Saxon images, see Brenske, *Kreuz-Zyklus*, 96–97. Ditges (as reported by Clemen, *Monumentalmalerei*, 597) interpreted this scene as “wahrscheinlich Helena vor dem Kreuz.”
1248). These two cycles, however, are unusually extensive; each features more than twenty scenes, including lengthy retellings not only of the discovery of the Cross, but also of the stages of the conflict between Heraclius and Chosroes II. Neither comes into question as an immediate model for St. Kunibert’s cycle of four scenes, although it seems clear from the cycle’s overlap with several of the associated scenes in Brunswick that the chapter and its artists had to hand some such pictorial cycle with both legends but focused on these particular four episodes. In the context of the chapel, the chapter’s combination of Helena’s discovery of the Cross (fig. 166) and Heraclius’s carrying of the recovered Cross into Jerusalem (fig. 168) had a functional logic, for the chapel was likely used to display the relic on the Cross feasts of the *inventio* and the *exaltatio Crucis*. At St. Kunibert, the merging of the *inventio* and Heraclius legends was site-specific, with the chapter choosing the themes of the narrative imagery for the flanks carefully with regard to the chapel’s anticipated uses.

Even the two episodes that have close parallels in the Brunswick and other cycles, namely, the testing of the Cross and Heraclius’s entry, display unconventional iconographies that point to the chapter’s keying of the narrative scenes to the physical presence of the relic in the chapel. While the testing of the Cross is common in True Cross cycles, it was an eminently meaningful selection for the chapel’s cycle, for the event was not simply a test of authenticity, but in the context of the chapel a powerful visual demonstration of the relic’s miraculous potency, in this case to heal the sick/resuscitate the dead (fig. 167). The testing scene at St. Kunibert, moreover, is unparalleled in showing Helena herself testing the Cross on the figure on

---

1110 See above, 442–443.
the bed, which is found neither in the different recensions of the legend nor in other cycles. Earlier and contemporary cycles show one of two figures holding the Cross, either Judas Cyriacus himself or Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, while Helena looks on, in accordance with the recensions of the legend (fig. 278). At St. Kunibert, Helena was thus given a special, active role in this episode. The chapter’s reasons for emphasizing Helena in this scene are not difficult to discern: credited with founding the *marytria* at St. Gereon, Xanten, and Bonn, Helena was an exceptionally important saint in the archdiocese of Cologne generally and among its elite spiritual communities in particular; her cult is attested at all three of these sites by the late twelfth century. At St. Kunibert, Helena’s cult, if not important before the relic acquisition, had certainly become important after, for the *Memorienbuch* calendar lists her feast as a red-letter (i.e., major) feast. In according Helena an active role in the testing scene, the chapter not only stressed her local and institutional importance, but further activated the Cross relic by showing that it was doubly sanctified through the touch of St. Helena herself. Through its possession of the Cross relic and with this contrived image, the chapter claimed an immediate stake in the larger archdiocesan cult centering on Helena, inserting itself into the company of the three other elite communities that traditionally presided over her cult.

---

1111 In the textual legend, it is Judas Cyriacus who places the crosses on the deceased youth; see Borgehammar, *Cross*, 267 (chapter 10): “... Iudas ... posuit super eum singulas cruces ... imposuit autem tertiam crucem, dominicam, super mortuum, et statim surrexit ...”

1112 These conflicting versions of who tested the Cross already occur in patristic sources; see Klein, *Kreuz*, 24. Twelfth- and thirteenth-century cycles display wide variation on this point: thus, in the Stavelot Triptych, it is Bishop Macarius who tests the Cross; in the Mosan procession cross from circa 1160–1170 (see note 1102), it is Judas. As Brenske, *Kreuz-Zyklus*, 85, observes, it is sometimes not certain which of these two figures is meant in testing scenes, but it is always either Macarius or Judas.

1113 See Chapter 5. In Cologne, the centre of Helena’s cult was St. Gereon; in addition to the arm reliquary (fig. 270) and the late antique rotunda, the chapter there also possessed a relic of Helena’s crown. It is mentioned in statues dating from circa 1264–1277 and was by this time carried in *corpus Christi* processions together with the lost bust reliquary of St. Gereon; see Falk, “Bildnisreliquiare,” 184 no. 38.

1114 HAStK, Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 22a: “xv kal. [Septembris]. Agapiti martyris. Helene regine.” A note in the margin next to the date records that the bells were rung on this feast: “hic conspulsabitur simpliciter.” Again, in the calendar this designation for the ringing of bells occurs only on feasts of special institutional importance.
Although the final scene of Heraclius entering Jerusalem with the Cross is close to the Saxon scenes of this event, it too diverges from them in showing Heraclius in the company of his empress (figs. 168, 279–280). At St. Kunibert, both figures process barefoot with the Cross, gazing upwards towards the angel perched on the gate. This episode recounts how Heraclius attempted to enter Jerusalem on horseback with the Cross but was denied entry by an angel, who reproached him for his pride and commanded him to return with the relic in barefooted humility.1115 This series of events usually was shown either in two scenes, first with Heraclius on horseback and then entering the city barefoot (cf. fig. 279), or in one scene with Heraclius on horseback encountering the angel.1116 The scene at St. Kunibert represents one of two known compressed versions of this event that show the angel and the barefooted Heraclius in the same scene; the other is the miniature in Alexander of Bremen’s commentary (fig. 280).1117 On the one hand, the use of this compressed form no doubt stemmed from the limited space of the lunette. But on the other hand, and as in the miniature, this compressed scene stands as a particularly strong parable of humility: even the emperor Heraclius must walk humbly and barefoot in the presence of the Cross.1118 In including the barefooted empress, the scene at St. Kunibert further underscores this dimension of the entry episode, which through a double example of imperial humility serves to admonish the viewer to humble him or herself in the presence of the same Cross.

As in all other versions of this event, however, the focus of the Heraclius episode is not simply on his humility, but also on the larger narrative of his act of recovering the True Cross and physically returning it to Jerusalem. Significantly, there are only three True Cross cycles

1115 The full legend is already detailed in Hrabanus’s homily; see Baert, True Cross, 141.
1116 For a survey of the different representations of this event, see Baert, True Cross, 144–163.
1117 Brenske, Kreuz-Zyklus, 96–97 n. 83, observes that the representation in the miniature is singular in showing Heraclius barefoot with the angel in one compressed scene.
1118 On this basic meaning of this episode within the Heraclius legend, see Baert, True Cross, 178.
from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that merge the legend of Helena’s finding of the Cross with the story of Heraclius’s translation of the Cross to Jerusalem, namely, in Brunswick, at the Sainte-Chapelle, and at St. Kunibert. In the former two cases, the conflation of the two legends has been connected to the Crusading ideology of these monuments’ patrons, in the former case Otto the Child, grandson of Henry the Lion, and in the latter Louis IX, who by analogy become latter-day Heracliiuses. The later cycle at St. Kunibert, however, does not participate in these Crusading dynamics, but nonetheless combines the two legends. In merging the inventio and Heraclius legends in its Holy Cross chapel, the chapter constructed a narrative of provenance and possession. The whole story of the church’s True Cross relic comes full circle, from the Crucifixion through Helena’s discovery and testing of the Cross and Heraclius’s return of the Cross to Jerusalem to the viewer’s presence before the church’s own piece of the same Cross (fig. 171). Deftly combining the relic with iconic and narrative imagery, the chapel collapses time; the viewer’s devotional present telescopes back to the Crucifixion, which the viewer relives in the presence of the relic whose history and immaculate provenance are written on the side walls.

In the new chapel, the capitular community inserted itself even more forcefully than before into the narrative of sacred history by creating an interactive physical space that enabled corporeal participation in the Crucifixion and the history of the church’s Cross relic. What the earlier display of the 1220s achieved through the charged sign of the patriarchal cross, the chapel accomplished by including the clerical viewer physically and notionally in the iconic event and the pictorial narrative that frames it. In creating this Cross chapel only forty years after the niche, it seems that the chapter recognized the possibilities of the new, affective

---

1119 Baert, True Cross, 6–7, 193; on the political contexts of the Brunswick cycle generally, see Brenske, Kreuz-Zyklus.
technologies of representation that had emerged around mid-century and sought to exploit them to re-present the Cross relic to itself. The chapter’s turn to the formal repertoire of the new Gothic cathedral chapels (fig. 162) for its new project and its engagement of a team of masons from that site do not constitute a simple, passive deference to a new style, but an active gesture aimed at re-inscribing the church into contemporary artistic and cultural developments.

Like the initial relic display, the Holy Cross chapel illuminates the central—and enduring—place of True Cross relics in schemes of self-fashioning among elite spiritual communities in the thirteenth century. As the physical witness to salvation, the Cross relic empowered the chapter at St. Kunibert, enabling it to sanctify itself through veneration of the relic in the multimedia displays in its clerical choir. And like the first display, the chapel confirms that monumental imagery and small-scale reliquaries stood in a mutually informing dialogue: without the Cross on the console (fig. 171), the chapel’s iconic and narrative frescoes lose their meaning, their performative function, and, not least, their devotional charge; without the framing frescoes, the Cross relic’s full devotional and institutional significance is indistinct. The artistic and cultural circumstances may have changed between the creation of the niche and the chapel, but the chapter, as ever, proved itself a clever coordinator of the arts.
Chapter 8
Donors

By its very nature, the large-scale and lengthy rebuilding project at St. Kunibert involved a complex network of agency ranging from the collective to the individual. This is evident from the notices in the *Memorienbuch* concerning the very start of work, which record that provost Theoderich laid the cornerstone, that the senior canon Vogelo oversaw the project and the fabric fund, and that the canon Caesarius made a bequest of forty marks to the *fabrica* during the early stages of work. As with comparable projects, the chapter as a corporation was the metapatron of the enterprise. This corporate framework not only meant differing degrees of agency in decision-making, with the dignitaries and senior canons playing the key roles, but also created significant space for personal patronage within the larger venture.

In this latter regard, the choir at St. Kunibert (fig. 35) is exceptional among contemporary monuments in the imperial territories, for it retains a wide range of examples of individual clerical and lay artistic patronage. Most visible and well-known are the donor images that appear in seven of the eight stained glass windows. Lay couples inhabit the Tree of Jesse and Kunibert windows (figs. 113, 123); both clerical and lay donors occupy all five windows with individual saints, which are divided among the lower storey of the apse and the east transept (figs. 31, 128, 130, 132–134). Apart from the famous image of the glass-painter and donor Gerlachus from Arnstein an der Lahn (ca. 1160), the stained glass at St. Kunibert provides the earliest examples of lay donor imagery in this medium in the German-speaking lands, and the earliest instance in which clerical and lay donors appear in the same glazing program.

---

1120 See Chapter 5. For Caesarius’s (d. before 1220) obit, see Appendix B, no. 2.
The high altar was also a site of converging clerical and lay patronage: the relics in the altar’s
sepulchre were assembled by dean Constantine; and the faux-marble colonnettes adorning the
faces of the altar were donated by a layman named Constantine (figs. 102, 103). Nowhere in the
imperial lands at this time can the visual, material, and spatial dynamics of artistic patronage be
studied like they can at St. Kunibert.

It is thus striking that these examples of individual artistic patronage at St. Kunibert have
yet to be subjected to extended critical and contextualized analysis, as has recently been the
case, for instance, in such contemporaneous contexts as Chartres cathedral.\footnote{1122} Hitherto, the
topic of personal patronage at St. Kunibert has been studied largely according to the histories of
individual sub-disciplines (i.e., stained glass) and not as a broader phenomenon that occurred in
a distinct spiritual, cultural, and social milieu. In the case of the stained glass, previous work
reasonably has focused on identifying the named donors in order to secure the windows’
chronology.\footnote{1123} Larger, more theoretical questions, however, have yet to be posed about how
these works of art functioned as patronal gifts and—above all—as representations; indeed, these
two phenomena are inseparable. The choir ensemble at St. Kunibert raises critical questions
about the extent and intentions of individual patronal agency in large-scale artistic projects,
particularly among lay donors, who in 1220s Cologne had only recently emerged as patrons of
public ecclesiastical foundations.

\footnote{1122} Important exceptions are the summary but seminal discussions of patronage dynamics at St. Kunibert in Ulrike
Bergmann, “Prior omnibus autor – an höchster Stelle aber steht der Stifter,” in OE, vol. 1, 143–144, and Weilandt,
“Auftraggeber,” in OE, vol. 2, 366–367, who approach the site generally (and the glass in particular) in expansive
thematic treatments of the topic of patronage. For an interpretive summation of the extensive recent debates on
patronage of the glass at Chartres, see Brigitte Kurmann-Schwarz, “Récits, programme, commanditaires,
concepteurs, donateurs: publications récentes sur l’iconographie des vitraux de la cathédrale de Chartres,” Bulletin

\footnote{1123} See the discussions of the donor figures in Oidtmann, “Glasmalereien,” 201–204, 209; Oidtmann,
Glasmalereien, vol. 1, 75–79, 81–82; Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 14, 122–123; and Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,”
154.
This chapter analyzes clerical and lay donor strategies in the choir ensemble, examining their spiritual and social meanings in context. Building on the foundation of preceding chapters, the first section addresses the issue of an overarching artistic plan for the choir. Was there a single, fixed program for the stained glass windows and altars in the east end? If so, what was its basis, and what implications did such a program have for personal artistic patronage? The second section examines the instances of clerical patronage, investigating how the individual canons operated in their own ritual space. The final section turns to the examples of lay artistic patronage, situating them within wider currents of social and spiritual change in early-thirteenth-century Cologne and focusing in particular on the meaning of donor imagery among this social group. Examination of personal artistic patronage in the choir ensemble at St. Kunibert, in turn, permits broader consideration of the nature of the exchange between corporate and individual patrons in large-scale building projects in the early thirteenth century.

1. The Choir Program

The question whether the St. Kunibert chapter devised an overarching program for the stained glass and altars in the choir is important not only from the viewpoint of artistic integration, but also for assessing how much control patrons had over the choice of subjects in the windows they financed. The issue of a choir program at St. Kunibert has been addressed solely by Scheuffelen and Brinkmann, who approached it solely from the perspective of the stained glass windows.1124 As Scheuffelen observed, attempts to deduce a single, underlying principle for the subjects in the windows are rendered difficult by the fragmentary state of the glazing; although it is incomparably full vis-à-vis other sites, the ensemble of windows is far

from complete.  

By contrast, the dedications and locations of the altars that originally stood in the east end, namely, the high altar and the side altars in the east transept and the side aisles, are fully documented (fig. 31).

As Scheuffelen first noted, the subjects in the three clerestory windows (fig. 35)—the Tree of Jesse, St. Kunibert, and St. Clement—relate to the dedication of the high altar, which was consecrated in honour of Christ and the patron saints Kunibert, Clement, and the Hewalds. For these windows, members of the chapter devised a coherent narrative program centred on the high altar-shrine ensemble that took as its principal themes the history of the church and its status as an ancient member of the local and universal Churches.

The rationale for the selection of saints in the lower storey windows is less clear (fig. 31). Only five windows survive, but the existence of fragmentary borders from four others (now lost) indicates that all eleven openings in the lower storey of the apse and east transept likely featured windows of this type. Of the five extant windows, a physical and thematic link between the subject of the window and a side altar occurs with the John the Baptist window, which is positioned above the Johannine altar in the east transept (figs. 128 and 138). The Katherine window also corresponds to the dedication of the side altar at the end of the north side aisle (figs. 31, 130). Although it is found on the north flank of the east transept, the Katherine window, however, is not located directly adjacent to the altar of St. Katherine, but is separated from it by the Cecilia window. But these two windows are identical in size and may well have been reset incorrectly during the first restoration of the windows in 1839–1840, by

---

1126 Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 7. See further Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 153. As suggested in Chapter 6, it is conceivable that windows dedicated to the Hewalds occupied the other two openings in the apse clerestory, thus completing the cycle.
1127 See Chapter 6.
1128 These borders were lost in World War II and their original positioning within in the east end is not certain, but their scale indicated that they came from the lower storey windows. See Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 2.
which point the altars of Katherine and Anthony had been destroyed. Given the thematic and physical link between the other windows (clerestory and John the Baptist) and the respective altars, it is most probable that the Katherine window originally was located next to her altar. As Scheuffelen suggested, it can likely be presumed that a Marian window was placed over her altar in the north arm of the east transept (fig. 31), mirroring the John the Baptist window-altar tandem in the south arm. Although the evidence is fragmentary, the chapter appears to have established an integrated program for these windows that was based in part on the side altars, with the windows corresponding to the dedications of the altars.

The Ursula, Cordula, and Cecilia windows, by contrast, display no links with altars in the thirteenth-century church (figs. 132–134). The Ursula and Cordula windows are located in the lower storey of the apse; the Cecilia window is located next to the Katherine window on the north flank of the east transept (fig. 31). Recognizing the lack of a connection between these windows and altars, Scheuffelen suggested that the chapter’s choice of these three saints was based instead on relics, citing for Ursula and Cordula the church’s collection of several fourteenth-century Ursuline reliquary busts of the type that proliferated in Cologne; with regard to Cecilia, Scheuffelen noted the foundation in 1391 of an altar that was dedicated to Mary and many other virgins, including Cecilia. It is, however, debatable whether these later busts and altar tell us anything about the church’s relic holdings in the early thirteenth century, much less

1129 See Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 2, who notes that these windows’ scale would make them interchangeable. Unlike the side altars in the east transept, the altars of Katherine and Anthony do not appear in Boisserée’s 1833 ground plan (fig. 90), and thus had certainly been removed before the restoration of the glass in 1839–1840. These two altars were among several altars that had been decommissioned around 1730, when they were likely destroyed; see KDM 6/4, 283.

1130 Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 7 and 176 n. 32. By analogy, one might suppose that a window dedicated to St. Anthony was placed next to his altar (fig. 31) to denote its dedication, but there is no way of knowing if this was the case.

1131 Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 7–8, followed by Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 153. The altar dedicated to Cecilia was located in the southeast tower; the relevant passage of the foundation charter reads (printed in KDM 6/4, 249): “altare . . . ad honorem beatissime dei genetricis perpetue virginis Marie et sanctarum Katherine, Agnetis, Agathe, Lucie, Cecilie et Margarethe virginum . . . .”
if relics alone were the basis for the selection of these three saints. The high altar sepulchre contained relics of Ursula and her 11,000 Virgins, of which Cordula was one, but Cordula is not mentioned by name in the authentications. Cecilia is absent from the high altar sepulchre, which further calls into question the relic thesis.

Rather, it seems more likely that the chapter’s program for the lower storey windows took into account multiple, intersecting concerns, so that the choice of saints cannot be reduced to any one guiding factor, whether an altar or a relic. John the Baptist and the Virgin, for instance, who had side altars and windows, are also represented by relics in the high altar sepulchre. The church also possessed a relic of Katherine in the 1220s, complementing her side altar and window; a small container, made contemporaneously with the reliquaries for the Eastern relics and long thought to be either a pyx, chrismal, or reliquary, can now be identified securely thanks to the 1499 inventory as a reliquary for oil from an oil-oozing relic of St. Katherine (fig. 286). The nexus of altars, relics, and windows in these three cases suggests that the chapter’s program for the stained glass and altars united several interconnected spheres of institutional and liturgical importance. Thus, Mary and the Baptist were saints of universal appeal on account of their status as major intercessors, but they were also clearly important on a local, institutional level. In addition to their relics and windows, they appeared among the figures on Kunibert’s shrine; and their feasts, all red-letter days, were significant at St. Kunibert.

---

1132 The Virgins’ relics, arranged in the two pockets to either side of the central hoard, are labelled generally “de corporibus sanctarum undecim milia virginum.” See further Chapter 6.

1133 The description of this vessel in the inventory (HAStK, St. Kunibert, Akten, A11a/III, 68v) reads: “Item quaedam antiqua monstrancia parva habens ymaginem crufixi cum ymaginibus beate Marie virginis et sancti Johannis Evangeliste in summitate continens in se de oleo sancte Catherine virginis et martiris.” The mention of the Crucifixion at the apex of the reliquary leaves no doubt that it is identical with the vessel in fig. 286. Writing in 1645, Gelenius described the central relic of Katherine, which has since been lost, thus (De admiranda magnitudine, 289): “Articulis sanctae Catharinae virginis et martyris ex quo mel et oleum emanarunt notabiliter.” For previous readings of the vessel’s function, see, for instance, KDM 6/4, 307 (a pyx or chrismal); OE, vol. 2, 265 cat. no. E 55 (reliquary, here supposed to have originally featured a transparent crystal container, but this is seemingly belied by the description in the inventory and the function as a container for oil); and, most recently, Cyzemmek, “St. Kunibert,” CR 22 (2007): 258 (reliquary).
as the marginal liturgical annotations in the Memorienbuch calendar indicate. The same applies to Katherine, who not only had a side altar, window, and a relic, but whose feast was also a red-letter day. The chapter may or may not have possessed relics of Ursula, Cordula, and Cecilia, but these three saints were above all key representatives of the Church of Cologne, with churches dedicated to them in the city. Accordingly, the feasts of St. Ursula and her Virgins and Cecilia are also marked in the Memorienbuch calendar as red-letter days.

Several currents, then, can be detected in the chapter’s choice of altar dedications and stained glass imagery for its clerical choir. Fundamentally, the windows and altars comprise an integrated ensemble that mapped out monumentally the church’s institutional and liturgical identities, which were so intertwined as to be essentially one and the same thing. One need only read through the list of saints in the chapter’s lesser litany (ca. 1250) to get a direct look into the community’s devotional universe (fig. 281). After an initial invocation of Christ (the main dedicatee of the high altar and in the axial Jesse window), the litany proceeds as usual through the choirs of prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, and virgins. Headed by Mary (side altar, relic, window), the litany includes the Baptist (side altar, relic, window), Clement (high altar, relic, window), Kunibert (high altar, relic, window), Katherine (side altar, relic, window),

---

1134 On the sepulchre and shrine, see Chapter 6. Their feasts are recorded in the Memorienbuch calendar as follows (HASTK, Geist. Abt. 143): fol. 4a: “Annunciatio sancte Marie virginis; hic conspulsabitur sollemniter”; fol. 15a: “Nativitas sancti Johannis Baptistae; hic conspulsabitur sollemniter”; fol. 16a: “Octava sancti Johannis Baptistae; hic legentur iii lectiones et cantabitur ultimem noctem de sancto Johanne”; fol. 21b: “Assumptio sancte Marie; hic conspulsabitur sollemniter”; fol. 22b: “Octava sancte Marie, Tymothei, et Symphoriani martirum; hic conspulsabitur cum magna campana”; fol. 23b: “Decollatio sancti Johannis; hic conspulsabitur sollemniter”; fol. 24b: “Nativitas sancte Marie virginis; hic conspulsabitur sollemniter.”

1135 HAStK, Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 34b: “Katherine virginis; hic conspulsabitur sollemniter.”

1136 I.e., St. Ursula (Ursula and Cordula) and St. Cecilia.

1137 HAStK, Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 30a: “Sanctarum xi milium virginum; hic conspulsabitur cum magna campana”; fol. 34a: “Cecilie virginis; hic conspulsabitur simpliciter.”

1138 The litany survives in Darmstadt, Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek ms. 871, fols. 76r–76v; on the book, an abbreviated gradual, see OE, vol. 2, 260 cat. no. E 50. The lesser litany was a compressed version of the greater litany. It was sung on different occasions; in the context of the manuscript, it occurs on Holy Saturday. See New Catholic Encyclopedia, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 2003) 8: 601, s. v. “Litany.”
Cecilia (window), and Ursula and her companions (Ursula relic, Ursula and Cordula windows),
among many other institutionally and locally significant saints, many of whom also had relics
and/or images in the new choir (institutional: George, the Hewalds, Nicholas, and Barbara;
Cologne saints generally: Peter [cathedral], Andreas, Pantaleon, Gereon, Severin, Heribert).
The chapter’s physical arrangement of the four side altars (fig. 31), which were used by the
canon-priests and chaplains to say private masses for themselves and others, thematizes
intercession by projecting the litany’s conceptual structure into space. The disposition of the
altars of Mary and John the Baptist, the archetypal intercessory tandem, replicates the wide-
spread Deesis configuration, with Mary to the left and John to the right of Christ (main
dedicatee of the high altar), as seen for example in the slightly earlier Psalter of St. Elisabeth
(ca. 1201–1207; fig. 287).1139 The other two side altars are placed in relation to these two altars
according to typological groupings, with the virgin Katherine paired with the Virgin Mary on
the north flank and the ascetic Anthony paired with the ascetic Baptist on the south. The
immediate thematic connection between those windows positioned above altars (the clerestory,
Johannine, and potentially Katherine and Mary windows), finally, also reflects current
legislative reality: shortly prior to the chapter’s conception of the choir program, the decrees of
Lateran IV had stipulated that an image of a saint, alongside inscriptions, was one approved way
of marking an altar’s titular saint (or saints), which was now a mandatory procedure.1140 The
chapter’s program for its clerical choir united central institutional and ritual concerns: the
church’s history and belonging in the local and universal Churches; the dedications of the altars;

1139 On the Deesis, see RDK, vol. 3, cols. 1197–1206, s. v. “Deesis.” On the Psalter of St. Elisabeth, see Harald
Wolter-von dem Knesebeck, Der Elisabethpsalter in Cividale del Friuli: Buchmalerei für den Thüringer
1140 Gardner, “Altars, Altarpieces, and Art History,” 10; Herbert Kessler, Seeing Medieval Art (Peterborough, ON:
Broadview, 2004), 124.
the church’s principal relics; and the liturgical functions of the high and side altars as sites of the convivial and private masses, respectively. With this integrated program, the chapter created a machine for its own salvation and a sacred physical and visual topography predicated on its institutional agendas and liturgy. The underlying theme of the choir program is the institution in all its different facets.

Despite the losses in the glazing, the evidence indicates that the chapter devised an overarching program for the windows that fully reflected its corporate concerns. The windows’ individual donors, both clerical and lay, thus appear to have exerted no particular influence on the choice of subjects for the windows, which is not to say that they could not specify the window in which they wished to appear in a donor image.\textsuperscript{1141} The canon Jordan, who occupies the Katherine window, for instance, appears to have been attached to her, for he established a memorial oblation of bread and wine for each canon on Katherine’s feast day (fig. 130).\textsuperscript{1142} Likewise, the laywoman Cordula appears together with her husband (or brother?) Marcwardus in the Cordula window, suggesting that her donation was linked to her inclusion in her namesake’s window (fig. 133).\textsuperscript{1143} In the narrative windows (which lack donor names) and the John the Baptist, Cecilia, and Ursula windows, no such connection can be adduced between the donor’s name(s) and the subject, but presumably each donor or group of donors would have indicated a preference for a certain window like Jordan and Cordula/Marcwardus, with the clerical designers of the program accommodating them as far as possible.\textsuperscript{1144}

\textsuperscript{1141} See Weilandt, “Auftraggeber,” 366, and Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 154, who reach similar conclusions on these two points.
\textsuperscript{1142} HATK, Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 34b (\textit{Memorienbuch}): “VII Kal. Decembris. Katherine virginis. Hic dantur albus panis et stopus vini singulis de domino Jordano.” This window is examined in further detail below.
\textsuperscript{1143} See Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 8, and Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 154. This window is examined in further detail below.
\textsuperscript{1144} All these windows and their donor images are examined individually below.
The presence of lay donors in the majority of the windows indicates that the chapter was not able to bear the full financial burden of glazing the east end. Given the high cost of stained glass in the Middle Ages and the many (and sizable) openings to be glazed, providing the new choir with a complete set of windows was probably the most expensive part of the rebuilding project, alongside the creation of several new *vasa sacra*. The Clement window (fig. 116), however, lacks donor imagery, suggesting that the chapter paid for this window, and thus possibly other, lost windows. The occurrence of clerical and lay donors in all the other windows suggests that the chapter encouraged personal patronage of the windows within its own ranks and found readily willing lay donors by means of an open “call for participation,” as Weilandt has posited.1146 As with other, contemporaneous large-scale projects, there was a cleavage at St. Kunibert between the chapter as a corporate conceiver of the choir and glazing program and individual patrons as donors of money and even materials, such as the marble columns on the high altar.1147 How, then, did individual patrons operate within this larger matrix? What were the modalities, motivations, and meanings of their patronage? The following two sections analyze these facets of clerical and lay artistic patronage at St. Kunibert, examining the spiritual and social relevance of these gestures in their local and historical contexts.

1145 On the general costliness of stained glass, with reference to St. Kunibert, see Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 153. The *vasa sacra* from the 1220s were likely financed in-house from a dedicated *ornatus* fund, as charters of the 1230s mentioning this fund suggest; see Chapter 7.
1147 On these distinctions in large-scale projects in general, see Kurmann, “Chartres,” 66–67; on St. Kunibert, see Bergmann, “Stifter,” 143–144, and Weilandt, “Auftraggeber,” 366. The marble columns on the high altar were given by a layman named Constantine; this donation is examined in full detail below.
2. Altar and Image: Clerical Donors

The extant examples of clerical artistic patronage at St. Kunibert illuminate the variety of ways the canons used the larger program of the corporate project to address their private concerns. Not all members of the capitular community contributed financially or materially to the new church; on the contrary, certain canons appear to have been very active individual patrons, whereas others—although caution is required because the ensemble is not complete—apparently felt less compelled to invest their own money in the enterprise. They turned instead to such well-tried means of securing salvation as oblations in return for liturgical commemoration, as evinced by the many such donations in the Memorienbuch.

Among the members of the chapter around the time that the choir was completed, dean Constantine (1219–1222) was perhaps the most prolific individual patron; his private patronage was also wide-ranging in its methods and materials. As his obit indicates, Constantine paid for the lead roof on the apse (fig. 76). It also records that he established an annual oblation from his estate centred on the True Cross relic after the chapter’s acquisition of it in 1222 (fig. 156). Whereas notation in the Memorienbuch of the oblation is to be expected, it is striking that Constantine’s act of having the apse roofed with lead was also recorded here. In fact, almost without exception, the individual canons’ financial contributions to the fabrica are documented in the Memorienbuch, which functioned as a prompt for chapter’s liturgical commemoration of canons and lay benefactors. Thus the Memorienbuch also records bequests to the fabrica by the canons Caesarius (d. before 1220) and Vogelo (d. 1226), as well

---

1148 Appendix B, no. 3.
1149 Appendix B, no. 4. See further Chapter 7.
1150 On the Memorienbuch’s function as a liturgical aide-memoire, see Van den Brincken, “Totenbücher,” 139.
as by dean Christian (d. 1247/1248).\footnote{Appendix B, nos. 2, 7, and 11.} In his will, Jordan (d. 1238), who appears in the Katherine window (fig. 130), also stipulated that 12 marks should be paid from his estate to the fabric fund.\footnote{Appendix B, no. 10.} The obit of Constantine’s successor, dean Wenemar (1222–1236), finally, notes that he contributed 18 marks during his tenure to assist with the construction of the sacristy (figs. 31, 75).\footnote{Appendix B, no. 9.} The fact that the canons’ donations to the fabric were often bequests and, as with Constantine and Wenemar’s patronage during their tenures, were even recorded in the Memorienbuch, suggests that they considered financial support of the fabric as a means not only of helping sustain the project, but also of securing their liturgical memoria, one that was in effect equivalent to the small donations of money and grain that occur in the obits alongside these donations.

It would seem, however, that Constantine was not content to place his spiritual fate in the hands of the chapter alone; he also directed his patronage at other, higher powers. The institutional significance of the relics that Constantine gathered for the high altar sepulchre for the altar’s consecration in 1222 has already been examined (figs. 102 and 103)\footnote{See Chapter 6.} But as the inscription on the outside of the lead chest and the note that Constantine placed inside the container indicate, this was as much a private as it was a public act. The inscription proclaims Constantine’s personal initiative in having the sepulchre made: “Constantine, canon priest of

\footnote{The obit of Constantine’s successor, dean Wenemar (1222–1236), finally, notes that he contributed 18 marks during his tenure to assist with the construction of the sacristy (figs. 31, 75). The fact that the canons’ donations to the fabric were often bequests and, as with Constantine and Wenemar’s patronage during their tenures, were even recorded in the Memorienbuch, suggests that they considered financial support of the fabric as a means not only of helping sustain the project, but also of securing their liturgical memoria, one that was in effect equivalent to the small donations of money and grain that occur in the obits alongside these donations.

It would seem, however, that Constantine was not content to place his spiritual fate in the hands of the chapter alone; he also directed his patronage at other, higher powers. The institutional significance of the relics that Constantine gathered for the high altar sepulchre for the altar’s consecration in 1222 has already been examined (figs. 102 and 103) But as the inscription on the outside of the lead chest and the note that Constantine placed inside the container indicate, this was as much a private as it was a public act. The inscription proclaims Constantine’s personal initiative in having the sepulchre made: “Constantine, canon priest of

\footnote{Appendix B, nos. 2, 7, and 11.} In his will, Jordan (d. 1238), who appears in the Katherine window (fig. 130), also stipulated that 12 marks should be paid from his estate to the fabric fund. The obit of Constantine’s successor, dean Wenemar (1222–1236), finally, notes that he contributed 18 marks during his tenure to assist with the construction of the sacristy (figs. 31, 75). The fact that the canons’ donations to the fabric were often bequests and, as with Constantine and Wenemar’s patronage during their tenures, were even recorded in the Memorienbuch, suggests that they considered financial support of the fabric as a means not only of helping sustain the project, but also of securing their liturgical memoria, one that was in effect equivalent to the small donations of money and grain that occur in the obits alongside these donations.

It would seem, however, that Constantine was not content to place his spiritual fate in the hands of the chapter alone; he also directed his patronage at other, higher powers. The institutional significance of the relics that Constantine gathered for the high altar sepulchre for the altar’s consecration in 1222 has already been examined (figs. 102 and 103) But as the inscription on the outside of the lead chest and the note that Constantine placed inside the container indicate, this was as much a private as it was a public act. The inscription proclaims Constantine’s personal initiative in having the sepulchre made: “Constantine, canon priest of

\footnote{Appendix B, no. 10.}
this church, ordered me to be made.”  

And the note causally connects the dean’s initiative with its anticipated effects: “I, Constantine, humble canon priest of this church, collected these relics in order that they may lead me to eternal rest at the end of time. Amen. And that they may guarantee me a pure life here on earth.” Invisible once the sepulchre had been placed inside the high altar, Constantine’s texts were addressed less to earthly recipients than to heavenly ones.

As dean, Constantine was the director of the chapter’s spiritual affairs; it is thus fitting that he chose the high altar as the vehicle for securing his salvation within the chapter’s larger sanctuary program. As a deacon, Constantine would have been involved personally in the celebration of the conventual mass at the high altar. His hopes for purification in this life and intercession for the next, already strong through his service of the altar, were thus doubled by the concentrated presence in the altar of a legion of saints whose relics he had devoutly gathered and whose aid he invoked. And after leaving this life and awaiting judgement at the Second Coming, Constantine could count on the saints’ unbroken intercession as they continued to preside over and sanctify the chapter’s masses.

Constantine’s concern with spiritual cleansing and the intercession of the saints at the end of time—*in novissimo die*, as his note says—betrays not simply a desire for attaining the afterlife, but also an acute awareness of the trials of purgatory, which had been officially

---

1155 “Constantinus sacerdos huius ecclesie canonicus me fieri iussit.”
1156 “Ego Constantinus humilis sacerdos huius ecclesie canonicus has reliquias congregavi ut in novissimo die me perducant ad eternam requiem. Amen. Et vitam puram in hoc seculo present.”
1157 As Baumgarten notes in *OE*, vol. 2, 82 cat. no. D 61. Baumgarten, however, supposes that the Constantine mentioned on the chest and in the note may be a different canon and not dean Constantine, but this is counter-intuitive given the internal evidence of the sepulchre and other considerations, all of which indicate a date in the early 1220s for sepulchre’s creation; see on this point Chapter 6, note 803.
declared Church doctrine seven years prior at Lateran IV.\textsuperscript{1158} As Gee has observed in a different context, invocations of the saints as personal assistants became particularly important as a patronal strategy after Lateran IV on account of the saints’ acknowledged ability to reduce one’s time in purgatory.\textsuperscript{1159} In its strategies, Constantine’s sepulchre seems to respond to these contemporary currents: recording his act on the box and in the note inserted among all the relics inside, Constantine literally placed himself in the midst of the saints, enjoining them as his personal protectors and assistants.\textsuperscript{1160} In combining the prayers of the community won by his donations with an appeal to the saints at the liturgical heart of the church, Constantine’s strategy for reducing his time in purgatory covered all possible bases. His patronage was not only multi-pronged, but also timely: Wenemar is attested as dean in late 1222, indicating that Constantine, who had perhaps anticipated his demise, likely died shortly after this flurry of private patronage.\textsuperscript{1161}

Though a very different type of object, the two windows with clerical donors are predicated on spatial and spiritual strategies that are structurally similar to those of Constantine’s altar sepulchre. Dressed in white choir robes and labelled FRANCIS SCHOLASTICVS and JORDAN[VS], the donors of the John the Baptist and Katherine windows, respectively, were both important members of the chapter (figs. 128 and 130).\textsuperscript{1162} Franco (i.e., Francis) and Jordan’s names appear among a core group of canons in charters from

\textsuperscript{1160} See \textit{OE}, vol. 2, 82 cat. no. D 61: “In der dem Pergamentstreifen eingeschriebenen Nennung seines Namens ist er gemeinsam mit den von ihm zusammengetragenen Reliquien der Heiligen gegenwärtig.”
\textsuperscript{1161} Wenemar is listed as dean in 1222 in an eighteenth-century list of the provosts and deans, and is securely attested as dean in three charters dated 1223; see Chapter 2, note 333.
\textsuperscript{1162} The name in Jordan’s window is original. The name FRANCIS SCHOLASTICVS is partly restored but secure; see Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 161.
the 1220s and 1230s; and as scholaster, or director of the capitular school, Franco was one the 
church’s lesser dignitaries after the provost and dean. Like Constantine, both canons sought 
to locate the objects of their patronage in close physical proximity to the clerical choir’s altars: 
Franco’s window is placed above the Johannine altar (fig. 138), and Jordan’s window likely was 
placed next to Katherine’s altar in the original scheme (fig. 31). None of the small windows 
with lay donor images, by contrast, displays a physical or thematic link with an altar. This 
strongly suggests that the “privilege of proximity”—to use Michael Michael’s words—next to 
the side altars was claimed by clerical donors of windows. Like Constantine, Franco and 
Jordan thus benefited from their eternal and vicarious attendance—here inscribed both in name 
and by means of image-proxy—at the celebration of masses.

Analogous to Constantine’s strategy, moreover, Franco and Jordan’s windows engage 
the saints as intercessory mediators through direct verbal appeal. In both windows, the clerical 
donors bow humbly before the individual saint (and, in Franco’s case, grasp his foot), imploring 
the saints to assist them through the tituli written on their banderoles. This mode of visual, 
verbal, and haptic patronal entreaty had local precursors in a private, monastic milieu, as 
evincing by the image of the monk Heinrich in proskynesis before St. Margaret in a Cologne 
missal from Groß St. Martin dating from the final decades of the twelfth century (fig. 282). As 
with Heinrich’s image, it may be assumed that Jordan and Franco devised their own Latin 
tituli and communicated them to the glass-painters, who likely worked on site with pictorial

1163 On Jordan, see Kürten, Stift, vol. 1, 316 no. 37. On Franco, see Kürten, Stift, vol. 1, 294 no. 21 and 302 no. 4, 
as well as Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 154. Franco was dean of St. Kunibert from 1238 to 1243 and subsequently 
scholaster of the cathedral school from 1243 to 1247.
1164 See above, 460–461.
89, where it is suggested that the otherwise unknown figure of Heinrich may have been the scribe-illuminator of the 
manuscript.
models similar to the manuscript image; presumably, Franco also stipulated that he wished to be depicted holding the Baptist’s foot, in line with the devotional posture in such images as Heinrich’s. Reading VIRGO KATHERINA P[RO] NOB[IS] IVG[IT][ER] ORA (“Pray for us perpetually, virgin Katherine”), Jordan’s banderole makes use of the traditional language of liturgical supplication from the litany to elicit Katherine’s spiritual assistance (fig. 130). Extending his free hand upwards in supplication, Jordan gazes up at a frontal Katherine, whose name is inscribed on her halo and who carries the wheel with which she was tortured and a palm symbolizing her martyrdom. In contrast to the missal page (fig. 282), which was essentially private or whose audience was restricted to a very small group of monk priests, Jordan’s window relocates this type of intimate, private devotional imagery into a more public sphere and, further, maps it onto ritual space. The window performed public and private functions simultaneously. It marked the dedication of Katherine’s altar with an image of a saint of particular institutional importance, one whose relic was kept in a lavish container (fig. 286). And it opened up a space for Jordan to inscribe himself in a permanent intercessory invocation to Katherine, who—as the oblation that Jordan made on her feast day suggests—appears to have been his preferred personal protector.

The interaction of words, gestures, and signs in scholaster Franco’s window is more complex (fig. 128). Looking up at the Baptist, Franco clutches a banderole that reads: SIS MICHI AVXILIUM SIS VITA SAL[VS] MORIENTI / AGNE DEI PECCATA TOLLIT BAPTISANS PRE[IT] ISTE (“Be my aid in life and my salvation in death / O Lamb of God, this one [i.e., John], precedes [you], baptizing, and removes sin”). Balancing a disc with the

1167 Compare the litany in fig. 281: “Sancta Katherina ora pr[o nobis].”
1168 On the memorial oblation, see note 1142.
1169 The upper half of the titulus is restored but the text is secure; see Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 161.
Agnus Dei in his right hand and gazing at it, the Baptist also carries a banderole; deriving from John 1:29, it reads ECCE AGNVS DEI ECCE QVI TOLLIT and thus announces Christ’s cleansing of humankind’s sin through his sacrifice as the Lamb of God. Through his votive image, verbal entreaty, and foot-grasping gesture, Franco inserts himself into a complex circuit of intercession and aid. He entreats the Baptist and Christ as a tandem, the Baptist directly and Christ indirectly; acting as an intercessory conduit, the Baptist, himself able to remove sin through his intercession, channels Franco’s entreaty further to Christ in the sign of the Lamb of God, whose own ability to expunge sin is noted in the titulus that the Baptist holds. Like Jordan’s window, Franco’s window blends public and private concerns, similarly transposing private modes of visual devotion (fig. 282) into the ritualized space of the choir (fig. 138). Presenting the Baptist as an ascetic in a hair-lined garment and as Christ’s forerunner (in Franco’s titulus), the window announces the titular dedication of the Johannine altar and figures the Baptist as a powerful intercessor who is both close to Christ and Christ-like. Overlapping with the Agnus Dei prayer (“Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi”), the Baptist’s ECCE AGNVS DEI titulus also would have reverberated with the words recited by a canon priest saying private masses at the side altar below. With his votive image, Franco positioned himself at the centre of this constellation, making himself the principal beneficiary. His presence at the sacred site of the altar meant that he could participate vicariously and eternally in these private masses; and his image itself also does the work of intercession by establishing a permanent, visual chain of divine aid. The window’s complex system of texts, gestures, gazes, and signs strongly suggests that Franco worked closely with the glass-painter to compose an image that

---

1170 John 1:29: “altera die videt Iohannes Iesum venientem ad se et ait ecce agnus Dei qui tollit peccatum mundi.” Cf., too, the Agnus Dei prayer of the Mass: “Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi.” This titulus also displays evidence of restoration but the text is doubtlessly authentic; see Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 161.
would work as an effective intercessory vehicle not only by virtue of its placement above the altar, but also by means of its own, sophisticated internal representational economy.

Indeed, as representations, Franco and Jordan’s windows transcend a basic concern with status, posterity, and the afterlife—those concerns that are often generally invoked as the motivation for donor imagery in stained glass windows (and other media). Although it seems clear that both canons paid for the windows in which they appear, neither one is figured as the “donor” of the window per se. Common in French windows, the motif of the donor offering a model of a window was rare in thirteenth-century German glass; the earliest known example, a Middle Rhenish window (\textit{ex situ}) with lay donors below SS. Augustine and Nicholas (fig. 283), dates from around 1250, and this visual trope was also unusual after this point. Votive panels in windows were also used to record donations of other things or acts, as a contemporary example from the collegiate church of St. Margaret in the Austrian town of Ardagger (before 1224) indicates (fig. 284). In this case, it is provost Heinrich’s (HEINRICVS TVM PREPOSITVS) rebuilding of his collegiate church, which he hoped would expunge his sins, as the rhyming \textit{titulus} in the border indicates with particular clarity: HAC PRO STRVCTVRA, PECCATA DEVS MEA CVRA. While Jordan and Franco’s financing of windows no doubt counted as a good work that would have earned them spiritual absolution on its own, the “donor” images in their windows do not thematize the act of giving, be it the window or something else (figs. 128 and 130). Nor do these windows seem to be exclusively memorial images, although their placement above and near side altars suggests that they were

\begin{flushright}
1172 See Becksmann, “Stifterbild,” 69. On the window, see Bergmann, “Stifter,” 143.
1173 On this panel, which is placed at the base of a narrative window dedicated to St. Margaret, see Eva Frodl-Kraft, \textit{Die mittelalterlichen Glasgemälde in Niederösterreich. 1. Teil}, Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi Österreich II (Vienna: Böhlau, 1972), 10–14. The \textit{titulus} translates: “God, cure my sins for this structure.”
\end{flushright}
intended in part to function with masses at the altars, whether for these donors themselves or for others.

Rather, the donor images and tituli in Jordan and Franco’s windows work to place the canons under the saint’s immediate and eternal protection, both visually and conceptually. These donor images participate in a broader understanding of the relationship between mortals and saints that held the connection between the donor and his or her saintly assistant to be akin to a feudal bond, a bond that was particularly important following the official codification of purgatory in 1215, when the need for saintly intercessors and the purging of sin was intensified (cf. the titulus in provost Heinrich’s window; fig. 284). Accordingly, Franco and Jordan’s gift of a window was made less to the chapter itself, which nonetheless profited from it, as it was to the individual saint pictured therein. In return, the tituli and gestures that Franco and Jordan employed in their donor images implore their personal saints to assist them, delete their sins, and pray for their spiritual welfare. The saint’s (and Christ’s) aid is invoked in these windows not only in view of the afterlife, but also in the here and now: Jordan asks Katherine for her unrelenting prayer; Franco enjoins the Baptist to be “my aid in this life and my salvation in death” in a chain of supplication that ultimately leads to Christ himself. In thematizing not the gift, but the canon’s sight, dialogue with, and touch of the saint, the windows create a conceptual opening that allows the donor to enter into an eternal devotional pact with the saint. Through their location near altars and their representational strategies, these two

---

1175 For analysis of analogous dynamics in the donation of windows at Chartres, see Manhes-Deremble, *Les vitraux narratifs*, 28, as well as Kurmann, “Chartres,” 69.
1176 On the ontological status of donor figures generally, see Lars Raymond Jones, “*Visio divina*, Exegesis and Beholder-Image Relationships in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Indications from Donor Figure Representations,” Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1999, esp. 73, 98, 228, 230, which has been formative in shaping my general conception of how these two windows work as representations. Jones explores the donor image with a
windows established a personal intercessory economy that operated within and outside of the liturgy (fig. 138). As both material gifts and images, Jordan and Franco’s windows created a contract with the saints, eliciting their help in order to facilitate the donors’ navigation of purgatory and attainment of salvation.\textsuperscript{1177}

These different examples of clerical artistic patronage at St. Kunibert point up the ways church furniture and monumental images in glass were complex sites of negotiation—between the chapter and the individual clerical donor, between the donor and the craftsman, and, not least, between the donor and the saint(s). The chapter’s overarching choir program offered the canons a variety of potential forums with which to secure their salvation. Even these few extant examples suggest that the canons developed sophisticated strategies. They used meaningful placement of their objects and images in relation to the liturgical foci of the choir. And their windows are carefully composed works that were designed to interact with the larger ritual space and operate as efficacious representations unto themselves. With their patronage, these individual canons integrated themselves into the larger salvational economy of the chapter’s integrated choir ensemble.

3. Citizens in the Choir: Lay Donors

Multilayered even within the inner ranks of the chapter, the patronage dynamics at St. Kunibert attain a further dimension of complexity in the case of the laity. The record of lay donors view to probing the deeper theoretical question of whether the donor figure ascends anagogically to the saint represented within the image (\textit{anabasis}) or whether the saint/divine descends to earth and the donor and, by implication, to the period viewer himself or herself (\textit{katabasis}). Examination of this more metaphysical issue, which depends to no small degree on complex theological underpinnings, in the donor imagery at St. Kunibert exceeds the boundaries of this chapter; I hope to address this in a future study.\textsuperscript{1177} On the donor image as a contract, particularly after Lateran IV’s affirmation of purgatory, see Jill Caskey, “Whodunnit? Patronage, the Canon, and the Problematics of Agency,” in \textit{Companion}, ed. Rudolph, 202.
artistic patronage in Cologne before the early thirteenth century is sparse. As elsewhere, the emergence of lay groups as patrons of art and architecture in Cologne was tied inseparably to the rise of the commune, which into the early thirteenth century was dominated by a potent collective of urban patricians known as the Richerzeche, or “brotherhood of the rich.” This group had already formed a commune before the mid-twelfth century; a “house of the rich,” a precursor of the later city hall, is attested around 1130 and again in 1149. In keeping with this political situation, the earliest instances of lay artistic patronage in Cologne are associated with this small, elite social group. As far as the very spotty record allows us to judge, patrician patronage in Cologne through the later decades of the twelfth century generally seems to have favoured new religious foundations rather than the many pre-existing institutions in the city.

The plethora of building projects at Cologne’s major spiritual institutions in the decades around 1200, however, offered new, unprecedented venues for lay patronage. This was not only the case for the well-ensconced patricians, but also, and particularly, for the rapidly expanding middle class of ordinary burghers, merchants, and craftsmen, who as a result of the late-twelfth-century boom in trade and the nascent money economy in Cologne had begun to occupy an ever-more important place in the city’s urban landscape. Private religious foundations of the type established by wealthy patrician families appear to have been beyond the means of

1180 Diederich, “Metropole,” 74; Böhringer, “Richerzeche,” col. 831.
1181 A remarkably early example is attested for 1144, when the cives Hermann, perhaps identical with the patrician Hermann vom Stave, founded the parish church of St. Mauritius, which was placed under the jurisdiction of St. Pantaleon and which was to serve as his burial place. In the final decade of the twelfth century, Richmodis, a widow and the daughter of the patrician Theoderich von der Ehrenpforte, founded the abbey Weiher on the outskirts of the city; her father was buried here in 1208. See Vogts, “Patriziergeschlechter,” 502–503, and Weilandt, “Auftraggeber,” 365.
1182 Diederich, “Metropole,” 74–75. As Diederich writes of this process of social change in later-twelfth-century Cologne: “Aus allem resultierte eine gesellschaftliche Differenzierung, wie sie für eine Stadtkultur typisch ist.”
merchants, craftsmen, and other citizens; at any rate, no evidence exists for such foundations at this time. Instead, the city’s well-established, public religious institutions, most of which were engaged in rebuilding projects of some sort (e.g., St. Kunibert, St. Gereon, St. Severin, St. Aposteln, etc.), offered a more viable venue for smaller and attainable acts of patronage among these segments of society.

In the opening decades of the thirteenth century in particular, these opportunities for patronage of the projects at Cologne’s principal religious houses coincided with currents of spiritual change that had broad ramifications for lay patronage, whether patrician or middle-class. Not only had Lateran IV codified purgatory as a binding doctrine, one that affected the clergy and laity alike, but it also issued prescriptions that had critical implications for lay piety and, by extension, patronage. These included mandatory annual communion, whether at Easter or Christmas, confession, and penance.1183 Quickening twelfth-century developments that saw the first iterations of non-monarchical or aristocratic lay charity and good works, Lateran IV meant that the laity was increasingly responsible for, and concerned with, managing its own spiritual welfare; but it also meant that the Church itself had tightened its control on shaping lay piety and, to no small degree, had made itself the intended recipient of good works.1184 For laity of means, as Gee has suggested, artistic patronage of ecclesiastical institutions in this context could itself become a mode of penance and good works, alongside alms-giving and other, more traditional acts of charity.1185

It is within this set of local and historical circumstances bearing on lay patronage that the different instances of lay artistic patronage at St. Kunibert must be situated and interpreted. As

---

1184 For the implications of these developments on lay artistic patronage in general, see Gee, Patronage, 25–26, 39, and, further, Kurmann, “Chartres,” 58–60.
1185 Gee, Patronage, 25.
the extant examples indicate, this major project attracted considerable interest among the local urban laity, who not only donated windows, but also provided building materials, such as the columns on the high altar (fig. 102). The lay donor figures in the stained glass even outnumber those of the canons themselves (five to two), although it is impossible to know whether this accurately reflects the original situation. But for all their interest in supporting the project, lay donors, beyond providing funds or materials, may have had little agency when it came to shaping the final products of their patronage, as the evidence for an overarching choir program devised by the chapter suggests. Can one even speak, then, of lay patronal strategies in the choir ensemble? This section analyzes the extant examples of lay artistic patronage in the choir with a view to understanding the different negotiations (visual, spatial, conceptual) between the chapter and its lay donors at the level of the objects themselves in order to illuminate the significance of these acts of patronage for both parties. This analysis, in turn, provides a basis for considering the choir’s meaning as a site of both artistic and social integration.

Of the examples of lay patronage in the choir, the most striking in its semantic and spatial implications is the donation, by an otherwise unknown layman named Constantine, of the colonnettes that adorn the front and sides of the high altar (fig. 102). The Memorienbuch records Constantine’s donation as follows: “July 4. Constantine the layman died, who gave (dedit) the marble columns that are around the high altar and four other, larger ones.” Constantine’s donation is noted in the Memorienbuch a second time in the obit of his wife Elizabeth, which reads: “December 4. Elizabeth, laywoman and wife of Constantine who gave

1186 HAsTK, Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 16a: “IV nonas Julii. Obiit Constantinus laicus qui dedit columnnas marmorae que sunt circa altare et alias iii maiores.” Apart from his name, nothing is known about Constantine’s particular social station.
the marble columns, died.” The identification of these “marble columns around the altar” with the marble-like colonnettes that ring the faces of the high altar seems clear enough. The mention of four other, “larger” columns possibly refers to the four monumental slate column shafts in the column bundles in the lower apse arcade (fig. 35), whose polished sheen is marble-like in appearance, but this identification is much less certain; among other things, these four “larger” columns mentioned in the obit also may have formed part of a lost shrine base behind the altar, which likely took the form of those at St. Severin and St. Ursula (fig. 250).

It is significant that Constantine’s donation of these columns was both noted in the Memorienbuch and recorded twice there, first in his obit and then in that of his wife, Elizabeth. As with clerical donors like dean Constantine, these records suggest that lay donors were equally concerned to have their acts of material patronage—ones that could not otherwise be associated with them in inscriptions or imagery—fixed in writing. Like the canons’ donations to the fabrica, Constantine’s donation of columns seemingly was intended in part as a contractual exchange for liturgical commemoration; this seems clear from the association in the Memorienbuch of the donation not only with Constantine himself as the donor, but also with his wife, which suggests that his donation was intended to serve them both.

---

1187 HASIK, Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 35a: “II nonas Decembris. Obiit Elyzabeth laica uxor Constantini qui dedit columnnas marmoreas.”
1188 See Vogts, “Patriziergeschlechter,” 504, and Weilandt, “Auftraggeber,” 366, both of whom, however, indicate that the donation was made by Elizabeth, which is belied by Constantine’s obit. As Vogts first recognized, the colonnettes on the high altar, though marble-like in appearance, are not technically marble, but rather of calc-sinter, the yellowish, marble-like stone that was quarried from the Roman aqueducts around Cologne and employed as a substitute for real marble (as in the sanctuary pavement).
1189 On the shrine pedestal, see Chapter 6. Ewald suggested that these four “larger” columns may have been used to suspend curtains around the altar or were part of a baldachin over the high altar; the latter, however, would be completely unparalleled at this time in Cologne and the Empire; see KDM 6/4, 277. Columns for suspending altar curtains are a possibility; the two columns that survive in situ beside the extant shrine pedestal at St. Severin (fig. 250) may have served this purpose. The identification of the four “larger” columns as the slate shafts in the apse arcade was suggested by Graf, “Ostchorbau,” 30. In view of the complete uncertainty surrounding the identification of these four “larger” columns, they will be omitted from the following discussion, which will focus solely on the columns on the high altar.
The symbolic and strategic scope of Constantine’s donation of these columns for the high altar, however, seems to transcend a basic desire for securing his and his wife’s memoria in a routine transaction with the chapter. The columns’ scale, number, and material suggest that Constantine and the chapter held discussions about how to procure them, and thus also about where and how the columns would be used in the project. It seems reasonable to suppose that Constantine’s donation was predicated to no small degree on the stipulation that the objects of his patronage be placed in the spatial and ritual context of the high altar. Constantine’s donation of columns mirrors other, earlier instances in which lay donors donated columns to building projects; as Hans-Rudolph Meier has observed of the donation in the 1130s or 1140s of columns for the nave of the cathedral of Piacenza by that city’s trade corporations, columns were popular among lay patrons on account of their inherent symbolism, with the donors’ gift of columns expressing their “support” of the Church—both literally and metaphorically.1190 Carrying the table of the high altar, the central site of the collegiate chapter’s conventual mass, Constantine’s columns seem to make a similar metaphorical statement about his support of the Church, albeit it in a fundamentally different spatial and ritual context than a church’s nave. Even if they bore no visible trace of his name or identity, Constantine’s columns, by dint of their privileged location on the high altar, assured him of a vicarious, but nonetheless indelible presence at the most sacred site in the new collegiate church, one that was for all intents and purposes analogous to dean Constantine’s vicarious presence in the high altar sepulchre hidden in the same altar (fig. 103). Constantine’s gift was mutually beneficial to him and the chapter: the chapter acquired costly marble columns, enabling it to decorate the high altar with sumptuous

---

materials that befitted the altar’s exalted role in the community’s liturgy; in return, the placement of the columns on the altar physically recorded Constantine’s good deed for both the chapter, which used the altar daily, and the saints in the shrines behind the altar, from whose prayers and intercession Constantine could hope to benefit even further.

Constantine’s provision of raw materials for the high altar appears to have been an exception within the larger pattern of lay artistic patronage at St. Kunibert. Apart from the record of Constantine’s donation, the *Memorienbuch* contains no indications of lay patronage for either the physical fabric or the fabric fund. This stands in sharp contrast to the repeated mentions in the *Memorienbuch* of the canons’ bequests and donations to the *fabrica*.\footnote{See above.} While it is impossible to know if the laity did donate to the fabric fund (perhaps such donations were never recorded), potential lay donors may have considered financial donations to the fabric fund an unattractive option because the fruits of their patronage would have been essentially invisible in the final product. As discrete objects, even Constantine’s marble columns were identifiable markers of his private patronage, even if their association with him had to be fixed textually in the *Memorienbuch*. Instead, at St. Kunibert stained glass appears to have been the preferred medium among lay patrons, seemingly because it provided a visible record of their patronage, one that offered the donor the opportunity to appear in the image and with his or her name, as in all three lower storey windows with lay donors (figs. 132–134).\footnote{On the general popularity of stained glass as a medium among lay donors for these reasons, see Bergmann, “Stifter,” 144.}

That being said, it is important to note that not all of the lay donor images in the windows at St. Kunibert are coupled with names. Lay donors occupy the Tree of Jesse and Kunibert windows, but these windows do not appear to have been marked with the donors’
names (figs. 113 and 123). This suggests that the laity’s patronage of stained glass windows, though clearly sustained by their desire for being visually present in the image, was not always predicated on their being readily identifiable in inscriptions, but instead was a more nuanced phenomenon, particularly when it came to narrative windows.

In the axial Tree of Jesse window, the donors, a male and a female (probably a couple), appear below the Crucifixion medallion in the middle of the window (fig. 113). Undoubtedly conceived by a clerical designer from the church, the Jesse window’s narrative is a complex statement on the history of salvation, from creation through Christ’s judgement at the end of time (fig. 108); the Crucifixion medallion in particular marks the pivotal moment of salvific transition between the Covenants, with the verdant Cross shown as the Tree of Life sprouting from Paradise. In this instance, it seems reasonable to suppose that the donors stipulated that they wanted to be included in this particular window, but that the ultimate decision on where to place the donors in the window lay with the clerical designer and the glass-painter who fashioned this multi-faceted piece of visual exegesis.

This makes the designer and artist’s gesture of placing the lay donors under the Crucifixion and in proskynesis all the more notable, for it makes recourse to visual practices that had long been the exclusive preserve of monks, clerics, and elite aristocratic lay patrons, as represented, for instance, by a miniature from Helmarshausen (ca. 1170; fig. 285). As Ulrike Bergmann has argued, in the miniature the abbot and a second monk do not simply appear at the

---


1194 On the window’s narrative, see Chapter 6.

1195 This also appears to have been the case with the donor imagery in the windows of the trades at Chartres; see Manhes-Deremble, Les vitraux narratifs, 28, and Kurmann, “Chartres,” 57–58.

1196 On the miniature, part of a series of four cuttings from a manuscript of unknown type, see OE, vol. 1, 164 cat. no. B 15. On the analogous use of older, privileged (i.e., monastic, clerical, and royal) modes of donor representation by the cathedral chapter at Chartres as the basis for the representation of the donors in the windows of the trades, see Manhes-Deremble, Les vitraux narratifs, 28.
Crucifixion as a historical event, but are also included in a much larger dynamic of salvation. Specifically, the representation of the Cross as the green Tree of Life suggests that the monks as patrons will ultimately partake of the Tree of Life thanks to their good deed(s) and, indeed, already partake of it vicariously in the image that they commissioned—both figures touch the Tree’s stalk. In placing the lay donors below the Crucifixion and next to the green stalk of the Tree of Life/Cross, the clerical designer and artist of the St. Kunibert Jesse window included the lay donors in a similar dynamic. The donors are present at the Crucifixion as an event; but they are also close to the sprouting Tree of Life itself, which they can now hope to attain on account of their donation of the window. The donors are not only privy to the Crucifixion, but are also embedded notionally within the window’s full narrative about salvation, which begins with the implied sin in Paradise at the bottom of the window and culminates in the figure of Christ in majesty at the apex (fig. 108). The donors’ provision of funds for the window was a good deed that helped expunge their sin; thus they could hope to fare well at the Last Judgement that is pictured at the top of the window in the figure of Christ as ruler and judge. As in the Helmarshausen page, the donors’ presence at the Cross-cum-Tree of Life expresses the anticipated reward for their patronage: the attainment of eternal life in Paradise at the end of time, as emblematized by the Tree. The exchange between the lay donors and the chapter as recipient seems fully symbiotic here: with the donation, the chapter was able to finance a costly narrative window that formed the crux of its glazing program; in return, the chapter

1197 Bergmann, “Stifter,” in OE, vol. 1, 143. See further the discussion of the page in OE, vol. 1, 164, cat. no. B 15. An earlier example of this idea also occurs in an aristocratic context in the famous image of Judith of Flanders embracing the Cross/Tree of Life in the Crucifixion miniature in the Gospels of Judith of Flanders (ca. 1051–1064). 1198 The image of Christ at the apex of the window is polysemous, but the Last Judgement is one of its several dimensions. Christ appears as the flos of the Tree of Jesse and as part of an Ascension scene. He also appears as ruler of the cosmos in a mandorla with the globus mundi, which, together with the tituli held by the outer angels (which note his eternal rule and throne), point forward to Christ’s judgement of humanity at the end of time, thus completing the eschatological unfurling of the window from the initial creation and Paradise, which are shown at the base of the window in the form of the four Rivers of Paradise. See Chapter 6.
meaningfully included the lay donors in the window’s narrative.\textsuperscript{1199} In this window, the donor imagery does not simply record the lay donors’ donation for posterity—the donors’ names are absent. Rather, the image itself was made into a salvific vehicle. With their patronage of the window, the lay donors purchased salvation by means of their good deed \textit{and} by means of donor images that conceptually included them in the story of salvation.\textsuperscript{1200}

The Kunibert window displays a similar set of dynamics (figs. 122 and 123). The two lay donors, a male and a female (again, probably a couple), appear at the base of the window in the opening scene, which depicts Dagobert’s vision of the miraculous appearance of light over the sleeping youth Kunibert.\textsuperscript{1201} As with the Jesse window, the selection of this window’s subject matter and the conception of the narrative probably would have resided with the chapter’s clerical designer and the glass-painter and not with the donors.\textsuperscript{1202} Nonetheless, as in the Jesse window, the chapter’s gesture of including the lay donors within the window’s narrative frame seems to serve a larger purpose than simply recording their patronage—again, the donors’ names are absent. In the window, the donors are literally part of the narrative of Kunibert’s life and become witnesses to the initial demonstration of Kunibert’s sanctity. It seems significant that lay donors are absent from the Roman pope Clement’s window (fig. 116) but are present in the local bishop Kunibert’s window; this suggests that these donors’ patronage of the Kunibert window was motivated by a desire to engage with their gift this prominent local saint as their spiritual assistant. As with the two windows with clerical donors (figs. 128 and 130), the lay donors’ donation of funds for the Kunibert window, while benefitting the chapter,
was directed first and foremost at Kunibert himself with the aim of contracting him as a personal spiritual patron and intercessor. In return, the window’s clerical designer included the donors within the unfolding of Kunibert’s life and in immediate proximity to Kunibert himself, seemingly with the intent of expressing these donors’ devotional—and contractual—arrangement with this major local holy figure.

As with the Kunibert window and the two windows with clerical donors, the donor imagery in the three small windows in the lower storey donated by lay donors works to create meaningful visual and conceptual bonds between these donors and the individual saints (figs. 132–134). These windows all feature named donors, who appear in each case as half-figures below the saints and within the space of the frame surrounding the saint. Originally identified as BLIDA and LUDWICVS, the donors of the Ursula window appear in supplication before a frontal, crowned Ursula, who bears an arrow and a palm alluding to her martyrdom and who is further marked out as being particularly important by the presence of the Hand of God above her head, which is not surprising given Ursula’s preeminent status in the local Church (fig. 132). Of all the lay donors in the windows, solely Blida and Ludwicus have been identified; their names occur from circa 1178/83 to circa 1215 in records of property transactions for the area of Niederich, which was part of the parish of St. Kunibert. Of all the lay donors in the windows, solely Blida and Ludwicus have been identified; their names occur from circa 1178/83 to circa 1215 in records of property transactions for the area of Niederich, which was part of the parish of St. Kunibert. It is an open question whether the lay donors in the narrative and other small windows were also parishioners of the St. Kunibert
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1203 The names were originally placed in the upper band of the ornamental border underneath the donor figures, as in the Cecilia and Cordula windows (figs. 135 and 136), but appear to have been lost during the last restoration (1959–1964), for they no longer appear in the window; see Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 162, who records the names as they are given here and notes that they were incorrectly placed in the side borders by the time she was writing. The lion is a modern addition; lines indicating waves on the green pieces below the lion suggest the original presence of water and thus perhaps also a ship, as with Cordula (fig. 133); see Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 162. Brinkmann, “Glasmalereien,” 152, notes the use of the Hand of God to signal Ursula’s importance among the other female saints.

The precise social status—whether patrician or bourgeois—of all of the lay donors in the glass is not clear from their names or costume. The costume is that of the well-to-do laity generally, see Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 14, 179 n. 51.

Bertha’s name is abraded but still mostly legible.

See Weilandt, “Auftraggeber,” 366, who cites the formal consistency of these windows as evidence of little intervention on shaping the windows’ appearance on the part of their lay donors.

On Christianus and Ludwicus’ costume, see Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 179 n. 51.

Marcwardus’s head is a modern replacement; these donors’ clothing was mostly replaced in later restorations. See Scheuffelen, “Glasfenster,” 161. Cordula’s head and folded hands are original.
the workshop to represent them this way. This gesture is significant, for Marcwardus’ haptic
entreaty turns to previously privileged, ecclesiastical strategies of visual devotion (figs. 128 and
282), claiming them as the basis for the creation of what, in a local context, must have appeared
as a strikingly new and assertive type of lay visual piety and devotion to personal saintly
protectors.

Indeed, while the type of devotional imagery used in these three windows had long been
established in clerical and monastic circles, for the laity in 1220s Cologne it marked a radical
step, whether the donor images were devised by the chapter and its glass painters, as seems
mostly to be the case, or, as with Marcwardus and Cordula, with perhaps moderate input from
the lay donors. As with the two clerical windows (figs. 128 and 130), these three small
windows with lay donors do not visualize the gift, but rather create an intercessory economy
linking the donor and the saintly recipient through a visual invocation of the donors’ names and
their gazes and gestures towards the saint (fig. 136). As Gee has observed, for lay donors from
social strata (urban patricians, merchants, and craftsmen) that had no access to heraldry (at this
point only available to very elite patrons), as was surely the case with the lay donors of these
windows regardless of their social station, the inscribed name, in tandem with a donor image,
was a critical instrument.1210 On a basic level, it served as a record of patronage, one that could
also serve to elicit continual prayer on the donor’s behalf after death.1211 But within the visual
economy of these windows, the donors’ names also seem to serve the further function of
commending them personally into the protection of the individual saint, in whose immediate
space the donors appear. Like the windows funded by clerics, these small individual windows

1210 Gee, Patronage, 5.
1211 See Becksmann, “Fensterstiftungen,” 65; Bergmann, “Stifter,” 132, 145; and, with reference to St. Kunibert,
operated for their lay donors as salvific vehicles both on the level of material gifts and as representations (fig. 133). Processed by the chapter, the lay donors’ gift of a window was ultimately made to the saint, establishing a contractual bond of assistance, one that had immediate currency for lay donors that were increasingly charged, after 1215, with maintaining their own spiritual welfare through good deeds and faced with the prospect of navigating purgatory.1212 In turn, the chapter and its workshop of glass painters expressed this bond visually and conceptually in the visual structure and language of the windows, which, being relit daily by the light entering the church, in effect continually reactivated the lay donors’ devotional bond with the saint.1213

The laity’s donation of windows at St. Kunibert seems to have been predicated above all on a desire to be included—visually, conceptually, and spatially—in the ritual and semantic fabric of the chapter’s choir program through the vehicle of the donor image. Even if none of the windows donated by lay donors was placed directly above a side altar (as far as we can tell), their gifts assured them of the spiritual benefits of being vicariously present in the sacred space of the clerical choir (fig. 35)—a space that was, physically, essentially inaccessible to them. Here, their donor images, when named, could more easily garner the commemorative prayers of the chapter; and their gifts/images, generally positioned among the altars placed throughout the choir, the holiest part of the building, were physically closer to the sacraments, to the many reliquaries, and to the patron saints’ shrines, and thus conceptually closer to both God and the

1212 Again, on these dynamics, with reference to the windows of the trades at Chartres, see Kurmann, “Chartres,” 69; on the donor image as contract and engagement of the saints after 1215 among the laity, see Gee, “Patronage,” 25–26, and Caskey, “Whodunnit,” 202.
1213 See Bergmann, “Stifter,” 144, who usefully notes that not only the general visibility, but also the dynamic aspect of light and the formal properties of stained glass windows also seem to stand behind their popularity as a medium of lay patronage in large-scale projects in the thirteenth century.
saints as recipients. But their windows also did more. Based on modes of devotional imagery (figs. 113 and 133) that had previously been the preserve of elite segments of society (figs. 282 and 285), the windows delineated their lay donors’ devotional arrangements with their chosen saintly assistants or included them notionally in the very unfolding of salvation. In their local context, which previously had seen little in the way of lay patronage of public religious institutions before 1200, these windows in the clerical choir at St. Kunibert, even if constructed by the chapter, constituted novel and radically public declarations of individual lay piety, ones that not only recorded the act of patronage for the sake of posterity, prayer, and status, but also openly negotiated an intercessory relationship between the lay donor and the saint. Such relationships had attained critical importance for an urban laity that was, after 1215, increasingly concerned (and required) to do penance and good works and to enlist the help of the saints.

The chapter’s choir program was a two-fold work of integration, one both artistic and social. Artistically, the chapter’s coordinated program of monumental imagery in stained glass and altars, shrines, and relics expressed its institutional identity as a member of the local and universal Church. Socially, the choir ensemble was the site of a complex negotiation between a chapter in need of funds to realize its ambitious project and lay donors who were keen to use this public project as a venue for addressing their spiritual needs. The relationship between the two parties appears to have been fully symbiotic and marked by mutual dependence. With the donations for the glass, the chapter was able to create a sumptuous new liturgical environment that articulated its institutional and liturgical priorities. Individual clerical donors inserted themselves into the larger program with objects and images that made use of the sacred spaces
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1214 On the politics and meaning of the placement of secular donations in sacred space generally, see Michael, “Privilege of ‘Proximity’” (from the perspective of heraldry), and, further, Andrew Martindale, “Patrons and Minders: The Intrusion of the Secular into Sacred Spaces in the Late Middle Ages,” in The Church and the Arts, ed. Diana Wood (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 143–178.
of the altars and created devotional bonds with intercessory agents. With their donations of windows, lay donors likewise received efficacious images that integrated them into salvation and instantiated devotional relationships with divine assistants; by being spatially included in the clerical choir, they benefited further from their presence by proxy within the choir’s sacred topography. Although the laity was taking a more active role in addressing its own spiritual welfare by means of its artistic patronage, the chapter at St. Kunibert and the Church remained the arbiter, conduit, and site of lay salvation, more than ever after 1215. The meeting of these two worlds in the choir at St. Kunibert is the product of a convergence of larger processes of social and religious change among the local laity and the possibilities and parameters of the chapter’s rebuilding project. The result was the creation of an ensemble of images and furnishings that is unique in the contemporary Empire in its complexity and uniquely expressive of the institution that was the collegiate church of St. Kunibert in the early thirteenth century.
Part IV

Conclusions

Between 1150 and 1250, Cologne, the largest city in the German-speaking lands and a thriving centre of religion and commerce, witnessed a building boom unlike anything in the imperial territories and much of the West. The rebuilding of the collegiate church of St. Kunibert was one of the most ambitious and most important of the many projects undertaken during this “great century of church building in Cologne,” as Meyer-Barkhausen famously called this period. As the last of Cologne’s great Romanesque churches and the immediate chronological precursor of its magnificent Gothic cathedral, St. Kunibert was in every sense a pivotal monument. St. Kunibert’s imposing architecture and its unparalleled ensemble of monumental art, liturgical furniture, and cult objects open a window onto the relationship between artistic integration, patronage, and the formation of institutional identity at one of medieval Cologne’s major spiritual institutions during the peak period of its power.

St. Kunibert’s elite status within the archdiocese of Cologne in the early thirteenth century was due to the tradition of its foundation in the Merovingian period by Kunibert, bishop of Cologne (ca. 623–650/663). By the ninth century, Kunibert had become a saint and the church of St. Clement that he erected during his episcopacy had become a collegiate church dedicated to St. Kunibert himself. Although little is known about the institution and the different church buildings before the thirteenth century, the recent discovery of the remains of a west end from circa 1040 in the western half of the current church reveals that St. Kunibert was already an important site of architectural activity by this time. Most likely erected on the personal initiative of Rudolf, bishop of Schleswig and possibly formerly provost of St. Kunibert,

1215 Werner Meyer-Barkhausen, *Das große Jahrhundert kölnischer Kirchenbaukunst* (Cologne: Seemann, 1952).
this west end was one of several major building projects in eleventh-century Cologne patronized by bishops, who, as princes of the imperial Church, dominated architectural production and patronage in the city in this period.\textsuperscript{1216}

In the early thirteenth century, however, the institutional structures governing architectural and artistic patronage at Cologne’s religious houses had shifted. As autonomous legal bodies, the chapters at St. Kunibert and Cologne’s other collegiate churches were now themselves patrons; the building projects that these spiritual communities undertook in the decades around 1200 were corporate enterprises borne by the chapters as collectives. With their prelates entrusted with advising the archbishop in matters both spiritual and temporal, and as high clerical representatives of the official Church, these clerical communities were also at the height of their political and spiritual authority. It is surely no accident that the “great century of church building in Cologne” dovetails not only with this period of clerical power and privilege in the city, but also with the first discordant cracks in the local ecclesiastical edifice occasioned by the cathedral chapter’s attempts, from the later 1160s and lasting through the 1250s, to centralize control of the archdiocese in its hands. Prompted neither by calamity nor physical necessity, the massive \textit{renovatio} project undertaken by the chapter at St. Kunibert from circa 1210 onwards constituted an attempt to engage, through the vehicles of architecture and art, with the church’s past, its present, and its status, and to assertively rewrite the institution into the urban landscape with a monumental, synthetic vision of its identity and power.

Close examination of St. Kunibert’s architectural envelope indicates that the chapter’s rebuilding of its church entailed a complex, diachronic process in which the community and its masons successively engaged with numerous major structures in and around Cologne in order to

\textsuperscript{1216} See the discussion of these episcopal patronage dynamics in Chapter 1.
realize this aim. Whereas previous studies placed the start of work on the new church at St. Kunibert around either 1200 or 1215, this study has situated the beginning of construction around 1210, in the later years of provost Theoderich von Wied’s tenure. Analysis of the building reveals that work began in the east end, which was conceived and built as a single structural unit using the east apse at St. Maria im Kapitol in Cologne and the west choir hall at St. Viktor in Xanten as primary models. Provost Theoderich knew the latter structure from his stay in Xanten in 1209 and likely recruited a master mason from the workshop there to design the east end at St. Kunibert. The oft-postulated singular impact of the elaborate trefoil choir at St. Aposteln—enshrined by scholars as the epitome of Cologne architecture around 1200—on the east end was minimal. Rather, St. Kunibert’s east end was based on a much broader range of sources: the chapter and its architect looked not only to the contemporary projects at St. Maria im Kapitol and Xanten, but also to such mid-twelfth-century precursors as the east ends at St. Gereon and Bonn to create a choir that was without parallel in Cologne at this time.

For the nave, begun under provost Bruno around 1219 while work on the east end was still ongoing, and the west transept, begun around 1230, the chapter turned primarily to the example of the renovated nave and west transept at St. Aposteln. Combining the model of the towering, rib-vaulted nave and western termination from St. Aposteln with features taken from the nave at St. Andreas and the verso of the west façade at Groß St. Martin, the chapter’s masons deftly integrated these two parts of the church into the formal and structural system that they had already established in the east end. St. Kunibert’s architectural fabric elucidates how architectural integration in prolonged building projects could involve dynamic processes of assimilation in which patrons and their masons responded to the continually shifting parameters of a local monumental landscape.
The collegiate chapter’s architectural patronage and this very process of diachronic integration were inextricably intertwined with the ecclesiastical political context in the archdiocese of Cologne in the early thirteenth century. For each successive section of its new church, the community at St. Kunibert looked to models at the most powerful and prestigious churches within the archdiocesan hierarchy. The turn to structures at the early Christian and Merovingian foundations of St. Maria im Kapitol, Xanten, St. Gereon, and Bonn as the basis for the east end articulated St. Kunibert’s own ancient origins and its membership in the college of priores, of which Xanten, Bonn, and St. Gereon were the three most powerful members alongside the cathedral chapter itself. Remarkably anachronistic for Cologne around 1200, the austere new choir expressed St. Kunibert’s institutional tradition and prestige, and in so doing asserted its traditional privileges and status in the face of the cathedral chapter’s effort to weaken the college of priores and secure control of the archdiocese for itself. The subsequent turn to St. Aposteln, St. Andreas, and Groß St. Martin for the massive new rib-vaulted nave and west transept again positioned the church within important contemporaneous building projects among the priores, this time bringing the project in line with current trends towards the selective assimilation of architectural forms from French Gothic architecture. Nonetheless, in both the nave and the west transept, these modernizing elements were combined with historicizing structural and decorative systems recalling local Ottonian and earlier Romanesque precedents, which underscored, like the anachronistic east end, the church’s long history and proud tradition as one of the most ancient foundations in the archdiocese.

An overarching concern with the institution’s history and status is also manifest in the ensemble of the high altar, saints’ shrines, opus sectile pavement, and narrative windows that the chapter had installed in the sanctuary in the early 1220s. Whereas earlier specialist research
considered the different parts of this grouping separately, this study has shown that the core sanctuary ensemble was a coordinated, multimedia unit. As the liturgical and institutional heart of the church, the high altar was made the centre point of a program of furnishings and imagery that delineated the church’s identity as an ancient member of the local and universal Churches. The placement of the shrines of SS. Kunibert and the Hewalds behind the high altar and a sepulchre replete with relics of Early Christian and Merovingian saints in the altar consecrated the altar with the traditions of the early Church. Spoliated from the eleventh-century building, the historicizing opus sectile pavement around the high altar firmly anchored the community’s new ritual space in the past. Framing the high altar-shrine tandem below, the three clerestory windows visualized the church’s history and located it within the larger unfolding of salvation.

The axial Tree of Jesse window presented the history of redemption from the fall to the end of time, providing a backdrop for the liturgy at the high altar and offering a complex work of visual exegesis for the clerics’ own contemplation of salvation. The flanking hagiographical windows with St. Clement, the first dedicatee of the church, and St. Kunibert, the founder, pointed back to the church’s origins and down to the relics of Clement and Kunibert at the high altar, while folding the church’s own narrative into the universal story of salvation pictured in the central Jesse window. Uniting liturgy, holy bodies, and pictorial history, the sanctuary constituted an exclusive devotional space that enabled the canons to experience their church’s history and identity while they performed the ritual work that would ensure their and their congregation’s salvation.

The community’s acquisition in 1222 of relics, from the East, of the True Cross and SS. Anthony, Nicholas, George, and Barbara further increased the sanctuary’s potential as a space for the canons’ devotion and salvation. Although the traffic in Eastern relics in the West was
substantial in the decades after 1204 and many artworks associated with such relics survive, the ensemble of *vasa sacra* and monumental frescoes that the chapter at St. Kunibert commissioned for its Eastern relics illuminates the multimedia and spatial dimension of Western reaction to Eastern relics in this period. Analysis of the sanctuary frescoes and the extant reliquaries indicates that the chapter rapidly integrated the new relics into its program for the sanctuary. The chapter’s coordination of the iconography of the Crucifixion fresco and the frescoes of SS. Anthony and Nicholas with the associated relics set the painted image and the relic in a reciprocal dialogue, activating the frescoes and illustrating the significance of the relics. Examination of the relic display reveals numerous levels of institutional meaning and several functions. The niche’s spatial proximity to the high altar established the Cross and the saints’ permanent physical presence among the community and enabled easy integration of the reliquaries into the liturgy. The display’s focus on the Crucifixion and the True Cross relic suggests two functions for the niche: to showcase the Cross relic on the major Cross feasts and to provide a devotional portal for the canons’ private veneration of the relic. The Crucifixion fresco performatively staged the Cross relic, explicating its meaning as the material witness of Christ’s suffering and God’s covenant with humanity through his sacrifice of his son on the Cross. With their highly unusual iconographies, the frescoes of Anthony as a healer of St. Anthony’s Fire and Nicholas interceding with his holy arms thematized the efficacy of these two saints’ body-part reliquaries, pointing to their ability to heal, intercede, and bless, likely with the intention of creating a cult, particularly in the case of St. Anthony as healer of St. Anthony’s fire. Taking up the integrative strategies of display from the earlier niche, the later chapel of the Holy Cross in the east transept, finally, embraced then-current modes of affective imagery for its central Crucifixion fresco, combining them with narrative scenes from the legend of the True
Cross to re-stage the Cross relic for the community. The chapel’s intimate scale and its performative frescoes facilitated the clerical viewer’s conceptual and corporeal experience of the Cross relic, the Crucifixion, and the history of the church’s True Cross relic.

Analysis of individual clerical and lay artistic patronage in the choir ensemble demonstrates the complexity of the negotiation between the chapter as corporate patron and individual donors. Designed to visualize the church’s history, liturgy, relics, and the titles of the altars, the chapter’s program of stained glass and altars for the clerical choir offered a rich spatial and semantic forum for acts of individual patronage. Individual canons utilized the altars as sites for locating the objects of their patronage, whether altar sepulchres or windows with donor images; these different works of art sought in their own ways to establish the donor’s vicarious presence at the altar and instantiate intercessory bonds between the donor and the saints, the intended recipients of these gifts. The examples of lay patronage illuminate how the new and very costly projects at Cologne’s public spiritual institutions provided a venue for lay donors to participate in these same dynamics. Although lay donors at St. Kunibert do not appear to have had much authorial control over the products of their patronage, their donations still worked to include them in salvation. The lay donor imagery in the stained glass windows positioned the donors in the unfolding of salvation and created devotional and contractual bonds with individual saints. The physical presence in the choir of objects of lay patronage further placed their donors and these gifts closer to the saints’ relics, the masses at the altars, and Christ in the Eucharist.

Since the early twentieth century, art historical discourse on St. Kunibert has cleaved the church and its art into discrete parts and separate media, studying them according to sub-disciplinary concerns, whether from the perspective of stylistic development, chronology, or
iconography. This study of St. Kunibert as a work of artistic integration elucidates the inherent methodological limitations of such approaches, which not only result in an incomplete understanding of the functions and meanings of individual works of art (whether a stained glass window, a reliquary, or a fresco), but also fundamentally obscure the nature and deeper aims of the artistic project at early-thirteenth-century St. Kunibert. Expanding the focus to address the church as an artistic and conceptual totality and relocating emphasis from stylistic history or iconography to the chapter’s patronage and its institutional worldview allows us to (re)situate the project at St. Kunibert within the set of human and historical factors that underpinned it, and thus better interpret its spiritual, social, and political meanings.

This type of analysis is critical in the context of early-thirteenth-century Cologne, because it circumvents the hermeneutic scholarly impasse created by Cologne’s non-conformity to the master narrative of French Gothic, which has resulted in an enduring focus on formalist histories and classification. By situating the project at St. Kunibert (fig. 56) or the contemporaneous rebuilding of the rotunda at St. Gereon (fig. 204) within the local narratives and institutional and political structures attendant upon high clerical artistic patronage in early-thirteenth-century Cologne, we can move beyond this impasse and focus instead on the root causes of Cologne’s unique visual culture. Such an approach also enables us to contextualize the role of architecture and art in shaping these communities’ corporate identity and in demarcating their political and clerical power. Whether through the new church’s anachronistic architecture or its lavish choir ensemble, the chapter at St. Kunibert responded with its artistic patronage to the different facets of its institutional narrative, from its history and liturgy through its relics and the clergy’s spiritual power as ministers of the Church. These concerns transcended the individual artistic media, which suggests that it is critical to take a deeper look
at complexes of institutional values and beliefs to understand the full meaning that such multimedia artistic enterprises had for their corporate ecclesiastical patrons, not just in thirteenth-century Cologne or Germany, but also globally in the High Middle Ages. All this is not to say that style is irrelevant, however; on the contrary, for the canons at St. Kunibert and St. Gereon, historicizing modes of building and recognizable formal ties with other structures erected by the priores were deeply meaningful. But this was precisely because of the local narratives about these institutions’ ancient pasts, the unique political constellation in the archdiocese at this time, and these communities’ attempts to project monumentally their institutions’ identity within this political context.

Indeed, and to return to Boisserée’s famous stylistic juxtaposition of St. Kunibert (fig. 56) and Cologne Cathedral (fig. 216) noted at the outset of this study, perhaps one of the most pressing questions posed by St. Kunibert and the reading of the church advanced here concerns not Late Romanesque art and architecture, but the emergence of “full-blown Gothic” in Cologne. St. Kunibert was consecrated in 1247; the very next year, the cathedral chapter began work on a new cathedral. Even more than in other parts of Germany in the first half of the thirteenth century (as at the Gothic Liebfrauenkirche, Trier, begun ca. 1230 and St. Elisabeth, Marburg, begun ca. 1235), the beginning of work on the enormous new Gothic cathedral in Cologne represented a radical break with local visual culture, one that has been ascribed generally since Robert Branner’s classic study to the centrifugal power of a centralized French “Court Style” that was adopted by elite patrons across Europe—in this case, by the Cologne cathedral chapter—due to its supposed connotations of royal prestige.\footnote{Branner, Court Style, 123–132.} As Groten has observed, the beginning of work on Cologne cathedral overlaps chronologically with the
cathedral chapter’s political triumph over the other members of the priores, whose political role in the archdiocese was now essentially nominal. Was the archbishop and cathedral chapter’s recourse to such French Gothic sites as Amiens and Beauvais for the new cathedral really due only to the purported prestige of the so-called “Court Style”? Or was it less about the imputed allure of Gothic as an expression of royal power in France and more about the cathedral chapter’s own new found powers in Cologne, or both? That is to say, was the use of a radically modern Gothic idiom a reactionary gesture meant to disassociate the cathedral chapter’s new church visually from the other, then-defeated institutional members of the priores with their historicizing and patently retrospective artistic creations, as emblematized so dramatically by St. Kunibert? Was the Gothic cathedral thus the crucible of a new paradigm of visual corporate identity in Cologne, in this case for the cathedral chapter? Addressing, much less answering, these questions far exceeds the scope of this dissertation. But given what has been said here about art, architecture, and institutional identity at St. Kunibert, it is clear that any answer lies not simply with the cathedral itself, its Gothic models in France, and the “Court Style,” but also with such structures as St. Kunibert and the local institutional and political network in Cologne.

This study of the relationship between artistic patronage and institutional identity in the rebuilding of St. Kunibert suggests that art and architecture did not simply reflect a preformed identity passively, but rather actively and dynamically constructed corporate identity among high medieval spiritual communities. At St. Kunibert, the chapter’s integration of the arts was a means to this end. It involved the diachronic integration of architectural models as the new church building was erected to plot the community’s place in the local church system; the

1219 For critiques of the Brannerian “Court Style,” see Bruzelius, St. Denis, 162–165, and Binski, “Cosmati,” 6–34.
1220 This question has also been raised by Nussbaum, “Anmerkungen,” 117.
synchronic integration of groupings of imagery, furniture, and objects in the clerical choir to create a synthetic, self-reflexive space of history, liturgy, sanctity, and clerical power; and, at all moments, the conceptual integration of the new church and its art into the institution’s local history, the universal history of salvation and the Church, and the social and political context of early-thirteenth-century Cologne. Because it runs counter to a canon that pivots on the rise and spread of French Gothic forms, late Romanesque St. Kunibert has been marginalized, not only generally within histories of thirteenth-century art and architecture, but also within the larger integrative movement in the discipline, which continues to focus on contemporaneous French cathedrals. Integrative study of St. Kunibert, however, not only elucidates how this key moment might help us re-envision the institutional meanings of art and architecture in thirteenth-century Cologne and the Empire, but also illuminates the powerful potential of medieval art and architecture to create, shape, and define communal religious identity.
Appendix A
The *Kunibertbrunnen* and the Legend of the Two Hewalds:
The Textual Record

1. *Officium of the Hewalds* (excerpt), fourteenth century


Amnis eunt contra cursum,
Ewaldi divinitus,
nocte supra eos sursum
luce missa coelitus

Cui Tylmo nomen erat,
Ewaldorum socio
panditur, ut eos quaerat
sub nocturno radio

Hinc translati a Pipino
mandatur ecclesiae
in loco Rheno vicino,
colendi Coloniae

Translation:

They travelled against the course of the river,
did the Hewalds, by divine heavenly agency,
with light sent on high above them in the night.

To a man named Tilmon,
a friend of the Hewalds,
it was revealed where he should seek them
under the nocturnal ray.

Translated from this place by Pepin,
they are given over to the church
in the place near the Rhine in Cologne.
2. Hymn for the Hewalds (excerpt), fourteenth century

(Text from Guido Maria Dreves, ed., Hymni inediti. Liturgische Hymnen des Mittelalters. Dritte Folge, Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi 12 [Leipzig: Reisland, 1892], 116)

Injecta Rhenus corpora
sursum vehit divinitus,
lux sanctitatis pignora
nocte revelat coelitus.

Translation:
With their bodies having been cast in,
the Rhine, propelled by God, carries them on high,
the heavenly light of sanctity reveals
the relics by night.

3. Sequence for the Hewalds (excerpt), fourteenth century


Sursum vehit ambos flumen,
adest vectis caeli lumen
sine nave patribus
Hosque simul in divina
redeuntes Agrippina
sacris locat aedibus.

Translation:
The river carries them both on high,
the light of heaven accompanies
the fathers, who are carried without a ship,
And, as they come to Holy Cologne,
places them simultaneously in holy buildings.
4. Sequence for the Hewalds (excerpt), later fifteenth century


Undis iactos vectat sursum
Rhenus illos per recursum
luce celsa comite.

Aede sacra reponuntur,
fontis novi, quo plectuntur,
manat rivus cespite.

Translation:

Thrown in, the Rhine carries them [the Hewalds]
in the waves on high against the current,
in the accompanying raised light.

They are placed in the holy edifice,
from the new well, where they suffered,
flows the brook of the ground.
Appendix B
Texts Relating to the Thirteenth-Century Rebuilding Project

1. Obit of provost Theoderich von Wied (d. 1242) (Memorienbuch, HASTK Geist. Abt. 143, fols. 4a–4b)


Translation:

March 26. Theoderich of good memory, archbishop of Trier and formerly provost of this church, died. He established for us annually a fund of ten solidi . . . [text breaks off and begins anew]. Theoderich of good memory, archbishop of Trier and formerly provost of this church,
died. He established for us annually a fund of ten *solidi* to be paid from the __________ [left blank] land capable of being ploughed in one day in Riehl for the celebration of a mass in memory of his parents. He conceded the administration of prebends to the church [i.e., the chapter] and handed over the church in Nettesheim for the use of the chapter, perpetually. He laid the first stone in the foundation of our church that now exists in the year of Christ 12 __________ [left blank] in the month of __________ [left blank]. He also later consecrated two altars in the church, namely the altar of the blessed Mary and [the altar] of the blessed John in the year of the Lord 1226. Hereafter, he consecrated the altar of the blessed Anthony and [the altar] of the blessed Katherine. He also established an office for a chaplain, perpetually, in the church; this priest shall receive an integral prebend without the *mensa*. He also gave the residence that he held by provostal right, in which the provost lives, according to the stipulations set out in the charter composed concerning this. For whom are given two solid measures of wheat to those present in the choir from the household of lord Wenemar of Asterlo.

2. Obit of the canon Caesarius (d. before ca. 1220) (*Memorienbuch*, HASk Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 7b)


*Translation:*

23 April. Caesarius the priest died, for whom are given seven *denarii* [and] a solid measure of wheat from Mauenheim to those present in the choir. Dying, he bequeathed around forty marks to the fabric of the church.
3. Obit of deacon and dean Constantine (d. 1222) (*Memorienbuch*, HASK Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 38b)


Translation:

December 30. Constantine the deacon and dean died, for whom are given six solid measures of wheat from the heath in Heimersheim for the purposes of making large loaves on feast days. One loaf on the feast of Kunibert. The other on the feast of the two Hewalds. The third on the feast of Clement. He had the first apse of the church, which we call the mitre, roofed with lead. He established annually thirty *denarii* from his claustral home for the offertory and sepulchre of the crucifix to be paid on Good Friday to the treasurer, for whom is given two solid measures of wheat to those present in the choir. Of which Baldwinus shall pay one and the other [shall come] from the granary of the lords.

4. Donation of dean Constantine (d. 1222) to the Cross (*Kämmereiverzeichnis*, HASK Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 39a)

De claustrali domo decani Constantini v solidos de quibus pertinent xxx denarii ad Crucem.
Translation:

From the claustral home of dean Constantine, five *solidi*, of which thirty *denarii* belong to the Cross.

5. Provost Bruno moves to dissolve the carpenter’s prebend and direct the funds gained from it towards lighting for church (HASTK, St. Kunibert U 1/25, 1223)


Translation:

Bruno, humble provost of the church of St. Kunibert in Cologne by the grace of God, [greetings] to all of Christ’s faithful, both present and future, perpetually. Let it be noted by all that, led by the zeal of piety, and at the petition of the convent of the said church, we, for the honour of God
and the blessed Kunibert [and] decreeing resolutely with the common consent and unanimous approval of the brothers of the same convent, have conceded perpetually, for the purposes of the lighting of the church itself, which suffers from a deficiency as regards candles for both day and night, a certain prebend for a carpenter which up to this point in time has existed at the church of St. Kunibert, which [prebend] the provosts of the same church have been accustomed to confer on lay carpenters, [and] from which [prebend] moderate to no advantage has come to the church itself. And that whenever it should happen that one vacates the same prebend, it should not otherwise be conferred on anyone at all. But, as said, the church itself is to be illuminated perpetually from this prebend. And in order that this deed of ours remain uninfringed and unchanged by the thoughtless initiative of no one, we have had the present page reinforced with our seal. Enacted in the year of grace 1223, on the vigils of the octave of the Lord’s epiphany.

6. Obit of deacon Theoderich (d. ca. 1225) (Memorienbuch, HASTK Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 38a)


Translation:

December 26. Theoderich the deacon died, for whom is given a solid measure of wheat from the granary of the lords to those present in the choir. He brought from abroad the relics from overseas placed in the niche next to the high altar. Namely, of the Cross. An arm of St.

7. Obit of subdeacon Vogelo (d. 1226) (*Memorienbuch*, HASStK Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 8a)


Translation:

26 April. Vogelo the subdeacon died, for whom are given two solid measures of wheat from the tenth of agricultural produce from Piperwalt to those present in the choir. He gave goods in Kaldenhausen and Weidengasse to the church. With whose counsel and direction of building operations work on the new church building was begun and pushed forward, to which he, dying, also bequeathed more than sixty marks.

8. Provost Bruno moves again to dissolve the carpenter’s prebend and direct the funds gained from it towards prebends (excerpt) (HASStK, St. Kunibert U 1/35, 1227)

[.. .] duas prebendas donavimus quas hactenus laice persone ex donatione prepositi habere consueuerunt una videlicet carpentarius alteram siliginis distributor ex quorum ministerio parva ut nulla utilitas ad ecclesiam dinoscitur pervenisse. Statuimus . . . dictas prebendas de cetero laicis non conferantur sed in usus fratrum . . . convertantur [.. .]
Translation:

[... ] We hereby give over two prebends, which laymen up to this point customarily held by right of the provost’s beneficence, namely one for a carpenter and one for the distributor of grains, from whose efforts little to no advantage can be seen to have come to the church. We ordain that the said prebends no longer be conferred on laymen but rather should be reserved for the brothers [...]

9. Obit of deacon and dean Wenemar (d. 1236) (Memorienbuch, HASTK Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 7a)


Translation:

April 17. Wenemar the deacon and dean died, for whom are given three solid measures of wheat from Merkenich on the feast of St. Remigius and a sealed charter exists concerning this. One of them is given today to those present in the choir. He gave around eighteen marks for the construction of the sacristy. And he donated half of his household after his death to the church for the sake of the soul of canon Thomas. He also ordered that one solid measure of wheat be deducted from his years of grace for the sake of his father and mother’s soul.
10. Will (excerpt) of canon Jordan (d. 1239) (HASTK, St. Kunibert U 1/45, 1238)

[…] Ad notitiam universorum pervenire volumus quod domino Jordano bone memorie concanonico nostro in extremis laborante Herimanno dicto Cloering cognate sua legavit mansum suum situm Mowenheim . . . tali conditione ut infra xxx dies post obitum suum xii marcas solvat ad fabricam ecclesie sancti Cuniberti. […]

Translation:
[. . .] We wish to inform all that lord Jordan of good memory, our fellow canon, on his deathbed bequeathed to his kinsman Herimann, called Cloering, his estate in Mauenheim . . . on the proviso that within thirty days after his death Herimann should pay twelves marks from it to the fabric fund. [. . .]

11. Obits of archbishop Arnold of Cologne (d. 1151) and obit and anniversaries of dean Christian (d. 1247/48) (Memorienbuch, HASTK Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 10a)

Translation:
June 11. Arnold, archbishop of Cologne, died, on whose behalf are given to each canon three denarii. On this day is given a solid measure of grain from the household of Walram to be divided among the brothers present in the choir for the anniversary of dean Christian, who died on this day and bequeathed many things to the fabric of the church. He gave to the church the vineyard in Honnef and the house upon the plot which pays six solidi and six denarii which are to be divided among those present in the choir. Whose commemoration is celebrated six times annually and for each commemoration a solid measure of wheat is divided among those present in the choir, of which five are to be paid out from the household of Wichenand and one from the household of Henry of Lothmer and Richolf.

12. Obit of Constantine the layman (Memorienbuch, HASTK Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 16a)

IV nonas Julii. Obiit Constantinus laicus qui dedit columnas marmoreas que sunt circa altare et alias iii maiores.

Translation:
July 4. Constantine the layman died, who gave the marble columns that are around the altar and the other four larger ones.

13. Obit of Elizabeth the laywoman, wife of Constantine the layman (Memorienbuch, HASTK Geist. Abt. 143, fol. 35a)

II nonas Decembris. Obiit Elyzabeth laica uxor Constantini qui dedit columnas marmoreas.
Translation:

December 4. Elizabeth the laywoman, wife of Constantine who gave the marble columns, died.
Appendix C
Texts Relating to the Shrine of St. Kunibert

1. **Pfarrer Johannes Polch on the opening of shrine of St. Kunibert in 1671** (*Memorialbuch of Pfarrer Polch, AEK, St. Kunibert, Pfarrarchiv, A II 03, fols. 79v–81r*)

Anno 1671 die 27 Maii, pridie festi venerabilissimi corporis Christi, post decantatas vesperas et completorium, reverendissimus dominus Paulus Aussemius vicarius in spiritualibus generalis et pro tempore simul decanus, in praesentia dominorum canonicorum capitularium, ex pia intentione reserari curavit tumbam maiorem sancti patris ac patroni nostri Cuniberti, tollendo videlicet laminas argenteas a medietate oblongi asseris, quo praedicta tumba superna in fastigio a latere sinistro versus sacristiam clausa seu tecta est, qua medietate (versus chorum incipiendo) a laminis denudata, serinearius cum parva serra oblongum illum asserem a fastigio usque ad quadraturam seu iuncturam tumbae dissecuit, et extunc cum alio instrumento denudatam ac dissectam partem asseris a iuncturis sui superna, inferna, et anteriori, disiunxit, et a tumba depositum. Patente itaque hac ratione tumba, decanus et capitulares inspicientes tumbam, repererunt in illa aliam archam seu scrineum quadratum ad tres circiter pedes longum et loris seu filis corraceis circum circa ligatum et tribus magnis sigillis superne bene clausum, et tumbae maiori extrinsecæ ita firmiter affixum, ut nullatenus loco moveri posset. Praeterea repererunt iuxta illud iacentem literam in pergameno scriptam, qua continebatur documentum publicum huius contenti, quod scilicet anno 1486 die 19 Martii, quae fuisse dies palmarum, archiepiscopus coloniensis Hermannus ex Lantgraviis Hessiae propter detractores quosdam, in praesentia decani et dominorum capitularium multorumque praelatorum ac dominorum consulum urbis coloniensis, thecam sancti Cuniberti etiam tunc temporis tribus coriis filis
circumductam et tribus sigillis (quae etiam hac vice adiacere deprehendimus) clausam aperuerit, et in ea repererit reliquias sancti Cuniberti cum capite, crinibus et cineribus. In fine eiusdem literae benefatus archiepiscopus haec formalia verba subscripsit: Ego Hermannus Dei gratia archiepiscopus coloniensis vidi beati patris sancti Cuniberti reliquias cum capite, crinibus et cineribus, quas ego manibus meis ad presentem archam reposui, clausi, et sigillo meo me praesente obsignavi. Hermannus archiepiscopus praefatus manu propria. Has literas decopiavimus in presenti, et originales eidem tumbae iterum imposuimus, copiam retinuimus, et asserem ante a tumba depositum reposuimus, firmavimus, ac laminas per aurifabrum apposuimus, ac sic debita cum devotione et reverentia tumbam sancti Cuniberti in altari ad suum loculum reponi fecimus. Cui actui ego Johannes Polch pastor et canonicus sancti Cuniberti ipse interfui. Nota bene in maioribus libris, ex quibus residentes canonici in pulpitis suis ab utroque latere praepositi et decani canunt, annotatum est, quod anno 1168 sub Philippo archiepiscopo coloniensis translatum sit corpus sancti Cuniberti et in sua theca repositum, die 20 maii. Ibidem quoque annotatum est, quod anno 1250 4 iduum octobris aperta sit haec theca et inventum sit corpus sancti Cuniberti integrum cum capite et pontificialibus. Ibidem habetur annotatum, quod in summo altari sancti cuniberti contineantur reliquiae de corpore sancti Clementis, de stola sancti Cuniberti, de casula sancti Brictii, de virga Moysi, etc.

Translation:

May 27, 1671, on the day before the feast of Corpus Christi, after vespers and compline had been sung, the most venerable lord Paul Außem, vicar general in matters spiritual and then also dean, in the presence of the lord canons and members of the chapter, with pious intention had the great shrine of the holy father and our patron St. Kunibert opened, namely by removing the
silver plates from the half [i.e., side] of the oblong [i.e., horizontal] beam, with which the aforesaid shrine is closed or roofed at the summit, on the gable on the left side facing the sacristy, [and] with the half [i.e., side] (beginning towards the canons’ choir) having been stripped of the plates, a carpenter cut with a small saw that oblong beam from the apex of the gable all the way to the square or junction of the shrine, and then, with the part of the beam having been stripped and cut from its joints on the upper, lower and vertical sides with a different instrument, he removed it [i.e., the beam] from the shrine. And with the shrine lying open in this way and while inspecting the shrine, the dean and members of the chapter discovered in it another chest or square box, some three feet long, well closed, bound in leather straps or strings and with three large seals on top, and so firmly attached to the outer [i.e., larger] shrine [in which it was found] that it could by no means be moved from its place. In addition to the chest, they found a letter written in parchment lying next to it containing a public document with the following content: namely, that on March 19, 1486, which was Palm Sunday, the archbishop of Cologne, Hermann, from the line of the Landgraves of Hessen, on account of certain detractors, and in the presence of the dean, lordly members of the chapter, and many other prelates, as well as members of the city council of Cologne, opened the shrine of St. Kunibert, which was then also closed with three leather straps and three seals (which we also discovered lying nearby), and found in it the relics of St. Kunibert, including his head, hair, and ashes. At the end of the same letter the kind archbishop wrote the following formal words: I, Hermann, by the grace of God archbishop of Cologne, saw the relics of the blessed father St. Kunibert, including his head, ashes, and hair, which I put back in the present chest, closing it and sealing it with my seal, with me present. [Signed] the aforementioned Hermann, written with his own hand. We copied the letter in the form of the present copy, and placed the
originals back in the same shrine, retained the copy, and replaced the beam that had been removed from the shrine earlier, fastened it and, with the aid of a goldsmith, reattached the plates, and so with the due devotion and reverence we had the shrine of St. Kunibert put back in its compartment on the altar. At which act I, Johannes Polch, priest and canon of St. Kunibert, was myself present. It should be noted that it is written in the great codices, from which the resident canons sing in their stalls from both the side of the provost and that of the dean, that the body of St. Kunibert was translated and placed in its shrine on May 20, 1168, under archbishop Philipp. And it is also noted there that this shrine was opened on October 12, 1250, and that the body of St. Kunibert was found whole, including his head and his pontifical vestments. It is also noted there that relics of the body of St. Clement, of St. Kunibert’s stola, St. Brice’s chasuble, and Moses’s rod, etc., are contained in the high altar at St. Kunibert.

2. Chapter minutes on restoration of the “hyerotheca” [i.e., shrine] of St. Kunibert (HASTK, St. Kunibert, Akten A11h, fol. 136r [October 29, 1682])

Item conclusum quatenus hyerotheca sancti Cuniberti reliquias eiusdem sancti continens in summo altari collocata et tracta temporis non parum attrita, et hinc inde defectuosa, a perito aurifabro [. . .] renoveti et repareti [. . .]  

Translation:
It was also concluded that the shrine of St. Kunibert containing the relics of the same saint, which is located at the high altar and which has suffered not inconsiderably the rigours of time, and is damaged here and there, should be restored and repaired by an expert goldsmith [. . .]
Anno 1168.

Annum 1168 sancti Cuniberti iterata translatione memorabilis extitit, quando Philippo colonensi electo necdum in diocesin reverso Livo phyunensi episcopus magni parentis sacras exuvias e priori theca argentea, quam Hermannus pius archiepiscopus ante annos ferme ducentos quinquaginta constituerat, solenni ritu levavit atque in praenobilis operis tumbam alteram transferendo collocavit, ita membrana huius ecclesiae: anno ab incarnatione Domini MC sexagesimo octavo, indictione prima, papatus domini Paschalis III anno secundo, imperii gloriosi principis Friderici anno xv, Philippi quoque coloniensis archiepiscopi anno primo, translatum est venerabile corpus sanctissimi patris nostri et confessoris Christi Cuniberti archiepiscopi coloniensis et in sua theca repositum a venerabile domino Lyvone phyunensi episcopo, x kalendas iunii, mense maii, vicesima die et secundo eiusdem mensis, ebdomada pentecostes, feria quinta, hora quarta, luna xi [. . . .]

Caeterum thecam hanc, in quam sancti viri pretiosum utique pignus adhoc tempus translatum est, illam ipsum esse, quam tot saeculorum saelici usu attritam nuper dissoluimus, vel et antiqui operis ac fabricae ratione. Licuit agnoscre, quippe quae facturae aliarum huius aevi thumabarum, ac imprimis trium magorum, quae per eosdem dies Philippi archiepiscopi impensis confecta est, quam simillima extitit. Erat autem tumba ipsa linea ad pedes ferme septime in longum, in latum vero sesquipedem protensa. Singulum eius latus septenis distinguebatur spatiis, quae argenteis obductis obducta laminis iisdemque auro illitis, intus autem vario coemento firmatis apostolorum imagines xi, dei parae item virginis, sancti Johannis Baptistae ac Dagoberti regis e sella sedentium opere subtilissimo representabunt, ad calcem ipse sanctus
Cunibertus ac Clemens Christo iudici pro humano genero supplicantes conspiciebantur. Caput autem thumbae eaedem iterum patronos, sed recentiori fabrica ac opere solidiore, expressos exhibebat, quaemadmodum et tectum decem omnino camellis vitae Christi mysteria superne proferebat. [. . .]

A fronte vero thumbae nullae inscriptiones reperiebantur, quasi dum frontispicium quod fabricae recentioris erat [. . . .] Ornabatur autem variis diversi generis lapillis et inter alios praegrandi ex achate lapide quem Sancto Cuniberto a Dagoberto seu Sigiberto rege donatum memoriae proditum est. [. . .]

Translation:
The year 1168 was memorable, with a translation of St. Kunibert having been done a second time, when, with Philipp, the elect to the post of archbishop of Cologne, having not yet returned to the diocese, bishop Livo of Funen, in a solemn ritual, raised the holy spoils of the great father [i.e., Kunibert’s relics] from the first silver shrine, which the pious archbishop Hermann had made some two hundred and fifty years before, and transferred them to a different shrine of celebrated workmanship. Thus a charter of this church: in the year of lordly incarnation 1168, in the first indiction, in the second year of the papacy of Paschal III, in the fifteenth year of the rule of the glorious prince Frederick, and in the first year of the episcopacy of Philipp, archbishop of Cologne, the venerable body of the most holy Kunibert, our patron, confessor of Christ, and archbishop of Cologne, was translated and put into its shrine by the venerable lord Livo, bishop of Funen, on May 22, in the week of Pentecost, the fifth Sunday [i.e., after Easter], in the fourth hour, the eleventh moon [. . . .]
Otherwise, that shrine, into which the precious remains of the holy man were at any rate translated at this time, is itself the one which, having been worn down by abundant use over so many centuries, we not long ago restored, by reason of the old work and physical fabric. One could recognize clearly that the shrine was similar in manufacture to that of other shrines of this period, and above all that of the Three Magi, which was made in the same days of Philipp, the great archbishop [1167–1191]. And the wooden core extended some seven feet in length and one and a half feet in width. Each of the sides was divided into seven fields, which, covered with gilded silver plates, and also strengthened on the inside with various cement, represented, in most subtle work, images of the eleven apostles, the Virgin, Mother of God, John the Baptist and king Dagobert, all seated; St. Kunibert himself and Clement supplicating for humankind before Christ the judge were to be seen at the foot of the shrine. The head of the shrine also showed the said patrons, but in more recent constitution or more solid work, just as the roof [i.e., sides of the gable] offered up ten scenes of the mysteries of Christ’s life, all in enamel. [. . .]

And on the front side of the shrine there were no inscriptions, seemingly because this part of the shrine appears to have been more recent work [. . .] This side was also adorned with diverse kinds of gemstones, among others a large achate stone that is said to have been a gift to St. Kunibert from either Dagobert or Sigibert. [. . .]
Appendix D
The East End of St. Kunibert and the Triconch at St. Quirinus in Neuss

The trefoil east end of the convent church of St. Quirinus in Neuss was deliberately excluded from the discussion of the east end of St. Kunibert in Chapters 2 and 3. Since Gall’s pioneering study, the apses in the triconch at St. Quirinus, with their thick-wall structure in the lower storey and freestanding column bundles with three shafts in the upper storey arcade, have always been mentioned in the same breath as the apse at St. Kunibert, with its thick-wall structure in the lower storey and freestanding column bundles with three shafts, here in both stories (figs. 35 and 229). The current state of the question, which ultimately goes back to Meyer-Barkhausen, is that the east end at St. Kunibert and the triconch east end in Neuss are more or less exactly contemporary, with both figured as representatives of the same “Entwicklungsstufe” in an evolutionary teleology that perceives them, and the thick-wall structure in their lower stories, as the “logical” development of ideas that are thought to be latent in the trefoil choir at St. Aposteln. Neither St. Kunibert nor St. Quirinus is given clear chronological priority, and the lower walkway and freestanding column bundles with three shafts common to both structures are thus supposed to have appeared simultaneously and independently at both places. The dependence of the east end of St. Kunibert on the reworked east conch at St. Maria im Kapitol and the west choir hall in Xanten, however, raises significant doubts about these suppositions and requires that the formal and chronological relationship between St. Kunibert east and Neuss east be rethought.


The current state of thought on the chronology of the east end at St. Kunibert and the triconch in Neuss is the end-point of a long historiography that reaches back to Gall on the one hand and Ewald on the other. Proceeding from the assumption that the east end of St. Kunibert was begun around 1210 in the later years of Theoderich’s tenure as provost, Gall argued that the triconch at St. Quirinus was slightly later than the east end at St. Kunibert; the apse design in Neuss, Gall suggested, was thus dependent on St. Kunibert.1223 The cornerstone for the foundations of the new church in Neuss, as the famous stone plaque in the interior wall of the south side aisle adjacent to the south portal indicates, was laid on October 9, 1209, by a magister Wolbero, who is usually regarded as being the master mason, and in the presence of abbess Sophia and archbishop Adolf I of Cologne (1193–1205).1224 Apart from the plaque with the date of the laying of the cornerstone, there is no other piece of textual or material evidence for dating St. Quirinus or the sequence of construction there other than the church building itself.

Gall argued that the nave and east end at St. Quirinus showed so many fundamental differences in conception that the two had to have been designed by two different architects, and thus he put the construction of the nave before the east end and reasoned that the triconch in Neuss was likely begun only in the later 1210s or even early 1220s after work had moved eastwards through the nave, and therefore definitely after the apse at St. Kunibert, the start date of which he put around 1210.1225 Gall concluded that the lower walkways and the column bundles with three shafts in the apses in Neuss stem directly from the apse at St. Kunibert, where he believed both features were first introduced into the Lower Rheinland as direct “imports” from France.

1223 Gall, Apsidengliederungen, 93–98, 105, 110.
1224 On the plaque, see the fundamental study of Bader, St. Quirinus, 85ff. The plaque indicates that Adolf was still archbishop of Cologne when the cornerstone was laid in 1209. Though he had been deposed in 1205, Adolf continued to claim the title of archbishop outside Cologne, and thus this discrepancy is easily explainable.
1225 Gall, Apsidengliederungen, 96, 110.
Gall’s picture of the chronological relationship between the apse at St. Kunibert and the triconch in Neuss and the issue of priority, with St. Kunibert coming before St. Quirinus and influencing it, was fundamentally altered in the 1950s. In his 1955 monograph on St. Quirinus, Walter Bader likewise put the nave before the triconch east end. Bader pointed primarily to two things when adducing the chronological priority of the nave over the east end in Neuss, both of which he, like Gall, ascribed to two different architects, with Wolbero responsible for the nave and a different, unknown architect for the triconch. First was the location of the stone plaque recording the laying of the cornerstone, which is located in the southwest corner of the nave, in the side aisle wall (interior) next to the south portal. Bader argued that the location of the plaque indicates that construction began in this area of the church itself, as the plaque appears never to have been moved. Second, Bader pointed to the way in which the string course moulding and corbel table that crown the second storey of the south side of the slightly earlier west end at Neuss were extended seamlessly onto the exterior wall of the new south portal, which, in turn, is attached to the nave, and then extended all the way along the exterior wall of the side aisle down to the east end. For Bader, this suggested that the new church was erected from west to east, for it indicated that the architect (for him, Wolbero) used the two lower stories of the incomplete west end to generate the height of the new south portal and the side aisles and galleries for the new nave. Whereas the first assumption—that the location of the stone plaque must indicate where work began—alone is problematic as evidence that work necessarily began in this spot, because the plaque could very well have simply been placed near

---

the south portal later, the second observation on the aligning and symmetrical junction of the slightly earlier west end and the southwest corner of the portal/new nave does constitute solid evidence that work most likely began here (and this is where the plaque is on the interior, between the south portal and the slightly projecting south arm adjacent to it), offering solid grounds for supposing that work at St. Quirinus progressed westwards through the nave and towards the east. That the nave and the triconch east end were the result of two distinct building campaigns, Bader argued further, is evident in the abrupt junction of the two parts of the church in the interior, where the lower galleries over the side aisles run up against the much taller triconch and are screened off from it with centrally placed column bundles. Bader nonetheless believed that the two westernmost square towers of the triconch up to the level of the eave moulding on the exterior of the clerestory were executed “by Wolbero,” and thus that Wolbero, though not the architect of the triconch east end, foresaw a triconch. His unknown successor then took up this plan and changed it radically by increasing the height of the triconch far beyond what Wolbero had planned. Bader thus proposed the following sequence of construction for St. Quirinus: starting in 1209, the nave was erected from west to east, followed by the entire triconch, before work moved westwards again, now focusing on the completion of the upper two stories of the incomplete late-twelfth-century west end and, finally, the west tower, whose completion Bader put around 1230/1240.
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1230 Cf. Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbaukunst, 53 n. 3, and Barbknecht, Fensterformen, 285–286 n. 405, both of whom suggest that the plaque may well have been placed near the portal only well after construction had begun and thus that the location of the plaque alone does not constitute evidence that work necessarily began here.  
1231 This is now the widely accepted sequence for work at Neuss; see Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 2, 835.  
1232 Bader, St. Quirinus, 120–121.  
1233 Bader, St. Quirinus, 120–121.  
The issue for Bader, then, was not the sequence of the nave and the triconch at St. Quirinus, but rather the chronological relationship between the nave, begun first in 1209, and the triconch, begun after the nave had been completed. Here, Bader pointed to the inconsistent and parallel use of pointed and round arches in the arcades in the galleries and the unequal dimensions of the nave bays themselves (which become progressively smaller towards the east) and suggested that these aspects of the nave indicate that it was executed “quickly and sloppily.” From these questionable observations alone, Bader concluded that the nave was built within “five years at the most,” and that it was therefore complete by around 1215. Because he believed that Wolbero had already planned to build a triconch, Bader argued, in turn, that the triconch itself was begun around 1215 by the same workshop (but under a different architect) and “without temporal break from the nave,” so that “we still remain in the second decade of the thirteenth century for the beginning of the triconch choir.” Bader thus dated the triconch east end in Neuss to circa 1215–1220. Having arrived at this conclusion, Bader then positioned the triconch in Neuss beside the apse at St. Kunibert, writing that “[o]ne will thus have to assume that the completion of the triconch [in Neuss] falls after the year 1215, not much earlier than the start of construction on the east end of St. Kunibert (1215–1227).” By this point, Bader was working, like other scholars, with Ewald’s “default date” of “1215” for the start of work at St. Kunibert (rather than Gall’s date of “circa 1210”), using this date as if it were a firmly established fact. Bader thereby laid the groundwork for the notion that Neuss east, the

---

1237 Bader, *St. Quirinus*, 123: “. . . der Dreikonchenchor . . . ohne Pause an das Langhaus angebaut.”
beginning of which he put with no substantial evidence right after the nave and around 1215, and St. Kunibert east, the beginning of which he put, following Ewald, in 1215, were more or less exactly contemporary.

Meyer-Barkhausen, for his part, disagreed with Bader’s contention that the nave and the triconch in Neuss were the result of two different campaigns. For him, the location of the plaque recording the laying of the cornerstone near the south portal by no means indicated that work began in the nave (he ignored the alignment of the eave mouldings and corbel table of the new south portal and nave with those of the slightly older west end), and he argued instead that the triconch, and not the nave, was begun in 1209. His evidence here consisted of the observation that the blind arcades of the triconch on both the south and north conches end abruptly where they meet the side aisle walls of the nave and are interrupted by them, which for Meyer-Barkhausen indicated that the triconch at Neuss must originally have been planned only for a single vessel nave rather than for the three-vessel nave that was ultimately built. He concluded from this alone that the triconch in Neuss predated the nave, and that it, and not the nave, was begun in 1209. As later excavations would prove, the foundations for the nave in Neuss indicate clearly that a three-vessel nave was always planned here, thus rendering invalid Meyer-Barkhausen’s reasoning and his argument concerning the priority of the triconch over the apse. At any rate, by attempting to place the start date of the triconch in Neuss in 1209, Meyer-Barkhausen implied that the triconch there predated the east end of St. Kunibert, the start date of which he, like Bader, also placed “perhaps around 1215” following Ewald’s “default

---

1240 Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbaukunst, 53 n. 3.
1241 Meyer-Barkhausen, Kirchenbaukunst, 52.
1242 See Barbknecht, Fensterformen, 284 n. 404.
date” for the laying of the cornerstone.\textsuperscript{1243} However, he did not pursue the idea that the apse at St. Kunibert was based directly on the apses in the triconch in Neuss, electing instead, like Bader, to see them instead as representatives of the same “Entwicklungsstufe,” writing that “[St. Kunibert] is, as was already demonstrated, more related to Neuss as an exponent of the same developmental stage of the triconch choir, rather than through any direct contacts.”\textsuperscript{1244}

Analogous to Bader, then, Meyer-Barkhausen ultimately left open the issues of priority and dependence between the two structures, casting St. Kunibert east and Neuss east instead as unconnected but nonetheless more or less contemporary examples of the same “Entwicklungsstufe” in a developmental teleology from St. Aposteln east.

Of the two principal arguments for the chronology of the triconch in Neuss formulated in the 1950s, it was Bader’s that found acceptance in subsequent scholarship. Kubach and Verbeek adopted Bader’s chronology for all of St. Quirinus in their enormously influential 1976 catalogues, likewise dating the nave in Neuss to 1209–circa 1215, the triconch to circa 1215–1220, the nave clerestory and the upper two stories of the westwork to circa 1220–1230, and the west tower to circa 1235–1240.\textsuperscript{1245} Because they also still ultimately adhered to Ewald’s “default date” of 1215 for the laying of the cornerstone at St. Kunibert, only questioning it with the use of a question mark but not overturning it,\textsuperscript{1246} Kubach and Verbeek further concretized the notion that the triconch in Neuss and the apse at St. Kunibert are exactly contemporary,

\textsuperscript{1243} Meyer-Barkhausen, \textit{Kirchenbaukunst}, 54: “Weniger später als in St. Quirin, vielleicht um 1215, wurde hier mit dem Ostbau begonnen.” Meyer-Barkhausen also implied this in the very structure of his book, electing to put his discussion of St. Quirinus before his discussion of St. Kunibert in his chapter 4, 47–58 (“St. Quirinus in Neuss und St. Kunibert in Köln”)

\textsuperscript{1244} Meyer-Barkhausen, \textit{Kirchenbaukunst}, 63: “Mit St. Quirin verbindet, wie gezeigt wurde, mehr die gleiche Entwicklungsstufe des Kleeblattdores, als daß an unmittelbare Beziehungen zu denken wäre.”

\textsuperscript{1245} Kubach and Verbeek, \textit{RBRM}, vol. 2, 835.

\textsuperscript{1246} Kubach and Verbeek, \textit{RBRM}, vol. 1, 549: “Grundstein (1215?),” and, at 553, “[w]ahrscheinlich 1215 beginnend mit der Krypta . . . .”
calling the two “fast gleichzeitig” in the entry on St. Kunibert.\footnote{Kubach and Verbeek, \textit{RBRM}, vol. 1, 554: “. . . das fast gleichzeitige Quirinusmünster in Neuß . . . .” The entry on Neuss (\textit{RBRM}, vol. 2, 835), for its part, likewise positions the two as more or less exactly contemporary: “Ungefähr gleichzeitig (um 1215) beginnt in Köln der Chorbau von St. Kunibert.”} This view, in turn, combined with Meyer-Barkhausen’s notion that the two represent the same “Entwicklungsstufe,” then formed the basis for the current notion that the apse at St. Kunibert and the triconch in Neuss are exactly contemporary but unconnected and that the use of thick-wall structure in the lower storey and column bundles with three shafts occurs at both places in a purely evolutionary teleology from the triconch at St. Aposteln.

The prevailing state of thought on the chronological relationship between St. Kunibert east and Neuss east and the related issues of priority and dependence, then, hinges entirely on two assumptions: that the cornerstone for the new collegiate church of St. Kunibert was, as Ewald contended, actually laid in or around 1215, and that the nave in Neuss was, as Bader contended, actually erected within “five years at the most,” and that the triconch there itself was also begun in or around 1215. The basis for both of these assumptions is very weak. The assumption that work on the new east end at St. Kunibert began in or around 1215 was an extrapolation made from the very meagre body of evidence that was available to Ewald in the early 1910s. As argued above, a start date for construction on the new east end at St. Kunibert around 1210 is, in view of the stylistic, textual, and contextual evidence, Theoderich’s tenure, and the use of parts of two churches that are themselves datable to the period spanning 1200–1210 as models, more probable than the “default date” of “1215.”\footnote{See Chapter 2.} The second assumption, that the nave at St. Quirinus took “five years at the most” to build and was thus done by circa 1215—and the related conclusion that the triconch was itself begun around 1215—is purely hypothetical. It must be stressed emphatically that, while the nave most likely does represent
the earliest part of St. Quirinus, Bader’s chronological framework of “five years at the most” for the nave in Neuss is completely arbitrary. While the nave there may display “signs of sloppy execution,” these “signs” do not in themselves mean that it was also erected “hastily” and therefore within “five years at the most,” as Bader suggested. In view of the complete lack of further textual or material evidence bearing on the chronology of construction in Neuss, it is impossible to say just how long the construction of the nave there took. It could have taken five years, as Bader suggested, but it could also have taken ten. The date of (circa) 1215 for the laying of the cornerstone at St. Kunibert and the date of (circa) 1215 for the beginning of the triconch in Neuss are scholarly constructs; there is no binding, or even solid, evidence for either one of these two suppositions. And even if one were to follow Bader and posit that the nave in Neuss only took “five years at most” to build, work on St. Kunibert, most likely begun around 1210, was probably already well underway before work in Neuss reached the triconch.

Thus, the only tool for dating the triconch in Neuss remains the triconch itself (fig. 229). It has long been recognized that the triconch in Neuss is based primarily and directly on two Cologne models, namely the much earlier triconch at Groß St. Martin (ca. 1150–1172; fig. 208) and its successor, the triconch at St. Aposteln (ca. 1200; fig. 178). The architect responsible for the triconch at St. Quirinus, who is usually supposed to have come from Cologne on account of his intimate knowledge of the building traditions there, clearly consulted both of these Cologne models in the use the trefoil ground plan for Neuss east, taking and creatively combining elements from both in devising the elevation of the new triconch.\textsuperscript{1249} The proportions in the apses in Neuss follow Groß St. Martin closely in the combination of a squat lower storey with a

\textsuperscript{1249} Meyer-Barkhausen, \textit{Kirchenbaukunst}, 47ff. Despite his chronology for Neuss east (triconch, rather than nave, begun in 1209), Meyer-Barkhausen’s meticulous discussion of the various ties between the choir in Neuss and those at Groß St. Martin and St. Aposteln remains the best treatment.
towering upper storey with precociously tall freestanding supports on tall socles. The trefoil choir at St. Aposteln, however, represents the source for the specifics of the ground plan and the configuration of the apse arcades in Neuss with their three broad arches in the apse arcades on the interior to seven narrower arches in the blind arcades on the exterior of the apse. The crossing lantern at St. Quirinus—a fenestrated octagonal lantern set on pendentives—likewise looks to the solution at St. Aposteln. The form of the supports in the lower apse arcades in Neuss, namely robust bundles of two columns against an almost invisible pier, here freestanding rather than engaged, also parallels St. Aposteln, where the supports in the same position, here engaged, take much the same form.

But what of the other salient features in the trefoil choir in Neuss that are not explainable via either Groß St. Martin or St. Aposteln—the thick-wall structure in the lower storey and the column bundles with three shafts in the upper storey arcades? It is precisely these two features that have long prompted scholars to associate St. Kunibert and Neuss and see them as representatives of the same “developmental” line from St. Aposteln. The reading of the chronology and sources for the east end at St. Kunibert advanced here, however, offers a new context to rethink the relationship between St. Kunibert and Neuss. Most likely begun around 1210, St. Kunibert’s apse is derived from the example of St. Maria im Kapitol, which provided a model for the use of thick-wall structure in the lower storey. The column bundles with three shafts in the apse at St. Kunibert, moreover, stem from its dependence on St. Maria im Kapitol and Xanten west, with its arch design, which prompted the architect to develop this form of
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1250 Meyer-Barkhausen, *Kirchenbaukunst*, 47, 49.
St. Kunibert’s apse design is thus explainable without Neuss, which suggests strongly that the architect in Neuss looked to St. Kunibert for these features, and not vice versa.

This is also suggested by other features that betray the Neuss architect’s use of St. Kunibert’s east end as a whole for parts of his design. The forechoir bays in Neuss (fig. 229), for instance, are very close in conception to the east walls of the east transept at St. Kunibert (figs. 47, 89) and diverge significantly from those in the earlier Cologne apses that served as bases for the trefoil choir (i.e., Groß St. Martin and St. Aposteln). At both St. Kunibert and Neuss, these walls are bisected into two halves in both the upper and lower stories. In the lower storey, the two blind arches are supported in both cases on a central column bundle with two shafts. In the upper storey, a single freestanding columnar support—at St. Kunibert a single inset colonnette, at St. Quirinus, a bundle with three shafts—supports the two arches that comprise the freestanding arcade. In both, the upper storey is constructed with thick-wall structure, with a narrow walkway, vaulted in each case with tunnel vaults that are bisected behind the centrally-placed support with a steeply pointed arch (almost triangular in Neuss, and on a continuous console, like those used throughout the apse at St. Kunibert). In Neuss, the outer halves of the tunnel vaults rest on consoles in the same fashion as the tunnel vaults in the two innermost arches in this same position at St. Kunibert. In each case, the rear wall is left solid (and, apart the presence of doorways that are found in the same spot in each, unadorned behind the innermost arches towards the crossing due to the stairwells behind), but is provided with a round-headed clerestory window behind the outermost two arches. In elevation, structure, and details, the design of the forechoir bays in Neuss presupposes thorough and direct knowledge of the east walls of the east transept at St. Kunibert. Because these walls at St.
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1254 See Chapter 2.
Kunibert are themselves rooted in the corresponding walls in the west choir hall in Xanten and represent a permutation of them, the architect responsible for the east end of Neuss appears to have taken all these features for his forechoir bays at St. Quirinus from St. Kunibert’s east end.

The narrow pointed vault of the forechoir bays in Neuss with its small pointed arches that cut into the vault also finds a direct parallel in the system of vaulting in the forechoir bay at St. Kunibert (figs. 38, 47), which further suggests that the architect in Neuss looked to the east end there.\footnote{This similarity between the forechoir bay vaults at St. Kunibert and Neuss has been observed by Meyer-Barkhausen, \textit{Kirchenbaukunst}, 47, 55, and Barb knecht, \textit{Fensterformen}, 138.}

The same is also true of the design of the lower and upper apse arcades and the use of the column bundles with three shafts in the upper arcades in the apses in the choir in Neuss, which represent permutations of ideas first developed in the apse at St. Kunibert (fig. 35). The broad arches in the lower apse arcades at St. Quirinus, for instance, are pointed and stepped, with inset “nook rolls,” here in the form of a continuous foliate band. In contrast to the corresponding arches in the apse at St. Kunibert, there is no real projecting face or recessed archivolts in the lower arcades in Neuss. Rather, the foliate “roll mouldings” meet over the supports and their ends almost fuse there, leaving no space for a reserved outermost face; likewise, in place of a hanging, recessed archivolt, the inner face of the arch here is simply projected backwards as a tunnel vault to the solid rear wall. As at St. Kunibert, the tunnel vaults here are bisected behind the supports by pointed arches that rest on continuous consoles set into the rear wall, here with foliate decoration like the roll mouldings. In Neuss, however, the freestanding supports take the form of double colonnettes before an almost invisible rectangular pier—a motif that is clearly based on the upper supports in the apse at St. Aposteln. In marked contrast to the lower arcade in the apse at St. Kunibert, there is no logical assignment of the faces of the stepped arches to
the supports below: while the arches in the lower arcades in Neuss are stepped and possess nook rolls, no attempt was made to engender unity between the different faces of the stepped arches and the freestanding supporting members below. This is all more conspicuous in the upper apse arcade. Here, the supports take the form of column bundles with three shafts, as at St. Kunibert. The oddly-shaped, almost misshapen, parabolic arches here are stepped and stilted, as at St. Kunibert, but are devoid of either nook rolls or hanging recessed archivolts. There is a substantial projecting foremost face, which is assigned to the front shaft of the column bundle, while the two flanking shafts are assigned to the recessed portion of the arch, which at the same time forms the tunnel vault that projects straight back to the solid rear wall. As at St. Kunibert, the stepped and stilted arches cut into the masonry of the apse semi-dome. The tunnel vaults are bisected behind the column bundles with pointed arches, as at St. Kunibert, but are further bisected such that they rest on two small consoles—a clear reminiscence of the solution at Groß St. Martin. As indicated in Chapter 2, in all of the Cologne apses before St. Kunibert—that is, Groß St. Martin and St. Aposteln, and even in the upper storey of St. Maria im Kapitol itself—the arches are unprofiled. The architect at St. Kunibert first introduced these motifs through his use of the Xanten system of arches and walkway vaults, and thus the Neuss architect appears again to have derived these aspects of his design from St. Kunibert’s east end.

When the apses in Neuss (fig. 229) and at St. Kunibert (fig. 35) are set side by side, it seems clear that many features in Neuss are echoes of features prefigured in the east end at St. Kunibert. Chronologically, then, Neuss’s triconch may well date somewhat later than 1215. Whatever the precise chronology of Neuss east, there is a clear line of dependence running from St. Kunibert to Neuss. As he did with the triconches at Groß St. Martin and St. Aposteln, the architect of the trefoil choir in Neuss took diverse elements from the east end of St. Kunibert for
his design. Perhaps more than any other late Romanesque structure in the Lower Rhineland, the triconch at Neuss is a paradigmatic example of architectural bricolage from a host of sites, in this case, three major east ends in Cologne, the trefoil choirs at Groß St. Martin and St. Aposteln—and the east end of St. Kunibert. Gall perhaps summed it up best when he wrote: “Seen as a whole, the particular achievement of the architect of St. Quirinus resides less in the creation of new elements and more in the very talented use and development of preexisting ones.”

1256 Gall, Apsidengliederungen, 107: “Im ganzen Betrachtet ist die besondere Leistung des Architekten von St. Quirin also weniger in der Kreation neuer Elemente zu suchen, als in der sehr talentvollen Ausnutzung und Fortbildung schon Vorhandener.”
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Figure 199. Ground plan of memoria, St. Gereon, Cologne, ca. 380
(source: Ristow, Frühes Christentum im Rheinland., Abb. 30)
Figure 200. Ground plan, St. Gereon, Cologne, multiple phases (east end ca. 1151–1156)
Figure 201. Cross-section, St. Gereon, Cologne, apse ca. 1151–1156
Figure 202. Apse, interior, St. Gereon, Cologne, ca. 1151–1156
Figure 203. East end, exterior, St. Gereon, Cologne, ca. 1151–1156 (photo: author)
Figure 204. Decagon, interior, St. Gereon, Cologne, 1219–1227
Figure 205. St. Helena *fundatrix* and St. Gereon, enamel, arm reliquary, St. Gereon, Cologne, ca. 1220–1230
Figure 206. Ground plan, Groß St. Martin, Cologne

Figure 207. Cross-section, Groß St. Martin, Cologne
Figure 208. East end, interior, Groß St. Martin, Cologne, ca. 1150–1172
Figure 209. East end, exterior, Groß St. Martin, Cologne, ca. 1150–1172
(towers complete by ca. 1220)
Figure 210. Nave to west, Groß St. Martin, Cologne, arcade before 1185; upper storey ca. 1225–1235 (photo: author)
Figure 211. West façade (verso) (reconstructed), Groß St. Martin, Cologne, ca. 1230 (photo: author)
Figure 212. Ground plan of memoria (fifth century) and later collegiate church, St. Severin, Cologne (source: Ristow, Frühes Christentum im Rheinland, Abb. 36)
Figure 213. Choir and apse, interior, St. Severin, Cologne, ca. 1220–1237
Figure 214. East end, exterior, St. Severin, Cologne, ca. 1220–1237

Image removed due to copyright
Figure 215. Nave to east, St. Caecilia, Cologne, ca. 1160
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Figure 216. Choir, Cologne Cathedral, 1248–1322
Figure 217. Cologne Cathedral, reconstruction showing junction of new choir and pre-Gothic nave around 1265 (source: Wolff, *Kölner Dom*, Abb. 10)
Figure 218. Nave (reconstruction), Old Cologne Cathedral, nave, ca. 870
Figure 219. Ground plans of major Lower Rhenish Churches, ca. 1170–1220
(source: Kubach and Verbeek, RBRM, vol. 4, Abb. 332)
Figure 220. Ground plan, west choir hall, St. Viktor, Xanten, ca. 1185/1190–1213
Figure 221. Cross-section to west, reconstruction of original state with plan for recessed towers, west choir hall, St. Viktor, Xanten, ca. 1185/1190–1213
Figure 222. Interior to south, west choir hall, St. Viktor, Xanten, ca. 1185/1190–1213
Figure 223. Interior to southwest, west choir hall, St. Viktor, Xanten, ca. 1185/1190–1213
Figure 224. Arcade and walkway vaults, southwest wall, west choir hall, St. Viktor, Xanten, ca. 1185/1190–1213 (photo: author)
Figure 225. Interior to south with southeast wall, west choir hall, St. Viktor, Xanten, ca. 1185/1190–1213
Figure 226. East wall in south arm of west choir hall, St. Viktor, Xanten, ca. 1185/1190–1213 (photo: author)
Figure 227. Façade, exterior, west choir hall, St. Viktor, Xanten, ca. 1185/1190–1213 (photo: author)
Figure 228. Arcade, façade, west choir hall, St. Viktor, Xanten, ca. 1185/1190–1213 (photo: author)
Figure 229. South conch, east end, St. Quirinus, Neuss, 1220s (photo: author)
Figure 230. East end, exterior, St. Clement, Schwarzerheindorf, ca. 1150
Figure 231. East end, exterior, St. Castor, Koblenz, ca. 1160
Figure 232. A. Quaglio, west apse, exterior, St. Maria ad Gradus (ca. 1150–1180), Cologne, drawing, ca. 1809
Figure 233. Dwarf’s gallery, east transept and apse, St. Georg, Limburg an der Lahn, ca. 1220
Figure 234. East end, exterior, St. Cassius and Florentius, Bonn, ca. 1150
(upper towers and gable ca. 1200–1210)
Figure 235. North conch of east transept, interior, St. Cassius and Florentius, Bonn, ca. 1210
Figure 236. Arcade, south arm, St. Pantaleon, Cologne, before 1216 (photo: author)
Figure 237. Façade, Overstolzenhaus, Cologne, 1220s
Figure 238. Ground plan, St. Andreas, Cologne
Figure 239. Nave to east, St. Andreas, Cologne, nave completed ca. 1220 (photo: author)
Figure 240. Upper storey wall, second nave bay (from east), south wall, St. Andreas, Cologne, nave completed ca. 1220 (photo: author)
Figure 241. *Muldennische*, north side aisle, St. Andreas, Cologne, nave completed ca. 1220 (photo: author)
Figure 242. Nave arcade, St. Pantaleon, Cologne, ca. 1150 (photo: author)
Figure 243. West façade, verso, Cistercian Abbey, Heisterbach, ca. 1227–1237 (demolished in 1809) (source: Boisserée, *Denkmale*, Tafelband)
Figure 244. Nave, St. Georg, Limburg an der Lahn, ca. 1205–1215
Figure 245. Transept, St. Georg, Limburg an der Lahn, ca. 1210–1220
Figure 246. Nave, Laon Cathedral, ca. 1155/60–1180
Figure 247. Marian Altar, Brunswick Cathedral, bronze, 1188

Figure 248. Tomb, Brauweiler Abbey, ca. 1200
Figure 249. Last Supper, Groß St. Martin Evangeliary, Cologne, ca. 1200–1210 (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, ms. 9222, fol. 2v)
Figure 250. High altar-shrine ensembles, St. Severin (lower; ca. 1237) and St. Ursula (upper; ca. 1260), Cologne
Figure 251. Shrine of St. Anno, Abbey of St. Michael, Siegburg, 1180s
Figure 252. Roman pavement, found near St. Maria im Kapitol, Cologne, third or fourth century
Figure 253. Ceiling, St. Michael, Hildesheim, second quarter of thirteenth century
Figure 254. Trees of Knowledge and Life, ceiling (detail), St. Michael, Hildesheim, second quarter of thirteenth century
Figure 255. Tree of Jesse, Groß St. Martin Evangeliary, Cologne, 1220s (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, ms. 9222, fol. 25r)
Figure 256. Balaam and the Queen of Sheba, Tree of Jesse window, Legden, ca. 1230
Figure 257. Crucifixion, Groß St. Martin Evangeliary, Cologne, 1220s
(Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, ms. 9222, fol. 71r)
Figure 258. Christ in majesty, Groß St. Martin Evangeliary, Cologne, 1220s (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, ms. 9222, fol. 13v)
Figure 259. Baptism of Christ, Brandenburg Evangeliary, Magdeburg (?), ca. 1210
Figure 260. Simon baptizing, *Vitae et passiones apostolorum*, Prüfen (Regensburg), ca. 1170–1180 (Munich, Bayerisches Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 13074)

Figure 261. Peter preaching and baptizing, ivory, Carolingian, ninth century
Figure 262. Bartholomew exorcising demons, *Vitae et passiones apostolorum*, Prüfen (Regensburg), ca. 1170–1180 (Munich, Bayerisches Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 13074)

Figure 263. Peter before Herod, mosaic, San Marco, Venice, ca. 1200
Figure 264. St. Heribert’s birth, Shrine of St. Heribert, St. Heribert, Cologne, ca. 1160–1170
Figure 265. Death of St. Martin, Groß St. Martin Evangeliary, Cologne, 1220s (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, ms. 9222, fol. 150r)
Figure 266. Adoration of the Magi (and detail of Virgin), fresco, St. Maria Lyskirchen, Cologne, ca. 1220–1230
Figure 267. Crucifixion, Psalter of Hermann of Thuringia, before 1217 (Stuttgart, Württembergisches Landesbibliothek, Cod. H. B. II, Fol. 24, fol. 73v)
Figure 268. Crucifixion, Missal, Magdeburg, 1214 (Magdeburg, Domgymasium, Codex 152)
Figure 269. St. Bruno, miscellany, St. Pantaleon, Cologne, ca. 1212–1235 (lost; formerly Düsseldorf, Hauptstaatsarchiv, G V 2, fol. 133v)
Figure 270. Arm reliquaries, St. Gereon, Cologne, ca. 1220–1230
Figure 271. True Cross reliquary (Cross removed), St. Matthias, Trier, ca. 1220
Figure 272. True Cross reliquary from St. Maria ad Gradus, Cologne, ca. 1230–1240
Figure 273. True Cross reliquary, Tongres, Basilique Notre-Dame, ca. 1180–1181
Figure 274. St. Nicholas saves three men from execution, fresco, Church of St. Nicholas, Boljana, Sofia, Bulgaria, 1259
Figure 275. Crucifixion, fresco, choir vault, St. Severin, Cologne, ca. 1260–1270
Figure 276. Portal, west choir screen, Naumburg Cathedral, ca. 1250
Figure 277. Helena interrogates the Jews, fresco (restored), Brunswick Cathedral, ca. 1240
Figure 278. Testing of the Cross, fresco (restored), Brunswick Cathedral, ca. 1240
Figure 279. Heraclius encounters angel, Heraclius carries the Cross into Jerusalem, fresco (restored), Brunswick Cathedral, ca. 1240
Figure 280. Heraclius carries the Cross into Jerusalem, Alexander of Bremen, *Expositio in Apocalypsin*, ca. 1280–1290
(Cambridge, University Library, Mm. 5.31, fol. 81v)
Figure 281. Litany from St. Kunibert, ca. 1250 (Darmstadt, Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek Hs. 871, fols. 76r–76v)
Figure 282. Monk Heinrich before St. Margaret, Missal, Cologne, final decades of twelfth century (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 12055, fol. 164v)
Figure 283. SS. Augustine and Nicholas, stained glass window, Middle Rhenish, ca. 1250
Figure 284. Provost Heinrich, stained glass window, St. Margaret, Ardagger, ca. 1224
Figure 285. Canon page, Helmarshausen, ca. 1170
(Münster, Westfälisches Landesmuseum, no signature)
Figure 286. Reliquary for St. Katherine’s oil, St. Kunibert, Cologne, 1220s
Figure 287. Deesis, Psalter of St. Elizabeth, ca. 1201–1207
Figure 288. Altar stair, St. Maria im Kapitol, Cologne, ca. 1050