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ABSTRACT

The late twelfth-century choir screen, or pontile, erected by the Campionesi in Modena Cathedral is a masterpiece of Italian Romanesque sculpture. The pontile separated the faithful in the nave from the clergy in the sanctuary. It served as a backdrop for liturgical dramas while the Eucharistic rite took place behind its balustrade carved with images of Christ’s Passion. Similar to other pieces of medieval church furniture, Modena’s screen was subject to alterations, removal, and reconstruction during its long history. Although discussed in general publications and in local studies of the cathedral, the pontile’s original form and its modern reconstruction have never received a detailed analysis. This in-depth study will provide new insight into one of the most complete and important of these Romanesque liturgical furnishings to survive.

My dissertation focuses on reconstructing the pontile’s original narrative program by relating the images to their religious and liturgical context and setting them against the background of the secular concerns faced by the bishop during his loss of power to the emerging city-state. Moreover, I examine Modena’s pontile in conjunction with the fragments of other screens in Northern Italy, Romanesque pulpits in the nearby region of Tuscany, and Gothic screens in Northern Europe. These studies are supplemented by comparisons with other Romanesque Passion cycles that may have informed the choice of images found on the pontile. By studying primary liturgical sources, like a contemporary sacramentary from Modena, and examining secondary sources, completing a catalogue of the existing fragments of the original structure, recording the monument’s complex history, and analyzing the issues and rites addressed by the images, I provide a new reconstruction of the pontile as it stood in the late twelfth century. Our understanding of the clergy’s perception of this structure is further enhanced by a discussion and reconstruction of the first choir screen erected by Wiligelmo in this building and replaced by the
Campionesi’s work. This analysis of successive change within the cathedral will pave the way for a better understanding of the transition from these large carved ensembles in stone to the painted wooden Passion altarpieces of the Renaissance.
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INTRODUCTION

MODENA’S PONTILE AND RESEARCH ON LITURGICAL FURNISHINGS

Raised platforms for speaking have been important for religious orators throughout history. In Islamic mosques *minbars* are used to recite the Friday sermon, while rabbis stand on *bimahs* for the reading of the Torah in synagogues. Holy men of the Bible also sought elevated positions from which to spread the word of God:

> Then Estras the priest brought the law before the multitude of men and women, and all those that could understand, on the first day of the seventh month…..And Estras the scribe stood upon a step of wood, which he had made to speak upon…..And Estras opened the book before all the people: for he was above all the people (Nehemiah 8:2-5).

The medieval clergy who succeeded the Old and New Testament preachers also employed raised sites for speaking. Elevated liturgical furnishings were used in churches from the Early Christian period onwards in order to raise speakers above the gathered congregations. As the converted populations became larger and the Church richer, such platforms became more varied, grand, and highly decorated pieces of furniture. These prominent fixtures for standing and separating various groups included ambos, pulpits, and choir screens. Despite the salience of the decoration and figural narratives located on these furnishings within medieval churches, interest in interior furniture has been overshadowed, to date, by a focus on exterior sculptural programmes.

This study delves into the inner realm of the church through an examination of the sculpted *pontile*, or choir screen, of Modena Cathedral (Figs. 1 and 120), a piece of furniture that was erected by architects/sculptors called the Campionesi between 1170 and 1184 C.E. Despite the fact that this *pontile* is one of the most complete surviving screens with an elaborate narrative cycle in Northern Italy, it has been the object of only a series of brief studies; many of these investigations are embedded within larger works dedicated to the entire cathedral or are essays focused on one aspect of the screen such as its formal
properties or place within the history of the church. Although these endeavours have provided valuable information about the *pontile*, they are typical of the haphazard treatment that medieval liturgical furnishings have received in research. Further, examination of this screen is fraught with the same difficulties that hinder the research concerning church furniture in France, England, and Germany.

The largest impediment for the study of liturgical furniture is the fragmentary state of the remains. During the centuries after their creation, furnishings were altered as the clergy sought to keep their building and figural programmes in tandem with changing liturgical needs and new theological concerns. In Modena, between 1208 and 1225, a later generation of the Campionesi artists were instructed to insert a projecting pulpit with a Blessing Christ, the Evangelists, and the Doctors of the Church into the balustrade, which required the removal of some of the original narrative sculptures. This partial destruction raises many questions about the original appearance of the *pontile* that have not been satisfactorily answered.

Alterations, however, were not the cause of most of the dismantling of furnishings. Many pieces of Italian church furniture, such as ambos and pulpits, were removed to make room for newer monuments. Moreover, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, clergy, reacting to the new doctrines formulated during the Council of Trent (1545-63), often completely removed screens that concealed the sanctuary and consequently the transformation of the wine and wafer into the blood and body of Christ. With the removal of these visual impediments, theologians sought to encourage the laity’s participation in the miracle of Transubstantiation. As a result, many screens were torn down including those in the cathedrals of Parma (1566) and Modena (1593). The dismantling of the latter *pontile* was proposed and fervently supported by Bishop Giulio Canano (1591-2), but the project was actually executed after his death by his successor Bishop Gasparo Sillingardi (1593-1607). At that time, the choir screen most likely was replaced by an iron railing similar to the one seen in photographs of Modena’s east end taken prior to the early twentieth-century reconstruction efforts (Fig. 2). This transparent barrier would have maintained the separation of the clergy and congregation while allowing the faithful a clear view of the liturgy and the high altar. The sculptures removed from the *pontile* were scattered and stored in various places throughout the church. For example, the panels with the evangelist symbols were immured beside the entrances to the crypt.

In response to the fragmentary physical evidence of medieval liturgical furniture, art historians have focused on stylistic arguments and documentary sources in order preserve and present the surviving
remains. This stylistic approach has been very useful for dating various pieces from different monuments, which were often removed from their original locations and set within the walls or floors of their respective churches, or attached to other fragments in later monuments. In this way, scholars have created a catalogue of pieces from which to draw comparisons and parallels between medieval furnishings across Italy. Unfortunately, few studies have sprung from this foundation to broach functional, thematic, liturgical, or iconographic topics. This situation is true for Modena’s pontile. Although some researchers have discussed the iconography found on the parapet and the later pulpit, most scholarship has been concerned with issues of dating of fragments, based on the stylistic analyses of the various pieces used for the early-twentieth-century reconstruction of the structure.

A second problem arises from our lack of understanding of the historical development of church furniture, a situation that hinders both the study of all of its functions, as well as the clergy’s and laity’s perceptions of these monuments. In their article on the jubé, or choir screen of Cluny III, C. Edson Armi and Elizabeth Bradford Smith provided a broad summary of the development of choir screen arrangements in the West. They outlined a general trend of change from low screens of the Early Christian period to high barriers in the later Middle Ages. According to their research, the twelfth century was a period of inconsistency within this development because both low and high screens were being erected with the higher monuments dominating by the thirteenth century. Thus, Modena’s tall, late-twelfth-century pontile that blocked the laity’s view of the sacred east end fits within the trend toward increasing height. Furthermore, Modena’s choir screen is typical of furnishings erected within its region during the medieval period. Unlike Central and Southern Italian churches that were equipped with two pulpits, one each on the north and south sides of the nave, religious buildings of Northern Italy tended to house only one speaker’s platform, as in the case of Modena Cathedral.

Armi and Smith identified a third problem for scholars studying liturgical furnishings; during the Middle Ages, writers used words interchangeably that today we use to designate different types of furniture, creating confusion in the mind of the modern reader. For example, in medieval French texts the words pulpitum and jubé were used to indicate a pulpit and screen respectively, as the terms are employed today, but each one was also used to describe a larger entity comprised of both a screen and a pulpit. Since manuscripts very rarely include textual or visual descriptions of furniture, scholars cannot easily
visualize and reconstruct to what the words refer, beyond the general idea of a raised platform. In the case of the Campionesi’s screen in Modena, all of the scant written references to the structure are from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, long after the period of its construction. While sixteenth-century writings refer to the screen as a “pontile,” one fifteenth-century author more vaguely designated it as “the place where the epistles and Gospels were sung,” a purpose that it most likely served from its inception since furnishings throughout the West had been used for these tasks. Unfortunately, the chroniclers did not amplify these terms with descriptions that would aid our attempts to reconstruct the pontile’s appearance.

Another complication with regards to the study of choir screens is the lack of knowledge about the development and character of the liturgy at certain times and in specific regions, as well as its relationship to the furniture used during the different rites. Although the Roman Mass was celebrated throughout the West, it was adapted to local architecture and geography. According to Armi and Smith, the change to higher barriers in the twelfth-century, when the Campionesi erected their pontile, did not seem to reflect a change in the liturgy. Nonetheless, Margo Fassler noted that by the twelfth century, each part of the Mass had multi-layered symbolic associations; this liturgical symbolism influenced the choice of images that decorated church furnishings and enhanced the laity’s experience of the services and Sacraments. Her observation provides a means to link the sculptures of the Passion and Old Testament found on the screen in Modena Cathedral to the Roman Mass and special liturgical festivals. This association will aid in explaining some of the interpretations of the images that comprise the pontile.

Until recently, choir screens were usually assigned the narrowly defined function of a speaking platform. In addition, scholars have stressed their role as a barrier and physical separator of the clergy, who performed the religious rites in the most sacred realm of the church, from the laity, who gathered in the nave and side aisles. Moreover, researchers have shown that the separate spaces created by the pontile within the building had symbolic significance: the sacred sphere of the altar was reserved for the clergy and considered the highest level, the partially permeable choir was a middle zone, while the more secular nave of the laity was the lowest space in the hierarchy. In an elevated sanctuary over a hall crypt, as in the case of Modena Cathedral (Figs. 3 and 120) and many Ottonian and North Italian Romanesque churches, the pontile’s position in between the most and least sacred realms of the building suggests that these large structures were probably used for a variety of purposes and not just for reading the Gospels. Unfortunately,
we have no specific written documentation for other uses of the *pontile* in Modena Cathedral. By studying other choir screens in conjunction with the Campionesi’s *pontile*, we may come to understand how the monument was integral to the architecture and life of the cathedral as well as the messages the clergy intended to send to the laity and each other.

In accord with my own study of Modena’s *pontile* as a threshold or physical point of transition between two separate spheres of the building, Jaqueline E. Jung’s recent article on the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Gothic screens of Northern Europe raises questions concerning the interpretation of screens as simple barriers used for hiding the mystery of the Mass.²² Jung argues that while the *jubé* literally divided space within the church, it also acted as a site of physical interaction between the clergy and laity: the faithful were often allowed to pass through the screen to partake in various religious rites.²³ Screens were also used for the elevation of the host, reading of sermons, displaying of relics, greeting of the faithful by the newly elected bishop, and pronouncement of legal announcements of both religious and secular content.²⁴ Furthermore, the physical division of the church seemed to increase the faithful’s yearning to be close to the holy and thus heightened their experience of the Mass.²⁵ I would caution, however, that this fluid exchange was carefully regulated by the clergy and will argue that they could adjust the permeability of the screen to suit their needs and as a statement of power.

Besides the physical interaction between the clergy and laity in the area of the *pontile*, visual communication amongst these two groups also occurred through the images that were represented on the balustrade. Based on reception theories, this visual contact and its intended effect will be the primary focus of this current study. The ecclesiastics would have chosen the subjects represented on the *pontile* and used the prominent imagery to engage the faithful who gathered in the church. Furthermore, the clergy could have used this opportunity to propound not only theological doctrines, but to address more temporal concerns such as the rise of heresies and the role of the church within the changing landscape of civic rule.

In cathedrals, such as that of Modena, these religious and temporal issues are tied together by one important thread – the bishop, who was the leader of both the religious and secular community until the rise of the commune.²⁶ The cathedral was his church: he performed the major services of the year at its high altar, he was responsible for enforcing correct doctrines in the face of heresies, and he was in charge of ensuring the safety of the larger mobile community of pilgrims who passed through his church as they
stopped during their travels along the *Via Emilia* and *Via Romea* to Rome (Fig. 4). By examining the screen’s sculptures in relation to the bishop and the concerns of the religious community, we can begin to understand the ideas and perceptions binding the *pontile* to his church, flock, and canons.

A study of Modena’s screen opens the way to a better understanding of all *pontili* in Northern Italy and the visual uses of choir screens in general. Despite its tumultuous history, the Campionesi’s creation is the most complete of such ensembles to survive from the Romanesque period within the region.27 As a result, it has the potential to provide scholars with a wealth of information about the physical forms of church furniture and their iconographic ties to the liturgy and concerns of the bishop and his canons. This study will focus on the original twelfth-century monument as it stood before the addition of the pulpit in the thirteenth century. It will involve an examination of the iconography of the *pontile* in relation to the bishop, patron saint, heresies, and political struggles as well as the choir screen’s physical setting within the building. This analysis will culminate in a proposed reconstruction the *pontile* including suggestions for the missing narrative pieces.

In chapter one, I will begin by introducing the *pontile*, its history, and its various figurative sculptures. The importance of the Passion narrative also will be addressed as the carvings are introduced in detail. Because of the fragmentary state of the structure, this iconographic analysis will be supplemented by comparative examples, including other Northern Italian *pontili*, as well as the abundant sculpted pulpits from the nearby region of Tuscany, and the Gothic choir screens from Northern Europe. While these other types of liturgical furnishings vary slightly in form, many of them served the same functions; they were raised platforms for preaching and reading the Gospels that partially or fully concealed the sanctuary from view. In addition, there are many thematic and stylistic parallels between furnishings that will be informative for understanding Modena’s structure.28 This analysis will be further supplemented by an iconographic comparison of the carvings of the Campionesi and the Passion friezes on churches in the area of Provence. Due to stylistic similarities, scholars have often compared these monuments, but this study also will reveal the unique qualities of the compositions designed by the artists in Modena.

The material of chapter two will move from the general survey of the *pontile* to an examination of the connections found between the imagery of the screen and the events that took place within and around the cathedral. It will focus on the *pontile*’s associations with the liturgy, particularly the important feasts
when the bishop presided over the rites. Dorothy Glass has shown that although Southern Italian pulpits have minimal sculptural programmes, their imagery was tied to the most important services of the year, namely those of Christmas and Easter. The extensive narrative on the pontile of Modena Cathedral reveals that it is no different. Having located a sacramentary produced in Modena around the time that the choir screen was raised, I will use it to examine the rite of the High Mass in relation to the sculptures of the Passion; in addition, various liturgical dramas that were enacted on special religious days will be considered in order to fully understand the liturgical implications of the sculpted narrative. While examining the liturgy, I will scrutinize the ways in which the imagery on the pontile became a visual substitute for those sacrificial elements, which the laity usually could not see or touch. I will argue that since the choir screen prevented the faithful from seeing the altar and the moment of the transformation of the bread into the body of Christ, the screen also became a substitute for the altarpiece, the viewing of transubstantiation, and even the partaking of the Eucharist.

After examining the images’ relationship to the sacred events that took place within the cathedral, in chapter three I will explore the more secular-religious concerns addressed by the sculptures. Here, ties between the Campionesi’s images and the clergy’s, especially the bishop’s, views of events taking place in the city outside of the church’s walls will be addressed. The turning point from the Mass to these more temporal concerns will be provided by the relics of the patron saint, San Geminiano. I will consider the importance of this figure for the local community and pilgrims, keeping in mind that the cathedral’s patron was once a bishop of Modena and thus of special importance to the reigning episcopal leader. During his life, this saint was also a staunch supporter of orthodoxy, an important aspect of his hagiography, considering that in the late twelfth century a number of heretical movements arose in Northern Italy and nearby Provence. The similarities between the imagery on the pontile of Modena and on the façades of churches in Southern France will be explored to show how the Passion narrative propounded orthodoxy and refuted the errors of heretics to a captive audience of the faithful who gathered in the nave. In addition, Maureen Miller has shown convincingly that heresy was not as narrowly defined as it is today. In the face of a rising commune that was slowly stealing secular powers from the bishop, the papacy expanded its definition of heresy to include not only religious dissidents, but also those who engaged in political disobedience to the bishop. By wielding the threat of excommunication over civic rulers, episcopal
leaders sought to maintain their influence over the secular sphere of the city. The pontile’s visual programme will be studied for reflections of this tension between the church representatives and laity.

Chapter four will focus on the first choir screen erected in this cathedral, the predecessor to that of the Campionesi. This pontile would have marked the edge of the raised choir built by Lanfranco, consecrated in 1106; its original form, however, has been questioned. Although later disputed, Arturo Carlo Quintavalle’s proposal that the Genesis scenes by Wiligelmo, currently immured in the façade (Fig. 15), formed this first screen has validity. A brief examination of the archaeological evidence from within the cathedral, along with a study of Northern Italian church façades and comparisons with the eastern ends of other churches within Countess Matilda’s territories will reveal the merit of Quintavalle’s theory. This section will further encompass a hypothetical reconstruction of the original presbytery of 1106 when Wiligelmo and Lanfranco had completed their work in this eastern portion of the cathedral. The earthquake of 1117 may explain the movement of those sculptures from the interior of the church to the façade. When the Campionesi, arrived in the second half of the twelfth century, they refashioned the east end and erected the sculpted pontile of this study. The changes in theological concerns involving the rising preoccupation with Christ’s body suggest the clergy’s need for a shift from an Old to a New Testament programme in order to actively engage the congregation during the religious rituals performed within the cathedral.

Chapter five will centre on a reconstruction of the Campionesi’s screen in its original form. This proposal will first approach the pontile as an appendage of the architecture in order to determine its physical parameters. Then, based on the discussions of liturgical and secular-religious themes outlined above, I will suggest which Passion scenes may have originally comprised the approximately 2.30m of the balustrade later consumed by the thirteenth-century pulpit and another 1.15m filled with plain marble panels in the current reconstruction. I also will tackle the placement of the supports of the pontile as well as discuss the arrangement of the smaller pieces of sculpture currently set between the crypt entrances.

This study cannot build a complete picture of every original aspect of this large and complex monument. Yet, by examining the interrelationship between formal, liturgical, and thematic threads of its sculptural programme, we can move beyond the earlier scattered studies of the pontile to a more thorough understanding of this structure within the sacred and secular spheres of the medieval church. Furthermore, this investigation will reveal some of the intimate connections between choir screens and the altars behind
and below them. This relationship may help to explain the development of monumental altarpieces at the expense of choir screens in Italy during later eras as well as provide a basis for explaining how the alterations to the east end of the church reflect the changing needs of the clergy and liturgy from the twelfth through the twentieth centuries.


5Barrachi, 130. Tommaso Sandonnini believed that a marble balustrade replaced the dismantled pontile. Barrachi has convincingly shown that such a structure would contradict the reasons for dismantling the original screen; in addition he found in the cathedral chronicles a reference to the purchase of iron, which was used most likely to replace the pontile with an iron grating, Barrachi, 130. “Per far tornare al m’da Santo Antonio la ferrata” (F.70, c.19) appears in an entry of April 21, 1594, Barrachi, 130.

6At the same time, the altar was moved towards the west in order to make it more accessible to the people, Baracchi, 124. The altar was rededicated on April 30, 1594, Baracchi, 130.

7The choir screens of Italy, in particular, appear to have been overlooked in scholarly studies due to the survival of fewer remains than in places North of the Alps. For example, in his study of Christian altars and their environs, Braun mentioned that choir screens were standard furnishings in France, Holland, Germany and Spain, Joseph Braun, Der christliche Altar in seiner gesichtlichen Entwicklung, vol.1 (Munich: Alte Meister Guenther Koch & Co., 1924): 397-398. In contrast, he did not discuss the pontili of Northern Italy, although he did mention the survival of ambos in Southern Italy, Braun 398-399.


10Armi and Smith, 561. Delmastro and Vacchero agreed with this observation of the variety of furnishings employed until the thirteenth century when tall screens became the norm, Delmastro and Vacchero, 55. The debate about the origins of tall Gothic choir screens has not been resolved. According to Marcia B. Hall, Rohault de Fleury claimed they were related to the Byzantine iconostases, or tall screens covered with icons, but Hall herself feels that there is a stronger connection between the high Gothic screens, that are more like walled gateways, and the raised presbyteries with low screens found in


12 Armi and Smith, 561. This situation persists in today’s scholarship where ambo and pulpit are sometimes used interchangeably or to refer to two different types of liturgical furnishings.

13 Armi and Smith, 561.

14 One exception to this general trend is the Exultet Rolls produced in Southern Italy from the eleventh through thirteenth centuries. These scrolls contained the text for blessing the candle during the Holy Saturday services. The illustrations contain a variety of images related to this event including representations of the reading of the scrolls by the deacons. The latter figures are shown with the necessary liturgical furnishings including generic representations of the candelabra, ambos and pulpits. Unfortunately, to date, no such medieval images of Northern Italian screens have been found. For more information on Exultet Rolls see: Myrtilla Avery, *The Exultet Rolls of South Italy*, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1936), Thomas Forest Kelley, *The Exultet in Southern Italy* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), and Giulia Orofino and Oronzo Pecere, eds., *Exultet: Rotoli liturgici del medioevo meridionale* (Roma: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1994).

15 Throughout the sixteenth century, the word “pontile” was spelled with one or two “l”s” depending on the writer. References to the maintenance of the screen used this term. For example, an entry in a chronicle on the fifth of December 1559, stated “per coglierie laqua quando lavarano le figure del pontillo L.2.4.4.” (F.68, c.43), Barrachi, 123. All of the authors who wrote about the logistics of removing the screen used this word. One example, a later chronicle from the first of April 1593, stated, “spesa fatta intorno al primo tassello d’asse fatto ad ambi li lati dell’altare maggiore dal salegato del pontile sino alle sedie del coro” (F.70, Reg.1592 to 1595, c.1v), Barrachi, 124. Today, the term refers to the architectural element of a gallery set on columns across the central nave separating the choir from the remainder of the church.


18 Armi and Smith, 561.

Hall, “The Tramezzo,” 339. In the sixteenth century when the screens were being destroyed, Vincenzo Borghini discussed this hierarchy, Hall, “The Tramezzo,” 339. Jeffrey F. Hamburger noted that the three divisions of space closely corresponded to Suso’s (c.1295-1366) discussion of the three separate spheres from most private to most public, Jeffrey F. Hamburger, “The Use of Images in the Pastoral Care of Nuns: The Case of Heinrich Suso and the Dominicans,” *Art Bulletin* 71 (1989): 20-45.

One famous example of this type of elevated presbytery over a hall crypt is found in the Ottonian church of St. Michael’s at Hildesheims (c.1015). This model is very different from the Cluniac or French pilgrimage church model in which ambulatories were used to navigate people around the sacred east end in order to visit relics.


Jung, 627.

Elizabeth C. Parker, *The Descent from the Cross: Its Relation to the Extra-Liturgical "Depositio" Drama* (New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc., 1978) 137 and Jung, 629. Jung based her research on Hall’s suggestion that screens could be a point of communication between clergy and laity, Hall, “The Tramezzo,” 339. On a practical note, Jung also noted that the physical barriers cut down on the chilling drafts that swept through the large Gothic churches in Germany, Jung, 629.

Jung, 628.

Two bishops ruled during the time of the pontile’s creation: Ugo (1173-1178) and Ardizzone (1178-1194). For a complete list of the bishops of Modena Cathedral, see: Giuseppe Pistoni, *I Palazzo Arcivescovile di Modena* (Modena: Aedes Muratoriana, 1976): 98-99. The bishops were aided by fourteen canons.

Smaller fragmentary remains of pontili can be found in Parma Cathedral (1178; Figs. 5-10), the Church of San Zeno in Verona (twelfth century; Figs. 11-12) and the Church of Sant’Ambrogio in Milan (early twelfth century; Fig. 13), while a Gothic pontile was reconstructed in the Abbey Church of Vezzolano (c.1220-30; Fig. 14). Screens with decorative ornament survive in the Veneto, such as those of San Marco and Torcello in Venice.


CHAPTER 1
THE PONTILE: ITS PAST AND THE PASSION CYCLE

1.1 THE PHYSICAL EVIDENCE AND ITS MEDIEVAL COUNTERPARTS

At the heart of the medieval city of Modena stands the cathedral dedicated to the fourth-century Bishop San Geminianus (Fig. 15). Erected on the Via Emilia, the major pilgrimage route that led through Northern Italy to Rome (Fig. 4), the cathedral and its saint were the focal point for groups of pilgrims travelling to and from the Holy City, as well as for the local religious community. Aware of the importance of their church, the citizens and the canons hired the “miraculous craftsman” Lanfranco to design and oversee the construction of their grand building (1099-1120), while the “worthy” sculptor, Wiligelmo, was hired to decorate both the interior and exterior of the cathedral.

Like so many medieval religious monuments, this church was altered and adapted to the changing needs of the bishop and his faithful followers several times from its inception to the present. One important feature that was modified on more than one occasion was a masterful ensemble of Italian Romanesque sculpture: a choir screen, or pontile, carved by an artistic family from Campione, the Campionesi, in the late twelfth century (Fig. 1). In Romanesque churches with raised choirs, the pontile served as an elevated sculpted balustrade that separated the nave where the faithful stood, from the choir where the high altar and clergy were located (Figs. 3 and 120). The pontile also projected over the arched entrances to the sacred crypt where the precious relics of the saints were housed and venerated beneath the choir. On account of its raised and thus highly visible position, the screen was the site for preaching, for reading the gospels and epistles, as well as for the elevation of the Eucharist. Furthermore, because of its location at the junction of the nave, choir, and crypt, the pontile was a liminal space or a point of transition from one realm to another; here the clergy and laity visually and physically interacted and were transformed by having
performed the sacred liturgy, experienced the Eucharist, or ascended from the crypt after visiting the relics that had aided a miracle. Therefore, these screens marked an important transitional site within the church and were ideal places for elaborate visual programmes.

Modena's pontile most likely spanned the entire width of the nave in order to create an effective visual barrier to the sacred choir area and thus heighten the mystery associated with the performance of the High Mass. The clergy entered the sanctuary via the sacristy on the northern side of the choir or by mounting one of the sets of stairs in the side aisles, one on either end of the building. The faithful could enter the crypt by descending the stairs under the projecting screen and passing beneath one of the three large arches located under the pontile. This design recalls that of Northern European choir screens, like the one marking the east end of Naumburg Cathedral (c.1230); thus, Modena Cathedral’s structure falls into the category of Kryptenlettner, a designation made by Erika Doberer in her study of the different kinds of lettners, or screens located in Germany, and jubés, or choir barriers found in France. The Kryptenlettner ties the raised choir and the nave together by disguising the meeting point of the floor and crypt ceiling. Therefore, through its position within the church, the pontile’s opaque surface united the upper and lower spaces of the eastern end into a unified whole.

Although exhibiting some similarities to the screens of Northern Europe, Modena’s twelfth-century pontile has a definite Italian character in the use of atlantes and lions with prey as bases for the columns. The former wear workmen’s belts and are seated with crossed legs and hunched backs that today support the props of a later pulpit (Fig. 17). Beneath the balustrade, beginning on the liturgical right, the first lion stands over an ox, holding the animal’s head in its front claws (Fig. 18). The second lion crushes an equestrian knight as he falls backwards under the beast’s body; he thrusts his sword into the beast’s mane, while his horse’s head is pinned by the giant forepaws (Fig. 19). The third roaring cat pins down another knight in chain mail. The animal’s front paws press down on the man’s shoulders, forcing him onto his back (Fig. 20). The armour each of these warriors wears mimics that worn by knights at the close of the twelfth century. The fourth and last lion pins down a two-headed dragon that twists and spirals under its conqueror’s body (Fig. 21).

The use of beasts and hunchbacks holding vertical supports recalls the popular format for twelfth-century church doorways first established in Northern Italy: lion-, gryphon-, or atlant-bearing columns
supporting a porch. Examples of this type of entryway are found at Modena (c.1106-17; Fig. 15), Piacenza (1122-32), Ferrara (c.1135-46), and Parma (c.1178-1200). Portals, as sites of announcements and legal proceedings, would have made an appropriate model for designing liturgical furniture from which the word of God was proclaimed. Because of their royal and legal connotations, lions also became popular supports for a variety of furnishings such as paschal candelabra (e.g. Cappella Palatina, c.1170-90), bishop’s thrones (e.g. footstool of the Bari throne, 1197), pulpits (e.g. Barga Cathedral, 1256), and pontili (e.g. Parma Cathedral, 1178; Fig. 10 and Chur Cathedral, 1178).

The choir screen of Modena Cathedral is further supported at its back edge by four corbels (Figs. 22-24). The front of each one is decorated with an acrobat. The two corbels on the ends have a second, longer side visible from the aisles. The piece on the northern end bears a lion consuming the sinful acrobat seen on the front face. The one on the southern side portrays Samson battling the lion, an Old Testament type for Christ’s journey into Limbo.

Returning to the columns, each one is topped by a decorated capital. Again, beginning on the liturgical right, the first two capitals, as well as the southernmost one, bear leafy vines ultimately based on the Corinthian capitals of ancient Rome (Fig. 25). The remaining three are covered with figurative stories. The second and the last depict the Old Testament events of the Sacrifice of Isaac and Daniel in the Lion’s Den (Figs. 26-27). The remaining figural capital, the third from the liturgical right, shows the Martyrdom of St. Lawrence (Fig. 28).

These capitals support the balustrade sculpted with scenes from Christ’s Passion, only some of which survive. The sequence currently begins with Christ Washing the Disciples’ Feet (Fig. 29), followed by the Last Supper (Fig. 30), the Arrest (Fig. 31), Christ before Pilate, the Flagellation (Fig. 32), and finally, Simon of Cyrene Carrying the Cross (Fig. 33). These images, like other medieval sculptures, were painted and repainted in subsequent centuries. While colonnettes were added between the scenes to create visual unity with the later pulpit, the images appear to have been separated from each other originally by low, plain vertical edges and framed on the upper and lower sides by two mouldings. The bottom one is decorated with a Greek meander; the top moulding is covered with leaves.

The larger Passion narrative is supplemented by two smaller scenes, which are embedded below the main sequence in the masonry between the arched entrances of the crypt. The first image portrays the
Payment of Judas by the Jewish Priests (Fig. 34) and the second bears St. Peter’s Denial of Christ (Fig. 35). These reliefs have a distinctive shape, with a short lower vertical trunk branching into two stubby horizontal arms. In Italian, they are called *penacchi* (singular: *pennachio*) or “plumes.”

Although the choir screen probably was comprised of an uninterrupted narrative sequence at its inception in the late twelfth century, a pulpit was added to it by a later generation of the Campionesi family workshop in the thirteenth century (Fig. 1). When the choir screen was reconstructed in the twentieth century, the pulpit was included creating the *pontile*’s thirteenth-century rather than its late-twelfth-century form. The pulpit is supported by the two atlantes that hold up columns originally topped by two medieval renditions of Corinthian capitals (Fig. 17). The body of the pulpit is comprised of six segments separated by round colonnettes. Two of the panels are decorated with the symbols of the four evangelists holding books: the beasts of Sts. Matthew and Mark appear on one panel, while those of Sts. Luke and John are represented on the other (Fig. 36). Another two panels show the four Latin church fathers seated on benches with ink wells: Sts. Jerome and Ambrose are on one piece, while Sts. Augustine and Gregory the Great appear on the second one (Fig. 37). The figures are individualized and are shown writing and cutting pen nibs. A divine messenger, either in the form of an angel or a bird, presumably a dove, inspires each man. The evangelists and church doctors flank an enthroned and blessing Christ holding a book (Fig. 38); the alpha and omega are carved into the background on either side of his large decorative nimbus. The Latin inscription above his head reads: NON LUCÊ CERNIS TAM HCN LUX MÊTE REFULGET (You do not see the light nevertheless from here the light shines for the mind).

Finally, tucked in the corner near the scene of the *Washing of the Feet*, the pulpit also has a small scene from the Passion, *Christ Awakening St. Peter in the Garden of Gethsemane*, inscribed with Christ’s words to Peter: +SIMON DORMIS N POTUISTI UNA HORA VIGILARE MECUM (Simon, sleepest thou? Couldst thou not watch one hour? (Mark 14:37; Fig. 39).

As the presence of a later pulpit suggests, the *pontile* as it stands today is the result of a long, complicated history, parts of which are still debated by scholars. In its first form, which did not have the protruding pulpit, the screen was erected in front of the raised choir of the cathedral, which originally was consecrated in 1106. Scholars throughout the twentieth century have argued about the exact dating of the *pontile* within the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. In the minority were A. Dondi, Arthur
Kingsley Porter, Augusto Bergamini, Giancarlo Silingardi, and, initially, Tommaso Sandonnini who argued that the entire choir screen was created in the early thirteenth century. Their dating of the structure relies purely on textual evidence.

The first written source appears on a fragment of the pulpit's cornice where the name Bozzalinus, who was massario, or steward, of the cathedral from 1208 through 1225, is inscribed. Dondi argued that this inscription dates the entire screen, but this piece of cornice was part of the pulpit's lectern, suggesting that the text provides the time frame for only the pulpit and not the balustrade, a view generally accepted by the scholarly community.

A surviving contract from November 30, 1244 stating the new terms of work on the cathedral created more confusion about the dating of the monument. The document stipulated the continued service of the Campionesi, then under the leadership of Enrico da Campione, if a raise was given to Enrico, his uncles, Alberto and Jacopo, as well as their sons and their heirs. The contract further stated that this particular raise was actually agreed upon by Enrico’s grandfather, Anselmo da Campione, and a massario named Alberto. Although the list of massari is incomplete, this steward was most likely Alberto de Aygo (1190-1208).

Bergamini and Dondi argued that the agreement between Alberto and Anselmo was the original contract between the clergy and the artists. By identifying Anselmo as the carver of the Passion cycle and assuming the youthful age of Enrico, they used this contract to date the entrance of the Campionesi into the city no earlier than 1190, and placed the creation of the entire screen in the thirteenth century. Renzo Grandi, too, believed that this agreement was the oldest written contract although he did not agree with the dating of the screen proposed by the other two scholars. The wording of the document, however, does not explicitly state that it was the oldest agreement. Furthermore, Roberto Salvini pointed out that although the contract refers to a previous settlement between the artists and the steward, there is no proof that an even earlier contract did not exist or that Anselmo had merely renegotiated the conditions of a prior agreement either written or verbal. The issue is further complicated by the repetition of names within the artistic family.

Grandi noted that while there is no evidence in the surviving documents that provides for a dating of the Campionesi presence in Modena earlier than 1190, stylistic and epigraphic analyses of the sculptures
reveal that the shop was present in the city before the last decade of the twelfth century. In the early
twentieth century, Sandonnini had reached the same conclusion. After studying the cathedral more closely,
he had rejected his own earlier theory that the pontile was a product entirely of the thirteenth century and
became the first to propose the now generally accepted time periods of 1160-80, for the original screen
with the Passion cycle and 1208-25, for the pulpit. Although most scholars accept this chronological
framework they propose differing precise dates for the creation of the balustrade: René Jullian proposed
1150-75, Geza De Francovich suggested 1160/65-1170/75, Salvini propounded c.1170, and recently Grandi
convincingly argued for the more precise dates of 1178-84. These various chronological proposals are
based on the following pieces of textual and stylistic evidence.

In his book on Modena Cathedral, Salvini was the first to tie an imperial decree of 1167 to the
arrival of the Campionesi in the city of Modena. This decree was issued by the imperial vicar, Gherardo
Rangini, and the consuls, or secular leaders of the commune; it gave to the fabric of San Geminiano a
license to excavate within the city and in the surrounding fields in order to find the necessary marble for the
cathedral. The need for stone indicated a large-scale production was about to be begun and included the
Campionesi’s work on the cathedral’s campanile, the Ghirlandina, as well as changes to the cathedral itself,
including the pontile. Salvini deduced that the artists had arrived and begun their work prior to the decree,
around 1165 or 1166, making the need for marble imperative.

Even though the artists may have been in the city by the late 1160’s, they did not begin work on
the choir screen sculptures right away, but focused their attention on the tower. An important inscription
survives on a piece of spolia immured under the cornice of the second level on the south side of the
Ghirlandina: M.C.S. VIII/Q(VI)NTA DOM(US)/ISTI(US) TURRIS +/+ FVIT FACTA [ET] OR[NA]TA.
This text documents the completion of the fifth level of the campanile and the commencement of the
decoration, for which the Campionesi were responsible. Over time, various scholars have interpreted the
date as either 1169 or 1179, but an epigraphic study by William Montorsi favours the former year. This
date has been confirmed as the moment of the Campionesi intervention on the tower due to changes in the
architectural programme, including the raised and monoforum style of windows and, most importantly, the
style of the sculptures.
In his studies of the Campionesi’s work on the cathedral, Saverio Lomartire noted that there is total agreement among scholars on the similarities and close connections between the sculptures from the fifth floor of the Ghirlandina and those of the capitals and corbels on the pontile. By comparing the David capital from the Room of the Judges (Fig. 40) in the tower with the Daniel capital from the choir screen (Fig. 27), one can see the same square angular heads, smoothed hair lines, broad noses, smashed and disjointed folds in the garments as well as the tendency to carve figures in high relief. Grandi argued that both the sculptures from the campanile and those of the corbels of the pontile (Figs. 22-24) are by the same Campionesi artist, an older sculptor whom he calls the Master of the Judges. This sculptor came from the Northern Italian milieu of Nicholaus, and Grandi believed that his hand can be found in the socle and capital sculptures of the façade at St. Trophîme at Arles. Furthermore, he used these similarities between the carvings at Arles and Modena to suggest that the sculptures of the Ghirlandina are an earlier phase of the Campionesi style that matures in the carvings of the balustrade. The maturation of the style is aided by the appearance of a younger Campionesi artist, the so-called Master of the Passion. This sculptor appears to have been influenced by the more solemn carvings of the apostles from the main portal at St. Trophîme at Arles done around 1178 (Fig. 41). This stylistic and epigraphic evidence suggests that after completing work for the fifth floor of the campanile in the 1170’s, the Master of Judges was freed to help create the pontile with the help of the Master of the Passion who arrived near the end of the decade. This time frame seems likely as the beginning point for the screen sculptures, for while the sculptors worked on the campanile, other workers would have had time to make any necessary alterations to the east end to accommodate the new pontile.

The next inscription of importance documents the cathedral's re-consecration by Pope Lucius III in 1184. The pontiff stopped in Modena during his travels through Northern Italy on the way to a meeting with the German emperor, Frederick Barbarossa, in which they discussed the Donation of the Empress Matilda and held a council against Catharist, Waldensian, and Arnaldine heresies. An inscription carved directly into the exterior wall of the south aisle records not only the consecration, but also the pope's recognition of the cathedral's relics and the benedictions he pronounced over the city upon his departure.
Giampiero Bartoli and Montorsi hypothesized that this was the first consecration of the cathedral\textsuperscript{47} a proposition that is difficult to accept. The *Relatio* that recounts the events related to the foundation of the current building at the turn of the twelfth century states,

> "When the day and the night was set for the exposition of the relics had passed, the altar of S. Geminiano was consecrated by the most reverend pope of Rome, Pascal, in the presence of bishop, clerics, abbots, monks, laymen and women with all honour and reverence and with the most solemn rites and this was the eighth day of October 1106."\textsuperscript{48}

The use of the word “consecrated” to describe the earlier event reveals that in 1184, the pope must have re-consecrated the church before many of the same types of religious and secular representatives. This idea is further supported by the fact that relics of a saint cannot be translated into an un-consecrated or unclean place, nor could the Mass be performed on unsanctified altars.\textsuperscript{49} Hence, if it had not been consecrated in 1106, the cathedral would have been unusable for over three-quarters of a century (1106-1184), an unlikely situation for a bishop’s church.

Because the inscription is carved directly into the south wall of the cathedral rather than on a marble plaque, Salvini argued that this event was inconsequential.\textsuperscript{50} This argument seems counterintuitive considering the presence of numerous religious dignitaries and the pope within the city of Modena, as well as the importance of the papal recognition of the remains of the city’s patron. As Dondi observed, this event was the occasion when the saint’s reliquary was opened and a bone removed for a new arm reliquary, the so-called *Braccio di S. Geminiano*.\textsuperscript{51}

For the dating of the *pontile*, this event is important because Doberer, Adolfo Venturi, and Grandi, proposed that this re-consecration by the pope would have taken place only when the eastern end of the cathedral was complete.\textsuperscript{52} Barracchi further supported this *terminus ante quem* of the choir screen with an excerpt from a later chronicle of 1595:\textsuperscript{53} “anno 1184 – (c.98) Ardius. Sub hoc Episcopo Lucius 3: Pontifex consecravit templum Domini Geminiano completum, et benedixit Civitatem” (“Year 1184 – (c.98) Ardius. Under this Pope Lucius III: The pope consecrated the completed temple of the Lord Geminiano and blessed the citizens”).\textsuperscript{54} The use of the word *completum* suggests that the *pontile* was finished in 1184, since it formed the important end to the liturgical choir.\textsuperscript{55} Grandi’s dating of the start of work on the sculptures to 1178 would have allowed ample time for the eastern end to be finished for the pope’s visit.
A comparison of the sculptures from the pulpit with those of the screen reveals the dramatic development in style that precludes both sections of the pontile from having been produced in the thirteenth century. By comparing the Trial before Pilate and Flagellation panel dated to the late twelfth century (Fig. 32), with the narrative scene of the Garden of Gethsemane, dated to the early thirteenth century (Fig. 39), the similarities and differences between the two generations become obvious. Although exhibiting a canon of proportions for figures similar to that of the earlier part of the screen, the sculptures on the pulpit seem more refined and less emotive than their twelfth-century counterparts, confirming a change of artists. Moreover, while the compositions are similar, the later sculptors gave their figures more space for movement. This dramatic difference in style lends credence to the dating of the pontile to 1178-84 and the pulpit to 1208-25.

Stylistic comparisons further reveal that many of the pieces of sculpture used to reconstruct the choir screen in the early twentieth century were made during the original twelfth-century phase of work. These pieces include the large sculpted and painted Passion scenes of the balustrade, the lions with their prey, the atlantes, the Corinthian\(^56\) and three figural capitals, the sculptures of the Denial of St. Peter and the Payment of Judas, as well as the corbels immured above the crypt entrances. Although the atlantes currently support the pulpit, I would argue that they, too, should be considered products of the twelfth-century shop. First, this iconography was typical of the earlier century and can be found on portals such as those of Piacenza Cathedral (1107-20). Second, the style of the carving has more in common with the flatter, stockier, less mobile figures of the earlier artisans (Figs. 17, 29, and 39)\(^57\).

When the pulpit was added in the thirteenth century, the original twelfth-century arrangement of the screen obviously was altered. This change included not only the removal of entire scenes from the structure, but also the shortening of the Washing of the Feet (Fig. 29), which was once wider; this fact is evident in that Christ's backside and one leg have been cut off while in the remaining scenes, for example the Betrayal (Fig. 31), the artists invariably fit the figures entirely within the curved inner frames. By reducing the size of one relief and removing other panels completely, the later sculptors preserved the necessary Passion narrative while creating the additional space needed for the pulpit\(^58\).

As mentioned in the introduction, the pontile of Modena Cathedral was dismantled completely in 1593 as part of the clergy’s effort to include the laity in the church rites\(^59\). Fortunately, the history of the
choir screen did not end there, because the pieces of the screen were conserved in various places throughout the cathedral: the Passion scenes were immured under a window in the south aisle of the east end, the evangelist and church doctor panels were set in the wall near the entrances to the crypt, the Christ-in-Majesty was placed near the Altar of the Holy Sacrament, and Christ Awakening St. Peter was set in the Chapel of the Sacrament. After the successful reconstruction of the choir area of the nearby abbey church of San Silvestro in Nonantola in 1914, the clergy of Modena Cathedral demanded a similar re-building of their sacred area. Since my dissertation will culminate in a theoretical reconstruction of the twelfth-century pontile, a brief synopsis of the early twentieth-century process seems appropriate in this summation of the history of the choir screen.

Proposals for the form of the reconstruction were based on the most up-to-date scholarship about the cathedral, which followed two lines of thought: one put forth by Roncaglia Messori and the other by Sandonnini.60 Both of these theoretical re-assemblages of the pontile included all of the pieces associated with the structure, both from the balustrade and the pulpit. In other words, they were re-creating the thirteenth-century monument.

Messori postulated that there once been a single central staircase that connected the nave to the sanctuary based on a seventeenth-century reference to a “scala” where removal of the pontile had begun in the sixteenth century.61 According to his theory, the sculpted panels formed parapets on either side of these steps (Fig. 42): on the northern flank there would have been a pulpit, comprised of the curved panels with the enthroned Christ, Evangelists’ symbols, and church fathers. On the southern side, there would have been a rectangular singing gallery made from the scenes of the Passion.62

In contrast, Sandonnini, who had been overseeing other restorations at the cathedral, rejected the theory of a central staircase and hypothesized that the sculptures formed a single balustrade that stretched across the nave and into the side aisles, where it joined staircases on both ends.63 Presumably, in this theory, the “scala” mentioned in the seventeenth-century reference would allude to one of the sets of stairs located in the side aisles, suggesting that demolition had begun at one end of the pontile rather than in the middle. At that time, he based his theory on the medieval outlines of vaults he had found within the south stairs leading to the choir in 1912; he believed that the vaults documented the base level of the pontile, and that the screen had stood as an uninterrupted balustrade across the nave into the side aisles.64
In addition, he argued that the *pontile* protruded no more than 2.5m into the nave over the entrances to the crypt\textsuperscript{65} in order to shelter the crypt stairs and to provide a flat platform on which the supporting lions could rest. A document of 1559 cited by Dondi supports Sandonnini’s theory that the balustrade projected into the nave towards the laity; it states that in order to “wash” the figures of the *pontile*, the fabric had to pay for scaffolding to be erected and water brought to this screen. The need for scaffolding to reach the sculpted figures supports the theory that the balustrade projected into the nave and that any existing stairs would not permit easy access to the images.\textsuperscript{66} Sandonnini’s proposal was considered by the *Comitato promitore*\textsuperscript{67} to be the most logical because it was based on the available evidence within the building; moreover, his previous close connection with the cathedral and some of its prior restorations made him the best candidate to oversee the team that conducted the actual reconstruction.

The project began with the documentation of the choir area and the Campionesi’s sculptures, including black and white photographs, measured plans and drawings, as well as refinements of Sandonnini's proposal for the reconstruction, which are preserved in the *Sopraintendenza al Beni Artistici e Storici di Modena e Reggio Emilia* in Modena.\textsuperscript{68} These alterations to the working plan included determining the position of the pulpit in relation to the continuous Passion sequence of the *pontile*. Sandonnini suggested that the pulpit, with the Evangelists’ symbols and church fathers, had been attached to the northern pier of the choir and straddled the balustrade, an arrangement similar to that of San Miniato al Monte in Florence (twelfth century; Fig. 43).\textsuperscript{69} Later, he changed his mind and by the end of 1916, realized that 2.30m of stone missing from the Passion balustrade corresponded to the width of the monolithic slab used for the pulpit floor that was found in the sixteenth-century presbytery revetment.\textsuperscript{70} This change of plans seems correct since the previously proposed format would have obscured the figurative sculptures of both the balustrade and the pulpit: half of the panels on the pulpit would have faced towards the apse instead of the nave and one of the supporting columns would have been hidden part of the Passion sequence from view. This problem was not considered at San Miniato because the furnishings are covered primarily with abstract patterns as opposed to narrative imagery.

In 1919, the destruction of the sixteenth-century arrangement was begun. This process revealed the iron framework that had been used to support the sixteenth-century floor, and also showed that the medieval capitals had been pierced and partially disfigured in the process of erecting the iron bars to
Moreover, the removal of plaster covering the walls revealed masonry that suggested to the team that the arches of the crypt entrances originally were rounded rather than pointed. In addition, there were trapezoidal shapes outlined in the masonry that seemed to correspond to the outlines of the sculptures of the Denial of St. Peter and the Payment of Judas (Fig. 44). One of Sandonnini’s aides, Giambattista Scarpari, used the curves of these sculpted stones to calculate what he thought to be the original outlines of the entrances to the crypt. The result required decreasing the width of the two lateral entrances and enlarging the central portal and then setting the penacchi in the spandrels. Furthermore, in order to make the immured “plumes” visible to people in the nave, the central columns supporting the pontile had to be moved away from the central axis, creating a widened space in the middle. Now, these decisions have been called into question since there is no evidence that such drastic changes had been made to these entrances in the sixteenth-century.

Another piece of evidence that affected the outcome of the reconstruction was the discovery of a piece of cornice supporting the landing of the stairs before the sacristy in the north side aisle. Since the cornice ran from the stairs in the side aisles to the wall of the crypt entrances and supported older bricks of the landing, Sandonnini suggested that the lower mouldings of the pontile had not run into the side aisles or this older cornice would have been removed. Hence, he theorized that the Campionesi had limited the length of their choir screen to the nave. This arrangement seems parallel to the pontile carved by Benedetto Antelami in Parma Cathedral (1178; Figs. 5-10); there the screen was comprised of three long sculpted panels that fit within the parameters of the nave. Even without extending the screen into the aisles and with the insertion of the protruding pulpit, Sandonnini was faced with another problem: there still were not enough Passion sculptures to complete the barrier across the nave. Rather than conjecture what the missing scenes may have been, the team added a plain square panel to the north side of the pulpit in order to fill the empty space. In addition, this change opened the question of how the pontile was going to attach to the rest of the choir. Sandonnini chose to wrap a blank square railing around the nave arcade piers and to join that railing to the stairwells; by doing this he created a passage between the piers and the pontile for use by the clergy.

After gathering the evidence based on the archaeological finds and further consideration of the arrangements of other elevated choirs in Italy, the identified pieces of the pontile were collected from the
various parts of the church. While the order of the Passion panels was determined by biblical chronology, Laudedeo Testi proposed the current arrangement of the non-narrative pulpit scenes, which placed the Blessing Christ as close to the centre as possible and facing towards the congregation in the nave, with the Evangelists and the Garden of Gethsemane on one side and the Church Fathers on the other. The final layout of the screen and pulpit made all of the sculptures as visible as possible to the faithful gathered in the nave. This concern led the team to place the figural capitals above the lions that were easily observable from the nave, while the Corinthian capitals were set in more obscured positions.

The reconstruction was completed in October of 1920, when it was revealed to the public for scrutiny. At that time, most of the scholarly and religious community accepted the reconstruction (Fig. 1), and in hindsight many of the team’s decisions are still deemed as valid. The alignment of the panels as a continuous balustrade with the intrusion of the pulpit as well as the conservation of the lateral stairs in the side aisles are, for the most part, deemed correct. However, the accuracy of other parts of the reconstruction must be questioned, especially the widening of the crypt arches and the manner of connecting the pontile to the side aisle staircases. In addition, the screen, as reconstructed, incorporates the radical intervention of the early-thirteenth century when the pulpit was added and approximately two meters of the original screen were removed. Furthermore, another 1.15m of the balustrade is missing and currently replaced with a plain marble panel. The presence of this gap leads one to ask important questions: what was the entire twelfth-century screen’s Passion programme when it was first erected in the cathedral and what did its images mean to the clergy, citizens of Modena, and pilgrims at that time?

1.2 ICONOGRAPHIC CONSIDERATIONS

Before the intrusion of the pulpit, the balustrade sculptures were entirely dedicated to the Passion, a topic traditionally associated with the thirteenth-century Franciscan devotion to humanism. This mendicant order (fd. 1204) popularized reverence to Christ’s humanity and thus emphasized his physical trials. Yet, already in the mid-twelfth century, Italian patrons and artists, inspired by the mystical writings on the Passion by Sts. Anselm and Bernard, had shown a fascination with these subjects, long before the Franciscan movement. Italian Romanesque Passion cycles are found, for example, on the Salerno ivories (early twelfth century; Fig. 45), the bronze doors of Benevento (late twelfth century), the pulpit made by
Guglielmo for Pisa Cathedral (now divided into two pulpits and housed in the Church of Sta. Maria di Castello in Cagliari, Sardegna, (1159-62; Fig. 46), and the painted cross in the Cathedral of Sarzana by another Master Guglielmo (1138). In addition, representations of single events from the cycle can be found all over Northern Italy on items ranging from furniture to portals. The plethora of visual renditions of Christ’s last days corresponded to the production of Italian literary and dramatic works on the same topic. A Passion play from the twelfth century (terminus ante quem 1150) survives at the monastery of Montecassino. Although the text is incomplete, it is the earliest of such plays to survive, its medieval German counterparts being from the thirteenth century. The Campionesi’s pontile fits within this trend of rising interest in the humanity of Christ that culminated in the ideals of St. Francis.

The surviving scenes comprising the balustrade have been studied primarily in relation to the Gospel of John because this text was read on Good Friday and thus figured prominently in the annual celebration of the Passion: the Easter liturgy. The Campionesi sculptures did rely heavily on this account, but there are major meaningful deviations from John’s scriptures that are based on the other Gospels, as well as on visual traditions. The iconography of the scenes also is dependent on the Provençal Passion sculptures found on the church of St. Gilles-du-Gard (c.1125-50; Figs. 47-55), the parish church of Beaucaire (c.1150; Fig. 56), and St. Trophîme at Arles (c.1148-58; Fig. 57). Unfortunately, scholars have tended to emphasize only the stylistic and general iconographic similarities between these French and Italian sculptures and have rarely compared the sculptures in minute detail. Jullian even claimed that while Modena’s pontile had few scenes, they corresponded almost exactly to the representations found in Provence. Yet, through comparisons with the cycles from Southern France as well as with other liturgical furnishings found in Italy and Northern Europe, we will see that the Campionesi were not slaves to their models and adapted the scenes to the very specific needs of their local patrons. A survey of the surviving images, their similarities to, and differences from biblical accounts, as well as with other representations of the Passion, reveal the uniqueness of their narrative character.
1.2.1 WASHING OF THE FEET

Currently, the twelfth-century Passion sequence begins with the Washing of the Feet (0.70m wide; Fig. 29), which today is positioned just to the right of the pulpit. This event is described only in the Gospel of John (13: 4-11):

“[Christ] riseth from supper, and layeth aside his garments, and having taken a towel, girded himself. After that, he putteth water into a basin, and began to wash the feet of the disciples, and to wipe them with the towel werewith he was girded. He cometh therefore to Simon Peter. And Peter saith to him: Lord, dost thou wash my feet? Jesus answered, and said to him: What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter. Peter saith to him: Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him: If I wash thee not, thou shalt have no part with me. Simon Peter saith to him: Lord, not only my feet, but also my hands and my head. Jesus saith to him: He that is washed, needeth not but to wash his feet, but is clean wholly.”

The Campionesi’s rendition of this event corresponds closely to this text. Christ has already changed his garment and is girded with a towel, which twists around his shoulders and hangs to his knees. A second garment seems to hang down his back in three layers. The clothes that he had set aside hang behind him, but their support has been lost.

Christ bends as he washes the foot of one of the apostles in a large round basin resting on the floor. The figures in this scene are not labelled, but the seated disciple is identifiable as St. Peter despite the absence of his attribute, the keys to heaven: throughout the narrative panels where he is labelled, St. Peter consistently appears as an older man with grey hair in tight curls around his head and longer tresses falling along his neck, a long moustache with curled tips and a beard also ending in swirls cropped close to his cheeks. These features also can be seen on the rendition of St. Peter in the Last Supper, where he holds his keys and is further identified by an inscription (Fig. 30). Although the colouring may be a later artist’s interpretation rather than a copy of earlier paint, the other physical similarities confirm the identity of the saint.

St. Peter sits on a tall bench and two more apostles stand behind Christ. All three followers have halos and hold books closed with clasps, an item not mentioned in John’s text. The final element of the scene is the explanatory text, which appears on the upper edge of the panel: “Mandatum,” the Latin word for command.

According to Gertrud Schiller’s categories of the representations of the Passion events, the Campionesi’s sculpture is typical of High Medieval images of the Washing of the Feet in that it combines
elements of two types of earlier formulas. First, it includes a bent figure of Christ shown in action using both hands to wash the foot of his disciple in the basin similar to the kind of image originally developed in Syria or Asia Minor. Yet, St. Peter is not shown in the act of objecting to this treatment as is typical of the eastern images. Rather, he holds the edge of his garments around his knee in order to keep them from falling in the way of Christ’s work, a trait associated with a second type of rendition of this scene that is Hellenistic in origin.

Typically, images of this event include many if not all of the disciples. In the panel’s current state, however, only three apostles are present. As observed earlier, the scene has been shortened on the left side since Christ’s backside and one foot are missing and the support for Christ’s garments is gone. A crack that separates the right side of the panel from the following scene also indicates possible changes to the image. De Francovich believed that the chips down the length of St. Peter’s arm and bench may have been due to the insertion of a colonnette over the low plain frame in the thirteenth century; however, the curved inner frame that should be found on this end of the panel, as in the other surviving scenes, is missing as well, suggesting a further shortening of the piece on its southern end. The cutter sliced as close to St. Peter as possible in order to preserve the major part of the scene and there may have been more disciples crowded behind this figure in agreement with other representations of this event.

No other images of the *Washing of the Feet* survive on any extant pulpits of Italy, not even in the extensive Christological cycle of the pulpit by Guglielmo that once stood in Pisa Cathedral and is now in Cagliari (Fig. 46). The designers of the screens in Northern Europe also seem to have omitted portrayals of this event. Nicholas of Verdun’s pulpit for Klosterneuburg, now an altarpiece (1181; Figs. 58-60), is comprised of an expansive cycle of Christian typology, the theological relationship between Old and New Testaments; its middle sequence focuses on the life of Christ or events that occur Under Grace, but lacks a representation of the *Washing*. The western screen in the Cathedral of Naumburg (c.1250-60; Figs. 61-66), which also documents the Passion of Christ, does not have a version of this scene. The screen of Notre Dame in Paris (c.1290-1350; Fig. 67), however, had a damaged sculpture of the *Washing of the Feet*, as documented in the 1856 engravings of Ribault. There, Christ bends to wash an apostle’s foot in a basin; a crack down the left side of the scene in the engraving suggests that more disciples may have been present when the screen was first erected, but were later lost. The most interesting aspect of this image is the
seated apostle who holds his garment in one hand and a book in the other. Thus, this figure is similar in pose and attributes to those of St. Peter on the screen at Modena, although the French sculpture is of a later date. A more apt comparison in time and geography is with the bronze doors of San Zeno (eleventh-twelfth centuries; Fig. 70) where five apostles hold books during the Washing.

An abbreviated version of this event appears on the friezes on the façades of the churches of St. Gilles-du-Gard (Fig. 50) and Beaucaire (Fig. 56), while a more expansive representation is sculpted on the southeast pier of the cloister of St. Trophîme at Arles (Fig. 57). In all three of these examples, as on the pontile of Modena, Christ stoops, to varying degrees, to cleanse the seated apostle’s foot in a round basin. Unlike Modena’s scene, in the Provençal works Christ has a towel knotted around his waist and an apostle sits on a low stool. All of the seated disciples hold up the hem of their garments, but at Arles and St. Gilles, the figure also gestures towards his head, indicating the wish for it to be cleansed too. This action corresponds to the words of St. Peter in the Gospel of John “Lord, not only my feet, but also my hands and my head” (13:9) and thus, the gesture identifies this seated apostle as the same figure seated on the tall bench at Modena. The choir screen image corresponds more closely to the representation at Arles than to that at St. Gilles in that they both include more apostles besides St. Peter. The Beaucaire rendition has Christ’s discarded garments hanging from a column in a similar fashion to the remnants of those on Modena’s pontile where the support is missing.95

Despite the similarities amongst this group of representations, the screen’s Washing of the Feet remains unique. Christ wraps a towel around his shoulders unlike the Provençal versions where it appears around his waist. St. Peter sits on a tall bench rather than a low stool, most likely to bring his head in line with those of the standing disciples. Thus, the strong vertical lines of the bodies are balanced by the horizontal alignment of the heads and halos creating a staid and solemn image in comparison to the more active sculptures of Southern France. Lastly, aside from the later thirteenth-century sculpture of the choir screen in Notre Dame in Paris, no other surviving liturgical furnishing shows the apostles holding books, although Italian bronze doors do supply another example. The importance of this detail will be discussed in chapter two.96
1.2.2 LAST SUPPER

The next scene on the pontile of Modena is the largest of the surviving images (3.0m wide; Fig. 30) and shows events associated with the Last Supper. Its details do not correspond to the Institution of the Eucharist, a scene that would be most appropriate for a screen set before the altar where the High Mass took place. Rather, it describes the moment when Christ identifies his betrayer, an event that occurred before the breaking of the bread. This incident is described in all four Gospels, but the Campionesi scene corresponds most closely to the text of John, which notably does not include a description of the Institution of the Eucharist:

“When Jesus had said these things, he was troubled in spirit; and he testified, and said: Amen, amen, I say to you, one of you shall betray me. The disciples therefore looked one upon another, doubting of whom he spoke. Now there was leaning on Jesus’ bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved. Simon Peter therefore beckoned to him, and said to him: Who is it of whom he speaketh? He therefore, leaning on the breast of Jesus, saith to him: Lord who is it? Jesus answered: He it is to whom I shall reach bread dipped. And when he had dipped the bread, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon” (John 13:21-26).

Christ stands amidst the twelve apostles who are seated in pairs at a long table for the meal. The men turn to each other as if questioning their partner about the identity of the traitor, as is alluded to in the text. Each figure has carefully individualized hair, beard, moustache, and clothing. In order to make their identities explicit, each one is labelled with a name carved into the upper edge of the scene. Reading from left to right, the figures are: Thomas, Bartholomew, Thaddeus, James, Judas, John, Christ, Peter, who holds the keys to heaven, Andrew, James, Philip, Matthew and Simon. Each disciple, including the traitor Judas, bears a halo, except for John. This omission must be for practical rather than religious reasons since, in accordance with the Gospel text, he rests his head on Christ’s breast and a halo would have hidden Christ’s body from view.

The long rectangular table at which they sit is covered with a cloth falling in U-shaped folds between each pair of apostles. This pattern is broken only once between Philip and Matthew. Here the scene has been cut, separating the last two apostles from the rest of the group. The table itself is littered with accoutrements for the meal including drinking vessels, knives, bowls, bread, and fish. Such realistic details situate this event in time, after the Passover meal, and the bread and the fish give the scene Eucharistic overtones. According to theologians the fish at the Last Supper also refers to the feeding of and preaching to the multitudes since at that time, according to John’s text, Christ stated, “I am the living bread
which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will
give, is my flesh, for the life of the world” (John 6:51-52). This miracle was celebrated in relation to the
Last Supper by Christian communities even before the Gospel of John was written; the two events also are
portrayed on the same panel on the Salerno ivories (Fig. 45). Notably, there are only two fish present in
the Campionesi’s sculpture. One is held by the betrayer, Judas; the other by St. Peter, upon whom Christ’s
church will be built.

The focus of the scene is on Christ placing the sop into Judas’ gaping mouth. In his other hand,
Christ holds the chalice in which he dipped the bread before giving it to the traitor. The action does not
take place in the exact centre of the panel, but Christ’s crossed-nimbus breaks the frame marking him as the
focus of attention. Furthermore, the empty space around his arm created by the bent St. John, centres the
viewer’s attention on the sop in this crowded but organized scene. A variety of artistic means was used
to differentiate Judas from his colleagues: the fish in his hand, Christ’s gaze towards the traitor, the lack of
a partner with whom to converse, and the space separating Judas from Christ in an otherwise tightly packed
composition. The physical separation of the miscreant within the Last Supper scene had already been
established in images of the Carolingian period and became extremely popular by the twelfth century.

This moment, in particular, was the most popular in western images. The doctors of the Western
church had concluded that Judas’ imminent betrayal was the most difficult of Christ’s tortures during the
Passion, but it did not become popular in Passion sequences until Christ’s death was no longer viewed
simply as a victory but as a sacrifice. The moment of the traitor’s identification appears on façades, as at
the Cathedral of Lodi (first half of the twelfth century; Fig. 71) and S. Giovanni Forcivitas in Pistoia
(twelfth century), as well as on bronze doors, such as those of Benevento Cathedral (late twelfth century).
All of these examples include John sleeping on Christ’s chest and the identification of the traitor through
physical separation and/or the acceptance of the sop. This moment was also popular in the minor arts and
one example is the full-page illumination in a manuscript from the monastic church of Nonantola, which
had close ties with Modena Cathedral (Evangelistary, Nonantola, Abbey Archive, 1076-1200; Fig. 72).
Here Christ feeds Judas the sop, but the latter also holds another piece in his hand below the edge of his
side of the table. The Salerno Ivories echo this idea of stealing and hiding something from the table since
the traitor is identified by his hand stretched towards a large fish (Fig. 45); on Modena’s *pontile* this association is carried further because he actually grasps the fish.

*Last Supper* imagery was popular on liturgical furnishings as well, and in Italy extant examples occur on the pulpits in the Cathedrals of Cagliari (Fig. 46), Volterra (c.1200; Fig. 73), and Pistoia (c.1200; Fig. 74). All of these scenes, however, conform to a pattern that is distinctly different from the Modenese rendition. In the pulpit versions, the apostles are crowded in two horizontal lines behind a short table instead of in a single spacious row. Christ sits at one end of the table rather than amidst his followers and John sleeps as Christ hands the sop down to Judas who kneels on the viewer’s side of the table rather than sitting down. In both the images at Volterra and Cagliari, a demon in the form of a dragon with an asp for a tail appears beside Judas. Fish do appear, but are set in bowls as well as scattered on the table. Two of the apostles, Peter and James, each hold one of them in their hands, yet since the fish are abundant, they may simply provide Eucharistic overtones to the meal.

The *Last Supper* was also a popular subject for choir screens. Versions appear on the screen of Notre Dame in Paris (Fig. 67) and on the remnants of the *pontile* now incorporated into a pulpit in the Church of Sant’Ambrogio, Milan (c.1100; Fig. 13). Neither of these examples represents the moment when Judas is identified as the betrayer. In contrast, the western screen in Naumburg Cathedral (Fig. 62) and Nicolas of Verdun’s pulpit in Klosterneuburg (Fig. 58) both portray that particular point in time. Unlike Modena, however, both German examples have abbreviated scenes with Christ in the centre and only a few apostles arranged around a short table. The Naumburg figures are portrayed in the act of eating and drinking and Christ feeds Judas the sop across the table. While eating the morsel, Judas reaches into the bowl before him. Interestingly, St. Peter holds a fish. In the version on the Klosterneuburg pulpit, Judas hides a fish behind his back. As Christ gives him the sop, he also passes the chalice to the apostles on his right seemingly oblivious to the fish the traitor has presumably taken from the table.

Despite the popularity of the *Last Supper* on Italian and Northern European liturgical furnishings, comparisons reveal that the frieze and pier sculptures from Provence bear the closest similarities to the Modenese *pontile* in overall composition, although the Campionesi altered the details. The *Last Supper* at St. Gilles (Fig. 51), Beaucaire (Fig. 56), and Arles (Fig. 57) all represent the moment that Judas is revealed to the others as the traitor. John sleeps on Christ’s breast and Christ feeds the betrayer the sop. The Arles
image is small and compact due to its restricted space on the cloister pier. Thus, Modena’s rendition exhibits the greatest affinities with the more expansive sculptures on the Beaucaire and St. Gilles friezes. In each of these scenes the disciples are lined up in a single row behind a long horizontal table. A cloth falls over the table in rhythmic folds and the top is covered with accoutrements for a dinner. In each scene, Christ stands in the centre and is marked as the focus of attention by his height. At St. Gilles, the image is damaged but one can still discern Judas pointing to his mouth with one hand, emphasizing his acceptance of the sop, while his other arm, now partially lost, reaches across John’s arm resting on the table. There is no evidence of a fish in either of his hands or in the grasp of the figure, presumably St. Peter, seated next to Christ. A fish does appear, however, on the plate before Christ and next to the chalice. Perhaps Judas’ now lost hand crept towards this plate in order to wrest the enticement from under Christ’s nose. The traitor in the scene at Beaucaire holds a slice of bread in his hand and St. Peter, who has the keys to heaven, holds an entire loaf.

All of these images of the Last Supper reveal an interest in representations of Judas grasping, hiding, or reaching for an item, often a fish, from the table, but the combination of Judas and Peter each holding a fish is unique to the Campionesi rendition. Although Bergamini identified the fish in this scene as a symbol of Christ in relation to St. Peter, he did not consider the equally prominent fish grasped by Judas. The obvious opposition of these two disciples on either side of Christ visually encourages the viewer to contrast them as examples of unorthodox and orthodox behaviour, an aspect that will be explored in the following chapters.

Another odd feature of this sculpture is that, aside from Judas, one other figure consumes part of the meal: on the far right, Matthew sips from a footed bowl. The Naumburg screen shows other disciples besides Judas partaking of the meal before them (Fig. 62): there, one drinks, a second eats and a third reaches for a fish in a bowl. The emphasis on eating and the largeness of the bowls suggest that these details were used to create a sense of realism, unlike Modena’s screen in which only Judas and Matthew are shown actually consuming something. Matthew’s action may refer to the meal just eaten, but also may resonate with undertones of the Institution of the Eucharist, which took place after the betrayer had left the table. Schiller stated that artists commonly included motifs that referred to Communion within images of the identification of Judas; one common motif used, for example, is the chalice held by Christ in the
From the twelfth century onwards, the scene of Christ identifying the traitor is infused with sacramental overtones, like those on the Klosterneuburg Altarpiece (Fig. 58). There, Christ passes the chalice to a disciple on one side while giving the host to Judas. The accompanying inscription states, “See, in two forms Christ’ holds himself in his hands.” Thus, Matthew’s actions in the Last Supper at Modena could have served to underscore the Eucharistic tone of the scene.

1.2.3 BETRAYAL

The third image of the narrative on the pontile is Judas’ Betrayal and the Arrest of Christ (1.0m wide; Fig. 31). The Campionesi rendition is typical of medieval images in that it combines several events in one scene. Again, this event is described on all four Gospel texts, but the identities of the figures of Peter and Malchus are derived from St. John’s text:

“Judas therefore having received a band of soldiers and servants from the chief priests and the Pharisees, cometh with lanterns and torches and weapons. Jesus therefore knowing all things that should come upon him, went forth, and said to them: Whom seek ye? They answered him: Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith to them: I am he. And Judas also, who betrayed him, stood with them....Then Simon Peter, having a sword, drew it, and struck the servant of the high priest, and cut off his right ear. And the name of the servant was Malchus” (John 18: 3-10).

The Campionesi artists portrayed the chaos of this event through the crowded composition of overlapping figures that contrasts with the compact but organized image of the Last Supper. The sculptors’ emotive style lent itself to the crowded format of the Arrest while at the same time the major figures and elements of the story remain clearly visible. Christ, again, is the central focus; he is marked by his height, his large crossed-nimbus and his placement in the centre of the image. He is surrounded by the soldiers and servants who wear short tunics, leggings and boots, unlike Christ, Judas, and Peter who wear the long robes and sandals evocative of ancient times. Although concerned with creating a crowd of men around Christ, the sculptor did not differentiate soldiers from servants. Judas stands next to Christ, but now lacks a halo and is thus more like his surrounding horde of men. As described in John’s text, the servants and soldiers carry weapons including clubs, an axe, and a spear, as well as a lantern. The latter is painted on a broken piece of raised stone; however the shape of the remnants suggests that this originally may have been a sculpted lantern. From the eleventh century onwards, a guard usually held a light near Christ’s head to indicate that the event took place during the night.
On the right, two men, one of whom is Malchus, grasp Christ’s right arm. Malchus also treads on Christ’s foot. Perhaps this carelessness explains why Peter tightly grabs the hair of the servant while slicing his ear with a short knife. The rough-hewn style of the Campionesi lends an agitated emotional content to the scene, despite the impervious faces of the characters.

The figures and actions are clearly identified on the upper edge of the panel: PETRÆ ABSCIDIT AURE MALCHO ~ XPC A JUDA TRADITUR IUDEIS (Peter cuts off the ear of Malchus ~ Christ is given to the Jews by Judas). In spite of the fact that the names of figures are derived from St. John’s text, the sculpture includes details found only in the other Gospels. Judas horde’s laying of hands on Christ is a feature mentioned in the books of Matthew, “Then they came up, and laid hands on Jesus and held him” (26:50) and Mark, “But they laid hands on him, and held him” (14:46). In the image, Judas grasps Christ’s neck and seems to pull himself onto his toes in preparation for the kiss that will identify the one to be arrested. The kiss itself, which the placement of Judas’ lips near Christ’s own suggests, is an element described in all of the Gospels except John’s text: “And when he was come, immediately going up to him, he saith: Hail Rabbi, and he kissed him” (Mark 14:45), “And forthwith coming to Jesus he said: Hail Rabbi. And kissed him” (Matthew 26:49), and “And he that was called Judas, one of the twelve, went before them, and drew near to Christ for to kiss him.” (Luke 22:47). The Campionesi rendition is closest to Luke’s account, because it does not actually state that the kiss occurred, but describes the movement prior to the actual moment of betrayal. Such features reveal that, although the imagery of the pontile may be based primarily on John’s gospel, the artists were not confined only to that text. One detail, which is not mentioned by the evangelists, is the large book that Christ holds in his hands. It is closed with a clasp and decorated akin to those held by the disciples in the rendition of the Washing of the Feet. By holding this manuscript with both hands, Christ is prevented from healing Malchus’ ear, the subsequent event of the Betrayal sequence in the textual sources.

The Campionesi image is typical of Western medieval representations of the Seizure because Christ appears on the left while Judas approaches from the right, and the number of disciples is fewer than the number of surrounding soldiers and servants. The pontile’s Arrest, however, is more similar to Byzantine renderings of this event, a type, which was copied in Italy. As Schiller noted, the post-Iconoclastic Eastern models show a tightly packed group with torches, clubs, and spears above their heads.
surrounding Christ. An example can be found in a late eleventh-century Byzantine Evangelistary in Parma (Fig. 75). There, like the screen sculpture, Malchus lays hands on Christ from behind while Peter cuts off his ear and Judas kisses Christ’s cheek; these main figures are surrounded by a throng of men with torches and weapons.

Scenes of the Arrest survive on the Tuscan pulpits of Cagliari (Fig. 46) and the Cathedral of Pistoia (Fig. 74) where they are carved on the same panels as the Last Supper. A close connection between these two scenes also occurs at Modena where the moment of betrayal follows immediately after the meal. The pulpit sculptures, like the Campionesi’s carving, show Christ approached by Judas before the kiss, amidst a throng carrying weapons and lanterns. The pulpit renditions, however, have more space between the figures, undermining the sense of a crowd that is effectively portrayed by the Campionesi. Another difference is that on the pulpits Christ embraces his errant follower rather than holding a book in his hands. While the Pistoia image does not include St. Peter relieving Malchus of his ear, the Cagliari version contains this event. There, the servant falls to his knees before Peter, but Malchus does not make any physical contact with Christ in order to elicit Peter’s vicious response, as at Modena.

The same trend holds true for Northern European furniture. The Arrest survives from the screens of Naumburg Cathedral (Fig. 64), Amiens Cathedral (c.1260; Fig. 76), and the Klosterneuburg pulpit (Fig. 59). In the case if the first two structures, which are later in time than the Modenese pontile, the actual kiss is pushed into the background by the throng or the action of St. Peter slicing Malchus’ ear. The viewer must look through the intersecting diagonals of movement made by arms and weapons in order to find Judas and Christ. This composition is very different from earlier examples such as the twelfth-century version at Klosterneuburg, which is more like that of the Campionesi; in these scenes, the crowd and St. Peter are pushed to the sides like brackets around the central pairing of Judas and Christ. At Klosterneuburg, Nicolas of Verdun dressed the members of this throng in the contemporary garb of twelfth-century knights who hold weapons and a torch, which is a parallel to the contemporary garments of the men with weapons in the Campionesi’s imagery. An interesting aspect of the enamels from Klosterneuburg is that Christ turns away from Judas in order to show the viewer a diminutive book in his hands, a motif also included in the Modenese Arrest.
Comparisons with the Provençal Passion cycles at St. Gilles (Fig. 62) and Beaucaire (Fig. 56) again reveal compositional similarities in the compact group of people that create a sense of a turbulent crowd pressing inwards. All include arresting figures in contemporary tunic and boots holding swords. In contrast to the pontile of Modena Cathedral, however, both French friezes flank Judas kissing Christ with a single or double row of soldiers; the result is a larger number of figures than appear in the sculpture at Modena. In addition, the Campionesi enlarged the episode involving St. Peter and Malchus and neatly tied them to the central figures through the servant’s arresting hand on Christ’s arm. In Provence, Malchus and Peter are partially hidden by other figures and are pushed to the fringes of the crowd. Lastly, while Christ embraces Judas at St. Gilles, the Beaucaire artists and the Campionesi portray him holding a book.

The Campionesi produced a compact composition with only the essential elements of the story stressed and thus clearly visible to the viewer, unlike the more crowded and active scenes portrayed elsewhere. Although the large figures are crammed into the space, they act with calm solemnity that is lacking in other renditions of the Arrest. Modena also differs from other twelfth-century Italian pulpits and the Provençal friezes in the prominence that it gives to St. Peter and Malchus, an importance that becomes even greater in thirteenth-century liturgical furnishings.

1.2.4 TRIAL AND FLAGELLATION

The next panel on the screen combines two scenes: Christ’s appearance before Pilate on the left and the Flagellation on the right (1.14m wide; Fig. 32). In order to do this effectively, the sculptor carved Christ twice; he appears like a bracket on either side of the panel where he faces inwards. On the north side his hands are bound and he is clothed, while on the other end he is tied to a pillar and stripped of his garments. The two episodes are tied together by the hand of Pilate that points to the Flagellation and thus guides the viewer’s eye from the moment of judgement to the commencement of physical tortures. These two events are described in all four of the Gospels but in this case the Campionesi rendition does not seem to be dependent on any one text. For clarity’s sake, we will examine each episode separately.

According to the New Testament and the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus, Christ endured a series of trials before the Jewish priests, Annas and Caiphas, the Roman procurator, Pilate, and the King of Judea, Herod. Out of this series, the Campionesi have represented only the trial before Pilate, which is
described in all four Gospels, although John’s account is the most thorough in describing the interchange between Christ and his judge (Matthew 27:1-31; Mark 15:1-15; Luke 23: 1-25; John 18:29-19:16). Although the moment when Christ’s fate is sealed by Pilate’s washing his hands was popular in Early Christian images, the Campionesi represented Pilate ordering Jesus be scourged: “Then he released to them Barabbas, and having scourged Jesus, delivered him unto them to be crucified”(Matthew 27:26).

On the pontile, a guard holds Christ by his wrists, presumably bound, before Pilate. The Roman procurator sits on an elaborate throne with a footstool. As he looks at Christ, he gestures in the opposite direction. The pointing finger not only directs the eye to the Flagellation but also suggests that the decision to crucify Christ has been made, further emphasized by the throne of judgement upon which Pilate sits. None of the accusing Jews appear in this scene.

Christ’s Trial before Pilate, represented without the washing of the hands, was popularly depicted in Ottonian images, such as that on Bishop Bernward’s doors for St. Michael’s at Hildesheim (c.1007-15; Fig. 77). There, two men hold Christ as he stands before the enthroned Pilate; a small demon cavorts on the arm of the throne as the procurator gestures towards the captive. Interestingly, no example of the judgement survives from a medieval Italian pulpit. It does not appear to have been a common scene on Northern furnishings either. A sculpture of Pilate passing judgement does occur on the Naumburg screen, but the sculptor returned to the earlier image-type in which Pilate is shown cleansing his hands (Fig. 66).

For the closest visual and temporal parallels to the scene on the pontile, we must again turn to the friezes at Beaucaire (Fig. 56) and St. Gilles (Fig. 53). In both of these friezes, Christ is pulled forward by his wrists towards an enthroned Pilate. The procurators of each scene may have gestured towards the ensuing image, as at Modena, but damages to the St. Gilles sculpture make this similarity difficult to confirm. Both of the Provençal examples contain numerous figures, four men aside from Christ at Beaucaire and seven at St. Gilles. The latter even includes a representation of the Jewish priest, Caiphas, rending his garments. In spite of the numerous figures present in the Provençal scenes, they are filled with graceful movement in contrast to the cramped and stilled arrangement of only Christ, a guard, and Pilate at Modena.
The *Flagellation* marks the end of Christ’s series of court trials and the beginning of his physical tortures; it commonly is represented from the ninth century onwards. Christ was mocked twice: once at the house of the High Priest and again in the *praetorium*. The first scenario is described best by Luke:

“*And the men that held him, mocked him and struck him. And they blindfolded him, and smote his face. And they asked him, saying: Prophecy who is it that struck thee? And blaspheming, many other things, they said against him*” (22:63-65).

Matthew gives the most detailed account of the second mocking:

“*And the soldiers led him away into the court of the palace, and they called together a whole band: And they clothed him with purple, and platting a crown of thorns, they put it upon him. And they began to salute him: Hail, king of the Jews. And they struck his head with a reed; and they did spit on him. And bowing their knees, they adored him. And after they had mocked him, they took the purple from him, and put his own garments on him, and they led him out to crucify him*” (Matthew 15:16-20).

This double torture and the visual traditions that stemmed from those accounts, may explain why the Campionesi’s representation does not conform strictly to one Gospel text. On the *pontile*, two men wearing short tunics and boots scourge Christ with three-pronged whips. The bound figure of Christ embraces a column that separates him from his torturers. He lacks the crown of thorns and the purple garment associated with the mocking that took place after the *Trial before Pilate*. Christ, rather, is stripped of his garments, a detail mentioned by Matthew prior to the donning of the purple cloak:

“*Then [Pilate] released to them Barabbas, and having scourged Jesus, delivered him unto them to be crucified. Then the soldiers of the governor taking Jesus into the hall, gathered together unto him the whole band; And stripping him, they put a scarlet cloak about him.*” (Matthew 27: 26-28).

Christ is shown wearing only a loincloth, characteristic of twelfth-century images, but does not face the viewer as is typical of renditions produced during that century.

According to Schiller, the *Flagellation* was commonly represented in monumental paintings in Italy by the year 1000. She further noted that the interest in this event is odd because these artists were influenced primarily by Byzantine cycles, which did not include this scene until much later. This episode was also portrayed in twelfth-century sculpture including a representation on the bronze doors of San Zeno in Verona and Benevento Cathedral. However, the *Flagellation* does not appear on any surviving pieces of twelfth-century Italian pulpits. Moreover, northern screens generally seem to have omitted this scene. One exception is the western choir screen of Naumburg Cathedral, but this sculpture is
a copy of the original produced in the thirteenth century when this event became the object of widespread popularity. There, in front of a group of Jewish bystanders, Christ stands with his back to the viewer as he is beaten by one man, a very different image from that portrayed at Modena.

In contrast, the twelfth-century friezes of Southern France include the Flagellation in their narrative sequences. Not surprisingly, the Campionesi scene is most similar to them, especially to that of St. Gilles-du-Gard (Fig. 54). At Beaucaire (Fig. 56), Christ, clothed only in a loincloth, stands bound to a column but the men wielding whips are missing; in their stead, a procession of armed men moves towards him from the right. The grave figure of Christ does have echoes of the Campionesi representation. At St. Gilles, two men on either side of Christ wield three-pronged whips. They convey a sense of motion as they twist and pull back in preparation for a swing at their victim who, although bound to the column in profile, starts to slouch in pain. Such dramatic turmoil has been lost in the pontile rendition. Although a similar iconographic vocabulary was used, the torturers have already completed their swings. As with their other images, the Campionesi have reduced the space, stilled the motion, and created a more meditative image.

1.2.5 SIMON OF CYRENE

The final surviving panel (0.75m wide; Fig. 33) of the large narrative sequence is an unusual one for a number of reasons. It represents Simon of Cyrene with bowed head carrying the cross in front of a blacksmith. The latter man holds the nails and hammer that would be used to crucify Christ and helps support the cross-beam and upper part of the cross. This event is mentioned in each of the Gospels except that of John. Luke’s Gospel states, “And as they led him away, they laid hold of one Simon of Cyrene, coming from the country; and they laid the cross on him to carry after Jesus” (Luke 23:26). Mark merely adds that Simon was the father of Alexander and Rufus (15:21), while Matthew adds no further details (27:32).

Unlike the texts for the other scenes, the written descriptions are very sparse with regards to details and the Campionesi rendition is quite distinct. Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of this sculpture is the omission of Christ himself, who appears prominently in every other scene on the screen. The figure was not cut from the panel, since the remaining men fit within the carved frame of the scene and overlap
the curved inner edges. The fact that Simon and not Christ carries the cross, regardless of the similarity of facial features, is proven by a number of details. The most obvious indicator is the inscription above the figure’s head: SYMON CIRENEUS. In addition, the figure lacks the crossed-nimbus, which Christ bears in every other scene. Furthermore, Simon wears the more contemporary dress of a tunic, leggings, and the boots that adorn the soldiers and torturers. In contrast, Christ and his disciples appear in long garments and sandals evocative of antiquity. Later, members of the clergy at Modena must have found the omission of Christ disturbing for today Simon bears a painted crown of thorns and blood in order to turn him visually into Christ. Even in this century the figure has been interpreted erroneously as the Saviour.

Another odd feature of this scene is the presence of the blacksmith, who is identified by an inscription on the upper edge of the panel: FABER. Although the Campionesi had enough room to represent two figures, they chose to show one of the torturers rather than Christ, which, in my opinion, makes the omission seem even stranger.

According to Schiller, Simon was not given great emphasis in the medieval meditations on the Passion, which adds to the mystery surrounding this particular scene, as does the fact that in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, images of Christ carrying the cross himself were becoming popular. Moreover, Early Christians developed three types of representations of the Carrying of the Cross. One type combines the bearing of the cross with the scene of Pilate washing his hands. These two events are depicted in wall paintings until the twelfth century in such places as SS. Martiri in Cimitile, S. Angelo in Formis, S. Maria in Pallara, and S. Urbano alla Caffarella, both in Rome. A second type shows both Simon and Christ carrying the cross, while a third and very rare type shows Simon carrying the cross by himself. Of this latter type, Schiller cites only one example, the Late Constantinian Triumphal Cross Sarcophagus on which the cross-bearing Simon is followed by a guard (c.340; fig. 78); she claims that “there is no parallel to this separate scene from which Christ is omitted,” but the image on the screen of Modena, as it appears today, may fall into this category.

I believe that this rare scene may have been derived from representations of the procession to Golgotha where Simon walks before or after Christ and is accompanied by a Roman guard. One such scene appears on the bronze doors of Benevento Cathedral (twelfth century; Fig. 79) and shows Simon carrying the cross in front of two Roman guards who accompany Christ. More interesting are the Ottonian
illuminations of this scene in which Simon appears before a gap between Christ and the guards who follow him as portrayed in the Pericopes of Heinrich III (Bremen, Staatsbibliothek, manu.b.21, 1039-43; Fig. 80) where one of the guards accompanying Christ reaches across the gap to help support the cross. Another example shows Christ crowned with horns by torturers as the group follows Simon on the road to Calvary (The Golden Gospels, Echternach, Germanisches National Museum, Nuremburg, c.1020-30; Fig. 81). The blacksmith does not appear in any of these earlier examples.

Although the scene of only Simon and one of the torturers does not appear on Tuscan pulpits or Northern European liturgical furnishings, it does in fact appear at least two other times in Provence: on the friezes of St. Gilles-du-Gard (Fig. 55) and Beaucaire (Fig. 56), although both have suffered damages. At the latter site, Simon carries the cross, followed by two blacksmiths with nails and hammer. The St. Gilles representation has more in common with the Modena version, because in it Simon bears a large cross with the help of the blacksmith. Not much of the blacksmith remains but the nails and part of his hand can be discerned on the top of the cross. He is followed by two other figures who are shod with boots and the short tunics of the other “contemporary” men on the frieze. No fragments of a Christ figure can be detected in either frieze due to damages. In comparison, the Modenese scene appears at this point to be an abbreviated version the model from Provence. The Campionesi sculptors reduced the number of figures in the Provençal models to just two: a torturer and Simon. Due to space restrictions of the choir screen, even the cross has been shortened to the point that it is almost a Greek cross. Like the aforementioned pontile scenes, the figures are not engaged in movement but stilled, creating a calmer image than the Northern friezes.

1.2.6 PENACCHI

As noted above, the penacchi, or “plumes,” currently immured under the pontile continue the Passion sequence, but on a smaller scale. The first in the Biblical chronology is the Payment of Judas (Fig. 34). This scene is unusual because it is not described in the popular text of John, but is in every other Gospel. The Campionesi version of this scene is based on the text that gives the most anecdotal detail, that of Matthew:
“Then were gathered together the chief priests and ancients of the people into the court of the high priest, who was called Caiphas: And they consulted together, that by subtlety they might apprehend Jesus, and put him to death. But they said: Not on the festival day, lest perhaps there should be a tumult among the people...Then went one of the twelve, who was called Judas Iscariot, to the chief priests. And said to them: What will you give me, and I will deliver him unto you? But they appointed him thirty pieces of silver. And from thenceforth he sought opportunity to betray him” (Matthew 26:3-16).

The sculptural rendition shows a seated Judas on the left (IVDAS), clutching a purse in his right hand while another dangles from his belt; the latter may be the purse of the disciples since he was in charge of their money. Despite this show of accumulated wealth, he holds out his hand to the priest for more coins. The high priest Caiphas (CAIPHAS), who is named only in Matthew’s writings, sits and counts a series of coins in his hands. He looks at Judas, who only has eyes for the money being tallied before him. A third figure, not mentioned in the scriptural account, stands with yet another bag of money beside the priest’s throne; he is identified as a CAMERARI, a chamberlain or treasurer who was in charge of the temple’s coffers. This event, according to Matthew, took place before the Last Supper. The text still describes Judas as “one of the twelve,” and thus he retains his halo in this scene. He is also dressed in a long Roman garment with sandals, while the priests wear pants and boots under their robes. Unlike the larger narrative panels, the identifying inscriptions appear on the background of the scene and are repeated on the upper edge.134

According to Schiller, the scene of Judas’s Payment is typically not represented in the early Middle Ages, although he is often shown returning the thirty pieces of silver.135 The Payment does appear below the Last Supper in the Gospels of Bernward (1011-14), and on a capital in Autun Cathedral (twelfth century), but it is rarely shown on liturgical furnishings. The only surviving examples on church furniture are from the thirteenth century. The first is a damaged fragment of the jubé of Bourges (1214-1225) in which Judas holds a large purse and seeks the coins from the priest. The second is the screen in Naumburg Cathedral where it appears after the Last Supper (Fig. 63). In that scene, Caiphas counts large coins into a large cloth held by Judas who bears a look of uncontrolled yearning. The surrounding Jews whisper amongst themselves presumably in abhorrence of the traitor.

The Payment of Judas also was carved on the Passion friezes in Provence. At St. Gilles, the enthroned Caiphas drops coins into the hands of Judas, who is flanked by two more Jews (Fig. 49). The priest seems to let the coins fall, as if he does not want his fingers tainted by their presence, in contrast to
the greedy clutch of Judas. Although the traitor at Modena exhibits similar gestures, the scene is closer to
that of Beaucaire (Fig. 56). In both of these images, the enthroned Caiphas carefully counts the coins into
his hand while Judas holds his palm out expectantly. Each Judas holds his right hand against his shoulders,
but at Modena, the figure clutches another bag of coins, emphasizing his greed and possessiveness. The
treasurer, who is present on the penacchio, appears to be unique among the surviving renditions of this
event although he may have once existed at Beaucaire. His presence at Modena may emphasize the large
amount of money involved in the payment.

The second penacchio and last sculpture representing an event from the Passion also involves
Christ’s betrayal by an apostle: St. Peter’s Denial (Fig. 35). This “plume” seems to rely more on the
Gospel of Luke for its details:

“And apprehending [Christ], they led him to the high priest’s house. But Peter followed afar off.
And when they had kindled a fire in the midst of the hall, and were sitting about it, Peter was in
the midst of them. Whom when a certain servant maid had seen sitting at the light, and had
earnestly beheld him, she said: This man also was with him. But he denied him, saying: Woman,
I know him not. And after a little while, another seeing him, said: Thou also art one of them. But
Peter said: O man, I am not. And after the space, as it were of one hour, another certain man
affirmed, saying: Of a truth, this man was also with him; for he is also Galilean. And Peter said:
Man, I know not what thou sayest. And immediately, as he was yet speaking, the cock crew”

In the Campionesi version, St. Peter (PTR) sits, in accordance with Luke’s text, with bowed head
on a stool that rests on the curve of the frame. He warms his hands and feet by a large fire (IGNIS). The
maidservant (ANCILLA), her spindle tucked under one arm, sits opposite him. She points an accusing
finger across the fire to St. Peter as the cock (OMILUS) perches above the fire ready to crow after the
saint’s third denial of Christ.

This representation conforms to the typical Western image from the ninth century onwards,
because it focuses on the exchange between the maid and St. Peter. Another example can be found on
the doors of Benevento Cathedral (end of the twelfth century; Fig. 82). There, the girl grasps Peter’s arm
as he turns to leave and the cock perched on top of the building crows. Even though this event is depicted
on doors and in manuscript illuminations, it does not seem to have been popular on pulpits or screens.
Nonetheless, it does appear on the western screen of Naumburg Cathedral (Fig. 65) and, like the portrayal
at Modena, it is squeezed into a small irregularly-shaped space. There the maid gathers her cloak in one
hand and looks out behind her towards an unseen spectator as she points at St. Peter with the other. The
apostle seems to be in the act of fleeing from accusatory glances; the fire and the cock are absent. Perhaps, most surprising is the fact that *St. Peter’s Denial* does not appear on any of the friezes in Provence although a scene identified as the prediction of the event was represented at both St. Gilles-du-Gard and Beaucaire.

With the inclusion of the *Denial*, Modena Cathedral’s *pontile* seems, according to surviving fragments, unique for liturgical furnishings in twelfth-century Italy. The Campionesi adopted the popular elements of the story and arranged them to fit conveniently within the awkward frame of the *penacchio*. Yet, the artisans have presented a unique arrangement: this “plume” along with that representing *Judas’ Payment* further encourages the viewer to compare the two disciples as exemplars of good and bad behaviour, a key theme in the iconography of the *Last Supper*, as noted above.

1.2.7 CAPITALS

Although not portraying events from Christ’s last days, the three figurative capitals allude to the Passion and thus expand the balustrade sequence. The use of Old Testament stories as typological parallels to New Testament events was common in the Middle Ages. According to Schiller, by the sixth century, Old Testament scenes of sacrifice were often painted in the presbytery near the altar in order to elaborate on the Christian sacrifice: “The liturgical celebration clarifies the meaning of these images of the Old Testament sacrifices, while at the same time they bring the celebration of the sacrament into the context of the history of Salvation, which is also expressed by the prayers of the liturgy.”

Liturgical furnishings continue and elaborate this use of typology in the choir area. The most complex example would be Nicolas of Verdun’s pulpit in Klosterneuburg, which represented the events of Christ’s life in relation to two Old Testament parallels, one from Before the Law and one from Under the Law. Other pieces of furniture use Old Testament narratives in less comprehensive schemes. For example, many of the ambos of Southern Italy, like the surviving example in Ravello Cathedral (1095-1150; Fig. 97), bear images of Jonah consumed and regurgitated by the whale as reminders of Christ’s three days in the tomb before the Resurrection. Benedetto Antelami’s *pontile* for Parma Cathedral, now dismantled, had at least three Old Testament capitals supporting its balustrade (Figs. 7-9). Those that survive portray the
stories of Adam and Eve, their sons Cain and Abel, as well as King David. The Campionesi screen follows the same format as Antelami’s *pontile* in its use of New Testament panels placed over Old Testament capitals.

The capital dedicated to the *Sacrifice of Isaac* shows a different part of the narrative on each of its four faces (Fig. 26). Its first image, found on the eastern face, depicts Isaac cutting the wood for the sacrificial fire. The cut branch falls on the flanks of the ram that stands on the northern side and will be killed in Isaac’s stead at the behest of the angel who holds its horn in one hand. With the other hand, the angel grasps the arm of Abraham who is about to raise a knife to Isaac’s throat on the third side. Isaac sits on the ground, hands bound and head pulled back by his father in front of a sacrificial fire lit on the fourth or southern face of the capital. The *Sacrifice of Isaac* was a popular Old Testament type for the *Last Supper* and the *Crucifixion*.\textsuperscript{141} On the Klosterneuburg pulpit, the scene of Isaac’s near sacrifice is juxtaposed to the enamel of Christ on the cross (Fig. 60). The same scene appeared on the later screen of Strassbourg Cathedral (thirteenth century) where Old Testament scenes and prophets of liturgical importance were rendered.\textsuperscript{142} Lastly, a panel showing the moment of the near sacrifice survives on the socle of the middle portal at St. Gilles-du-Gard.

The second Old Testament capital represents *Daniel in the Lion’s Den* (Fig. 27). On the western face of the capital Daniel is seated amidst the lions, two of which gently place a forepaw on his knees. Daniel raises one hand palm forward towards the viewer while gently embracing the lion on his left with the other. A third lion raises its gaping mouth over the back of this lion on the southern side. On the next or eastern face, an angel with spread wings walks and points towards the final side of the capital where Habakkuk, with a sack of food and wine jug slung over his shoulder, passes behind a lion towards Daniel. The prophet Habakkuk bringing food to Daniel was not only a reference to salvation through Christ, but also a pre-figuration of the *Last Supper*.\textsuperscript{143} The portrayal of the story of Daniel appears to be unique on surviving liturgical furnishings, although he may be represented on the Nicola Pisano’s pulpit (c.1250) as a corner figure.\textsuperscript{144}

The last of the figural capitals, centred on the *Martyrdom of St. Lawrence* (Fig. 28), seems an unusual choice for the *pontile* since it does not belong to the Old Testament. The capital shows the saint being thrown in prison on the eastern side, taking part in a baptism on the north, and being roasted on the...
grill. The scene on the fourth or southern face is an odd one comprised of a standing nude with rings around his biceps. While not a pre-figuration for the Passion, St. Lawrence was one of the followers of Christ who died for his faith. Such a sacrifice follows in the footsteps of Christ. The question remains, however: why was this particular martyr represented? The unusual events portrayed on the capital will be examined in more closely in chapter three.145

This survey of the pontile sculptures reveals that the Campionesi relied heavily on Provençal models for their compositions and choice of subjects. The influence of foreign programmes on the screen’s designer should not be surprising, since Modena was situated on the Via Emilia, a vital meeting and dissemination point for artists and ideas in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.146 In regard to the frieze at St. Gilles-du-Gard, Carra Ferguson O’Meara noted that the patron had been very selective in the choice of scenes since episodes from Christ’s last days had been omitted.147 This statement is even more true for the creator of Modena’s pontile, since it has even fewer scenes and most of the sculptures are abbreviations of the Provençal representations. The alterations to the French iconography and compositions reveal an interest in producing calmer, more empathetic images for contemplation on the interior of a church. The changes along with the choice of figural capitals reveal a programmatic invention that defies Grandi’s belief that the Campionesi lacked imagination despite their powerful carving style.148 The interest in showing a surprising amount of detail is a trait associated with other screen sculptures found in Italian churches, such as in the Parma Deposition (Fig. 5), and in cities north of the Alps, like those of Amiens and Naumburg (Figs. 61-66 and 76); the resulting visual richness created a imminent sense of reality that in turn made the narrative more immediate and identifiable for the viewer who observed the scenes during the Mass.149

The visual sequence of the pontile moved the viewer from the north to the south end of the structure. While a horizontal reading of this sort gives the choir screen its narrative cohesion, it is activated on its vertical axis by the performance of the High Mass above it, through the presentation of liturgical dramas on and around it, and by the veneration of relics below it. This combination of horizontal narrative with vertical engagement, especially during the elevation of the Eucharist, could have created a large cross in the minds of the faithful who focused upon the eastern end of the church, where the liturgy was
performed. By reading the scenes as connected to events happening above, below and around the screen, the pontile becomes an integral part of the cathedral, as well as of the experience of the faithful.

---

1 Lanfrancus is described in this manner in an entry, in the Relatio translationis corpus sancta Geminiani (Archivio Capitolare O.II.11, May 23, 1099): Anno itaque dominice incarnationis millesimo nonagesimo nono ab incolis prefate urbis quesitum est ubi tanti operis designator, ubi talis structure edificator inventiri, possit. Donante quipped Dei misericordia inventus est vir quidam, nomine Lanfrancus, mirabilis artifex mirificus edificator. Eius denique conscilio et auctoritate ceperunt Mutinensis cives...fundamentum ponere,” Giulio Bertoni, Atlante storico-artistico del Duomo di Modena (Modena: R. Fotografia Editrice, 1979): VII. The architect is also commemorated in an inscription that appears on the apse of the cathedral: INGENIO CLARVS LANFRANCVS DOCTVS ET APTVS EST OPERIS PRINCEPS HVIVS RECTORQVE MAGISTER. See: Giulio Bertoni, Atlante storico-paleografico del Duomo di Modena (Modena: P. Orlandini e Figli Fotografi, 1909): section II, entry II. According to the Relatio, the decision to rebuild the cathedral was made by the canons and citizens during a vacancy of the episcopal seat. For a full transcription of this document, see: Augusto Bergamini, ed., Relatio de innovatione ecclesie sancti Gemniani Mutinensis presulis (Bologna: Grafiche Dehoniani Bologna, n.d.).

2 The latter artisan was praised on the marble plaque commemorating the foundation of the cathedral and currently immured in the façade. The inscriptions of this plaque appear on a scroll held aloft by Enoch and Elijah. The primary inscription reads; DVM GEMINI CANCER CVRSVM CONSENDIT OVANTES IDIBVS IN QVINTIS IVNII SVP TEMPORE MENSILE DEI CARNIS MONOS CENTVM MINVS ANNS ISTA COMVS CLARI FVNDATVR GEMINIAI. In a smaller script the following words were added: INTER SCVLTORES QVANTO SIS DIGNVS ONORE CLARET SCVLTVRA NVNC WILIGELME TVA. See: Bertoni, Atlante storico-paleografico, section II, entry I.

3 An elevation of the Eucharist was already taking place in the twelfth-century, Gerard G. Grant, “The Elevation of the Host; A Reaction to Twelfth Century Heresy,” Theological Studies 1 (1940): 228-229. This elevation was marked by an emphatic gesture by the late twelfth century, Miri Rubin, Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995): 55. The relationship between the liturgy and the pontile will be discussed in further detail in chapter two.

4 Jung has documented the physical interaction between laity and clergy in her description of Northern screens as liminal spaces, Jaqueline E. Jung, “Beyond the Barrier: The Unifying Role of the Choir Screen in Gothic Churches,” Art Bulletin 82 (2000): 630.

5 Jung, 628. In the later Middle Ages, in order that everyone, including those whose view was blocked by the choir screen itself, could see the elevated host, small holes were cut into the plainer screens of English churches. These holes allowed the faithful standing near the screen to see the host. Members of the congregation however, would also try to steal glimpses of the host prior to its elevation through these holes in the screens. See: Eamon Duffy, The Stripping of Altars: Traditional Religion in England c.1400-c.1580 (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992): 97. The fragmentary evidence of screens in Italy does not give proof that the same practice occurred there.

6 Erika Doberer, “Il ciclo della passione sul pontile di Modena,” Romanico padano, Romanico europeo (Parma: Università degli Studi di Parma, 1982): 392. Doberer’s categories of screens were summarized in her dissertation Die deutsche Lettner bis 1300, University of Vienna, 1946. Due to the difficulty of locating a copy, I have not been able to read the document. Doberer also describes three other types of screens: the first category is the Kanzellettner, a screen that is actually a large centralized projecting pulpit. The second type is the Hallenlettner, which is a vaulted structure with a solid rear wall and an open arcaded front; the third screen is called a Schrankenlettner and is a solid partition with a central platform without a vaulted space. A brief summary of these designations is available in: Erika Doberer, “Lettner,” Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, vol. 6, eds. Josef Höfer and Karl Rahner (Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1961): 987. For a more detailed summary of her categories, see Jung, 624-625.

47
Jung, 625. Jung bases her analysis of Northern screens on Doberer’s definitions. See note five of this chapter.


Bertoni, Atlante storico-artistico, xxv.

Guglielmo under the influence of the clergy may have been the first to create this design of lion-supported pulpits with narrative panels in his structure once in Pisa Cathedral (1159-1162), Clara Baracchini e Maria Teresa Filieri, “I pulpiti,” Niveo de marmore: L’uso artistico del marmo di Carrara dall’XI al XV secolo, ed. Enrico Castelnuovo (Genova: Edizioni Colombo, 1992): 120. For more information on the legal and judicial interpretations of lions see: Christine Bornstein Verzar, Portals and Politics in the Early Italian City-State: The Sculpture of Nicholaus in Context (Parma: Università di Parma, 1988): 31-50.


12The two central lions support modern columns made of Istrian marble shipped from Venice; they replace the two shortened supports now used under the pulpit with the atlantes, Cristina Luchinat, “La ricomposizione del pontile campionese,” I restauri del Duomo di Modena 1875-1984, eds. Cristina Luchinat, Luciano Serchia, and Sergio Piconi (Modena: Edizioni Panini, 1984): 237.

13The northernmost and southernmost capitals in the current reconstruction are modern copies of medieval counterparts that were too damaged to be reused in the twentieth-century.

14These times include the documented occasions on August 22, 1488, when a painter named Niccolò was hired to wash and touch-up parts on the screen, “per fare portare vino in domo per fare lavare el pontile...a Nicolò depintore per fare lavare dete figure,” (F.55, Reg.1483, c.130), Orianna Baracchi, “Il Pontile,” Il Duomo e la Torre di Modena: nuovo documenti e ricerche, eds. Orianna Baracchi and Carlo Giovannini (Modena: Aedes Muratoriana, 1988): 122. Niccolò was subsequently paid for his work on September 6, 1477, (F. 60, c.58), Baracchi, 122. Another re-painting occurred on January 5, 1522, when Master Adam was given wages to paint one figure of the pontile, “A mo Adam de Sette per sua mercede de haver depinto una figura de quelle del pontile,” (F.66, c.56v), Baracchi, 123.

15Sandonnini deduced that the colonnettes were a later addition to the balustrade because their capitals were engaged with the upper cornice rather than attached to the scenes themselves. He further observed that the colonnettes dividing the scenes of the ambo appear to be integral to the original conception. He postulated that the small columns dividing the scenes of the balustrade were then added when the pulpit was put in place in order to create a homogeneous structure, Tommaso Sandonnini, Cronaca dei restauri del Duomo di Modena (1897-1925), ed. Orianna Baracchi (Modena: Aedes Muratoriana, 1983): March 2, 1916, 99. Pieces of the mouldings found currently on the pontile are twentieth-century copies of their medieval counterparts replacing missing fragments.

16The position of these “plumes” will be discussed further in relation to the twentieth-century reconstruction of the pontile later in this chapter.
In the early twentieth century these atlantes were found on the backs of two of the lion supports. Because their bases were wider than the backs of the lions, they were removed and used as separate column-bearing figures for the pulpit. Unfortunately, their accompanying columns that had been adjusted in the thirteenth-century reconstruction were then too short to reach the pulpit and tall modern bases were carved for these figures based on the moulding profiles of the seats under the atlantes, Luchinat 234. For more information on the atlantes with “belts of strength” representing the artisan, see: Christine Bornstein Verzár, “Text und Bild in der norditalienischen Romanik: Skulpturen, Inschriften, Betrachter,” Studien zur Geschichte der europäischen Skulptur im 12./13. Jahrhundert, eds. Herbert Beck and Kerstin Hengevoss-Dürkop, vol. 1 (Frankfurt: Henrich Verlag, 1994): 500-502.

Today, a capital with four eagles and a Corinthian capital support the pulpit. They are modern copies of medieval examples. The original pieces were not incorporated into the reconstruction due to the fact that the iron bars used to support the floor of the choir in the sixteenth century had marred one beyond repair while the second was deemed too small to serve as a suitable support, Luchinat, 237.

SCS MARVS, S MATHEUS appears on the upper border of one panel and SCS LVCAS, SCS IOHANES is written on the other.

The figures are again identified by inscriptions in the upper border: SCS ERONIMUS, SCS AMBROSIIUS, SCS AGUSTIN ET S GREGORIS DOCTORES. Today, the “SC” of “St. Jerome” is cut off by the column framing the left side of the panel.

Although they bear a close resemblance the Campionesi renditions of eagles, presumably these birds are doves, since the dove was a symbol of the Holy Spirit and divine inspiration, as well as an attribute of St. Gregory.

The exact interpretation of this inscription is debated among scholars because of the supposed misspelling of the word HINC as HCN. I have taken my translation from Montorsi’s epigraphic study, William Montorsi, Iscrizioni Modenesi Romaniche e Gotiche: Duomo e Palazzo del Comune (Modena: Aedes Muratoriana, 1977): 253.

Doberer argued that this scene was actually carved in the fifteenth century in imitation of an original relief possibly damaged when changes were made to the structure, Doberer, “Il ciclo,” 398, note 7. Lomartire and Poeschke have proven through stylistic comparisons that this is not the case, Saverio Lomartire, “I Campionesi al Duomo di Modena,” I Maestri Campionesi, eds. Rossana Bossaglia and Gian Alberto dell’Acqua (Bergamo: Edizioni Bolis, 1992): 66, and Joachim Poeschke, Die Skulptur des Mittelalters in Italien, vol. 1 (München: Hirmer Verlag, 1998): 115.


“BOSARINI MASARI SCI GEMINIANI FEC FIERI.” The same name appears in a thirteenth-century sentence added to a marble plaque presently located on the exterior of the major apse that states renovations under the guidance of Bozzalinus were done on the cathedral east end for San Geminianus. “BOSARINVS MASSARIVS SANCTI GEMINIAI [FIERI FECIT],” Bertoni, Atlante storico-paleographico, section II, plate XII.

Dondi, 17.


29 The incomplete list of massari for the time period in question is: Rodulphus Ballesteriuso, or de Ballesteris (1174-1176), Gandulphus, also called Garfagnoli (1177-1182), Albertus Aygi, or de Aygo (1190-1208), Bozzalinus (1208-1225), and Hubaldinus, also called Hubaldus and Hubaldio (1230-1263), Dondi, 152. The identity of the massario is corroborated by the appearance of Anselmo’s name (mag. Anselmus petrus de campignone) on an act of 1209 confirming his presence in Modena about the time of Alberto’s stewardship, Grandi, “God’s Balcony,” 108.

30 Bergamini, “A Theological Interpretation,” 126 and Dondi, 16-17.


33 For example, one Enrico da Campione negotiated the 1244 contract, while another Enrico da Campione worked on the Ghirlandina in 1319.

34 Grandi, “I Campionesi,” 546.


38 Salvini, Il Duomo di Modena, 103.


Grandi, “I Campionesi,” 554.

Grandi, “I Campionesi,” 554.

Salvini, Il Duomo di Modena, 103.

For a full transcription of this panel see G. Bertoni, Atlante storico-paleographico, section II, entry XII.


Salvini, Il Duomo di Modena, 103.

Dondi, 195. The Braccio di S. Geminiano was replaced with a new reliquary in 1607, Silingardi, xiii.


Baracchi, 121.


Baracchi, 121. Although this text dates to the sixteenth-century, it has been used in support of the argument that the pontile was completed by 1184 and the entry may have been based on an earlier source that is now lost.

When the iron railing was placed in the stead of the pontile in the sixteenth century, more columns and capitals were needed than the four from the original pontile; extra columns were pilfered from a monument erected by Altemps in 1512 and other unknown sources, Porter, vol. 3, 28.

De Francovich originally assigned these sculptures to three artists: the Master of the Passion, a collaborator in charge of lions, columns and capitals, and a third assistant who sculpted the corbels, De
Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, 48-52. As noted above, Grandi argued that only two men worked on these sculptures, seeing the corbels, capitals and lions as by the same hand, the Master of the Judges, and the balustrade as a product of the Master of the Passion, Grandi, “I Campionesi,” 552-553. Supposedly, Grandi’s work is a refinement of Salvini’s proposal made in 1966 that the pontile was the result of three sculptors, Grandi, “I Campionesi,” 551-553. In the later translation of Salvini’s work, however, Salvini proposes that two masters and two to three assistants created the screen, Salvini, *Il Duomo di Modena*, 127-128.

58 De Francovich believed that two sculptors were responsible for this intrusion, De Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, 52-53, but Grandi postulates that only one artist, perhaps with an aid, carved these earlier pieces, Grandi, “I Campionesi,” 556.

59 Refer to page two of this study.

60 Luchinat, 212-217.

61 Vedriani stated that Canano had begun demolition at the “scala,” Luchinat, 213. Vedriani was the earliest antiquarian of the cathedral and published his history of the church in 1666. French medievalists were particularly enthusiastic supporters of Messori’s theory, Luchinat, 213. Furthermore, Pagella resurrects the idea that the Passion sequence may have formed a pulpit that was dismantled and rearranged during the stewardship of Bozzalinus, Enrica Pagella, “Figure del cantiere modenese,” *Il Duomo di Modena*, ed. Chiara Frugoni, vol. 3 (Modena: Franco Cosimo Panini Editore S.p.A., 1999): 106.

62 Luchinat, 213. This grouping of the sculptures recalls choir arrangements of Central and Southern Italy, where two pulpits were joined together by a low balustrade with a central passage, as can be seen in the choir of the church of San Clemente, Rome (c.1100). In contrast, Northern Italian clergy showed a preference for a single pulpit.

63 Sandonnini, *Cronaca*, 26 septembre, 1912, 53. Sandonnini was furthering proposals already made by Bortolotti and Venturi who had suggested that the pontile was not interrupted by a central staircase, Luchinat, 213-214.

64 Using the outlines of the vaults found within the stairs, Sandonnini believed that the Campionesi raised the crypt roof by 1.0m from its original level, Sandonnini, 26 September 1912, 53. However, later scholars have shown that his calculations were incorrect and that the level of the choir had been raised only 0.40m, Luchinat, 214-215.

65 Luchinat, 217. The sixteenth-century workers doubled this extension to meet the first column of the nave arcade. The new structure had to be supported by two rows of columns and capitals pillaged from various medieval monuments including the pontile.

66 Dondi, 17.

67 “Comitato promitore” is “Organizing Committee” in English.

68 “Sopraintendenza al Beni Artistici e Storici di Modena e Reggio Emilia” is “The Supervising Office of Artistic and Historic Works in Modena and Reggio Emilia” in English.

69 Luchinat, 217. I believe that Doberer erroneously resurrected this old proposal in her theoretical reconstruction of the thirteenth-century screen, Doberer, “Il ciclo,” 392. In 1915, Sandonnini also entertained the idea that the pulpit once attached to the eastern edge of the choir behind the balustrade, Luchinat, 216.
Most of the cracks in the capitals were filled with cement making them reusable, Luchinat, 237. Luchinat, 234. Currently, about fifteen centimeters separate the central axis of the columns supporting the crypt entrances and those upholding the choir screen. Doberer, “Il ciclo,” 392. In fact, Scarpari had executed his decisions without the complete approval of the organizing committee, Luchinat, 234. Luchinat, 234. Arturo Carlo Quintavalle, “Di un’annosa questione: il pulpito e il pontile di Benedetto Antelami nel Duomo di Parma,” Romanico padano, civiltà d’Occidente (Florence: Marchi & Bertolli, 1969): 108. Luchinat 235. Luchinat describes this arrangement as an “innovative but unhappy solution,” Luchinat, 238. Luchinat, 238. Anne Derbes, Picturing the Passion in Late Medieval Italy: Narrative Painting, Franciscan Ideologies and the Levant (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996): 17. In the Cur Deus Homo, St. Anselm stressed that the crucifixion was redemptive precisely because it occurred on the level of humanity, Sandro Sticca, The Latin Passion Play: Its Origins and Development, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1971): 43. St. Bernard’s Sermones in Cantica made the crucifixion in the centre of a devoted pathos, Sticca, The Latin Passion Play, 43. This date came from Sticca, The Latin Passion Play, 60. Robert Edwards, The Montecassino Passion and the Poetics of Medieval Drama (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977): 22. Two thirteenth-century plays survive from the Benediktbeueren collection, Sticca, 52. Poeschke argued that the Campionesi had first-hand experience with the sculpture of St. Trophîme at Arles and St. Gilles-du-Gard, Poeschke, 49. De Francovich took this even further arguing that the Campionesi were actually educated in Provence, most likely at Beaucaire, before proceeding to Modena, De Francovich, Benedetto Antelami, 69. Jullian, L’éveil, 187. This excerpt and all other biblical passages are taken from the Douai-Rheims Bible published with the approbation of his Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons. By the eighth century, painters were taught to portray St. Peter with grey or white hair. Instructions from a collection of Irish texts described how to paint the apostles according the Roman tradition and St. Peter is described as “grey and [with] a round tonsure,” Caecilia Davis-Weyer, Early Medieval Art 300-1150 (Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1986): 78. In the case of the Campionesi’s creation, according to anylses of the polychromy, the entire screen was repainted in the

87. The first letters of the word “*mandatum*” are painted rather than sculpted, presumably because they are replacements for their lost carved counterparts.


89. Schiller, 44.

90. Schiller, 45. Paul often replaced Judas when all twelve apostles were shown after the Passion events, Schiller, 45.

91. Sandonnini was the first to argue that the *Washing of the Feet* was cut in the early thirteenth century. Tommaso Sandonnini, *Relazione sulla ricostruzione del pontile del Duomo di Modena* (Modena, 1913): 7-8, cited by Luchinat, 218. Montorsi, *Iserzioni*, 258-259 and De Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, 48 also postulate that the panel is cut on this end.


93. In 1312, this pulpit was dismantled and shipped to Cagliari where the Pisans had continually tried to impose their authority. The scenes formed a large rectangular box in Pisa Cathedral but are now divided to form two pulpits. While these pulpits do not include an image of the Washing, the popularity of representing the Last Supper, with which it is often associated, and the presence of the Washing on later pulpits, such as that by Fra Guglielmo d’Agnello in S. Giovanni Forcivitas, in Pistoia (c.1270), suggest that the earlier pulpits may have had now lost representations of this event.


95. Due to damages to the frieze, the column has been separated from the remainder of the foot-washing scene. In figure 56, the column appears in the first panel in the left column and the *Washing of the Feet* appears in the second panel on the same side.

96. Refer to page 66 of this study.

97. For the images see: *Duomo di Modena: La cena, opera scultoria dei Maestri Campionesi (sec. XII-XIII)* (Bologna: Grafiche Dehoniane, c.1990): 8. There does not appear to be anything on the figures nor in the inscriptions to allow one to make such a definitive statement although Porter claims that the turban identifies the one figure as James the Greater, Porter, vol. 3, 47.

98. Schiller, 25.

99. Christ stands 1.35m from the left side rather than at the centre of the panel (1.5m).

100. The handing of the sop to Judas over the body of John may be derived from images where Christ administers the Eucharist to the other disciples over John’s body.
In the case of the sculpture on the pulpit in Milan Cathedral, Tcherikover has identified the scene as monks partaking of a meal in the guise of a Last Supper since there are only eleven tonsured men rather than twelve seated at the table, Anat Tcherikover, “The Pulpit of Sant’Ambrogio at Milan.” *Gesta* 38 (1999): 55-56. After viewing this sculpture in person, however, I would like to add that the faint remnants of haloes can be found around the heads of each of the figures, although these may have been added at a later point in time.


For more on the representations of Judas and Peter holding fish, refer to pages 83, 88-89 and 117-118 of this dissertation.

Other images show figures holding vessels but not actually consuming the meal. One example is the Last Supper in the Golden Gospels of Heinrich III written at Echternach between 1043 and 1046 where a figure holds a cup close to his mouth. For a copy of this image refer to Schiller, figure 84.

Jung, 636.

Schiller, 54.

Schiller, 36.

"FRET ECCE SUIS SE BINA EXPS SUB SPECIE MANIBUS."

Schiller noted that the Betrayal was represented as early as the fourth century and that the Seizure of Christ is commonly combined with the Kiss of Judas, Schiller, 52.

This example was taken from Gertrud Schiller’s study of Passion iconography, Schiller, figure 171. Unfortunately, she did not cite the collection or manuscript number for this work.

The scene also survived among the fragments of the screen of Bourges Cathedral, but is omitted from this discussion due its fragmentary state. The composition is not similar to that of the Campionesi since Judas approaches Christ from the left, not the right.

A book is also present in the fragmentary scene of a choir screen once in Bourges Cathedral (1214-1225), but the images is otherwise not similar to that of the Campionesi in Modena.

Furthermore, according to Schubert, this scene and the *Road to Calvary* are baroque copies of thirteenth-century originals, Schubert, 160. The event also appeared on the choir screen of Bourges Cathedral, but is too damaged for comparison.


In her article describing a possible reconstruction of the twelfth-century pontile, Doberer identifies this scene as Christ carrying the cross, Doberer, “Il ciclo,” 395. Sandonnini also identified the figure as “Gesù che porta la croce,” Sandonnini, March 1, 1916, 99, as did Arturo Carlo Quintavalle, *La Cattedrale di Modena: problemi di romanico Emiliano*, vol. 1 (Modena: Editrice Bassi and Nipoti, 1964): 261.

Simon may have aided Christ with his burden in the *Road to Calvary* of the choir screen once in Bourges Cathedral. This suggestion is based on the fact that the figure helping Christ appears to wear secular clothing and wraps an arm around the cross. The lack of heads and other damages to the sculpture, however, make any definitive identification difficult.

While the words “CAIPHAS” and “CAMERART” are repeated on the upper edge of the *penacchio*, the word “TUOMS” appears above Judas.

At St. Gilles-du-Gard, there appears to be a damaged scene of the forecourt of Pilate and a figure raises a finger towards Peter, but the apostle ignores the gesture as he peers around the corner at Christ.


Schiller, 25.


Schiller, 26.

In addition to suggestions that his figure is Daniel, it has also been interpreted as Fortitude, Hercules, and Judah, Crichton E. Gilbert, “The Pisa Baptistery Pulpit Addresses its Public,” *Artibus et Historiae: An Art Anthology* 41 (2000): 19-20. The iconography of the figure seems to support the interpretation of the nude as Daniel and a symbol of Fortitude, since he is shown with three lions rather than the one associated with the Greek hero, Hercules. Furthermore, St. John the Baptist appears on a corner as well, suggesting that these are biblical figures. Considering this information, I would argue that the figure of a woman with a dog may be a representation of the apocryphal heroine Judith and perhaps a symbol of Prudence.

For the identification of the scenes on this capital see pages 125 through 127 of this study.


Jung, 363. Jung suggests that the clergy believed that by making the images more real for the viewer, it was more likely that the images would be remembered, Jung 363.
The pontile, which defined the edge between the nave and the church’s eastern end, acted as an integrating architectural feature tying the hall crypt and raised east end together into one liturgical unit (Fig. 1). As a large, elevated yet semi-permeable barrier, it dictated to both the clergy and laity the avenues of physical and visual approach to the two most sacred spaces of the cathedral: the presbytery and the crypt. Furthermore, it provided a stage-like setting for the rituals performed within the church. By sculpting on the raised choir screen renditions of religious events that also were considered historical in the twelfth century, the ecclesiastics stressed the intersection between contemporary rites and the events surrounding the Passion of Christ, which Elizabeth Parker identified as a defining relationship between liturgy and architecture. The choice of subjects on the pontile from the Washing of the Feet through the Last Supper, Payment of Judas, Arrest, Denial of St. Peter, Trials, and Road to Golgotha would have made the important connection between ritual and building visually concrete (Figs. 29-35). While scholars, like Augusto Bergamini and Erika Doberer, observed that the pontile’s images were directly related to the Christian rites, to date no one has outlined these associations in detail. A study of the ties between the sculpted scenes and ritual acts paves the way for understanding the iconography chosen for the pontile and reveals that the screen was actually an active participant in the experiences of the faithful who gathered for the services.

While the choir screen would have formed a backdrop for the short daily masses performed at one of the minor altars near the laity in the nave, it would have assumed a more prominent role when the bishop and his canons enacted one of the exceptionally ritualized High Masses behind its sculpted balustrade. At that point, the barrier became the focus for the laity as their view of the mysterious sacrament was largely obstructed by its very presence. Through its presentation of the episodes leading up to Christ's death, the
cathedral’s screen documented the events from which the Eucharist derived and stressed the relationship between the historic sacrifice and the rite performed by the clergy. As such, the pontile's imagery was intimately related to the performance of the liturgy of which every gesture, word, and nuance was tied to the re-presentation of the Passion. According to one early authority, Honorius of Autun, writing around the year 1100, the Mass itself was a drama in which the church became a theatre and the priest an actor while the prayers and gestures became symbolic of the various events of the Passion:

“It is known that those who recited tragedies in theatres presented the actions of opponents by gestures before the people. In the same way our tragic author [i.e., the celebrant] represents by his gestures in the theatre of the Church before the Christian people the struggle of Christ and teaches them the victory of His redemption. Thus when the celebrant [presbyter] says the Orate he expresses Christ placed for us in agony, when he commanded his Apostles to pray.”

If the liturgy was a drama, then during the High Mass the pontile was its stage.

Honorius’ insight was based on a tradition of interpreting the Mass allegorically and in this manner he followed in the footsteps of Amalarius of Metz who, in 823, wrote De Ecclesisticis Officiis, a symbolic interpretation of the Roman Stational Mass. Although his contemporaries condemned his writings, they were widely popular and influential on later liturgical developments. In his texts, Amalarius assigned various roles to the congregation and clergy, including the bishop, as part of his construction of the Mass as a rememorative act recalling the ministry, death, and Resurrection of Christ. For example, Amalarius stated:

“The sacraments ought to have some degree of resemblance to those things for which they are sacraments. Wherefore, the priest should be similar to Christ, just as the bread and liquid are similar to the body of Christ.”

Such allegorical views allow for the symbolic interpretation of the sculptures on the pontile in relation to the performance of the liturgy that took place behind and on its platform (Figs. 1 and 120). Unlike the balustrade images, however, Amalarius’ analysis of the standard order of the Mass does not always correspond to the chronological order of Christ’s life. His interpretations of individual parts of the rite are discordant with the historical sequence and, as a result, the participants, both clergy and laity, change identities depending on the action being performed, although there is an attempt to maintain the association between Christ and the celebrant. I believe that this synchronic approach may also have been akin to the laity’s perceptions of the screen, for a person might not always view the scenes one after another from left to right; rather, a worshipper’s attention could focus on an image pertinent at any given moment.
moving back and forth between figures regardless of sequential order. In practice, the specific words of the
texts and prayers would highlight different images on the screen at various times bringing them to
prominence for the knowledgeable viewer during the Mass; the subject of some sculptures may be invoked
repeatedly throughout the ceremony, while others might not be mentioned at all. In this chapter, I seek to
highlight some of these integral links between the liturgy and the sculptural decoration of the screen. Thus,
I will examine the allegorical interpretations and specific textual associations between the pontile and the
High Mass as it would have been performed by the bishop when the full ceremony was typically enacted.
As a basis for organization, I will follow the order outlined in a sacramentary, the book used by the
celebrant for performing the Mass; although written in Modena just before 1173, around the time the choir
screen was being conceived, I am the first scholar to apply its contents to the screen.8

The cathedral’s manuscript begins with the Foremass or the preparation of the celebrant prior to
entering the church proper with the clergy. This section consists of the Praeparatio ad Missam (or the
preparation of the celebrant’s soul for Mass) and the donning of liturgical vestments, as well as special
prayers. According to Amalarius, this portion of the ritual corresponds to the preaching of Christ that
purifies and guides the soul while the remainder of the celebration symbolizes his Passion and
glorification.9

Since these acts took place in the sacristy (sacrarium), located off the northern side aisle, there are
few specific texts that can be related to the imagery on the pontile set in the nave of the cathedral. The
Foremass does stress the idea of preparing a willing participant for the performance of a sacrifice, reflecting
the same idea of the Passion – Christ’s death by choice.10 The passages associated with the donning of the
garments show a preoccupation with arming the celebrant as a warrior of God with virtues that will prepare
him for spiritual combat during the rite.11 Many of the qualities associated with the various garments,
including fortitude, chastity, purity, and charity, were traits associated with Christ himself, especially
during the Passion trials, for example, when he was tied to a column and whipped during the Flagellation
(Fig. 33). This emphasis on virtues paves the way for interpreting the celebrant as Christ’s representative.12
The idea of preparing for spiritual combat in the name of the faith is echoed in the column-bearing figures
of the screen, where lions attack and overcome soldiers, dragons, and an ox (Figs. 18-21); while the laity
gathered in the nave for the upcoming rite, perhaps these beasts, crouching at their level, reminded them of
the spiritual battle they, too, must undergo in order to be ready to partake in the upcoming sacrifice.

The *Introit*, or entry of the clergy into the church, marks the first of Amalarius’ three symbolic
parts of the Mass-proper. For the medieval interpreter, this first subdivision represents Christ’s *Entry into
Jerusalem*, an important event of the Passion sequence that is missing from the *pontile*. In the rite
performed at Modena, this section begins with the celebrant’s words “*Introibo. Judica me Deus.*” (“I will
enter. God judge me.”). It includes, the *introit* chant that is read by the priest to the people, the kissing and
incensing of both the altar and Gospel book, the *Confiteor* (the prayer at the foot of the altar), the hymn
*Gloria in Excelsis*, the Collect (a petition spoken by the celebrant), and the reading of the Gospel.

During the singing of the antiphonal *introit* hymn, the chorus represents the Old Testament
prophets; the entrance of bishop signifies the advent of Christ and the congregation stands for the Jews to
whom he preaches. According to Amalarius, the bishop follows the Gospel book in the procession and,
while passing through the church, must meditate on the life of Christ since he has pledged to take up the
cross and follow, in accordance with scripture: “*Then Jesus said to his disciples: If any man will come
after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me*” (Matthew 16:24). This reference to
carrying the cross was intimately connected to Simon of Cyrene, the secular bystander who was recruited
by the Romans to help Christ transport his burden to Golgotha and thus became a moral exemplum for the
faithful (Fig. 33). Through allegorical interpretation, the bishop, following the Word of God in the
procession, was akin to Simon of Cyrene following Christ on the road. Thus, the episcopal representative
entering the cathedral to celebrate Mass could be related to the image of Simon bearing the cross and
walking towards the site of the Crucifixion. As noted in the previous chapter, the cross bearer is an
anomalous image in that it is the only scene that does not include the figure of Christ, the central
protagonist in the other surviving balustrade sculptures. Simon’s appearance on the *pontile* can be partially
explained by this allegorical interpretation of the bishop not only following Christ in his faith, but also
physically and/or visually moving towards the site of the upcoming sacrifice.

The subsequent kissing of the altar is interpreted by Amalarius as another commemoration of
Christ’s *Entry into Jerusalem*, for his representative has arrived in the sacred east end, symbolic of the
heavenly city. This theologian also understood the incensing that follows the kiss in terms of Old
Testament offerings,\textsuperscript{18} such as the intended sacrifice of Isaac by Abraham sculpted on the four faces of one of the \textit{pontile}'s capitals (Fig. 26). Incense purified, protected, and honoured the receiver and no Old Testament priest could begin his service without this essential ingredient.\textsuperscript{19} Perhaps the tall flames on the altar that consume one face of the Abraham capital, visually echoed the smoke rising upwards from the altar and thus presented the typological source for the use of incense during the High Mass; the laity may have been able to see the wisps of scented smoke rising from behind the screen and thus connected the invisible act with the visible sculptures. As a type for Christ’s sacrifice on the cross, Abraham’s attempted slaying of his son, Isaac, would also have been associated with the actual Mass since both the rite and the Old Testament story were related to the Crucifixion.

The \textit{Gloria in Excelsis}, recited at Modena, if time permitted (\textit{si adest tempus}), is broken into three parts: the song of the angels during the Nativity, the praise of God, and the glorification of Christ. Although this hymn references the beginning of Redemption through the Incarnation, it also used words similar to those spoken by Christ during the \textit{Last Supper}, as Joseph Jungmann noted; the song’s verse “\textit{I have exalted thy glory on earth, by achieving the task which thou gavest me to do}” is comparable to the scriptural account of the meal, “\textit{I have glorified thee on earth; I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do}” (John 17:4).\textsuperscript{20} Thus, the hymn can be related to the largest surviving image on the screen, where Christ and the twelve apostles appear seated at a table (Fig. 30), and even to the entire balustrade for only through the Passion events, represented here in stone, would Christ complete his task (Fig. 1). At this point in the Mass, however, the texts are referencing the upcoming climax of the celebration.

As the celebrant performed the next part of the Mass, the recitation of the Collect, he faced east. More importantly, in the Middle Ages, the priest was admonished to lift his hands for this prayer said on behalf of the faithful community; medieval theologians perceived this posture as imitating the crucified Christ.\textsuperscript{21} At Modena, the raised hands may also have recalled the modified \textit{orans} position, exhibited by Daniel as he sits in the lions’ den on the western face of another of the screen’s capitals (Fig. 27): the prophet sits with one arm extended around the neck the lion on his left side, while the other is raised palm forward pressed against his chest by the beast on his right. Perhaps the fact that Daniel prayed seven times a day (Ps. 118: 164) explains the use of this petitioning posture. His strong devotion, suggested by the pose, saved him from the ravenous beasts that surround him. The use of a posture of prayer in the sculpture
could have created a connection between the celebrant and the loyal prophet through visual lines rising from the capital, through the Passion to the back of the priest just visible above the balustrade as he faced the altar. In contrast to the celebrant, however, Daniel faces fully frontal towards the west and the gathered crowds, a reversal and perhaps a visual compensation for the officiant’s more private position.

In contrast, the lessons of the Gospel, which varied according to the liturgical calendar, were read from a position fully visible to the laity. Since the original choir screen lacked a pulpit, a lectern may have been attached to the northern or Gospel side of the pontile for such purposes. After receiving the celebrant’s blessing, the deacon carried the book to the lectern most likely preceded by a thurible or censer of incense, since the sacramentary gave instructions for its preparation prior to the Gospel reading. At this point, Amalarius identified the thurible as the body of Christ filled with sweet scent and the celebrant as the living Christ whom the Gospels discuss. Notably, the person who would stand just behind the sculpted balustrade and thus would have been most visible to the crowd was now identified with the protagonist of Christianity.

The next subdivision of the Mass, according to Amalarius, is symbolic of the Passion and Burial of Christ, the most significant section for the imagery on the choir screen since the content of the rite and the sculptures overlap (Fig. 1). At Modena this is the largest part of the Mass and included: the Laying of the Offerings, the Orate Fratres (the petition for prayer from bystanders), the Pater Noster, the Kyrie Eleison, the Credo (the statement of the faith), the Preface (the formula marking the beginning of the upcoming Canon), the Canon (the Eucharistic prayer), and the Consecration.

Since Christ had instituted the Eucharistic mystery with bread and wine altered through heavenly intervention during the Last Supper, these elements had to be available for the celebration of Mass. They were placed and arranged in a cross formation on the church’s table, the altar, in an act called the Laying of the Offerings. Although the Campionesi’s image represents the moment that Judas is identified as a traitor and not the Institution of the Eucharist, the large image of the Last Supper could be associated with the latter momentous event since both bread and chalice appear on the table (Fig. 30). In this liturgical context, the cloth that falls in rhythmic folds over the table may have been meant to echo the sindon or
corporal, the fabric that the clergy carefully spread over the altar just prior to the Laying of the Offerings. Thus, the sculpted table of the Lord seen in the sculpture by the laity would reflect in appearance the altar dressed by the privileged ecclesiastics for a repetition of the sacrifice behind the screen.

While the offerings were passed to the bishop by the deacon and arranged on the altar, the former recited a series of intercessory prayers. These petitions included remembrances of the Passion from which the blood and body ultimately derived: “Domine Jesu Christe, qui in Cruce passionis tuae de latere tuo, unde tibi Ecclesiam consecrare, sanguinem manare voluisti” and “Suscipe, Sancta Trinitas, hanc oblationem, quam tibi offerimus in memoriam Incarnationis, Nativitatis, Passionis, Ressurrectionis, & Ascensionis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, & in honorem perpetuae Virginis mariae, atque omnium electorium tuorum, qui tibi placuerunt ab initio Mundi.” Again, there is a direct relationship between the words of the rite and the choice of subject for the choir screen: Christ’s sacrifice is mentioned in both passages and the Campionesi recreate in stone his trials prior to the Crucifixion (Fig. 1). Then, the bread and wine were incensed, again recalling the Old Testament sacrifices, like that of Abraham and Isaac, discussed above (Fig. 26). After this preparation of the offerings, the bishop sought prayers on his behalf through the petition, Oorate Fratres. As he spoke, he stretched out his arms, recalling the shape of the crucifix, an image not found on the pontile, a notable omission, and hence emphasized his role as mediator between God and the faithful, akin to Christ whose Passion is set before the eyes of the congregation.

After a responding prayer, the recitation of the Pater Noster and Kyrie Eleison amid a series of psalms, the Credo was recited in order to assert the tenets of orthodoxy, an important liturgical tool for the refutation of heresy, a topic that will be addressed further in chapter three. The Credo was only included in the Sunday Masses and particularly solemn performances of rites (e.g. when the bishop presided). This list of beliefs included a brief summary of the salient events in Christ’s life and specifically referred to Pontius Pilate, the only trial figure to be depicted by the artists (Fig. 32): “Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato, passus et sepultus est” (“Crucified even for us by Pontius Pilate, died and buried”). Like the sculptors who only depicted Pilate on his throne discoursing with and passing judgment on Christ, this text is the only explicit reference to Christ’s court trials within the Mass. Interestingly, the passage moves directly from Pilate to Christ’s death. This organization reflects the presentation of events by the Campionesi. In their sculptures, the pointing hand of Pilate guides the viewer directly to the scenes of
physical torment and the Road to Calvary (Fig. 33) where the Crucifixion took place. This arrangement implicated the court, and specifically, the Roman procurator, as instigators of the tortures leading to death.

After stating the tenets of belief concerning the Father and Son, the text turns to the Holy Spirit that speaks through the prophets ("qui locutus est per prophetes") in preparation for the coming of Christ. Similarly the Holy Spirit could have been called to mind when viewing the two Old Testament capitals with Abraham, Isaac, and Daniel (Figs. 26-27). These prophets exemplified the Spirit in the old age that typologically pointed to the coming of Christ. This relationship is echoed in the format of the choir screen where the capitals physically supported the balustrade dedicated to the same protagonist.

The Canon begins after the Credo and is necessary for any celebration of the Eucharist. Although treated by liturgists as a monolithic unit, it is actually comprised of a series of prayers and oblations: the Preface, Te Igitur, Sanctus, Benedictus, General Intercessory Prayer, Communicantes, Hang Igitur, Quam Oblationem, Unde et Memores, Supra Quae, Supplices, Memento Mori, Nobis Quoque, and concluding hymns glorifying God.31 Through its many prayers, the bishop, in the name of the community, petitioned God, through Christ, to accept the offerings.32 Although the words of consecration are embedded within this series of prayers, for the sake of clarity that significant climax will be treated separately after a discussion of the Canon as a whole.

In the twelfth century, the majority of this section of the Mass was recited in isolation and thus the communication between celebrant and congregation was reduced to a minimum.33 The laity’s participation was limited to what they could see above the screen, namely the celebrant’s back and upper body; not coincidentally, during the same century more movements, gestures, and signs were added and each one was invested with importance. For example, the priest generally took the orans position, a standard pose for the recitation of prayers that would be immediately identifiable by the faithful and, as was previously observed, is partially repeated by Daniel on the screen’s capital.

According to allegorical interpretations of the liturgy, as the celebrant turned to the east just prior to the beginning of the Canon, the altar became the table of the Last Supper (Fig. 30), while the corporal became the towel that Christ wrapped around his body and used to wipe the feet of the disciples (Fig. 29).34 In their representation of the Washing of the Feet, the first image in the Passion sequence to survive on the
balustrade, the Campionesi rendered the towel prominently around Christ’s neck and shoulders as he bends to rinse St. Peter’s feet, an iconographic emphasis possibly explained by this symbolism. Further, within the liturgical context, the decorated books held by the apostles in this same scene, an odd feature of the sculpture, may have been associated with the jewelled Gospel book that was used during the readings and thus had been visible to the laity.

Moreover, at this point in time, the *vexillum*, a linen cloth attached to the bishop’s pastoral staff, became a symbol of suffering and more specifically for Christ’s sorrow for the traitor, Judas. The latter’s moment of weakness appears on one of the *penacchio*, or plume-shaped sculptures (Fig. 34), where he greedily accepts money from the Jewish priests for his betrayal, depicted prominently after the image of the *Last Supper* (Fig. 31). Thus, various aids used during the Mass seem to have informed both the choice of events pictured on the choir screen and some of the details included in them. These items could have made a concrete connection between the historical events rendered in stone and the living Mass performed before the eyes of the faithful.

The onset of the Canon is marked by a formula called the Preface, which expressed gratitude for Christ’s acts that secure salvation, namely the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension. According to the sacramentary of Modena Cathedral, the canons had special Prefaces reserved for the celebration of the Nativity, Epiphany, Lent in its entirety, the Resurrection, the Ascension, Pentecost, and the Assumption of the Virgin, as well as in honour of the Holy Cross, the Apostles, and the Holy Trinity; a single formula, “in the usual manner,” was used on all other days. Just prior to reciting this section of the Canon, the celebrant is instructed to carry the book in his hand and approach the representation of the Saviour, then a second picture of the same subject, and finally a hanging cross. These images must have been situated in the east end since the Canon was performed there and thus the hanging cross must have been located near and most likely above the screen, an important factor for my reconstruction in chapter five. Following these written prescriptions, the bishop’s acts around the east end would have moved him in and out of visibility for the congregation, in keeping with typical twelfth century liturgical requirements.

The Preface was followed by the *Sanctus*, which focused on the earthly church and was often sung by the people as well as the clergy. This song was not only derived from the vision of Isaiah (6:3), but also related to a revelation recorded in Daniel immediately after his account of the lions’ den (7:10),
of the narratives sculpted on the screen (Fig. 27). Both prophets saw the celestial multitudes who minister to God crying out “Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus.” This call is followed by the hymn *Benedictus* that referred to the coming of Christ. Not only was this idea related to his coming during the *Entry into Jerusalem* where the crowds welcomed Christ with song (Matt. 21:9; Mark 11:9), and important image missing from the Passion sequence on the balustrade to be discussed further in my reconstruction, but also to the sacraments. Within the context of the Mass these hymns referred to the transformation of the bread and wine into Christ’s body and blood, another form of *adventus*.

The first official prayer of the Canon sequence is the petition for acceptance of the sacrifice by God through Christ, called *Te Igitur*. This acceptance is crucial for the subsequent consecration. While the actual text of this petition does not relate to the images of the *pontile*, it is followed by the act of signing three crosses that symbolized the three times Christ was mocked in trials before the Jewish priests, Herod, and Pilate. The latter’s judgement comprises one of the larger scenes of the balustrade (Fig. 32).

The *Communicantes*, another prayer of the Canon, emphasized a sense of community with the saints whose names it listed. According to Jungmann, aside from biblical figures, the only saints who appear in this prayer were martyrs especially venerated in Rome. Among this elite group stands St. Lawrence, the cleric whose feast was one of the oldest celebrated in the holy city and the only martyr to be depicted on the *pontile*. He appears in the midst of his martyrdom by grilling on the third figural capital (Fig. 28). His inclusion in the iconography of the choir screen is enigmatic, but his presence in the community of saints emphasized in the great Eucharistic prayer of the Church may partially explain the choice of this saint for the screen. His inclusion, however, cannot be fully explained by this prayer alone since many other martyrs are mentioned yet not present on the Campionesi’s monument.

The last section of the Canon to relate to the imagery on the balustrade is the *Supra Quae*, another plea for acceptance of the oblations. In order to establish the validity of the offerings, the celebrant presented Old Testament precedents that were pleasing to God, namely the sacrifices of Abel, Melchisedek, and, most importantly for this study, Abraham. This patriarch was willing to sacrifice his own son, but instead was able to bring him home alive reflecting Christ’s sacrifice involving death and Resurrection. The moment of the intended offering is shown on one face of the Abraham capital and would have been an important precedent for the Mass (Fig. 26). The mention of Abel could also call to mind the sculptures
placed on the façade of the cathedral where images from Genesis were carved on a series of panels by an earlier sculptor at the cathedral, Wiligelmo (c.1106; Fig. 85). Abel’s pleasing sacrifice of a lamb to God is shown among these Old Testament events. The linking together of Abel and Abraham in the prayer may have created a mental connection between the exterior programme and the interior carvings, tying the cathedral together.

The Consecration and Elevation of the sanctified offerings are embedded within the series of prayers that form the Canon; at Modena Cathedral, they took place between the *Hanc Igitur* and *Quam Oblationem* prayers. The ability to consecrate the host was a priestly power that the clergy believed they derived from Christ via the apostles, all of whom appear with their teacher in the Campionesi’s rendition of the *Last Supper*, which can be associated with the Institution of the Eucharist (Fig. 30). This belief in the exclusive power of the clergy was emphasized by the celebrant’s act of turning away from the laity and receding from view by moving towards the altar and, thus, away from the screen. The words of consecration for the wafer also stressed this privileged, historic connection by echoing Christ’s utterance during the *Last Supper* as recorded in the scriptures:

> “Qui pridie quam pateretur accepit panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas elevates oculis in caelum ad te deum patrem suum omnipotentem tibi gratias agens benedixit fregit dedit discipulis suis dicens accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes hoc est enim corpus meum.”

In addition to referencing the events during the meal, the first phrase of this consecration “qui pridie quam pateretur,” (“on the day before he was crucified”) was typically used to describe the betrayal and refer to the impending arrest, the rendition of which immediately follows the *Last Supper* on the pontile (Figs. 30 and 31).

The words of consecration for the chalice again recall the scriptural account of the words spoken during the *Last Supper*:

> “Simili modo posteaquam caenatum est accipiens et hunc praeclarum calicem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas item tibi gratias agens benedixit dedit discipulis suis dicens accipite et bibite ex eo omnes hic est enim calys sanguinis mei novi et aeterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Haec quotiescumque feceritis in mei memoriam facietis.”

This excerpt parallels the biblical accounts, especially that of Matthew (26:28) whose words in reference to the chalice were excerpted and used for the transformation of both bread and wine. At this point, one should remember that of all the disciples represented by the Campionesi in the *Last Supper*, Matthew is the
only one shown consuming part of the meal and he drinks from a footed bowl reminiscent of a chalice. Thus, within the context of the liturgy, this figure emphasizes the Eucharistic overtones of the meal and thus its relevance to the Mass.

The priest enhanced the words of consecration with dramatic movements that suited the text and underlined his identification with Christ by re-enacting the latter’s actions during the Last Supper. In the twelfth century, the officiant’s words were no longer audible to the congregation who were relegated to the nave and he often took Communion as an individual on behalf of the faithful community; hence, Parker argued that the laity were reduced to passive observers, but I would argue that they were actively involved in this climactic moment through the contemplation of the Eucharist and, by extension, the images of the pontile itself.

After the words of consecration had been spoken, the celebrant raised the Host so that the people could view it. The tradition of lifting the Eucharist, or Elevation, was instituted during the Romanesque period, coinciding with the introduction of higher barriers placed between the clergy and the audience. According to Jacqueline Jung, liturgical sources reveal that the clergy were concerned with the participation of the laity in the Mass despite the erection of these physical obstructions to the altar. For example, the Parisian Bishop Odo of Sully (d. 1208) wrote that the Host should be seen by all. This interest in revealing the transformed wafer led to the major Elevation in the thirteenth century, but the twelfth century saw a minor version that served the same purpose.

At Lyon the priest would raise the host for viewing and then would stand with arms extended, recalling the image of Christ on the Cross, reminding the congregation that the Mass reproduced the sacrifice on Golgotha. This reference was made more blatant at Modena, and at other sites with comparable decorated furniture, through the proximity of the Host held by the officiant to the sculptures documenting the events leading to the Crucifixion. While the Last Supper image carved by the Campionesi does not show the Institution of the Eucharist, it recalls this event through its details, as noted above, especially when one considers this image separate from the remainder of the Passion story. The raising of the Host here would have taken place above the choir screen in order to be viewed by the people. By standing above the sculptures, a direct visual and theological relationship could have been drawn between
the bishop holding the body of Christ and the images of the Passion, especially with the largest scene, that of the *Last Supper*, since the bishop was Christ’s representative who had just left the table of the Lord, namely the altar.

The Elevation became more and more important for the congregation as their reception of the Eucharist was gradually restricted. By the twelfth century, the public only participated in Communion one or two times a year, namely at Easter and sometimes Christmas. Due to this limited consumption, people actively sought to view the Host so that its divine grace would contact their bodies, allowing them to participate in the sacrament. To see it, was to be blessed as if one had actually consumed the Eucharist. This visual and mental engagement was so strong that towards the end of the twelfth century stories of visions of the Host shining brightly or appearing as an infant had begun to circulate. Contrary to the rules of the Mass, some celebrants would raise the sacrament several times in order to satisfy the laity’s demand to view it. In order to prolong this experience, people would even leave midway through the service and move from church to church in order to see the Elevation as many times as possible.

This spiritual communion was enhanced by contemplating the historical source of the service, Christ’s Passion. As the kneeling faithful looked upon the Host, they were to be spiritually transported to Calvary where they, too, could experience Christ’s death and Resurrection, the events that led to salvation. According to Miri Rubin, as the Eucharist became increasingly important and mysterious, the dominant image offered for the faithful’s reflection was the Passion, since the same effects of Communion could be achieved through fervent viewing as through the consuming of Christ. By documenting events associated with his death, body, and blood, the pontile’s images could have become a substitute for actually witnessing the miracle of the Mass (Fig. 1). The large, staid images of the choir screen (Figs. 29-33), opposed to the more active figures found in the narrative sequences on the contemporary Provençal façades (Figs. 47-55), would foster contemplation, devotion, and mental focus prior to the final epiphany in the form of the elevated Eucharist. At Modena, through a mental re-enactment of the Passion through meditation on the images, whether following the entire sequence from the *Washing of the Feet* to Simon of Cyrene or focusing on one pertinent scene, the laity could have created a
devotional experience of the historical event in lieu of watching the transformation of the wafer and wine
(Figs. 29-33). Thus, the clergy may have used the screen to engage the laity mystically and emotionally,
while psychologically passing on some of the benefits associated with consuming the Host.

The remaining parts of the Mass, for Amalarius, symbolize the Resurrection and Ascension of
Christ.68 Understandably, there are few connections between the Mass and the Passion sequence of the
pontile from this point onwards. At Modena, this section of the liturgy included the Commingling, the Kiss
of Peace, the Pax Domini, Communion of the Priest and, if necessary, of the Faithful, the Communion
Chant, Post-Communion, and the Dismissal. The first of these parts to have important implications for the
choir screen is the Communion of the Faithful.

Due to the increasing reverence of the Eucharist, the clergy began to take measures to insure the
security of Christ’s body during the rare times that the populace partook in Communion. From the ninth
century onwards, the celebrant placed the Host in the mouth of the awaiting layperson.69 In order to
accomplish this task during the later Middle Ages, the officiant had to move to a location accessible to the
laity. Within Modena Cathedral, this place would have been either in the side aisles, or more typical of
other medieval churches, to a minor altar set in the nave. Such precautions prevented any pieces of the
Host from falling to the floor to be trampled or being stolen from the church rather than consumed.

In Modena Cathedral, if the priest had stood at an altar in the nave during this act, he would have
been before the images of Christ’s Passion. Particularly pertinent in this context would be the image of
Christ placing the sop directly into Judas’ mouth during the Last Supper (Fig. 30). The similarity of this
gesture to that of the officiant giving the laity their Hosts surely would not have been lost on the
participant, especially when one contemplated the image by itself, separate from the Passion sequence. The
relationship between Judas and the laity who received the sacrament was expanded further by the clerics.
As precautions were implemented, an increasing emphasis was placed on the purity of the recipient of
Communion through confession of not only criminal, but also spiritual sins.70 In order to partake of the
Host with the community, the recipient had to be pure akin to all of the disciples, including Judas whose
inner state, prior to consuming the sop, is evidenced by the halo he still bears in the Last Supper scene;
Christ and the clergy knew that both traitor and laity would succumb to sin after leaving the table or the
church. Chrysostom even chastised those people who did not pause after Communion to give a hymn of praise, but hastened off impatiently from the table like Judas rushing away to arrange Christ’s Arrest.\textsuperscript{71}

After the Dismissal of the people, the celebrant and accompanying clergymen left the altar, returning to the sacristy. The Recession was accompanied by the song of the three Hebrews in the fiery furnace. This text can be tied to Daniel in whose biblical book this passage appears (Daniel 3: 52-90); in addition, the three youths were often related to St. Lawrence who suffered martyrdom by grilling over a fire, as is prominently shown on one of the screen’s figured capitals (Figs. 27-28). As observed earlier, the choice to represent this particular saint on the screen is enigmatic, but this relationship with another of the figured capitals, that of Daniel, may again partially explain the presence of this iconography.\textsuperscript{72}

Having studied the Mass both literally and allegorically in relation to the pontile, I have highlighted a number of powerful connections between the two. The first and last sections of the rite, as defined by Amalarius, reveal fewer connections with the Passion sequence, yet do exhibit ties with the supporting figures. As one would suspect, the screen’s imagery has the most direct associations with the middle portion of the Mass that Amalarius had related to the Passion. This climactic portion of the ritual included the consecration of the sacraments and was strongly related to the historical Last Supper, the most prominent image on the screen and the one to which the rite repeatedly related itself (Fig. 30). The size of that image and its prominence for the High Mass suggests that it most likely took pride of place in the original choir screen, as will be discussed in chapter five.\textsuperscript{73} While the strong connections between the Mass and the Last Supper are important, the fact that other events found on the pontile were not recalled as often during the Mass is also interesting. For instance, the Arrest, the trial scenes, and the Road to Calvary are briefly referenced during the Mass, but do not appear to have been as significant for the rite as the Last Supper (Figs. 31-33). Moreover, in this liturgy, the Payment of Judas, Peter’s Denial, and the Flagellation do not appear to have been specifically mentioned at all, although they do appear prominently on the choir screen (Figs. 32 and 34-35). The less detailed treatment or omission of these scenes from the texts was probably due to the focus on events most intimately connected to the sacrifice.

The emphasis on re-presenting the events that are the source of the Mass would have been even more overt during the Easter season when the celebrations of the liturgical year coincided with the time of Christ’s trials and death. Rites performed during this period were more important than those enacted at any
other time of the year since the sacrifice would overlap with historical time. From the Ottonian period onwards, the engagement of the congregation during this annual remembrance was encouraged by the greater dramatization of the Passion via such ceremonies as the procession on Palm Sunday and the lighting of the Paschal Candle during the Easter Vigil. Moreover, sermons, especially the one delivered on Good Friday, would stress sharing Christ’s sufferings, both mentally and spiritually, a kind of *compassion*. Throughout Lent (the forty days preceding Easter), and especially during Holy Week (Palm Sunday through the Easter Vigil), the drama of the rite would have been intensified as the faithful remembered the Passion of Christ in vivid detail creating an intimate spiritual connection with past events in the present, the memory of which would have been aided visually by the stone sculptures within Modena Cathedral. In this atmosphere, the staid images by the Campionesi would be a permanent aid to spiritual devotion that would have heightened the religious experience of the community as a whole.

Indeed, Easter was a truly communal time, for the laity would receive their annual Holy Communion. To not take part in this event was a sign of exclusion from the group. The faithful would go to confession during Holy Week in order to be able to partake of the Host with everyone else; in addition, those people accused of particularly serious sins would undergo the rite of Penance in order to be cleansed, readmitted into the religious community, and hence be allowed to fully participate in the Mass. The sacrificial bonds that united the group were emphasized by the bishop in his sermon prior to Communion during the Easter celebrations. As mentioned above, the clergy would perform the Mass behind the screen, but would come to an altar set in the nave in order to distribute the Host to the awaiting faithful. As each person knelt to receive the sacraments the screen would still be before them, presenting the awesome events that had led to this climactic moment (Figs. 1 and 120). As a result, the ties between the images on the choir screen and the rites of Lent and Holy Week were many; although this connection between the Campionesi’s monument and the annual celebration of the Passion may seem obvious, a thorough examination of this relationship has not been undertaken previously.

The Campionesi’s images show the fewest associations with the events and readings for the period of Lent preceding Holy Week. Notably, the first week of this season, called *Septuagesima*, was dedicated
to St. Lawrence, who appears on one of the figured capitals of the pontile (Fig. 28). Again, however, this reference to the martyr seems to only explain in part his presence since the remaining weeks of Lent were also dedicated to other saints who do not appear on the choir screen.81

During the ensuing weeks, the readings emphasized Old Testament precursors to the Passion as well as the prophecies fulfilled by Christ. An instance of the former is found in the responsorials, or chants comprised of responds and verses, for the Sunday and Thursday of Quinquagesima, the fifth week before Holy Week. These responses related the Genesis story of Abraham, including his attempted sacrifice of Isaac that is portrayed on the pontile’s capital (Fig. 26).82 As Lawrence Frizzell and J. Frank Henderson observed, even the term describing this period, “Pascha,” was derived from the Hebrew word for Passover revealing the clergy’s attempt to relate Christ’s sacrifice to Old Testament events, such as those described in Exodus.83 An example of the Passion’s fulfillment of prophecies can also be found during Quinquagesima when the Gospel selection was Luke 18: 31-43; in it Christ predicted that “after they [the Gentiles] have scourged him, they will put him to death; and the third day he shall rise again” (Luke 18:33). During this reading, the laity’s eyes might naturally have been drawn to the Flagellation scene carved on the choir screen (Fig. 32). There, Christ appears bound to a column and whipped before his Crucifixion, aiding the viewer’s visualization and thus spiritual experience of this torture. Such Messianic visions were intended to lead the faithful through contemplation of the mysteries of the Incarnation and Resurrection, the events that bracketed the all-important Passion that, in turn, led to the mystery of the Eucharist.

Beginning in the Early Christian period, emphasis during Easter had been placed on baptism in order to facilitate the high rate of conversion. Christians understood this ritual as a death and then a rebirth into Christianity akin to the Resurrection.84 The actual rite was performed during Holy Week, but the preparation and scrutinies of the catechumens, or initiates, took place during Lent beginning on the Sunday of Quinquagesima. These allusions remained in the Easter liturgies, although the occurrence of adult baptisms continued to gradually decline being replaced by those of infants throughout the Middle Ages. With this decrease, Lent increasingly took on a penitential character85 that can be associated with the desire to overcome sin and evil just as Christ had battled and overcome Satan through his death. This reproachful tone existed in twelfth-century Modena for not only does the sacramentary outline the rituals for infant
rather than adult baptism,\textsuperscript{86} liturgical books of the period described the rites of Penance in detail. Criminals underwent rigorous ordeals in order to be absolved of their sin and re-admitted into the community of the faithful through Communion.\textsuperscript{87} In addition, according to Peter Cobb, by the tenth century, all of the laity, not just those required to do public penance, partook in some of the penal observances, such as fasting.\textsuperscript{88}

The official beginning of Lent was Ash Wednesday, located in \textit{Quinquagesima}. The importance of this day is marked by an emphasis on taking up the struggle against evil and engaging in Christian warfare through fasting.\textsuperscript{89} References to armour, battles, and conflict between two forces symbolized by light and dark recur throughout the paschal liturgies of the period, again recalling the lions overcoming their armed and sacrificial foe found supporting the columns of the \textit{pontile} (Figs. 18-21).

The initiation of the rigorous penitential rites also occurred on this day. Penitents, barefoot and clothed in sackcloth, gathered in the church before the bishop who marked them with ashes. After humbly admitting their errors and begging forgiveness, they were told which acts of penance would cleanse them. They were then dismissed from the cathedral until Maundy Thursday of Holy Week when they were reconciled with the flock.\textsuperscript{90} The accompanying readings emphasize this exile by shifting to imagery of Exodus recalling the Hebrews’ forty years wandering in the desert. A sense of isolation is also emphasized by the passage Matthew 26:73, in which St. Peter is accused of being a follower of Christ, a statement that he denies for the third time. This moment of weakness is represented on one of the \textit{penacchio} on which a cock crowed as a maid accused the saint for the final time (Fig. 35). Being acquainted with this popular biblical story, worshippers viewing this image would have understood that after this last accusation, St. Peter fled into repentant seclusion.

A further penitential association with the choir screen may be present in the close association of the \textit{Last Supper} and the image of St. Peter’s foot being washed (Figs. 30-31). The saint received the washing in order to be a part of Christ just as sinners received their orders for ritual penance in order to be a part of the Christian community. Hildegard Giess convincingly argued that the presentation of these two scenes side by side in various materials were meant to address penitents who must wash away their stain of sin in order to approach the Lord’s table akin to the disciples who had to be cleansed in order to partake in the first Communion.\textsuperscript{91}
The next paschal association with the Campionesi’s monument occurs on the Tuesday before Palm Sunday. On this day, the first lesson related the story of Daniel in the Lions’ Den (Daniel 14: 27-42). As noted above, this prophet’s rescue from certain death by mauling and starvation in the pit appears on a pontile capital (Fig. 27). It was a precursor of the Passion for both he and Christ were miraculously delivered from their fates through divine intervention. In the ensuing week, the latter figure would become the prominent protagonist in the liturgies and, not coincidentally, is the foremost figure in the sculptures of the balustrade.

As one would expect, the sculpted images exhibit the most references to the events of Holy week when the focus of the community turned to ceremonies rememorative of Christ’s sufferings. This week begins with Palm Sunday when a procession bearing palms winds its way towards the cathedral in celebration of Christ’s Entry into Jerusalem. In this elaborate ceremony, a parade of bishop, clergy, and laity would usually begin outside of the city, preferably at an elevated site, and process through the town gate treading on garments thrown to the ground by the faithful who also held up palms that had been blessed earlier in the day. Often, the procession appears to have included a symbol of Christ, such as a Gospel book, reliquary, image of Christ seated on an ass, or, particularly popular in Northern Italy, a large cross. As an important day marking the beginning of com-passion with Christ, the omission of a related sculpture on the pontile seems very odd.

The ensuing Mass of Palm Sunday was marked by an emphasis on themes of Christ’s persecution. On this day, the Gospel reading was John 8:46-59 in which Christ responded to his Jewish harassers and proclaimed to them that “Abraham your Father rejoiced that he might see my day; he saw it and was glad.” (8:56) and “Amen, Amen I say to you, ” Jesus answered, “ before Abraham was made, I am” (8:58). Through these readings, the images of Christ’s sufferings were typologically tied to the Abraham capital (Fig. 26). After the Gospel, the first of the Holy Week accounts is read in full: Matthew’s Passion story from the plot against Jesus by the Jews through the burial of Christ (Matthew 26-27). The congregation could follow the events related by this evangelist in the visual representations that formed the choir screen (Figs. 29-33).

Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday were less auspicious parts of Holy Week, but had become times for celebrating the parts of the religious service by the seventh century. The rites of these three
days encompass readings and hymns that stress feelings of penitence, suffering, and sorrow. One cause of Christ’s pain was the betrayal by Judas referred to obliquely through an antiphon sung during lauds on Monday: “And I said to them: If it be good in your eyes bring hither my wages: and if not, be quiet. And they weighed for my wages thirty pieces of silver” (Zechariah 11:12). The relationship between this verse and the imminent betrayal by Judas for the same reward would not have been lost on the learned members of the audience. Notably, in the sculpture of Judas’ payment, the money is quite large, emphasizing the counting of the coins and thus the apostle’s greed (Fig. 34). The Monday Gospel (John 12:1-9) would have further stressed this connection, since it related the anointing at Bethany when Judas questioned the use of expensive perfume underlining his avarice that led to John’s accusation that the traitor stole from the apostles’ communal purse. This emphasis on Judas’s greed is also underscored by the designer of the pontile, for in the scene of his payment Judas holds two purses and eagerly seeks more funds with a beseeching hand.

Tuesday’s Mass was marked by the reading of the Gospel of Mark from the anointing in Bethany through the burial of Christ (Mark 14, 15:1-46).96 Wednesday’s celebrations included readings focused on Christ as the sacrificial victim97 leading directly to the Passion story according to Luke (12, 13:1-53) whose traditional symbol, the ox, emphasized the idea of oblation.98 The contents of Wednesday’s prayers were repeated on Good Friday including the request for divine mercy for the Church, Pope, clergy, catechumens, ill, heretics, Jews, and pagans.99 For Amalarius the repetition of these prayers represented the fact that the Jews hatched the plot against Jesus on Wednesday, represented on the screen by Judas’ payment (Fig. 34), and followed through with their plan on Friday, depicted in the larger scene of the Arrest (Fig. 31).100

Maundy Thursday was the next important day of Holy Week as it commemorated events associated with the Last Supper as well as being the designated day for reconciling penitents and for consecrating the oils of baptism, confirmation, and anointing the sick. This day’s liturgical importance was underlined by the performance of the Mass with the Eucharist, which was omitted from the services after Palm Sunday and all subsequent meetings until Easter Sunday morning.101
Thursday’s morning service was called the Mass of Remission as the penitents who had been expelled from the church were absolved and readmitted into the community of the faithful by the bishop. The latter was seated on a throne at the head of the nave of the church. Within Modena Cathedral, he would have been seated directly below the images of Christ’s Passion. This juxtaposition might have suggested a parallel between the Saviour and the clergyman who, through their sacrificial and liturgical acts, could remove the stain of sin from the unfaithful.

The bishop would also be present for and perform the second Mass of the day when the various oils used by the clergy throughout the year were blessed, Hosts were reserved for use on the following day, and the altars were stripped of their ornament. Healing and cleansing themes, associated with Maundy Thursday, were important for the blessing of these liturgical liquids and, indeed, for the rest of Easter week since purity was necessary for their transformation as well as for spiritual preparation. This theme was made more evident through the central reading of this Mass: the account of the Washing of the Feet recorded only by John (13:1-15) and represented on the pontile (Fig. 29). The reading ended with Christ’s order, “For I have given you an example, that as I have done, so you do also” (John 13:15), a command that led to a ceremony performed after the Mass denoted by “Mandatum,” the Latin word for “order,” in the liturgical books of the period. As observed in chapter one, this word appears on the frame above the image of Christ washing St. Peter’s foot before other apostles, an explicit liturgical reference connecting the ceremonial present to an historical event of the Passion.

The name of this ceremony came to reference the liturgical repetition of the Washing of the Feet in the West since it referenced Christ’s orders, “You call me Master, and Lord; and you say well, for so I am. If then I being your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; you also ought to wash one another’s feet” (John 13: 13-14) and “A new commandment I give unto you: That you love one another, as I have loved you, that you also love one another” (John 13:34). Undertaken by Christ during the Last Supper in order to purify his apostles, the Washing of the Feet retained this character throughout the Middle Ages; in addition, on account of Christ’s second order, it was also interpreted by early monastic writers as an act of love and humility that bound the fraternal community together. This interpretation allowed the washing to slowly gain popularity in the liturgy. As time passed, hymns and scriptural readings such as Psalm 51:4
(“Wash me yet more from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from sin”) were associated with this act and by the twelfth century, when the pontile was erected, the washing was a ritual part of the Maundy Thursday services.  

Within cathedrals, like Modena’s, this rite consisted of the bishop’s imitation of Christ’s act. While John’s account of the historical event was read, the bishop removed his chasuble and wrapped himself with a linen cloth similar to the corporal; then he proceeded to wash and kiss the feet of twelve randomly selected pilgrims or poor men who were often asked to dine with the officiant after the ceremony. This act had penitential overtones of humility, keeping in mind that penitents had been reconciled with the Church earlier in the day through the bishop’s prayers, but was also an expression of Christian love and charity. While Bergamini sees the books held by the apostles in the Campionesi carving of the Washing as symbolic of the new law of love announced at the Last Supper and recorded in the Gospels, I believe that they, like the word “Mandatum,” further emphasize the liturgical context of the image. The medieval viewer could not help but associate the sculpted jewelled books with the one that was used for the readings during the ceremony. The visual analogy would create a connection between historical and contemporary time, allowing the designer to stress the origins of the current rites performed within the church. This interpretation is supported by rare portrayals of this event in which disciples were shown holding a scroll with the beginning verse of a hymn sung during the Mandatum; Giess entertained the notion that books in similar scenes may be general attributes or an actual influence from the liturgy on a par with those inscribed scrolls. The liturgical associations in the case of Modena’s scene would be comparable to those present in the Last Supper when the tablecloth was associated with the corporal on the altar, as discussed above.  

The sculpted renditions of manuscripts also may have referred to the Word of God made flesh before them and through whom salvation would be attained. This reference to spiritual redemption would have been strengthened through the association of the Washing of the Feet with the rite of Baptism. St. Augustine related the Washing with salvation and the forgiveness of one’s sins through the Crucifixion, a connection furthered by Bernard of Clairvaux in the twelfth century; Gertrud Schiller argued that these references account for the iconographic items associated with salvation found in representations of the Foot Washing. For example, St. Augustine related the towel used by Christ to wash the disciples’ feet to his
grave cloth believing that they were both symbols of redemptive death.\textsuperscript{114} Notably, the \textit{Porta dei Principi} on the south flank of Modena Cathedral was the baptismal portal. Catechumens entered this door in order to be baptized in a marble font.\textsuperscript{115} The neophytes, or newly baptized, would then process into the nave where they would have stood in front of the image of the \textit{Washing of the Feet} during the Easter Vigil before receiving their first Communion.\textsuperscript{116}

Either after the performance of the final Mass of Thursday or on the morning of Good Friday, all of the altars within the cathedral were stripped of their decorations. They and the floor of the church, like the feet of the brethren, were washed in preparation for the Easter festivities.\textsuperscript{117} With the removal of all such decorations, the painted stone sculptures of the \textit{pontile} would have been even more prominent in the stark interior and thus the object of greater focused attention during the remainder of the Holy Week services.

This sombre mood was emphasized on Good Friday by the omission of the daily sacrifice. In this manner, the clergy stressed the absence of Christ in death; the lack of the Host, even for viewing, would have heightened the effect of spiritual communion through contemplation of the Passion. The bishop was again present for the rite\textsuperscript{118} that engaged both clergy and laity in an imitation of the \textit{Crucifixion}. After the Lesson and the singing of the canticle of Habakkuk, who is pictured delivering food to Daniel on one of the capitals (Fig. 27), the reading of the Passion according to the Gospel of John helped the faithful make the transition from reflection on, to imitation of the Passion.\textsuperscript{119} The re-living of Christ’s last day on earth by the people led to the formulation of re-enactments and liturgical dramas that will be discussed later in this chapter.

A second service occurred later in the day ending with the \textit{Adoratio Crucis} or Adoration of the Cross.\textsuperscript{120} Like the Palm Sunday procession, this custom was imported from Jerusalem where, according to the Spanish nun Etheria, who visited the city in 392, the day began with an account of \textit{Christ’s Trial Before Pilate}; the faithful, then paraded to the site of the column used during the \textit{Flagellation} followed by the veneration of a relic of the True Cross.\textsuperscript{121} As discussed in chapter one,\textsuperscript{122} the use of a column during the scourging is not mentioned in the scriptures, yet the Campionesi, based on a western visual tradition, provided this detail in their rendition of Christ’s torture (Fig. 32). The importance of the pillar as a relic led to its inclusion in medieval images and hence explains its presence on the \textit{pontile}. 80
The emphasis on moving through the historic sites of Christ’s Passion was transferred from Jerusalem to the West with the ceremony itself where the commemoration of Christ’s judicial and physical trials was maintained through the reading of John’s Passion story from the Arrest through the burial of Christ (John 18-19) prior to the Adoration itself. Amid the singing of antiphons, hymns, and psalms as well as the recitation of prayers, the officiant and half of the chorus would bow before the cross. According to Amalarius, through this prostration, the community humiliated themselves as Christ had humbled himself by being crucified and thus the congregation engaged in an act of com-passion. The ceremony ended with the kissing of the crucifix.

Many crosses used during the Good Friday Adoration contained a relic of the True Cross. Such a reliquary may have been employed in Modena Cathedral where an eleventh-century Byzantine reliquary, present in the cathedral from its foundation in 1099, contains a piece of the True Cross. The latter’s existence in the Cathedral may be partially supported by the fact that a special Preface for the Canon of the Mass was reserved in honour of the Holy Cross in the sacramentary produced in Modena prior to 1173. If the reliquary was used during the Good Friday celebrations, it must have been mounted on an altar accessible by the people and thus visually coordinated with the choir screen. Thus, the sequence on the pontile would present a visual complement to the Adoration (Figs. 1 and 120). Both the text read during the rite and the images carved on the monument lead up to the ultimate moment of the Crucifixion. As a result, the cross that was used in this ceremony was most likely placed in coordination with the screen. During the Adoration, it was no longer a mere object of contemplation, but rather became the actual historical cross, whether it contained a relic or not. Two deacons often hid behind it in the darkness in order to call out reproaches from Christ to the people as they bowed, and at Modena, these clergymen could have been hidden from view behind the screen; thus the balustrade would have also served a practical as well as narrative function during the ceremony. Antiphons sung during the Adoration provided a dramatic image of the Crucifixion in words in order to intensify the experience for the participants. At some point after the Adoration, a cross or Host was laid to rest in a receptacle symbolizing Christ’s burial in the sepulchre in a ceremony called the Depositio. This item was then “resurrected” on Easter morning during another rite called the Elevatio. If performed in Modena’s church, as in the nearby cathedral of Parma, these ceremonies may have taken place in the crypt or under the shelter of the pontile.
The Easter Vigil held on the following day marked the end of Lent and Holy Week as well as beginning of the Paschal celebrations; to miss this event was to risk being excluded from the Christian community. The evening was comprised of three main parts: the Office of the Vigil, Baptism, and consumption of the Eucharist. The latter was a physical consummation of the spiritual communion performed throughout the year, especially on the preceding day when only a select few had received the pre-sanctified Host reserved from Maundy Thursday Mass. During Good Friday, the laity would have participated in the services through the fervent viewing of the Passion images rather than of the Host.

The Office of the Vigil included the blessing of the paschal candle. First, the church lights were extinguished signifying the abandonment of the light of the prophets. The Paschal candle was blessed through the singing of the *Exultet*. Finally, the taper was lit, often by the bishop. Following the *Exultet*, twelve prophetic passages were read; although the selections changed with time, the inclusion of the accounts of Creation, the Flood, Abraham’s sacrifice, and Daniel remained constant since they were considered fundamental texts. Notably, the first two readings appear in the Genesis cycle on the façade of Modena Cathedral (Figs. 83 and 86). In those images, God is shown in a mandorla creating light, then creating Adam, and finally raising Eve from the latter’s side. The flood represented by Noah and his family peering from windows of the ark is near the end of the sculpted sequence. Thus, a connection between Old Testament stories and New Testament events could be recalled as the faithful walked past the façade, through the main portal, and into the nave of the church, a literal path through Christian time. The remaining basic texts centre on figures, both of whom appear on the capitals supporting the pontile. While Abraham’s sacrifice was a type for God’s surrender of His only son, Isaac represented mankind saved from death just as the catechumens would be redeemed during Baptism (Fig. 26); Daniel represented the faith that sustained people through the dangers of life and was an example for those about to be baptized and the faithful as a whole (Fig. 27).

After these readings and chants, the clergy were ready to perform the rite of Baptism in which people spiritually died and were born anew in Christ. Following the blessing of the water by the bishop, the catechumens were covered with it three times just as Christ spent three days in the tomb. After baptism, the neophytes processed into the nave of the cathedral where they participated in their first Communion. The infant neophytes would be carried before the choir screen where they would be visually
linked to the *Washing of the Feet*, as observed above (Fig. 29). Associations between these new Christians, whether adult or children, could also be made to the figure of Abraham, for St. Paul explained that baptism introduced Gentiles into the family of God and Abraham (Gal. 2: 26-29). Further, fish were also a symbol of Christ (χρυς) and Baptism and are an enigmatic iconographic element in the Campionesi’s representation of the *Last Supper* where both Judas and St. Peter grasp a fish (Fig. 30). Within this context, the fish held by St. Peter would have been particularly important since he holds the keys to heaven in his other hand; his fish could thus allude to Baptism, a key ritual for salvation.

Just as the Easter Vigil marked the end of Holy Week, I would argue it also provided the endpoint for the sculpted images on the screen. As a monument dedicated to literally and typologically to the Passion of Christ, the story that it presents most likely would end with the tortures of the protagonist. The triumphant Resurrection, not often depicted in sculpted Passion sequences of the twelfth century, would have been marked liturgically through the performance of the Mass, liturgical dramas, and the celebrations of the ensuing Easter Week. This point will impact my reconstruction of the choir screen.

Not surprisingly, all of the dramatic ceremonials of Holy Week appear to have connections to the sculpted balustrade except for those of Palm Sunday, a notable omission. While some of the sculpted details stress future salvation, as in the case of St. Peter’s keys and fish, the presence of books in the scene of the *Washing of the Feet* and even in the *Betrayal* scene may have emphasized the liturgical context, which re-enacted the dramatic events of the Passion. In addition to aiding the mental preparation of the laity for commemoration of Christ’s sufferings and enhancing their com-passion, the *pontile* could have acted as a didactic tool to which a speaker could have pointed in order to highlight an Easter sermon or the readings of the Passion accounts throughout Holy Week. The presence of St. Lawrence and Simon of Cyrene is not explained through the Easter celebrations that focus primarily on Christ and his trials.

Having tied the Mass and Easter services to the *pontile’s* sculptures, I will now turn to a discussion of liturgical dramas, further ritual acts whose contents may be reflected in the Campionesi’s monument. These plays were related to the Mass and especially the ceremonies of the Paschal and Christmas seasons, since they were often performed during those periods. Although ultimately based on biblical passages, these dramas provided more details that were derived from various other sources including exegetical and apocryphal texts, sermons, and hymns. By blurring the distinction between
audience and participant, they created a more immediate experience of biblical events than permitted by the more remote and symbolic drama of the Mass.\textsuperscript{140} Many of the plays were written at the same time that the Romanesque building revival took place, and Nikos Psacharopoulos, a theatre director, suggested that they were meant to be enacted within the churches and to exploit the architecture for their staging.\textsuperscript{141} While Modena’s \textit{pontile} clearly functioned as a site for preaching and reading of the gospels, as attested in the surviving documents,\textsuperscript{142} I believe that it also may have been used during such theatrical performances (Fig. 1).

Dramas were enacted on and around the later Gothic choir screens. For example, during the feast of the Annunciation in Durham Cathedral, a sculpted angel was lowered to an awaiting Virgin via a wire from the upper story of the screen.\textsuperscript{143} In other cathedrals, the area sheltered by the balustrades sometimes served as the sepulchre for the Good Friday rites of \textit{Depositio} and \textit{Elevatio}, as well as the performance of the \textit{Quem Quaeritis}, and \textit{Visitatio Sepulchri} play in which the three Marys’ trip to the empty tomb was re-enacted on Easter morning.\textsuperscript{144} As Dunbar Ogden observed, the latter play was often performed in the nave of churches in Italy\textsuperscript{145} and this arrangement might have been particularly appropriate in the case of Modena Cathedral since the \textit{pontile} connected the nave to the hall crypt that could have represented Christ’s tomb. Another play entitled \textit{Peregrinus} and representing the \textit{Journey to Emmaus} was performed in Rouen Cathedral. It required a member of the choir, dressed as Mary, to stand in the pulpit and attest to the Resurrection by holding up the grave clothes or even throwing them down to the congregation.\textsuperscript{146} Thomas Campbell noted that any play required a raised platform to be built so that all of the people could see the performance;\textsuperscript{147} however, this rostrum was already in place if the church housed a choir screen.

Modena’s \textit{pontile}, like these later examples, could have been used in a similar manner. It would have provided the perfect stage-like setting for plays due to its elevated level and access to the crypt, which could have been used for the entrance and exit of characters.\textsuperscript{148} That such plays were performed within this cathedral is suggested by the influence of dramas on the sculptures found on the façade of the church. For instance, the prophets Isaiah, Zechariah, Jeremiah, Moses, Daniel, and Habbakuk, who line the jambs of the central portal of Modena Cathedral’s façade have been related to a Christmas play called the \textit{Ordo Prophetarum}.\textsuperscript{149} This drama was derived from a fifth- or sixth-century sermon entitled \textit{Contra Judeos, Paganos et Arianos Sermo de Symbolo}, which was erroneously attributed to St. Augustine.\textsuperscript{150} Sections
eleven through eighteen of this text addressed the errors of the Jews through their proclamations, and the prophets on the jambs of the main portal hold inscriptions related to this same drama suggesting that it was performed at Modena and may have been enacted on the pontile in a similar manner to performances at Tours and Rouen. There the “prophets” were summoned forth by two clerics positioned in the pulpit and after the final prophecy was delivered, all of the actors united in singing from the pulpit, which, due to terminology problems discussed in my introduction, may refer to the loft of a choir screen. Within Modena Cathedral, the “prophets” when summoned, hypothetically, could have made their appearance by climbing the steps from the crypt into the nave and then disappearing to the side stairs in preparation for mounting the screen for the finale.

Further evidence for the impact of the knowledge of such plays on the clergy of Modena Cathedral, is provided by the images composing the Genesis frieze on the façade (Figs. 83-86). These scenes incorporate extra-biblical details that suggest acquaintance with another popular liturgical drama, the *Play of Adam*. For example, Chiara Frugoni showed that this play inspired the anomalous scenes of Adam and Eve both hoeing after the *Expulsion* (Fig. 84), as will be discussed more fully in chapter four. As these dramatic re-enactments became more popular throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, their gestures, props, and theatrical staging remained influential and any similarities between the plays and the details in the Campionesi’s sculptures may provide an explanation of some of their functions.

A Passion play discovered at the abbey church of Montecassino, as noted in chapter one, was written in the twelfth century. Unlike earlier dramas, which had seen Christ’s suffering as an inherent part of a fuller Easter drama, this play treats the Passion as complete in and of itself. This text could have travelled throughout Italy in a similar manner to the large number of *Exultet Rolls* that were produced at Montecassino and Benevento and then distributed throughout Southern Italy as well as to Central and Northern Italian cities, like Pisa and Milan, as part of the Gregorian reform movement; these scrolls contained the blessings for the Paschal candle and thus were tied to Eastertide as the drama would have been. Moreover, transfers of plays from a monastic context to performances in cathedrals did occur, sometimes with an expansion of the drama. Even though not specifically documented for Modena, this play, although incomplete, provides interesting comparative material for the pontile’s iconography. Both
the drama and the art manifest a greater interest in the humanism of Christ and the details of his Passion in twelfth-century Italy. Furthermore, both items could have been used as didactic tools for the edification of the community.

The surviving text of the play records the words and some of the actions for the portrayal of Judas’ bargain with the Jewish priests, the Arrest, Christ’s court trials, St. Peter’s Denial, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection. In their overall formats, the sculpted pontile and the drama follow a similar pattern in their selection of scenes (Figs. 1 and 29-35). When describing the play, Robert Edwards stated that, “although [it] does not urge reform, it continually images the choices of faith and disbelief.” By placing orthodox examples of right and wrong before the eyes of the laity, both the drama and the sculptures impress upon the viewer the entrapments of the soul, the consequences of error, and, most importantly, the path to salvation.

Of the large sculpted images that form the long balustrade, the drama only mentions three events: the Arrest, the Trial before Pilate and the Flagellation, all scenes only addressed in passing in the Sunday and Easter rites. The first image, that of the Betrayal (Fig. 31), like the scriptures and the play, groups together both the moment of the kiss and the removal of Malchus’ ear. In contrast to the descriptions in the Gospels which state that the disciples fled after Peter had attacked the servant (Matthew 26:50-56; Mark 14:47-50), both the image and the play place their departure before or simultaneous to the drawing of the Peter’s sword. The Campionesi omitted all of the apostles except Peter and Judas, thus creating a more tightly compact and dramatic rendition of the event akin to the instructions for coinciding actions in the drama: “His dic[tis] loricati capiant Iesum et ligent eum et discipuli fugiant, et Petrus incid[at] auriculam Malcho.” Moreover, unlike the scriptures, the play specifically states that the soldiers carried clubs, an item that appears in the artists’ rendition: “Venientes cum lanternis armis fustibus lucernis dicite quem queritis.”

Another small detail on which both iconography and play agree is that Judas was believed to be shorter than Christ. The text states that Judas leans towards his master (“bending toward him and kissing this Jesus;” “inclinens se ei”) and Sandro Sticca believed that this is a concession to the tradition of Judas’ lesser height, a tradition maintained by the Campionesi. If so, this would allow for the literal fulfillment of the prophecy made by Christ after the Washing of the Feet: “I speak not of you all: I know
whom I have chosen. But that the scripture may be fulfilled: He that eateth bread with me shall lift up his heel against me” (John 13:18). Judas’ lesser height required him to raise his heel as he leaned forward to kiss Christ, an apt description of the pontile’s image.

The second event narrated by both the drama and the Campionesi is the Trial before Pilate (Fig. 32). Like the scriptures and the artist’s representation, the drama refers to the act of leading a bound victim. When the Jews transfer him to Pilate’s court, they say, “Iesum strictum religatum perducamus ad Pilatum iudeorum presidem.” Later, the writer instructs: “Interim loricati ducant Iesum ligatum corma Pilato.” Although no ropes are readily visible in the Flagellation on the pontile, they may be present under the guard’s hands, which covers Christ’s wrists that are arranged in a gesture of bondage.

More striking similarities exist between the second half of this image and the descriptions of the Flagellation by the dramatist. While the scriptures contain no reference to Christ being tied to a pillar, a tradition about the column gradually developed and was incorporated in the liturgy at an early date, as seen above in Etheria’s account of the Good Friday events in fourth-century Jerusalem. Based on this convention, the designer of the pontile scene used this iconography, and the play makes reference to it twice: As the Jews lead Jesus from Caiphas to Pilate they cry: “Religemus ad columpnam demergentem in erumpnam Iesum mortis obsidem.” Later, in the middle of his trial before the Roman procurator, the writer instructs: “Ad hec nichil Iesus respondeat set tollatur a presentia Pilati, dum uxor eius dormit et ligatur ad columpnam et flagelletur.” The sculptures prominently display Christ’s bound hands as he embraces the pillar during the Flagellation.

Although the drama does include events up to the Crucifixion, it does not mention Simon of Cyrene (Fig. 33). This omission may be due to a loss over time since sections of the text that encompass the description of the Road to Calvary, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection are missing. Until the development of the Passion plays in the thirteenth century, dramatists hesitated showing Christ himself making his way to Golgotha, and this play may have included Simon of Cyrene in order to avoid that scene. The text, however, does stress that nails will be used during the Crucifixion, an emphasis not seen in the scriptures, but apparent in the Campionesi representation through the inclusion of a blacksmith with large nails and a hammer following Simon: “Ut in lingo suspendatur adque clavis configuratur postulan et
Such emphasis on ropes, whips, swords, clubs, and nails reveals the beginning of the avid interest in Christ’s physical tortures that became more and more popular throughout the thirteenth century.

The surviving dramatic text also encompasses the two smaller events portrayed on the penacchi: the Payment of Judas and the Denial of St. Peter (Figs. 34-35). In the case of the latter scene (Fig. 35), the play and the sculpture have one striking similarity that contrasts with the biblical sources: the maid accuses Peter just before the cock crows. Within the play, the same woman actually points a finger at the disciple all three times, which contrasts with the scriptures that state that the maid only performed the first accusation; the Campionesi carving would also recall all three denials since the maid performs the third accusation in contrast to the scriptural account. Her presence at the final denial may have led to the inference that she had performed all three charges. Other visual examples of this use of the maid as the only persecutor are discussed in chapter one. Furthermore, the text makes a subtle reference to the maid weaving: “Certe nescio quid dicas cur sic verb[a] falsa plicas tetro sub mendacio?” A similar idea may have been inferred from the sculpture since the woman holds a spindle for making the thread used for weaving.

The Campionesi’s rendition of Judas’ Payment shows Caiphas himself, with the aid of the chamberlain, paying the apostle in the form of large coins (Fig. 34). The scriptures do not state that the high priest handed the traitor his money, but rather that the gathered priests appointed a sum of thirty pieces of silver for his betrayal of Christ. Yet, both the sculpture and the play represent Caiphas himself giving the coins to the greedy disciple. The instructions for this scene state: “Ad hec Cayphas det denarios Iude.” Particular emphasis is placed on the fact that the coins will be of full weight: “[N]os triginta tibi damus numbos iusti ponderis,” and might account for the money’s large size in the sculpture. This concern with the money and its weight would have been particularly important in the twelfth-century economy that was slowly and warily converting from trade to monetary exchange.

Another drama dealing with Judas may account for his actions in the pontile’s rendition of the Last Supper (Fig. 30). In her discussion of this scene from the Klosterneuburg pulpit, Schiller connected the portrayal of Judas hiding a fish behind his back to a Passion play that alluded to his stealing one from the table during an unguarded moment (Fig. 58); she argued that Judas’ furtive action combined with the presence of a half-eaten fish on the table in the enamel implied that he had stolen the item and was thus a
The identification of Judas as a thief is further supported by the Montecassino Passion Play. During the scene of the Arrest, Judas hails Christ, who responds, “[O] amice quid venisti? Mecum fu[rtim tu] existi ut latronem perdere. Cur me tunc non tenebatis cum docentem videbatis in templo consistere?” Here Christ accuses the Jews of stealing him in the night rather than trying to arrest him during the day; both Judas and his Jewish horde are demoted to the level of common thieves, a theme more easily pictured in renditions of the Last Supper as presented on the pontile. While Schiller argued that the stolen fish on the Klosterneuburg enamel is not symbolic, but a realistic detail tied to a drama, I would argue that in both the German and Italian scenes by stealing the fish, an Eucharistic symbol or representation of Christ, the artists portrayed Judas as a thief who will steal Christ from the disciples for monetary gains.

In the Campionesi version of the Last Supper, Judas’ criminal intent is contrasted with St. Peter, the only other figure holding a fish. The latter apostle is not a thief who steals from the Lord, but the legitimate successor of Christ, whose blessed future is underlined by the keys to heaven that he holds in his hand. He will be the successful fisher of men on Christ’s behalf. Notably the only two betrayals, or examples of immoral behaviour, by disciples shown on the pontile in the “plumes” involve the same two disciples – Judas’ Payment and St. Peter’s Denial.

The Daniel capital (Fig. 27) can also be related to a play that appeared after the eleventh century: Historia de Daniel Representanda written by Hilarius and dramatized in the twelfth century. It is similar and coeval with the Danielis ludus written and performed in Beauvais (c.1140) in that both plays included similar scenes although they were developed independently. Margot Fassler convincingly argued that these were Feast of Fools dramas that incorporated themes of misrule, folly, and discord within the
reverent context of the cathedral and its orthodox traditions.\textsuperscript{182} They were most likely performed in the church on January 1 as part of a reform to bring under control the frivolities associated with the days after Christmas.\textsuperscript{183}

Important in the context of Modena’s pontile, Daniel, in the Beauvais plays, is presented as a person who can see into the future to the coming of Jesus,\textsuperscript{184} whose Passion, the capital supports. The text pushes the ties between Daniel and Christ even further when the youth cries his lament before being cast into the lions’ den:

\textit{“Heu! heu! heu! quo casu sortis venit hec damnum mortis? Heu! heu! heu! scelus infandum! Cur me dabit ad lacerandum hec fera turba feris? Sic me, Rex, perdere queries! Heu! qua morte mori me cogis! Parce furori.”}\textsuperscript{185}

Here, according to Margot Fassler, Daniel’s words became a historical type for Christ’s feelings of mortality before the \textit{Crucifixion}.\textsuperscript{186} This relationship between prophet and Redeemer is visualized on the pontile where Daniel sits amidst the lions below the mortal sufferings of Christ.

While Daniel is in the den, an angel instructs Habakkuk to take a meal to the prophet. He receives it with thanks and according to the drama, he praised God for the sustenance by singing \textit{“Alleluia.”} The lions surrounded the prophet hungrily as he accepted the food that saved him from death – an allusion to the meal of the Mass.\textsuperscript{187} This scene from the drama represents the exact same events rendered on the capital: Habakkuk, following the guidance of an angel, delivers a meal to Daniel in the den. Thus, it presented a type for the Mass, a sacrament derived from the Passion.

Thus, the dramas provide further evidence of the sculptures’ relevance to the liturgical context of the cathedral. While corroborating orthodox interpretations of the images, the plays also provide different means for understanding some of the enigmatic details found in the Campionesi’s creation. Most importantly, these dramas provide one way to understand the presence of the fish held by Judas and St. Peter in the \textit{Last Supper} (Fig. 30).

Through the use of biblical, liturgical, and dramatic details, the clergy and the Campionesi created a series of images that helped the laity empathize with Christ and partake in the Mass, which was becoming more and more distant. Items such as the books, large towels, and tablecloth reminiscent of the corporal gave a liturgical context to the historical events. In addition to its spatial, dramatic, and didactic functions, the \textit{pontile} may have aided in spiritual Communion and the sculptures may have served as devotional
images for independent worship, since the laity sought religious experiences through representations of Christ’s humanity. This more direct involvement of the secular community with the screen leads to a focus not only on the crypt where the faithful would go in order to have direct contact with the divine through the relics of the patron saint, San Geminiano, but also on the more worldly issues the clergy addressed through the images on their screen.
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For some of the more learned clergy, the act of laying the offerings may have brought to mind St. Lawrence, another figure found on the pontile. At Modena, the deacon offers the chalice and then the bread to the celebrant so that they may be offered to God on behalf of the faithful and then arranged in the form of a cross on the altar for consecration. According to Jungmann, this order of presentation from deacon to officiant, is a vestige of the old Roman order when the deacon was entrusted with the chalice. St. Lawrence was an advocate for this system for in a legend he tells Pope Xystus: “Numquam sacrificium sine ministro offerre consueveras…cui commissisti Dominici sanguinis despensationem” (“Never become accustomed to offer the sacrifice without a minister whom you entrust the administration of the blood of the Lord”), Jungmann, vol. 2, 59. This admonition was heeded in the twelfth-century practice in Modena Cathedral.

Muratori, col. 90. My translation of this excerpt is, “O Lord Jesus Christ, who on the cross of your passion, from your side whence you consecrate the Church to you, you wanted blood to flow.”

Muratori, cols. 91-92. I have translated this section as, “Take up, Holy Trinity, this sacrifice that we offer to you in memory of the Incarnation, Nativity, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of the Lord our Jesus Christ and in perpetual honour of the Virgin Mary, but also of all of your elect, whom had satisfied you from [their] entrance into the world.”
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“Supra quae propitio ac sereno vultu respiceri digneris, et accepta habere, sicuti accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui justi Abel, et sacrificium Patriarchae nostri Abrahae, et quod tibi obtulit summus sacerdos tuus Melchisedech, sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam,” transcribed from Botte, 42. My translation of this passage reads: “With this I appease [you] and, in particular, be worthy to be looked upon with bright visage, and to be accepted, just as the gift of your just boy Abel, and the sacrifice of our Patriarch Abraham, and that Melchisedek, your highest priest, offered to you, sacred sacrifice, pure host.”


Duffy, 109.

The fact that the priest turned away from the viewer during this sacred moment, even made observation of the transformation difficult when it was performed at a more accessible altar in the nave or crypt, Parker, “Architecture,” 301. This arrangement can be seen in the Crucifixion by Roger van der Weyden where a priest stands at an altar performing a Mass with his back towards us and a pilgrim who kneels on the steps in the background; for a copy of this image, see Parker, “Architecture,” 342.

Young, vol. 1, 36. The lines are most comparable to Matthew 26: 26, “And whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke and gave to his disciples, and said: Take ye, and eat. This is my body.”

This passage was transcribed from Botte, 38. My translation is: “He, who, on the day before he was crucified, accepted the bread into his holy and venerable hands, elevated [his] eyes to heaven and giving thanks to you God, his all-knowing father, blessed, broke, [and] gave [it] to his disciples saying: All take and eat from this; this is even my body.”


This passage was transcribed from Botte, 38-40. My translation reads: “In a similar manner, after having eaten, and accepting this splendid chalice into his venerable and holy hands, giving thanks even to you, blessed, [and] gave [it] to his disciples, saying, “All accept and drink from this; this is even the cup of my blood, of the new and eternal testament, mystery of the faith that will be poured forth for you and for many in remission of sins. However, often you will do this, do it in memory of me.”
Jungmann, vol. 2, 196. Matthew 26: 27-28 reads: “And taking the chalice, he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying ‘Drink ye all of this. For this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins.”


Young, vol. 1, 37. The origins of the elevation are still debated but, according to Duffy, this tradition stemmed from the eleventh- and twelfth-century discussions concerning the actual point in time when both the bread and wine were consecrated. One camp argued that the after the bread was consecrated the act was done while others believed that both elements must be blessed before consecration had taken place, Duffy, 95-96. In addition, the elevation would also compensate for the congregation's inability to hear and see the moment of transformation, Marcia B. Hall, “The Italian Rood Screen: Some Implications for Liturgy and Function,” Essays Presented to Myron P. Gilmore, vol. 2, eds. Sergio Bertelli and Gloria Ramakus (Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice, 1978): 217 and note 10.


Duffy, 102 and Jungmann, vol. 2, 364. Although the chalice was also elevated, the reaction of the people was not as visceral was with the Host, Duffy, 95-96. Perhaps this was due to the fact that they could not see into the cup to view the blood whereas the Host was plainly visible on the paten.


Hardison, 65.

Hope, “The Medieval Western Rites,” 282.

Duffy, 91.


Rubin, Corpus Christi, 64 and 150. By 1117, Anselm of Laon discussed spiritual communion as not only effective but beneficial for the laity, Rubin, Corpus Christi, 150.

Young, vol. 1, 82.

Jungmann, vol. 2, 381. According to Jungmann, throughout the twelfth century, the chalice was gradually administered to the public less and less frequently; the command to eat and drink was fulfilled by the priest who drank from the chalice on the community’s behalf when he consumed the sacrament,
Jungmann, vol. 2, 385. Notably, however, the sacramentary of Modena Cathedral still contains instructions for administering both the host and the chalice to the public on these occasions.


72Later, the relationship between the three youths and the martyr would lead to the reading of an oration on the victorious suffering of St. Lawrence during the recession. This oration is found as early as the fourteenth century in Blew MS. of Sarum Manuale but Jungmann argues that the speech dated to the pre-Avignon popes who celebrated daily mass in the Sancta Sanctorum, a papal chapel dedicated to St. Lawrence, Jungmann, vol. 2, 461-2.

73The placement of the Last Supper in the centre of the pontile is discussed again on pages 170 and 171 of this study.

74Parker, The Descent, 83.

75Parker, “Architecture,” 296.


77The choir screen of Modena Cathedral is not the only example of a raised platform that is related to the rite of Easter. Most liturgical furnishings can be related to the two major feasts of the liturgical year, Christmas and Easter. See: Jung, 622-657 and Dorothy F. Glass, Romanesque Sculpture in Campania: Patrons, Programs, and Style (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1991): 203-221.

78Duffy, 93.

79Duffy, 93.

80Dudley, 228.

81For example, the second week of Lent, Sexagissima, was dedicated to St. Paul. These dedications were based on the patron saint of the stational church used in Rome for services during that week, Joseph Pascher, Das Liturgische Jahr (München: Max Hueber Verlag, 1963): 54-57.

82For a full outline of the responsorials for these days see: Pascher, 63-64.

83“Pascha” is the Aramaic word for the Hebrew word Pesach or “Passover,” Frizzell and Henderson, 190.

84This belief was based on scripture. “Know you not that all we, who are baptized in Christ Jesus, are baptized in his death? For we are buried together with him by baptism into death; that as Christ is risen from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also may walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection” (Romans 6:3-5).

86 “Tunc accipe infantem, quem vis baptizare”, Muratori, cols. 97-98. Although infants could be baptized at any time, Easter remained the preferred moment for this rite. By the twelfth century, the dismissal of catechumens during Lent was used for children in preparation for their baptism, Jungmann, vol. 1, 234.


88 Cobb, 466.

89 Hardison, 98.

90 Penitential acts included fasting, prayer, isolation, and physical torments, Hardison r., 93.


92 Pascher, 105-106.

93 Young, vol. 1, 91. Alternatively, the church precinct could symbolize the Mount of Olive; from there the people would process out of the city and back through the town gates to the church itself which represented Jerusalem, Hardison, 112.

94 This celebration originated in Jerusalem. A pilgrim named Etheria, who traveled to the Holy Land in 392, described the palm procession that took place in that city: “At five o’clock the passage is read from the Gospel about the children who met the Lord with palm branches, saying ‘Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.’ At this the bishop and all the people rise from their places, and start off on foot down from the summit of the Mount of Olives. All of the people go before him with psalms and antiphons, all the time repeating, ‘Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.’ The babies and ones too young to walk are carried on their parents’ shoulders. Everyone is carrying branches, either palm or alive, and they accompany the bishop in the very way the people did when once they went down with the Lord. They go on foot all down the Mount to the city, all through the city to the Anastasis, but they have to go pretty gently on account of the older women and men among them who might get tired.” (entry31.2-31.4: “Et iam cum coeperit esse hora undecima, legitur ille locus de euangelio, ubi infantes cum ramis vel palmis occurrerunt Domino dicentes ‘Benedictus, qui venit in nomine Domini.’ Et statim leuat se episcopus et omnis populus, porro inde de summo monte Oliueti totum pedibus iter. Nam totus populus ante ipsum cum ymnis vel antiphonis respondents semper ‘Benedicus, qui venit in nomine Domini.’ Et quotquot sunt infantes in hisdem locis, usque etiam qui pedibus ambulare non possunt, quia teneri sunt, in collo illos parentes sui tenent, omnes ramos tenentes alii palmarum, alii aliuarum; et sic deducetur episcopus in eo typo, quo tunc Dominus deductus est. Et de summo monte usque ad civitatem et inde ad Anastase per totam civitatem totum pedibus omnes, sed et si quae matrone sunt aut si qui dominici, sic deducunt episcopem respondents et sic lente et lente, ne lassetur populus, porro iam sera peruenitur ad Anastase”). The English translation was taken from, John Wilkinson, *Egeria’s Travels: Newly Translated Documents and Notes* (London: S.P.C.K., 1971): 136. The Latin transcription is taken from: W. Heraeus, ed., *Silvae vel potius Aetheriae Peregrinatio ad loca sancta* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1908): 41-42. This ceremony spread throughout the West during the eighth century, being accepted in the city of Rome itself in the twelfth century, Cobb, 460-461.

This Gospel was originally omitted from Holy Week readings because it mistakenly was believed to be derived from Matthew’s account, Tryer, 67. However, at some unidentified point in the twelfth-century, it appears in the outline of Tuesday’s events, Pascher, 121.

Hardison, 116.


The deacon calls for the crowd to bow and rise for each prayer but the cry is commonly ignored with regards to the prayer for the Jews, Hardison, 115.

Hardison Jr., 115.

Cobb, 461.

Hardison, 118.

The host was reserved from the final service of the day for use on Good Friday when no bread would be transformed into the body and blood of Christ; since Christ was dead on that day, there could be no Consecration. This Host is then “buried” in order to foreshadow Christ’s placement in the tomb, Hardison, 123.

Hardison, 119.

In full, the pontifical books refer to this rite as follows: “*Mandatum: De mandato seu lotione pedum,*” Bergamini, *Duomo di Modena*, 8. Indeed, the rite of foot washing had already appeared in Northern Italy by the fourth century, Pascher, 142.

Refer to page 26 of this dissertation.


Schiller, 42.

Schiller, 42.

Young, vol. 1, 98 and Hardison, 127. Interestingly, in Rome, this Pope performed this rite on twelve sub-deacons in the Church of St. Lawrence who appears on the capital of the pontile, Tryer, 110.


Giess, 31-32. For example five apostles hold books on the bronze doors of San Zeno (eleventh – twelfth centuries) and a manuscript illumination shows Christ himself holding an inscribed scroll in Gottingen, Universitäts-Bibliothek, MS. Theol. 251. sacramentary, c. 975, fol.58.

Schiller, 43. St. Ambrose’s description of the Early Christian rite included a washing of neophytes’ feet by the bishop and prises in imitation of Christ’s act of sacramental humility, Annabel Jane

Schiller, 45. “*Et linteo quidam ut se praecingeret, posuit vestimenta quae habebat: ut autem formam servi acciperet quando semetipsum exinivit, non quod habebat deposuit sed quod non habebat accept.* Crucifigendus sane suis expoliatus est vestimentis, et mortuus involutus est linteis: et tota illa ejus passio, nostra purgation est,” Augustine, *Joh. Tract.* 55, 7, Migne P.L. 35, col.1787 quoted by Giess, 15-16, note, 50. Translation: “And, indeed, he placed the linen so that he girded himself as a garment that he had; so that moreover he accepted the form of a servant when he humiliated himself, he had not laid aside what he had, but that he had accepted what he had not. Being crucified without his clothes he was exploited and in death he was wrapped in linen: and all that of his suffering, is our cleansing.”

Modena Cathedral never had a separate baptistery, Comitato Diocesano di Modena, 654.

Infants were given Communion in the form of wine, Pascher, 173.

Tryer, 107. In churches administered by canons, like Modena Cathedral, the altars were washed on Good Friday, Tryer, 118.

This particular service was an a-liturgical rite, according to Hardison, comprised of lessons, canticles and prayers, Hardison, 120. A form of the Mass was performed for the clergy, monks, nuns, and special individuals on Good Friday; these people received Hosts that had been blessed the previous day and the ceremony was called by the misnomer, the Mass of the Pre-Sanctified, Hardison, 134.

Frizzell and Henderson, 197.

Hardison, 131.

According to Etheria, “By the time they arrive Before the Cross it is pretty well full day, and they have another Gospel reading, the whole passage about the Lord being led away to Pilate, and all the recorded words of Pilate to the Lord and to the Jews,” (entry 36.4: “*Ante Crucem autem at ubi uentum fuerit, iam lux quasi clara incipit esse. Ibi denuo legitur ille locus de euangelio, ubi adductur Dominus ad Pilatum, et omnia, quecumque scripta sunt Pilatum ad Dominum dixisse aut ad Iudeos, totum legitur*”). Later, she writes: “Before the sun is up, the dismissal takes place At the Cross, and those with the energy then go to Sion to pray at the column at which the lord was scourged, before going home for a short rest” (entry 37.1: “*Post hoc ergo missa facta de Cruce id est antequiram sol procedat, statim unusquisque animosi uudent in Syon orare ad columnam illam, ad quem flagellatus est Dominus*”). The English translations were taken from, Wilkinson, 136. The Latin transcriptions were taken from, Heraeus, ed., 41-42.

See pages 38 to 39 of this study.

Hardison, 131.

Hardison, 131.

Young, vol. 1, 120. In Rome, the Pope would enter the chapel of St. Lawrence (*Sancta Sanctorum*) and retrieve a cross before processing to the Church of the Lateran and then the Church of the Holy Cross for the Adoration ceremony. After Mass and Vespers he would process in the reverse order, lastly replacing the cross in the saint’s chapel, Young, vol. 1, 120. In imitation of the *Via Crucis*, a cross
reliquary was tied to the Pope’s back for his procession from the chapel of St. Lawrence to the Lateran; thus the pope symbolically assumed the role of Christ, Parker, *The Descent*, 103.

126Parker, *The Descent*, 150-151.

127The presence of the relic within this *stauroteca* is only attested to in a document of 1847 but Lorenzini argued that it, like the reliquary, was in the possession of the clergy by the time the new cathedral was built, Lorenzo Lorenzini, “‘Paramenti et altri supplimenti’. Note su arredi sacri e dotazioni liturgiche della cattedrale di Modena,” *Domus Clari Geminiani: Il Duomo di Modena*, eds. Elena Corradini, Elio Garzillo, Grazilla Polidori (Milano: Arti Grafiche Amilcare Pizzi S.p.A, 1998): 196.


129Hardison, 131.

130Hardison, 132. For those accustomed to receiving Communion daily (i.e. monks and nuns), this intense ritual devotion to the cross is followed by Mass using the Host sanctified and reserved from the Maundy Thursday service, Hardison, 132.

131For more information on the *Depositio* at Parma Cathedral, see: Parker, *The Descent*.

132Mâle, *Religious Art in France in the Thirteenth Century*, 16. This light was replaced by the fire that symbolized Christ (“Lumen Christi”).

133Five grains of incense were pushed into the wax as a reminder of Christ’s wounds and of the spices purchased by the three Marys, Mâle, *Religious Art in France in the Thirteenth Century*, 16-17. The candle was quite large, sometimes decorated with flowers and inscriptions. These floral decorations also refer to the interpretation of the candle as a tree of life. This explanation was given literal representation in the images of candelabra in the *Exultet Rolls* where flowers are depicted growing from the shaft of wax. For more information on the associative meanings of paschal candelabra, see: Michael Schneider-Flagmeyer, *Der mittelalterliche Osterleuchter in Südtalien: Ein Beitrag zur Bildgeschichte des Auferstehungslaubens* (Bern, Frankfurt, and New York: Peter Lang, 1986). On occasion, its wooden core was called “Judas,” a prominent figure in the Passion epic, Tryer, 150.

134Hardison, 149-150.

135Hardison, 151-152.


138One notable exception is the image of the Resurrection on the Cagliari pulpits by Guglielmus. However, the narrative on these furnishings focuses on the appearances of Christ rather than on his Passion and sufferings.


142A document from 1523 refers to the pontile as the place for the singing of the gospels (Doberer, “Il ciclo,” 396, note 2). The screen probably served this function originally in the twelfth century since many pulpits in churches throughout medieval Italy served a similar function.

143Parker, “Architecture,” 304, note 44.

144Parker, “Architecture,” 304, note 44. These title in English is “Whom do you Seek?” and “Visit to the Sepulchre” respectively. For more information on staging dramas, see: Dunbar H. Ogden, The Staging of Drama in the Medieval Church (. London: Associated University Presses, 2002).

145Ogden, The Staging of Drama, 39.

146Campbell, 634. Surviving manuscripts contain plays performed in Rouen Cathedral form the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Ogden, The Staging of Drama, 68.

147Campbell, 635.


149In Latin the drama is entitled Contra Judaeos Paganos et Arianos. Glass has related the choice of prophets on the jambs of Ferrara and Verona Cathedrals by Nicholaus to this same drama. She notes that it is an interest developed by Nicholaus and his school, but does not mention Modena Cathedral or its sculptor, Wiligelmo, under whom Nicholaus trained. Furthermore, Glass found ties between this liturgical drama and the inscriptions as well as the choice of figures on pulpits in Campania, a region of Southern Italy, Glass, Romanesque Sculpture in Campania, 220, Dorothy F. Glass, “Pseudo-Augustine, Prophets, and Pulpits in Campania,” Dumbarton Oaks Papers 41 (1987): 215-226, and Dorothy F. Glass, “Prophecy and Priesthood at Modena,” Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 63 (2000): 326-338.

150The drama was often enacted during matins of Christmas day, Young, vol. 2, 125. A version of the dramatic text survives in Salerno.

151Young, vol. 2, 153.

152Young, vol. 2, 166. For my discussion of the problems with medieval terminology for liturgical furnishings, see pages three to four of this dissertation.


Refer to pages 25 and 53, note 81 of this dissertation.

Edwards, 1.


Campbell, 631. In this new context, the plays sometimes retained their private character, taking place completely in the sacred area behind the screen, Campbell, 633, while others took on a more public nature as the clergy tried to engage the laity, Campbell, 634.

For a full English translation of the Passion play see: Edwards, 10-21. All ensuing quotes from the play will be taken from this translation. According to Edwards, David Bevington has proposed that his play actually began with the Entry into Jerusalem and ended with Christ’s appearance to the apostles after the Resurrection, David Bevington, *Medieval Drama* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975): 202 as quoted by Edwards, 22.

Edwards, 8.

III. Transcribed from Sticca, *The Latin Passion Play*, 67. This passage reads: “When these things are said, let the armed men take Jesus and bind him and let the disciples flee, and let Peter strike off Malchus’ ear.” This translation is by Edwards, 12.

II. vv. 43-45. Transcribed from Sticca, *The Latin Passion Play*, 67. This excerpt states: “Coming with lanterns, weapons, clubs, and lamps, tell me whom you seek.” This translation is by Edwards, 11.


VII. vv. 139-141. Transcribed from Sticca, *The Latin Passion Play*, 71. This excerpt reads: “Let us lead Jesus tightly bound to Pilate, ruler of the Jews.” This translation is by Edwards, 14.

VII. Transcribed from Sticca, *The Latin Passion Play*, 71. This passage states: “Meanwhile let the armed men lead Jesus bound before Pilate.” This translation is by Edwards, 15.
Sticca, *The Latin Passion Play*, 97. Refer to footnote 121 of this chapter for Etheria’s discussion of this column.

VII. vv. 142-144. Transcribed from Sticca, *The Latin Passion Play*, 71. This passage reads: “Let us bind Jesus to a pillar, sinking to his ruin, a hostage to death.” This translation is by Edwards, 15.

VIII. Transcribed from Sticca, *The Latin Passion Play*, 72. This excerpt states: “Let Jesus answer nothing to this but be taken from the presence of Pilate while his wife sleeps, and he is tied to a pillar and let him be whipped.” This translation is by Edwards, 16.

Perhaps this kinship between drama and image is due to the writer’s reliance on visual iconography in his creation of scenes since Edwards argues that he was dependent on art for his conception of historic events, Edwards, 87. Regardless, it is evidence of the common approach taken to these subjects by both creators.

Von Götz, 14.

VII. vv. 154-156. Transcribed from Sticca, *The Latin Passion Play*, 71. This excerpt reads: “They [the Jewish priests] ask and desire that he [Christ] be hanged from a cross and fixed to it with nails.” This translation is by Edwards, 15.

For more examples of the use of the maid in renditions of St. Peter’s Denial, see pages 43 and 44 of this study.

V. vv. 106-108. Transcribed from Sticca, *The Latin Passion Play*, 67. This passage reads: “And let Peter answer the maid and say: I truly do not know what you are talking about. Why do you weave together false words to create a foul lie?” This translation is by Edwards, 13. According to the play instructions, this scene took place simultaneously with the trial before Caiphas; the *pontile* would have created a stage like arena that would have been suited a dual performance – one above in the court and the other below in the yard.


Schiller, 36.

For my discussion of the perception of Judas as a thief, refer to pages 32 to 33 of this study.

II. vv. 37-42. Transcribed from Sticca, *The Latin Passion Play*, 67. In English, this excerpt reads: “Why have you come, friend? You have come out with me secretly to destroy me like a thief. Why did your men not seize me when you used to see me stand teaching in the temple?” This translation is by Edwards, 11.
Although dated to c.1140, the text is preserved in a manuscript of 1227-1234, Ogden, “The Staging of The Play of Daniel,” 11.

“The Feast of Fools,” 66-67

The week after Christmas was a time to celebrate the first days of Christ’s life but also the various offices of the clergy. Such playfulness often led to reversal of roles and eventually misconduct within the church, Fassler, “The Feast of Fools,” 69-70.


Fassler, “Feast of Fools,” 95.

CHAPTER 3

CIVIC AND SECULAR ISSUES AND THE PONTILE

Medieval church rites included more than just the narrowly defined rite of the Mass. Dramas, miracles assisted by relics, and the prostrations of pilgrims were also considered liturgical events. This broader definition of the liturgy accepted that the social or communal acts of the laity, both local and foreign, were important factors of life within the cathedral. Not only did the faithful bring their customs into the church, but the bishop and his canons also sought to reach out and to affect the community in which they functioned. In order to propagate their views, the clerics used imagery on their ecclesiastical buildings to display the tenets of the faith and to address current issues, both theological and political. Such matters included not just the local struggles with the rising communes, but also more far-reaching problems including the spread of heresies, which were rampant in the mid-twelfth century.

Scholars have characterized the medieval façade as a kind of "billboard" for messages to the public, and yet it was by no means the only venue for ecclesiastical propaganda. In her study of Campanian sculptures, Dorothy Glass argued that pulpit programmes also addressed secular concerns, an important insight, which can be extended to liturgical furnishings in general. In Northern Italy, Benedetto Antelami’s pontile of 1178 for Parma Cathedral is one such example of visual persuasion on interior furniture (Fig. 5). Arturo Calzona recently argued that the prominent display of Christ’s seamless tunic in the Deposition panel of this monument referred to the unity of the Church against schismatics, a bid for a Christian republic in a time of social upheaval. The significance of this scholarship cannot be underestimated, since Romanesque scholars have rarely viewed the religious sculptures mounted within the church as important for addressing more secular concerns. Using this methodology, I will argue that, as a
monument intimately tied to the liturgy and the religious experience of the laity, Modena Cathedral’s sculpted pontile also may have propounded the clergy’s view on social events and trends taking place on the peripheries of the liturgy and outside of the cathedral.

The patron saint, San Geminiano, and his relationship to the choir screen provides a pivotal axis for turning from the more regimented aspects of the liturgy, such as the Mass, to concerns centred on local, civic, and secular issues (Fig. 1 and 120). San Geminiano’s relics, housed in the crypt beneath the pontile, provided the faithful with direct, physical access to the supernatural and bound the community together. The unifying quality of his remains was evident during the revelatio held prior to their translation in 1106 when cives and milites were posted as guards of these precious items during their display; thus, the citizens actively ensured the safety of their saint’s remains and his patronage over the city. The laity were interested in protecting San Geminiano from thieves, but also from the clergy who might pillage the body for relics to bestow upon other churches. By preserving the entire corpse in Modena, the citizens retained the city’s prestige, since the saint would have been a point of attraction for pilgrims journeying down the Via Emilia to Rome. As a result, they had helped to maintain a source of income as well as the presence of an ever-changing foreign community that transmitted new ideas to the residents of the city.

San Geminiano had been bishop of Modena in the fourth century and ranked among the Confessors, the first saints recognized by the Church after the martyrs. His life and miracles were commemorated in the sculpted lintel of the Porta dei Principi of his cathedral (Fig. 87). There one sees the saint’s journey on horseback and then by boat to Constantinople where he exorcized the Byzantine princess, the event depicted in the third panel. Next, the emperor is shown bestowing riches, namely a book and chalice, upon the saint in gratitude for his daughter’s cure. The fifth segment portrays a kind of adventus, for the saint again appears on a horse, but this time re-entering Modena, while the last scene portrays the solemn burial of the bishop in the city. These images record the major events that determine the importance of saint to the people: his civic protection, his ability to heal the possessed and mentally afflicted, and his protection of travellers.

The patron saint’s popularity in the mid- to late twelfth century rose again as attested by the revival of his confraternity in 1155 after a seeming lapse. One of the main confirmations of his eminence is the appearance of his name in numerous twelfth-century manuscripts, especially in the Missale ad usum
ecclesiae Mutinensis (mid-twelfth century; Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, ms. Parm. 996); in addition, two 
feast days are reserved for him in the calendar of the saints in a sacramentary written just prior to 1173 
(Modena, Biblioteca capitolare, Cod. II 20). By supporting a cult centered on a saintly bishop, 
San Geminianus’ episcopal successors attempted to bolster their position, not always successfully, within 
the community.

The ties between screens and patron saints were very explicit at other sites. For example, the now 
destroyed screen from Reggio Emilia (second half of the twelfth century) had a series of panels depicting 
the Virgin and Child with angels and saints, including the patron saint, San Prosper, who had also been a 
bishop. In Amiens Cathedral, a later jubé (1489-1532) was associated with a translation of the major relics 
from the crypt into the choir area. On the feast day of the patron saint, the believers would process before 
the screen where the bishop would bless them with the arm reliquary of St. Firminus, a form of spiritual 
bonding for the community. Modena Cathedral, too, had an arm reliquary that housed an arm bone of 
San Geminianus taken from the corpse during the pope’s examination of the body during the 1184 
ceremonies; it, too, could have been used to bless the populace from the pontile. Such explicit 
references to the saints buried in the crypt beneath the screens and commemorated in the sanctuaries behind 
the pontili further confirm my theory that choir screens can be read vertically as well as horizontally 
through space.

Within Modena Cathedral, a vertical reading of the pontile from the elevated presbytery, where the 
High Mass was performed, down and through the entrances to the hall crypt housing the saint reveals a 
hierarchical organization of liturgical space from the sacred places least to most accessible to the laity (Fig. 
120). Further, this type of formation presented the historical Christ between by his earthly episcopal 
representatives and imitators, two means by which the faithful could achieve access to divinity. Above, 
there was the bishop who was responsible for leading the terrestrial flock and administering the rites 
necessary for salvation. Below, the remains of the bishop-saint resided and offered an immediate means 
for approaching the divine. In fact, the crypts were sometimes accessible to the point that those visitors 
who sought miraculous aids were permitted to sleep near the relics overnight, especially during the feast of 
the saint. If such practices were permitted in Modena Cathedral, the petitioners may have slept at the base 
of the stairs under the shelter of the pontile.
If the laity entered the crypt via the central portals sheltered by the choir screen, they would have passed by the column-bearing lions with their prey (Figs. 18-21). As symbols of a powerful force overcoming an opponent, the lions may have served both as apotropaic sculptures as well as reminders of the power of the relics, Christ, and his Church. Further, as they entered and left the crypt via the same doors, petitioners would have seen the capitals bearing images of Daniel, Abraham, and St. Lawrence. These figures of divine precursors and an emulator of Christ could have provided the laity with examples of successful sacrifices, prayers, and models of behaviour.

An interesting spatial relationship may have occurred within Modena Cathedral between the pontile, San Geminiano’s remains, and the relic of the Holy Cross, possibly present in the church in the twelfth century.\(^20\) The saint’s hagiography provides an intimate connection between the True Cross and the remains of the bishop: in order to exorcize the Byzantine princess, San Geminiano repelled the devil with the sign of the cross.\(^21\) The True Cross most obviously had ties to the pontile for it was the instrument of Christ’s death, the ultimate sacrifice undertaken after the Passion events depicted on the screen. This relationship between saint, cross, and pontile may have been made visually blatant, if Modena Cathedral, like many other churches throughout Europe, had housed a Holy Cross Altar in the nave. Elizabeth Parker observed that as the main sacrificial table was moved further to the east and behind the choir screen, subsidiary altars dedicated to the cross were erected in the nave; eventually these structures became the principal altar for serving the laity.\(^22\) They were used for less formal performances of the Mass, the Adoration of the Cross on Good Friday, as well as for the distribution of the Host on the few occasions that the faithful were permitted to participate in Communion.\(^23\) Since the cross was the key to the historic and continuing religious meanings of the church, its altar became a standard element placed \textit{in medio ecclesiae} (“in the middle of the church”) by the sixth and seventh centuries.\(^24\)

The central bay under the Northern European \textit{Kryptenlettner}, a type of screen similar to the pontile,\(^25\) housed the altar dedicated to the Holy Cross (Fig. 16).\(^26\) Modena’s choir screen could not accommodate an altar under its structure without blocking one of the entrances into the crypt. Thus, if this sacred table had existed, it most likely would have been set in the nave in line with the centre of the pontile. This altar would have been below the Passion sequence and the importance of its relic would have been explicated by the sculptures on the balustrade; further it would have been on axis with the saint’s resting
place in the crypt creating a spatial relationship between the saint, Christ, and the instrument of the Passion. The space between a Holy Cross altar and the edge of the presbytery was considered especially sacred since it marked the threshold to the east end; hence, this site became the favoured burial place of bishops and prominent clergymen in the twelfth century. At Modena, tombs were found in this area during the twentieth-century restorations, but appear to have been part of an older cemetery incorporated into the new cathedral’s floor. The combination of saint, screen, and altar could have pushed these religious connections centred on death and resurrection westwards into the midst of the laity, in order to engage them psychologically in the sacred sphere that united the community within the church.

Since San Geminiano had been a strong advocate of orthodoxy and an opponent to Arianism, he and his relics were also used to combat heresies in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Working in a pilgrimage site, the clergy of Modena would have been particularly sensitive to this problem since the routes used by travellers provided the means by which unorthodox thinking rapidly spread from one site to another. Those northern pilgrims heading to Rome, called Romipetae, crossed the Alps or Southern France, travelled down the Ventimiglia to Genoa, from the Alps onto the Via Emilia, which passed near Modena Cathedral and then to the Via Romea, and finally the Via Francigena (Fig. 4). These journeys were arduous under the best of circumstances and in the late twelfth-century wayfarers through the Italian peninsula were in particular danger due to not only wars amongst the city-states, but also between the communes and Frederick Barbarossa. At the time the choir screen was created, the clergy and citizens of Modena were very concerned with the welfare of pilgrims who chose to stop at their shrine. In 1175, funds from the mills between the Porta Baggiovara and the Rosta Bridge were given to the massaro, or steward, of San Geminiano for the building of a hospital for the welfare of travellers.

The Campionesi’s marked interest in St. Peter, whose remains were venerated in Rome, may reflect this concern with protecting pilgrims and fostering movement along the Via Emilia to the Holy City. After Christ, this apostle is the most popular figure on the screen appearing prominently in four of the surviving scenes: the Washing of the Feet, the Last Supper, the Arrest, and his Denial of Christ (Figs. 29, 30, 31, and 35). The numerous and consistent representations of this disciple make him easily identifiable and he is always placed near the dramatic moment of each composition. The visual emphasis on this figure may have referenced Rome, which was the hub of orthodoxy, the seat of St. Peter and his
papal heirs, as well as the city to which pilgrims may have journeyed. The prominence of Christ’s first successor also may have been a statement to the local and foreign communities about the special connection between the cathedral canons and Rome. On May ninth, 1182, Pope Lucius III had extended apostolic protection to these ecclesiastics, and they, in turn, may have been proud to foster allegiance to the papacy and Rome.

Another type of pilgrim also passed through Modena, the crusaders. Earlier, Matilda of Canossa who ruled over a large area of Central and Northern Italy, including Modena, played an active part in the First Crusade (1095-99) and had gathered together men for this holy war from the many cities under her control. The crusaders proceeded on to Jerusalem, where Christ had undergone his Passion, which is prominently depicted on the pontile. The First Crusade was an overwhelming success, after which the Latin Kingdom was founded in the Holy Land. Throughout the twelfth century, the number of pilgrims passing through the East sharply increased. These military and religious travels to Jerusalem helped to fuel interest in the historical events that occurred there, namely the Passion, and religious accounts of them. In order to feed this growing infatuation with the re-conquest of the Holy Land and the descriptions of events that had taken place there, the clergy created replicas of buildings and representations of the Passion events in more accessible locations in the West, a trend the Campionesi’s monument supports.

Furthermore, while Jerusalem was under their control, the crusaders and merchants showed a great concern for re-building and protecting the sites associated with Christ and his trials, such as the Holy Sepulchre, the House of John, and the Garden of Gethsemane. This concern for actual places associated with Christ was transferred to the West. The surviving scenes by the Campionesi do not contain any specific references to the Holy Land, but details of specific buildings often were included in images of the Entry into Jerusalem, as seen in the version from St. Gilles-du-Gard (Fig. 47). There the city walls contain a domed structure that may refer to the Dome of the Rock, a building used by the Crusaders, or perhaps the Anastasis Rotunda. The absence of this event at Modena is an obvious omission from the sequence, as noted in chapter two. Although the Campionesi opted for more iconic scenes that eliminated details of specific places in the remaining sculptures, the events of Christ’s Passion could not help but conjure up thoughts of Jerusalem, particularly with the recent disastrous second crusade (1147-48) and the loss of various lands to Saladin during the time that the pontile was being carved.
As travel allowed people to witness sacred sites and remains, the enigmatic figure of Simon of Cyrene found on the choir screen of Modena Cathedral carries particular importance (Fig. 33). The Gospel accounts concerning Simon were very brief, so many questions about him were left unanswered and his character was open to different interpretations. He became known as a pilgrim since he was from the country and had journeyed to Jerusalem to become an eyewitness as well as the first emulator of Christ. In the Middle Ages, Simon was viewed as a positive force in the Passion epic: an ordinary man willing to take up the cross and actively endure some of the tortures of the Lord. The Campionesi artists have underscored this idea by adding a reference to those tortures in the form of the blacksmith who holds a hammer and long nails as he walks behind Simon on the way to Golgotha. Thus, the latter figure became an example of one who was willing to suffer with Christ and a model for the faithful to practice compassion or emulation, which was important for the liturgy as well as for the individuals who suffered for him on a daily basis, including pilgrims. Not coincidentally, the enigmatic Simon also bears the cross on the frieze of St. Gilles-du-Gard, another important pilgrimage centre and departure point for crusaders heading to the Holy Land; in addition, the style of its sculptures is linked to those of the Campionesi (Fig. 55).

As a warning against avarice, the Payment of Judas on the choir screen may have held special significance for pilgrims (Fig. 34). Sermons of the eleventh through thirteenth centuries admonished pilgrims about carrying money with them, and promoted travel in complete poverty in emulation of the apostles. Spiritual travellers were warned that if they died with money in their pocket, the gates of heaven would remain closed to them. As a visual admonishment on the choir screen set at the entrance to the crypt and viewed by those entering to contact the divine, this sculpture may have reminded the pilgrims of those things that they should deem worthless. The greedy, treacherous disciple, who holds money in his hands and has more in a purse, may have been a warning intended to encourage pilgrims to dispense their money as alms, especially in Modena, and travel to the Holy City without the weight of material goods.

Warnings against monetary wealth also may have addressed a third type of traveller on the Via Emilia: the commercial trader or merchant. In the Early Christian period, Judas’ return of the silver coins was a popular image, but in twelfth and thirteenth centuries representations of his payment became more prevalent; Ingrid Schulze has noted that this phenomenon coincided with the change from a trade to
money-based economy as well as with the rise of reactionary poverty movements, both heretical and orthodox. The paradigm of poverty that developed became a socially explosive and positive force, and Judas’ acceptance of the silver coins was the antithesis of that ideal. Schulze argued that the faithful in Naumburg Cathedral in the mid-thirteenth century would have been aware of the warning against the dangers of material wealth portrayed in this type of image. The citizens of the Northern Italian city-states in the late twelfth century may have also been aware of this warning against money and the greed it incited. In particular, Modena itself was located on one of the major commercial routes connecting Northern to Southern Italy and its residents would have been exposed quickly to the new monetary system and the dangers the clergy believe accompanied it. By including an image of Judas’ betrayal for monetary gain, the ecclesiastics may have wanted to warn the faithful against the greed that money created.

In view of this cautionary stance towards material goods, and especially coinage, one image from the Passion sequence that is not present on the balustrade, but is a candidate for one of the missing reliefs, is Christ’s Cleansing of the Temple, an image found on the frieze of St. Gilles-du-Gard (Fig. 48). All four evangelists recorded this event and according to Matthew (21: 12-16), Mark (11: 15-19), Luke (19:45-46), and the synoptic Gospels, it occurred at the beginning of the Passion cycle. After returning to Jerusalem, Christ entered the temple courtyard and drove away those engaged in commercial transactions and overturned the tables of the money-changers scattering their coins in order to purge the house of prayer of their influence. This violent reaction to the exchange of money within the temple may have paralleled the same concerns that the clergy had about the new monetary system and its effect on the laity. As part of the Passion sequence and a popular image earlier in the century during the reign of Matilda of Canossa, it could have admonished the faithful to purge themselves of the greed that consumed Judas. Furthermore, Christ’s threatening action in the courtyard of the temple often was interpreted as the immediate cause of the priests’ plot against him and ergo would fit well within the screen’s narrative sequence.

The economic links between cities on the pilgrimage routes strengthened the individual city-states and may have aided in the transfer of artisans. For example, St. Gilles-du-Gard, a church decorated with an extended Passion sequence akin to that on the pontile in Modena Cathedral (Figs. 47-55), was a juncture for three major economic and pilgrimage routes; from this site, wayfarers from Champagne, Lyon, Spain, Gascony, and Languedoc departed for Italy. Thus, the Campionesi, a family originally from Northern
Italy, may have seen and worked on this church or another Provençal frieze in situ as they travelled along one of these routes, and even may have journeyed down the Via Emilia itself, in order to reach Modena. Moreover, the transmission of artistic ideas could have passed along the Via Emilia without the sculptors. For example, the strong commercial relations between Pisa and Provence fostered a familiarity between the regions that included the knowledge of sculptures.\textsuperscript{55} Similar economic connections occurred between Modena and other cities.\textsuperscript{56} Thus, the Campionesi may not have been the only ones to have first-hand knowledge of the Provençal facades that influenced the pontile, but the clergy of Modena may have also heard of those sculptures through other travellers, including pilgrims, merchants, and even ecclesiastics.

While people moving along the pilgrimage routes are not literally figured on the screen, certain sculpted scenes, like Judas’ Payment (Fig. 34) and the Road to Golgotha (Fig. 33), may have addressed among other groups, this ever-changing community. In the case of the latter scene, both figures are portrayed unambiguously as lay people, who wear rustic clothing and lack halos. According to Jacqueline Jung, the inclusion of secular figures on liturgical furnishings provided medieval viewers with points of immediate recognition and often presented models and anti-models to be emulated or rejected respectively.\textsuperscript{57} Within the context of the Campionesi’s screen, the Road to Golgotha contains both the virtuous model, Simon, and the despised anti-model, the torturous blacksmith, evoking feelings of compassion and hatred in the viewer. Through these sculptures, the clergy offered pilgrims, crusaders, and travellers exemplars to be emulated including Simon and St. Peter (Figs. 26-33). Even the patron saint, San Geminiano would have been incorporated in this rhetoric as he was a heavenly citizen and object of veneration that the pontile helped to shelter.

The frequent exchange of information between people on the pilgrimage routes, however, could also have had a negative aspect for the clergy and its community. Wayfarers facilitated the transfer of heretical or unorthodox ideas and theologies. In the twelfth century, the clergy, themselves, were struggling with issues of internal restructuring that had been raised in the eleventh century during the Gregorian Reform movement. Lay people also realized the need for change and as discussions centred on this challenge, many heterodox groups begun by lay people arose on the fringes of the debate. These lay groups, however, did not always proclaim simple reform of the current church hierarchy; many of them came to question not only the validity of the sacraments, but also the need for the ecclesiastics themselves.
As the twelfth century progressed, the clergy sought to refute the unorthodox ideas that heretics preached in the cities and, as a result, solidified their stance on ecclesiastic concerns, such as clerical celibacy, the precise moment of Transubstantiation during the Mass, and the meaning of the sacraments. The lay movements, however, had become widespread and entrenched in areas of Southern France and Northern Italy due to the popularity of itinerant lay preachers, the protection of heretics on the part of secular authorities, and particularly in Northern Italy until the 1230’s, the clergy’s preference for persuasion rather than force to convert those committing these errors.

Emile Mâle was the first scholar to associate specific sculptures with heretical outbursts in Southern France. Around 1140 in Provence, Peter de Bruys had led a religious movement against infant baptism, the Eucharist, the Roman clergy, ostentatious churches, and even the cult of the cross. As a form of protest, he inflamed his followers to sack churches and burn crucifixes. Mâle suggested that the prominent sculptures of the Crucifixion and Last Supper on the façades of Provençal churches, like those at St. Gilles-du-Gard (Fig. 51), could be related to this heresy, which criticized the Church and questioned theological tenets. In 1139, an angry crowd murdered Peter de Bruys, yet his ideas led to a number of other heterodox groups with anticlerical tenets in Southern France and Northern Italy.

One such example is the Waldensians, a sect that followed Waldes of Lyons. The latter was a rich merchant and usurer who in 1173 renounced his ways, distributed his wealth amongst the poor, and commenced a life of preaching modelled on the apostles. His beliefs differed very little from orthodox tenets, yet those discrepancies threatened clerical power. He accepted the sacraments, but felt that they were not as important for salvation as public prayer and sermonizing. Further, he argued that if a clergyman was unavailable, any man or woman could perform the necessary office that was normally enacted by the ecclesiastics, a threat to the clergy’s claim to have the sole authority to perform sacrifices. This kind of declaration flouted the Church’s power, and the Waldensians may have been particularly threatening to Modena’s clergy, since this city was one of the first places where the heresy appeared in Northern Italy. Despite their mostly orthodox beliefs, Waldes and his followers were condemned for being disobedient, since they continued to preach even after papal sanctions had been placed upon them.

One of the most insidious groups for ecclesiastics in the late twelfth century was that of the Cathars, a heretical sect that had originated in France and, which via itinerant preachers, spread rapidly
throughout Northern Italy from 1150 onwards. These people rejected the sacraments, including marriage. For baptism, one of their elect, called perfects, simply laid hands on an individual rather than performing the orthodox rite that required the use of holy water. In addition, they preached a form of dualism, or a theory that the universe was controlled by two powers, one good and the other evil. For the Cathars, God was the source of all things virtuous and the spiritual creator; evil matter, on the other hand, was the product of a fallen angel, who was the source of sinful physicality. Most important for this study, was their belief that if all material was evil then Christ could not have taken on a human body, and, thus, there could not have been a physical Passion or Resurrection. Further, they argued that the Eucharist was no different from ordinary bread, a belief in direct opposition to Church theology. This heresy was one of the best organized. It even formed a powerful counter-church to the orthodox institution in the areas of Southern France and Northern Italy.

While sects from France infiltrated the northern city-states during the twelfth century, the area around Modena was also the source of new heterodox movements. One such group, the Speronists, arose in nearby Piacenza in the 1170’s, the same decade that the design for Modena Cathedral’s pontile was most likely conceived. Members followed the beliefs of Ugo Speroni, a jurist who rejected the medieval priesthood as having no scriptural basis in the New Testament and touted that the members of the clergy corrupted all that they touched, including the bread of the Mass; Ugo based this tenet on the faults and defects he found in predecessors of the clergy, the priests of the Old Testament. He also maintained that the sacraments, especially Baptism of infants, Penance, and the Eucharist, were not necessary for salvation since they were inventions of the same clergy and not based on scripture. For Speroni and his followers, the key to heaven was inner purity and spiritual communion with the Word of God. As a result, they believed that Baptism was not an act, but rather an internal state brought about by the Holy Spirit through the contemplation of the Bible, so only a predestined few would receive this gift. The other sacraments, also creations of the church hierarchy, similarly were deemed meaningless, or even obstacles to inner spirituality, and thus, could and should be ignored.

This sect lasted at least fifty years and was particularly threatening to the local clerics because its followers, unlike more outspoken groups, would quietly partake in what they perceived as a meaningless Mass, while mentally pursuing a union with the Word and Christ without the clergy’s direction, an
unidentified enemy within their midst.\textsuperscript{71} The possible presence of heretics in the cathedral jeopardized the success of Mass, which required that the laity formed a community bound by the same faith and love;\textsuperscript{72} the undetected presence of heretics during the sacramental sections of the rite threatened that communal bond.

In response, the clergy used different parts of the Mass not just as confirmation of tenets for believers, but also as weapons against unknown enemies. For example, the Roman liturgies contained prayers said on behalf of Jews, pagans, heretics, and schismatics in the hopes of destroying their theological errors. The bishop would lead the congregation in this general intercessory prayer after the recitation of the \textit{Credo}, which outlined the tenets of the faith and so was also used to refute heresies.\textsuperscript{73} The \textit{Credo} was included in solemn Masses prior to dismissal, a call for catechumens, pagans, heretics, and Jews, whether guests during the first half of the celebration or an unwelcome presence, to leave the premises.\textsuperscript{74} The intercessory prayers said on behalf of heterodox believers were repeated silently by the congregation during the Wednesday and Good Friday services of Holy Week\textsuperscript{75} and sermons against unorthodox faiths were preached from the pulpits.\textsuperscript{76} In addition, art or visual propaganda was also employed in this battle for control over the masses as it had been during the Investiture Controversy.

Both Southern France and Northern Italy, where heresies were particularly prolific and widespread, were two areas in which small and extended Passion sequences were especially popular on the exterior and interior of churches and prominently displayed. The striking similarities in choice of scenes and iconography between the Provençal sculptures and the Campionesi’s creation has led scholars, like Arturo Carlo Quintavalle, to suggest that the patrons of both programmes were concerned with the same issue, namely heresies.\textsuperscript{77} Most discussions on these sculptures and their heretical associations follow in the footsteps of Mâle by focussing on the images of the \textit{Last Supper} that appear on the French façades as well as on the Campionesi’s choir screen (Figs. 30, 51, and 56).

These sculpted scenes of the meal are particularly similar in iconography and composition. Slightly later Italian examples of the \textit{Last Supper}, like that on a pulpit fragment of Pistoia Cathedral (c.1200; Fig. 74), typically show eleven of the apostles behind a table with Christ seated at one end giving the sop to Judas who is separated from the group on the viewer’s side of the table. In contrast, the Campionesi’s version, like those of the Provençal artists, portrays all of the apostles including Judas behind the table. Furthermore, they both omit the devil that is often depicted in Italian sculpted versions of this
event. Augusto Beragmini and Erika Doberer also observed that by placing the sop in the centre of the composition both the St. Gilles-du-Gard and Modena sculptors emphasized Christ placing the wine-soaked bread in Judas' mouth, the significant gesture that designated the traitor (Figs. 30 and 51). Even though St. John sleeps on Christ's breast, he is easy to miss when viewing the sculpture and thus the proximity between Judas and Christ seems greater.

Based on the text of John 13: 26-27, medieval theologians believed that until Judas consumed this bread, he was still pure ("And when he had dipped the bread, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon. And after the morsel, Satan entered him."). The devil entered him with the sop and at that the moment he committed himself to the horrible act of betrayal for monetary gain. This interpretation is supported by the Campionesi's rendition of the Last Supper for Judas still retains his halo, a symbol of spiritual virtue, as he did in the scene of his payment (Fig. 34), but he lacks the aura in the ensuing image of the Arrest (Figs. 30 and 31). The entrance of Satan is figured literally in other Italian sculpted versions of this scene through the inclusion of a demon near the traitor; on the pontile, however, Judas prepares to commit a theft in order to signify his new sinful state. He grasps a fish, a symbol of Christ, preparing to snatch it from the table while the disciples and Christ look elsewhere.

In contrast to the evil that Judas signified, the Eucharist was a pledge of future salvation. Partaking of the Host marked the believer as part of the Christian community because of its guarantee of eternal life. This promise of salvation also may be referenced in the Last Supper by St. Peter, who holds a fish in one hand and the keys to heaven in the other, providing a counterpoint to the traitor and his fish that connotes, among other things, sin. Another foil to Judas is St. Matthew, the only other apostle to perform an action different from the disciples at the table: drinking from a footed bowl. This gesture may have reminded the viewer of the act of drinking from the chalice during Communion and thus added another redemptive overtone to the sculpture. Eventually, St. Matthew would be appointed by Christ to take over Judas' responsibilities. On the choir screen both Matthew and Judas have similar profiles with bangs cropped low on the forehead and hair grown long as well as prominent noses easily displayed by their three-quarter profiles. These physical similarities seem to allude to Matthew’s future role.

As the personification of betrayal and greed, Judas was abhorred as the embodiment of unbelievers who became traitors and enemies of God through their beliefs and actions. Within the
sequence of Modena Cathedral’s choir screen, Judas is the most frequently depicted figure after Christ and St. Peter. He appears in the middle of the Arrest where he prepares to kiss Christ, he sits in the penacchio depicting his payment, and occupies the narrative centre of the Last Supper with Christ, Sts. John and Peter (Figs. 30, 31, and 34). In particular, Christ's administration of the sop to the sinful Judas was considered a refutation of heretical tenets, for it played a pivotal role in supporting the historical Passion. Through this act, Christ condemned himself, by choice, to the tortures of the Passion and ultimately to his physical death. Portraying this moment on the screen as part of the Passion story, allowed the clergy to bolster their claims about the humanity of Christ as well as the historical and scriptural source of the Mass, a theological tenet questioned by the Cathars, as noted above. Moreover, when the Campionesi’s scene is viewed as an image of Communion, it proclaimed the necessity of eating from the Lord’s table in order to enter into heaven through the inclusion of the fish and keys held by St. Peter. During the Last Supper, the ability to perform the sacred service of the Mass was passed down from Christ to his apostles, and later from them to the clergy.84

Yet, heretics, as discussed earlier, questioned not only the necessity for the clergy, but the validity of the sacraments themselves. Although the Campionesi rendition is not of the Institution of the Eucharist, it incorporates many Eucharistic references including the chalice, bread, and fish. These details may have blurred the boundaries between the moment of the betrayer’s identity and that of Christ distributing the bread and wine to his disciples, especially when the sculpture was viewed in the context of the Mass.85 The presence of St. Matthew, drinking from a bowl reminiscent of a chalice, would have furthered the redemptive associations between actions performed during the Mass and the Last Supper. Thus, the sculpture may have presented to the medieval viewer the ultimate historical source of the bishop’s power to transubstantiate and distribute the Eucharist. Notably, when the bishop raised the Host for viewing, he could have stood above the screen and a relationship could have been drawn between him and the images of the Passion, especially the Last Supper, creating a proclamation of divine and orthodox beliefs in the face of heretical attacks.

When a layperson knelt in the nave before the celebrant to receive Communion, he may have looked at the screen and made a connection between his own sinful soul and that of Judas who received the sop. Bergamini assumed, without stating it, that this scene was interpreted solely as an image of
Communion and argued that this rendition of Judas eating was a refutation of heretical error, since Christ had not refused to communicate Judas.\footnote{86} He clarified this idea by suggesting that the scene was meant to refute the Waldensians, whom, he incorrectly claimed, believed the validity of the sacrament was dependent on the worthiness of the priest.\footnote{87} This argument, however, does not seem logical at first glance. By contrast, I will propose that this scene does indeed support the orthodox belief in the validity of the sacrament despite the quality of the celebrant, a tenet of the Speronists, but does so in a subtle manner.

In his letter to Ugo Speroni, Vacarius wrote in support of the Mass and the quality of the sacrament,

\begin{quote}
"Numquid, quia impii cottidie deo ministrant, dicendum est quod sit socius impiorum? Nam etiam impiissimus Judas ei specialiter ministravit, nec tamen societatem cum eo traxit."
\end{quote}

The proximity between Judas and Christ in the Campionesi’s \textit{Last Supper} (Fig. 30), reveals the physical closeness of the thief, a sinner, with humanity’s saviour, the symbol of good. After this close contact, Christ would institute the Eucharist. The proximity to Judas, a vessel of evil, did not corrupt Christ’s body nor prevent him from creating a valid sacrament. By rendering this moment on the \textit{pontile}, the designer may have commented on the orthodox belief that the Host, the body of Christ, similarly could not be contaminated by the touch of or proximity to an unworthy celebrant.

Further anti-heretical messages may be imbedded in the choice of scenes and the choir screen’s layout. For example, the presence of Old Testament prophets supporting the Passion speaks to the validity of the early biblical books in the face of arguments put forth by groups like the Speronists (Figs. 26 and 27). These figures could have proclaimed the sanctity of the position of priest from the earliest recorded time. Further, Abraham and Daniel present heroic examples of dedication to the faith that was fulfilled in Christ and emulated by the saints, like St. Lawrence (Fig. 28); as Renzo Grandi argued, the juxtaposition of these capitals with the Passion provided a visual model of the true believer who did not slide back into unorthodox manners.\footnote{89} Even those who did err, like St. Peter during his denial of Christ, that is rendered on one of the \textit{pontile’s penacchio} (Fig. 35), could repent and be saved rather than suffer the fate of Judas who did not repent over his sins, despite his later return of the silver to the Jewish priests, an event not depicted on the choir screen.
The *Washing of the Feet* (Fig. 29) may have bolstered support for another sacrament that the heretics denied: infant baptism. Ernst Kantorowicz argued that the juxtaposition of the *Foot Washing* with the *Last Supper* (Fig. 30) reflected the sacramental order in which Baptism preceded first Communion. If so, two of the rites performed by the clergy and necessary for salvation, despite heretical denunciations, derived from the same historical night. This belief confirms the close relationship between these two scenes on the *pontile* despite the crack that currently separates them.

Although not found on the *pontile* in its current state, beginning with the Gregorian Reform and the Investiture Controversy, and into the late twelfth century, the *Cleansing of the Temple* was associated by theologians with the purging of the church of clerical abuses as well as secular and heretical influences. Christ’s removal of wrongdoers from the temple came to parallel the clergy’s attempt to remove not only ecclesiastical sinners, whom unorthodox thinkers attacked, but also to overthrow the heretics themselves. Through the cleansing of the Church, the clergy maintained the community bound by the same faith that ensured successful sacrifices at the altar. The scene appeared on the St. Gilles-du-Gard frieze (Fig. 48), but interestingly Mâle did not incorporate the image into his discussion of the sculptures’ relationship to heresies presumably because it did not appear on other portals and friezes of the region.

By documenting the sources of the sacraments in Christ’s Passion, the ecclesiastics overtly could have declared the historical validity of the rites, their necessity for salvation, and by default, the need for the clergy who performed them. This concern with legitimizing the church hierarchy against various heretical attacks continued into the thirteenth century, when Salvo Burci from Piacenza wrote the “Higher Star” treatise in 1235 to tout orthodox reasoning in the face of heterodox tenets of the Cathars and even the Speronists. Salvo stated that the clergy were necessary for administering the sacraments and that throughout the New Testament one could find scriptural support for the terminology used to describe that hierarchy. This concern with proving the biblical origins of the clergy is reflected in the imagery on the *pontile*, which documents the sources of the sacraments and their first administrator, Christ. Not only would the images proclaim this heritage to the orthodox believers, but also to any known or unknown heretics possibly present within the cathedral.

In the late twelfth century, the region around Modena was percolating with unorthodox ideas that spread quickly through the masses from the 1170’s onwards, coinciding with the time of the *pontile*’s
creation. The choice and placement of the images on the screen appears to have addressed many of the tenets of contemporary heretics. This visual form of persuasion was supported in 1184 by the *Ad abolendum*, a joint statement against heresy made by Pope Lucius III and Emperor Frederick Barbarossa during the Council of Verona. This document was the pope’s new creed for the church militant against heresies calling for civic and religious leaders to pursue and persecute heterodox believers. The pope condemned a number of heresies, including the Waldensians, Cathars, and Speronists. Notably, on his way to this council, Pope Lucius III stopped in Modena, where he re-consecrated the cathedral with its newly finished pontile (Fig. 1).

Unfortunately, the pope provided few guidelines by which heresy could be identified, reflective of the fact that the definition of an unbeliever was still quite malleable as theologians sought to solidify their stance on various religious issues. One result of these loose criteria for designating heretics in the twelfth century was that the label could be and was applied more broadly to include, on account of their disobedience, the political enemies of the Church and its local representatives, the bishops. The foundation for this far-reaching definition can be found in the period of the Gregorian Reform and Investiture Controversy. Pope Gregory VII’s *Dictatus Papae* 23, issued in 1075, sought to establish the territorial and sacred powers of the popes; to disobey them was equated with disobeying Christ and thus with becoming a heretic. This statement was recalled numerous times throughout the twelfth-century, as Gregory’s successors struggled to maintain their temporal powers.

The rights of ruling on secular as well as spiritual concerns in Modena had been conceded to the bishop in a diploma by Guido di Spoleto in 891 and until the rise of the commune, the episcopal representative had many prerogatives. The bishop was a member of the *borghese* (or bourgeois) class, and his secular and sacred powers included declaring war and peace, negotiating treaties, and forming alliances. During the twelfth century, communes across Northern Italy slowly took over these responsibilities and privileges even to the point of wresting control of the cathedral space, creating hostility between the podestà and consuls, or the leaders of the secular government, and the bishop.

Communal activities were documented in Modena as early as 1135, although the roots of civic institutions in this city can be found already in the tenth century. In 1156, the *palazzo communale* on the eastern edge of the public square was enlarged and by 1194 a city government, called the *Palatium vetus*.
Comunis Mutinae, was fully entrenched. Evidence of the dramatic change from a bishop-ruler to a civic government in the twelfth century is found in the documentation of the two consecrations of the cathedral. According to the *Relatio* recounting the 1106 event, the Countess Matilda had acted as an arbitrator between the people and the pope. In contrast, in 1184 when the inscription recording the pope’s visit to the cathedral was carved into the exterior wall of the south aisle, the names of the “reggetori,” or civic administrators, were inscribed amongst those of the clergy without an aristocratic intercessor. For Giulio Bertoni this was an indication of a flowering of communal power within the city.

Throughout Northern Italy, the change of secular rule led to conflicts over civic rights between the people and their religious leaders. The churches, particularly the cathedrals, were placed in the midst of arguments between the clergy and the communities that in the twelfth century were becoming separate political entities. Indeed, since rituals were expressions of power, they sometimes became permeated by these struggles, changing the cathedral into a kind of social arena of political communication or propaganda in favour of the pope, bishop, and his canons.

Despite the resistance of the clergy in Modena, the commune wrested more and more control of the city and even the cathedral; unlike other cities where a baptistery was available for civic meetings, the secular government used the church for their assemblies prior to the building of the commune’s city hall, most likely against the will of the ecclesiastics. Moreover, the secular leaders even passed laws dictating when offerings could be made for the maintenance of the structure; in fact, there appears to have been a feud centred on the rights of the people over the cathedral beginning at the end of the eleventh century, when the citizens had laid the founding stone.

The commune’s physical encroachment on the cathedral grounds occurred at the same time as the erosion of the bishop’s power over temporal issues. Although in Modena the bishop remained the nominal figurehead of the commune throughout the Romanesque period, he lost most of his temporal powers to the secular government. In some respects, he was even powerless within his own church. For example, the massario, or steward in charge of the fabric’s funds, was appointed by the bishop and his chapter, but the commune dictated that the selected candidate must be of the borghese class and not a member of the clergy. By 1204, Pope Innocent III complained to the archbishop of Ravenna that the podestà in Modena had even assumed the right of regulating the ringing of the cathedral’s bells. Coinciding with this
struggle between the commune and the bishop was the revival of the confraternity of San Geminiano.\textsuperscript{109} This renewal of a brotherhood of Christian laymen for the patron saint may be further evidence of the conflict between the clergy and the laity, for power over the city’s patron saint could be related to the management of the cathedral. As control shifted to the commune, the people had to cooperate with the clergy in management of the local cult\textsuperscript{110} and thus the holy remains gained an even more communal quality.

With the rise of a secular government, the canons, and especially the bishop who would no longer dominate both sacred and civic politics, may have felt the need to comment on the power of the Church and respond to the politics of the day. The commune’s interference in the administration of the churches at the end of the Romanesque period, may have led the designers of the pontile’s programme and of the later pulpit to stress the clergy’s religious roles and their sources of authority.\textsuperscript{111} Standing at the threshold of the divine and already addressing a captive audience, the pontile would have been the perfect site to embed messages of episcopal might. Even the choir screen itself may have been a site of contention within the cathedral. First, it separated the laity, including the civic leaders, from the sanctuary with the main altar and canons, led by the bishop, a particularly important fact when one recalls that the commune and the clergy were sharing the cathedral space in the late twelfth century. Thus, in times of need, the screen could have been used as a physical expression of the clergy’s definition of “us” and “them” within the church space. In other words, I would argue that the permeability of the pontile barrier could be adjusted to suit ecclesiastical needs.

Second, Jung associated Northern European screens with judicial asylum in a manner similar to that of the church portal decoration in Northern Italy, as suggested by Christine Verzár.\textsuperscript{112} In Italy, this relationship between interior and exterior may have been visually expressed through the use of lion-supported columns for porch-portals where the bishop had dispensed his judgements in the first quarter of the twelfth century and for interior furnishings where he pronounced religious statements, the strongest source of his power in the late twelfth century. This arrangement suggests a movement of the bishop’s political platform to an area near the high altar, and not coincidentally the remains of the bishop-saint, an area of the cathedral less susceptible to secular claims.\textsuperscript{113} The visual relationships between the bishop, the images of Christ, and the saint in the crypt below might have been statements of control over the faith and thus the community. In this position, the bishop would also have been seen in opposition to Pilate who sits...
on a throne of judgement on the choir screen (Fig. 32). Pilate was a secular leader whose rule had gone awry leading to the persecution and death of Christ. In contrast, the bishop was a spiritual leader, whose judgement was guided by the divine.

Third, excommunications, like those pronounced for heretics, were issued by the bishop from elevated positions during the High Mass on Sundays or feast days when the majority of the community would be gathered to hear his statement. Within Modena Cathedral, this site was most likely the choir screen platform. In the twelfth century, these declarations were applied not only to heretics, but also to civic leaders. In some cases, the laity allied themselves with anti-clerical and heretical movements as they struggled to wrest political control from the bishop. In these cases, the idea of excommunication seems apt to our modern eyes. Yet, this rite could be directed against any kind of person and secular leaders were excommunicated not because of unorthodox beliefs, but rather for disobedience, akin to the condemnation of the Waldensians in the Ad abolendum.

With regards to specific images and their possible relationship to excommunicants, Judas again figures prominently. The Synod of Tours of 567 decreed that those people ostracized from the church were further punished through the reading of the curse psalm, number 108, which includes the following sentences:

“O God, be not thou silent in thy praise: for the mouth of the wicked and the mouth of the deceitful man is opened against me. They have spoken against with deceitful tongues; and they have compassed me about with words of hatred; and have fought against me without cause” (Psalm 108: 2-3).

Early exegetical writers including St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and Cassiodorus, believed that this particular psalm likened the perpetrators to Judas. In the case of the choir screen’s image of the Last Supper, Judas’ gaping maw turned towards Christ might have been a model of the heretic or disobedient sinner who opened his mouth against the pope and bishops, the sacred representatives on earth (Fig. 30).

Furthermore, a sculpture of the Cleansing of the Temple would fit well within the original iconographic sequence of the balustrade considering the clerical admonishments to communal leaders. As discussed above, Christ’s eviction of the money-changers was related to the medieval removal of heretical thinkers. By extension, disobedient communal leaders were included in this group. An image of the Cleansing in Modena Cathedral could have referred to the bishop’s and canons’ desire to remove the
secular leaders from the physical space of the church. A similar interpretation has been offered for images of Samson and the lion, like that found on one of the corbels of the pontile (Fig. 24); according to Anat Tcherikover, from the seventh-century writings of Isidore of Seville through the twelfth-century Glossa Ordinaria, the beast’s submission to this biblical hero was comparable to the deference of earthly rulers to the Church.120

Another image with more specific references to civic leaders, is the capital of St. Lawrence (Fig. 28). This martyr’s presence on the choir screen is not fully explained by the liturgy. He is not mentioned in the sacramentary’s calendar of the saints (before 1173),121 nor did the cathedral appear to possess one of his relics. According to his hagiography, he was a Roman archdeacon murdered in 258 during the Valerian persecutions. When Decius Caesar arrested Pope Sixtus, the latter commended the Church to St. Lawrence, but predicted that the archdeacon would ascend to heaven in three days. Not coincidentally, the saint was given three days to gather the church treasures and hand them over to the Romans. He used the time to distribute the wealth amongst the poor, the antithesis of Judas, and then presented to the Roman soldiers the impoverished people as the Church’s wealth. For his impertinence he was thrown into prison where he performed baptisms, converting Lucillus, a pagan and fellow prisoner, Hyppolitus, his jailor, and Romanus, a Roman soldier. After refusing to give Decius Caesar the gold, to identify the remaining Christians in Rome, and to pray to pagan idols, St. Lawrence was slowly grilled to death. During the Middle Ages, his feast in Rome was second in importance only to those of Sts. Peter and Paul and was celebrated on the tenth of August.122

As discussed in the first chapter,123 three faces of the Campionesi’s capital comprise the saint being thrown in prison, taking part in a baptism, and being roasted on the grill (Fig. 28). The fourth scene is very odd and includes a nude with “rings” wrapped around his biceps flanked by two onlookers. This scene has not yet been successfully identified.

Arthur Kingsley Porter suggested that the first scene on the capital, facing east, was the condemnation of the saint by the prefect of Rome who is enthroned on the corner of the capital; he argued that St. Lawrence is accompanied by the faithful St. Hyppolitus, who unwillingly obeys the tyrant’s orders. The second scene, on the northern face, is generally accepted as the baptism of St. Romanus who emerges with nude torso from a baptismal font grasping its edge in his hands. Beside him stands the clothed
St. Lawrence pouring water from a jug onto his head. Porter identified the clothed kneeling figure in the background as St. Hyppolitus. This scholar further argued that the third and fourth images portrayed tortures of the saint: the first depicting him torn with irons and then the most common scene associated with this saint, his death on the grill. Yet, Porter admitted in a footnote that the third image, that on the southern side, is problematic since the torturing of this martyr with irons departs from every extant version of the saint’s legend. Moreover, I would argue that this scene cannot be that of torture if one follows the narrative sequence established in the other capitals. The sculptors of the pontile rendered the Old Testament stories in chronological order beginning on one face and proceeding counter-clockwise. If one follows this pattern with the St. Lawrence images, the unidentified scene is either the first or last in the series, i.e. either before his condemnation or after his death.

While Porter identified the baptism, condemnation, and martyrdom scenes correctly, I would argue that the fourth scene actually shows an event that took place after the saint’s death. Maria Pia Fantini arrived at the same conclusion independently and suggested that the scene was St. Lawrence’s nude soul rising to heaven; this interpretation, however, is not satisfactory since the soul lacks a halo and the rings around its biceps are not explained. I believe that the image portrays another event from the saint’s afterlife. This theory is based on a later source, the Legenda Aurea, a collection of saints’ lives compiled before 1267 by Jacobus de Voragine with the help of earlier texts and oral traditions. According to Jacobus, the Emperor Henry and his wife Kunigunde had remained virgins, but the former suspected the empress of dallying with a knight. To prove her innocence, Henry commanded her to cross fifteen feet of hot coals. As she prepared to walk, she prayed to the Lord and Henry, hearing her words, struck her. The empress, however, succeeded in her challenge with the aid of the Virgin Mary. When the emperor died, a horde of demons passed by the cell of a hermit and told him that they were hastening to the judgement of Henry to see if he was one of their own. Upon their return, they glumly told the hermit that they thought they had won the emperor, for during the weighing of his soul his false suspicion of his wife and other ill deeds fell in their favour. Unfortunately for them, at the last moment, St. Lawrence had brought forth a large gold bowl and threw it on the good side of the scale, freeing the soul to heaven.

Although documented in a later source, the legend of Henry and St. Lawrence seems to explain the enigmatic image on the Campionesi capital. The problematic scene would now be the last in the series,
portraying the judgement of Henry’s nude soul, a miracle performed by the saint after his martyrdom. In
the centre of the capital face stands Henry with hands raised in a prayer. The rings around the soul’s arms
are not irons of torture, but the talons of a devil whose human-like head can be seen on the corner above the
Roman soldier stoking the fire under St. Lawrence’s grill on the preceding side. The demon is one of the
horde who, thinking they have won the soul, reaches out to claim the prize. A second human-headed devil
observes the scene from the opposite side and may have been meant to denote the group of creatures vying
for the emperor’s spirit. Above Henry’s head is a piece of broken stone hanging from an arch and may
have once been a hand descending from heaven or perhaps the vertical bar of a scale, the pan of which was
lost along with the soul’s feet. On the right corner, one can see the prefect of Rome seated and dispensing
judgement over the saint on the next face. His throne, however, is oddly shaped. Most seats of judgement
were shown with armrests and/or lion-footed supports, but the prefect appears to sit in a round chair with a
decorated edge. In fact, only when one stands at the corner of the capital, does this rounded object appear
as a chair and not as a bowl like the one described in the Legenda Aurea. The small confines of the capital
face may have led the sculptor to blend the bowl and throne into one object.

The choice of this scene was particularly potent in Modena for it may have recalled another
emperor, Henry IV, who in 1077 had submitted to the pope and Countess Matilda of Canossa, the ruler of
the territory around Modena. With regards to the contemporary political situation in the city, an image of a
saint, persecuted by civic leaders and yet saving an emperor may have addressed the commune in a couple
of ways. First, on a local level, the image would support the bishop’s claims to power over secular
representatives. As a delegate of the papacy and guardian of saints, the bishop had the power to save
communal leaders after death, despite their wicked deeds and persecution of the Church during life. By
recalling a former emperor, who had been saved by a saint and whose name was the same as another
imperial leader who had caved to the will of ecclesiastical power, this scene may have also called for
obedience among the local communal leaders, a form of warning to errant rulers. Furthermore, since he
had protected the church’s treasure by distributing it amongst the poor, St. Lawrence may also have been
seen by the ecclesiastics as a protector of church property in the face of temporal pressure;\textsuperscript{129} within the
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context of the restrictions placed on the bishop and his canons by the commune during this period, the choice to portray this saint on the screen may have been a warning for the civic leaders who passed rules concerning the finances of the cathedral.

In a larger political context, the capital may have addressed the actions of the current emperor who was intruding on Northern Italian territories at the time of the pontile’s construction: Emperor Frederick Barbarossa. In 1167, the fear of imperial intrusion into civic authority and the oppression by the podestà, an imperial representative, led to the formation of a coalition of city-states, led by Milan and including Modena, the so-called Lombard League. This alliance was supported by Pope Alexander III wary of Frederick’s imperial claims and of his backing of the anti-pope Victor IV. In 1177, the emperor and pope signed the Peace of Venice that formally recognized Alexander III as the true religious leader, but the independence of the city-states was not agreed upon until the signing of the Treaty of Constance in 1183.130

The late 1170’s, thus, became an important time for the Christian republics, and Calzona argued that images, like those by Antelami for the choir screen of Parma Cathedral (1178; Fig. 5), could be read in relation to the significant events surrounding the Peace of Venice.131 Not coincidentally, between 1172 and 1175, the bishop of Modena also expanded his palace perhaps in retaliation for the emperor’s claims to secular power expressed through the earlier restructuring of the ancient arena to accommodate changes to the imperial palace for the podestà in 1162.132 Regarding Modena’s position in this political battle, the St. Lawrence capital urges the communes to uphold the papacy and thus the Lombard League against a misguided ruler. In this struggle, the commune and bishop were on the same side because Modena was part of the League, but the clergy may have used the sculpture to goad further and/or continued participation in the alliance, as the cities involved in the League constantly changed.

The prominence of St. Peter, already noted as an important saint for pilgrims, may also reference the bishop of Modena’s stance in the schism, on the side of the true heir of St. Peter, the Pope, and hence the Lombard League. In this manner, St. Peter, unlike the heretical Judas in the image of the Last Supper (Fig. 30), stands as a symbol of orthodoxy and represents the true line of transmission of power from Christ through the papacy. That authority was supported by three general councils held in the Lateran in Rome during the twelfth century, including a meeting held around the time the choir screen of Modena was being sculpted: 1123, 1139, and 1179.
Within this struggle between secular and sacred leaders, an image of the *Entry into Jerusalem* seems an obvious omission from Modena’s pontile. Christ’s *adventus* would have aided the bishop’s bid for recognition as leader by the people of the city. This scene would have recalled not only imperial entries into towns, but also San Geminiano’s return to Modena, pictured on the *Porta dei Principi*. As a spiritual leader of his people, Christ’s Entry, as well as that of the saint’s, and by extension those of his episcopal successors, presented a model of the ways in which the people should react to a divinely inspired ruler.

As we have seen, the choir screen stood at the centre of a complex religious and civic panorama. Although set within the cathedral rather than on the façade, the designer of the programme chose imagery that could address liturgical ceremonies as well as events that took place outside of the church. In this case, the pontile propounded messages to a captive, if primarily orthodox audience, as opposed to the exterior sculptures that were meant to engage some of the people who passed by the building. By selecting images signifying either good or bad behaviour, the designer of the programme placed before the laity the choices that they too had to make. Obviously, the bishop and his canons encouraged those who took up the cross to follow the example of the obedient Simon or the repentant St. Peter as opposed to the treacherous Judas.

Such moralizing imaging of right and wrong set before the eyes of the laity may also have occurred in an earlier choir screen of Modena Cathedral. This first pontile would have marked the edge of the raised choir, consecrated in 1106; its form, however, has been questioned. Although later disputed, Quintavalle was the first to propose that the Genesis scenes by Wiligelmo, currently immured in the façade, formed the earliest screen erected in this building. A brief examination of the archaeological evidence from within the cathedral along with a study of North Italian church façades and comparisons with the eastern ends of other churches within Countess Matilda’s territories reveal the merit Quintavalle’s idea and lead the way to a hypothetical reconstruction of the church’s east end that preceded the Campionesi’s arrival.

---


4A similar but later example is the pulpit carved by Guglielmus for Pisa Cathedral (1159-1162); in the fourteenth century, it was shipped by the Pisans to the town of Cagliari as part of a claim to political dominance over the island of Sardinia. Thus, the clergy and citizens of Pisa attached a vested secular interest to the sculptures, which were displayed prominently within the church. Indeed, the Pisans seemed to have believed that their pulpit would have sent a political message to the people of Cagliari and assumed that they would then carry that message back out into the city.

5Arturo Calzona, “Il pulpito di Benedetto Antelami tra vescovo, commune e impero,” Le vie del medioevo, ed. Arturo Carlo Quintavalle (Milan: Electa Editrice, 2000): 297-308. Calzona further related this iconography of the Deposition to the Peace of Venice, an agreement between the emperor and pope that will be discussed later in this chapter.

6According to St. Augustine, since the universe was comprised of two parts, the heavenly and earthly cities, saints became the mediating model for Christian citizens, Thomas J. Heffernan, “The Liturgy and the Literature of Saints’ Lives,” The Liturgy of the Medieval Church, eds. Thomas J. Heffernan and E. Ann Matter (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2001): 77, and cults of saints became intricately tied to the lives of the people. Excerpts of a patron saint’s life were commonly used in minor ceremonies such as prayers for the dying, blessings for pregnancy, and funeral rites, Heffernan, 79.


8Webb, 68.

9Despite the fact that his entire corpse was preserved in Modena Cathedral, the San Geminiano’s cult was widespread in Central and Northern Italy. His cult was disseminated from Venice to Rome with a primary concentration in the Po Valley by the tenth century, Mauro Calzolari, “Edifici di culto intitolati a San Geminiano in Italia nel Medioevo,” Civitas Geminiana: La città e il suo Patrono, ed. Francesca Piccinini (Modena: Franco Cosimo Panini, 1997): 207. For example, he was as particularly popular in Pontremoli where his day was marked with the same solemnity as those of the Virgin, apostles and Archangel Michael, Paolo Golinelli, Città e culto dei santi nel medioevo italiano (Bologna: Cooperativa Libreria Universitaria Editrice Bologna, 1991): 99. Adoration of the saint travelled primarily along the Via Emilia and in the twelfth century was further fostered by communal and commercial ties with other regions, Calzolari, 207. In part, his popularity was due to his voyage to Constantinople, which made him particularly appealing to pilgrims as those travelling to Rome. Popular tradition recognized the diverse places he visited on his journey and these eventually developed into sites of his cult, Golinelli, Città e culto, 100; medieval travellers would have helped to spread his popularity.

Gottfried Kerscher (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1993): 340-355. Further, Dietl argued that the images of exodus and arrival on the portal symbolize a departure and return to the fold of the cathedral, a visual promotion of communal harmony, Dietl, “Der Geminianuszyklus,” 348.


13Modena, Biblioteca capitolare, Cod. II 20, transcribed in Antonio Muratori ed., Liturgia romana vetus tria sacramentaria complectens, leonianum scilicet, gelasianum, et antiquum gregorianum (Venetiis: J. B. Pasquali, 1748): cols. 85-101. The calendar of the saints is transcribed in cols. 95-96. This list records both San Geminiano’s “birthday” and the annual celebration of his 1106 translation.

14This interest in supporting bishop-saints, including San Ambrogio in Milan and San Zeno in Verona, began in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries in Northern Italy, Gregorio Penco, “Monasteri in alta Italia e culti santorali tipologia e vie d’irradiazione,” Benedictina 30 (1983): 359-360. The emphasis on San Geminiano as a bishop is seen in a manuscript written and decorated in Modena in the second quarter of the twelfth century, Trattato sul Vangelo di Giovanni, by St. Augustine On folio 2r, Giovanni Canevario is shown offering his book to the saint who appears in bishop’s clothing and holding a crosier. Piccinini argues that a statue of the saint may have existed in the early twelfth century and that it provided the basis for this miniature, Francesca Piccinini, “Il Santo Patrono: immagini della devozione,” Civitas Geminiana: La città e il suo Patrono, ed. Francesca Piccinini (Modena: Franco Cosimo Panini, 1997): 60. Aside from the sculptures by Wiligelmo for the Porta dei Principi, this manuscript illumination is the oldest surviving representation of the saint.


16Knipping, 181.


19Flanigan, Ashley, and Sheingorn, 702. Records of miracles mention numerous holy vigils held by the laity. For example, at Conques, William, a blind man, kept night vigils in hopes of a cure, Flanigan, Ashley, and Sheingorn, 702, note 11. Further evidence is found at Chartres Cathedral, where the guardian of the relics slept in the east end of the church and even ate his meals on the rood screen, Dawn Marie Hayes, Body and Sacred Place in Medieval Europe, 1100-1389: Interpreting the Case of Chartres Cathedral, diss. (New York University, 1998): 135.

20For more on the presence of his relic in Modena, refer to page 81 in chapter two of this study.

21Cattabriana, 452.


Parker, *The Descent*, 112. This altar was placed in the centre of the building since the cross was believed to be the axis of the cosmos and through this placement would become the pivotal point of the church, Parker, *The Descent*, 112.

For a discussion of this relationship, refer to page 13 of this study.

Jacqueline E. Jung, “Beyond the Barrier: The Unifying Role of the Choir Screen in Gothic Churches,” *Art Bulletin* 82 (2000): 625. Naumburg Cathedral’s east end screen houses one in its central bay. Moreover, this type of altar was erected in Italy as well; St. Peter’s in Rome housed an Altar of the Cross against the south wall of the nave, Parker, “Architecture,” 281. Tronzo relates the church of St. Peter’s altar to those cross altars found in the Northern churches in the early medieval period, William Tronzo, “The Prestige of St. Peter’s: Observations on the Function of Monumental Narrative Cycles in Italy,” *Pictorial Narrative in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, eds. Herbert L. Kessler and Marianna Shreve Simpson (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1985): 104-106. One example was housed in St. Riquier where the Holy Cross Altar was set before a stucco and mosaic image of the Crucifixion meant to evoke thoughts of the Passion.


Cattabriana, 453. San Geminiano participated in a meeting held in Milan in 390; this council condemned a heresy begun by a monk named Gioviniano who proclaimed, among other things, that the Virgin had lost her virginity giving birth and that celibacy and marriage were equally valuable for salvation, Cattabriana, 453. Because of his participation in these gatherings, the saint was viewed as a staunch defender of the faith.

Pilgrimage, or the journeying to a specific shrine or holy place, was a phenomenon that medieval theologians believed had a basis in scripture. The popular preacher Jacques de Vitry (d.1240) noted that the first pilgrim was actually Abraham since the prophet had left home and family in order to seek a promised land, Debra J. Birch, *Pilgrimage to Rome in the Middle Ages: Continuity and Change* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998): 1-2.
A church dedicated to St. Peter was located close to San Geminiano’s cathedral, further reflecting a history of devotion to the Prince of the Apostles in Modena. In fact, prior to San Geminiano’s elevation to patron saint, St. Peter appears to have been preeminent in the city, Soli, vol. 3, 79-92.

Several thousand crusaders were garnered from Parma, Cremona, Modena, and Reggio alone, Lodovico Vedriani, History dell’Antichissima Città di Modena (Modena, 1667), 1:64 as quoted by Jeanne Fox-Friedman, “Messianic Visions: Modena Cathedral and the Crusades,” Res 25 (1994): 84. For later crusades, these warriors partook in a rite of taking up the cross. This ceremony derived from the rite of bestowing the staff and scrip on pilgrims travelling to holy shrines, Kenneth Pennington, “The Rite for Taking Cross in the Twelfth Century,” Traditio 30 (1974): 430.

This trend included not only representations of the Passion, as at Modena, and an increased interest in the Holy Cross, but also the building of replicas of the Easter Sepulchre and the decoration of cloisters to mimic holy places. For a discussion of sepulchres see: Pamela Sheingorn, “The Easter Sepulchre; a Study in the Relationship between Art and Liturgy,” diss., University of Wisconsin, 1974. One cloister that was related to the cult of loca sancta is that of Monreale; for more information on this cloister see: Wayne Dynes, “The Medieval Cloister as Portico of Solomon,” Gesta 12 (1973): 61-69. Churches in the East were also decorated with sculptures of the Passion events. For example, a lintel from the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem bore scenes of the raising of Lazarus, Christ met by Martha and Mary, the preparations for the Last Supper, the choice of the ass, the Entry into Jerusalem and the Last Supper. Borg argued that this lintel was actually influenced by Italian, particularly, Tuscan sculptures, Alan Borg, “Observations on the Historiated Lintel of the Holy Sepulchre, Jerusalem,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 32 (1969): 25-40. For a more recent discussion of art in the holy city, see: Nurith Kenaan, “Local Christian Art in Twelfth-Century Jerusalem,” Israel Exploration Journal 23 (1973): 221-222.


For more on the odd omission of the Entry into Jerusalem, refer to pages 61, 67, and 76-77 of this study.
Troops were again drawn from Northern Italy, but there does not appear to be any specific mention of soldiers garnered from Modena, and many Italians, including the Genoese, chose to partake in the Spanish Crusade against the infidels that coincided with the Second Crusade to the Holy Land. For more information on the Second Crusade, see: Virginia G. Berry, “The Second Crusade,” A History of the Crusades, vol. 1, ed. Marshall W. Baldwin (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955): 463-512.

According to Müller, in the early Middle Ages, Simon was shown strictly as bearer of the cross; during the time of the crusades, however, he disappeared from view in favour of images of Christ carrying the cross. At turn of fifteenth century, a smaller Simon often appears helping Christ carry the cross in images of the Road to Calvary, Gottfried Müller, “Simon von Kyrene – Kreuzträger, Pilger, Bauer, Augenzeuge und Typos der Emulation: Ikonographische Beobachtungen an Hand einiger spätmittelalterlicher Kunstwerke,” Herbergen der Christenheit; Jahrbuch für Deutsche Kirchengeschichte (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1985-1986): 57. Both the Provençal Passion friezes and the Campionesi’s choir screen defy this general outline through their inclusion of Simon bearing the cross.

Müller, 53. Although associated with pilgrims, Simon does not usually carry the accoutrements of these wayfarers; rather he often appears in rustic clothing, Müller, 58.

Müller, 63. By the thirteenth/fourteenth century, the subject of carrying the cross by Christ with the help of Simon became the object of much contemplation and many visions, Müller, 54. In later sources a more negative interpretation of Simon was put forth; he had to be forced to help Christ rather than choosing to aid him, Müller, 54.

Birch, 67-68. One example of this type of warning is found in the Veneranda dies sermon recorded in the Codex Calixtus, wrongly attributed to Pope Calixtus and probably written by Aymery Picaud of Parthenay-le-Vieux (c.1139). In that sermon, the author warns that pilgrims should travel like the apostles with neither bread nor money (Luke 9:3) and criticized those who carried gold and silver for eating and drinking rather than for distributing as alms, Birch, 67-68.

Birch, 68.


Schulze, 46.

Schulze, 46.

The Gospel of John (2: 13-17) contains the most detailed account of the Cleansing, but connects the story to the Marriage in Cana. Often renditions of this event were rendered in accordance with John’s Gospel, but followed the order of the synoptic Gospels, as is the case of the frieze of St. Gilles-du-Gard, Robert H. Rough, The Reformist Illuminations in the Gospels of Matilda, Countess of Tuscany (A Study in the Art of the Age of Gregory VII) (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973): 7, note 1.

Images of the Cleansing of the Temple were related to the Gregorian Reform, as will be discussed later in the chapter. For more information on this image during Matilda’s reign see: Robert H. Rough, The Reformist Illuminations in the Gospels of Matilda, Countess of Tuscany (A Study in the Art of


53Some trade routes coincided with pilgrimage roads while others intersected the pilgrimage routes at certain junctures, Esther Cohen, “Roads and Pilgrimage: A Study in Economic Interaction,” Studi Medievale 3rd ser. 21 (1980): 324

54Cohen, “Roads and Pilgrimage,” 334. The Via Tolosana, the route of the Rhône and the passages to Italy, primarily Genoa, all connected in this city, Cohen, “Roads and Pilgrimage,” 334. These routes also served the pilgrims since the money-changers of St. Gilles states that one of their primary functions was to serve these travellers, Cohen, “Roads and Pilgrimage,” 335.


57 Jung, 641.


Cullen, 196. By 1177, these heretics had become radical dualists proclaiming the existence of two gods probably under the influence of, or at least encouraged by, Niketas of Constantinople who visited Languedoc via Northern Italy in 1174, Cullen, 196.

Cullen, 196. The Good Men read passages from the scriptures in vernacular, the Passion of Christ being one of the most popular, and then commented on the verses and their true spiritual meaning, Wakefield, 32. According to them, Christ simply deluded human eyes rather than taking on bodily form during the Passion, Wakefield, 33.

I would like to thank Dorothy Glass for kindly pointing out the existence of this sect to me. Hamilton, “The Albigensian Crusade,” 178. The idea that the quality of the sacrament depended on the worthiness of the celebrant was a common Post-Gregorian sentiment found in many heresies, Lambert, 59. Ugo Speroni was perhaps embittered on account of court cases concerning economic conflict between the townspeople and the clergy of Piacenza, Wakefield and Evans, 29. By 1177, he had written a treatise summarizing and defending his beliefs. He sent this document to his friend and fellow student from Bologna, Vacarius (d. ca. 1198) then residing in Salerno. Vacarius was aghast at what Ugo had written and penned a refutation to each of the latter’s tenets. While Ugo’s original letter does not survive, Vacarius’ document still exists in a manuscript titled, “Liber contra multiplices et varios errores.” For a transcription of his response, see: Ilarino da Milano, *L’Eresia di Ugo Speroni nella confutazione del Maestro Vacario: Testo inedito del secolo XII con studio storico e dottrinale* (Studi e Testi, CXV [Vatican City, 1945]). For a translation into English of excerpts of this document, see: Wakefield and Evans, 152-158.


Russel, 47. Speroni argued that there was no original sin. Instead there were two categories of humans, the predestined and the foreknown. The latter were doomed to damnation whereas the former were holy even when external justice systems claimed they had sinned, Lambert, 82.

Lambert, 81.


The dismissal “Si quis catechumenus est, procedat! Si quis haereticus est, procedat! Si quis Judaeus est, procedat! Si quis paganus est, procedat! Si quis Arius est, procedat! Cuius cura non est, procedat,” Jungmann, vol. 1, 480, marked the shift from the service of the Word to the service of the Sacrifice. It was not included in a sacramentary produced in Modena (Modena, Biblioteca capitolare, Cod. II 20), but it was not an act performed by the celebrant for whose use the manuscript was made. Thus, the dismissal may have been recited in Modena Cathedral, especially considering that the formula was used all over Italy including in churches of Milan, Aquelia, Benevento, and Bari, Jungmann, vol. 1, 480.
Conversion was a recurring theme during Easter, a turning away from the worldly to spiritual life, Stephen Borghéhammar, “A Monastic Conception of the Liturgical Year,” *The Liturgy of the Medieval Church*, eds. Thomas J. Heffernan and E. Ann Matter (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2001): 34. This motif was an apt choice that emphasized a refutation of heresies.


Arturo Carlo Quintavalle, “Antelami, Benedetto,” *Enciclopedia dell’Arte Medievale*, vol. 2 (Rome: Instituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1991): 60. Quintavalle also argues that the new imagery was accompanied by a new style that can be found not only in Parma and St. Gilles, but also in Genoa in the church dedicated to San Lorenzo, Quintavalle “Antelami, Benedetto,” 59.


Westerhoff, 110.

Gertrud Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art: The Passion of Jesus Christ*, vol. 2, trans. Janet Seligman (Greenwich: N.Y. Graphic Society Ltd., 1971): 35 and Wakefield, 16. For Paul, greed was the root of all evil and thus Judas could represent any sinner whether Jew or heretic: “For the desire of money is the root of all evils; which some coveting have erred from the faith, and have entangled themselves in many sorrows” (1 Tim 6:10). For more on interpretations of Judas see: Ingrid Westerhoff, “Der moralisierte Judas: Mittelalterliche Legende, Typologie, Allegorie im Bild,” *Aachener Kunstblätter* 61 (1995-1997): 85-156.


Refer to page 71 of this study for more on this possibility. This tendency to blur the distinction between the sop and the consecrated Host persists in current scholarship. Silingardi identified the image as the Institution of the Eucharist, Giancarlo Silingardi, text, Giampiero Bartoli, *Il Duomo di Modena: conosciamolo insieme* (Modena: Mucchi Editore, 1985): xv.

Bergamini, “A Theological Interpretation,” 128. In his profession of faith made in 1180 or 1181, Waldes wrote, “We do not in any way reject the sacraments which are celebrated in it [the Church], with the aid of the inestimable and invisible power of the Holy Spirit, even though they be ministered by a sinful priest, as long as the Church accepts him; nor do we disparage the ecclesiastical offices or the blessings celebrated by such a one, but with devout mind we embrace them as if performed by the most righteous…We firmly believe and absolutely affirm that the Eucharist, that is, the bread and wine after consecration, is the body and blood of Jesus Christ and in this nothing more is accomplished by a good priest, nothing less by an evil one,” Wakefield and Evans, 207.

Vacarius in Ilarino da Milano, 479. In English, this passage reads: “Because wicked men minister daily before God, may one say that He is the companion of the wicked? Even the most impious Judas ministered especially to Him, but from this he formed no fellowship with Him.” This English translation is the work of Wakefield and Evans, 156.


Rough compiled a list of medieval theologians who had dealt with the Cleansing of the Temple and its meanings including the church fathers, Peter Damian (d. 1072), Anselm of Baggio, Bishop of Lucca (d. 1086), Anselm of Laon (d.1117), and Gerhoh of Rechbersberg (d.1169). For his complete list see: Rough, 17-19.

Furthermore, an expansive rendition of the scene appeared in the Gospels of Matilda; Rough has tied this image in particular to the strong pro-papal philosophy of the Countess and theologians, who surrounded here, Rough, 43.

Wakefield and Evans, 273-274.

Grandi, “God’s Balcony,” 118. Servières argued that the tall jubés were actually statements of exclusion to heretics and a form of defense for the sanctuary in violent times, Servières, 1918, 361. The ability completely exclude heterodox followers, however, depended on the clergy’s ability to identify such people, which they could not readily do, as in the case of the Speronists. Therefore, I would argue that the choir screens were more statements of the power of the clergy and testaments to orthodoxy set within the cathedral.

Grandi, “God’s Balcony,” 118. The pope outlined the duties of the bishops with regards to heresy, including the regulation that they must visit parishes where heresy had been reported at least twice per year, Lambert, 72. The overall toleration of heretics found in the Northern Italian city-states may have been the determining factor in the pope’s emphasis on Italian sects with Ad abolendum, Lambert, 72. From that time onwards, popes tried to force communes to adopt and enforce anti-heretical laws, but the civic representatives, for the most part, were unreceptive, Diehl, 50-51.


Porter, vol. 1, 24. The podestá was the local leader appointed by and representing the emperor. The consuls were elected by the citizens of the city.


"Queritur ergo principis Mathildis sententia, que quidem sicut decuit, et ut predestinatum fuerat, ipso quoque, ut credimus, iam disponente sedem prenotavit expectandam apostolicam, denuntians hoc in anno venturo esse in Italiam" (Archivio capitolare O.II.11). My rough translation of this passage is: “Therefore, the thought of Countess Matilda was asked, that just as indeed it was fitting, and as had been predestined, so we believe by the same [God], now arranging, she must await the Apostolic seat, officially announcing in the following year to be in Italy.” For a full transcription of the Relatio, see: Beragmini, Augusto. ed. Relatio de innovatione ecclesie Sancti Geminiani Mutinensis presulis. Bologna: Grafiche Dehoniane Bologna, n.d.


Flanigan, Ashley, and Sheingorn, 697 and 709.

Porter, vol. 1, 24, who further notes that in nearby Parma elections for the podestá were sometimes held in the cathedral, Porter, vol. 1, 25.


The consuls formerly revoked his token position as their leader in 1227, Arbizzani, “Diploma di Guido di Spoleto,” 66.


Soli, vol. 2, 65. The confraternity originally began in 980 according to a document found in the Archivio Capitolare but by the beginning of the twelfth century had ceased to exist, Soli, vol. 2, 65.

Webb, 78.

Mathews has made similar arguments for the sculptures of the south portal of Santiago de Compostela; according to her, that programme stresses the ecclesiastical authority, betrayal of Christ, and images of sin and evil through the identification of the bishop as a type for Christ, Karen Rose Mathews, “Reading Romanesque Sculpture: The Iconography and Reception of the South Portal Sculpture at Santiago de Compostela,” *Gesta* 39 (2000): 3-12. Since similar ideas were incorporated into the imagery of choir screens, there is a kinship between portals and pontili, a relationship that is based on their importance as thresholds within the church.


Interestingly, and I think not coincidentally, the early thirteenth-century commune erected a large stone reminiscent of San Geminiano’s altar in shape outside of the communal palazzo for its own proclamations and dispensation of justice in addition to its use as a measure for commercial purposes. This

Elevated positions were used for these pronouncements by the ninth century; for example, Pope John VIII (872-882) read the excommunication of Photius from a high ambo, Roger E. Reynolds, *Law and Liturgy in the Latin Church 5th – 12th Centuries* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1994): 409. The bishops were intimately tied to this process and performed the rite, Reynolds, *Law and Liturgy*, 412; excommunications were commonly read after the Gospel, which implied that they too were read from pulpit, Reynolds, *Law and Liturgy*, 409. These declarations provided the details of the punishment and the manner in which penance could be undertaken, Reynolds, *Law and Liturgy*, 410.

Webb, 82. The clashes between the pope and emperor, that led to excommunications, provided the opportunity for communes to gain more power by siding with one or the other party, Webb, 82.


Reynolds, *Law and Liturgy*, 409. Most of the verses of this psalm outline the types of punishment that the petitioner wishes to be given to the evil-doers and is called a curse psalm.


Furthermore, as early as the ninth century, the rite of excommunication specifically referred to baptized sinners, possibly related to the Campionesi’s image of the *Foot Washing*, who now had desecrated Christ’s vineyard, a reference the Eucharist and, thus the *Last Supper*, and had taken the goods of the poor of the Church akin to Judas who stole from the apostles, suggested by his fish and money, Reynolds, *Law and Liturgy*, 412.


The sacramentary does not mention St. Lawrence in its list of feast days, but it does include that of Pope Sixtus, St. Lawrence’s mentor and close associate. A church dedicated to St. Lawrence did exist in Modena and was enlarged in 1188, just after the pontile in the cathedral as completed, Soli, vol. 2, 225.

Not all feast days were public holidays, but among the number that were, is the feast of St. Lawrence. The martyrs continued Christ’s work, their festivals also linked in the spirit of Easter, Borgehammar, 15.

For my description of this capital, see page 46 of this study.


128 *The Golden Legend of Jacobus de Voragine*, vol. 2, trans. Granger Ryan and Helmut Ripperger (London: Longman’s Green and Co., 1952): 444-445. The bowl as a chalice that the emperor had given the church of Einstetten in honour of St. Lawrence. In anger the demon bit a piece of the bowl and, according to the legend, the church’s chalice was missing a handle from that day onward, *The Golden Legend*, 445.

129 I would like to thank Barbara Haeger for her insight into this aspect of St. Lawrence’s character.


131 Calzona, “Il pulpito,” 303. He argues that Antelami’s inscription and arrangement of the figures in the *Maiesta* reflects unity of church, which the Schism had disrupted but had now returned. Furthermore, the Deposition also emphasized the unity of the church through the prominent display of the tunic; since the relic was stained with blood from the sacrifice, it was considered a symbol of obedience, Calzona, “Il pulpito,” 305.

CHAPTER 4

WILIGELMO’S GENESIS FRIEZE: A FIRST PONTILE?

When Modena Cathedral was rebuilt beginning in 1099, the master sculptor Wiligelmo and his shop embellished both the interior and exterior of the new building. This undertaking involved carving capitals, corbels, images for the lintel and jambs of the main portal, of the Porta della Pescheria and of the Porta dei Principi on the north and south flanks of the church respectively, as well as the many relief sculptures found embedded in the façade (Fig. 15). The group on the west front includes a plaque of Enoch and Elijah holding a scroll with an inscription commemorating the foundation of the cathedral and bearing the signature of the sculptor (Fig. 88), two genii holding down-turned torches (Fig. 89), and the four well-known narrative panels that portray thirteen scenes from the Book of Genesis (Figs. 83-86). These Old Testament images span events from Creation, through the fall of Adam and Eve, the story of their sons, Cain and Abel, Noah’s Ark, and the Curse of Cam.¹

Today, the panels are set in the façade at two different heights (Fig. 15). On a lower level, two segments flank the main portal while two more panels are raised above the side portals. Although a late twelfth-century intervention by the Campionesi sculptors for the completion of the façade accounts for this disjointed appearance, the original location of these carvings is a matter of debate. The most widely accepted theory asserts that at the time of the translation of San Geminiano’s relics into the new building in 1106, the four segments formed a continuous frieze at the lower level across the two inner bays on either side of the once single central doorway (Fig. 90).² Only the buttresses that support the façade would have interrupted this band until the Campionesi added the two minor flanking portals that displaced the outer segments of the narrative. This hypothesis, however, does not address many problems concerning the placement of these sculptures on the façade.
In *La Cattedrale di Modena: problemi di romanico Emiliano*, Arturo Carlo Quintavalle formulated an interesting proposal that catapulted Wiligelmo’s Genesis frieze into the centre of scholarly attention. After considering the commonly acknowledged lack of cohesiveness between the architecture and positioning of the images at Modena, a situation atypical of Romanesque art, he suggested that these reliefs were not initially intended to be on the façade, but were interior decorations, more specifically, that they originally formed a *pontile* erected between the presbytery and the nave. Soon medievalists, especially Eric Fernie, formulated rebuttals to this proposal, as they struggled to maintain the long held assumption that the frieze, from its inception, belonged to the front of the cathedral. Due to the fervent reaction against his idea, Quintavalle published a weak retraction in his book, *Wiligelmo e Matilde: l’officina romanica*, and from that time most scholars, at his urging, returned to the mainstream theory that the Genesis reliefs were always meant for the façade. Having studied the frieze and read not only the original proposal but also the counter-arguments, I would like to re-examine and resurrect Quintavalle’s controversial proposal that the panels were not originally made to form a horizontal band on the church front, but rather constituted a screen at the western edge of the presbytery.

As Quintavalle determined, the church that existed before the current building in Modena had liturgical furnishings in the form of a pulpit and a balustrade carved with decorative patterns, fragments of which still survive. He argued effectively that if the previous eleventh-century building and the current church in the late twelfth century had liturgical furniture, then the cathedral during Lanfranco’s and Wiligelmo’s time also would have had such equipment. The search for the interior furnishings of Lanfranco’s presbytery is based on this logical assumption. This *pontile* would most likely have been in place by 1106 when the church was consecrated and the relics of the saint were translated into their new abode, because the eastern end of the church was complete at that time. Thus, the sculptor Wiligelmo was at the cathedral when the *pontile* demarcating the edge of the most sacred precinct would have been carved.

Quintavalle’s idea that Wiligelmo’s sculptures formed the missing piece of furniture sprang from thematic similarities between the sculptures of Modena and those produced at Cremona Cathedral (c.1115). He observed that Cremona’s church has a series of scenes from Genesis now set in the portal as well as a sculpture with Enoch and Elijah holding a scroll, akin to the plaque carved by Wiligelmo and now
embedded in the façade of Modena Cathedral (Fig. 88).\textsuperscript{11} Both the inscription by Wiligelmo and the text at Cremona refer to the foundation of their respective cathedrals.\textsuperscript{12} Since the latter text does not refer to the view of the city (\textit{urbs} or \textit{civitas}) as an exterior inscription would, but rather to the “middle” (\textit{media}) presumably of a building, Quintavalle, among other scholars, has postulated that it was placed originally within the church.\textsuperscript{13} Because of the close iconographic affinity between the inscribed panels of Modena and Cremona, he argued that the panel by Wiligelmo also belonged on the cathedral interior and that both formed part of an altar in their respective churches.\textsuperscript{14} By the same token, he suggested that the Genesis scenes of both buildings were also part of balustrades erected along with those altars and were later placed on their respective facades.\textsuperscript{15}

Quintavalle observed that the segments of the Genesis cycle could form a whole framed by the arcade above each narrative scene (Figs. 83-86).\textsuperscript{16} The close correspondence between the length of the combined panels (11.2m), the nave, measured from the middle of the piers (10m), and the current length of the \textit{pontile} by the Campionesi (10.8m) helped to support his theory. Since the span of the Old Testament reliefs attached end-to-end would be slightly longer than the nave (by 1.2m), he argued that the sculptures would have formed a balustrade that projected in front of presbytery piers in the same way that the Campionesi’s monument does today (Figs. 1 and 120).\textsuperscript{17}

Roberto Salvini, who was the first scholar to attack Quintavalle’s proposal, wrote, “We may pause to pin the epithet absurd on the recent suggestion that all four of these [Genesis] reliefs once formed part of a rood screen that was later removed to make way for the screen designed by the masters from Campione.”\textsuperscript{18} He accepted the theory that the panels were always meant to form a continuous frieze across the four inner bays of the façade and that the Campionesi altered this arrangement when the side portals were added.\textsuperscript{19} Yet, he did not formulate a cohesive rebuttal against the evidence that Quintavalle had gathered from the sculptures.

In an article that was “intended to provide more evidence in support of [Salvini’s] case”\textsuperscript{20} against the \textit{pontile} theory, Fernie argued for a dismissal of the similarities between the width of the Old Testament panels when connected and the width of the current choir screen; he believed that since the bays between the façade buttresses measure in total 9.85m that the correspondence is purely coincidental.\textsuperscript{21} Yet I believe that this very similarity in measurements may have been the factor that inspired the clergy to immure the
remnants of the *pontile* in the church front. The clerics appear to have deemed the Genesis cycle to be of didactic or sacred value and thus preserved it, akin to the decision made by the ecclesiastics of the Church of Sant’Ambrogio in Milan, who preserved and reused the remnants of an early-twelfth-century *pontile* in a new pulpit around 1200 (Fig. 13). In order to keep the sculptures without altering the architectural plans the clergy would have sought the most convenient ample public place to preserve the sacred pieces of stone: the then sparsely decorated façade. This choice of location is particularly apt since both choir screens and façades mark important thresholds in church architecture: the entrance to the presbytery and the access point of the cathedral itself.

Next, Quintavalle argued that when the *pontile* was dismantled, the result was a partial loss of elements at the edges of the pieces, indicated, for example by the presence of half an arch found on the right side of the first panel currently located above the north side portal (Fig. 83). Fernie countered that this segment has clearly raised borders on both ends distinguishing it as a single unit despite the partial arch; he further stated that all of the other segments also have these edges, with the possible exception of the third panel in the narrative sequence. The presence of the raised rims suggested to Fernie that elements were not lost, but purposely carved as incomplete entities and that they support the theory that the panels belong on the façade. A close examination of the borders, however, does not reveal the sense of unity that he suggested existed between the sculptures and the west front of the church.

Reading from north to south across the façade, the left side of the first panel in the sequence has a wide border comprised of a worn decorative egg and dart edge and a polygonal band with an engaged column, which supports the first arch of the sculpted arcade (Fig. 83). In contrast, the raised border on the right side is only a thin squared, not polygonal, edge lacks an outer decorative moulding and is not even half the width of its counterpart on the left. The second segment seems to begin on the right side with a thin raised edge that is partially embedded in the buttress (Fig. 84). The figure of Eve is pressed against this side and her shoulder seems to be attached to the perimeter by a small piece of stone left by the carver. The arch above her head is missing the outer side of its haunch and its corbel rests beside the raised edge, not on it. In contrast, the last arch, on the right side of the same panel, is complete; it sits on a corbel attached to a thick, raised border with a concave curve that acts like a column support. The third section begins in a manner similar to the ending edge of panel two (Fig. 85). The arch is complete and rests on a
corbel attached to a thick border with a concave side. In this case, however, it is decorated with a row of palmettes. This same segment on its right side is embedded in the buttress of the façade to the point that the figure of God in the scene of *Cain’s Marking*²⁶ is partially hidden. If there is a raised border under the masonry, it is completely hidden from view. The fourth and final portion of the narrative begins with a wide polygonal border supporting an arch without a corbel (Fig. 86). In contrast, the other end lacks a raised edge. It was damaged and half of the arch has been replaced and the segment filled with extra masonry pieces and exposed brick; hence, any border that marked the end of the sequence has been lost.

Thus, while the extant examples of the borders indicate that the segments are indeed separate units, their varying widths and decorations defy the unifying quality between wall and sculpture that Fernie’s argument seemed to imply. Some of the diversity of these edges may be the result of alterations at a later time, perhaps due to the removal of the panels from their original setting and their placement in a new location. In the process, some ends may have been damaged, trimmed, or even removed as the scenes were torn from their original settings, transported, and reset. While this examination focuses on different compositional elements than Quintavalle’s study, the variety of borders supports his theory that the panels have irregularities possibly due to loss of parts of the frieze.

With regards to these raised edges, I have found that their most interesting feature is actually their placement within the Genesis sequence; they not only define each segment as a unit, but also mark important thematic divisions within the narrative. The first internal border marks the division between Adam and Eve’s sin and their punishment. Adam and Eve’s story is divided from that of their sons’ Cain and Abel by the second border, while the third division marks a change of theme from sin and murder to redemption of the Earth through death and condemnation of heresy. Therefore, the presence of the borders and their division of subject matter may suggest that the segments were conceived as separate entities to be combined into a larger whole, but in and of themselves these boundary markers do not necessitate a placement of the images on the façade.

One of the more convincing aspects of Quintavalle’s argument that the sculptures were not originally intended for the façade consists of the measurements of the panels and the spaces in which they are placed. He noted that the segments have very similar measurements; according to him, each piece is 1m high, excluding the separate cornice, and 2.8m long.²⁷ However, in spite of the accepted theory that
Wiligelmo and the architect, Lanfranco, worked in close collaboration, the gaps between buttresses on the façade are not the same size as the sculpted pieces. The distances between the buttresses at the foot of the wall are from north to south: 2.8m, 2.3m, 2.25m, and 2.5m, an extraordinary variety considering the uniformity of the length of the panels (Fig. 91). Thus, the first segment fits within its allotted space, but according to Quintavalle, the remaining narrative sections are too large for their current locations. The result can be seen best on the right side of the third panel where God in the Marking of Cain is partially embedded in the buttress (Fig. 85).

Salvini seemed to use his discussion of the buttresses that divide the façade as an unsuccessful argument against Quintavalle’s evidence. The buttresses have wide bases and taper as they rise towards the upper levels of the façade. Quintavalle acknowledged in his original proposal and in his retraction that the bases of buttresses may have been widened in the fifteenth century, which would account for part of the embedding of the reliefs. In contrast, Salvini judged that this type of masonry support was part of the original plan to articulate the wall, as was typical of Romanesque architecture. He believed that the buttresses dividing the façade were conceived to be larger in width at the bottom and thinner at the top since comparative supports can be found on the façades of other churches, like Paray-le-Monial (c.1100). If the buttresses were not widened at a later time, they would seem to bolster the idea that the Genesis cycle is in the wrong place since there would have been less space available to accommodate the sculptures at the lower level from the building’s inception.

Francesco Gandolfo tried to account for the discrepancies through a discussion of the building process employed by Lanfranco. The architect first built the walls of the cathedral with brick and then revetted the exterior surfaces with marble. Gandolfo suggested that the stone used for the carvings was measured and cut to fit the spaces prior to the addition of the revetment; hence, once the marble was added to the wall surface, the available space decreased and the sculptures had to be embedded in the buttresses. While this may be true, the addition of the revetment alone does not account for the widely varied spaces between the buttresses, ranging from 2.25 to 2.8m. Even when the brick of the façade was still exposed, the experienced stone craftsmen would have realized that there was a marked difference in the widths of the spaces and would have tried to take this into account instead of cutting the panels to a uniform width.
Rather than discussing the buttresses, Fernie based his rebuttal on a correct claim that Quintavalle made errors in his description of the discrepancies between the panels and their allotted spaces\(^\text{35}\) yet these “errors” are not so drastic as to discount the latter’s theory. Quintavalle supposed that all four panels measured 2.8 m; based on this assumption he stated that only a single panel, the first one, fits within the frames of the buttresses without embedding\(^\text{36}\). Fernie noted, correctly, that currently only two panels are actually set into the buttresses, the two segments flanking the main portal (Figs. 84-85)\(^\text{37}\). Here the embedding is extreme enough that figures are partially hidden from view by the masonry. Fernie accounted for the insertion of the inner two panels as an attempt to avoid intrusion into the jambs of the main portal\(^\text{38}\). This is a reasonable assumption yet, if the “worthy” Wiligelmo produced both the portal and the segments of the frieze, in coordination with the architect Lanfranco, he would most probably have made accommodations to avoid embedding his sculptures while leaving the necessary space for the entryway.

Today, as Fernie observed, the fourth panel is not 2.8m, but actually 2.67m and the span above the south side portal, in which it currently is immured, is actually about 2.95m (Fig. 86)\(^\text{39}\). Yet, while Fernie is correct in showing that the last panel is accommodated by its current space, it does not “fit” as he claims; it is actually too small for this location. While the cornice extends the entire width of the bay, the narrative and its surmounting arcade have been shortened. A crack reveals that the carved segment was cut just beside the figure of Cam and rises to slice the arch above his head in half. The remaining space has been filled with extra masonry and the missing piece of the arcade has been carved on these replacement stones. If the panel had not been cut, it probably would have measured 2.8m in width like its counterparts.

Fernie claimed that the difference between the current width of the panel and its present location can be accounted for by the fact that the two outer segments were not intended to sit in this position, having been raised to accommodate the later portals; the extra width of this higher space was created by the partial removal of the pilaster of the larger buttress from the level of the side portal capitals and above (Fig. 92)\(^\text{40}\). Yet, at the lower level, where he suggested the panel was before the addition of the entryway, the greater width of the buttresses, as Salvini had observed, and the remnants of the pilaster, discussed by Fernie, create a space only 2.5m wide, as Quintavalle measured. Thus, even at its current length of 2.67m, the
sculpted panel would be approximately 0.17m too long for the space; in order to fit, the segment would have been embedded in the buttress like its counterparts. This problem would have been even greater if this piece had once been 2.8m wide like the other narrative segments.

As discussed above, the visual evidence strongly indicates that the fourth segment of the Genesis story has been shortened; thus we should ask ourselves why this occurred. One theory suggests that the insertion of the sculptures in the masonry at the lower level may account for the last panel’s missing end and raised border, but another explanation for the shorter length of this piece can be put forward if the sculptures were once located within the cathedral. Assuming the panels had been attached to each other or some type of support to form a larger complex, especially a screen, the damage may have occurred when the dismantlers had to take apart the furniture. As is evident in the numerous divisions between scenes present in the Genesis panels, cuts made could not run through the middle of an episode because the narrative would no longer have been legible. Rather these jagged divisions of the pieces appear around figures at the beginnings and ends of the individual scenes. In the case of the last image, the cutters sliced as close as possible to the figure of Cam. This approach to removal allowed dismantlers to separate the sculptures with as little loss of salient details as possible and it was a popular method of taking liturgical furnishings apart as is evident throughout Italy where fragments of sacred furniture were kept and reused.41

The next set of arguments revolves around the cornice located above the narrative. It, unlike the figural scenes, does not penetrate the buttresses. In addition, it has been cut at points different from those of the panels indicating that it is not permanently attached to the sculpted images. Fernie admitted that these cuts in the cornice could be the result of the fact that, unlike the narrative sequence, it could be severed at any length rather than at the boundary of a scene; however, he argued that these slices really indicate that the cornice was set into place after the figurative panels.42 According to him, the sculptors were able to shorten the pieces and accommodate the errors of calculation that affected the sculpted scenes.43 This reasoning seems counterintuitive. As master of the shop and the only name to appear in the commemorative inscription held by Enoch and Elijah, Wiligelmo was most likely hired to design and carve the major elements of the programme. While he may have contributed to the decorative parts of the sculptures and those pieces set in remote sites, like corbels and capitals, these non-narrative items would likely have been relegated to the more minor carvers of the shop. As the master, Wiligelmo’s prime
concern would have been the figurative scenes and their coordination with the architecture, if the panels indeed belonged to the façade. He would have been most concerned with fitting the narrative pieces within the allotted space, wherever that may have been, rather than adjusting the cornice to fit its space perfectly.

While Quintavalle questioned whether the foliage of this cornice was characteristic of Wiligelmo and hence, its dating, Fernie showed that there is a close resemblance between carvings on the cornice and upper part of frieze suggesting that they were both made by this sculptor’s hand at the same time. Since the cornice fits neatly within the parameters of the spaces on the façade and shows a close unity with the motifs of the Genesis scenes, Fernie and M. F. Hearn argued that the narrative panels could not have been placed anywhere but on the façade nor could they have been produced at separate times. The pontile theory, however, does not affect the period of the Genesis sculptures’ creation and would not change the dating of the cornice; the screen marked the edge of the eastern end and must have been finished by 1106 when the translation of the relics occurred. Thus, Wiligelmo and his shop could have carved both the cornice and the Old Testament scenes according to the choir screen theory. Moreover, the dating of the Genesis sculptures does not ensure that the pieces were immured in the church front.

The cutting of the cornice and frieze at different lengths would make more sense if they had formed part of a screen. This cornice projects quite far from the wall and thus, could have originally made a handrail set over the narrative. The cornice would then be similar to that found on the current pontile inside the cathedral: its decorative frames were not carved from the same piece of stone as the Passion sequence (Fig. 1 and 33); as a result, when the choir screen was reconstructed, the cornice was reattached and sections that were lost in the sixteenth century were replaced. Since the cuts in Wiligelmo’s cornice do not coincide with those in the figurative sculptures, I believe that, as a capping and decorative element, it was made and torn apart separately and, due to its lack of iconographic content, easily adjusted to fit its new location between the façade buttresses.

Fernie also correctly pointed out that the each end of the cornice flanking the main portal has a moulded diagonal profile slanting away from the doorway (Fig. 93). The upper edge lines up with the outside boundary of the narrative scenes, while the lower edge cuts inwards. He noted that, “the result makes it appear as if the moulded profile of a balustrade has had to be adjusted to the jamb by the pushing back of the salient cornice.” He concluded that these “cornice returns” were an un-classical way of
marking an entryway since the remainder of the stone, of which the cornice is a part, forms the first three or
four small mouldings of the doorjambs associated with Wiligelmo.49 While on the surface this argument is
very convincing, Fernie fails to mention that these mouldings, unlike the carved inner jambs, are plain. If
necessary, any twelfth-century sculptor could have carved the remaining stone behind the decorative
cornice ends to match these simple curves. Furthermore, when set within the interior, the cornice returns
could have marked another kind of entrance or important opening with similar simple jambs that had led to
the sacred east end. When reset to accentuate the main portal of the façade, the foreign insertion would
have been disguised by the pieces of various sizes that comprise the mouldings of the outer jambs. The
stone of the cornice is similar to that of the jambs, which should not be surprising since they, the lintel, and
the Genesis scenes were carved by Wiligelmo and his shop at the same time. The result would be an “un-
classical” way of marking a doorway while at the same time creating an overall unified appearance to the
façade at eye-level.

The last and least convincing statement raised by Fernie was comprised of a summary in which he
discounted the discrepancies in the sculptures as acceptable to the designers.50 Rather than citing other
Romanesque monuments where carvers purposely created discrepancies, he looked at Modena’s panels and
referred the presence of half-arches at the ends of segments as support for the sculptor’s acceptance of
oddities.51 Such a statement contradicts our understanding of Romanesque sculptors who were technically
astute artists and very conscious of frames for figural carvings. Scholars have used discrepancies in
sculptural ensembles throughout medieval Europe to identify areas of change, especially when dealing with
the production of masters whose art had to be approved by the clergy. In the case of liturgical furnishings,
an example of this approach is William Tronzo’s study of the pulpit in the Cappella Palatina; by examining
the peculiarities about the speaker box’s L-shape and its setting, Tronzo reconstructed the monument’s
original appearance and dated it to c.1170-90.52

Quintavalle began from the same premise when he studied the peculiarities of the current
arrangement of the Genesis scenes. Unfortunately, the Old Testament narrative could not be removed for
archaeological assessment during the latest restoration and Quintavalle recanted his theory until further
evidence could be found. Yet, as we have seen, many of the rebuttals to the proposal are weak and the incongruities about the sculptures still remain enigmatic if the panels were not placed in another location after their inception.

By considering the façades of other churches found in Northern Italy, I believe that new problems concerning the presence of the Genesis sculptures on the church front arise. First, Italian Romanesque sculptors and architects preferred to place continuous horizontal friezes across the entire façade, or to the edges of the outer turrets or towers if present. Such is the case of the church front of San Michele in Pavia (c.1100-60; Fig. 94). There, the friezes run across the whole façade rather than stopping and starting in the middle of the western front, as in the case of Modena. The sense of continuous balance and symmetry between decoration and building seems to have been on Lanfranco and Wiligelmo’s agenda since the other decorative elements like corbels and loggia arcade extend across the entire width of the church front (Fig. 15). This sense of architectural and sculptural unity would have called for Wiligelmo to carve six panels for the façade of Modena, one panel for each space defined by the buttresses, however, only the four pieces were incorporated into the wall. The absence of narrative panels for the two outer bays makes the otherwise integrative ideal seem disjointed.

Secondly, the other sculptures randomly immured in the façade seem to support the idea that the pieces belonged originally within the cathedral. While accepting the theory that the frieze remains on the exterior, Hearn believed that the sculptures of genii with down-turned torches on the façade were once part of the interior (Fig. 89). Similar proposals have been made for the Evangelist symbols currently set above the rose window. These suggestions derive from the incongruities about the placement of these pieces, while similar discrepancies about the frieze have been viewed as inconsequential. If the frieze, cornice, and other errant sculptures were removed from the façade, the result would be a plain exterior accentuating the protruding sculpted portal and upper loggia. I would argue that this format seems likely since this type of exterior is common in Northern Italian churches of the Romanesque period, such as Piacenza Cathedral (beg. 1122), Verona Cathedral (c.1135), and Parma Cathedral (early twelfth century; Fig. 95).

In addition to the lack of unity between architecture and decoration that suggests the sculpted frieze does not belong on the exterior, the subject matter of the scenes would have been just as appropriate for an interior setting and a first choir screen, as for a façade. In fact, both pontili and façades were
important thresholds in the church that required special consideration and often bore key Christian
iconography. As a result, the subject matter of Wiligelmo’s panels could have been suitable for placement
between the main altar and the faithful.\textsuperscript{56} Set in front of the sacrificial table in the presbytery, the scenes
from the first book of the Bible would have provided Old Testament parallels to the liturgical rites of the
medieval church.\textsuperscript{57} As observed in chapter one, Old Testament scenes of sacrifice were often painted in the
presbytery near the altar in order to elaborate on the Christian oblation of the Mass.\textsuperscript{58} In this context, Cain
and Abel’s offerings would have alluded to the presentation of the sacred bread that was turned into the
body of Christ at the altar in the sacred east end (Fig. 85). The scenes chosen were also recalled in the
lessons of the Paschal Vigil;\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Creation}, the \textit{Fall}, and the \textit{Flood} appear in the Easter verses as well as
among Wiligelmo’s carvings. Furthermore, an allusion to Christ’s crucifixion is also found in the crossed-
nimbus worn by the Creator in the scenes on the first three segments (Fig. 83-85), and the murdered Abel
prefigures the New Testament sacrifice since his innocent blood was spilled by his brother just as Christ’s
was shed by the Jews (Fig. 84).\textsuperscript{60}

Wiligelmo’s carvings contain iconographic elements related not only to the Mass but also to the
liturgical rites of Baptism and Penitence, also performed within the church. With regards to the former
sacrament, the \textit{Creation} story was interpreted in light of Baptism in the \textit{catechesis} and this textual
connection would tie the first panel of the Genesis cycle to the events that took place within the cathedral
(Fig. 83).\textsuperscript{61} The relationship is made explicit by the primordial water in the Garden of Eden. This water
that gives life just as the baptismal waters give birth to new Christians appears under the prone body of
Adam in the scene of \textit{Eve’s Creation}.\textsuperscript{62} At the end of the first panel, Adam and Eve sin and the second
segment is concerned with their punishment (Fig. 84). These events would remind the faithful that through
his sacrifice, the source of the baptismal rite, Christ, the new Adam, would redeem mankind from the
punishment due to original sin. Another reference to Baptism occurs on the last panel where Noah appears
in the ark during the flood (Fig. 86). The deluge was the water that cleansed while at the same time
bringing death\textsuperscript{63} just as the baptismal waters wash away sin so that a person can be reborn as part of the
Christian community. Noah, thus, became a type for Christ, saving humanity through the ark, as the
Saviour would rescue his people through the church. Wiligelmo has underlined this connection between the ark and religious architecture by rendering the boat as a double loggia recalling church interiors where superimposed arcades lined the nave.

In an era when the bishop pardoned sinners who had committed serious crimes, Penitence was another important rite that allowed convicted criminals to rejoin the community of the faithful. The penitential character of Wiligelmo’s sculptures is embodied in the scene of Adam and Eve’s Expulsion, represented on the second panel (Fig. 84). According to liturgical books of the period, during the events of Ash Wednesday, public sinners were clothed in sackcloth and presented barefoot, like the woeful progenitors, to the bishop; he placed ashes upon their head and cast them from the church as Adam was expelled from Eden while a cleric recited the responsory taken from the words spoken to Adam by God after the Fall: “In the Sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return to earth, out of which thou wast taken: for dust thou art, and into dust thou shalt return” (Genesis 3: 19). The sinners were absolved and reconciled with the Church on Maundy Thursday of Holy Week.

Wiligelmo’s image of God confronting Cain also had penitential overtones (Fig. 86). As punishment for murdering Abel, God cursed Adam’s eldest son turning him into a wanderer. In response to Cain’s fear of being killed himself, God marks him as a means of identification and protection. I have argued elsewhere that the scene at Modena should be interpreted as the Marking of Cain rather than just a Condemnation. Instead of simply confronting Cain, as in other representations of the Condemnation (e.g. the frescoes of Saint-Savin-sur-Gartempe; Fig. 96), the anthropomorphized God actually places his hand on Cain’s shoulder, a unique choice of iconography. This touch may refer to Genesis 4:15: “And the Lord said to him: No, it shall not be so: but whosoever shall kill Cain, shall be punished sevenfold. And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, that whosoever found him should not kill him.” The mark is being placed on the shoulder, a site where criminals and sometimes Jews were branded for identification purposes during the Middle Ages as shown by Ruth Mellinkoff. Furthermore, the mark of Cain was popularly perceived as a brand like those placed on criminals and heretics. Such a mark made the invisible enemy, in this case Cain who is a symbol of sinners, identifiable by others and would be an appropriate scene for the narrative considering its other references to heresies. In addition, this mark, was akin to the ashes placed upon the
criminals during the ceremonies of Ash Wednesday, identifying Cain as different, or as an “other,” and something to be scorned, similar to the orthodox perception of not only people who had committed heinous crimes, but also heretics and Jews.71

These typological references to the rites performed within the cathedral were strengthened by references from liturgical dramas that, as discussed in chapter two,72 were enacted in the church, especially around the times of Christmas and Easter.73 Most Old Testament plays throughout the Middle Ages centred on the figures of Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel, Noah and his sons, as well as Abraham and Isaac.74 According to Hardin Craig and Adeline Jenney, the stories focussed on these individuals were popular precisely because they underlined the content of the lections, or readings from the divine service, and the responsories, or chants sung after a lesson, in the period prior to Easter (Fig. 84).75 For example, the play entitled, *Ordo representationis Adae*, or *Play of Adam*,76 includes the following words after the Fall, “*De ambularet*”; these are the same words used in an Easter responsory and also are found on the inscribed scroll of the Creator confronting Adam and Eve in Wiligelmo’s sculptures.77 A second example occurs on the third panel where the Creator marks Cain. God holds a scroll inscribed with the words “*Ubi est Abel frater tuus?*” (“Where is your brother Abel?”). The same passage appears in the play and as a responsory (Fig. 85).78 During *Septuagesima*, the first week of the Easter season, the lections and responsories from Genesis focus on *Creation*, the *Temptation*, the *Fall*, and the story of Cain and Abel while those of *Sexagesima*, the second week of Eastertide, were centred around Noah.79 The popularity of these events derives from their allusions to the redemption of Christ and led to the development from liturgical verses to Old Testament plays tied to the Easter season and then transferred to Christmas celebrations.80

For the sculptures at Modena, the *Play of Adam* provides more parallels than just textual similarities. This particular play is divided into three sections: the first act deals with Adam and Eve, the second part centres on their sons, and the last part is comprised of a procession of prophets. The choice of subject matter stresses aspects of sin, death, and the freedom from these constraints. Scenes similar to those described in the text are represented in the sequence carved by Wiligelmo. Chiara Frugoni revealed a more direct relationship between these sculptures and the play. For example, the text refers to God as “*Figura*” or “*Salvator*,” and the latter term alludes to Christ’s role as saviour of humanity. Wiligelmo has
paralleled this allusion through the use of a crossed-nimbus that visually turns God the Creator into Christ-Logos (Fig. 83-86). Frugoni further mentioned that the scene of both Adam and Eve hoeing the ground is most rare, since the biblical text stresses Eve’s punishment as pain during childbirth; as a result, in the visual arts, she is often shown suckling or holding a child as seen on the bronze doors of the church of San Zeno, Verona (twelfth century; Fig. 68). Unlike the Bible, the drama describes both progenitors toiling in the fields, “tunc Adam fossorium tollet et Eva rastrum, et incipient colere terra, et seminabunt in ea triticum,” a description that is startlingly similar to the image carved by Wiligelmo (Fig. 84).

Both the allusions to the rites that were performed within the cathedral and the use of iconographic details from liturgical dramas would have made these Old Testament sculptures an appropriate addition to the interior of the cathedral. By placing the Genesis narrative on a barrier before the eastern end of the church, Wiligelmo would have built upon a tradition of representing pre-figurations near the main altar as well as on liturgical furnishings of the Romanesque period. For example, Jonah is represented being consumed and regurgitated by the whale on ambos, such as that of Ravello Cathedral (1095-1150; Fig. 97). Prophets also appeared on pulpits in Tuscany as in the case of the platform in Barga Cathedral (c.1256; Fig. 98) where the prophet Isaiah is sculpted. Furthermore, if the biblical sculptures immured in the façade of the church of San Zeno in Verona (c.1125-1135; Fig. 11) once formed a choir screen, as Evelyn Kain argued, the Genesis scenes from that series would provide an Old Testament parallel to the Modena screen.

While agreeing with Quintavalle that the Genesis cycle once formed a barrier at the eastern end of the nave, his reconstruction of that screen is problematic. In his proposal, Wiligelmo’s pontile had a format and placement similar to that of the Campionesi (Figs. 1 and 120): a continuous frieze of sculptures supported by lion-bearing columns in front of the presbytery and over the entrance to the crypt. Yet, the archaeological evidence found within the church during the early twentieth-century restorations does not support this proposal.

When the sixteenth-century balustrade and arrangement of the east end were removed in 1919, remnants of a structure were found under the nave floor. The raising of the pavement revealed an almost square foundation on axis with the middle of the crypt; it extended 3m into the nave and was 3.85m wide (Fig. 99). This “square” attached to another foundation that ran parallel to the presbytery for the entire
width of the nave. Everyone seemed to agree that this was the remnant of a central staircase that had joined the nave floor to a platform projecting from the sanctuary and this interpretation is still supported today by scholars like Adriano Peroni and Gandolfo.86

Problems developed when the team sought to date these foundations and the remains became the centre of a heated debate. Laudadeo Testi, a follower of Roncaglia Messori, saw these remains as part of the Campionesi intervention and proof of the theory that the Campionesi sculptures formed a pulpit and a singing gallery (Fig. 42).87 In contrast, Tommaso Sandonnini and his team believed that they were the remnants of the earlier arrangement of the crypt built by Lanfranco for the remains were too low to be part of the Campionesi construction and too high to be part of the eleventh-century building which had stood on the site.88 They also were continuous with the crypt foundations laid by Lanfranco at the turn of the twelfth century, indicating that they were of the same chronological time frame.89 Moreover, the sculpted scenes of the Passion, carved by the Campionesi, would not have fit easily into a structure separated by central stairs suggesting that the latter were part of an earlier arrangement. After examining the evidence, the overseeing committee of the government, the Consiglio Superiore di Antichità e Belle Arti, sided with Sandonnini.90 They agreed that this foundation was evidence of Lanfranco’s arrangement and so the reconstruction of the Campionesi’s pontile continued according to Sandonnini’s plan, a decision still commonly supported today by such scholars as Quintavalle, Erika Doberer, and Cristina Luchinat.91

In addition to the foundations discovered under the pavement, the reconstruction team also found remnants of arches attached to the nave piers during the removal of the sixteenth-century raised floor and its supporting walls. These arches were made of bricks similar to those used during the first phases of construction on the building.92 The remnants of one opening was left partially visible on the northern side of the crypt entrances by the twentieth-century restorers (Fig. 100). Sandonnini believed that these arches were the remnants of windows because the outlines did not run to the base of the wall that divides the church from the crypt.93 The windows would have been necessitated by the darkness under the raised platform. In contrast, later scholars like Luciano Serchia believe that these remnants of vaults were for side entrances; the steps of these doorways would have led down under the platform set behind the stairs.94 Regardless of whether these arches were once portals or windows, they indicate that there was a projecting platform that extended into the nave and to which the central staircase attached.
A drawing by Serchia shows a hypothetical reconstruction of this arrangement (Fig. 101). It includes the central staircase, projecting platform, and the side entrances attached to the piers as well as two more proposed entrances into the crypt flanking the nave staircase. More important for this investigation, the illustration incorporates a plain balustrade around the entire upper edge of the projecting platform and into the side aisles. This hypothetical reconstruction of the elevation, however, is problematic. The most disturbing aspect of the drawing is that it does not correctly render the placement of the large piers that rise to support the ceiling of the church and to which the crypt entrances were attached. Such elements would have interfered even with the arrangement of marble panels around the perimeter of the western edges as shown in the sketch and the Genesis panels would not fit well into this hypothetical arrangement.

An unidentified artist, perhaps at the beginning of the twentieth century, formulated a more interesting hypothesis (Fig. 102). S/he postulated that the Genesis panels formed a continuous barrier attached to the nave piers; in other words, a sculpted segment was attached to the north and south side of each arcade support in order to demarcate the edge of the eastern end. While promising, this reconstruction is problematic as well. First, according to the drawing, the central staircase rises to neatly adjoin and to fill the gap left by the two panels set in the nave space. This arrangement, however, ignores the fact that the stair foundations were attached to the base of a platform that projected into the nave in front of the piers. In addition, while the drawing shows the stairs fitting between the sculptures, in reality the space between them would be 2.15m while the steps, according to the foundations, would have been 3.85m wide (Fig. 103). Thus, if the stairs had adjoined directly to the panels, almost half of the width of the steps would have been blocked by the narrative scenes. A similar problem with measurements occurs in the side aisles; according to the drawing, the first and last segments fit in the side aisles by themselves, but in reality they are too small to fill that space and the artist does not account for the gaps that would be present. Despite these problems, the idea that the panels adjoined the piers has merit and it will serve as the basis for my reconstruction.

With regards to the extra space in the side aisles, the presence of the central staircase in the nave does not preclude the presence of stairs on the north and south aisles. Luchinat acknowledged that there is no definitive proof that side aisle stairs did not exist in Lanfranco’s time. The presence of steps along with a central staircase would create a raised east end similar to that of the abbey church of Nonantola,
located only twenty-five kilometres from Modena (c.1100; Fig. 104). This, too, is a reconstructed east end, but the historical remnants there support the presence of three sets of steps. Close connections, often fraught with tension, existed between Nonantola’s abbey and Modena Cathedral suggesting that close ties in their plans, architecture, and sculpture may have existed; for example, the main portal of the cathedral’s façade was copied by the sculptural workshop at Nonantola in 1121. Similarities in the architecture are paralleled by the affinities in the issues, primarily the Investiture Controversy, addressed by the sculptural programmes of both churches.

If three staircases did exist, these entrances into the east end would need to have been controlled and the central axis in line with the main altar would have needed to be accented. A sculpted barrier extending from the side stairs to the nave piers and from the nave piers to an open space to form a gateway in the centre of the presbytery could have served both of these functions (Fig. 105). This barrier, created with the Genesis panels, would also have acted as a backdrop to the raised platform where the elevation of the Eucharist could have taken place. The current space between the railing of the northern set of steps and the projection of the nave pier measures 2.75m, a very close number to the 2.8m width of the first panel of the Genesis frieze (2.8m; Fig. 103). The opening between the projecting nave piers is 7.75m wide. The next two panels of the Genesis frieze measure 5.6m in length. Thus, if one panel is set, in narrative order, against each pier, a 2.15m space is left in the middle, on axis with the central staircase, for entrance into the sacred east end. This opening most likely was filled with a gateway that could be opened and closed as needed; the odd cornice returns found flanking the main portal could have demarcated this main entryway into the presbytery. The final space between the south nave pier and the railing of the south set of stairs is 2.88m. The final panel, in its current state of 2.67m would easily fit within this space, however, as already noted, it was probably 2.8m like its counterparts and thus would fill the gap more aptly.

The arcade carved above the figural scenes would create visual unity across the piers and gateway, tying the separate parts together into a whole (Figs. 83-86); this harmony was what had led Quintavalle to suggest that the panels were joined end to end. Furthermore, the raised borders would mark points of articulation at the nave piers and the gateway into the sacred sanctuary. This arrangement would explain the use and variety of raised borders that separated the sequence into thematic units. Each edge marks a point of physical as well as narrative transition either at a stair, pier, or central passage. The varying widths
of these borders may be accounted for by loss during their removal from their settings against the piers, handrails, and any supports for a gate that may have closed off the entrance into the presbytery.

The placement of the panels in line with the piers behind a projecting platform would be similar to the east end of the church of San Miniato al Monte in Florence (Fig. 43). There, two sets of side stairs rise to an east end over a raised crypt. The screen for the sacred area is set back from the edge of the east end to line up with the nave piers leaving a passageway in the middle on axis with the nave. Since the panels are not on the edge of the raised presbytery, a platform extending towards the nave is created, a situation akin to the one I am proposing for Modena. Although the panels at San Miniato are decorated with geometric patterns and rosettes, the Genesis panels would be suited to this hypothetical disposition at Modena.

Unlike the arrangement at San Miniato al Monte, however, the Lanfranchian layout may have placed the pulpit at a distance from the balustrade, but close to the presbytery. The speaker’s platform at Modena could not have straddled the balustrade as it does at San Miniato since the column supports would have obscured the sculptural programme on the screen. Quintavalle argued that this separate pulpit would have stood on the north or Gospel side of the nave and was composed of the four evangelist symbols now immured in the façade above the rose window (Fig. 15). A separate lectern for use during the Mass also may have been erected on the projecting platform near the staircase.

While San Miniato al Monte is a monastic church and Lanfranco’s monument is a cathedral, they shared common ties that might explain the similarities in their eastern barriers. Both buildings were centres of reform movements in the eleventh century. The crypt of the church of San Miniato was begun by Hildebrand, a corrupt bishop of Florence in the early eleventh century (1014-c.1068), but by mid-century the church was under the control of local bishops loyal to the papacy and Countess Matilda, who made the city a centre of reform by 1069. At that time, the lower façade, hall crypt, and raised presbytery were elaborated (c.1069-1100); stairs led up to this east end in the side aisles while steps descended into the crypt on the central axis of the nave. The building campaign continued throughout the twelfth century; the marble screen and the pulpit with its figural lectern date to this third period of elaboration begun in 1128 and ending in 1207. I would argue that the liturgical furnishings were conceived early in this campaign because services were transferred into the new east end at the beginning of the third phase of construction.
Modena, too, had close ties to Countess Matilda. The area was not only technically under her jurisdiction, but the city was close to her castle at Canossa where Pope Gregory VII and Emperor Henry IV met in 1077 during the height of the Investiture Controversy. Despite the Countess’ decidedly pro-papal stance, in 1084, Modena Cathedral was under the control of a German imperial bishop named Eriberto and thus the city was anti-papal. The decision to rebuild the cathedral came during a vacancy of the episcopal seat after the bishop’s death coinciding with a time of reform for the citizens who were trying to re-align themselves with the papacy. This change of political stance is evident in 1106 when both Pope Pascal and Countess Matilda were present for the consecration of the new church and translation of the saint’s relics. This period of change is exactly when the new crypt with its raised east end and staircases were erected and Wiligelmo carved the Genesis sculptures.

The use of elaborate east ends over raised crypts and decorated with furniture are found in a number of churches of the countess’ territories, including the Cathedral of Parma as well as the church of San Zeno in Verona. A number of these churches were sites of pilgrimage, but also the use of this type of crypt may have been part of an architectural statement within the lands ruled by the Matilda. Elaborate raised crypts are typical of a number of early Ottonian churches; by harkening back to an architectural format used when the emperor and pope worked hand-in-hand, these churches may visually recall a time when there was a united Christian Imperial community, an ideal that Matilda fostered. Similarly artisans working in the countess’ territories, used other architectural vocabulary, such as porch portals, to create a visual link with Rome and underscore the power of Christian rule; as Christine Verzár argued, these double-storied entryways reflected Matilda’s pro-papal program and propaganda for reform in the face of the political struggles of the Investiture Controversy.

In addition to showing parallels with other churches within the countess’ territories, this newly proposed arrangement would dispel Hearn’s concerns about the placements of supports for a screen comprised of the Genesis scenes. Despite the problems with Fernie’s argument, Hearn fully supported this interpretation in his book on Romanesque sculpture where he reiterated his concerns about the raised borders at the ends of the panels. He added that these dividers “signify points of articulation” and would mark natural locations for column supports if the panels formed a screen of similar format to the Campionesi monument. According to his theory, a column would have been located in the centre of the
nave supporting the division between the second and third panels creating a disruption and awkward viewing disposition. First of all, a study of liturgical furnishings in Italy reveals that divisions in narratives do not necessarily correspond to vertical supports as is seen in the cases of the Campionesi pontile within Modena Cathedral and the pulpits of S. Michele in Groppoli (1193) and Barga Cathedral (c.1256; Fig. 98). Moreover, with my proposed arrangement, the screen would not have required column supports since the panels would have rested directly on the floor.

If the Genesis sculptures were originally intended to form a pontile, when were they moved and immured in the façade? Likely, they did not remain in their original location for a long period of time since Modena’s church front seems to have influenced the sculpted frieze found on the façade of Lincoln Cathedral built by the mid-twelfth century. The Modena screen may have been damaged during the large earthquake of 1117, which shook Cremona, Nonantola, and Modena. The last city suffered less devastation during the quake, although the choir screen may have endured losses at that time; this disaster may partially account for the damage to and possible missing scene of the fourth panel in the sequence. During the aftermath of the quake, the screen may have been dismantled and mounted on the cathedral’s façade as a frieze in order to preserve what had survived. In fact, William Montorsi argued that the Campionesi were later hired to repair damages to the bell tower and presbytery caused by the earthquake. After the pontile’s removal, a temporary replacement may have been required in order to retain the mystery of the High Mass at the main altar. Perhaps plain stone panels were erected or a painted wooden substitute may also have been built in order to serve the needs of the clergy while they concentrated on completing the building of the cathedral into the 1130’s. The arrival of the Campionesi in the 1160’s to do work on the Ghirlandina tower would have provided the opportunity to plan and create a more permanent replacement for the original screen.

In the 1170’s, the Campionesi would have had time to adapt the cathedral’s eastern end to suit the new pontile. They removed the central staircase, if it had not already been eliminated previously, and elevated the crypt roof, and thus the choir, by about 0.40m. An extension of the stairs in the side aisles would have taken place during this early phase of work on the cathedral. These architectural adaptations were required because the continuous narrative format of the Passion sculptures was not suited to the layout implied by the thematic divisions evident in the Genesis cycle. While these radical changes to the eastern
end took place, the established sculptors of the shop also would have had time to work on the decorations for the Ghirlandina and the upper zone of the façade. With the arrival of the new artisans, the carvings for the major scenes of the pontile would have been undertaken. Both the alterations to the sacred east end and the carvings for the choir screen would have been completed by the time of the cathedral’s re-consecration in 1184.

With the number of changes that had taken place during the century and the new concerns of the bishop and the clergy, studied in the previous chapters, the designer of the new pontile’s programme would have sought an appropriate new narrative to serve his community. While the Old Testament typology is still present in the new screen, it is subordinated to the New Testament events, a more popular arrangement in the later Middle Ages. As Quintavalle suggested, the result was a shift from the Old Testament prefigurations to a more overt Christological cycle that was more directly tied to the blood and body of Christ as well as in its refutation of the twelfth-century heresies popular in the region.119 We will now turn our attention to the original appearance of the Campionesi’s creation when it was first erected in the late twelfth-century.

---
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CHAPTER 5

RECONSTRUCTING THE CAMPIONESI’S ORIGINAL TWELFTH-CENTURY PONTILE

In the late twelfth century, the bishop, his canons, and the Campionesi designed and erected a replacement for the earlier pontile erected by Wiligelmo. The programme for this new structure focused on Christ’s Passion, introducing a wealth of new symbolic references to the liturgy as well as to contemporary events. My study of the choir screen at Modena has shown that the Mass was central to understanding the imagery that composed this structure and that the bishop was a key figure for explicating the meaning of the monument. The cathedral was his church, as he performed the ritualized High Masses, protected the various petitioners who entered the building, and combated heresies, which included the dissident political leaders who vied with the episcopal representative for power. Furthermore, the bishops fostered an episcopal cult through devotion to the patron saint of the cathedral and city, San Geminiano, an early head of the diocese. The centrality of the bishop and patron saint to the cathedral provides a pivotal point for my reconstruction of the Campionesi’s original construction (1178-1184).

The first chapter of this study outlined conflicting opinions about the thirteenth-century form of the pontile, which led to disagreements about its twentieth-century reconstruction and its present form.¹ Both Roncaglia Messori and Tommaso Sandoninni had presented varying proposals for the arrangement of the sculpted remains. The former suggested that the Passion images had formed a singing gallery opposite the later pulpit (Fig. 42), whereas Sandoninni theorized that the sculptures formed a choir screen. The Comitato promotore, or Organizing Committee, requested that the twentieth-century restorers implement the latter’s vision of the thirteenth-century pontile (Figs. 1 and 120), and, since its completion, scholars have come to a general agreement about the correctness of the balustrade arrangement of the Passion sequence.² Overall, critics have been less satisfied with the placement of the pennachio as well as the
arrangement of the supports for the structure. These evaluations of the reconstruction have led to interesting suggestions that centred on the original appearance of the twelfth-century choir screen and on the ways in which incorporating the pulpit may have altered that structure.

5.1 PHYSICAL AND SPATIAL RECONSTRUCTION

There are three distinct aspects of any proposed reconstruction of the choir screen: the first is spatial and determined by the measurements of the architecture, the second is programmatic or concerned with iconography, and the third is structural and centred on the problem of supporting the balustrade. Before turning to iconographic concerns, I will examine the placement of the *pontile* in relation to the raised presbytery because, as an architectural element, the choir screen necessarily must have been integrated into and dependent upon its physical setting. Its exact location would have affected its size as well as its manner of attachment to the east end of the church.

As previously discussed in chapter one, scholars believe that the *pontile*’s length was limited to the width of the nave, because of the discovery of remnants of an older cornice that supported the stairs’ landing before the sacristy on the cathedral’s north side. This cornice was exposed on June 20, 1919, and spanned the space between the northern stairs and the wall with the crypt entrances. Since it supported the older bricks of the landing rather than Campionesi work, Sandonnini deduced that it could not have upheld the *pontile*; further, its presence precluded the joining of the choir screen to the northern set of stairs leaving the side aisles free of visual obstruction. This proposal is further supported by the evidence provided by the *pontili* remains from both Parma Cathedral (1178; Figs. 5-10) and the Abbey Church of Vezzolano (c.1220-30; Fig. 14). In each case, reconstructions based on archaeological and textual evidence, suggest that both choir screens only spanned the nave and did not continue into the side aisles. In fact, restriction of screens to the width of the nave was so common that definitions of these early furnishings list this characteristic as an essential criterion. Furthermore, at Modena the extended wall that forms a pseudo-narthex for the crypt underneath the *pontile*, also ends at the outer edges of the nave arcade piers (Figs. 1 and 120). This protrusion, with its three arched entrances to the crypt, further bolsters the idea that Modena’s choir screen also was attached to the nave piers and was likely the same width as the lower extension (11.25m).
Unfortunately, the restorers’ plan to reduce the pontile’s width in accordance with the new archaeological finding created a problem for the twentieth-century cathedral canons. The clergy wanted to cross the east end from the sacristy without having to enter the choir enclosure via the sixteenth-century doors near the apse. As a result, the restoration team entertained a number of ideas that would enable them to restrict the choir screen’s width, attach it to the presbytery, and provide the freedom of movement the canons desired. Their solution was the addition of a recessed square balcony that allows for the passage of one person around the piers that stand behind the southern and northern ends of the pontile. As a result, one can walk from the side aisles, around the nave arcade piers, and across the choir screen floor; at the same time, the restorer’s maintained the prominence of the rectangular screen, in order to echo its twelfth-century appearance (Figs. 1 and 106).

This situation, however, is most likely not reflective of the early medieval arrangement since rectangular liturgical furnishings, like the Vezzolano pontile (Fig. 14) and the pulpits of Barga Cathedral (c.1256; Fig. 98) and San Miniato al Monte in Florence (twelfth century; Fig. 43), were often attached to nave arcade supports. The Campionesi’s choir screen probably followed this pattern of a rectilinear element attached on its shorter ends to the piers at the edge of the presbytery (Fig. 107). These smaller, less visible sides were either blank or decorated with architectural and/or floral motifs similar to the sides of other liturgical furnishings that did not face the laity. For example, the pulpit of Barga Cathedral has one side decorated with a single prophet under a broad arcade, while the one in San Bartolommeo in Pantano, Pistoia (1235-1250) has large rosettes on its less visible ends. Moreover, the problem of the clergy’s movement across the eastern end of Modena Cathedral would not have existed in the twelfth-century since, according to Soli, the original choir enclosure had wooden doors in the middle of the north and south sides; these openings were permanently closed with marble plaques in the sixteenth century when the doors near the apse were opened, but in the beginning, they would have provided easy access across the east end.

5.2 PROGRAMMATIC RECONSTRUCTION

Having determined how the pontile attached to the presbytery and thus its width (11.25m), we can now turn to issues concerning the scenes that composed the balustrade facing the laity. While Adolfo
Venturi\textsuperscript{11} and Erika Doberer\textsuperscript{12} tackled an entire reconstruction of the original choir screen, many scholars proposed partial adjustments to the current balustrade in order to reflect the twelfth-century arrangement.

Everyone seemed agreed that the widest surviving image, that of the \textit{Last Supper}, and in particular the figure of Christ in that scene, was originally aligned with the central axis of the church (Fig. 30).\textsuperscript{13} This theory is supported by the centrality of this image to the celebration of the Mass, the rites of Holy Week, and the refutation of heresies, and also because it is the only surviving scene in which a figure breaks the upper frame. Christ’s halo protrudes from the picture into the cornice breaking the rhythmic pattern of the disciples’ heads and marking him as the center of attention, so that he becomes the axial figure for the choir screen. Moreover, this arrangement would align Christ with the high altar behind, the relics below, and the celebrant standing above the scene during the elevation of the Eucharist, a point to which I shall return later in this chapter. While Christ is the iconographic focus, he is not the physical centre of the image, a point not discussed by scholars to date.\textsuperscript{14} He is closer to the northern side, situated 1.35m from the northern edge and 1.65m from the southern end. Thus, the original monument had more room for other scenes on the liturgical right than to the liturgical left (Fig. 108).

Another notable feature of the \textit{Last Supper} panel is the plain molding to which the last figure, St. Simon, and a curved inner frame are attached. This plain, flat strip, which is 0.08m wide, separates the \textit{Last Supper} from the ensuing \textit{Betrayal} scene. The colonnettes that currently divide the other scenes were added by the thirteenth-century sculptors, who sought to unify the appearance of their pulpit with the surviving scenes of the balustrade, as discussed in chapter one.\textsuperscript{15} Originally, each Passion scene of the sequence was most likely framed by the flat moldings that still survive behind the small columns. Similar types of plain frames are found on other Italian liturgical furnishings, such as the pulpits in Cagliari Cathedral (1159-1162; Fig. 46). Furthermore, many pieces of furniture that have such separations also have wider versions of the same molding to mark the corners of the structure, as can be seen on the pulpit of San Miniato al Monte (Fig. 43). For Modena Cathedral’s \textit{pontile}, I have used the visible flat molding situated between the \textit{Last Supper} and \textit{Betrayal} as a reference point for my reconstruction, thus assuming that a 0.08m flat divider existed between each pair of scenes (Fig. 108). In keeping with the evidence from other Italian liturgical furnishings, I have also incorporated a 0.16m molding at the beginning and end of the entire sequence in order to mark the structure’s corners.
The second surviving panel that has received much academic attention is that of the *Washing of the Feet* (Fig. 29). In its current state it measures 0.70m, but as discussed in the first chapter, this scene seems to have been reduced in size.\(^{16}\) Its shortened state is suggested by the missing support for Christ’s clothes, his missing backside and foot on one end, as well as the missing curved inner frame and St. Peter’s chipped arm on the other side. Scholars generally agree that the panel was cut, perhaps at the clergy’s urging, in order to create room for the pulpit in the thirteenth century; the image, however, had to remain recognizable and, as a result, the major iconographic elements were left in tact.\(^{17}\) Scholars, however, do not agree on the original appearance and length of the pre-cut scene.

William Montorsi argued that the sculpture was not actually cut, but rather rounded on its edges; in his theory, only 0.08m of the original image was eliminated.\(^{18}\) Unfortunately, a simple rounding of the edges does not seem to account for the missing elements. Geza De Francovich convincingly contended that the missing support for Christ’s clothes was similar to the column seen in the frieze at Beaucaire (Fig. 56) and that it must have been cut from the image.\(^{19}\) I would argue that by extending the curve of Christ’s back to form his hip, finishing the length of his leg to create a bent foot, and adding some space for a column and the inner curved molding edge, the original image would have been a minimum of 0.11m longer on the left side. Thus, the panel must have been at least 0.81m wide. This measurement is based on the assumption that only the three apostles currently in the image appeared in the pre-cut scene, but the absence of the curved frame behind St. Peter suggests that this was most likely not the case.

Sandonnnini was the first to propose that all twelve apostles had once appeared in this scene and De Francovich agreed.\(^ {20}\) In this theory, even the errant Judas would have been included in the image for he was still holy, as indicated by his halo, until the image of his treacherous kiss.\(^ {21}\) Sandonnnini believed that once all of the apostles were included, the panel would then measure the same as the *Last Supper*, 3.00m.\(^ {22}\) Yet, this desire to include all of the disciples seems counter to the more staid and concise images found flanking the *Last Supper*. Furthermore, such a large scene beside the panel depicting the meal would make the screen appear visually unbalanced since only smaller sculptures survive on the opposite side of the central scene. In addition, two large pieces side by side would detract from the centrality of the *Last Supper*. Lastly, a broad rendition of the *Washing*, as Sandonnnini proposed, would not be in keeping with the concise portrayal of the other Passion events executed by the artists.
Although the Campionesi were influenced by the Passion cycles in Provence, clearly they had departed from the friezes of St. Gilles-du-Gard (Fig. 50) and Beaucaire (Fig. 56) in their presentation of the Washing of the Feet. Both of those versions depict only Christ and St. Peter. Yet these French examples are directly attached to or contained within the same frame as an image of the Last Supper, perhaps leading to a restriction in the number of disciples. Although set beside a representation of the meal, the Campionesi did not follow this extremely restricted model, since at least three disciples currently survive. In this manner, their version is more akin to the Provençal exception to the rule: a rendition at St. Trophîme at Arles, where five or six apostles appear in the Washing (Fig. 57). Similarly, some twelfth-century Italian models use a limited number of disciples. For example the bronze doors of the church of San Zeno, Verona (early twelfth century; Fig. 70) include a version of the Washing with five disciples, while the Salerno ivories (early twelfth century; Fig. 45) incorporate an example with seven apostles. I would argue that the Campionesi, like the sculptors at Arles and Verona, included five apostles in order to produce a staid, abridged version of the event that still included all of the necessary details for relating the story.

In the surviving fragment, the two standing overlapping apostles consume approximately 0.44m of space. I believe a similar pair of figures, holding books and with heads aligned at the top of the panel, stood behind St. Peter facing towards Christ. This addition would produce an orderly, calm image approximately 1.25m in width (0.70m + 0.11m + 0.44m; Fig. 108). The compact but organized crowd of the Washing would provide a counterbalance to the tightly controlled chaos of the Arrest that appears on the southern flank of the Last Supper (Fig. 31).

Various scholars who proposed reconstructions also include suggestions for the subjects of the scenes that were lost when the pulpit was added to the pontile in the thirteenth century. De Francovich, Montorsi, and Arturo Carlo Quintavalle presumed that after shifting the Christ figure of the Last Supper into the middle of the choir screen and enlarging the Washing of the Feet, there would have been room for only two more scenes, a theory with which I agree. My theoretical reconstruction has space on the northern side for two images, measuring 2.785m in width (Fig. 108). The former three scholars presumed that the same two events were missing, but I disagree with their hypotheses.

The first of their missing images was a rendition of the Garden of Gethsemane or Christ on the Mount of Olives. This theory is based on the observation that Christ Waking St. Peter in the Garden of
**Gethsemane** appears on the pulpit (Fig. 39), which does not contain any other Passion imagery. Hence, De Francovich, Montorsi, and Quintavalle, as well as Joachim Poeschke, believed that this scene originally was included on the pontile. De Francovich and Quintavalle proposed that this sculpture would have appeared between the *Last Supper* and the *Washing of the Feet,* but this arrangement would break the chronological order that exists in the remainder of the sequence. Each of the four Gospels places the events of the garden after the *Last Supper* and before the *Arrest,* but there is no visible break between these two events on the pontile precluding the addition of a scene in their midst. To place this event before the *Last Supper* defies not only the Gospels, but also the order of celebration during Holy Week: the *Washing* was commemorated during the second Mass of Maundy Thursday and the *Last Supper* was the focus of a later Mass on the same day. According to my research, there was no particular emphasis placed on the *Waking of Peter* in the twelfth-century Mass or during the Easter celebrations. Furthermore, this scene is not found on contemporary liturgical furnishings or on the Provençal friezes that had influenced the designer of Modena’s programme. Thus, I propose that the non-chronological placement, the lack of ties between this scene and liturgical or secular issues addressed by the other images, and the absence of contemporary, comparative parallels in sculpture indicate that this scene was added in the thirteenth century to create a transition from the pulpit to the balustrade and may have had special significance in light of the later changes.

The second scene that De Francovich, Montorsi, and Quintavalle hypothetically added before the *Last Supper* was *Christ’s Prediction of St. Peter’s Denial.* Doberer, too, in her full reconstruction of the pontile, also proposed that this scene should be included in the Passion cycle to the north of the *Washing of the Feet.* This theory is based on the knowledge that *Christ’s Prediction* appears in the friezes of Beaucaire (Fig. 56) and St. Gilles-du-Gard (Fig. 109); further, the actual scene of *St. Peter’s Denial* is included on the choir screen of Modena Cathedral (Fig. 35). As a result, these scholars deduced that the *Prediction,* too, must have appeared on the twelfth-century balustrade. Although both of the Provençal friezes contain the *Prediction,* the actual Denial is not present at either St. Gilles-du-Gard or Beaucaire. Thus, in their current state, they do not support the idea that both scenes should appear in the choir screen’s biblical account in Modena. Moreover, while this proposal makes narrative sense, there does not appear to
be any liturgical or social reason that would support the presence of this scene on the choir screen or tie it to the themes addressed in the surviving images. As a result, I have not included this event in my proposal. In Doberer’s reconstruction, Modena Cathedral’s pontile began with the image of the Entry into Jerusalem. All four Gospels record this event, but John’s account mentions the branches of palm leaves often shown in renditions of this incident:

*And on the next day, a great multitude that was to come to the festival day, when they had heard that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem took branches of palm trees, and went forth to meet him, and cried: Hosanna, blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord, the king of Israel. And Jesus found a young ass, and sat upon it, as it is written: Fear not, daughter of Sion: behold, thy king cometh, sitting on an ass’ colt. These things his disciples did not know at first; but when Jesus was glorified, then they remembered that these things were written of him, and that they had done these things to him. The multitude therefore gave testimony, which was with him, when he called Lazarus out of the grave, and raised him from the dead. For which reason also the people came to meet him, because they heard that he had done this miracle. The Pharisees therefore said among themselves: Do you see that we prevail nothing? Behold, the whole world is gone after him (John 12: 12-19).*

The reference to the palms recalls the Entry into Jerusalem, which was commemorated with a procession of faithful bearing these branches on Palm Sunday, the first day of Holy Week. Since many of the remaining sculptures show events tied to the special days of Holy Week, the absence of the Entry does seem odd. Moreover, since Palm Sunday was the first day of this special period, beginning the pontile sequence with this scene, as Doberer proposed, seems logical. The readings for Advent Sunday (the first day of the liturgical calendar) also included a description of Christ’s arrival in Jerusalem (Matthew 21: 1-9), which, like those of Palm Sunday, was meant to suggest a symbolic appearance within the cathedral. Further, the allegorical interpretations of the High Mass also support the inclusion of the Entry in the pontile’s sequence. For example, the first section of the rite from the Introit, or entry of the clergy into the church, through the first kissing of the altar was interpreted as a commemoration of Christ’s entrance into Jerusalem. These ties to the rites performed within the church also may suggest the typical beginning point for movement of clergy within the cathedral. The placement of the Entry on the northern end of the screen may have reflected the emergence of bishop and his canons on the north side of the cathedral either via the Porta della Pescheria or through the sacristy.

In addition to complementing the ties to the liturgy found in the other surviving scenes, the Entry into Jerusalem also had connections to the socio-political situation, as discussed in chapter three. Christ’s arrival was modelled on the Roman image of the imperial adventus. The idea of a religious leader
welcomed by the citizens may have bolstered the bishop’s claim to be the true leader, both in the spiritual and secular spheres of the community. As noted earlier, the bishop’s predecessor, San Geminiano, is rendered in a similar adventus scene on the Porta dei Principi of Modena Cathedral visually maintaining the bishop’s role as ruler to be welcomed by the citizens (Fig. 87). 38

While the Entry has narrative as well as liturgical and social support for its inclusion on the choir screen, Doberer only buttressed her theory in a endnote by means of a comparison with Nicholas of Verdun’s Klosterneuburg pulpit (Fig. 58); according to her, since the Passion sequence on the latter monument begins with the Entry with one disciple following Christ, so too should the Campionesi pontile. 39 Although Nicholas of Verdun’s creation seems to be the only surviving pulpit to include this event, the Entry into Jerusalem did appear on at least one Gothic choir screen, that of Notre-Dame in Paris (c.1290-1350; Fig. 67). 40 There, Christ was followed by four apostles. This scene also was very popular in Italy; it appeared on lintels like those by Biduinus for the central portal of San Cassiano a Settimo (1180) and a portal of Sant’Angelo in Campo, now in the Palazzo Mazzarosa in Lucca (before 1180; Fig. 110), 41 as well as amongst the images of the Salerno Ivories (Fig. 45). These examples reveal the variety of ways in which this event was rendered. All include Christ seated on an ass followed by two to twelve apostles. This group approaches people either before a building representing Jerusalem or a tree filled with children in accordance with the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus, 42 and figures lay garments on the ground as recounted by Sts. Matthew, Mark, and Luke. 43 One expansive version, including all of the above elements as well as the twelve apostles, forms one of the largest scenes on the lintel frieze of St. Gilles-du-Gard over the façade’s north portal (Fig. 47). 44

Again, in keeping with the Campionesi’s style, we must imagine that their version of the Entry was more rhythmic and abbreviated than the Provençal version, yet still included all of the pertinent information for the recognition of the story without extraneous details. While the St. Gilles rendition includes the tree filled with children and a representation of Jerusalem, the former iconography with its tiny figures amidst branches does not seem in keeping with the Campionesi’s large, emotive style. Thus, I will incorporate the representation of Jerusalem with a couple of figures laying down clothes before Christ seated on the ass, omitting the tree. Furthermore, the Modenese version most likely did not contain all twelve disciples, since, again, the sculptors tended to reduce the number of figures found in their Provençal
models and the scene would be too large to be balanced by the smaller scenes on the southern half of the
pontile. Therefore, a small number of figures most likely followed Christ, akin to representations of the
*Entry* found on other liturgical furnishings and on Italian doors like those of San Zeno, Verona (Fig.69).
The latter includes two disciples as does the rendition found on the Salerno ivories (Fig. 45). In order to
portray the idea of a group with a small number of people, I suggest that four apostles followed Christ on
Modena’s choir screen, similar to the later scene found on the choir screen of Notre-Dame, Paris (Fig.67).
On the Italian pontile, the figures probably bore palms, overlapped one another, and were tall enough to
align their heads along the uppermost edge of the panel in line with Christ. Using the same measurement
for an overlapping pair of figures as I did in the *Washing* (0.44m), this small group would consume a
maximum of 0.88m of space. In fact, they may have consumed slightly less room depending on the amount
of overlap in the group. In addition, they would have followed and probably been partially behind the
figure of Christ on the ass, who would most likely have marked the centre of the panel, as he does in the
*Last Supper* and the *Betrayal* images. On the other side, a couple of figures laying garments on the
ground most likely would have appeared between Christ and a representation of Jerusalem. Approximately
0.60m would provide enough space for these overlapping elements. Thus, the total measure of the panel,
1.48m, would be about half that of the *Last Supper* (Fig. 108).

Having agreed with Doberer that the Passion cycle on the choir screen began with Christ’s *Entry
into Jerusalem*, my reconstruction still has room for one more scene (approximately 1.145m) on the
northern side between Christ’s *adventus* and the *Washing of the Feet*. Based on the narrative sequence
presented in the synoptic Gospels, the *Cleansing of the Temple* could fill this gap:

> And the pasch of the Jews was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. And he found in the
temple them that sold oxen, sheep, and doves, and the changers of money sitting. And when he
had made, as it were, a scourge of little cords, he drove them all out of the temple, the sheep also
and the oxen, and the money of the changers he poured out, and the tables he overthrew (John 2:
13-17).

This event would further expand upon the socio-political issues that were also addressed by the
surviving scenes. As discussed in chapter three, medieval theologians believed that Christ’s actions in the
temple paralleled the clergy’s agenda to purge the Church of ecclesiastical abuses, heretics, and secular
influences, especially those of the commune. Moreover, this scene echoes the allegorical and literal
emphasis placed on cleanliness and purity believed necessary for the success of the Mass. For example, the
Foremass was related by Amalarius to the preaching of Christ that cleanses and incense was used repeatedly throughout the rite in order to ensure purity of the celebrant and Eucharist. In addition, the reading of *Christ’s Cleansing the Temple* (Matthew 21: 10-17) took place on Tuesday of the first week of Lent in order to set the penitential and purifying overtones of the season. St. John’s account of this event was read on the Monday prior to Palm Sunday in order to re-emphasize those ideas and further reinforce the belief that Christ would rebuild the temple in a Christian guise.

Although it was not an uncommon image, as observed by Rough, I know of no examples of this scene that appear on contemporary liturgical furnishings of the period. For the purposes of this study, two examples are of particular interest: a version found in the *Gospels of Matilda* (Pierpont Morgan Library, MS. M. 492, end of the eleventh century; Fig. 111) and the sculpted scene located on the frieze of St. Gilles-du-Gard (Fig. 48). Both are very expansive renditions that include all of the elements recorded by John including: the oxen, doves, sheep, money-changers, money, and Christ’s whip. The earlier manuscript illumination is important as a Northern Italian predecessor, and also because it was commissioned by Countess Matilda and, thus, is reflective of the reformist programme that she fostered within her lands, which included Modena. Her political stance in the early twelfth-century and the continued debates centred on issues derived from the Investiture Controversy, suggest that the late twelfth-century bishops and their canons may have been aware of the political implications of this scene.

The Provençal version of the biblical story (Fig. 48) may have provided the choir screen’s sculptor with a model on which to base his panel. Within the frieze, Christ stands beside a tower representing the temple proper and raises his arm to strike the money-changers with a whip, mostly lost, as he pushes them away with his other hand. Four men have hastily gathered their goods including the doves, sheep, oxen, and moneybags before being cast out of the temple courtyard. In keeping with the more iconic style of the pontile, the forms in the Campionesi version would have been less mobile and perhaps fewer in number to create a more staid image. Christ may have evicted only two men in the Modena version with a ram, ox, one dove, and a large moneybag. They may also have included a tower or some form of architecture on the north and south sides in order to give the illusion that the figures were being cast from the temple courtyard. Three large staid humans with smaller animals would easily fill the remaining space on the
north side of the *Last Supper*. Furthermore, Christ’s use of a whip in the second scene to the north from the *Last Supper* would provide a nice parallel to the *Flagellation* scene (Fig. 32) which appears on the second panel to the south of the central scene (Fig. 108).

Having filled the northern half of the *pontile*, we now turn to the southern section. More scenes survive on this side of the *Last Supper*, which makes sense since the thirteenth-century pulpit appears to have been added to the North or Gospel side of the cathedral. The remainder of Doberer’s reconstruction also centres on this part of the screen, but is less convincing than her proposal concerning the inclusion of the *Entry into Jerusalem*. One difficulty with her theory is her lack of concern with measurements. This oversight combined with her acknowledgement that the *pontile* only spanned the width of the nave and her belief that the *Last Supper* formed the centre of the screen are problematic, since she postulated that there were three scenes on the north and five panels on the south. After the *Road to Calvary* (Fig. 1), she proposed an image of *Christ in Limbo*, a scene that would parallel the presence of the Samson and the lion on one of the corbels (Fig. 24). According to her, since Samson and the *Descent into Hell* appear together on the Klosterneuburg Pulpit (Fig. 50), the scene must be missing from the choir screen in Modena. She further hypothesized that this event was followed by a rendition of the Resurrection as it is organized in the same German monument. *Daniel in the Lion’s Den* is a type for the Resurrection in that enamel sequence, and thus, Doberer argued that the Daniel capital on the *pontile* (Fig. 27) supports the presence of a Resurrection image on the balustrade. Her third and last scene is a rendition of the Three Marys Buying Spices and Mourning at the Tomb. This suggestion did not stem from a Klosterneuburg comparison, but rather arose from the fact that this scene appears on the Provençal friezes of Beaucaire (Fig. 56) and St. Gilles-du-Gard (Fig. 112) as well as on a capital from a parish church in Modena (Fig. 113).

Doberer’s theory shows an overdependence on the Klosterneuburg pulpit, which has a smaller Passion Cycle than that of the Italian *pontile*; she compensated by including numerous scenes that occurred after Christ’s death. Inexplicably, she completely disregarded the physical parameters of her choir screen reconstruction, which she had restricted to the width of the nave. In fact, very little room is available to the south for any additional panels, let alone three more scenes. Once Christ’s head is placed on the central axis of the church 1.65m of the *Last Supper* extends towards the south (Fig. 108). With the addition of the *Arrest* (1.00m; Fig. 31), the *Trial* and *Flagellation* (1.14m; Fig. 32), the image of *Simon Carrying the Cross*
(0.75m; fig. 33), and the separations between the scenes (0.08m each), only 0.685m of space remains for any additional scene and its frame. This space is even smaller than the extant image of Simon, suggesting that only a small number of figures, perhaps two or three would have appeared in a narrative setting.

Moreover, Doberer ignored the twentieth-century restorer Sandonmni’s observation that the panel with Simon of Cyrene ends with a forty-five degree angle, which indicated that it was the last scene of the pontile (Fig. 33).[^58] The placement of this Road to Calvary panel at the end of the narrative sequence is reinforced by the Holy Week liturgies. As discussed in chapter two, the Easter Vigil marked the end of Christ’s Passion and Holy Week itself;[^59] since the Campionesi’s creation was both a literal and descriptive documentation of the events of that period, probably beginning with the Entry into Jerusalem, the balustrade sequence would most likely have ended with his tortures and his exit, on the Road to Calvary. The triumphant Resurrection was not often depicted in sculpted Passion narratives of the period in Italy. Moreover, the celebratory character of that later event would have been supplied by the liturgy and was not in keeping with the sober character of the pontile scenes. In addition, by ending the choir screen with an image of departure, the narrative again may have reflected the movements of the clergy through the cathedral from north to south (i.e. from the sacristy or Porta della Pescheria through the Porta dei Principi or the Porta Regia that the Campionesi added to the south flank of the cathedral).

Since the Road to Calvary marks the end of the sequence and there is no crack between the Last Supper and the Arrest, the missing image must have been attached to the judicial and physical trials of Christ. One possible place for an additional panel may have been between the Betrayal and Trial scenes since repairs suggest that they might have been separated at one time (Figs. 31 and 32).[^60] If an image had existed between these events, it would most likely have been Christ’ trial before the Jewish priests. This scene however, appears neither on Italian pulpits, nor among the surviving scenes of Northern European choir screens, like that of Naumburg, nor in the Provençal Passion sequences. Furthermore, the Campionesi tended to reduce the narrative to its barest essentials while still presenting a complete story; within this style, the image of Pilate passing judgement would summarize the conclusion of all Christ’s court trials as it did on the Naumburg choir screen (Figs. 32 and 66). As a result, there does not appear to be any strong liturgical or socio-political support for the inclusion of the Jewish sentencing of Christ.
A more convincing location for the additional panel is between the *Flagellation* and *Road to Calvary* images (Figs. 32 and 33). Upon close study, the remains of a sealed crack is visible between these two scenes and Sandonnini’s early twentieth-century diary strongly bolsters this observation since he treated the latter piece as a unit separated from the whole. At this point, the smaller size and the oddity of the *Road to Calvary* should be recalled (Fig. 33). The image is 0.25m smaller than the next largest surviving scene and is the only one that does not include Christ, the main protagonist and focus of every other sculpture, including the hypothetical suggestions.

No comparative renditions of this event exist on liturgical furnishings, since programme designers typically opted to show *Christ Carrying the Cross*, as in the case of the choir screen in Naumburg. Furthermore, as already noted in chapter one, at the time the choir screen was built, images of Christ, not Simon, bearing the burden of the cross were becoming more popular. The only comparable images to that of the pontile are found in Provence, but here the comparisons are complicated by the damages wrought to both the friezes of St. Gilles-du-Gard (Fig. 55) and Beaucaire (Fig. 56). Both of the French scenes are cut after the two or three figures following Simon. Notably, in the St. Gilles-du-Gard frieze, the third man in line is not facing the cross-bearer but is turned in the opposite direction. While this figure may be a witness to the *Flagellation*, he may also indicate that another group followed behind the first and is now lost due to mutilation. In this case, the scene may harken back to earlier Carolingian and Ottonian images that portray Simon followed by a group of guards with Christ, such as the illuminations from the *Pericopes of Heinrich III* (Bremen, Staatsbibliothek, manu.b.21, 1039-1043; Fig. 80) and *The Golden Gospels*, Echternach (Germanisches National Museum, Nuremberg, c.1020-30; Fig. 81). A comparable sculptural example exists on the Antependium in Aachen where figures holding a rope turn to face Christ who follows after them. The bronze doors of Benevento (twelfth century; Fig. 79) also contain an image of a man turned back towards Christ as they follow the cross-bearing Simon.

Based on these images of the *Road to Calvary*, I would suggest that the small, remaining space was filled by a separate panel with Christ and guards following Simon of Cyrene and the blacksmith. The placement of the main protagonist on a second piece of stone would have created the necessary gap between the first and second groups in keeping with the visual tradition; moreover, by rendering the event on two pieces, the sculptors would not have needed to leave a huge blank space between the groups of
figures, something the twelfth-century workshop hated to do as is evidenced by their surviving compact compositions. The *Road to Calvary* may have had a large frame in between the two parts, as with the other separated scenes, but the curved inner edges of the two segments may have created a large enough gap for a visual pause without emphatically dividing Christ physically from the image of Simon. Thus, in my reconstruction, I have not included a 0.08m divider between the two pieces.

In the thirteenth-century, when room was needed for the pulpit, the first half of this event would have been an easy sacrifice, for by painting the figure of Simon with the crown of thorns, the cross-bearing figure could be turned into or stand for Christ as it does today. In addition, by extending this sculpted event, the liturgical and socio-political associations with Simon carrying the cross are not changed. He remains an example for the local laity, pilgrims, and those performing penance, a rite rising in popularity in the twelfth century, to follow. The presence of Christ in the extended scene would have visually reinforced Simon’s acts of emulation and servitude in the name of salvation.

Through the incorporation of the *Entry into Jerusalem*, the *Cleansing of the Temple*, and a larger version of the *Road to Calvary*, the *pontile* of Modena Cathedral fits within the programmatic composition of other medieval choir screens and retables; Dorothy Gillerman noted that these types of monuments generally contained an even number of events if the Crucifixion was shown separately. In my reconstruction, the balustrade now contains eight biblical, historical scenes and I agree with scholars like Montorsi, Saverio Lomartire, Poeschke, and Doberer that the ultimate sacrificial moment, the *Crucifixion*, either painted or carved, was separated from the *pontile’s* narrative sequence rather than inserted in the balustrade.

Several large Romanesque crucifixes from Northern Italy are preserved, revealing their popularity in the region and at that time, including a large, wooden example from the old Church of Sta. Maria in Cremona (twelfth century; Figure 114). Bartoli had proposed that within Modena Cathedral a cross was mounted on the *pontile* in between numerous lamps. Such an arrangement can be seen from behind in a fresco of the *Institution of the Crèche* from the Church of St. Francis of Assisi (Fig. 115); there the screen is shown supporting a large wooden cross. In contrast, however, the sacramentary produced in Modena before 1173 states that prior to reciting the *Preface*, the celebrant should carry the book in his hand and approach the representation of the Saviour, then a second picture of the same subject, and finally a hanging
cross. Considering this text, I would agree with Lomartire that within Modena Cathedral the crucifix was suspended from the ceiling by chains in a similar manner to the one that hangs in the cathedral today (Fig. 116). This arrangement would have allowed the clergy to mount the sacrifice over the scene of the Last Supper enhancing the vertical reading of the pontile from the crypt of the saint, through the Last Supper with inferences to the Institution of the Eucharist, and the ultimate sacrifice pictured above. Furthermore, if the cross was hung, the bishop, during the elevation of the consecrated wafers, would appear in line with these holy scenes and both he and the Host would become a part of the sacrificial nature of the vertical reading. The cross, itself, would present the climax of the balustrade narrative, as well as the source for all the rites and rituals that took place below.

In addition, within Italy, Elizabeth Parker observed a relationship between pontili, Holy Cross Altars, and crucifixes. As I proposed in chapter three, a Holy Cross Altar may have been set up in the middle of Modena Cathedral’s nave before the pontile. In this liturgical arrangement, a crucifix hung above the choir screen could also have been visually related to the nave as well as the main altar within this Italian church. The close relationship between the oblation at the altar and the crucifix was made possible in the twelfth century by the grafting of a meaning of sacrifice onto the cross, a symbol of victory. In response, as Staale Sinding-Larsen observed, crosses, whether simple crucifixes or pieces elaborated with Passion cycles, emphasized the memoria passionis aspect of the Mass; images of the Washing of the Feet, Last Supper, Arrest, Flagellation, and Road to Calvary found on crucifixes helped to underline the sacrificial nature of the ceremonies performed within the church. I would argue that Modena Cathedral’s pontile (Fig. 120) served a similar function since it presented the same scenes and was also closely associated with the rites performed at the altar. Thus, the close ties between the choir screen and the monumental cross suggest that the large sculpted balustrade would have provided the narrative supplement for the crucifix.

5.3 RECONSTRUCTION OF THE SUPPORT STRUCTURE AND ITS IMAGES

Continuing with a vertical reading of the choir screen, I will now focus on the area below the balustrade and on the placement of the sculpted pennachi and supports. Before beginning this endeavour, however, I should restate that the twentieth-century clergy placed numerous constraints on the height of the
reconstruction as it stands today. They demanded that the choir screen be as short as possible in order to minimally affect the performance of rites. As a result, some alterations were originally made in order to satisfy the ecclesiastics’ requirements and do not necessarily reflect the twelfth-century arrangement. One change was to reduce the height of the pedestals under the lions. With their original, thicker bases, these supports would have been comparable in height to the pedestals of Parma Cathedral’s choir screen (Fig. 10), but were shortened in the twentieth-century in order to counteract the addition of a thick architrave beneath the narrative panels. The sculpted architrave appears to have been based on a carved cornice of the Campionesi’s Porta Regia, but in the twelfth century a similar one probably existed, since a strong horizontal beam would have been required to uphold the images over the columns. Furthermore, the surviving panels from the pontile of Parma Cathedral have thick vegetable borders on both their top and bottom (Figs. 5-6), and the Campionesi most likely had some decorative frame to border the balustrade narrative in a similar manner. As a result, the original choir screen with the combination of the larger plinths under the lions and a horizontal support for the balustrade was probably about 0.18m higher than it is today. Thus, a step between the presbytery floor and the level of the pontile may have existed in the late twelfth century.

Two other changes of import were made to these supports. The first alteration concerns the placement of the column-bearing lions under the balustrade. In their current arrangement, they are visually disconcerting since the feline on the southern end guides the viewer’s eye away from the central axis of the cathedral. This lion was switched with the one on the far north by the restoration team, who wanted to place the smallest lion on the northern end. Comparisons of the restored monument with early twentieth-century photographs make the change evident (Figs. 1 and 44). The reasoning behind the restoration team’s alteration, however, is not as clear. They seemed to have wanted to keep the sculpted capitals coordinated with the lion supports as they had been found before the destruction of the sixteenth-century arrangement. In this format, the smaller lion supported a Corinthian capital and Sandonnini’s team placed it on the northern side because the projecting pulpit would obscure it. As a result of the switch, the three figured capitals remained clearly visible from the nave. Yet, in the twelfth-century there would not have been a problem of seeing the capitals in spite of the pulpit. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the capitals were not rearranged when the sixteenth-century architects dismantled the Campionesi’s structure,
doubled the extension of the east end floor into the nave, and then re-erected the pontile columns among others pillaged from different medieval monuments in order to serve as supports for the railing. Thus, to restore emphasis on the centre of the cathedral, I would argue that the smaller lion should again occupy the southern end, where it would look down the nave and the larger one should be returned to the northern end where it would guide the eye towards the other lions.

Comparisons between the current structure and the photographs taken prior to the restoration also expose the second alteration: the removal of the atlantes from the backs of the two central lions (Figs. 17-22 and 44). These human figures were set on modern bases under the thirteenth-century pulpit, but, as discussed in chapter one, they were an iconographic element typical of the twelfth century, not of the thirteenth, and thus their current position seems erroneous. The question remains, however, where did they appear in the original monument? The engineer Domenico Barbanti, a member of the restoration team, believed that the atlantes had always sat on the lions’ backs; in contrast, Sandonnini believed they had been supports for the pulpit that had been incorporated into the sixteenth-century structure, since the shape of their bases did not match the backs of the lions exactly. Although Sandonnini convinced the Committee to adopt his theory, the removal of the atlantes sparked debate amongst scholars.

De Francovich vehemently opposed the removal of the hunchbacks from the lions citing their small proportions when set on the floor and the survival of analogous supports made for the choir screen of Chur (1170-1178). While acknowledging the examples at Chur and recalling that such combinations were used to uphold the portal of Ferrara Cathedral (1132-1135; Fig. 117), Montorsi agreed with the separation of atlantes and large cats. He believed that the amalgamation of the two was made for economic reasons in the sixteenth century, that the humans were disharmonious on the lions, and that nothing else could have supported the pulpit. Montorsi’s economic explanation for the combination of the atlantes and lions in the sixteenth century does not seem convincing, since the clergy doubled the extension of the presbytery and added a second row of columns to support it; the hunchbacks could have easily been incorporated into this new structure as separate supports without any extra expense. In fact, why should the clergy have made the workers go to the trouble of adapting the atlantes to the lions rather than using them to support two more columns? Furthermore, in the twelfth-century there was no pulpit and therefore the atlantes were free to support the balustrade. In addition, while the combination bases may
seem disharmonious to our eyes, they were not to medieval people as shown by the surviving examples at other sites discussed above. Sandonnini’s reasoning for moving the figures can also be refuted by looking at those other examples: medieval hunchbacks’ seats were often slightly larger than their mounts in order overhang and “hook” onto those lower figures. Upon viewing the backs of the atlantes at Modena, one can see that they were carved at the bottom to fit the roughened saddles of their mounts in a similar manner.

Although I believe that the humans and lions were combined in the twelfth century, unfortunately there is no definitive proof that they were set together. Therefore, I have proposed two possible arrangements of the column supports (Fig. 118). In Version A, the lions and atlantes are reunited forming the middle pair of bases that accent the central entrance to the crypt. In Version B, the atlantes uphold the outer columns of the pontile. In both of these arrangements, the human figures would not disrupt the visual directional cues supplied by the turned lions’ heads. If seated on the outer edges, the atlantes, only partially visible from the nave, would look straight ahead drawing a viewer forward. They would provide the same visual cue if seated on the lions, but would have drawn the viewer forward while the lions turned them inward towards the central axis.

Six columns exist in each proposal in order to align the central lions with the crypt supports while at the same time fully bracing the balustrade. To reduce the number of columns to four and place the two outer lions at the extreme ends of the choir screen would leave large unsupported gaps between the middle and outer columns (approximately 4.625m). Therefore, if the hunchbacks sat atop the inner lions, the outer columns would likely have been set on plain bases directly on the floor. While at first glance this proposal may seem odd, one must remember that for those gathered in the nave these columns were only partially visible since they support the extensions on the side-aisle edges of the piers. I would even argue that this fact suggests that the atlantes did belong on the lions, for in the outer positions they would have been less effective as visual cues to the people. The six medieval columns that originally may have supported the choir screen would have been incorporated, like the sculpted bases, into the sixteenth-century arrangement, which doubled the width of the east end extension upheld by two rows of columns pillaged from various monuments. The original six columns would have been topped by the three figured capitals of the pontile and three Corinthian versions of which numerous Romanesque examples survived in the cathedral (Figs. 25-27).
Before turning to the arrangement of the capitals, we need to discuss the placement of the pennachi or “plumes” depicting the Payment of Judas and the Denial of St. Peter (Figs. 34-35), since their order will affect the disposition of the capitals. Scholars have debated the incorporation of these supplemental Passion scenes from the very beginning of restoration efforts and most disagree with their current placement. This opposition arises from the fact that the arches to the crypt were altered based on the curves of these sculptures. Originally, the entrances were slightly pointed and narrower than the current ones (Fig. 44). The team believed that the original openings were rounded and that the pointed examples were the result of a later intervention, although Sandonmini did not explain his reasoning for this assumption.92 As discussed in chapter one, Giambattista Scarpari used the sculpted pennachi to calculate the curve of those rounded arches leading to larger entryways and the near perfect fit of the sculptures in the spandrels.93 The widening of the arches can be observed when viewing the area from the central axis of the church (Fig. 1). In their current position, the columns supporting the central opening are splayed and no longer align with their counterparts in the crypt behind them. Each support was pushed approximately 0.14m outwards from the centre line of the crypt columns. Furthermore, Scarpari insisted that the pontile’s central props also be splayed in order to be consistent and to continue the widening effect out into the nave. The members of the Committee agreed to this plan although they had originally wanted all of the columns aligned with those of the crypt.94

There is, however, no archaeological or written evidence to support this widening of the spaces between the columns and no justification for the assumption that the Campionesi originally used rounded openings. This workshop used both pointed and rounded arches in their architecture; thus, the pointed examples, which existed at the beginning of the restoration, may very well have been a Campionesi creation. Therefore, the change from pointed to rounded openings based on the curve of the pennachi, was deemed by Cristina Luchinat to be a true error in the reconstruction,95 and I would agree. By reinstating the original arches, the columns would be realigned in keeping with medieval Italian practices. The reversion, however, would not necessarily change the position of the “plumes” as others have argued.

Greischel, for example, believed that the pennachi sat on top of the two central column capitals where they supported the springing of arches directly under the balustrade and reflected the arched entrances to the crypt.96 This hypothesis seems unlikely because the bases of the “plumes” appear to be too
wide (about 0.30m) to rest on the capitals (roughly 0.25m). In a related study, De Francovich rightly pointed out that this arrangement would have created a structure that was too high for and disproportionate to its surrounding architecture. Each pennachio is approximately 0.40m tall. If this height were added to the arches in addition to the extra 0.18m of the larger lions bases, this reconstruction would have required a full flight of stairs to mount the pontile from the choir. Further, the choir screen would have dwarfed the arches that led to the crypt rather than echoing them. Thus, while the structure may have been taller than its current reconstructed height, this proposal would have been too high.

Doberer, too, proposed that the original pontile was supported by arches on both its shorter ends and under the balustrade, where they reflected those of the crypt. According to her, the pennachi filled the two flanking spandrels of the middle arch, which faced the nave. She based her theory on the existence of a lateral arch that is still visible today in the masonry. The bricked curve to which she refers, however, has been positively identified as part of Lanfranco’s earlier presbytery and was once the opening for a window or door that led under the central staircase that once attached to the choir. Thus, she seems to have based her theory on older remains. Furthermore, her reconstruction only included the four lion-supported columns and had three arches across the front. Since these openings could not be constructed to span the nave and at the same time align with the entrances to the crypt, her proposal would have broken the rhythm of this area. In addition, her reconstruction is problematic in the same way as that of Greischel: it would be too high for the architecture of the building, for in addition to the height of the “plumes” one must also add space for the springing of the arches. Furthermore, I would add that the pontile most likely did not have supporting arches because trabeated architecture appears to have been the preferred choice for Northern Italian liturgical furnishings of the twelfth century.

A. Dondi and Bartolotti placed the pennachi at the base of the entrances that lead to the crypt, so that they formed the springing of the arches in whose spandrels they are currently located. Yet, as already noted, the masonry exposed during the twentieth-century reconstruction process does not suggest that a radical change was made to these arches. There is no evidence that the “plumes” were once in this position, although the masonry had quasi-triangular shapes in the spandrels. If the arches were returned to their former state, the spandrels appear to be wide enough to accommodate the pennachi, although they may not have rested as neatly on the archivolts. Still, we must remember that the thick architrave, which
was added to support the balustrade in the twentieth-century, encroached into the available space above the arches. In the twelfth century, as discussed above, one step may have led up to the choir screen floor and the architrave could have been embedded in the space created by the stair rather than consuming wall space above the arches. Thus, the *penacchi* could easily have been located in this position in the original arrangement.

This formation is partially bolstered by the sculpted narratives, which present minor supplementary scenes to the Passion cycle. They can be considered subsidiary because Christ does not appear in either “plume” and these scenes did not have great liturgical significance. As a pair, however, these sculptures work well together by emphasizing the acts of betrayal made by Christ’s companions. Through Judas’ acceptance of money and *St. Peter’s Denial*, both men abandoned their leader in his time of need. In my reconstruction, these treacherous deeds are subordinated to the balustrade, yet are still prominent enough to be viewed with and connected to Christ’s pain as well as with the imagery in the capitals. Yet, I must still consider the appropriate order of these sculptures.

Currently, the *Payment of Judas* (Fig. 34) appears in the northern spandrel and the *Denial of St. Peter* (Fig. 35) is in its southern counterpart. Montorsi believed that this arrangement was incidentally chosen, since Giulio Bertoni, who in 1909 published a book on Modena Cathedral prior to the restoration efforts, rendered the opposite order in one of his plates, suggesting that the sculptures were found in the cathedral in Bertoni’s order. Montorsi further argued that the restorers chose the current sequence in order to reflect the biblical time frame of the Passion. Yet, Sandommini’s choice of order seems to be the most logical, despite the arrangement of the “plumes” when they were in the southern chapel. As we have suggested with the surviving pieces, the designer of the *pontile* rendered the Passion narrative in a chronological order. By following the biblical narrative, the sculptor aided the laity with their feelings and acts of *compassio*, for the viewer could “walk” sequentially through the events with Christ as s/he looked upon the screen. To suddenly and inexplicably disregard this order, even with subordinate scenes, seems contradictory.

In general, the scriptures support Sandommini’s choice of arrangement. St. John’s text is the only Gospel to associate the *Payment of Judas* with the *Betrayal* (Fig. 31). The remaining evangelists and the Synoptic Gospels place this event prior to the *Last Supper* (Fig. 30). Set in the northern spandrel, as it is
today, this scene would appear prior to the Passover meal. In my twelfth-century reconstruction (Fig. 108). Here it could have been associated with the Cleansing of the Temple, or Christ’s rejection of money on holy ground. Moreover, in the scene of his payment Judas still retains his halo, but does not after the Last Supper, suggesting that the scene should be placed prior to the meal. Further, the Denial of St. Peter cannot be associated with events that occurred before the meal, and thus, logically, must appear on the southern spandrel at the end of the Last Supper, where it could be associated with the Arrest and trials of Christ (Figs. 31 and 32).

Placed in the spandrels, the pennachi appear at the same level as the capitals (Figs. 26-28) and together they present the viewer with a good as opposed to a bad typology. These moralizing exemplars are placed closer to the nave atop the columns and thus are more visible, whereas the images of betrayal are pushed into a less noticeable location, a physical expression of how they should be valued. Due to this relationship, I would argue that the content of the “plumes” could possibly indicate the original arrangement of the figured capitals.

The Payment of Judas (Fig. 34), for example, can be linked to Daniel, for Judas was believed to have dug a pit and fallen into it, just as Daniel was thrown into the lions’ den (Fig. 27). Verses from Psalm 7 were believed to reference Judas digging a ditch from which he will not arise:

\[
\text{And in it he hath prepared the instruments of death, he hath made ready his arrows for them that burn. Behold he hath been in labour with injustice; he hath conceived sorrow and brought forth iniquity. He hath opened a pit and dug it; and he has fallen into the hole he made. His sorrow shall be turned on his own head; and his iniquity shall come down upon his crown} \ (\text{Psalm 7: 14-17}).
\]

Furthermore, during Easter, prayers and antiphons that further developed the association between Judas’ betrayal for money and the idea of a pit and beasts were read. For example, “because they have dug a pit to take me, and have hid snares for my feet” (Jeremiah 18: 22) was used to reference the traitor’s act. Hence, both the penacchio and the capital present contrasting figures that can be associated with pits. Through faith Daniel, like Christ, would arise from his fate, whereas the unrepentant Judas would be ruined. Moreover, once set before Judas’ Payment, the Daniel capital would have been near the northern end of the Last Supper (Fig. 30). The meal that Habbakuk brought to the prophet, depicted on the northern side of the capital, foreshadowed that Passion event suggesting a close connection between this sculpture and the balustrade scene.
With regards to the orientation of the capital, Daniel seated amidst the lions most likely faced the nave, as it does today. This is the most recognizable face and the praying figure presented the laity with a model for proper behaviour within the cathedral. As discussed in chapter two, Daniel was associated with the liturgy of the Mass, since the sculpture echoed one of the positions assumed by the priest during the ceremony. As an Old Testament model of faith and a prophet whose prayers had been answered, Daniel also would have been a particularly potent image for the petitioner descending into the crypt to request divine aid. Upon rising from the depths of the church, the laity would have seen the pointing angel. Within the context of the narrative, this figure guides Habbakuk to Daniel, but as part of the cathedral, the angel points the way out of the church, to the north through the Porta della Pescheria. As a divine messenger, the angel also would have been a sign of hope that one’s prayer had been answered.

In order to reflect the pairing of good and bad typology set up between the Payment of Judas and the Lion’s Den, I believe that the St. Lawrence capital (Fig. 28) was paired with the one of St. Peter’s Denial (Fig. 35). Although the apostle later repented for his error, on the pennacchio St. Peter is shown avowing no affiliation with Christ and thus presents an example of unfaithfulness. In contrast, the deacon refused to abandon his Christian faith, even in the face of fatal persecution. His fidelity to the name of Christ is emphasized in the antiphons and verses of his feast day: “A. The Holy Lawrence spoke: My night knows no darkness, but rather it was bright in the light. V. Then the Lord himself knew that I had not denied his name.” The emphasis on the saint’s loyalty to Christ regardless of his fate is an exemplar for the faithful to follow.

The placement of the capital near the entrances to the crypt and in line with the pennachio of St. Peter’s Denial would have set it near the southern end of the Last Supper. In this position, the martyr would have been visually close to St. Matthew, who drinks from a footed bowl reminiscent of a chalice. St. Lawrence, as an archdeacon, had a special connection to the Eucharistic cup, since these clerics held that liturgical object for the celebrant during the sacrifice. This relationship is stressed by the psalm chosen for vespers on the saint’s feast day: “I shall take the chalice of the Lord; I shall call upon the name of the Lord” (Psalm 115: 13). Thus, this position would reinforce the archdeacon’s connection to the liturgy.

In the case of the martyr’s capital, the scene of his death on the grill most likely faced the laity in the nave, as this was the most recognizable event of his life. In this position, the torturous heat would have
been echoed by the fire that warms St. Peter’s feet on the “plume”. As the petitioner rose from the depths of the church s/he would have seen the saint’s condemnation due to his devotion to his chosen faith. Similarly, the viewer is admonished to maintain her/his support of the Church in the face of secular persecution in order to achieve the fulfillment of her/his requests to San Geminiano.

The final figured capital is that of the sacrifice of Isaac (Fig. 27) and I would argue that this capital originally topped the column supported by the southernmost lion, where it could have been associated with the Road to Calvary on the balustrade. This choice of placement depends upon the close relationship between the Old Testament story and the final events of the Passion. Isaac, carrying wood for his own sacrifice, was a type for Christ bearing the cross, and, if the latter once followed Simon, the image of Isaac’s willing oblation would have expanded that scene typologically. Furthermore, by the fifth century, theologians like St. Augustine argued that the ram caught in the thicket, pictured on one face of the pontile capital, prefigured Christ crowned with thorns; although the crowning of Christ does not appear on the balustrade, he may have worn the item in the expanded rendition of the Road to Calvary that I proposed as part of my reconstruction.

The penultimate moment of Isaac’s near sacrifice most likely faced the nave. This Old Testament moment was finally fulfilled in the New Testament by the Passion pictured above in the balustrade. As discussed in chapter two, the scene of the oblation had connections to the liturgy of the Mass, which repeated and commemorated Christ’s sacrifice. As one descended into the crypt, the faithful would have been presented with this image of sacrifice and the saving of a life through God’s beneficence. This image was one of hope for someone who wished to petition the saint for a miracle as well as a model for good behaviour that would ensure a divine answer. Ascending from the crypt, the viewer would have been faced with Isaac chopping wood in order to perform his duty to God just as the petitioner must complete any promises in order to be saved or healed.

Corinthianizing capitals would have topped the outer two columns as well as the second support from the northern end, similar to the present arrangement (Fig. 25). The corbels that are set in the wall of the crypt entrances would also remain in the same sites as they occupy in the current reconstructed monument (Figs. 22-24). The longer corbels with imagery on two sides are placed on the ends of the wall in alignment with the outer two posts, while the two smaller ledges with only one sculpted face each are set
behind the two outer lion-supported columns. The final two inner props would be in line with the 
penacchio immured above the arches. Thus, the corbels with the acrobats, a secular iconography, are 
pushed to the peripheries of the monument.

My reconstruction of a choir screen set on six columns, restricted to the width of the nave, and 
dedicated to the Passion of Christ is in keeping with the surviving archaeological evidence. The 
suggestions that I have made for the imagery missing from the balustrade take into consideration the 
Provençal models that greatly influenced the Campionesi and remnants of other liturgical furnishings. By 
adding the Entry into Jerusalem, and the Cleansing of the Temple, as well as expanding the Road to 
Calvary, I further the intricate associations between the pontile imagery, the liturgy, and the socio-religious 
issues found in the extant scenes. By agreeing with other scholars, and placing the Christ of the Last 
Supper on the central axis of the church in line with the hanging crucifix, the celebrant, and the remains of 
the patron saint, my theory accentuates the line of divine power that emanates from the eastern end of the 
church into the nave, especially if an Altar of the Holy Cross was situated near the laity. The order of the 
balustrade scenes was dictated by chronology, permitting the viewer to feel compassio either by 
“travelling” with Christ on his journey to Golgotha or by focusing on one scene of his turmoil. Moreover, 
this order of the Passion scenes with a theme of entry on the north and a narrative of exit on the south may 
have reflected processional movement through the cathedral. For the placement of the smaller sculptures, 
like the capitals and pennachi, I have taken into consideration the supplementary nature of the iconography 
and its visual coherence to the larger Passion sequence. My proposed structure would have remained intact 
until the early thirteenth-century when the pulpit was added and the monument radically altered to suit the 
new needs of the clergy in the Gothic period.

1For my outline of the twentieth-century reconstruction efforts, refer to pages 20 through 24 of this 
study.

2General agreement, however, does not mean complete unanimity; once in a while, a scholar 
resurrects Messori’s theory that the Campionesi sculptures formed a pulpit and a singing gallery on either 
side of a central staircase that led to the presbytery. For example, in his book on the cathedral, Bartoli 
again proposed the theory of a central stair, but did not support his choice of returning to this idea. 
disparity of time between the two interventions of the Campionesi workshop, at least forty years, suggests 
that Passion sequence and the pulpit were not originally conceived as two separate, but pendant pieces, as 
Messori’s theory suggests.
3Refer to page 23 of this study.


7 Sandoninini had proposed either extending the choir screen to the north, regardless of the archaeological evidence, or of creating semi-circular balconies around the nave arcade piers, Sandoninini, June 20, 1919, 106. Another restorer, Mario Martinozzi proposed that diagonal passages around the piers be erected, Luchinat, 236. The idea of using square balconies was most likely the solution of Domenico Barbanti, Luchinat, 236.

8 Doberer, too, believed that the *pontile* was rectangular and restricted to the width of the nave, Erika Doberer, “Il ciclo della passione sul pontile di Modena,” *Romanico padano, Romanico europeo*, (Parma: Università degli Studi di Parma, 1982): 393. She, however, returned to the idea that the pulpit was erected separate from the choir screen since it was made at a different time, Doberer, “Il ciclo,” 392.

9 Luchinat, 238. Luchinat simply identifies this scholar as Soli, Luchinat, 238; Sandoninini, too, only states that this nineteenth-century professor’s last name is Soli, Sandoninini April 23, 1920, 130 and note 97. These closed entryways are still visible in the fourth inter-columnar space on each side of the choir, Luchinat, 247, note 88.

10 The change of the choir enclosure doors was most likely due to the sixteenth-century movement of the main altar from the apse towards the west in order to make it more visible to laity in the nave, who would have been able to view it through the iron railing. At that time, the choir stalls which had lined the north and south sides of the choir were moved into the apse, where they are found today, Luchinat, 238. Rather than move the altar, the choir stall chairs and southern and northern doors to the choir, the restoration team and clergy preferred to leave these items as they had been found.

11 Venturi proposed that the *pontile* had a rectangular shape comprised of only the Passion scenes that survive. In order to accomplish this formation, he could not place the scenes in chronological order. The front of the choir screen was made of the Betrayal, the Last Supper and the Trial with the Flagellation; the short northern end was made of the Washing of the Feet while the Road to Calvary formed southern side. In this theory, the structure was supported by only the four lions, one on each corner. Adolfo Venturi, “Museo civico di Modena. Un capitello romanico,” *Le Gallerie Nazionali Italiane*, 3 (1897): 273, as summarized by Geza De Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami: Architetto e scultore e l’arte del suo tempo*, vol. 1 (Milan and Florence: Electa Editrice, 1952): 57-58, note 31. This proposal has a number of problems. As De Francovich pointed out, however, the width of the front in this theoretical reconstruction would not be large enough to span the three entrances to the crypt; furthermore, Venturi did not deal with the smaller sculpted *penacchio*, De Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, 57-58, note 31. I would add that in this arrangement, key scenes for the evocation of *compassio* and containing important liturgical references would not have been visible from the nave.


14 Most scholars have created their reconstructions of this structure via iconographic studies and not concerned themselves with the measurements of the panels. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the staff of the cathedral, especially the church’s guardian, Ricardo, for allowing me to measure the pieces of the choir screen.

15 For the evidence supporting the later addition of the colonnettes, refer to page 15 of this study. Some damages were incurred during the addition of the colonnettes. For example, the “T” making Thomas’ name, the first disciple on the left of the Last Supper is missing, presumably damaged or lost when then the colonnette was added, Montorsi, Iscrizioni, 261.

16 For more on the evidence of shortening of this panel, refer to page 27 of this study.

17 De Francovich, Benedetto Antelami, 65 and Montorsi, Iscrizioni, 260.

18 Montorsi, Iscrizioni, 259.

19 De Francovich, Benedetto Antelami, 64. Due to the fragmentary state of the Beaucaire frieze, the column is visible after the Prediction of St. Peter’s Denial; in the image I have provided for this dissertation (Fig. 56), the column appears in the first picture on the upper left and the Washing of the Feet continues in the next panel, second from the top in the left column.

20 Luchinat, 218 and De Francovich, Benedetto Antelami, 65.

21 Often in the West, only eleven apostles were shown in this scene, but the presence of Judas at the foot-washing was supported and vehemently defended by St. Augustine, Ernst H. Kantorowicz, “The Baptism of the Apostles,” Dumbarton Oaks Papers 9-10 (1956): 227. Sometimes Judas was replaced in this scene by Paul, Gertrud Schiller, Iconography of Christian Art: The Passion of Jesus Christ, vol. 2, trans. Janet Seligman (Greenwich: N.Y. Graphic Society Ltd., 1971): 45, however, the holiness of Judas prior to the actual betrayal in this Passion sequence suggests that if all twelve had been present, the traitor would be too.

22 Luchinat, 218. Based on this large measurement, Sandonnini did acknowledge that if not all twelve apostles were once present in the Washing, one to two other narrative panels were missing from the screen, Tommaso Sandonnini, Appendice alla relazione sulla ricostruzione del pontile nel Duomo di Modena (Modena, 1916): 11, quoted by Montrosi, Iscrizioni, 258, note 22. Unfortunately, despite numerous attempts, I have been unable to locate a copy of Sandonnini’s Appendice.

23 The two scenes were most likely set side by side as discussed in chapter two, because of their close association in the liturgy of the Mass and the rites of Holy Week; see page 75 of this dissertation.


27 In his charters (Biblioteca Estense, Dono Crespellani, B. 7. n.1, fasc. a), Crespellani recorded a photograph by Sorgato that portrayed the Washing of the Feet, the Last Supper and the Capture of Christ in the wall together, Luchinat, 246, note 3.


29 Doberer, “Il ciclo,” 393-395.


31 No scene from Pilate’s forecourt survives at Beaucaire. At St. Gilles-du-Gard, one does see St. Peter peeking from the courtyard into the area of Christ’s trial before the Roman leader; one figure does point at the saint but Peter’s lack of engagement with that figure suggests that this forecourt scene is not the actual denial.

32 Doberer, “Il ciclo,” 393.


34 For more information on this liturgical celebration, see pages 76 to 77 of this study.

35 Stephan Borgehammar, “A Monastic Conception of the Liturgical Year,” *The Liturgy of the Medieval Church*, eds. Thomas J. Hefferman and E. Ann Matter (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2001): 26. Borgehammar also suggests that this concern with arrivals was meant to show that Christians, esp. monks, should prepare for the second coming as the Old Testament prophets prepared for the first coming, Borgehammar, 27.

36 See pages 61 to 62 of this study.

37 Refer to pages 110 and 128 through 129 of this study.


39 Doberer, “Il ciclo,” 398, note 11. Furthermore, she did not discuss the inscriptions that link this enamel with the Palm Sunday rites: “The day of palms” and “The crowd praises God, who redeems and ealts according to his will.”


The Gospel of Nicodemus was read in Jerusalem during Palm Sunday celebrations in the fourth century, Schiller, 20.

"And a very great multitude spread their garments in the way; and others cut boughs from trees, and strewed them in the way," (Matthew 21:8), "And many spread their garments in the way; and others cut down boughs from the trees, and strewed them in the way," (Mark 11:8), and "And as he went, they spread their clothes underneath the way," (Luke 19:36)

This event does not survive in the frieze at Beaucaire, which currently begins with the *Washing of the Feet.*

The ass’ colt, which appears in the St. Gilles-du-Gard scene, was probably not rendered by the Campionesi, as it is an extraneous detail that does not further the narrative and is often omitted, as seen on the Salerno ivories and the lintel of the palazzo in Lucca.

See page 120 of this study.

Refer to page 60 of this dissertation.


Pascher, 94.


The mosaic cycle of Monreale (c.1182-1190) also contains an image of this scene produced around the same times as the Campionesi choir screen, but has been left out of this discussion due to its location in Southern Italy.

For more on the relationship between this illustration and the Gregorian Reform see: Rough, 10-43.

Doberer, “Il ciclo,” 393. Because of this lack of concern with the size of the panels, Doberer did not tackle the issue of the original width of the *Washing of the Feet*, as seen above.


Doberer, “Il ciclo,” 395. She further argues that the capital is a copy of the scene that once marked the southern end of the choir screen in Modena Cathedral.

Luchinat, too, had a problem with the numerous suggested scenes and the relation of the *pontile* to the architecture of the cathedral, Luchinat, 246, note 40.
Unfortunately, the current reconstruction prevents study of this angle because of the cornice mounted on top of the scenes. Thus, I was unable to confirm his observation but his detailed accounts of the process, for good or ill, suggest that this was not a detail that he would invent.

See pages 82 through 83 of this study for my discussion of this liturgical event.

At this juncture, filler was applied to the bottom left corner. In this case, however, the repairs to this scene may have been due to damage caused by the addition of the colonnette between these two sculptures, because a crack is not clearly visible between the images.

Sandonnini gave its measurement, but opted not to discuss the sizes of the remaining sculptures. Instead, he recorded the total width of all of the panels together (6.75m).

This scene is a copy of the original sculpture produced in the thirteenth century; for an image of this later sculpture see, Ernst Schubert, *Der Naumburger Dom* (Halle: Verlag Janos Stekovics, 1997): 163.

This arrangement was so common that choir screens, altars, and crucifixes became symbolically tied together, comprised of imagery surrounding Christ’s sacrifice, Jung, 632.

Bartoli, 16.

Similarly, crucifixes were placed prominently on the central axis of screens in Northern Europe as exemplified at Bourges and Naumburg (Fig. 61), Jacqueline E. Jung, “Beyond the Barrier: The Unifying Role of the Choir Screen in Gothic Churches,” *Art Bulletin* 82 (2000): 632. This arrangement was so common that choir screens, altars, and crucifixes became symbolically tied together, comprised of imagery surrounding Christ’s sacrifice, Jung, 632.

Bartoli, 16.

In 1593 the cross was placed in the Guidoni family chapel and later on the Altar of the Most Holy Crucifix. In 1920 it was returned to its location over the rood screen and has been
recently restored, Bartoli, 16. Although this crucifix was made later than the *pontile*, it may have replaced a late-twelfth-century version, which would further emphasize that the clergy of Modena indeed were following the trend of mounting such crosses within their church.

Lomartire, “I Campionesi,” 48. Lomartire also suggested that the crucifix may have been mounted on a higher rood beam surrounded by candles. Hall has made a similar argument for a later rood screen, which once stood in Sta. Croce. Marcia B. Hall, “The Tramezzo in Santa Croce, Florence, Reconstructed.” *Art Bulletin* 26 (1974): 333. Crosses were often supported on a beam or loft on which lights perpetually burned so that the Rood beam or loft was often called the ‘candle-beam’, Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c. 1400 – c. 1580* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992): 157-158.

Similarly, Crucifixion was removed from narrative sequence on the tympanum of the Porte de la Calende, c. 1300, Rouen, Cathedral of Notre Dame. There the crucifix appears in the top register rather than between the Road to Calvary and Deposition and as Gillerman noted this arrangement might have been made to echo interior formations where a crucifix hangs over the Passion sequence; likewise, Passion retables also omit the scene of sacrifice, which was represented by a crucifix over the altar, Gillerman, “The Arrest,” 85-86.


For this discussion of the choir screen and a Holy Cross Altar, see pages 107 to 108 of this dissertation.

A similar arrangement of the placement of the cross on an altar and the choir screen once stood in the abbey church of St. Denis in France. For more on the arrangement of the choir and altars at St. Denis, refer to: Edward B. Foley, *The First Ordinary of the Royal Abbey of St.-Denis in France: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 526* (Fribourg: The University Press, 1990).

R. N. Swanson, “Passion and Practice: the Social and Ecclesiastical Implications of Passion Devotion in the Late Middle Ages,” *The Broken Body: Passion devotion in Late-Medieval Culture*, eds. AA. MacDonald, H.N.B. Ridderbos and R.M. Schlusemann (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1998): 1. In addition, this arrangement of the crucifix hanging over the screen was so popular that it was mimicked by crusaders who hung the shields of dead knights high in the church for all to see; according to the thirteenth-century text written for a community of female religious, the *Ancren Riwle*, the shield became the dead knight’s crucifix and a reminder of Christ’s knighthood on the cross, Giles Constable, “The Place of the Crusader in Medieval Society.” *Viator* 29 (1998): 382.


Luchinat, 236. One change to the cathedral that was beneficial for the clergy was the lowering of the floor to the Campionesi level. A new floor was laid in the cathedral in 1209 with slight rising incline towards the west and the restoration team reconstructed the current floor at that level, Sandonnini, December 15, 1912, 60-61, April 5, 1913, 62, and 207, note 71.

Luchinat, 236.

In the current arrangement, the lower cornice that runs the entire length of the balustrade is sunk into this architrave in order to anchor the scenes in place, Luchinat, 224.
The measurement of 0.18m coincides with the height of the twentieth-century architrave, Sandonnini, January 13, 1918, 103.

Sandonnini, February 27, 1929, 126, January 11, 1920, 124 and February 27, 1929, 126.

Luchinat, 237.

For more on the atlantes, refer to pages 13 and 14 of this study.

Luchinat, 234. This can be seen in his conceptual drawings for the reconstruction, see Luchinat, figure 229, 223.


Fantini attributes this observation to De Francovich but does not reference her source, Fantini, 366. Despite this lack of documentation, the comment is correct: the telamons are smaller than the lion supports.

De Francovich, Benedetto Antelami, 76. Although not in favour of the removal of the atlantes, once they were separated from the lions, De Francovich was willing to support their use as bases for columns for the pulpit in the reconstruction, De Francovich, Benedetto Antelami, 76.

Montorsi, Iscrizioni, 256.

Montorsi, Iscrizioni, 255-256.

Based on the unaltered spaces between the first set of crypt columns, the central arch of the crypt entrances and thus the two central lions supporting the choir screen would have spanned about 2.00m. By subtracting that space from the total width of the pontile and dividing the remainder by two, I deduced that the span between the inner and outer columns would have been 4.625m if only four columns were used.

Luchinat, 211.

Luchinat, 234. According to Luchinat, the rounded archivolts to the sides of the arches were closed in walls built by the Campionesi to fill the wall to support the pontile. The shop had used this elsewhere in the cathedral in order to prepare walls for support functions, Luchinat, 234.

For more information on Scarpari’s changes, see page 23 of this study.

Luchinat, 234. The Committee may have felt forced to accept Scarpari’s proposal since the widening of the arches had been done quickly without the presence and assent of one of their representatives, Luchinat, 234.

Luchinat, 238.

Greischel, 10 as quoted by De Francovich, Benedetto Antelami, 58, note 31.

Due to the high placement of the pennachi and the capitals, measurements of these items were difficult to attain and may contain inaccuracies.

De Francovich, Benedetto Antelami, 58, note 31. The Campionesi did raise the presbytery floor 0.40m from the Lanfrancian level to its current height.

100 Doberer, “Il ciclo,” 392.

101 For more on this opening, see page 157 of this study. The reconstruction team left the remains of one of these openings visible when they rebuilt the crypt entryway.


103 Montorsi, Iscrizioni, 264 and Giulio Bertoni, Atlante storico-paleografico (Modena: P. Orlandi e Figli Fotografi, 1909): plate XIIIV. Bertoni’s arrangement supposedly reflects the order of the pennachi as they were found in the southern chapel prior to the alterations to the cathedral. He does, however, render them in a vertical arrangement not a horizontal one as they are set in the wall today.

104 Montorsi, Iscrizioni, 264.

105 Schiller, 53.


107 See pages 62 through 63 and 65 of this dissertation for more information on the similarities between Daniel’s pose in the sculpture and the priest’s posture during the Mass.

108 The close association between Sts. Peter and Lawrence is revealed in the connection between their churches in medieval Rome. St. Lawrence’s building served as a collection church for processional Masses performed in St. Peter’s church on St. Lawrence’s feast day, see Pascher, 546.

109 Pascher, 550.

110 Interestingly, deacons appear on other sculpted liturgical furnishings as well. For example, two deacons support the lectern of the Gospel pulpit of Salerno Cathedral (1175-1185) and three more appear on the base of the candelabrum in S. Giovanni del Toro in Ravello (early thirteenth century). The visual connection between clerical rank and speaking platforms was most likely due to the deacons’ use of this furniture during services.

111 The sacrifice of Isaac is paired with the Road to Calvary on a later rood screen in the monastery church of Doberan (1360-1366).


113 For more on this interpretation of the sacrifice of Isaac within the context of the liturgy, see pages 62 and 82 of this study.
CONCLUSION AND AFTERLIFE OF THE PONTILE

Through a detailed examination of the unique qualities of the Campionesi’s late-twelfth-century pontile, this study has moved beyond previous examinations to reveal a rich and complex monument that was integrated into the life of the cathedral. By looking at the iconographic programme and its connections to the liturgy and communal issues, I have shown that the surviving remnants can be read for a wealth of information about the choir screen’s position, form, and uses within the church. For example, liturgical barriers have often been seen as definitive delineators of space for the clergy on one side and the laity on the other. In the case of Modena Cathedral’s monument (Figs. 1, 108, and 120), however, as with other choir screens, the faithful crossed this boundary to enter the crypt and side chapels in the eastern end; yet, I have argued that the Italian ecclesiastics seemed to be able to adjust the permeability of the pontile to insulate their source of power in times of rivalry with the rising commune who vied to co-opt these sacred spaces of the cathedral. Thus, in addition to their liturgical functions, the pontili were also visual statements of religious authority.

Through their choice of imagery, the bishop and his canons presented the people who filled the nave of the cathedral with theological and ideological threads of thought. By consciously choosing to move to a New Testament narrative, in contrast to the first Old Testament pontile that I believe was erected in this building by Wiligelmo in 1106 (Figs. 83-86 and 105), the clergy and the Campionesi updated the interior of the church in order to reflect late twelfth-century liturgical rites as outlined in a twelfth-century sacramentary, religious doctrine, and civic issues. By building a structure dedicated to the Passion, the ecclesiastics endorsed a programme in keeping with the rising interest in the humanity of Christ fostered by the fascination with the Holy Land during the Crusading period. Furthermore, the iconography was well suited to proffer ritual associations between contemporary liturgies and historical events. Thus, the Passion was associated with the Eucharist and the ceremonies of Holy Week. Further, I have proposed that the
pontile also could be a visual substitute for parts of the rites that were performed in the sanctuary behind it as well as for the consumption of the Host. In addition, the events of the Passion were particularly well suited to respond to twelfth-century attacks on orthodoxy, whether from foreign heresies like Catharism, local North Italian sources like the Speronists, or even from the local communal leaders who were labelled heretics for their disobedience. The last days of Christ’s life presented the biblical origins of the rites and power of the clergy, both key issues in combating unorthodox believers.

The continued concern with protecting and bolstering ecclesiastical authority may partially explain the programme for the pulpit that was inserted into the balustrade by a later generation of the Campionesi workshop during the stewardship of Bozzalinus (1208-1225; Figs. 1). In addition to the one narrative image of the Garden of Gethsemane (Fig. 39), the pulpit includes representations of the blessing Christ (Fig. 38), the four evangelical beasts (Fig. 36), and the four Latin Church Fathers (Fig. 37). These sculptures placed new ideas before the faithful gathered in the nave in the thirteenth century, a time when preaching became almost sacramental in nature.¹

Read together as a unit, the pulpit panels, minus the scene of Christ Waking St. Peter, present the viewer with a maestà akin to the imagery found on one piece of the pontile carved by Benedetto Antelami for Parma Cathedral (1178; Fig. 6). This iconography was related to the pulpit’s function as stage for reading the Gospels by the evangelists and for preaching, a tradition extended by the doctors of the church.² Christ sits on a throne and holds a jewelled book that signifies his status as Logos or the Word.³ The evangelists are depicted as the winged beasts from the visions of Ezekiel (1) and Revelations (4:6-7).⁴ Christ surrounded by the apocalyptic animals appeared as early as the fifth century and together they stressed the divine presence that permeated the church throughout the liturgy.⁵ When seen in tandem with the Passion narrative, the pulpit stresses Christ’s divine nature, whereas the balustrade emphasizes his human side through the portrayal of his physical trials.

The close association between the evangelists and Christ in this apocalyptic vision led Arturo Calzona to suggest that the Gospel writers originally appeared on either side of Christ, akin to Antelami’s sculpture for Parma Cathedral.⁶ This proposal seems logical since the beasts currently face each other, directing the viewer’s eye towards the colonette that separates them. If Sts. Matthew and Mark sat to Christ’s right and Sts. Luke and John to his left, the sculptures would guide the viewer’s eye towards the
enthroned figure, the most important panel on the pulpit. In this arrangement, one piece with the Church Fathers probably appeared beside each of the evangelist pieces, again echoing Antelami’s composition. The image of *Christ Waking St. Peter* would remain in its current location in order to provide the transition from the pulpit to the Passion sequence on the balustrade, even though this thirteenth-century insertion is out of narrative sequence. This last panel may have urged the clergy and the Church to be vigilant in this era of political instability and renewed fervour for the fight against heresy, just as Christ reprimanded St. Peter to remain on guard.

In addition to presenting a divine vision in stone, the pulpit imagery stressed the power of the clergy as interpreters of scripture based on the tradition of the church fathers who had been elevated to the level of the evangelists. The texts of Sts. Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory, and Jerome served symbolic and didactic functions by providing the basis for medieval theology; as a result, they were commonly represented on later choir screens. The ecclesiastics may have felt that such an emphasis on their sacred powers was necessary due to the slow erosion of their secular influence at the hands of the commune. By 1204, the clergy’s powers in Modena had eroded to the point that the *podestà*, the imperial leader of the commune, claimed the right to ring the church bells. In addition, at the time Bozzalinus became *massario* of Modena Cathedral, Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) renewed the Church’s attacks on heresy. The sculptural emphasis on the divinely inspired clergy may have stressed the true line of the transmission of the Word, possibly in contrast to the interpretations put forth by the laity that led to heresy.

The new pulpit also underscored the power of the scriptures in relation to new changes to the church architecture, through the inscription above Christ’s head that, according to William Montorsi, reads in Latin: “You do not see the light, nevertheless the light shines for the mind” (Fig. 38). This text refers to the insight that derives from the Gospels read from the pulpit by the clerics. At the time of its insertion, this inscription may also have pointed out the startling changes to the interior of the cathedral made by the physical light streaming through larger windows recently installed by the Campionesi in the crypt and the rose window, added to the façade by the same workshop just after the pulpit was erected (Fig. 119). Thus, while underlining the clergy’s power, I believe that this pulpit also provided the framework for interpreting the building as a celestial monument of religious enlightenment symbolized by light.
Light symbolism may also reveal one way in which the pulpit was subtly integrated with the balustrade imagery (Fig. 1). St. Augustine had argued that light was not just a metaphor for Christ, but was his actual form during the Resurrection. As a divine vision after his death, the pulpit presents the aftermath of the Passion and Crucifixion, pictured on the balustrade and the crucifix hanging from the triumphal arch. In addition, the four Church Fathers emphasized the symbolic associations between Old and New Testaments that are visualized physically on the pontile in the use of capitals supporting the balustrade. Furthermore, the two parts of the structure refer to the two sections of the Mass: through the emphasis on Christ’s humanity, the balustrade presented the Eucharistic liturgy, while the pulpit revealed the liturgy of the Word by stressing the divine nature of the protagonist of Christianity. These two independent, but related pieces were combined into a cohesive whole.

The creation of large pontili decorated with expansive narratives, like that produced by the Campionesi, seems to have been a relatively short-lived phenomenon extending from the late eleventh through the thirteenth centuries. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in Italy, the programme of Christ’s Passion and triumphant Resurrection began to be transferred from the choir screens to large, wooden altarpieces. This change was actually a reversion to earlier practices, when such images appeared on altar frontals that were visible to the laity because the priest stood behind the altar. Elizabeth Parker observed that as screens were erected in churches and thus, hid the main altar, visual stimuli were moved from the altar frontals to the pontili. Then, in later centuries, under the influence of the mendicant orders and the rise of individualized spiritual devotion, especially to Mary, the clergy moved the Passion imagery to gigantic altarpieces set upon the sacrificial table. These changes seemed to coincide with the change of patronage from a local saint to the cult of the Virgin. As a result, those Italian screens erected in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries tended to bear fewer narrative scenes than their earlier counterparts. For example, the structure erected in Santa Croce in Florence during the early fourteenth century, had imagery relegated primarily to the pediments of the chapels that formed it.

This movement of the Passion iconography from the main altar to the choir screen and back to the sacrificial table was made easier due to the ideological ties between pontili and altars. The large size of the newer liturgical panel paintings may have stemmed from the period when both they and pontili were being employed at the same time; in order for the altarpieces to be seen over the screens, they needed to be
large and tall. The sculpted imagery on *pontili* and other liturgical furnishings, such as pulpits, provided later artists with models for their expansive altarpieces. Not only did the screens present the same programmes that appeared on such altar decorations, but also the emotive style found on the furniture, like that of the early Campionesi workshop, was continued and further developed by the later painters. Thus, the liturgical furnishings of the twelfth century paved the way for the evolution of narrative programmes. In turn, the large altarpieces contributed to the expendability of *pontili*, like Modena Cathedral’s choir screen, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Only in the twentieth century was the fascination with these large furnishings resurrected and the structures re-erected due to a greater interest in returning to the original look of the Romanesque interior.


4Matthew is the angel because his Gospel begins with Christ’s genealogy and thus is associated with the Incarnation, whereby Christ became human. The lion represents Mark because his voice called out in the wilderness; further, he is associated with the Resurrection since the lioness breathes life into her cubs three days after birth, just as Christ rose from the tomb on the third day. Luke is the ox because his writings begin with the sacrifice of Zechariah and the ox is a sacrificial animal; thus, Luke is also associated with the Passion and Christ’s sacrifice. Lastly, the eagle is associated with John who spoke with the spirit of God as this bird rises into the clouds and, as a result, is associated with the Resurrection. Thus, the evangelist symbols were interpreted in terms of the dual nature of Christ through association with the events that encapsulated his human and divine aspects. For more on the various interpretations of the evangelical beasts, see Emile Mâle, *Religious Art in France in the Thirteenth Century: A Study in Medieval Iconography and its Sources of Inspiration*, trans. Dora Nussey, 3rd ed. rev. (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1913): 35-37.


6Arturo Calzona, “Il pulpito di Benedetto Antelami tra vescovo, commune e impero.” *Le vie del medioevo*, ed. Arturo Carlo Quintavalle (Milan: Electa Editrice, 2000): 303. Montorsi also agreed that the panels were incorporated incorrectly into the monument, William Montorsi, *Iscrizioni Modenesi Romaniche e Gotiche: Duomo e Palazzo del Comune* (Modena: Aedes Muratoriana, 1977): 263-264. The two evangelist panels were found in walls descending into crypt in 20th century in the opposite arrangement to that found on the pulpit today.

7Moskowitz, 289.
I would like to thank Barbara Haeger for her insight into the iconography of this sculpture.

A sign of this elevated status is the recitation of the 
*Credo*, or statement of the tenets of the Christian faith, on the feast days of the Doctors of the Church. This statement of belief was only said on special days and the four doctors took their place next to the Apostles as outstanding heralds of the faith to whom a 


Peter D. Diehl, “Overcoming Reluctance to Prosecute Heresy in Thirteenth-Century Italy,” *Christendom and its Discontents: Exclusion, Persecution and Rebellion 1000-1500*, eds. Scott L. Waugh and Peter D. Diehl (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996): 54. This is signalled by a letter, which attacks heresy sent by the Pope to the city of Viterbo, Diehl, 54. Only by the 1230’s do communes begin to take heresies more seriously and adopt anti-heretical laws, Diehl, 55.


Saverio Lomartire, “I Campionesi al Duomo di Modena,” *I Maestri Campionesi*, eds. Rossana Bossaglia and Gian Alberto dell’Acqua (Bergamo: Edizioni Bolis, 1992): 73. The changes to the east end at this time were partly due to functional problems with sinking ground. The area of the church was tilting to the north and the campanile was shifting to the south, probably aggravated by continued work on the tower, Lomartire, “I Campionesi,” 66.


One example of this type of antependium in Italy is the gilded Altar Frontal of St. Ambrose by Wolvinus for Sant’ Ambrogio in Milan (854-59); for an image of this frontal, refer to James Snyder, *Medieval Art: Painting, Sculpture, Architecture 4th-14th Century* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1989): figure 272. An early example of the movement towards larger altarpieces is a *Maieitas Domini with scenes related to the True Cross* painted by a Sienese artist in 1215 an currently housed in the Pinocateca Nazionale in Siena (98 x198 cm); for a picture of this altarpiece see: Henk Van Os, *Sienese Altarpieces 1215-1460*, vol. 1 (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1988): figure 3. One of the most famous large altarpieces of the ensuing centuries was the Maestà by Duccio for Siena Cathedral (1311). Later Italian choir screens tended to be more architectural in format and less iconography was incorporated into their structures, as in the case of the *pontile* of Sta. Croce.

Parker, “Architecture,” 301.

For more information on the relationships between mendicant orders and altarpieces, see: Henk
Van Os, *Sienese Altarpieces 1215-1460*, vol. 1 (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1988): 21-38. The special devotion of the mendicant orders to the Virgin may have influenced the building of the later pontile in the abbey church of Vezzalano (c.1220-30), which is dedicated to Marian iconography.

22 This trend can be seen in the case of Santa Maria del Fiore in Florence, among all cathedral newly re-dedicated to the Virgin in the Gothic period. This church had a patron saint, Santa Reparata, venerated in a hall crypt under an elevated choir, similar to Modena Cathedral’s architectural arrangement. With proliferation of the Virgin’s cult, the church was rededicated and decorations had a new focus.


24 Timothy Verdon, “Verbum caro factum. Teologia, spiritualità ed iconografia del pulpito istoriato,” *Pulpiti Medievali Toscani: storia e restauri di micro-architetture*, ed. Daniela Lamberini (Firenze: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1999): 20. The close association between these liturgical furnishings was observed earlier in this study when the connections between choir screens and Holy Cross Altars were discussed. In order to read this section, refer to pages 107 through 108 of this dissertation.
APPENDIX A

FIGURES
Figure 1: Campionesi, Pontile, Modena Cathedral, 1179-1184, with pulpit of 1208-1225 (after postcard published by Ghigo Roli Fotografia, Modena.)

Figure 2: Early Twentieth-Century Photograph of Nave with Brass Railing, Modena Cathedral (after Cristina Luchinat, “La ricomposizione del pontile Campionese,” I restauri del Duomo di Modena 1875-1984, eds. Cristina Luchinat, Luciano Serchia, and Sergio Piconi (Modena: Edizioni Panini, 1984): 211.)
Figure 3: Plan, Modena Cathedral (Image after Adriano Peroni, Il Duomo di Modena: atlante grafico (Modena: Edizioni Panini, 1988): plate 3.)

Figure 4: Map of Medieval Italian Pilgrimage Routes (after Arturo Carlo Quintavalle, ed., Romanico padano, Romanico europeo (Parma: Artegrafica Silva s.r.l., 1982): figure 1.)
Figure 5: Benedetto Antelami, Deposition Panel, *Pontile*, Parma Cathedral, 1178 (Image after a postcard.)


Figure 10: Benedetto Antelami, Lion Support, *Pontile*, Parma Cathedral, 1178 (Image courtesy of Margaret Metcalf.)
Figure 11: Old Testament Panels, Façade, Church of San Zeno, Verona, twelfth century (Courtesy of Margaret Metcalf.)

Figure 12: New Testament Panels, Façade, Church of San Zeno, Verona, twelfth century (Courtesy of Margaret Metcalf.)

Figure 14: *Pontile*, Abbey Church of Vezzalano, c. 1220-1230 (after a postcard published by Edizione Ente Prov. Turismo, Asti.)
Figure 15: Façade, Modena Cathedral (Courtesy of Christine Verzár.)

Figure 16: East Choir Screen, Naumburg Cathedral, c. 1230 (after Jacqueline E. Jung, “Beyond the Barrier: The Unifying Role of the Choir Screen in Gothic Churches,” *Art Bulletin* 82 (2000): figure 2.)
Figure 17: Campionesi, Atlant, Pontile, Modena Cathedral, 1179-1184 (after postcard; photograph by Beppe Zagagua.)

Figure 18: Campionesi, Lion with Ox, Pontile, Modena Cathedral, 1179-1184 (after Marina Armandi, ed., Il Duomo di Modena: atlante fotografico (Modena: Edizioni Panini S.p.A., 1985): 872.)


Figure 23: Campionesi, Acrobat Corbels, Pontile, Modena Cathedral, 1179-1184 (after Adolfo Venturi, *Storia dell’Arte Italiana: L’arte romanica*, vol. 3, 1904; (Nendeln: Kraus Reprint Limited, 1967): figure 247.)

Figure 24: Campionesi, Samson and lion with Acrobat Corbel, Pontile, Modena Cathedral, 1179-1184 (after Erika Doberer, “Il ciclo della passione sul pontile di Modena,” *Romanico padano, Romanico europeo* (Parma: Università degli Studi di Parma, 1982): figure 14.)

Figure 26: Campionesi, Abraham and Isaac Capital (West, South, East, and North Faces), Pontile, Modena Cathedral, 1179-1184 (after Adolfo Venturi, *Storia dell’Arte Italiana: L’arte romanica*, vol. 3, 1904; (Nendeln: Kraus Reprint Limited, 1967): figure 239.)

Figure 27: Campionesi, Daniel Capital (North, West, South, and East Faces), Pontile, Modena Cathedral, 1179-1184 (after Adolfo Venturi, *Storia dell’Arte Italiana: L’arte romanica*, vol. 3, 1904; (Nendeln: Kraus Reprint Limited, 1967): figure 235.)
Figure 28: Campionesi, St. Lawrence Capital (East, North, West and South Faces), Pontile, Modena Cathedral, 1179-1184 (after Adolfo Venturi, Storia dell’Arte Italiana: L’arte romanica, vol. 3, 1904; (Nendeln: Kraus Reprint Limited, 1967): figure 243.)

Figure 29: Campionesi, Washing of the Feet, Pontile, Modena Cathedral, 1179-1184 (after Augusto Bergamini, Duomo di Modena: la Cena, opera scultoria dei Maestri Campionesi (sec. XII-XIII) (Bologna: Grafiche Dehoniane, c.1990): 7.)
Figure 30: Campionesi, Last Supper, Pontile, Modena Cathedral, 1179-1184 (after a postcard published by Ghigo Roli Fotografia, Modena.)

Figure 31: Campionesi, Betrayal, Pontile, Modena Cathedral, 1179-1184 (after a postcard published by Ed. ris. Amministrazione Duomo, Modena.)
Figure 32: Campionesi, Trial before Pilate and Flagellation, Pontile, Modena Cathedral, 1179-1184 (after Augusto Bergamini, *Duomo di Modena: la Cena, opera scultoria dei Maestri Campionesi (sec. XII-XIII)* (Bologna: Grafiche Dehoniane, c.1990): 13.)

Figure 33: Campionesi, Road to Calvary, Pontile, Modena Cathedral, 1179-1184 (after Augusto Bergamini, *Duomo di Modena: la Cena, opera scultoria dei Maestri Campionesi (sec. XII-XIII)* (Bologna: Grafiche Dehoniane, c.1990): 14.)


Figure 37: Campionesi, Sts. Jerome and Ambrose, Sts. Augustin and Gregory, Pulpit, Modena Cathedral, 1208-1225 (after Augusto Bergamini, Duomo di Modena: la Cena, opera scultorea dei Maestri Campionesi (sec. XII-XIII) (Bologna: Grafiche Dehoniane, c.1990): 3.)
Figure 38: Campionesi, Christ Enthroned, Pulpit, Modena Cathedral, 1208-1225 (after Augusto Bergamini, *Duomo di Modena: la Cena, opera scultorea dei Maestri Campionesi (sec. XII-XIII)* (Bologna: Grafiche Dehoniane, c.1990): 3.)

Figure 39: Campionesi, Garden of Gesthemane, Pulpit, Modena Cathedral, 1208-1225 (after Augusto Bergamini, *Duomo di Modena: la Cena, opera scultorea dei Maestri Campionesi (sec. XII-XIII)* (Bologna: Grafiche Dehoniane, c.1990): 6.)
Figure 40: Campionesi, David Capital, Ghirlandina, c.1169 (after William Montorsi, *La Torre della Ghirlandina: Comacini e Campionesi a Modena*. Modena: Aedes Muratoriana, 1976: 111.)


Figure 43: View to the East, San Miniato al Monte, Florence (after a postcard published by Casa Editrice GIUSTI de Becocci, Florence.)
Figure 44: Early Twentieth-Century Photograph of Crypt Entrances with Plaster removed, Modena Cathedral (after Cristina Luchinat, “La ricomposizione del pontile Campionese,” I restauri del Duomo di Modena 1875-1984, eds. Cristina Luchinat, Luciano Serchia, and Sergio Piconi (Modena: Edizioni Panini, 1984): 225.)

Figure 45: Christ and the Samaritan Woman, Raising of Lazarus, Entry into Jerusalem, Feeding of the Five Thousand, the last Supper, and Washing of the Feet, Salerno Ivories, early twelfth century (after Robert P. Bergman, The Salerno Ivories: Ars Sacra from Medieval Amalfi (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1980): figures 29 and 30.)
Figure 46: Master Guglielmo, Last Supper and Arrest, Pulpit, Church of Sta. Maria di Castello, Cagliari (formerly of Pisa Cathedral), 1159-1162 (after Salvatore Settis, ed., Il Duomo di Pisa, vol. 2 (Modena: Franco Cosimo Panini Editore, 1995): figure 1824.)

Figure 47: Entry into Jerusalem, North Portal, Façade, Abbey Church of St. Gilles-du-Gard, c.1125-1150 (after Richard Hamann, Die Abteikirche von St. Gilles und ihre künstlerische Nachfolge, vol. 2 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1956): plate 37.)
Figure 48: Cleansing of the Temple, Frieze, Façade, Abbey Church of St. Gilles-du-Gard, c.1125-1150 (after Richard Hamann, Die Abteikirche von St. Gilles und ihre künstlerische Nachfolge, vol. 2 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1956): plate 56.)

Figure 49: Payment of Judas, Frieze, Façade, Abbey Church of St. Gilles-du-Gard, c.1125-1150 (after Richard Hamann, Die Abteikirche von St. Gilles und ihre künstlerische Nachfolge, vol. 2 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1956): plate 55.)
Figure 50: Washing of the Feet, Central Portal, Façade, Abbey Church of St. Gilles-du-Gard, c.1125-1150 (after Erika Doberer, “Il ciclo della passione sul pontile di Modena,” Romanico padano, Romanico europeo (Parma: Università degli Studi di Parma, 1982): figure 5.)

Figure 51: Last Supper detail, Central Portal, Façade, Abbey Church of St. Gilles-du-Gard, c.1125-1150 (after Erika Doberer, “Il ciclo della passione sul pontile di Modena,” Romanico padano, Romanico europeo (Parma: Università degli Studi di Parma, 1982): figure 7.)
Figure 52: The Arrest, Frieze, Façade, Abbey Church of St. Gilles-du-Gard, c.1125-1150 (after Richard Hamann, *Die Abteikirche von St. Gilles und ihre künstlerische Nachfolge*, vol. 2 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1956): plate 73a and 73b.)

Figure 53: Trial before Pilate, , Frieze, Façade, Abbey Church of St. Gilles-du-Gard, c.1125-1150 (after Richard Hamann, *Die Abteikirche von St. Gilles und ihre künstlerische Nachfolge*, vol. 2 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1956): plate 77a, 78, and 81.)
Figure 54: Flagellation, Frieze, Façade, Abbey Church of St. Gilles-du-Gard, c.1125-1150 (after Richard Hamann, Die Abteikirche von St. Gilles und ihre künstlerische Nachfolge, vol. 2 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1956): plate 83.)

Figure 55: Road to Calvary, Frieze, Façade, Abbey Church of St. Gilles-du-Gard, c.1125-1150 (after Richard Hamann, Die Abteikirche von St. Gilles und ihre künstlerische Nachfolge, vol. 2 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1956): plate 84.)
Figure 56: Passion, Frieze, Parish Church, Beaucaire, c.1150 (after Geza De Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami: Architetto e scultore e l’arte del suo tempo*, vol. 2 (Milan and Florence: Electa Editrice, 1952): plate 55.)

Figure 58: Nicholas of Verdun, Entry into Jerusalem and Last Supper, Enamels, Klosterneuburg Pulpit/Altarpiece, 1181 (after Helmut Buschhausen, *Der Verduner Altar: Das Emailwerk des Nikolaus von Verdun im Stift Klosterneuburg* (Wien: Buch- und Kusntverlag Gesmbh, 1980): plates 17 and 20.)

Figure 60: Nicholas of Verdun, Sacrifice of Isaac and Samson Battles the Lion, Enamels, Klosterneuburg Pulpit/Altarpiece, 1181 (after Helmut Buschhausen, *Der Verduner Altar: Das Emailwerk des Nikolaus von Verdun im Stift Klosterneuburg* (Wien: Buch- und Kunstverlag Gesmbh, 1980): plates 25 and 36.)
Figure 61: West Choir Screen, Naumburg Cathedral, c.1250-1260 (after Jacqueline E. Jung, “Beyond the Barrier: The Unifying Role of the Choir Screen in Gothic Churches,” Art Bulletin 82 (2000): figure 5.)

Figure 62: Last Supper, West Choir Screen, Naumburg Cathedral, c.1250-1260 (after Jacqueline E. Jung, “Beyond the Barrier: The Unifying Role of the Choir Screen in Gothic Churches,” Art Bulletin 82 (2000): figure 16.)
Figure 63: Payment of Judas, West Choir Screen, Naumburg Cathedral, c.1250-1260 (after Jacqueline E. Jung, “Beyond the Barrier: The Unifying Role of the Choir Screen in Gothic Churches,” *Art Bulletin* 82 (2000): figure 15.)

Figure 64: Arrest, West Choir Screen, Naumburg Cathedral, c. 1250-1260 (after Jacqueline E. Jung, “Beyond the Barrier: The Unifying Role of the Choir Screen in Gothic Churches,” *Art Bulletin* 82 (2000): figure 17.)
Figure 65: St. Peter’s Denial, West Choir Screen, Naumburg Cathedral, c. 1250-1260 (after Ingrid Schulze, *Der Westlettner des Naumburger Dom, Das Portal als Gleichnis* (Frankfurt: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH, 1995): 55.)

Figure 66: Trial before Pilate, West Choir Screen, Naumburg Cathedral, c. 1250-1260 (after Ingrid Schulze, *Der Westlettner des Naumburger Dom, Das Portal als Gleichnis* (Frankfurt: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH, 1995): 24.)

Figure 68: Adam and Eve Toil, Bronze Doors, Church of San Zeno, Verona, twelfth century (after a postcard published by Edizioni G. Randazzo.)

Figure 69: Entry into Jerusalem, Bronze Doors, Church of San Zeno, Verona, twelfth century (after Marino Adami, *La Porta bronzea di San Zeno in Verona* (Verona: Randazzo Edizioni Turistiche, 1984): 37.)
Figure 70: Washing of the Feet, Bronze Doors, Church of San Zeno, Verona, twelfth century (after a postcard published by Edizioni G. Randazzo.)

Figure 71: Last Supper, Façade, Lodi Cathedral, first half of the twelfth century (A. Venturi, *Storia dell’Arte Italiana: L’arte romanica*, vol. 3, 1904 (Nendeln: Kraus Reprint Limited, 1967): 131.)

Figure 73: Last Supper, Pulpit Fragment, Volterra Cathedral, c.1200 (after Enrico Castelnuovo, ed., *Niveo de marmore: L’uso artistico del marmo di Carrara dall’XI al XV secolo* (Genova: Edizioni Colombo, 1992): 123.)
Figure 74: Last Supper and Betrayal, Pulpit Fragment, Pistoia Cathedral, c.1200 (after Enrico Castelnuovo, ed., *Niveo de marmore: L’uso artistico del marmo di Carrara dall’XI al XV secolo* (Genova: Edizioni Colombo, 1992): 123.)

Figure 76: Betrayal, Choir Screen, Amiens Cathedral, c.1260 (after Jacqueline E. Jung, “Beyond the Barrier: The Unifying Role of the Choir Screen in Gothic Churches,” *Art Bulletin* 82 (2000): figure 18.)


Figure 83: Wiligelmo, Genesis Panel with Creation, Creation of Adam, Creation of Eve, and the Temptation, Façade, Modena Cathedral, 1106 (courtesy of Christine Verzár.)
Figure 84: Wiligelmo, Genesis Panel with God confronting Adam and Eve, the Expulsion, and Labours of Adam and Eve, Façade, Modena Cathedral, 1106 (after *Itinerario Romanico attraverso la mostra: “Lanfranco e Wiligelmo: il Duomo di Modena”* (Modena: Editrice Coptip, 1984): 72.)

Figure 85: Wiligelmo, Genesis Panel with Sacrifice of Cain and Abel, Abel’s Murder, and the Condemnation of Cain, Façade, Modena Cathedral, 1106 (after *Itinerario Romanico attraverso la mostra: “Lanfranco e Wiligelmo: il Duomo di Modena”* (Modena: Editrice Coptip, 1984): 73.)
Figure 86: Wiligelmo, Genesis Panel with Murder of Cain, the Deluge, and the Condemnation of Cam, Façade, Modena Cathedral, 1106 (after Itinerario Romanico attraverso la mostra: “Lanfranco e Wiligelmo: il Duomo di Modena” (Modena: Editrice Coptip, 1984): 73.)

Figure 87: Wiligelmo, Life of San Geminiano including the Journey by horseback and ship to Byzantium, Exorcism of the Princess, the Emperor bestowing Gifts on the Saint, Adventus at Modena, Burial of the Saint, Lintel, Porta dei Principi, Modena Cathedral, 1106-1115 (courtesy of Margaret Metcalf.)
Figure 88: Wiligelmo, Enoch and Elijah with Foundation Inscription, Façade, Modena Cathedral, 1106 (Bergamini, Augusto, ed. Relatio de innovatione ecclesie sancti Gemniani Mutinensis presulis (Bologna: Grafiche Dehoniani Bologna, n.d.): 26.)

Figure 89: Wiligelmo, Genius with Down-turned Torch, Façade, Modena Cathedral, 1106 (after Itinerario Romanico attraverso la mostra: “Lanfranco e Wiligelmo: il Duomo di Modena” (Modena: Editrice Coptip, 1984): 44.)
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Figure 90: Modena’s Façade according to Roberto Salvini and prior to the Campionesi intervention (after Roberto Salvini, *Il Duomo di Modena*, 1966 (Modena: Artioli Editore, 1983): figure 3.)

Figure 91: Modena’s Façade with Measurements of the Genesis panels and Spaces between the Buttresses; based on a drawing by Roberto Salvini (original drawing after Roberto Salvini, *Il Duomo di Modena*, 1966 (Modena: Artioli Editore, 1983): figure 3.)
Figure 92: Unfinished Pilaster, North Side of Southern Minor Portal, Façade, Modena Cathedral, 1106.

Figure 93: Cornice Returns, North and South Sides of the Major Portal, Façade, Modena Cathedral, 1106.
Figure 94: Façade, St. Michele in Pavia, c.1100-1160 (after Rolf Toman, ed., *Romanesque: Architecture, Sculpture, Painting* (Köln: Könemann Verlagsgesellschaft mbH, 1997): 85.)

Figure 95: Façade, Parma Cathedral, twelfth century (after a postcard.)

Figure 97: Epistle Ambo with Jonah Eaten and Regurgitated by the Whale, Ravello Cathedral, 1095-1150 (after Dorothy Glass, *Romanesque Sculpture in Campania: Patrons, Programs, and Style* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1991): 76.)
Figure 98: Pulpit, Barga Cathedral, c.1256 (after Dorothy Glass, *Romanesque Sculpture in Campania: Patrons, Programs, and Style* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1991): 74.)

Figure 100: Remnant of Arch, North Side of Crypt Entrance, Modena Cathedral, 1099-1106 (courtesy of Margaret Metcalf.)

Figure 102: Unidentified Artist, Reconstructive Drawing of Lanfranco and Wiligelmo’s Presbytery, Modena Cathedral (after Cristina Luchinat, “La ricomposizione del pontile Campionese.” *I restauri del Duomo di Modena 1875-1984*, eds. Cristina Luchinat, Luciano Serchia, and Sergio Piconi (Modena: Edizioni Panini, 1984: figure 244.)

Figure 103: Cross-Section of Nave to East with Measurements of Aisles and Genesis Panels (based on an image after Adriano Peroni, ed., *Lanfranco e Wiligelmo: il Duomo di Modena* (Modena: Edizioni Panini S.p.A., 1984): 188.)
Figure 104: Nave to the East, Abbey Church, Nonantola, c.1100 (after *Itinerario Romanico attraverso la mostra: “Lanfranco e Wiligelmo: il Duomo di Modena”* (Modena: Editrice Coptip, 1984): 11.)

Figure 105: Dawn Cunningham, Reconstruction of the First Presbytery by Lanfranco and Wiligelmo, Modena Cathedral.

Figure 107: Plan of the Campionesi Choir with the *Pontile*, Modena Cathedral, 1184 (my drawing based on a plan after Arturo Carlo Quintavalle, *La Cattedrale di Modena: problemi di romanico Emiliano*, vol. 2 (Modena: Editrice Bassi and Nipoti, 1964): figure 17.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>1.48m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleansing</td>
<td>1.145m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing</td>
<td>1.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Supper</td>
<td>3.00m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>1.00m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trials</td>
<td>1.14m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road to Calvary</td>
<td>0.685m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.75m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1mm = 2cm

= Hypothetical Scenes

Figure 108: My Programmatic Reconstruction of the Campionesi Pontile, Modena Cathedral, 1178-1184
Figure 109: Prediction of St. Peter’s Denial, Frieze, Façade, Abbey Church of St. Gilles-du-Gard, c.1125-1150 (after Richard Hamann, *Die Abteikirche von St. Gilles und ihre künstlerische Nachfolge*, vol. 2 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1956): plate 61.)


Figure 113: Three Marys Buying Spices, Capital, Parish Church, twelfth century, now in the Museo Civico d’Arte, Modena (after Erika Doberer, “Il ciclo della passione sul pontile di Modena,” Romanico padano, Romanico europeo (Parma: Università degli Studi di Parma, 1982): figure 16.)

Figure 114: Wooden Crucifix, “Old” Church of Sta. Maria, Cremona, twelfth century (after Arturo Carlo Quintavalle, Wiligelmo e Matilde: l’officina romanica (Milan: Electra, 1991): figure 58.)

Figure 116: Crucifix mounted over Pontile, Modena Cathedral (after a postcard published by Franco Cosimo Panini.)
Figure 117: Lion and Atlant Support, West Façade, Ferrara Cathedral, 1132 (after Christine Bornstein Verzár, Portals and Politics in the Early Italian City-State: The Sculpture of Nicholaus in Context (Parma: Universitá di Parma, 1988): figure 117.)
Plan A:

Plan B:

Figure 118: Two Suggested Reconstructions of the Supports for the Campionesi’s Pontile, Modena Cathedral, 1178-1184.
Figure 119: View of the Nave to West from the Crypt, Modena Cathedral (after a postcard published by Ghigo Roli Fotografia.)

Figure 120: View of the East End, Modena Cathedral (after a postcard published by Franco Cosimo Panini.)
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