



Title	The portal sculpture of Perrecy-les-Forges, Brionnais sources and innovations
Author(s)	Tokita Darling, Masuyo; Vallorge, Gilles//French translation from English
Citation	Le renouveau des etudes romanes, 203-226
Issue Date	2000-04
Doc URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2115/74681">http://hdl.handle.net/2115/74681</a>
Type	proceedings
Note	2ème colloque scientifique international de Paray-le-Monial 2-3-4 octobre 1998
Additional Information	There are other files related to this item in HUSCAP. Check the above URL.
File Information	Tokita2000_ENG.pdf (English version (Figures are included in the French version PDF))



[Instructions for use](#)

# *The Portal Sculpture of Perrecy-les-Forges Brionnais Sources and Innovations*

*Masuyo Tokita-Darling*  
Hokkaido University, Japan

The former Benedictine priory church of Perrecy-les-Forges preserves a handsome Romanesque porch. Visitors today are impressed by the orderly ashlar stonework, richly ornamented bases, beautiful foliated capitals, and the solemn sculptural ensemble of the nave portal (Fig. 1, 2). The porch is virtually intact, and exhibits a rare unity of architecture and sculpture.

Despite geographical proximity to Cluny, Perrecy was not a Cluniac institution but one of the most important priories of Fleury. In 876 (or 877), Echarde II, Count of Morvois, bequeathed his territory of Perrecy with a church of St. Peter to Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire, Fleury. The establishment of the priory of Perrecy is recorded in Book III of *Miracula Sancti Benedicti* by Aimoin: when Echarde died and was buried in the monastery of Fleury near the church of Saint Virgin, the brothers of Fleury built a dwelling for themselves in Perrecy; then, relics of St. Benedict, along with other precious relics were transported from Fleury to Perrecy and a church in honor of God, the Virgin and St. Benedict was built. In the following passages of the same chapter Perrecy is referred as « *Patriciacensi coenobis* ». The relation between Perrecy and Fleury remained strong and the priory continued to prosper from the tenth through to twelfth centuries.

The extant basilica, except for the eastern end remodeled in a late Gothic style, was built in the early eleventh century, and in the early twelfth century the basilica was extended westward by constructing a Romanesque porch (Fig. 1). The Charter of Marguerite in the Cartulary of Marcigny records that Marguerite, wife of Hugh of Chaumont, ceded her lands to the priory of Marcigny in the « galilee » of Perrecy. The « galilee » usually meant the west end or porch of a church in the Middle Ages. Although this charter is not dated, it does state that Marguerite became a nun not long after this donation during the time of « *domini Poncii abbatis* ». If this « Ponce » is identical with Abbot Ponce (1109-1122) of Cluny, the document must have been written after the death of Abbot Hugh (1109) and the cession must predate 1122, the year Abbot Ponce's tenure ended. The Chartes of Cluny, no. 3874, dated November of 1108 and the sixtieth year of Abbot Hugh, records similar cessions of lands to Marcigny that were held first at Cluny and second at Perrecy. Even though some uncertainties remain concerning the date of Marguerite's cession in the Perrecy porch and whether the porch was completed when the cession was held, the construction of the Perrecy galilee, at least, must have been well along by 1108.

This date indicates that the Perrecy porch precedes such representative galilees in Burgundy as Vézelay, Cluny III, and Charlieu. When the construction of the Perrecy porch had started, therefore, existing galilees in Southern Burgundy were those of Cluny II, Tournus, Paray, Mont-St-Vincent, and perhaps a part of the narthex of St. Vincent, Mâcon.

Despite Perrecy's dependency to Fleury, the priory's porch represents the beautiful outcome of the local building practice, especially that of Brionnais and Allier (Fig. 2). Coursed ashlar stonework in the interior and exterior walls, low groin vaults, round arches with and without doubleau,

compound supports on cruciform plinths, ornamented bases, and capitals with attached-neckings, all show the characteristics of the region in the phase immediately preceding the dissemination of the architectural style of Cluny III. At Cluny III, the traditional combination of ornamented bases, attached-necking capitals, and round arches were replaced with another set of simple bases of scotia and tori, detached-necking capitals, and pointed arches. Cluny III, which preferred internationally established aesthetics, also employed such ornamental motifs of classic origin as egg and dart and fluted pilasters.

Comparisons of bases, capitals, and portal sculptures of Perrechy with some Brionnais examples will suffice to demonstrate the region's contribution to Perrechy. Several ornamental motifs used for the Perrechy bases derived from bases in Charlieu and Anzy. The execution of the Perrechy bases, however, shows more refined carving techniques. As Edson Armi demonstrated, the closest examples to Perrechy bases are found at Mâcon and Vézelay, where the presence of a common Brionnais workshop is clearly visible. Several pairs of foliate capitals of Perrechy and Vézelay also demonstrate close stylistic relations between the two. The portal sculptures of Perrechy also attest the presence of a workshop that must have been based in southern Burgundy and were active in such places as Avenas, Anzy, and Mâcon. The Christ in Majesty and the flanking seraphim on the tympanum and the archangels on the corbels of Perrechy recall the style of the Avenas altar, the west portal of Anzy, and the Mâcon portal. The style of the lintel and the jamb capitals of Perrechy, on the other hand, is rather closer to that of Vézelay, especially that of the Nativity portal in the narthex. The Perrechy portal, thus, bridges the two styles represented by the Avenas altar and the Vézelay side portals. Both styles are related, with some differences in technical refinement and individual characteristics, to the ambulatory capitals and other fragments from the eastern part of Cluny III. It should also be noted that all of these sculptures related to the eastern part of Cluny III are found in non-Cluniac style churches constructed on a local practice in the Brionnais and the Autunois immediately before the architectural style of Cluny III became an influential model.

### *Portal Sculpture*

The sources and factors that influenced the choice of iconographies of the Perrechy portal, on the other hand, are not so clear as the above. In fact, the Perrechy portal exhibits an unusual conjunction of iconographies, and we wonder whether the sculptural ensemble conveys any coherent themes that can be called a program. The conventional themes of Christ in Majesty for the tympanum and St. Michael fighting against demons for the doorway corbels are conjoined with precocious Passion narratives for the lintel and its flanking extensions, while locally popular iconographies of the three-headed bird confronting the warrior/faun and St. Anthony's quest for St. Paul the First Hermit are selected for the jamb capitals. Were these iconographies conceived together as an ensemble?

Close observations of the portal reveal several anomalies : we notice artificial cuts on the adjacent parts of the corbels and capitals ; both ends of the lintel suffer similar damages ; obviously the lintel was carved out of a different kind of stone from the rest of the portal. Keeping these problems in mind, I took measurements of various parts of the portal (Fig. 3), observed damages, compared the portal configurations of Perrechy with other churches, and requested of Dr. Annie Blanc stone analysis (Fig. 3). The results obtained from these examinations yielded the following : 1. the depth of the jamb capitals was too large for the present location ; 2. the height of the capitals (66 cm) coincides with that of the lintel and its extensions ; 3. the lintel is longer than the diameter of the tympanum ; 4. very fine limestone (limestone micritique) was used exclusively for the lintel ; 5. the rest of the portal was carved in the limestone à entroques, the same stone used for most of the foliate capitals of the porch ; 6. the middle and outer archivolts were designed and executed to conform with the lintel extensions.

Integrating these facts, I propose that the unique configuration of the Perrechy portal as we see it today is the result of a modification of the initial portal scheme. The first plan must have had a design similar to other Burgundian portals. This means that the original lintel block would have

been flanked with capitals as seen on the Anzy portal. At one point in the middle of the portal construction, however, the original lintel block was replaced with the extant one and the initial configuration was modified. That is to say, the capitals were replaced with the horizontal blocks so as to extend the continuous space of the extant lintel. Consequently the capitals were lowered to the corbel level and were squeezed in adjacent to the corbels by cutting off the angles of the capitals about 6 cm and by trimming back the surface of the corbels (Fig. 3).

The discordance between the tympanum and the lintel is not only physical but also observed in their compositional and thematic relationships. Unlike a typical Romanesque lintel, which is usually subordinate to the tympanum in composition and iconography, the Perrecy lintel appears to be independent of the tympanum. Here, the sculptor, or the Passion Master named after the iconographies he carved, uses the continuous space of lintel like a scroll on which the narrative story unfolded in sequence from left to right. The Passion Master revived the linear nature inherent in a frieze by conforming the temporal progressions of the narratives to the horizontal axis of the lintel.

Why was the portal configuration changed? And why was the very fine limestone used exclusively for the lintel when the Passion narratives appear to continue from and to the left and right extensions? Had the extension blocks, which are the same kind of stone as the rest of the portal, originally been one piece prepared for the lintel and then been divided into two when the reconfiguration of the portal had occurred? Perhaps a close observation of the iconographies of the lintel will yield some clues.

### *Description of the Passion Narratives*

The Perrecy Passion narratives unfold, left to right, in a cyclic manner without clear compositional demarcation (Fig. 4-7). After the Last Supper, Christ came with his disciples to the garden called Gethsemane on the Mount of Olives (Matt. 26 :36-46, Mark 14 :32-42, Luke 22 :39-46). We observe a group of nine disciples soundly sleeping (Fig. 4). In the center we find two more disciples. The bearded one seems to be carefully listening to Christ, while the other one awakens his sleeping brethren. Christ with a cross-nimbus holds a large palm branch in his left hand and raises up his right hand as though admonishing his disciples. Behind Christ appears an angel.

The story of the night of the Arrest continues in full scale on the lintel (Fig. 5). On the left, all eleven disciples, barefoot and dressed in long robes, follow Christ at their head. Their left-to-right movement is countered by Judas of Iscariot from the right. Stooping and extending his arms, Judas draws « near to Jesus, for to kiss him » (Luke 22 :47).

Judas is accompanied by a band of soldiers « with lanterns, torches, and weapons » (John 18 :3) (Fig. 5). Occupying the center of the lintel directly beneath the exalted image of Christ is the scene of the Arrest; the soldiers « laid hands on him (Christ), and held him » (Matt. 26 :50; Mark 14 :46). Behind Christ, a soldier with a club grabs Christ by his shoulder as if he is pushing Christ forwards; the next soldier seems to be pointing at Christ in a gesture of accusation. The third soldier with bristled hair, a token of an evil spirit, holds a large lantern and a torch. Another soldier twists around vehemently to rebuke Christ. Christ in contrast stands resignedly among the soldiers. The Arrest of Christ is followed by the concomitant episode of Peter cutting off the ear of Malchus (Matt. 26 :51, Mark 14 :47, Luke 22 :50, John 18 :10) (Fig. 6). Peter's extraordinary size and vehement action set off this scene from the rest. Malchus, with little remaining except for his contour on the stone surface and a part of his shoe, must have been kneeling facing Peter so that his right ear would have been clearly visible to the audience. The diagonal arrangement of club, sword, arms, drapery, the intense movements of Peter and the soldier before the Christ, the irregular density of space between the figures, and the deeply carved folds all heighten the clamor of the night of the Arrest.

The next scene appears to have consisted of three figures : Christ with his cross-nimbus and book, a tall soldier grabbing Christ's shoulder, and a third figure that barely remains (Fig. 6). Old

photographs and a view from the tribune, however, enable us to discern a seated figure facing Christ.

The following scene is also ambiguous (Fig. 7). The figure with a large cross-nimbus and a book must be Christ. A barefoot figure with a nimbus in the far left corner must be one of the disciples. The third figure with a staff is unlikely to be another disciple, because he has no nimbus and wears some kind of footwear. He appears to be talking to the man with partially bristled hair who is dressed in an elaborate short tunic and a mantle. Behind him is another man, who looks almost naked except for a belt, one shoe (sock?), and a piece of fabric hanging over his shoulder. He appears to point out the way where Christ and the two figures are heading. Neither architectural elements nor props that hint at the iconographic setting are included.

What do the last two scenes present? According to the accounts found in the four gospels, Christ was led to Annas, Caiaphas, Pilate and Herod between his Arrest and Crucifixion. The seated figure in the corner must be one of them. The possibility of his being Pilate or Herod, however, seems minute for two reasons. First, it is unlikely that the Passion Master abruptly skipped several episodes to portray « Christ before Pilate », because to this point our cycle has depicted every episode during the Arrest of Christ in sequence. Second, the Flagellation and/or the Bearing of the Cross, the iconographies that usually follow « Christ before Pilate, » are absent on the right extension. Therefore, the seated figure must be either Annas or Caiaphas.

The last scene shows clear movement from left to right as if the story would continue beyond the extension (Fig. 7). The sense of unfinishedness may have stemmed from its nature as a concomitant « connecting » scene. In this regard, the synoptic Gospels recount that Christ was led from the court of Caiaphas to Pilate's hall by the multitude of priests and ancients. If our last scene represents this movement, which we may title « the Way to the Hall of Pilate, » the third figure in front of Christ could be a priest. In this case, the immediately preceding scene on the lintel would be « Christ before Caiaphas ». The fact that the figure before Christ on the right extension has no halo but wears shoes supports this inference. And the man in the elaborate short tunic and the mantle could be Pontius Pilate, who « went out to them » (John, 18 : 29). Though « the Way to the Hall of Pilate » is rare, a cloister capital from the cathedral of Pamplona (Navarre) shows this scene following the Kiss of Judas and Peter cutting off the ear of Malchus.

### *Characteristics of the Perrecy Passion Cycle*

Perrecy's Passion presentation is a harbinger to its monumental cyclic conception and to its purely narrative depiction. These characteristics become evident as we compare Perrecy's with other representative Romanesque Passion cycles such as the cloister capitals from La Daurade, the facade of Saint-Gilles-du-Gard, the portal of Condrieu, ambulatory capitals of Issoire and Saint-Nectaire among others. The comparison also reveals the extraordinary « zoom in » character of our cycle. In other words, at Perrecy the majority of the Passion/Resurrection episodes was omitted in favor of the episodes that occurred during the night of the Arrest.

Under such circumstances, the exterior sculpture of the central radiating chapel of Selles-sur-Cher (Loire-et-Cher) draws our attention as a rare precursor of Perrecy's. Here the same Passion episodes from the night of the Arrest were selected for the continuous horizontal space. Do the artistic relationships of Selles with Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire and Perrecy's dependency on Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire allude to an indirect relationship between these Passion cycles by way of Fleury? Or did the region's rich iconographic sources and experiments spread to southern Burgundy through the Loire? In this regard, we should note the Crucifixion capital from Fautrières executed by the Donjon workshop, which was active on both sides of the Loire. The church of Fautrières was controlled by Perrecy and ultimately belonged to Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire. It is uncertain whether the capital once was one of several Passion episodes. Nonetheless, the close relationship between Perrecy and Fautrières and the narrative sequence from Perrecy's Passion scenes to the Crucifixion capital of Fautrières tempt us to speculate on the possibility that the idea of introducing Passion narratives to public locations may have derived from the Loire and Cher regions, the

center of which was Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire. The purely narrative nature of Perrecy's Passion cycle is exceptional in Burgundy, where only certain Passion iconographies were selected and disposed in a seemingly random fashion without forming a narrative cycle.

In addition to the early date and its « zoom in » character, the depiction of our Passion narratives are contrary to conventional examples. For instance, the focus of the Agony in the Garden in the conventional presentation is the praying Christ. At Perrecy this key element is eliminated in order to emphasize the naked disciples who succumbed to the temptation of sleep. Christ here is not presented as the Prayer in Agony but as the Awakener.

Formal emphasis on the disciples recurs in the next scene, the Arrest of Christ. In the conventional presentation, « a great multitude with swords and staves » (Matt. 26 :47, Mark 14 :43) occupies most of the space and the number of the disciples is either reduced to a few or, except for Peter, expelled from the scene. The Passion Master of Perrecy, in contrast, rendered literally all eleven disciples (Fig. 5), surpassing the number of soldiers represented. The Biblical accounts do not refer to the disciples at the moment of the Arrest, except for recording that « then his disciples leaving him, all fled away » (Matt. 26 :56, Mark 14 :50). Following the Arrest, our cycle depicts Peter's violence which Christ reproached.

The unusual emphasis on the night of the Arrest and the unconventional presentations of the episodes indicate, first, that our Passion cycle was not aimed at a didactic purpose for a general audience, and, second, that the Passion Master does not seem to have copied readily available models for the iconography. As we have examined above, the Perrecy portal was constructed facing the porch, unlike the narthex portals of Charlieu and Cluny III that were originally the portals of the west facades. Perhaps, therefore, characteristics of our cycle may be better understood in light of the architectural context.

The Romanesque porch, or « galilee », had practical, liturgical, and symbolic functions for both laymen and monks. Regarding the liturgical function before the Romanesque period, Prof. Heitz demonstrated that *églises-porches* of the Carolingian period served as a stage for liturgical dramas and processions and that *galilee* and *cripta salvatoris* from the period of the Carolingian *antéglises* rendered the same homage to Christ of the Passion and of the Resurrection. The early tradition was carried to the eleventh-century tower-porch of Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire, the mother house of Perrecy. The Customary of Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire recounts that the Palm Sunday procession ended in the tower porch and how the porch functioned during the celebration of Easter. At Perrecy, we have already noticed that Christ in the Gethsemane scene holds a branch of a palm tree in place of a scroll (Fig. 4). This unusual motif for the iconography implies that, following the liturgical customary of the mother house, the Palm Sunday procession at Perrecy also ended in the porch. Indeed, the use of *galilee* for liturgical processions was widespread. At Cluny, not only the Palm Sunday procession but also the itinerary of regular Sunday processions ended in the vestibule after visiting various stations. This vestibule was called the « galilee ».

It is worthy of notice that most Romanesque *galilees* are found in Benedictine monasteries and that typically a *galilee* had a doorway on the south wall in order to provide a passage between the *galilee* and the cloister. The porch of Perrecy was not an exception ; the oldest extant plan of Perrecy shows a doorway on the south wall of the porch. This doorway is filled in today.

The symbolic significance of the *galilee* in association with Christ's Passion and the Palm Sunday procession was already established in the early twelfth century. A contemporary author, Rupert of Deutz (c.1075-1129) stated the following : « When each Sunday before Easter has been dedicated, by this procession do we signify for ourselves that we ought to go into Galilee, that is into another country to see the Lord with his apostles, ... "so that we will walk in newness of life (Rom. 6)". That is why in processions of this type we always follow our prelates going before us, like the Lord into Galilee, and we appropriately call the place where we end the procession the "Galilee". There is no one who is unaware that this annual procession of palms is a harbinger of the Passion, and that it is for the renewal of our devotion. »

In addition to the liturgical association, the term « galilee » had a metaphoric significance that must have been derived from passages in Matthew 28 : 10-16

*And going quickly, tell ye his disciples that he is risen : and behold he will go before you into Galilee. (Matt. 28 :7)*

*Then Jesus said to them : Fear not. Go, tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, there they shall see me. (Matt. 28 :10)*

*And the eleven disciples went into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. (Matt. 28 :16)*

Galilee, thus, is the very place where Christ appeared first before the disciples after the Resurrection, and commissioned them to teach, convert and baptize all nations. The romanesque galilee located between the secular and sacred spheres was the very space leading men to the house of God. For monks, therefore, as Gardette stated, « comparison was possible between Galilee and the porch where people were convinced to convert ».

Seen from the viewpoint of the cenobites who were to pursue ardently the apostolic profession, especially amid the Benedictine reform movement, the series of events that had taken place in the darkness on the Mount of Olives must have been pivotal. Though the Gospels do not recount the fear and remorse of all the disciples, Peter's penetrating self-reproach was not his alone. Contemporary monks, who, I believe, were the primary readers of the portal sculpture, must have found their own images reflected in the human frailty of the disciples in the night of the Arrest. It can be assumed that the monks were aware of the symbolic reference of going into the galilee to renew one's devotion. Couldn't the formal emphasis on the disciples, especially on Peter, then, be viewed as a visual reminder of the apostles' transmutation from unreliable disciples to the courageous, united apostles? Perrecy's unique Passion cycle may well have been introduced to this location in accordance with its functions and its architectural metaphor.

The innovative introduction of Perrecy's Passion narratives raises fundamental questions concerning whether iconographies of different parts of a Romanesque portal were chosen as an ensemble to form a program and how much the symbolic and practical functions of a particular part of architecture, the galilee in our case, were considered with respect to the relationship between a monumental sculptural ensemble and the use of its space. Several questions I have pointed out in this paper remain unsolved and await further investigation.

#### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aimoin, *Miracula Sancti Benedicti*, II, xv, 35.  
Perard, Étienne, ed., *Recueil de plusieurs pièces curieuses servant à l'histoire de Bourgogne*, Paris, 1664.  
Prou, M., and A. Vidier, *Recueil des Chartes de l'abbaye de St. Benoît-sur-Loire*, 2 vols, Paris, 1900-1937.  
Armi, Edson, *Masons and Sculptors in Romanesque Burgundy : The New Aesthetic of Cluny III*, University Park and London, The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1983.  
Barrès, Henri, *Quelques sculptures de l'église de Perrecy*, 1949.  
–, *Perrecy, son prieuré, son église*, 1957.  
Berland, Jean-Marie, « La place du monastère de Perrecy et de ses églises parmi les prieures de Fleury », *Actes du 109<sup>e</sup> congrès national des sociétés savantes*, Dijon, 1984, p. 621-643.  
Conant, Kenneth J., *Cluny, les églises et la maison du chef d'ordre*, Mâcon, 1968.  
Darling, Masuyo Tokita, « The Foliate Capitals of Perrecy-les-Forges : Implications for Cluny », *Current Studies on Cluny, Gesta*, 27/1 and 2 (1988), p. 73-82.  
–, *The Romanesque Architecture and Sculpture of Perrecy-les-Forges*, Ph. D. Dissertation, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1994.  
–, « On the Portal Sculpture of Perrecy-les-Forges and the Dating of the Ambulatory Capitals of Cluny III », *Bijutsushi* (Journal of the Japan Art History Society), 145 (Oct. 1998), p. 116-135.  
–, « On the Portal Sculpture of Perrecy-les-Forges and the Dating of the Ambulatory Capitals of Cluny III, » *Bijutsushi*, 145 (Oct. 1998), pp. 116-135 (in Japanese).  
Diemer, Peter, *Stil und Iconographie der Kapitelle von Ste Madeleine, Vézelay*, Ph.D. dissertation, Heiderberg, 1975.  
Forsyth, Ilene, « The Vita Apostolica and Romanesque sculpture : Some Preliminary Observations », *Gesta*, 25/1 (1986), p. 75-82.

- Gardette, P., « Étymologies, GALILAEA, “porche, narthex, galerie à l’entrée d’une église” », *Revue de linguistique romane*, 18 (1954), p. 112-115.
- Heitz, Carol, *Recherches sur les rapports entre architecture et liturgie à l’époque carolingienne*, Paris, 1963.
- Thiollier, Félix, ed. in collaboration with Brossard, E., Dechelette, J., Durand, V., and Jeannez, E., *L’art roman à Charlieu et en Brionnais*, Montbrison, 1894.
- Kerber, Bernhard, « Burgund und die Entwicklung der französischen Kathedralskulptur im zwölften Jahrhundert », *Münstersche Studien zur Kunstgeschichte*, vol. 4., Recklinghausen, 1966.
- Oursel, Raymond, « Le rayonnement de Perrecy », *Zodiaque*, 98 (October, 1973), p. 2-11, Pls. 1-18.
- Oursel, Raymond and Anne-Marie Oursel, *Les églises romanes de l’Autunois et du Brionnais*, Mâcon, 1956.
- Pendergast, Carol, *The Romanesque Sculpture of Anzy-le-Duc*. Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1974.
- « Perreci : des moines bénédictins réformés de Perreci en Bourgogne », Entry in Hélyot, ed., *Dictionnaire des ordres religieux*, III, p. 224-228. *Encyclopédie Théologique* 22.
- Salet, Francis, *La Madeleine de Vézelay*, Melun, 1948.
- Stratford, Neil and L. Saulnier, *La sculpture oubliée de Vézelay*, Bibliothèque de la Société française d’archéologie 17, Paris, 1984.
- Vergnolle, Eliane, *Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire et la sculpture du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, 1985.
- Von Lücken, Gottfried, *Die Anfänge der burgundischen Schule, ein Beitrag zum Aufleben der Antike in der Baukunst des XII. Jahrhunderts*, Basel, 1913.

#### NOTES

1. Diocese of Autun, canton of Toulon-sur-Arroux, arrondissement of Charolles, department of Saône-et-Loire.
2. Perrecy was classified as a historic monument in 1862. The first major restoration of the basilica and porch was undertaken by Selmersheim in 1883. See his rapport and devis, dossier no. 1140, the Archives of Monuments historiques, Paris.
3. Étienne Pérard, ed., *Recueil de plusieurs pièces curieuses servant à l’histoire de Bourgogne* (Paris, 1664), V, 51-55; M. Prou and A. Vidier, *Recueil des Chartes de l’abbaye de St. Benoît-sur-Loire*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1900-1937), XXV, p. 59-67. – The Cartulary of Perrecy includes another will of Echard II, dated January of the first year of Charles the Young. See Pérard, *Recueil*, I, p. 46-48; Prou and Vidier, *Recueil des chartes*, XXVII, p. 74-78. Also Jean-Marie Berland, « La place du monastère de Perrecy et de ses églises parmi les prieures de Fleury », *Actes du 109<sup>e</sup> congrès national des sociétés savantes*, Dijon, 1984, p. 625, prefers Prou and Vidier’s dating of 876 to Pérard’s dating to 840.
4. E. de Certain, *Les Miracles de saint Benoît écrits par Adrevald, Aimoin, André de Fleury, Raoul Tortaire et Hugues de Sainte-Marie, moines de Fleury*, Book III by Aimoin, XV, p. 161-162.
5. Masuyo Tokita Darling, « The Romanesque Architecture and Sculpture of Perrecy-les-Forges », (hereafter, « Perrecy-les-Forges »), Ph. D. dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1994, p. 16. Perrecy is also recorded « Patriciacum monasterium » in the next Chapter of Miracula. Also see, Jean-Marie Berland, « La place de monastère de Perrecy et de ses églises parmi les prieures de Fleury », *Actes du 109<sup>e</sup> congrès national des sociétés savantes*, Dijon, 1984, p. 626.
6. André de Fleury, *Vita Gauzlini abbatis Floriacensis monasterii* (annotated and translated into French by R.H. Bautier and G. Labory, *André de Fleury, Vie de Gauzlin, abbé de Fleury* [Paris, 1969]), p. 90-91: « Rodulfus, Patriciacensi prelatus congregationi, ipsum locum plurimum dehonestavit edificium. Ipsam etiam basilicam in meliorem statum reformavit ». Also, « *Quem secutus, Willelmus domum hospitum cauce et arena duxit ad perfectum, haud similem in totius Burgundie ducatum* ».
7. Whether the eleventh-century basilica originally had had a porch/narthex before the present porch was constructed is uncertain. The odd disposition of the turret at the north-western corner of the original north aisle may suggest that there once stood some kind of vestibule adjacent to the westernmost bay of the nave.
8. Jean Richard, *Le Cartulaire de Marcigny-sur-Loire (1045-1144) : essai de reconstruction d’un manuscrit disparu*, Dijon, 1957, p. 171, n. 290, « *Factum solemniter in galilaea monasterii Parriciaci in manu domni Seguini prioris Marciniacensis...* ».
9. *Lexicon Latinitatis Medii Aevi : Praesertim ad res Ecclesiasticas Investigandas Pertinens*, (*Corpus Christianorum : Continuatio Mediaevalis*), Turnholti, 1975, p. 411; Domino du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, IV, p. 15; J. F. Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, Leiden, 1963, p. 460; P. Gardette, « Étymologies, GALILAEA, “porche, narthex, galerie à l’entrée d’une église” », *Revue de linguistique romane*, 18, 1954, p. 112.
10. J. Richard, *Marcigny*, p. 172, « *Illa [Margarita] non multo post saeculum reliquit tempore domni Poncii abbatis* ».
11. A. Bernard and A. Bruel, eds., *Recueil des Chartes de l’Abbaye de Cluny*, Collection des documents inédits sur l’histoire de France, Paris, 1876-1903, V, p. 228, no. 3874. The term « galilee » is not included in the Cluny document. Comparison of the passages in the two sources, however, reveals both accordance and discordance; the names of the father and the husband are in agreement in the two documents, but the wife’s name in the Marcigny Cartulary is recorded as « Margarita » while it is « Luca » in the Cluny document. Though I consulted, with the kind help of Dr. Martine Chauney, the Cluny Index in Bibliothèque municipale, Dijon, under the entries « Luca », « Marguarita », « Hugh of Liebald », and « Hugh of Chaumont », I could not find any clues as to whether « Marguarita » is identical to « Luca ». Jean

Richard dated the Charter of Marguerite to 1108, assuming that it was made as a development and complement of Cluny document no. 3874. See J. Richard, *Marcigny*, p.63, n. 3.

12. Narthexes and porches of Chatel-Montagne, Evreuil, Vouillon, Deols, Flavigny, and Lyon should be mentioned as other important examples outside Burgundy.

13. Masuyo Tokita Darling, «Foliate Capitals of Perreccy-les-Forges: Implications for Cluny III», *Current Studies on Cluny, Gesta*, 27/1 and 2 (1988), p. 77. In Burgundy, the traditional attached-necking structure – the basket of a capital and its necking were carved out of the same block of stone –, was replaced with the detached-necking structure of classic origin – the basket was detached from the necking.

14. M.T. Darling, «Perreccy-les-Forges», *op. cit.*, p. 113-114.

15. M.T. Darling, «Perreccy-les-Forges», *op. cit.*, Fig. 66-96.

16. Edson Armi, *Masons and Sculptors in Romanesque Burgundy: The New Aesthetic of Cluny III*, University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1983, Fig. 11C-11f, 12c-13b.

17. M.T. Darling, «Foliate Capitals of Perreccy-les-Forges», *op. cit.*, Fig. 5-9; 104-105, 108, 114, 116-119, 128-129.

18. F. Salet, *La Madeleine de Vézelay*, Melun, 1948, p. 163-166; Peter Diemer, *Stil und Ikonographie der Kapitelle von Ste Madeleine, Vézelay*, Ph.D. dissertation, Heiderberg, 1975, p. 200-203; Edson Armi, *Masons and Sculptors in Romanesque Burgundy*, 90 ff; M.T. Darling, «Perreccy-les-Forges», *op. cit.*, p. 184-190.

19. M.T. Darling, «Perreccy-les-Forges», *op. cit.*, p. 196-198.

20. M.T. Darling, «A Sculptural Fragment of Cluny III and the Iconography of Three-headed Bird», *Animals and the Symbolic in Mediaeval Art and Literature*, edited by Luuk Houwen. *The Mediaevalia Groningana series*, vol. 18, Groningen, Egbert Forsten, 1997, p. 209-223; Carol Pendergast, «The Cluny Capital of Three-Headed Bird», *Current Studies on Cluny, Gesta*, 27/1 and 2 (1988), p. 31-38.

21. Also Ps. 21:1-8, 13-18; 2 Sam. 15:30-32.

22. Schiller, *Iconography*, II, pls. 206-207, 209-210, 226, 228.

23. The identification is very difficult because, in addition to the poor condition, iconographic confusion between Annas and Caiaphas often occurred in medieval works. For instance, the *Codex Egbert* (Trier cod. 24, fols. 79v and 80v) and the *Gospels of Otto III* (Aachen, fol. 458) illustrate «Christ before Annas» following «the Arrest of Christ», while the *Gospels of Otto III* (Munich, 4453, fol. 247v), the *Book of Pericopes of Heinrich II* (Munich, 4452) and the *Codex Aureus of Echternach* (Germanisches Nationalmuseum Nürnberg, fol. 110v) illustrate «Christ before Caiaphas» following «the Arrest». Moreover, in these Ottonian manuscripts both Annas and Caiaphas are similarly depicted rending their garments. Distinguishing Annas from Caiaphas would be very difficult unless we knew to which Gospel these illuminations

belong or the Ottonian illustrators labeled the protagonists.

24. For example, Luke 22:71 and 23:1 account, «And they said: What need we any further testimony? for we ourselves have heard it from his own mouth. And the whole multitude of them rising up, led him to Pilate».

25. The capital, now in Museo de Navarra, is dated from the mid-twelfth century. Pedro de Palol and Max Hirmer, *Early Medieval Art in Spain*, New York, Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1967, p.156, pl. 140-141.

26. Perreccy's Passion cycle also precedes the mystical writings of such representative authors as Rupert of Deutz (c. 1075-1129), Hugh of St. Victor (1096-1141), and St. Bernard of Clairvau (c. 1090-1153). The mystical writings that immediately preceded are by such authors as Peter Damian (1007-1072), John of Fécamp (d. 1078), Lanfranc (d.1089), and Anselm (1033-1109).

27. Passion episodes absent from Perreccy's cycle are The Entry into Jerusalem, Christ Washing the Disciples' Feet, the Last Supper, the Flagellation, the Way to Calvary, the Crucifixion, the Entombment, the Resurrection, the Three Women at the Tomb, Noli me tangere, the Journey to Emmaus, and Doubting Thomas.

28. M. Aubert, «L'église abbatiale de Selles-sur-Cher», *Bulletin monumental*, 77, 1913, p. 387-403; *idem*, «Selles-sur-Cher», *Congrès archéologique de France* (Blois), 88(1925), p. 205-215. Éliane Vergnolle, *Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire et la sculpture du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, 1985, p. 180-185; *idem*, «L'art des frises dans la vallée de la Loire», in *The Romanesque Frieze and its Spectator*, ed. Deborah Kahn, London, New York, 1992, p. 112-113.

29. One of the oldest Passion iconography for public locations is found at Saint-Mexme, Chinon (Indre-et-Loire); E. Vergnolle, *L'art roman en France*, Paris, 1994, p.187.

30. The capital (H. 35.5cm, W. 34cm, D. 18cm) is too small to have been a nave capital or an ambulatory capital on a free-standing column. The three-sided carving and the symmetrical composition with an emphasis on the Passion instruments suggest that the capital might have once been disposed next to or between the central windows in the apse behind the altar.

31. Neil Stratford, «Le portail roman de Neuilly-en-Donjon», *Congrès archéologique de France*, Bourbonnais, 1988, p. 311-338.

32. Other than stone sculpture, I should mention two detached folios of full-page drawing from the treasure of Auxerre cathedral. One folio depicts the Crucifixion framed by sixteen Passion/Resurrection scenes and the other shows an Apocalyptic vision of Christ in Majesty framed by the twenty-four elders. Maurice Prou, «Deux dessins du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle au trésor de l'église Saint-Étienne d'Auxerre», *Gazette archéologique*, 12 (1887), p. 138-144; M. Schapiro, «Two Romanesque Drawings in Auxerre and Some Iconographic Problems», in *Studies in Art and Literature for Belle Da Costa Greene* (1954) and reprinted in M. Schapiro, *Romanesque Art*, New York, 1977, p. 306-327, Fig. 2-3.

33. The lintel of the west portal of Cluny III may have depicted in sequence the Three Women at the Tomb, the Ascension, and the Journey to Emmaus, though little

evidence is left except for some fragments of sleeping soldiers and the apostles. See, K. Conant, *Cluny*, Fig. 202-208. Some of these iconographies with or without Noli me tangere and the Suicide of Judas are disposed on capitals at Vézelay, Autun, Saulieu, and Moûtiers-Saint-Jean. Also the Last Supper combined with Christ Washing the Disciple's Feet was selected for several lintels in Brionnais. These Burgundian examples, however, post-date Perrecy's.

34. Gertrud Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art*, Vol. 2, *The Passion of Jesus Christ*, trans. J. Seligman, London, 1972, p. 51-56.

35. Comparisons of Perrecy's Passion depiction with those of Ottonian and Byzantine manuscripts and ivory plaques lead us to the negative conclusion that they did not serve as a direct model for Perrecy.

36. Medieval galilee served as a shelter for pilgrims and beggars, as a place for formalizing legislative actions, as ritualized space for exorcisms and reconciliation of penitents, as a place for lay burials, and as a « cushion » or transitional space to maintain the monastic life. M.T. Darling, « Perrecy-les-Forges », *op. cit.*, chapter II, p. 81-95. – P. Gardette, « Étymologies, GALILAEA, “porche, narthex, galerie à l'entrée d'une église” », *Revue de linguistique romane*, 18, 1954, p. 112.

37. Carol Heitz, *Recherches sur les rapports entre architecture et liturgie à l'époque carolingienne*, Paris, 1963, p. 77ff and p. 209.

38. This is based on E. Vergnolle, *Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire, op. cit.*, p. 34-36.

39. In this regard, Vergnolle infers that the earliest examples of Christ's Entry into Jerusalem on the west facade of the tower-porch of Saint-Paul of Cormery (Indre-et-Loire) may relate to the Palm Sunday procession which ended in the galilee-porch. Vergnolle, *op. cit.*, p. 174-175, Fig. 171.

40. *Consuetudines Farfenses*, II, I. Bruno Albers, *Consuetudines Monasticae*, I, p. 44. Also, Heitz, « Réflexions sur l'architecture clunisienne », *Revue de l'art*, 15, 1972, p. 89.

41. *Consuetudines Cluniacenses*, I, X; Pl. 149, p. 654; K. Conant, *Cluny*, p. 60.

42. A plan of the priory and the layout of monastic complex, ca. 1760. The original plan is now kept in the Bibliothèque municipale, Dijon. I am indebted to Dr. Martine Chauney for discovering this plan in July 1983.

43. Rupertus Abbas Tuitiensis, *De divinis officiis libri XII*. Pl. 170, p. 130-131, chap. 8.

44. The iconographic program of the central portal of the Vézelay narthex conveys this aspect of the galilee eloquently. M.T. Darling, « Functions of Romanesque Galilee and The Pentecost Iconography of Vézelay » (in Japanese), *Festschrift für Prof. Sahoko Tsuji zum 65 Geburtstag* (Tokyo: Chuo-Koron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1996), p. 79-106.