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INTRODUCTION

The mood of the Municipal Council of Braine and officials of the national government in 1832, just after the Bourgeois Monarchy had installed itself in the Palais Royal, was anything but quixotic. The Gothic church of the Premonstratensian abbey of Saint-Yved was converted from a delapidated, partially despoiled, yet basically integral medieval monument to a simple parish church suitable for the modern residents of Braine. In order to reduce Saint-Yved to more practical dimensions, as well as minimize the cost of restoration and maintenance, its west facade and four western nave bays were demolished (Fig. 2).

Where the Gothic facade and nave once stood is now a large barren parvis delimited by walls on three sides (Pl. I): to the east by a modern rubble facade erected at the second nave bay from the crossing; and on the north and south by aisle walls of the destroyed nave bays, left intact almost three meters high. These walls have nineteenth century extensions toward the west which link the north wall to the west side of the old Premonstratensian cloister, and the south wall to a modern presbytery and the wall enclosing the château of the Counts of Braine. Here the open west end of the parvis joins the rue Saint-Yved leading past the château to the town center, a spacious marketplace on Braine's main commercial artery, the east-west highway between Soissons
and Reims. Spreading out alongside this route, Braine lies near a wooded tableland edging the Aisne river valley, and is situated at the border of the ancient provinces of Île-de-France and Champagne.

The 1832 demolition created a problem for historians which, in fact, has remained unsolved, for today the precise form of the Gothic facade and sculpted west portals of Saint-Yved is no longer known. Contemporary historians have not investigated this problem for several reasons. Some scholars would not concede it exists, and for others the loss, barring some spectacular discovery, is virtually irrevocable. Both attitudes help to explain why the situation is now accepted with such wide-spread passivity; why no one has ventured to clarify what our knowledge of the facade actually is. However, both attitudes are unrealistic and they need to be revaluated completely.

Even the most cursory inspection of documents relative to the form of Saint-Yved before 1832 will reveal that these records do not agree on the church's mere outline; and not one of them accurately describes the site—the parvis visible today—where the dismantled facade and nave bays once stood. Compared to this basic confusion, the obscurity surrounding the west portals of Saint-Yved is understandable. First, the nineteenth century documents only agree that there was a dominating central entrance and that each portal of the west facade was preceded by a porch. Otherwise, they contradict one another on plans, elevations and even whether there were two portals or three. Secondly, when the facade was demolished, sculpture belonging to the central Coronation Portal was salvaged to perform three functions for the truncated church (Figs. 3-4): some sculpted stones were installed at
random in a small porch attached to the modern facade; some were cut down and employed as decoration for the choir and choir chapels; and others were broken-up to make a rubble fill beneath a new pavement inside the church. As long as this sculpture remained dispersed or inaccessible, no accurate reconstruction of the Coronation Portal was possible. Thirdly, other medieval sculptural and architectural elements do exist which may have belonged to the Gothic facade of Saint-Yved, but no one has tried to determine their exact origins. Four columns complete with bases, capitals and abacuses were rehabilitated along with the Coronation sculpture to construct the nineteenth century porch of Saint-Yved. The possibility that these elements came from a demolished west portal needs to be examined. Moreover, the Musée Saint-Leger at Soissons, since 1832 the depot for homeless Braine sculpture, contains what may be the head of a column-statue and a sculpted tympanum and lintel representing The Inferno and Christ in Limbo (Fig. 5). At some unknown date before the 1832 demolition, The Inferno was removed from an equally unknown architectural context and displayed in the narthex tribune of Saint-Yved. If this sculpture ever did belong to the Gothic facade, then the fact has yet to be proven. Finally, by order of the Commission des Monuments Historiques, the dispersed sculptural decoration of the Coronation Portal was reconstituted during the 1960's to construct a new Coronation Portal approximating the original (Figs. 6-8). The stones were carefully correlated and found to comprise one-half of the old tympanum, lintel and voussures. But uncertainty about the original embrasure design, of which no part was known to exist, led to
incorporating architectural elements for the new embrasures which never had belonged to the Gothic portal. This project greatly increased our knowledge of the Gothic Coronation Portal, but a definitive groundplan and elevation are still lacking. Without these measurements, nothing can be determined about the lateral west portals.

This new impasse is proof that only by deliberately undertaking to recover and correlate a maximum number of elements from the demolished facade can we hope to gain information sufficient to permit an accurate, thorough reconstruction of one or all the west portals. This observation leads to the thesis of the following study. Doubtless we will never know just how much of the Gothic facade still survives somewhere in recognizable form decorating private gardens, embedded in walls or in the rubble beneath Braine's streets, and conceivably even outside the borders of France. But the author proposes that when the parvis of Saint-Yved and certain sites inside the truncated church were excavated in 1971-1972, accessible data concerning the dismantled facade was increased to proportions which are adequate for a precise reconstruction of the west portals.

Having considered the basis for a revaluation of contemporary attitudes toward the 1832 demolition, let us examine those sources of knowledge about Saint-Yved which form the principal context of the following study. The difficulty one faces today in reconstructing the west portals can be traced to the fact that the church building and the facade's sculpted decoration were seldom subjects of interest before the nineteenth century, by which time Saint-Yved was becoming a picturesque ruin. Indeed, they became a matter of serious concern only
after the western half of the church was destroyed. Thus knowledge inherited from preceding centuries is limited to the following incoherent data. In 1631 André Duchesne published extracts from the Liber obituum of Saint-Yved, which contained a commemoration to Countess Agnes "who founded our church." Since the pious wife of Robert I, Count of Dreux and Braine, died in 1204, construction certainly had begun before this date. From eighteenth century savants we learned the consecration date of Saint-Yved, 1216, when Alberic of Reims and Bishop Haimard of Soissons transported the relics of Saint-Yved from the old collegiate church to a new church; and that

1. If one existed, a complete bibliographic study of the Premonstratensian monastery to which Saint-Yved was attached would constitute a large volume indeed. With some exceptions the subject can be traced through the following sources: Recherches bibliographiques sur de département de l'Aisne, 3 Vols., Soissons, 1866-1883, a catalogue of 14,390 books and copied charters made by Charles Perin, President of the Société Archéologique de Soissons (articles enumerated in Vol. III, catalogued after Perin's death, were willed to the city of Soissons in 1882 and are referred to hereafter as Soissons, Bibl. Mun., Perin); the complete literary oeuvre of Stanislas Prioux (d. 1866); Ministère de l'Instruction Publique, Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France..., Vol. III, 1885; Abbé Pecher, Annales du diocese de Soissons, 10 Vols., Soissons, 1863-1894; Lucien Broche and Maxim de Sars, Histoire de Braine, la Charité-sur-Loire, 1933; Père Norbert Backmund, Monasticon Praemonstratense, Vol. II, Straubing, 1952; pp. 484f.

2. Histoire généalogique des maisons de Dreux, de Bar-le-Duc..., Paris, pp. 23,240. According to Emile Brouette, Obituaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Yved de Braine, Louvain, 1959, the original obituary, which Duchesne may have used, is lost. Duchesne's version of Anges' commemoration on VIII Kalendas Novembris (October 24th) is the same as the one found in a copy of the calendar made by Gaignières in 1692 (Bibl. Nat., Ms. lat. 5479).

stained glass for the latter was donated by the Queen of England.

4. Abbé Charles-Louis Hugo, Sacri et canonici ordinis praemonstratensis annales, I, Nancy, 1734, cols. 394f; cited in Gallia Christiana, IX, Paris, 1751, cols. 366, 489, and by Abbé Claude Carlier, Histoire du duché de Valois, II, Paris, 1764, pp. 64f. Precisely where this information originated has not been determined. One source may have been Braine's only notable native historian, Mathieu Herbelin, who was bursar of the monastery of Saint-Yved before his death in 1576, and who cited the 1216 dedication in "Histoire des comtes de Dreux et de Braine" (Braine, Archives Municipales, Ms. fr.).

The dedication is not mentioned in the oldest cartulary of Saint-Yved (Archives Nationales L11583, there dated XIIIth century). It is doubtful that Herbelin had all the charters therein collected by Canon Nicolas Cardon of Laon Cathedral, as Prioux stated (Bulletin de la Société Archéologique de Soissons, X, 1856, pp. 227f). According to Brouette, loc. cit., Herbelin only made additions to the cartulary; Plateau prefers a XIVth century date for the manuscript (Bulletin de la Société Archéologique de Soissons, VI, 1899, pp. 84f), and Cottineau, the XVIIIth century (Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieures, I, Macon, col. 475). The date or dates when this cartulary was compiled is less problematic than the fact it is not complete. At the time of his death in 1866, Prioux was editing a cartulary from material in the Herbelin version, from another cartulary made in 1692 by Gaiginères (Bibl. Nat., Ms. lat. 5479, with obituary attached) and, probably, an additional group of charters now in the Archives Nationales (L1168). However, Prioux's unpublished manuscript in the Archives de la Société Archéologique de Soissons is not a definitive modern edition (see Victor de Beauville's Recueil des documents inédits concernant la Picardie, IV, Paris, 1881), and no one since Prioux has assumed the task of compiling one. This is a clear indication of the general neglect which the records of the Abbey of Saint-Yved have sustained since the XIXth century.

The dates 1204 and 1216 are the only ones so far discovered which specifically relate to the construction of the Gothic church, although the first has not yet been fully incorporated into modern scholarship (e.g., P. Héliot, "L'abbatiale de Saint-Michel-en-Thiérache, modèle de Saint-Yved à Braine...," Bulletin de la Commission Royale des Monuments et des Sites, 1972, p. 20). These are not the only documented dates pertaining to the several churches of Saint-Yved; the question is which church was involved when, for example, Carlier specified that Robert I founded prayers in the church of Saint-Yved in 1179 (op. cit., I, p. 467), and a trial of heretics was conducted there in 1204 or 1205 ("Ecclesia Remenensis," Gallia Christiana, IX, col. 101).

If all references to the abbey for the period in question were to be compiled chronologically, it is probable that a substantial history of Saint-Yved would emerge. Whether or not it will affect current ideas about the date of the Gothic building remains to be seen, however certain problems will be difficult to resolve. Our primary sources for the activities of the Premonstratensian abbey, the cartularies of
Moreover, about 1750 an anonymous canon of Saint-Yved, otherwise Saint-Yved, are above all a record of feudal economics, not a history of the church. Carlier, op. cit., II, pp. 64f, surely confused the situation by saying Robert II of Braine completed in 1216 what his father, Robert I, had advanced at great expense. No donations to the abbey by Robert I—except a cartload of wood in exchange for a daily mass (1179)—are mentioned in the cartularies. In fact, no donations at any time are there stipulated for building the monastery or a church. Thus, who actually bore most of the financial burden of these enterprises, the nobility or the Premonstratensian Order, and how the expense was managed, through property exchange or money, are not clear today.

Doubtless the abbey profited from donations by and exchanges with Countess Agnes of Braine, her son Robert II, his wife Iolande de Coucy, and the local nobility and clergy (cf. Prioux cartulary, Charters XLVII, XLVIII for April, 1208); and we recall that stained glass for the Gothic church was donated by the Queen of England. But it is probable to me that, for three reasons, the monastery's participation in building the Gothic church must have been greater than ever has been realized. First, no one has questioned the assumption that either Robert I or Robert II endowed the abbey for the construction of this church. Yet we have remarked there is no evidence of donations by Count Robert I; indeed, it appears that he had no personal attachment at all to Saint-Yved. He endowed St.-Thomas du Louvre in Paris (Prioux, Monographie de l'ancienne abbaye royale de Saint-Yved, Paris, 1859, pp. 11ff); and after his death in 1188, recorded in the Martyriology of Notre-Dame at Paris, Robert was buried at St.-Pierre de Vienne, a Benedictine abbey which he had patronized in the Dauphiné. Furthermore, Robert's death stimulated building activity at Braine, but not at Saint-Yved; according to Pecheur (Annales, III, 1875, p. 149), Countess Agnes founded the priory of St.-Remi at Braine in his memory, and later the Hôtel-Dieu (1201).

Secondly, since Robert I died an old man in the shelter of the convent at Vienne before the Third Crusade began in 1189-1190, he could not have left rich metals, rents and other revenues to construct the Gothic church of Saint-Yved upon departing for a "holy voyage" to Jerusalem, as Mathieu Herbelin stated. However, as a result of the French Revolution, a direct association between the building of this church and the devoutness of the cadet branch of the Capetian dynasty became an elaborate theme in XIXth century scholarship (cf. pp.9ff). Now at the date when modern historians believe the Gothic church was begun, or ca. 1190, Count Robert II left Braine on the Third Crusade with King Phillip Augustus (d'Harmonville, Dictionnaire des dates, 1842); and it is only logical to think that the extravagant cost of travelling to Jerusalem, moreover as a prince of the realm would have prohibited Robert from making an important donation to Saint-Yved upon his departure. Thus, the piety of the Capets will not be compromised today by remarking that the outset of a crusade was not a
preoccupied with describing royal tombs in the abbey, remarked that the west facade contained "twelve apostles" copied from the Cathedral of Laon. By 1764 Abbé Claude Carlier had recorded measurements for the church, 214 x 70 feet, to which Canon Duflot writing in 1787 added "214 feet long from the portail (facade) to the rond-point." These rudimentary observations did not, however, engender a literature about the Gothic building and graphic descriptions before the Revolution are no less disappointing. In 1782 the last Count of Braine had a survey of his local properties made which reveals the church's groundplan, but generalized to the extreme (Fig. 9); an engraving by Tavernier published in 1789 depicted the west facade convenient time for royal largesse to the church at home; and that the monastery of Saint-Yved, which itself had extensive properties, would have experienced less financial strain in 1190 than the Count of Braine. This point brings us to one final observation. Since no records mention the acquisition, barter or transport of stone for the abbey, this important commodity, a typically regional limestone, quite probably was quarried on lands near Braine owned by the Abbey of Saint-Yved. Also, some men to perform heavy labor, and even skilled jobs, could have been conscripted under feudal obligation to the abbey or the Premonstratensian Order, the mother house being located some 30 kilometers from Braine in the forest near Laon.

5. Prioux, *Monographie*, p. 19; a copy of the original description is at Soissons, Bibl. Mun., Perin 1031, p. 16.

6. Nicolas Duflot, bibliophile and busar of the abbey, presented his "Description topographique de la ville de Braine" to the Société d'Agriculture de Laon in 1787 (Archives Départementales D9, Ms. fr.). See also Doms E. Martène and U. Durand, *Second voyage littéraire de deux religieux bénédictins*, Paris, 1724, who record measurements of the monastery, the iconography of the stained glass of Saint-Yved, and remark its Renaissance jubé.

7. "Atlas perpetuel de la seigneurie," Cartes A-B, Archives Départementales E130 bis. Figure 10 superimposes the "Atlas" on a modern land registry made in 1931 (Braine, Archives Municipales, 2d ed., 1961); Fig. 11, an official registry of 1813, is an appallingly schematic and colorless record by XVIIIth century standards (Braine, Archives Municipales).
of Saint-Yved from the east (Fig. 12); and this epoch closed with the facade shown in miniature on the scale of a large postage stamp (Fig. 13).

Until the nineteenth century, thus, the church building had been taken for granted as a scaffolding for glass and receptacle for tombs, reliquaries and embroidered chasubles. Indeed, when the revolutionary tide had subsided, it was simply described as a place from which such precious objects had been stolen; and by 1808, when the vaults of the neglected church had crumbled, the local government took notice only because it wanted to profit from selling the old stones. This pitiful situation might have leveled the entire fabric had Saint-Yved not received a champion in the peppery monarchist, Curé Beaucamp.

Encountering King Charles X after the Coronation at Reims in 1824,

8. Laborde, Voyages pittoresques en France, VI, Paris, Pl. XXXIV.
10. The Revolution at Braine is well documented but the available records have never been compiled: see Chateau, "Histoire de Braine depuis son origine jusqu' à present...", 1829, Soissons, Bibl. Mun., Ms. fr., pp. 89ff; Aubry-Polyn, Saint-Yved alias Notre-Dame de Braine, 1962; Prioux, op. cit., pp. 19 f; Broche and Sars, op. cit., pp. 186ff. Records of the estimation and sale of religious properties are preserved in the Archives Départementales at Laon ("Domaines," see especially Q189, Q813, Q826). Part of the "Registre des Délivrations du Conseil Municipal de Braine" also survives: for the periods 1788-1791 and 1802-1816 (Archives Départementales ID1, ID5); 1793-1795 (Braine, Archives Municipales); 1791-1793 (lost, see Max Buffenoir, "Le registres de la Municipalité de Braine pendant la Revolution," Bulletin de la Société Archéologique de Soissons, V, 1931-1932, pp. 213-267).
Beaucamp proclaimed that that delapidated abbey enclosing remains of the descendents of Louis VI was no less than a royal pantheon second only to Saint-Denis, and that a monument attesting the piety of the French kings must not be allowed to perish.\textsuperscript{11} The measure of truth in this imaginative argument saved the eastern half of the church, where the tombs were or had been, and induced a prompt restoration.

As a result of these events, a gradual awakening to the idea that Saint-Yved was significant as an example of medieval art occurred in Paris.\textsuperscript{12} However, Beaucamp's interest in the tombs had drawn everyone's attention away from the west facade, and the French government kept no accurate records of the facade either before or during the 1832 demolition. Nor did it make any serious provision for the Gothic portals on the modern facade where, as an afterthought, certain medieval elements remarked above were reinstated to construct a porch, but without even a minimum of order. In fact the royal tombs were responsible for the only volume ever devoted entirely to Saint-Yved, the great \textit{Monographie de l'ancienne abbaye royale de}

\textsuperscript{11} See Beaucamp's "Notice sur l'église royale de Saint-Yved de Braine et sur les tombes royales qu'elle renferme," Archives Départementales, Ms. fr., datable 1824, and the more extensive \textit{Mémoire sur l'église royale de Saint-Yved de Braine}, Soissons, 1825. His campaign to preserve the church unfolded between 1824 and 1826 (Appendix A).

\textsuperscript{12} In particular, see Ludovic Vitet's \textit{Rapport a M. le Ministre de l'Intérieur sur les monuments, les bibliothèques, les archives et les musées des départements de l'Oise, de l'Aisne,...}, Paris, 1831 (Appendix A). Respect given to the church as a work of art, was as Vitet suggested, not a literary tradition of any importance. Duflot, \textit{loc. cit.}, did remark the majestic character of the building; but one is not certain Mathieu Herbelin was praising its quality, or merely the speed of construction when he related a legend that twelve master masons were chosen to build Saint-Yved (\textit{loc. cit.}).
Saint-Yved published in 1859 by Stanislas Prioux. Prioux was the nineteenth century historian of Braine; between his earliest book entitled *Histoire de Braine* of 1846, and his last, *Répertoire archéologique de l'arrondissement de Soissons* in 1863, a score of related articles appeared in regional journals, all of which still are profitable reading.

There are three primary sources for a precise reconstruction of the west facade of Saint-Yved as it existed before the 1832 demolition. The first is, alas, the truncated church standing today and diverse remains of the lost facade. The second source is a series of unpublished scale drawings of Saint-Yved prepared in conjunction with a restoration estimate in 1825 by the governmental architect, Monsieur Gencourt. This series is remarkable because it includes a groundplan of the complete church and a longitudinal section through the central Coronation Portal (Figs. 14-15). The Gencourt drawings are

13. Prioux was sent to England to have the Gaignières tomb drawings copied (Oxford, Bodleian); for copies in the Bibliothèque Nationale, see H. Bouchot, *Inventaire des dessins exécutés pour Roger de Gaignières et conservés aux département des estampes et des manuscrits*, Paris, 1891.

14. See above, note 4. Lucien Broche and Maxim de Sars, *Histoire de Braine*, 1933, is more accurate and especially useful since Prioux frequently did not cite his sources. The first substantial XIXth century history of Braine, employed wholesale in Prioux's *Monographie*, was Chateau's "Histoire de Braine depuis son origine...", an unpublished manuscript dated 1829 now in the Municipal Library at Soissons. Chateau was Treasurer of the Fabric of Saint-Yved in 1826.

15. See Appendix A, February 8, 1825. The drawings were traced in 1836 (Archives Nationales F21-1875, Aisne, An IX-1848, "Restauration de l'église de Saint-Yved...", January, 1836); cf. Figs. 16-17. The plan of Saint-Yved published in 1840 is essentially a copy of Gencourt's (Taylor, *Voyages*, Vol. II); cf. Fig. 18.
supplemented by official records dating from 1823 which document both the demolition activity and restoration of the choir, transept and two eastern nave bays. The bulk of these records is divided now between national and departmental archives, although small dossiers also exist in the presbytery of Braine, belonging to the parish, and in the Musée Saint-Leger at Soissons. This important quantity of paperwork does not, however, by any means compensate for the fact that not only were the Gencourt drawings carelessly executed, but an elevation of the original west facade of Saint-Yved was omitted from the 1825 series. This monumental lacuna would have proven catastrophic for historians had the facade of the church not been represented graphically by three perspectives from the southwest datable between 1800 and 1832 (Figs. 19-21). When compiled these graphic sources describe Saint-Yved better than the art and literature of seven centuries. But as chance would have

16. Archives Nationales F21-2517 (Archives de l'Administration des Beaux-Arts); Archives Nationales F19-662, F19-673 (Archives de l'Administration des Cultes); Archives de la Commission des Monuments Historiques, "Restauration de Saint-Yved de Braine," dossiers from 1826; Braine, Archives Paroissiales, "Documents sur Braine et son église" (containing extracts from the "Registre des Délégérations du Conseil de la Fabrique de Braine" otherwise lost or known only indirectly). The "Délégérations du Conseil Municipal de Braine" from 1816 to 1827 are now lost; for the period 1827-1844, see Archives Départementales ID7-9. Those documents which are needed to understand this epoch, when the fate of Saint-Yved was determined by both great and small pecuniary circumstances, are translated in Appendix A.

it, the west portals were concealed in the three perspective views, thus all the nineteenth century designs made before 1832 either are imprecise or incomplete; moreover, they actually contradict one another.

Once the demolition had taken place, the problem of recording what had been lost stimulated a serious interest in the facade of Saint-Yved. Thomas King was the first to attempt a reconstruction, publishing a complete groundplan and elevation in 1857 (Figs. 22-23). King said his designs were based upon a "representation (modèle) of Saint-Yved in ruins as well as diverse drawings made to scale in possession of a former supervisor of road construction (at Braine)." Beyond doubt he was referring to the lithograph or watercolor perspective mentioned above, and to Gencourt's drawings of 1825; but in fact the King designs differ noticeably from both sources and they should be considered as interpretations, not copies. The relationship of these sources and King's reconstruction to Prioux's Monographie published two years later is still more curious. This 1859 volume contains not only a set of excellent scale engravings at 1:200 representing Saint-Yved as seen today, but a groundplan including the lost facade that is quite unlike any earlier plan (Figs. 24-25). In the text Prioux spoke of a remarkably exact cardboard model of the complete church which a Monsieur Ferry had constructed according to directions given him by the citizens of Braine. Presumably Prioux's facade plan reflects the Ferry model, but it corresponds neither to Gencourt's drawings nor to

King's reconstruction. Moreover, if the model was a precise as Prioux said, then why did he not represent the west facade in elevation?\(^19\)

Because of their satisfying completeness, the King designs were cited and republished so many times that interest in reconstructing the west facade has ceased.\(^20\) As for the body of sculpted decoration which existed at Saint-Yved before the 1832 demolition, the above-mentioned fragments of a Coronation Portal and a tympanum representing The Inferno, this was described by Amedée Boinet as it appeared in 1908-1911 without knowledge of its original architectural context.\(^21\) All subsequent references to the Braine facade sculpture have been scattered and brief; it was observed but not researched.\(^22\) So the matter rested until the 1960's when the porch to the nineteenth century facade of Saint-Yved was dismantled by order of the Commission des Monuments Historiques, and the liberated Gothic sculpture employed to recreate the original Coronation Portal. This action was unquestionably a real breakthrough,

\(^19\) The location of Ferry's model today is not known. Building models of Saint-Yved still is a hobby at Braine; one large wood example, which the owner says he made, now reposes in a private garden near the Pension Ste.-Marie. It is very generalized and lacks a west facade.

\(^20\) See Lefèvre-Pontalis, Congrès Archéologique de France, I, 1911; most recently republished in Ministère des Affaires Culturelles, Principes d'analyse scientifique, Architecture, II, Paris, 1972, Chapter XIII.


\(^22\) Bibliographies are found in Musée du Louvre, Cathédrales, Paris, 1962, and W. Sauerlaender, Gothic Sculpture in France, 1140-1270, New York, 1972.
being the first example of a restoration of the west portals to be calculated from stones belonging to the old facade. Furthermore, the diligently restored Coronation Portal cast a dark shadow over King's 1857 reconstruction, assumed to be well anchored by nineteenth century documents, but this fact has not yet been realized. Here is eloquent proof that a modern approach to the demolished facade of Saint-Yved should be archaeological.

The study of the west facade which now follows resulted from three archaeological investigations made in 1969-1972. First, the old stones of the Braine Coronation were given a thorough physical examination before the new portal for them was completed in 1970, in order to assess the accuracy of that reconstruction. However, because the original stones constituted only one-half the tympanum, lintel and voussures, the iconography of the missing stones had to be determined by referring to contemporary Coronation Portals. The geographically closest of these, the Coronation Portal of Laon Cathedral, had been restored in the nineteenth century; thus, the cathedral's west portals were cleaned for the first time since that epoch so that the medieval stone could be properly examined, and the quality of the restoration evaluated. Finally, eight sites in the parvis of Saint-Yved were excavated, and five soundings were made inside the church to ascertain precisely what architectural elements from the demolished west facade still exist in situ. One could hope this new information, together with that gained from studying the Coronation sculpture, would lead to a complete reconstruction of one or all the west portals of Saint-Yved.
For the final presentation, indeed for the amalgamation of this material, it was necessary to begin by describing the excavated foundations of the Gothic facade, then reconstruct the Coronation Portal and, finally, the two lateral west portals. Thus the study has three divisions, each involving recovery and correlation of the facade stones. Nineteenth century documents and twentieth century scholarship are examined at each stage, but only after sufficient archaeological data has been accumulated to judge whether or not this information should be incorporated into a modern restoration of the west portals.

There are appendices relevant to both Saint-Yved and Laon Cathedral, Appendix A constituting an annal of the restoration at Braine from 1822 to 1853, and Appendix B, a catalogue of restored stones in the Coronation Portal at Laon. Illustrations for the study fall into two categories, photographs and scale drawings: those drawings prepared specifically for the thesis are referred to as "Plates" and are grouped together; all the other illustrations are called "Figures," except those pertaining to the restored Laon sculpture, which appear last and are catalogued according to Appendix B.

The conclusion of the thesis is concerned with reevaluating the historical position of the Gothic facade sculpture of Saint-Yved de Braine. The reason for this development, the author now is convinced, is that as a result of the 1832 demolition modern scholarship unwittingly has misjudged both the character and date of the fragmentary Braine portal sculpture, its attention perforce concentrated on existing portals of the same epoch at Sens, Laon, Chartres, Paris and Reims. Quite obviously the character of the Braine sculpture has eluded coherent
description; at best, the burlesque and the courtly are compounded in modern imagination. On the other hand, the date of the church so far has posed no noticeable problem for the dating of the sculpture: whereas architectural historians concur that Saint-Yved was begun ca. 1190-1195, other scholars believe the facade decoration was not carved before the first decades of the thirteenth century; thus, when correlated these views would signify that the building of Saint-Yved commenced on the east, and after the completion of the west facade, the church was consecrated in 1216. With respect to the current situation, the research relative to Saint-Yved to be presented here does, in the final analysis, introduce two subjects for the reader's consideration. First, it defines the intrinsic qualities of the sculpted west facade and perceives in them a specific achievement worthy of the celebrated age ca. 1200. Secondly, a new perspective of the church emerges which indicates the construction of Saint-Yved began on the west ca. 1190, and that the historical role of the Gothic facade would have been greater than heretofore realized.

CHAPTER I

EXCAVATION OF THE PARVIS OF SAINT-YVED DE BRAINE,
1971-1972

Sites I and II: General Observations

The parvis of Saint-Yved was formed in 1832 when the Gothic facade and four western nave bays of the church were demolished (Pl. I). This courtyard is located in front of a modern facade erected at the second nave bay from the crossing, and it is bounded on the north and south by aisle walls of the demolished nave bays, left standing to a height of 2.78m. Each aisle wall extends as far west as the opening for a stairwell in the narthex; and each rests upon a chamfered socle which is continuous throughout the church interior (Figs. 26, 40). These walls have nineteenth century additions on the west, linking the north wall to the west side of the Premonstratensian cloister, and the south wall to a modern presbytery and the wall enclosing the chateau of Braine.

The purpose of excavating the parvis of Saint-Yved in 1971-1972 was to determine precisely what part of the west portals of the Gothic facade still exists. To achieve this goal three directives were followed at the outset of the project. First, nineteenth century

24. On the north, 19.53m, on the south, 19.50m from the socle of the modern facade.
groundplans of the church superimposed on a plan of the modern courtyard revealed that today, one-half the area where the south portal and porch once stood lies beneath the garden and modern wall of the presbytery (Pl. II).  

But preliminary soundings in the garden uncovered no trace of this entrance, thus actual excavation was confined to the parvis itself. Preliminary soundings made inside the parvis also were useful guides: the north and south walls were found to be supported on medieval foundations which, near the center of the courtyard, had been demolished extensively; for this reason, all excavations were made tangent to one of the parvis walls. Finally, beneath the 6.38m-long modern extension of the north aisle wall lies the socle of the west wall of the north porch (Figs. 38-39).  

This landmark was the only one extant belonging to the Gothic facade, thus it was made the point of departure for the excavation. The socle, which has an ogee moulding 0.07m wide, begins 25.98m west of the modern facade's socle, at the angle where the porch joined the west wall of the Gothic facade. The socle course below most of this wall was destroyed in 1832; but inside the porch the socle

25. Plate II shows an excavation guide made in 1970 with the most precise of all the nineteenth century plans of Saint-Yved, the one published in Prioux's Monographie of 1859. Since the Prioux plan locates the north porch one meter too far west, it was redesigned to correspond with vestiges of the facade.

26. The extension became the south wall of a house constructed where the old north stairwell had been, and was eventually opened in the center for a garage door (now blocked-up).

27. The socle below the west wall of the Gothic facade originally extended 3.19m north of the porch socle. This was learned from a sounding at Site VIII, which uncovered medieval foundations for the socle course beneath the modern wall.
continues 1.60m eastward where, reaching the portal embrasures, it turns south toward the axis of the church. Thus, the depth of the destroyed north porch was precisely 1.53m. The top of the socle course has an incised groove along the outer edge marking the original line of the north wall of the porch, whereas the modern wall now above the socle was set back 0.135m in order to be aligned with the old north aisle wall. The exterior (porch) and interior (aisle) socles of the church were constructed on the same level—hereafter designated "height zero"—and the present level of the parvis corresponds roughly to this height (Fig. 29).

Site I was a rectangular trench 8 x 9 x 2.35m alongside the courtyard's north wall, extending from the narthex stairwell as far west as the socle of the west wall of the Gothic facade (Pls. III-IV, Figs. 27-30). Over this area had stood the north portal and one-half the central portal and narthex. The depth of the excavation was limited by the present water table at -2.35m, thus how Saint-Yved was constructed below this level is not known. Above the water table were found five distinct components of the structure of the Gothic church.28

The lowest of these is a remarkably solid, carefully constructed rubblework foundation made from rocks laid in courses between layers of orange-colored mortar (Pl. V, Figs. 31-32). Levels were maintained every 0.15-0.20m at -2.35m, -2.14m, -1.90m and -1.65m, each one having

28. The medieval structure of all sites excavated, both outside and inside the present church, was left intact as it was found, with the exception of some areas of rubblework below -1.65m in Sites I-II.
a hard crust of mortar. In general, the rubblework appears to have been prepared by cutting and chipping stone into rocks with two approximately flat surfaces to facilitate making level strata. These rocks vary in size from 0.95 x 0.50 x 0.25m to 0.12 x 0.14 x 0.04m and smaller, the largest ones employed for the lowest strata. The strata were disturbed during the 1832 demolition, however originally this rubble made a flat continuous bed at -1.65m larger than the facade itself. Thus, the left wall of the central porch was constructed on a bed 4.80m wide, or more than twice the width of the wall, and it extended 2.80m west of the north porch into Site II (Figs. 33-34).

The rubblework foundation at -1.65m supports a footing some 0.60m tall, the surface of which is a thick crust of the same orange-brown mortar employed for the rubble. The footing is composed of two courses of squared blocks of soft limestone at -1.63/1.72m and -1.03m. Some of these stones are re-used material because they are dressed and show traces of plaster. Probably this footing originally had formed a continuous bed at -1.03m. It projects 0.62m west of the facade's west wall, 1.20m from the aisle wall of the narthex, and can still be traced 3.78m in the area between the two walls of the north porch (Figs. 29, 35). 29

29. A grave had been dug in the footing of the north porch precisely, as it turned out, on the central axis of the portal (Pl. V, Figs. 36-37). A skeleton was found oriented on a stone of the footing, and since both the feet and skull were missing, it must have been disturbed during the demolition activity of 1832. Being 1.35m below the socle, the depth of this burial corresponds to thirteenth century burials on the interior of the church (Appendix A, letters of Curé Beaucamp dated March 11, 13, 14, 1826). In 1826 Beaucamp excavated the tombs of Count Robert II, his
Upon the footing at -1.03m were constructed the walls of the north porch and side-aisle (Figs. 29, 38-40). The base of these walls comprises three masonry courses of hard rectangular limestone blocks about equal in height and averaging 0.75m long: a rough-cut foundation which projects beyond the other courses (-0.69m), a course of dressed stone (-0.33m), and the wall socle (-0.00m).

Site II was a short extension of Site I west of the north and central porches, increasing the trench's dimensions to 12 x 9 x 2.35m (Figs. 41-47). Here the stratification changed radically. With the exception of the rubblework bed for the central porch which projects into this zone, as mentioned above (Figs. 33-34), the four meters excavated in front of the Gothic facade provided completely new elements for analysis. Some elements could be identified but others could not because the site proved too small to contain them; moreover, bad weather and a rising water table created impossible working conditions. As a result Site II remains a fragment defying accurate description.

Adjoining the western limits of the rubblework foundation for the north and central porches is a constructed stone surface, the boundaries

wife Iolande de Coucy, and his mother Agnes located in the choir at Saint-Yved. These burials were 2-3 ft. deep, thus 0.61-0.91m below the choir floor, which in 1826 was unpaved. Since the original paving of the north porch was 0.36m below that of the choir, the exterior burial in question was 0.99m deep (1.35-0.36m).

Beneath the footing at this point was found another skeleton resting on a wooden plank 2.35-2.40m deep (Pl. V). The feet lay under the footing and the rest of the body to the west. Beyond any doubt this burial took place before the Gothic church was built: the building was constructed over it, and the grave is much too deep to be associated with the church.
of which could not be determined since they lay outside the site except on the east (Pls. IV-H, V). Three courses of stone were found. The lowest, at -2.28m, may be the same course which exists beneath the facade at this level, however it lies underwater so one cannot be certain. The stones of the two superior courses at -2.08m and -1.90m are small (0.20-0.30m), either rounded or roughly shaped into squares and oblongs, and were set in light brown mortar. The courses themselves were not laid with thick strata of mortar.

All these elements of color, form and structure clearly represent a departure from the rubblework of the Gothic church, and they indicate the remains of an earlier building which may have been destroyed during 30.

The stone surface at H was not unified when discovered (Pl. IV). There was an incoherent section in the coursing at A; also, west of the rubblework foundations for the central porch (G) is a marginal strip at B containing numerous graves. When excavated this burial area lay 1.90m deep beneath a fill: it was a rectangular bed of white chalk about 4.00m wide from north to south, located 29.03-30.33m west of the modern facade. There were three graves at approximately equal depth, or -2.12: at C the bed contained chipped rocks of white limestone resting on a stone course (-2.29m); the stone coffin of a small child was placed at D; and at E, just north of the coffin, were found two skeletons. The feet of the only skeleton excavated were missing and evidently had been removed when the rubblework for the central porch was laid at G. The skull also was missing. Since the construction at H now covers the place where the skull would have been, this burial appears to date earlier than both surfaces G and H, and eventually was disturbed by both. See Figs. 43, 48-53.

West of this ensemble at F, scattered at random on a fill some 3.80m west of the Gothic facade wall, were found three square-cut limestone blocks of the same type employed for the footing of the Gothic church. Probably they were deposited here during the demolition of the footing (Fig. 53).
the epoch when the church was built. The fact that these old foundations actually join those of the Gothic facade unavoidably suggests that when the latter was constructed, its mass displaced a comparable area of the older structure. Precisely how much was displaced will never be known for, with the possible exception of the stone strata found everywhere at -2.30m, the Gothic facade was an entirely new fabric. Everything which had occupied the site previously was dismantled.

31. What the old building could have been remains a mystery. Surely one of the most pressing of all questions to resolve about medieval Braine is the location of the first collegiate church of Saint-Yved, which according to Carlier had been attached to the château since the VIIth century, and evidence for which Stanislas Prioux found in a so-called "Merovingian" capital that he said was discovered during the 1832 demolition in the foundations of the Gothic facade. See Claude Carlier, *Histoire du duché de Valois...*, III, 1764, p. 124; cited by Prioux, *Monographie*, pp. 5f (later called the "oratory of the Palatium Brennacum" in his *Répertoire archéologique*, 1863), and more recently by Broche and Sars, *Histoire de Braine*, 1933, p. 250. This old building is thought to have been occupied by the Premonstratensians arriving in 1130.

The earliest reference to capitals dating from an epoch before the Gothic church was built, a letter by the architect Monsieur Danjoy of March 21, 1840, classifies the stones as post-Carolingian (Appendix A, 1840). It follows that Prioux and Danjoy may not have been referring to the same stones.

In Prioux's day the so-called "Merovingian" capital was located in one of the south chapels of Saint-Yved and is represented in E. Fleury, *Canton de Braine*, I, fol. 33, where it is conveniently labeled "Merovingian." Two other capitals shown on Folio 33 are said there to have decorated the garden of the entrepreneur Brodin (Figs. 54-55), the same Monsieur Brodin who had the Burial of the Virgin transformed into an altarfrontal in 1838 (n. 60). Probably these are the capitals cited by Danjoy and they were deposited in Saint-Leger at Soissons during the 1960's. Obviously they are not Merovingian, so one must assume the original collegiate church was refurbished sometime in the XI-XIIth centuries. Indeed, the church may not have survived the destruction of the château in 931, in which case it was rebuilt at this epoch (cf. Broche and Sars, *op. cit.*, p. 250n). In sum, the two Soissons capitals did not come from the first collegiate church, but they may derive from a pre-Gothic rebuilding. The one for four columns must have belonged to a cloister.
Site I: The North Portal

The site where the north portal once was is now shamefully empty to have been the subject of an excavation. Of all the masonry once there, only two stones remain west of some rubble in the portal's left embrasure (Figs. 56-58). But if carefully studied these masses reveal a definite pattern which, because it sets severe limits on any attempted reconstruction of the groundplan and elevation of the portal, must be described in detail.

The north portal and porch uncovered in Site I cannot be regarded in isolation and understood. For this reason Sites III-VI were excavated, and later Site XI inside the church. However, certain fundamental observations are possible without referring to these other sites.

We recall that the depth of the north porch was 1.53m,\(^{32}\) thus the missing socle course of the left embrasure of the portal extended as far west as Line A, or 24.38m from the modern facade socle (Pls. V-VI). On Line A, at the corner where the socles of the porch wall and left embrasure joined, one stone of the embrasure socle was supported by a block of dressed stone which exists at B (-0.33m). West of Stone B lies a rough-cut stone of the foundation course at C (-0.69m). Behind these stones, to the east, the left embrasure of the portal was constructed on a footing (-1.03m) which supports orange-colored rubblework at E laid in two strata level with the masonry coursing of the porch wall (-0.69m, -0.33m). The surface of this rubblework is a semi-circular plateau level with Stone B at -0.33m, and it has a thick crust of orange-brown

\(^{32}\) Page 20.
mortar. At its maximum, Plateau E extends 1.25m from the original line of the porch's north wall toward the portal axis. Constructed on top of Plateau E is a small triangular-shaped rubble mass at F; Mass F now rises to -0.11/15m but originally was higher.

These meager elements of masonry and rubble permit us to make the following preliminary deductions concerning the plan and elevation of the north portal. First, to reconstruct the portal accurately, the outline of the socle course of the left embrasure must be determined. The primary evidence relative to this problem is the rubblework at Plateau E, lying behind and level with Stone B which carried a socle stone. Since rubble in the north portal embrasure would not have been visible, the entire surface of Plateau E at -0.33m originally was concealed: either it was faced with masonry, in which case the plateau carried rubble behind the embrasure wall; or it supported the left embrasure wall itself. This is the most important single fact gained from excavating the area of the north portal.

That Plateau E did support masonry of the left embrasure is proven by Mass F, rubblework lying diagonally across Plateau E in a straight line one meter long. This line could only have resulted from a formation against masonry which, resting at a depth of -0.33m, was beyond doubt the socle course.\textsuperscript{33} Therefore, the socle of the left embrasure wall was carried by at least one dressed stone at B and by Plateau E, which originally may have been larger; behind this masonry,

\textsuperscript{33} Similar formations were found in Site IV (Fig. 78, p. 37).
the wall was constructed of rubble represented today by Mass F. This information severely limits any reconstruction of the portal groundplan.

Secondly, Plateau E joins one prominent rectangular limestone block at J, located 0.46m deep and extending 1.53m from the old porch wall toward the portal axis. Because this stone is soft, irregular and small it could not have been masonry in the left embrasure. It must be identified as rubble, and thus originally was hidden from view. Stone J is another key limitation on any reconstructed groundplan of the north portal. At -0.46m it is too high to have carried masonry courses like those beneath the socle of the porch wall (-0.33 - 1.03m) inside the portal itself. Nor was Stone J faced with these courses some 0.35m thick on the south, because the left embrasure wall would have extended at least 1.83m toward the portal axis (1.53m + 0.35m). Beyond doubt this system never existed. Since the total span between the walls of the north porch was approximately five meters, the wooden door could have been no wider than 1.34m, or not even one-third (5.00m - 1.83m x 2). The wall courses beneath the socle of the north porch, therefore, did not exist inside the left portal.

Thirdly, the paving of the north porch—but not necessarily of the portal or church interior—would have had to exist between -0.33m and -1.03m, i.e., between the base of the socle course and the footing which supports the foundation course. Probably the pavement was no lower than -0.69m, otherwise the rough-cut foundation blocks of the porch wall would have been visible.

34. This dimension appears on the Gencourt plan of 1825.
If Stone J, discussed above, carried the paving of the left portal, then the pavement was level with the base of the embrasure socle at -0.33m, and it was 0.13m thick. In this case, the west entrance to the portal was introduced by two steps in the porch which filled a 0.36m-high space between the portal and porch pavements (-0.33 - 0.69m); and the steps would have been 0.18m tall (36 ÷ 2), a practicable possibility because those of the transept stairwells are 0.17-0.19m high.

**Fill III and the Gothic Church**

Sites I-II were found to contain three identifiable fillings. However in Site II, west of the Gothic facade, the stratification of the fillings was difficult to analyze because the site was too small; thus, only a few general observations are possible until the parvis is excavated further west toward the boundary of the Premonstratensian cloister. Beyond doubt Fill I and Fill II were deposited in the parvis after the 1832 demolitions.\(^35\) The major question is whether or not Fill III was discharged in Site II during the medieval construction campaign, and there is some tangible evidence that it was.

The first nineteenth century filling to be identified covered the area of Site I, thus it extended as far as the west wall of the Gothic facade and was deposited level with the church socle (Fig. 59). Fill I was a coarse orange-brown earth containing orange mortar, glass (modern), tiles, bones from destroyed graves and other broken-up material from the Gothic church. Most of the latter was unrecognizable but a few

\(^35\) Both XIXth century fillings were excavated completely.
architectural fragments originating from columns, capitals and vault nerves were salvaged. No decorative sculpture from the west portals was found.

Fill III lies in the area west of the north and central porches; except on the east, its limits are unknown as they exceeded Site II (Figs. 60-61). Fill III has two sections: one is clearly stratified and thus was discharged in layers; the other section is a mixed composition deposited at one time. These two sections appear to have been placed successively—the mixed filling on top of and beside the stratified—but during the same epoch. The stratified part of Fill III was the first to be deposited and it contains alternating bands of dark grey mud, orange sand and stone trimmings (Fig. 62). The lowest band rests at -1.89m above a constructed surface at A, which presumably had belonged to a pre-Gothic building once standing west of the church. In front of the north porch, this stratified fill extends three meters west of the footing and rises to -0.73m (B).
In the area of the central porch it attains only -1.33m (C), thus a second mixed filling was deposited here to -0.73m (D), and the mixed fill also occupied all the zone excavated west of the stratified section to a depth of -1.90m (Fig. 63).

Fill II, which dates after the 1832 demolition, was deposited over Fill III west of the Gothic facade (Figs. 60, 62). It was finer, cleaner and whiter than Fill I, because it contained trimmings from stones which probably were quarried from Saint-Yved and recut in the

36. Pages 22f.
nineteenth century building yard. Fill II was used to raise the height of Fill III from -0.74m to the level of the present parvis. Since -0.78m is a few centimeters lower than the foundation course of the north porch wall (-0.69m), and one can reasonably expect the thirteenth century parvis to have been near this level, probably Fill III was created during the medieval construction campaign. Furthermore, if Fill III had resulted from the 1832 demolition, then it would be difficult to explain when and why this filling was deeply excavated, as shown by Figure 64. Here the south wall of Sites I-II is represented as it would have looked soon after 1832: Fill I joins Fill II above the footing for the central porch at A; however west of this footing, Fill II was deposited in a hole excavated in Fill III at Lines B-C and C-D (-0.75 - 1.90m). Since line C-D corresponds roughly to the location of the left wall of the old central porch, this excavation probably occurred when the wall was dismantled. Thus, Fill III would have been deposited prior to 1832 at the epoch when Saint-Yved was constructed.

Site III: the South Portal

Sites I and II had proven that no wall masonry belonging to the central portal and porch remained in the middle of the parvis, so this area was not excavated. But one could expect to find foundations of the south portal and east wall of the Gothic facade against the courtyard's

37. Figure 65 represents the south wall of Sites I-II in its present state with additions since the parvis was created; an asphalt paving was inserted and at least two persons were buried at C-E, displacing the XIXth century filling.
south wall, thus Sites III and IV were opened here (Pl. III, Figs. 66-69). All depths excavated, as on the north and every subsequent site, were measured from the socle of the adjacent side-aisle wall.

The wall of the south side-aisle, now 2.79m tall, exists as far west as a stairwell entrance in the narthex, where the wall socle is 0.09m lower than its counterpart on the north. After the 1832 demolition, the aisle wall was extended 2.83m straight west of the stairwell, then some five meters diagonally northwest to enclose the garden of a modern presbytery. Since the presbytery wall was constructed on medieval foundations which otherwise would have been destroyed, it has had the beneficent effect of preserving vestiges of the Gothic church to this day. The same cannot be said of two recent, random additions on this side of the parvis: fortunately, the site of the south portal was not disturbed significantly by the placement of a metal trashbasket, its feet sunk into the ground with a large cement ball; but the anchorage for a modern lamppost destroyed an important section of rubblework behind the Gothic facade's east wall.

Site III was a rectangular trench with one short side against the presbytery wall and its long sides out in the parvis. Because the wall lies diagonally across the parvis, this trench actually reached 5.25m north of the south aisle wall, i.e. to the area where the left embrasure of the south portal joined the wall of the central porch. Site III exposed four strata of masonry and rubblework which unquestionably belonged to the structure of the south portal and porch of the Gothic facade, because all have identical counterparts on the north; therefore, a plan of Site III superimposed on Site I will permit
all the information relative to the foundations of the two lateral portals of the old west facade to be viewed at one time (Pl. VII, Figs. 70-71).

The footing for the medieval walls on the south was composed of two strata of soft squared limestone blocks and it had made a continuous bed at -1.44m and -1.08m (Pl. VII-E). Coming out from beneath the presbytery wall at a 90 degree angle to the south aisle wall was found Course C, lying above the footing at -0.70m. Course C was constructed of hard, rectangular rough-cut stones located on a line 5.12m west of the stairwell doorway in the narthex, and left intact as far as 3.84m north of the aisle wall. This masonry corresponds to the foundation course at the entrance to the north portal. Its east face—or back—was constructed against rubblework at B whose surface, a hard mortar bed, color and composition were identical with rubble found in Site I. Beyond doubt Surface B at -0.70m had carried a course of dressed stones: it is located on the same north-south line 4.86m west of the stairwell doorway as rubblework at -0.69m which supports a dressed block in the north portal embrasure (cf. Fig. 58). Finally, a layer of rubble at D had been constructed over Surface B to 0.38m below the socle; given the fact that the south aisle wall socle is 0.09m lower than the north, Course D is equivalent (-0.47m) on the north portal to Stone J at -0.46m. Therefore, the basic structure of the two lateral portals was identical.

Site III and the Three Portals of the West Facade

When the data concerning the south portal uncovered in Site III is compiled with information obtained about the north portal from Site I,
we are permitted to make the following conclusions about the groundplan and elevation of all three entrances in the west facade of Saint-Yvéd.38

One can reasonably state that, given the homogeneous character of this church, a structural system employed for both lateral portals also would have been used for the central entrance.

First let us consider the design of the portals, then the west porches. At the west opening of each portal, the two masonry courses used to support the socle of the porch wall were laid in straight lines between the porch walls (Pl. VIII). They did not carry the embrasure walls of the portal. The embrasure walls rested upon a socle course—the same as in the porch—supported by rubblework. Site III provides ample proof for this: at the entrance to the south portal, the foundation course (-0.70m) and the rubblework which had supported a course of dressed stone (-0.33m, missing) still exist on a line 3.84m straight north of the south aisle wall, or about one meter from the right wall of the central porch.

The stone base of the portal embrasures was a 0.33m-tall socle course carried by rubblework, and at least one dressed stone where the portal joined the porch walls (Pl. VI, Fig. 58). For the north portal this rubblework exists at Plateau E. Since no rubble would have been visible, any reconstruction of the north portal must design the socle of the left embrasure over the entire surface of Plateau E.

The pavement in the area between the portal embrasures was level with the base of the socle course lying on Plateau E at -0.33m (Pl. IX).

38. The north portal is discussed above, pp. 26f.
This paving was supported by a rubblework course constructed at -0.47m, rubble which is represented today by Stone J for the north portal and Course D on the south. The paving stones were 0.14m thick (-0.33 - 0.47m).

This conclusion was verified by Site XI shown in Figures 72-73. Site XI was opened at the threshold of the north transept door, which once lead into an area east of the monastery called the "court of honor" by Dom Martène in 1718. In fact, this little door appears beneath the transept windows in an engraving of Saint-Yved by Tavernier in 1789 (Fig. 12). The threshold is a single stone, very hard and richly veined like marble; it lies under the transept wall, so there can be no question about its authenticity. This stone has all the characteristics of the paving stones reconstructed for the west portals: at -0.33m it is level with the base of the socle course, which remains constant throughout the church; it is 0.14m thick (-0.33 - 0.47m); and it is supported by rubblework. Beyond any doubt the threshold stone was a step because it is worn down in the center of the side leading into the transept, thus the pavement in the transept was level with the door threshold. These facts clearly signify that the paving of the church interior from the transept westward through the portals was level.

40. Laborde, Voyages pittoresques, VI, Pl. XXXIV.
41. See also p. 36.
With regard to the three west porches of the facade, we recall that two masonry courses at the entrance to each portal spanned the entire width of the porch and did not carry walls (Pl. VIII, Fig. 58). The course of dressed blocks at -0.33m is aligned with the portal embrasures, whereas the foundation course at -0.69m extends some 0.30-0.40m into the porch. This masonry must have served some important function; and the only logical explanation for its presence here is that the course of dressed stone functioned as a step attaining the level of the portal paving at -0.33m. More precisely, it was the support against the back of one short stone course making a step, which lay on top of the foundation course and concealed the rough-cut blocks from view (see Pl. X). Since there is a space 0.36m high between the foundation course and the portal paving (-0.33 - 0.69m), the step would have risen one-half this distance, or 0.18m. The course of dressed stones behind the step made a second step. Two steps 0.18m tall also are practicable because those in the transept stairwells are 0.17-0.19m high.

The pavement of the west porches was level with the base of the first step leading into the portals at -0.69m, thus level with the foundation course of the porch walls which it concealed from view. The visible masonry base for the facade and porch walls, terminated by a moulded socle, was 0.69m tall (Pl. X).

The East Wall of the Facade: Site IV

Site I was sufficient proof that the east wall of the facade—the narthex wall—had been completely destroyed in the area of the nave, but that one would find its foundations supporting the walls of the
parvis. However, vestiges of the northwest angle of the narthex found in Site I were quite incomprehensible; they had been severely damaged when the waterline was laid for a house constructed inside the old north stairwell (Fig. 74). Thus, Site IV was opened alongside the south wall of the parvis in order to expose the narthex's southwest corner, and it was a rectangular trench 1.54m wide extending 3.00m west of the south stairwell doorway, or 22.50m from the modern facade socle (Pl. III).

The medieval foundations beneath the south aisle wall and its modern extension were found to be identical with those of the north porch and aisle walls (Pl. XI, Figs. 75-79). The uppermost strata of the footing for the narthex has a hard crust of orange-brown mortar at -1.09m which supports three masonry courses: a rough-cut foundation which is 0.37m wider than the wall (-0.69m), a course of dressed stone (-0.35m), and the chamfered socle of the aisle wall.

At the east wall of the narthex stairwell, the socle turned south into a corridor leading to the stairs (Pl. XI-A). The two masonry courses below the socle continued west to support the angle pier of the narthex, thus the threshold of the south stairwell was the course of dressed stone lying at -0.35m.42 Because its edge (partly broken) was not worn down, this course was not a step leading from the side-aisle into the stairwell. It had been level with the narthex paving, therefore the pavements in the narthex and west portals originally were on the same level (-0.33-0.35m).

42. Figure 77.
The pier foundations in the southwest corner of the narthex began 0.82m west of the east wall of the stairwell at B. The demolished pier was supported on the same two masonry courses which lie under the socle of the aisle wall, but laid at a 45 degree angle to the south wall.\footnote{43} One wedge-shaped stone remained from each course projecting out from beneath the nineteenth century wall: to the west of the dressed block at -0.35m was a hard mortar bed 0.69m deep where a second wedge of the same course had been lying prior to 1832;\footnote{44} beyond this empty space was rubblework, and an identical pattern existed on the level of the foundation course. The missing socle of the southwest angle pier of the narthex, therefore, originally had rested on two blocks of dressed stone at -0.35m.

Some mortar beneath the socle still exists on the surviving dressed stone, and it forms a thick crust 0.37m high extending 1.89m west of the stairwell's east wall (C-D). At this point the crust joins another, slightly higher mortar bed separated from the first by a low ridge (D-E): the ridge is none other than the mortar joint between the socle and another missing block of stone which belonged to the east wall of the facade. The mortar bed for the facade wall continues 2.44m west of the stairwell, where it is terminated by rubblework constructed behind the wall, still intact to the height of the aisle socle.\footnote{45} The stone masonry of the facade's east wall, thus, was 0.55m thick at this level (2.44-1.89m).

\footnote{43}{Figure 76.}
\footnote{44}{Figure 78.}
\footnote{45}{Figure 79.}
The precise location of the opening to the south portal in the east wall of the facade is not known. A hole dug for the modern lamppost destroyed the only means of tracing the old groundplan today, rubblework constructed behind the facade wall. However, this rubblework still exists as far as 1.10-1.20m north of the south aisle wall to Line F; thus adding a masonry facing to the rubble at F, the facade wall would have extended a minimum of 1.50m north of the aisle wall before it turned west into the south portal (1.10m + 0.40m).

Summarizing the data uncovered in Site IV, the following may be concluded about the east wall of the facade. Mortar and rubblework revealed that the facade wall rose behind the pier in the southwest angle of the narthex at 1.89m west of the east wall of the narthex stairwell. Its minimum extension toward the church axis was 1.50m. Whether or not this wall had a socle is not known from the excavation; however, like the embrasures of the north portal, it was constructed on rubblework below the level where a socle course would have been (-0.35m). Having determined the location of the facade's east wall, we now know that the narthex bay was 5.64m long on the south side of the church, or 0.14m longer than the standard nave bay (5.50m); the side-aisles being 5.64m wide, the aisle bays in the narthex were square.

Sites IV-VI: The Angle Piers of the Narthex

The mortar and rubblework of Site IV had spoken eloquently enough.

46. This rubblework is supported by the footing at -1.09m and extends 1.39-1.54m toward the south portal axis (Fig. 76).
47. The missing nave bays can be measured accurately from window mouldings still extant in the south aisle wall of the parvis (Pl. I).
But the form of the masonry foundation below the southwest narthex pier was not sufficiently clear to reconstruct the damaged angle pier on the northwest, thus it was necessary to excavate Site V and Site VI (Pl. III). Site V was a trench 5.96m long against the south wall of the parvis, extending from the stairwell to the southeast aisle pier of the narthex. The masonry foundation for both the narthex pier and aisle wall were found perfectly intact and the coursing was identical with that in all the other sites (Pl. XII, Figs. 80-83): the footing supported a rough-cut foundation, a course of dressed stone, and the socle. On Lines A-B and C-D the course of dressed stone beneath the pier socle turned at a 45 degree angle to the south wall, creating a broad polygonal surface in the form of a truncated triangle. This surface was composed of three wedge-shaped stones: one at each extremity was inserted beneath the south wall, and a large transverse wedge lay parallel to the wall. The foundation blocks, of course, had the same form.

Site VI uncovered remains of the first pier east of the narthex in the north aisle (Pl. XII, Figs. 84-85). This pier had the same type of foundations as the pier in Site V, except the inner core supporting the center of the pier socle was composed of rubblework, not masonry. Rising above these foundations would have been four colonettes and one column, the standard aisle pier at Saint-Yved (Fig. 86).48 Two colonettes at each side received the wall formeret and a vault rib, whereas a column on the axis between the bays received the transverse arch.

48. The wall pier between the fourth and fifth bays of the north aisle.
As comparative plans of the three side-aisle pier foundations uncovered in Sites IV-VI show, all these foundations were constructed with wedges (Pl. XII). In Site IV, the surface receiving the socle of the southwest narthex pier formed half a truncated triangle; the extant Stone B would have joined a second missing wedge, Stone BB, which lay partially beneath the facade wall; thus, the form of Stone BB was like the missing wedges in Site VI, because empty spaces for these stones are shaped similarly.

Now let us return to Site I and the badly damaged remains of foundations for the northwest angle pier of the narthex (Figs. 40, 74). Here it is important to note that the two masonry courses above the wall footing remain intact as far west as 1.11m from the north stairwell wall, and foundations for the angle pier would have been still further west. These foundations can be reconstructed by superimposing the plans of Site I and Site IV as in Plate XIII. This system reveals that the pier foundations at the northwest corner of the narthex lay not less than 0.26m west of those beneath the southwest angle pier. Furthermore, that a large damaged stone at -0.34m (A) probably is the remains of a wedge-shaped dressed block restored at B; and the missing wedge at this level, Stone C, would have been triangular.\(^{49}\) Therefore, the two wedges were shaped like those uncovered in Site V.

As damaged as it is, Site I proves that the northwest and southwest angle piers of the narthex were very small masses. Theoretically the

\(^{49}\) Stone D at -0.11m is modern rubble installed to support the XIXth century wall.
angle piers would have been composed of three colonettes (Pl. XIV): one for the vault rib and one to receive the formeret of each wall surface. To have space for such a pier above the foundations at the northwest angle of the narthex, the facade wall must be restored here 0.13m further west than on the south side of the church. Since decreasing the bulk and complexity of the angle piers would eliminate this north-south misalignment of the facade wall, one may wish to argue that the piers had only two colonettes, not three, thus the east wall of the facade did not have formerets over the lateral portals. However, the fact that the southwest angle pier foundations are much more extensive than those on the north is sufficient evidence that three colonnetes did exist at each angle of the narthex (Pl. XIII).

The Excavation of the West Facade: Conclusion

The 1832 demolition of the west facade of Saint-Yved was restricted because the parvis had to be walled off from private properties flanking the church on the north and south. Thus the side-aisle walls were left standing as far west as the narthex, and modern westward extensions were constructed above foundations belonging to the Gothic facade. The entire facade cannot be traced from these foundations today, but a significant part of its groundplan and elevation has been reconstructed accurately.

Beyond doubt the most provocative aspect of the data made available by excavating the parvis is the fact that it was not recorded previously by any document concerning Saint-Yved, not even those made before the 1832 demolition, thus our knowledge of the old church indeed
has been increased. The only detailed drawings of the lost facade known to have been measured from the actual church are those by Monsieur Gencourt (1825), Thomas King (1857) and Stanislas Prioux (1859).\textsuperscript{50} As Plate XV illustrates, all the old groundplans mislocated the northwest corner of the Gothic facade.\textsuperscript{51} But of more importance to a study of the three west entrances, none of the varying nineteenth century plans of the north portal corresponds to the excavated area of the left embrasure, where masonry and rubblework which supported the socle course still exist. Therefore, the original groundplan of the lateral portal embrasures still remains to be clarified.

The elevation of the Gothic facade in early drawings also was represented inaccurately. Whereas there were two steps inside the west porches in front of the portal embrasures, the Gencourt elevation shows only one preceding the central porch (Fig. 15), and no steps at all appear in King's elevation (Fig. 22). With regard to the visible base supporting the facade and porch walls, two masonry courses and a moulded socle originally rose 0.69m above the pavement of the porches, and the socle was continuous inside the west portals. Neither

\textsuperscript{50} See further discussion of these drawings on pp. 82ff, 98ff, 102ff. we recall that the Gencourt designs have not been published but were known in the mid-nineteenth century, whereas those by King have been adopted by most scholars and widely disseminated.

\textsuperscript{51} In Plate XV the XIXth century plans were measured from the existing axis of the first aisle pier east of the facade's east wall. This may appear arbitrary since, for example, the extant wall of the north stairwell also could have served as a point of departure. However, there is no way one can align these documents so that they will correspond with vestiges of the Gothic facade; moreover, to eliminate any question about the obvious discrepancies between the old plans of the north portal and its actual remains, the plans were superimposed on the site in every reasonable manner.
of these facts was recorded by Gencourt and King, in whose drawings the base is short (some 0.30m) and completely unrelated to the structure of the portal embrasures.

The historical significance of Thomas King's drawings of 1857 is that they represent the first attempt to reconstruct the lost facade of Saint-Yved after the 1832 demolition. The difficulties King faced, even with the aid of the Gencourt drawings, is proven by numerous discrepancies between his designs and the church itself. It is not surprising that excellent engravings of the extant building published only two years later in Prioux's *Monographie* include a new groundplan of the west facade, raising questions about those of 1825 and 1857, and a reconstruction of the facade elevation was omitted altogether. Thus above all, the excavation of the parvis revealed the necessity of studying the facade's extant stones, not nineteenth century documents, in order to determine the precise measurements of the west portals of Saint-Yved. Having gained this new vantage point, let us turn now to the actual rebuilding of the Coronation Portal in 1970, because it was the first example of a restoration of the west portals to be made from original stones of the Gothic facade.
CHAPTER II
RECONSTRUCTION OF THE ORIGINAL CORONATION PORTAL

The Coronation Portal Reconstructed in 1970

In 1963 the Commission des Monuments Historiques decided to have the nineteenth century porch dismantled and reconstruct the Coronation Portal of Saint-Yved inside the church behind the central door. Since Amedée Boinet's study in 1911, everyone had been aware that the nineteenth century porch contained twenty sculpted figures from the Tree of Jesse of the original Coronation Portal, the central portal of the Gothic facade, arranged in two rows and inserted at random into the vault of the porch (Fig. 3). Two more voussure figures were on display inside the church, along with the head of a statue-column(?); the Virgin and Christ from the tympanum were housed in two blocked-up choir windows; and one-half the lintel, depicting the Burial of the Virgin, had been the altarfrontal in the Chapel of the Virgin since 1838. All these elements, except the head, were to be re-united in the modern reconstruction. Also it was decided that certain other

52. The project was inspired by the Louvre exhibition "Cathédrales" in 1962 where Monsieur Pierre Pradel had assembled the three extant stones from the old tympanum, dispersed since 1832. A permanent form was proposed after the exhibition by inspecteur-général Jacques Dupont who requested the Coronation Portal be reconstructed (Archives Monuments Historiques, "Saint-Yved de Braine," letter of May 2, 1963).
parts of the nineteenth century porch should be rehabilitated (Fig. 4)—four columns and capitals, one abacus, two corbel figures and a frieze—because they undoubtedly were medieval, and it was thought that at least some had once belonged to the Coronation Portal.

The Architect-on-chief, Monsieur Maurice Berry, was charged with designing the new portal and Claude Machin, Chef de chantier of the Entreprise Quelin at Soissons, was to construct it. After removing the sculpture from the nineteenth century porch, however, Machin examined the curved form of each voussure stone and discovered that the twenty stones originally had belonged to four separate arcs with diminishing radii. Until this time (1968) the new portal was planned with two rows of voussures like the nineteenth century porch. Now all that was changed; in fact, Monsieur Machin's astute observations produced the final design for the Coronation Portal as rebuilt in 1969-1970 (Figs. 6-8).

This was the first example of the restoration of a west portal of Saint-Yved to be calculated from stones of the Gothic facade. The actual process of this reconstruction deserves to be discussed at length in order that the admirable verisimilitude of Machin's design can be fully understood and appreciated. However, in view of the very real difficulty of rebuilding a portal when only one-half the tympanum, lintel and voussures were extant and nothing at all was known about the original embrasure design, the 1970 restoration was not complete. Thus its lacunae will be the subject of following chapters, where the author tries to resolve certain problems crucial to restoring the old Coronation Portal in its entirety.
Monsieur Machin began his design of the Coronation Portal by determining the original number of voussure rows, which was four, and by consigning each of the twenty-two extant voussure stones to one of four arcs of a circle in the following manner (Fig. 6). Nineteen of the twenty-two figures were seated within the vine scroll of the Tree of Jesse, and the Tree of Jesse originally had comprised three voussure rows. This fact was obvious because two stones flanking the central axis on three rows could be identified, the vine of each row having terminated at the axis with a distinctive foliage design. The axial stones also provided examples of the curves of three voussure rows, thus the thirteen other stones extant from the Tree of Jesse were distributed in rows by matching their curves with these examples. A fourth row, the outer voussure with the largest radius, was easy to spot since the three extant stones had no vine.

The innermost row of the Tree of Jesse, the arc with the smallest radius, contained six extant figures whose scrolls, with one exception, had born legible names in 1911 when Boinet studied them. Since the coloration of the scrolls dates before the 1832 demolition, beyond any doubt it reflects the original order of these stones which, according to the names, followed St. Matthew's chronology for Christ's ancestors.

54. Page 72, n. 93.
This iconographic information also was interpreted as a clue to the original number of voussure stones in the portal, although the question was not resolved until the width of the tympanum had been determined. Monsieur Machin reasoned that if Row I were said to contain eight figures instead of the six extant, then the second row would have had ten, the next row twelve, and the outer fourteen. Added together this would produce a total of forty-four voussure figures, one-half of them extant. Of this number, the outermost fourteen could be subtracted because the figures were not sculpted with a vine scroll, leaving thirty ancestors of Christ in the original Tree of Jesse. Such a restored configuration would be exactly like the Coronation Portal at Laon Cathedral, so it was temporarily adopted on the evidence of painted names at Saint-Yved. From this viewpoint the iconographic structure of the Braine Tree of Jesse appeared chronological, the most recent ancestors after the Babylonian Captivity being physically closest to the tympanum and Christ.

The tympanum and lintel of the Coronation Portal were reconstructed next, then the proposed number and pattern of the voussure stones was

55. The unusual spelling of Sadoch (Greek and Latin "Sadoc," Hebrew "Zadok") could date to the Middle Ages; one example from the XIIIth century, in the Evangelia of William of Hales at the British Museum, is dated 1254.

56. The name "Eleazar" was not visible in 1911 since Boinet does not mention it; however, this stone unquestionably followed Eliud because it flanked the other side of the central axis.

57. Boinet misread Matthan as "Joatham;" this is a chronological error, probably showing that most of the paint already had worn off.
verified. The arc of the lower right half of the tympanum, a large stone sculpted with an angel standing behind a column, had been lodged at Soissons since 1832 (Fig. 88). The radius of this arc and that of the innermost voussure row was the same, proof the two arcs originally were in contact. Thus there had been only four voussure rows; a fifth row with little angels against the tympanum at Laon and Chartres was omitted at Braine.

The tympanum originally had contained a lobed arc like other Coronation Portals at Senlis, Mantes, Laon and Chartres. Each of the three extant stones from the tympanum—Christ, the Virgin and the Soissons Angel—still had traces of a small arc which had been chiselled away when the Coronation Portal was dismantled and these stones put on display. More precisely, on the Christ stone one could see the joint of two small arcs in the upper righthand corner (Figs. 89, 92): one arc rose leftward over Christ's head toward the Virgin; the other extended toward the right side of the tympanum. The Soissons stone proved the lateral arc had been supported by the capital of a column, which explained the function of columns in the tympanum, because part of the original moulding remained intact above the capital (Figs. 94-95). However, the Soissons Angel and Christ never were tangent; the latter stone being much taller, these figures had been separated by a third now missing.

Since one stone from the base of the tympanum was missing on the

58. The top lefthand surface of the Virgin's stone showed the same pattern, but too damaged to be measured (Fig. 93).
right side, and only one extant on the left, the width of the Coronation
tympanum had to be calculated by matching traces of the right lobe of
the arc inside the tympanum found on Christ's stone with the arc's
moulding on the Soissons stone. This operation separated Christ and
the angel at a proper distance, produced one-half the tympanum (2.00m),
and a tri-lobed arc above the figures. The design was verified when
the combined lengths of the four voussure stones proposed for each side
of Row I added up to the height of the reconstructed tympanum.\textsuperscript{59} The
other three rows, divided into ten, twelve and fourteen stones of
appropriate length for each row, also fitted this pattern. None of
the rows originally had keystones.

Thus it was established that the original tympanum had contained
six figures: Christ and the Virgin, one angel at each corner standing
behind a column which supported a lobed arc, and two other figures
(both missing) between the end pieces and the center. That four of
these were standing angels was proven by the Virgin's stone (Figs. 90-
91); cut down at the left side, it had represented an angel swinging a
censor because a wing, an arm, the censor and right foot still remain.
Christ's stone was cut down on the right side, but it once had been
large enough to contain an angel at his side, making a total of four
stones at the base of the tympanum.

\textsuperscript{59} Unexpected verification of the eight figures proposed for Row I
came at the very moment the voussures were being rebuilt. I happened
to be digging at the base of the southwest lantern pier and found the
fragment of a left shoulder supporting a scroll (Fig. 87). This had
been a voussure figure which, because of its size, was identified as
the fourth on the righthand side of Row I. The shoulder was noticeably
larger than those of the scroll-bearing figures on Row IV.
Now that the dimensions of the tympanum and voussures were established the Coronation lintel could be reconstructed. Beyond doubt the base of the tympanum originally was level with the abacus blocks of the capitals supporting the voussures; thus, the portal had had a dropped lintel 1.11m tall. Otherwise, had the lintel been elevated wholly or even partially into the tympanum zone, the tympanum would have risen higher than the arc produced by the combined lengths of four voussure stones at each side of Row I. This situation would have necessitated adding two more stones to Row I (and every other row), a virtual impossibility because the additional stones would have dropped below the lintel.

The form of the Gothic Coronation Portal of Saint-Yved now was restored except in the area of the embrasures. However, the embrasures could not be reconstructed accurately because none of the original elements were extant. Thus in order to rebuild the Coronation, it was decided that four columns from the nineteenth century porch should be

60. The lintel played a minor role in rebuilding the Coronation Portal because the extant lefthand stone depicting the Burial of the Virgin is but the fragment of a rectangular block and contains only figures. For this reason it could not be used to determine the width of one-half the tympanum (Figs. 97-100). The stone, measuring 1.825m wide, was installed as the altarfrontal of the Chapel of the Virgin in 1838 by the entrepreneur Brodin, a fact which came to light when the altar was dismantled because the name and date were penciled on the back. Brodin had added eight small porous stones to the ends of the lintel fragment to make it fit the dimensions of the altar, giving the baroque effect of one long stone and two curved end pieces. The ends and background of the lintel were painted blue so they would appear to be all of one piece.

61. Dropped voussures at this epoch are very rare indeed; those in the Saint Ann Portal of Notre-Dame at Paris resulted when the disparate designs of two periods of construction were combined.
incorporated into the new portal even though their provenance was not known. This decision created two problems significant enough to alter radically the verisimilitude of the restoration. First, the capitals and bases of these columns measure only 0.32m², whereas the profile of each voussoir row requires a surface 0.39m wide and 0.44m deep. Such a large surface could only be obtained by building the embrasure walls outward in a chevron pattern to extend the capitals (Fig. 7).

The second problem concerned the support of these columns. Their shafts are 0.21m in diameter and 3.05m tall; the column complete from abacus to base, 3.65m. Obviously the Coronation tympanum had been higher, the dropped lintel alone requiring 1.11m, thus the column bases were placed 1.27m above the present floor of the church on the socle of a wall (Fig. 8). The 0.33m-tall socle was copied from the extant socle of the left wall of the north porch, and the 0.94m-high wall borrowed from the nineteenth century porch. Added together these assorted elements now elevated the tympanum 4.92m above the floor, a reasonable estimate but not a true restoration of the original embrasure design.

The Original Tympanum

Having reviewed the process of reconstructing the Coronation Portal in 1969-1970, the reader is now familiar with the Coronation stones and will be interested to know whether or not the old portal was, in fact, rebuilt as accurately as possible with the exception of the embrasure design. The subject of the embrasures is a special problem which will be examined later; our immediate concern is to verify and, in some instances, to complete the design of the tympanum,
lintel and voussures of the Coronation.

The original width of the tympanum was the most critical of all elements to be established when the Coronation Portal was rebuilt because three large sections of the base were missing. How the width finally was calculated has been explained above. But while the portal was actually being built it was discovered that both the large central stones, for Christ and the Virgin, had trench-shaped holes cut into their top surfaces. The holes had been used to lift these stones and exist also for some voussure figures. Each hole measured 0.135-0.14m wide, its center being 0.565m from that side of the stone which was not cut down after 1832. Because a stone's weight would have been distributed equally on both sides of this center when it was being lifted (0.565m x 2), originally both the Christ and Virgin stones had been approximately 1.13m wide at the top before the Coronation Portal was dismantled and the stones were cut down. The three straight sides of the Soissons angel stone are not parallel, thus these two central stones were trapezoids. Now if a tympanum is designed with two central trapezoids each 1.13m wide at the top, and two corner stones which reproduce the profile of the Soissons Angel, the result is a tympanum 3.96m wide at the base (Pl. XVI).

The veracity of this design, however, is not confirmed by the fact that traces of the lobed arc inside the tympanum on Christ's stone match perfectly with those above the capital of the Soissons stone.

62. The moulding of the lobed arch originally was chamfered. This form was difficult to re-establish and necessitated making a small model (Fig. 96). Monsieur Jean Liger, who made the model for me, discovered the chamfered form, which also had been deduced by Monsieur Machin.
As Plate XVII illustrates, the right lateral lobe can be traced equally well in a tympanum designed 4.05m wide. For this reason, when the tri-lobed arc was used to determine the tympanum's width in 1969, the resulting design was not theoretically accurate. Fortunately a definitive test does exist: the exterior moulding of a tympanum drawn 4.05m wide automatically will separate from the interior architecture supported on columns (Pl. XVII-Point A, Fig. 102). This test proves the minimum width of the old Coronation tympanum was 3.96m as drawn above and its maximum 4.00m, or the size actually rebuilt in 1970.

The matter of the width having finally been settled, the question of the missing figures of the tympanum is solved. On the lefthand side, the fragmentary foot next to the Virgin proves this angel stepped toward the Virgin just as the Soissons Angel advanced toward Christ (Figs. 88, 90). A walking movement requires 0.31m for the feet and drapery of the Soissons Angel and a space 0.326m wide for the Virgin's angel, which was a larger figure. Since there are only 0.265m available for the feet of the angel at the right beside Christ, this figure necessarily would have been standing and not walking.

The Coronation tympanum at Saint-Yved is represented in Plate XVIII with all the missing parts restored. One angel at each corner steps forward bearing a candlestick. The third and fourth angels carry censors; but the

63. See n. 71.
64. The feet of these angels vary in size about one centimeter.
one near the Virgin walks forward to cense the central figures, whereas
the other stands quietly beside Christ. This asymmetric arrangement
makes it quite clear that the humble, gracious Mary was the center of
attention in the Braine portal, her bowed head echoed in the arc above
and by a sweeping movement of the angel's wing beside her. Christ was
made important by virtue of contrast, both he and his attendant angel
being erect and motionless. Since the Palace of Heaven is placed above
a continuous row of clouds, and so is the lintel depicting the Burial
and Resurrection of the Virgin, the difference between this world and
ours below is well marked. 65

The Coronation tympanum at Braine was iconographically symmetrical
like all the other Coronations of that day, so both angels beside
Christ and the Virgin would have carried censors because one of them
does, the left. The attribute of the angels at the extremeties was
more difficult to restore, with one figure missing and the attribute of
the Soissons Angel broken. However, the column shaft of the Soissons
Angel has a round boss on its surface near the angel's right arm, thus
the attribute once made contact here (Fig. 101). Another long thin boss

65. Regarding the row of clouds at the base of the tympanum, there is
a section 0.23m wide missing on the central axis: i.e. two holes 0.10m³
exist in the moulding of each stone beside the axis, and both are
original and well-formed (Figs. 104-106). The missing stone could only
have been a cloud 0.22-0.24m wide like all the others; it was inserted
into the hole to avoid having a joint in the clouds at the central axis.
For this reason, the possibility that the lintel contained a small column
must be dismissed. Moreover, because the two lintel scenes were
enframed by clouds above and below, a lonely column which reposed on
clouds would have been unconventional.
exists straight above the first, on the corner of the capital (Fig. 102). Of the two objects this angel and its counterpart might have been carrying—a censor or a candlestick—only a candlestick held in the angel's right hand could explain these two bosses on the column. The candlestick would have had to be slender and tall enough to touch the capital, yet its base light enough to be carried with one hand; thus, the candlestick imitated the type in the Coronation Portal at Senlis (Fig. 103).

The Original Profile of the Voussure Rows

One important correction now must be made to the 1970 reconstruction of the Coronation Portal which concerns the original profile of the voussure rows. First, let us recall that when the nineteenth century porch was built, its vault was designed much lower and narrower than any arc of the old Coronation Portal had been (Fig. 3). And, of course, the tunnel form of the new porch vault was ill-suited to receive the Coronation voussure stones because four arcs with different radii had to be fitted into one. To create a completely new curve, the old curves either were destroyed or concealed in the following manner. The original moulding on the short curve of each stone—the side facing the tympanum—was cut off so that the voussure could be reshaped (Pl. XIX-A); then the moulding of the long curve was inserted into the porch vault, and thus it was saved from certain destruction.

When this porch was dismantled in order to rebuild the Coronation Portal, the twenty voussure stones therein were found to require a masonry surface 0.39m wide and 0.44m deep stood on end. Unfortunately
the embrasure walls for the new portal were constructed according to these dimensions, as mentioned above (Fig. 7). But two voussure stones which had been put on display inside the church after the demolition of the facade in 1832, and were never used in the nineteenth century porch, still had their original profiles: Stones 2 and 3 on Row III of the reconstructed Coronation Portal (Pl. XIX-B). Of these two Stone 3 still is in perfect condition, and it proves that originally each voussure row required a surface 0.39m² above the abacus of the embrasure capital, and thus capitals 0.39m², not a surface 0.39m x 0.44m. Moreover, that the Gothic roll moulding of the inner curve of the voussure stones was small and quite flat compared to the big moulding cut for twenty figures inserted into the nineteenth century porch.

**The Original Distribution of the Voussure Stones by Row**

The reconstruction of the voussures of the Coronation Portal in 1970 primarily involved placing the twenty-two remaining stones into one of four rows. Of these, the outer row with three extant figures seated outside the Tree of Jesse was clearly marked. So was Row I, where six figures carry scrolls with painted names, as discussed above. The real problem was sorting out the other thirteen figures belonging to Rows II and III. One method for distributing the figures is to calculate the radius of each row, then classify the stones according to

66. Pages 50f.
67. See Figs. 122-123.
to these radii (Pl. XX). But the radius of a handmade arc is
impossible to measure exactly; thus the more precise the method used,
the more inaccurate is the result. For example, using the formula

\[
\frac{4 \times \text{height} + \text{chord}}{8 \times \text{height}}
\]

for the radius, a mistake of 0.01m in measuring
the height can produce an error of 0.33m in the radius.

A far more effective way to deal with the radius—and the one
actually used to rebuild the Coronation Portal—is not to calculate it
from the stones at all, but distinguish rows simply by the different
heights of their curves, i.e. by the degree of roundness or flatness of
the arc (Pl. XXI). The arc with the shortest radius will be the highest
above its chord, and the largest arc will be the lowest: Row I = 0.039m,
Row II = 0.03m, and Row III = 0.025m. This method is accurate and
simple in theory, but it requires either a very "good eye" or precise
measurements.70

Also it should be noted that the length of the voussure stones
diminishes as the arcs become larger; averages for the outer (long)
chord are Row I = 0.98m, Row II = 0.90m, and Row III = 0.85m. Likewise,

68. Calculus.
69. These numbers do not apply to stones flanking the central axis
of the portal; they are longer than average, thus their arcs are
higher than average. For this reason axial stones are not as useful
as other stones in determining the curvature of an arc; see above, p.
70. The examination is prolonged by stones in poor condition. Of
the twenty-two extant voussure stones, nine had the original scoring at
both ends, but five of these were damaged at critical points (Fig. 107,
n. 75); six were scored on one end only, and seven had been cut down at
both ends. The original fine pink mortar, easily distinguished from
a coarse white mortar used in the XIXth century, still adhered wherever
the ends had not been reworked, or were recut only slightly to fit the
vault of the XIXth century porch.
the figures become shorter: Row I = 0.83m, Row II = 0.79m, and Row III = 0.76m. There are, of course, a few exceptional stones which defy all these rules.

The twenty-two extant voussure stones of Saint-Yved are represented in Plate XVI exactly as they are arranged today in the rebuilt Coronation Portal. The classification of each voussure stone by row in 1970 was verified by this drawing in the following manner. The height and chord of the outer curve of four "model stones", their original lengths unchanged (Row I-2, Row II-3,7, Row III-3), were reproduced according to actual measurements; then after painstaking examination, each remaining stone was classified according to these models.\textsuperscript{71} The radii of the voussures were calculated every 0.39m (plus mortar) from the original width of the tympanum, or 3.96m as discussed above.\textsuperscript{72}

There are four stones in the Tree of Jesse which are exceptional (Pl. XXIII). Of this group only Stone 8 of Row II can be better designed somewhere else, on Row I of the Tree, because its arc is higher than the ordinary. However, this figure could not have belonged to Row I since all four places on the right side of Row I are filled already, there being three figures extant and a shoulder of the fourth.\textsuperscript{73} As for Stone 4 in Row III, it is too badly damaged to be measured accurately, but the estimated arc at 0.018m high (or 0.024m when the

\textsuperscript{71} The chord of the short curve also could be reproduced, but not the curve itself in those twenty stones which had been recut. The four model voussure stones also can be reproduced when the tympanum is designed 4.05m wide (Pl. XVII); therefore, this test was sufficiently accurate to classify rows, but it did not validate the restored radii of the rows.

\textsuperscript{72} Pages 52f.

\textsuperscript{73} Note 59. \textit{Erratum}: PL. XXII has been omitted.
missing ends are restored) is far too low to fit either Row II or Row I. Therefore, the distribution of all the voussure stones by row is correct as we see it today.

The Original Order of the Voussure Figures:
End Profiles

Having distributed the voussure stones properly by row, we must now establish the original order of the figures within each row. The order of the six figures in Row I is assured because it is chronological, with names on the painted scrolls deriving from the geneology of Christ according to St. Matthew. Also the place of four figures flanking the central axis in Rows II and III is certain. However, only these ten stones were known to have been restored to their original location when the Coronation Portal was rebuilt in 1970; the positioning of the other twelve was governed by expediency, the reason being that a very real problem was created by twenty-two missing voussure figures. 74

There is a method for matching voussure stones which was not used during the 1970 construction and it should be explained here. Tracings of end profiles of the voussure stones were compared to find differences important enough to warrant separating two stones belonging to the same row. The end profiles of all twelve stones in question were judged to be either well-matched or ill-matched near the outer, long curve and the

74. Since the axial stones of Rows II and III were extant, other sculpted stones on these rows were placed just below them to avoid leaving gaps between the figures and modern stone. Two figures were located at the bottom of Row IV on each side to visually "anchor" the overall design.
axis of the figures, two areas which had not been recut in the nineteenth century. 75

Most of the profiles belonging to one row were found to be interchangeable; thus, for example, the personages on Row II, 7-8 76 and Row II, 6-7 77 could have been tangent in this order on the old Coronation Portal like they are today. The same may be said of Stones 2 and 3 on Row III, which were carved by the same sculptor and carry his mark incised on the upper ends. Since neither one was employed in the nineteenth century porch, recutting cannot be responsible for the harmony of these figures, which are matched perfectly in their present order (Pl. XXVI-A, Figs. 122-123). 78 Nevertheless, the test did yield

75. A second method exists, but it proved less successful. Stones containing the Tree of Jesse (Rows I-III) which had not been shortened at both ends to fit the XIXth century porch still had their original scoring of three incised lines (Fig. 107): one line marked the central axis (B), and one at each side measured the width of the stem or foliage of the Tree of Jesse (A, C). Doubtless the function of this system was to enable the sculptors to keep the vine centralized on the axis of the figure. The axial Line B averaged 0.23m from the moulding on the long side of the stone; the width between Lines A and C was approximately 0.095m.

How well two scored ends would have matched when the stones involved unquestionably were tangent before the 1832 demolition is demonstrated by Pl. XXIV-A (Row I, 3-4); also by Pl. XXIV-B (Row I, 5-6) and Pl. XXIV-C (Row I, 6-7), where the stones had been cut down in the XIXth century, but not damaged sufficiently to prohibit estimating the location of the scoring. However, it was found that two stones perfectly matched had never been tangent, as in Row I, 2-4 (Pl. XXIV-D), thus the results of this test were negligible. Moreover, since the scoring was standardized there were only minor deviations, and these were dismissed when the vine actually was carved.

76. Pl. XXV-A, B; Row II, 7-8 were tangent in the XIXth century porch, but these stones match better when their order is reversed.

77. Pl. XXV-C; these stones were not tangent on the XIXth century porch.

78. Probably the sculptor matched the stones carefully before the voussure was constructed; however, the rule of modern practice is to perfect the contours of a row after all the stones are in place.
significant results, and they are summarized in the table below listing the end profiles of stones on the same row which do not match. These figures would not have been tangent in this order on the Gothic portal.

**Row II**

**Left**

5 bottom—3 top  
4 bottom—3 top (now tangent, Pl. XXVII-A)

**Row III**

**Left**

5 bottom—4 top (now tangent, Pl. XXVII-B)  
2 bottom—3 top (Pl. XXVI-B)

**Row IV**

**Right**

14 bottom—8 top (Pl. XXVII-C)

This new information, however, failed to produce a spatial configuration for the twelve voussure stones in question; according to physical data alone, any one of four figures on the left in Row III of the rebuilt Coronation Portal could have been located immediately below the axial stone. For this reason two iconographic criteria were established in a further attempt to locate and identify all of the Braine voussure figures: the first requires a study of the basic pattern of the voussure cycle; the second concerns the distinctive character and meaning of the Coronation Portal at Saint-Yved.
The Iconographic Pattern of the Braine Voussure Cycle
Compared to Coronation Portals at Laon, Senlis and Chartres

The extant voussure stones of the Coronation Portal at Saint-Yved are represented schematically in their present order by Pl. XXVIII to illustrate how the total configuration is divided iconographically into groups or types of personages. That there are four groups is the most significant fact to be gained from the reconstruction of the voussures in 1970, and it is the crucial point in any discussion of the iconography of the Braine Coronation Portal. One group appears in the outer row where fourteen figures are seated on benches, the three who remain carrying scrolls. The Tree of Jesse occupies all the other rows and itself contains three clearly marked series. The Tree began with Jesse, who would have been the first on Row III. The first extant figure in Row III is a woman wearing a crown (Row III, 2) and the ten men following her also wear crowns, whereas six carry globes and sceptres. The iconography changes with the eighteenth figure in this series—the sixth on Row II—after which are seen two individuals wearing caps who make expressive gestures. Row I of the Tree of Jesse has yet a third series distinguished by six figures carrying scrolls.

These four divisions of the Braine voussure cycle illustrate the same formula for cycles employed in contemporary Coronation Portals ca. 1200 at Laon and Chartres. There each series of the cycle is marked by an abrupt iconographic change in order to maintain its integrity in the total design. This fact was confirmed when, for the first time, the nineteenth century restoration of the Coronation Portal at Laon was...
made the subject of a thorough investigation. In 1971 the three west portals of Laon Cathedral were cleaned, and the medieval sculpture examined in order to determine whether or not the original form, iconography and coloration had been restored accurately. The results of this study should be explained here in detail because they contribute to our knowledge of early Coronation Portals in general, but are particularly relevant to the portal at Braine. 79

Briefly told, the west portals of Laon Cathedral were restored in the following manner. Sculptors from Paris and Laon were joining the restoration team at Laon when Geoffroy DeChaume, a "statuaire" from Paris, arrived in 1865. This was a year after the two western towers had been consolidated (1853–1864), and at the same time the three west porches were completed with pinnacles. The excellent Boeswillwald, Architect-en-chef and later Inspecteur-général des Monuments Historiques,

79. I cleaned the sculpture of the three west portals from a mobile scaffolding. Soft paintbrushes were used to remove a thick mantle of grey-black dirt from the surface of the figures; and from behind heads and cavities came bird's nests (energetically rebuilt), rocks, gunshells, ping-pong balls and the like which had accumulated around the figures since the portals were restored in 1868–1890. After the cleaning restored parts could be detected easily, in many cases from the floor of the portals, by the smooth surface and darker patina of the new stones, and from white or yellow lines marking the joints. These joints were outlined on the stones in chalk and each figure photographed from several angles, after which the chalk was removed with a moist sponge

Several photographs of the west portals of Laon Cathedral taken before 1865 exist in the Archives photographiques des Monuments Historiques and the Bibliothèque Nationale, Cab. Est., Collection Edouard Fleury, Tome II, Ville de Laon et faubourgs, fols. 32–33; see also a small collection of casts in the Musée des Monuments Français. For the restoration of the portals, consult the Archives de la Commission des Monuments Historiques, "Cathédrale de Laon," 1846–1892 (hereafter AMH).
established a guide for the restoration which he called the archaeological method: in sum, that every original stone would be conserved in its proper place if at all possible. Thus, one of his first acts was to reverse the judgment of his predecessor, Van Cleemputte, who had found two column-statues in the tribune over the side-aisles and was determined to place them in the west portal embrasures. They were sent to the local museum instead, "having never belonged to the cathedral," with the astute observation that they might have come from the church at Braine.80

At first DeChaume was put to work on the three gables of the west porches, for which he carved eleven new figures as well as enframing clouds.81 This completed in 1867, he began models for four large gargoyles and seven animals on the facade.82 But in 1868, having executed only the large statue of the Virgin above the gallery between the towers, his full attention was directed to restoring the three west portals. These were restored consecutively: the central portal from 1869 to 1875, the north portal from 1875 to 1878, and the south portal from 1878 to 1882. The tympana, lintels and voussures of all three portals were painted in 1888, and the column-statues and

80. ANH, letters of Van Cleemputte, September 25, 1842, and Boeswillwald, April 13, 1892; see p.
81. ANH, March 25, 1892 (financial record of 1865-1891).
82. Actually sculpted by Tournier and Chapot.
capitals received "\textit{encaustiquage et coloration}" at the same time.\footnote{83} The remarkably high quality of Geoffroy DeChaume's restoration of the Coronation Portal results from his scrupulous respect for the original sculpture. Every facet of a damaged piece, no matter how small, and every movement in the figure was carefully observed when models for the new stones were being created. Moreover, beyond doubt virtually all the missing attributes of the figures were restored accurately from fragmentary evidence.\footnote{84} Consequently, the modern

\footnote{83. AMH, estimate of June 28, 1888. Although the records are not always explicit, one ascertains that the Coronation Portal was not taken down during the restoration, which comprised remortaring all the joints, replacing stones too damaged to conserve, and the addition of large stones for the trumeau and lintel. The condition of the lateral portals was much worse. A large crack had developed behind the right colonette in the north tympanum, causing the entire left section to slip out from the voussures and press down upon the center of the lintel. Since bronze armatures were placed behind the tympanum for support, the lintel would not necessarily have been taken down during repairs, however the entire south portal had to be dismantled: AMH, \textit{loc. cit.}, and the estimate of July 51, 1867; reports of August 22, 1879 and June 22, 1882 (probably referring to the south portal, not the north as stated).

\footnote{84. See Appendix B, Pl. XXIX, and illustrations Al-BV, 14. Two angels standing in the tympanum originally carried the censors and \textit{navettes} (boat-shaped oil receptacles) we see today (A2, A5). The basins of the censors and the \textit{navettes} were re-established from examples carried by the angels on Row I (BI, 10); also see "Notre-Dame de la belle Verrière" at Chartres. The two kneeling angels held candlesticks, of which the bases with three feet are wholly or partly original (A1, A6). The unusually large basin of the candlestick, in the form of a chalice with a point for the candle, was re-established from a fragment protruding from the chest of the angel where the basin was attached.

The attributes of ten little angels in the first row of voussures all have been restored correctly—censors, \textit{navettes}, crowns, the sun, crescent moon and Book of Seven Seals—with one possible exception (BI, 1-10). The third angel carries a palm for which not a scrap of evidence existed (BI,3). However, the position of the arms and body are so similar to that of its counterpart, the eighth angel with the Book of Seven Seals, that the third must also have held a tall vertical object, a candlestick or palm branch. There are three other examples of completely restored attributes in the portal of which only one is questionable: the sceptre held between the thumb and forefinger of the
viewer enjoys a visual experience of the Coronation Portal today which is as authentic as it ever can be in the absence of the only original parts of real importance: all the heads, the inscriptions and the coloration.

The principal question posed by the restoration is whether or not all the figures in the Tree of Jesse originally wore crowns as they do today (Pl. XXIX). For in fact, the restored crowns mask an important transition in the iconography of the Tree of Jesse which occurs with the curious sixth figure of Row III carrying two attributes instead of one: a sceptre and a scroll (BIII,6). Up to this point, following Jesse, David, Bathsheba and Solomon (BIV, 1-4), we can be certain that all the figures were Kings of Judah since all carry flowering sceptres. But after this transitional king—the eighteenthVirgin's right hand could be an invention of the restorer (A3); but without some object of this genre her hand, which was originally limp with the palm down as seen today, would be singularly inexpressive. The Virgin did not hold a scroll since there are no traces of one remaining on her body. The other two completely restored attributes belong to ancestors of Christ (BII,8 and BIV,9).

Finally, a row of clouds between the tympanum and lintel was re-established from original fragments at each extremity (BI,1 and BI,10); and according to Boeswillwald, the general form of the Gothic lintel appeared at the moment he had its vaulted substitute demolished (AMH, report of July 15, 1867). Nevertheless, the restored lintel is unusually tall (1.765m) and appears disproportionate.

85. The restored heads are too large and expressionless for the figures. Also one wonders if some heads should not have been turned otherwise, with the faces more frequently over the axis of the bodies to reduce the high degree of contrapposto animating the voussure cycle today (BII,3, III,1, V,14). Since this delicate matter is best decided when the statues are headless, the stump of the neck exposed completely, with strands and curls of hair arranged about the neckline to suggest the original direction of the face, Monsieur DeChaume's judgment cannot now be seriously questioned.

86. For examples of original flowering sceptres, see BIII,1 and BIV,3,10-12.
figure in the series and fourteenth king after Solomon—the remaining
twelve figures of the historical cycle all carry scrolls or rolls (Row
III,7-Row II,8). Such a deliberate iconographic variation in the line
of ancestors from Jesse to Christ clearly was used to identify the last
king of Judah (Zedekiah), and to mark the Fall of Jerusalem. Consequently,
the twelve figures in question represented the Hebrews during the
Babylonian Exile and after their return to Jerusalem, the humbled
ancestors from Salathiel to Joseph who were not kings. This explains
why they carry scrolls and not sceptres; thus, they should not have been
restored with crowns, but bareheaded or wearing caps as on the
Coronation Portal at Chartres.87

One must be prudent, of course, but to question whether the
ancestors of Christ could have held scrolls like the prophets
traditionally did would miss the point of this discussion. The
voussures at Laon present a historical cycle composed of several series
of personages; and at that epoch each series was clearly indicated by
an iconographic change in order to maintain its integrity and a
specific characterization in the total design. Thus, what is
remarkable at Laon is not the use of scrolls, but the cycle itself.

87. The Laon Tree of Jesse comprising two historical series
corresponds exactly to St. Matthew’s geneology (I:1f), except one
king was added to the period before the Captivity, making fourteen
instead of thirteen after Solomon. Matthew does not cite Ahaziah,
Athaliah, Joash, Amaziah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim and Zedekias, so the extra
king would have been taken either from Chronicles or the Book of
Kings. However, St. Matthew’s chronology probably was respected by
placing Zedekias after Jechonias (Jehoiachin), who is last in
Matthew’s geneology.
Since Marcel Aubert's monograph on Senlis Cathedral, we have learned to distinguish four categories of events and personages in the voussure cycle of early Coronation Portals (Pl. XXX): the history of the Hebrews from Creation to the establishment of the Kingdom of Judah; the Tree of Jesse according to Isaiah's prophesy and the paternal genealogy of St. Matthew, itself composed of two series—the good and evil kings of Judah before the Babylonian Captivity, then the Hebrews in exile and returned to Jerusalem—and finally, the prophets. Aubert identified the first series of this historical cycle with the fourth and outer row of fourteen figures at Senlis, the Kingdom of Judah with the third row of twelve, and the last—the prophets—with both the second and first rows containing eighteen figures. With the exception of Zorobabel, Aubert himself neglected the ancestors of Christ after the Captivity because they could not be identified by their individual characteristics, and this created a lacuna in the genealogy at Senlis.

89. Because the figures at Senlis have a high degree of individuality, it is logical that Aubert should have tried to identify each one individually, and with remarkable success for the leperous King Ozias, for example. However, individual characterization had limits and it was used only infrequently in later cycles at Laon and Chartres.

The two authors above also suggest the fourth figure in the second row could be Zorobabel, who conducted the Hebrews out of captivity. Since he was not a king but a governor of the people (Haggai 1:12-14), it is probable that this crowned figure represents the last king of Judah, and that he was followed by ancestors of Christ after the Captivity. Finally, there seems to be no reason why the three "prophets" at the end of Row IV (Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel) could not have been ancestors of Jesse (e.g., Saul, Boaz, Obed).
If Senlis presents some difficulty for the modern observer, the Coronation Portal at Chartres Cathedral does not because its iconographic structure is remarkably clear. Indeed, in the voussures at Chartres we find a perfect example of the complete historical cycle outlined by Aubert (Pl. XXXI). The ancestors of Jesse occupy the outer Row V. The Tree of Jesse begins on Row IV with Jesse, David, Bathsheba and fourteen kings, making a series of seventeen personages, which corresponds exactly to St. Matthew’s chronology for the Kingdom of Judah. All the kings are crowned and carry sceptres where attributes still exist. In the Coronation Portal of Laon Cathedral, the Kingdom of Judah is represented by the first eighteen figures in the Tree of Jesse (Row IV, 1-Row III,6). Since the eighteenth figure in the Braine Coronation also is a king, doubtless this series had the same pattern as the Laon cycle (Pls. XXVIII-XXIX). Thus the Braine Tree of Jesse began with Jesse, David, Bathsheba, Solomon and fourteen crowned kings, and it extended from Row III,1 to Row II,6 (extant).

The Kingdom of Judah at Chartres terminates abruptly with the third figure on Row III (Jechonias). Unlike Senlis, this series unmistakably is followed by the genealogy of Christ after the Fall of Jerusalem: nine bareheaded ancestors complete Row III who are distinguished by scrolls, whereas the Kings of Judah carried sceptres. The same formula was used at Laon Cathedral; but there are twelve scroll-bearing ancestors in the Laon series instead of nine, since the geneology continues on Row II and is the complete list given by St. Matthew. Thus, by analogy to both Laon and Chartres, the four figures completing Row II of the Braine Coronation should be identified as the ancestors of Christ after
the Fall of Jerusalem; the two persons extant from this group wear caps, not crowns which are the primary attribute of kingship at Saint-Yved (Pl. XXVII, Figs. 118-119).90

The iconography of the voussure cycle at Chartres changes a fourth time with Row II, the last row of historical personages, which contains eight prophets carrying scrolls like the ancestors of Christ. But neither we nor the medieval spectator would confuse the prophets with the genealogy since they are placed outside the Tree of Jesse, each figure seated on a bench at the base of which is carved the New Jerusalem. The last row of historical figures in the Coronation Portals at Senlis and Braine, Row I in both portals, also introduces an iconographic change: eight persons carrying scrolls. That these figures are prophets is logical if one refers to Chartres. At Laon the last historical row continues the genealogy of Christ, thus fourteen prophets were relegated to the outermost row outside the Tree of Jesse, a place which at Senlis and Chartres was reserved for the ancient

90. It is quite improbable that a series of four prophets was inserted on Row II at Braine after the Kingdom of Judah as a preaching on the Fall of Jerusalem. At Chartres and Laon the transition from kingdom to exile is accomplished without fanfare. Furthermore, four prophets are not sufficient for a Coronation cycle. On the other hand, were these four grouped with the fourteen figures in Row IV to produce eighteen prophets, at the expense of the genealogy of Christ, then the meaning of the Braine Coronation cycle would have been unconventional (p. 73).
Hebrews before the Kingdom of Judah was established. Clearly Senlis and Chartres illustrate one type of historical cycle and Laon, another. And clearly the Braine Coronation cycle had the same structure as the cycles at Senlis and Chartres: since Row I contained eight prophets, the outer row represented fourteen ancestors of Jesse, the three extant figures carrying scrolls.

The fact that Boinet identified all three series in the Tree of Jesse at Braine with the geneology resulted, of course, from reading the scrolls on Row I which bore painted names in 1911. However the coloration of that day, of which there are a few traces still on the voussures, was relatively modern since portals in this humid region of France must be repainted about every one hundred years if they are to remain colored. Therefore, at some time before the demolition of 1832, the original configuration of the Braine cycle was modified when the figures, whose names were no longer visible, were misinterpreted. The prophets on Row I were given the names of Christ's ancestors, and

91. All fourteen prophets at Laon are men, although one may argue with difficulty that Figure BV,5 is feminine. If this row had contained the ancestors of Jesse, then the Laon voussures did not have prophets. However prophets are essential to the cycle's iconography; moreover, one would expect to see several women among Jesse's ancestors as at Senlis and Chartres.

92. Op. cit., p. 265 and note. According to Boinet, whose judgment in 1911 never has been questioned, the six figures in Row I cannot represent prophets because their scrolls carry the names of Christ's ancestors: Sadoch, Achim, Elud, Eleazar, Matthan and Jacob, or the last six before Joseph in St. Matthew's geneology. Thus he identifies the figures in Row IV as prophets, not ancestors. Aubert did apply the Senlis cycle program in reference to Braine--patriarchs, ancestors, prophets--but his reason was not mentioned (La sculpture française du moyen-âge, Paris, 1946, pp. 218ff).
as a result the voussures at Braine acquired the same configuration as the cycle at Laon.\textsuperscript{93}

\textsuperscript{93}. Doubtless the scrolls were painted before 1832 because these voussure stones were inserted into the XIXth century porch at Saint-Yved without regard for chronological order. The person who had the scrolls painted probably did refer to the Laon cycle; this cannot be proven, of course, but the relationship between the two Coronation Portals was a subject of interest to the canons of Saint-Yved in 1750, if not earlier (cf. pp. 7f).

An analysis of twenty-two paint samples taken to this date from the Coronation Portal at Laon Cathedral, together with four from its Last Judgment Portal and twenty more from the Coronation Portals at Senlis and Braine, provides a set of facts for the study of color and color harmony. I wish to thank Monsieur Marcel Stefanaggi, an engineer at the Cellule Scientifique, Direction de l'Architecture, who made these analyses. The complexity of a comparative study cannot be detailed here, but certain results can be summarized.

A modern laboratory is not needed to observe that because of the severe climate which attacks the elevated and exposed site of Laon Cathedral, the nineteenth century paint has been lost already. Consequently, for the portals there to have remained colored and the sculpture protected, they would have had to be repainted every one hundred years or so, producing about seven coats. Because the surface wears off so rapidly, one cannot be certain that any color goes back as far as the thirteenth century; for like that of the nineteenth century, this coloration could have disappeared before a repainting. None of the samples from Laon shows more than four layers of color in stratification today; sometimes only one. In several cases a preparation for color remains, but not the color itself. Thus, it is altogether probable that the stratification observed in any sample represents neither a complete nor a continuous chronology of the painting. That is to say that the stratification could be a sampling of colors which were juxtaposed at random from widely separate epochs: what appears to be the first coat might be the third; and the outermost coat, what remained when the nineteenth century paint wore out. Given these formidable drawbacks—to which must be added the fact that lead white is a standard preparation at all epochs, and there exists no conspicuously modern color (e.g., Prussian Blue)—by what methods can the original coloration of the Coronation Portals be approached? Indeed, there seems to be none at all. Using today's methods of laboratory analysis, one cannot date any of the colors from Laon, Senlis or Braine as, for example, bones can be dated by a carbon-14 test. Since a color chronology cannot be established, there is no proof whatsoever that the throne at Laon was painted gold at the same time that the mantles of the two angels standing in the tympanum were painted green, and the same problem exists at the other churches.
The Distinctive Character and Meaning of the Braine Coronation Portal

The importance of retaining the majestic four-part cycle sculpted at Chartres Cathedral ca. 1200 as a guide to understanding the theology of early Coronation Portals is that its structure is complete and equilibrated. This would have been important to the faithful of the Middle Ages, for the prophets indeed had lamented the sins of Judah, forewarning God's punishment and the destruction of Jerusalem, but they also had promised the return, the new kingdom and a just king. Consequently, in the Tree of Jesse the faithful would have seen that the Old Testament was bound to the New, and ancient history to medieval man, by an act of redemption which was Christ himself. This act of redemption was personified for them on the embrasures of Coronation Portals by "Christophers" and it took place in the transcendent world of the tympanum itself: the New Jerusalem, the Kingdom of God.

Since the basic voussure pattern at Senlis and Chartres also is found in the Coronation at Braine, is it possible that these three portals could have had distinct nuances of meaning? To answer this question let us refer to the Coronation Portal of Laon Cathedral, where the voussure configuration does not follow the traditional pattern established at Senlis. The Laon Tree of Jesse develops to

94. In particular, Isaiah 9:6f, 2:1f; Jeremiah 23:6, 33:15f; Ezekiel 34:22f; Daniel 7; Hosea 2:19f; Micah 4,5; Haggai 2; Zachariah 2,3,7-9; Malachi 4; Samuel 7.
96. For the redemption and betrothal of the Church to Christ, Hosea 2:19f (Katzenellenbogen, loc. cit.); for the church building as a symbol of the Kingdom of God, see Paul Frankl's Gothic Architecture, Baltimore, 1962, pp. 229-235, 267f.
a maximum the genealogy of Christ from the epoch of the Kingdom of Judah; now adjacent to the tympanum, it is given pride of place over the prophets. Between the genealogy and the tympanum, a fifth row was added to the old cycle which contains ten little angels amid clouds of heaven; a row so small—0.25m wide—that its absence at Senlis and presence at Laon has no connection whatever to the different proportions of the two portals. These changes indicate that the Biblical sources of the Coronation Portal were refreshed at Laon, in particular the Book of Revelation, for they unite Christ with the Church to reveal that apocalyptic moment at the end of all time when the faithful are saved.

From the structure of the Tree of Jesse we learn that the Christ of Laon Cathedral unmistakably is the powerful Saviour of the Apocalypse, who identified himself to St. John as "the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David;" that the Laon Christ holding a book is the Saviour who, at the world's frightening end, took the book of prophesy from the throne of God. In this act of redemption Christ and the Church were united as Spirit and Bride, she made pure by his blood and victorious over evil; and the Virgin of Laon is the apocalyptic Bride, accompanied by angels framing the tympanum who praise her with sun, moon, crowns and the Book of Seven Seals. At Senlis Christ's power to

97. Revelation 5:5-9; 22. The heavenly city of Jerusalem is carved on the dais below the voussures (see D1-6, D7-12).
redeem simply was transferred, by his commanding gesture and the book, to a new authority, the Church. But at Chartres the exegesis of the Laon Coronation design was acknowledged, and the Bride graciously accepts salvation for all mankind. This exalting moment now is witnessed by the prophets, enthroned in the New Jerusalem they had promised would come.

By comparison with its magnificent contemporaries the Coronation Portal of Saint-Yved is modest and curiously old-fashioned. Unlike the dramatic Laon portal, Christ is not a powerful king, the veritable Saviour the Apocalypse, and the humble Mary is not a symbol of the Church Victorious. He is not crowned, the line of David is shortened, and a row of little angels praising the Virgin around the tympanum was omitted. Unlike Chartres, the Braine prophets still appear in the Tree of Jesse as at Senlis; they are not seated in the Heavenly Jerusalem to witness the final triumph of the faithful. Since the Braine Coronation did not project into high relief the apocalyptic moment of salvation at the end of all time, then what was its distinctive character and purpose? Doubtless the answer to this question, as at Laon, is to be found in the iconographic structure of the Braine voussure cycle. However, to engage in a more refined analysis of the voussures than the classification of stones by series, the personages in the Braine cycle must be identified by name. Although this will be a difficult task with twenty-two stones missing, certain important individuals can be identified by determining the original order of existing stones in the following manner.
The original order of the twenty-two extant voussure stones in the
Braine Coronation Portal is restored by Pl. XXXII, in so far as this is
possible according to iconographic and archaeological data available to
the present study.100 The relative position of the six prophets on Row
I is certain, but these figures cannot be identified individually. As
for the three extant ancestors of Jesse on Row IV, they cannot be
arranged in any order whatever since eleven figures are missing from
this row, and their primary attribute being scrolls on which painted
names no longer exist (Figs. 108-113, 129-131).

The lefthand side of Row III, where the Tree of Jesse begins,
presents fewer problems with five out of six figures extant. The
first four figures would have been Jesse, David, Bathsheba and Solomon
as at Laon and Chartres. The one woman we see there today unquestionably
is Bathsheba, and she should have been restored third on Row III (Fig.
122).101 The actual third stone on Row III, a well-publicized figure
whose tunic is drawn aside like a curtain to expose a finely modeled
right leg, is the best candidate among three figures remaining in this
row for Solomon himself, and thus Stone 4 (Fig. 123): the bottom end of
this stone matches the top of the Bathsheba stone perfectly.102
Furthermore, originally the figure's head, tilted to the right, was
leaning on his left hand (or fist) with the arm and elbow propped-up
on his left knee. When this hand and forearm were broken off, the

100. See also the table on p. 61.
101. Suggested by Boinet, op. cit., p. 267; misidentified as a
sibyl in Louvre, Cathédrales, 1982, No. 48, and I. Deuchler, Der
102. Pages 60f, Pl.XXVI-A,B; these stones do not match when
reversed, so the male figure is not David.
fracture produced a large rough area on the side of his beard showing the old point of contact (Fig. 124). Thus, his unusual pose may be described as meditative and it would represent the Dream of Solomon; therein Solomon asked the Lord, not for riches and honor, but an understanding heart with which to judge between good and evil (I Kings 3:5f). This theme appeared earlier at Senlis where Solomon's attribute is a large book containing wisdom the Lord was pleased to grant him. The figure flanking the central axis on the lefthand side of Row III is Abia, the sixth in the geneology and the second king reigning after Solomon (Fig. 126).

Between Solomon and Abia there is space for one king of Judah, Roboam, whereas there are two spaces to fill in the geneology before Bathsheba: Jesse and David. For these three places there are two figures available. The one holding a sceptre must be Roboam (Row III,5, Fig. 125) because David and Jesse traditionally were characterized by some particular attribute setting them apart from the later kings of

103. Boinet thought the king referred to here as Solomon might have carried a globe.
104. Senlis Cathedral, Row III, Stone 4. The identity of Stone 4 is somewhat problematic. Some scholars do not concur with Aubert (ibid., 1910) that the personage immediately below Stone 4 is David; because this figure holds a sword, of which only the hilt remains below the right fist, he has been identified as Solomon (most recently, Sauerlaender, op. cit., p. 407). However, I agree with Aubert that the Senlis iconography is relatively complex, or indirect, and that Figures 2 and 3 both represent David: once during his youth playing the harp; and again as "chief and captain of the people" who emerged victorious from the struggle between the Houses of Saul and David, and united all Israel by the sword (cf. II Samuel: 3-5). Thus Figure 4 holding a book would be Solomon.
Judah, who at Braine hold sceptres and globes; thus, David carried a harp and Jesse was associated with the branch or rod prophesied by Isaiah.105

This postulation means that the last extant figure to be arranged on the left in Row III either is David or Jesse himself (Figs. 120-121). Since the profile of the top end of this stone does not fit the Bathsheba stone at all, the figure would not be David. However, some other criterion ought to be applied because large sections of the stone were cut from both ends in the nineteenth century: the top of the head, foliage at both ends and the right foot.106 The figure in question is seated facing the tympanum with his right hand extended before his body in the same manner one would hold out a lantern in darkness; the fact that his left hand is capped over the left knee precludes any large attribute needing the support of both hands. Thus, he could not have held the harp traditionally characteristic of David, and the temptation to identify this figure as Jesse is almost irresistible.

Jesse's Biblical "attribute," of course, was his son David and the possibility this figure carried some object in his extended right hand is of secondary importance. If he did the object necessarily was long, slender and held between the fingers, yet it was not the staff of a sceptre. In all three figures who now carry sceptres at Braine (Row III, 5, Row II, 3, 5), the sceptre is light enough to be held in one hand, but so long it reaches down to the knee. Since the left hand of the figure

105. Consult the chart on Pl. XXXIII illustrating how the identification of Roboam affects Row III.

106. The bottom end of the stone is so damaged it is useless in a comparison of end profiles. However the top end, even though cut down, does match the bottom of Stone 6 (Abia); thus the fact it does not match the bottom of the Bathsheba stone is significant.
in question is capped over the knee, palm down, it would be an obstacle to a sceptre and makes an interesting motif in itself. Thus if an attribute existed, it had a short staff held aloft at arm's length and merged with the leaf stemming from Jesse's branch: the flowering rod of Jesse. Were this the case, then the gesture was creative and, moreover, distinctive when compared to the sceptre-bearing kings, because this figure's sidewise position facing the tympanum is remarkably resolute and meaningful.

The identification of the five kings remaining on Rows II and III involves a delicate matter of interpreting the meaning of various attributes. This complication does not exist at Laon and Chartres, where all the Kings of Judah after Solomon are merely royal stereotypes with crowns and sceptres.\(^{107}\) So let us refer to the older portal at Senlis which, as remarked earlier, had served as a model for Saint-Yved. Whereas St. Matthew is silent about the character of the kings of Judah, the Book of Kings and Chronicles were devoted to the moral struggle of the Hebrews. There it is quite clear that some kings were faithful to God's commandments, but just as many were not and incurring God's wrath, the Kingdom of Judah was destroyed as a punishment for sin. This fact was not lost to Marcel Aubert when he studied the Coronation Portal at Senlis,\(^{108}\) and Aubert often relied upon moral characterizations

107. There are two exceptions at Laon, BIII-6 and BIV-10 (p. 66).
108. Ibid., 1910.
to identify the Kings of Judah: for example Abia and Joram both sit with crossed legs, a sign of evil and infidelity, whereas Achaz sleeps while the kingdom is neglected. Can Aubert's method be applied to the voussures at Braine? If so, this would confirm its validity and illucidate for us the meaning of the Braine cycle.

Of the eight kings extant at Braine following Solomon, three carry sceptres, three hold globes and two are empty-handed: by order of their appearance in Row III, Roboam holds a sceptre, Abia is empty-handed and Asa carries the globe (Figs. 125-127). Because only the wicked King Abia has no attribute other than a crown, this may well be the sign of his infidelity. Thus the one king extant on Row III remaining to be identified, a rather sinister-looking figure who goes empty-handed like Abia and sits with crossed legs, would be the evil Joram, a characterization obviously derived from the model of Senlis (Row III, 9, Fig. 128). If this interpretation is correct, then King Solomon's desire for insight to discern between good and evil reveals in another form a moral question essential to the entire series; and that wisdom Solomon seeks is the attribute of Christ himself, as foretold by the prophets.

The remaining three kings on the left in Row II all carry a globe or sceptre, thus these personages would be the last faithful kings in the Old Testament chronology (Figs, 114-116, Joatham, Ezekias, Josias). 109

109. There is no way of knowing which king extant on the left in Row II below the axial figure (Josias) was the higher, thus the penultimate faithful ruler, Ezekias.

The order of two extant ancestors after the Fall of Jerusalem on Row II, Stones 7 and 8 on the portal rebuilt in 1970, is not known, but these stones would be perfectly matched if reversed (Pl. XXV-A,B and n. 76). The personages have not been identified.
The theory that these attributes signaled religious fidelity at Braine seems invalidated, however, by the last king of Judah, who is the infidel Jechonias (or Zedekias) and is holding a globe in his left hand (Row II,6, Fig. 117). This apparent flaw when Aubert's method is applied to the voussures of Saint-Yved should not be taken too seriously, for the arresting features of the Tree of Jesse are spiritually foreign to contemporary Coronation Portals at Laon and Chartres, where Bathsheba and the Kings of Judah are merely royal stereotypes. They certainly are not at Braine; and neither are the central figures in the tympanum, the Virgin and Christ.

If the conflict between good and evil under the Old Law, which caused the fall of man, indeed was as clearly and simply restated at Saint-Yved as the available evidence indicates, then this was the distinguishing quality of the Braine voussure cycle. Following Senlis, its purpose was to contrast the Christian era symbolized by the Coronation tympanum. One may conclude by saying that the paramount theme of the Coronation Portal at Saint-Yved was not an exalting moment at the very end of time as at Laon and Chartres, but a new beginning of history on earth: the Christian era, whose most humble servant and principal guardian is to be the Church; a new age wherein the redemptive power of Christ governs, thus the working of salvation is to be manifested among men for all generations to come. In the final analysis, this theme is a public exhortation to Christian conduct in life and it was appropriate for the central entrance of a monastic church.
The Embrasure Design of the Coronation Portal: Preliminary Observations

Now that the restoration of the tympanum and voussures of the Coronation Portal has been completed insofar as possible from the only primary source, evidence provided by the old stones themselves, the original embrasure design must be investigated in order to determine the groundplan and elevation of the portal. No elements from the Coronation embrasures are known to exist. However, a certain number of facts about the embrasures are preserved by three sources: dimensions of the tympanum and voussures; the west facade's masonry and rubblework extant in situ on or beneath the modern parvis excavated in 1971-1972; and detailed but badly executed drawings of the Coronation Portal made in 1825 before the facade was demolished. Thus, the first step toward restoring the Coronation Portal in its entirety is to integrate this varied information. Wherever contradictions occur the archaeological data, our primary source for a reconstruction, always takes precedence over the old drawings.

The only detailed drawings of Saint-Yved measured from the church before the demolition of the west facade and four nave bays were made by the governmental architect, Monsieur Gencourt, who prepared a plan and longitudinal cross-section of the entire building in 1825 (Figs. 132-133). At that time the fate of Saint-Yved had not been determined.

110. The Gencourt drawings are in the Archives Monuments Historiques. Both are signed by Gencourt and (Louis) Duroché; the latter, probably acting as an expert ("verificateur"), was an older man and well-known at Braine. In 1791 he was assigned by the fledgling Republic to measure and estimate the value of the convents of Saint-Yved and Notre-Dame with an eye to their sale (Archives Départementales, Q813, letters of February, 1791).
However the cross-section clearly shows the three projects being considered, all of which make some basic structural change in the western half of the church.\textsuperscript{111} For the first project which involved restoring the entire church, Gencourt planned to demolish the vaults of all six nave bays (already in ruin) and cover the nave with a flat ceiling. Since the second project entailed demolition of the nave itself, a new central door was designed in front of the lantern crossing at A. Between these two extremes, because the latter struck the Conseil des Batiments Civils as bizarre, lay the so-called "provisional project:" the east end was to be restored first so that cult practice could be resumed, and the western half later as soon as finances permitted. Thus, when the restoration of Saint-Yved actually began in 1829, a rubble wall was put up at B between the second and third nave bays west of the lantern, and it was left permanently after the revolution of 1830.\textsuperscript{112}

Of the six other documents representing the west facade of Saint-Yved before the 1832 demolition, three are described below, pp. the remaining three will not be discussed since they are too generalized, or too small, to be useful for a reconstruction of the west portals (Figs. 13, 9, 11): a charming miniature of Saint-Yved executed for the last Count of Braine and now in the Municipal Library at Soissons (Ms. 239, fol. 3r); a cadastre prepared for the same count in 1782 (Cartes A and B, "Atlas perpetuel de la seigneurie," Archives Départementales) and another made after the Revolution in 1813 (Braine, Archives Municipales, Section D, Feuille 2). An engraving by Tavernier published in 1789 (Voyages pittoresques, VI, Pl. XXXIV) shows the west facade from the east (Fig. 12).

\textsuperscript{111} See the estimate of February 8, 1825, and séance of June 4, 1825 (Appendix A, 1825). The total number of projects was four, the fourth being to demolish Saint-Yved and build a new and smaller church.

\textsuperscript{112} Gencourt dropped out of sight shortly after the church became serviceable in 1837; the townspeople were unhappy about inheriting the upkeep of Saint-Yved, and the Curé caused an awful uproar about the transfer of Braine sculpture to Soissons. Another interpretation is given by Prioux who blames Gencourt, not the government, for the 1832 demolition (Appendix A, 1832).
This brief history accounts for several remarkable oddities of the 1825 elevation, but one is nearly at a loss to explain all the others. Frequent outlandish discrepancies with the actual building—e.g., a triforium gallery beneath the transept rose windows—or misinterpretations of the 1825 plan itself make the Gencourt groundplan by far the more reliable of the two documents. Yet both are so extremely naive that they could not have been executed either by the architect or the entrepreneur Brunteau, one of whom must have been responsible for measuring the church. One is forced to conclude a third party was involved, the architect's draftsman at Soissons, who had never seen the building. At the heart of the problem, however, is the fact that neither document was a serious effort to reproduce Saint-Yved. And certainly no one in this group of men would have been interested in correctly describing the west facade, since it was in relatively good condition and not the object of immediate attention. All this is the more calamitous because, having been made before 1832, these drawings were not perforce interpretations of the facade; yet because of their numerous errors, all the earliest reconstructions of Saint-Yved were interpretive, which is the reason they all differ to some degree.

In the first place, the west facade projects a total of 7.30m from the narthex wall in Gencourt's elevation, but only 6.20m on his groundplan. The gable of the Coronation Porch was designed 13.75m high, leaving a space only 5.25m in diameter for the rose window of the facade, although we know this rose was comparable to those of the
Furthermore, the nave bay west of the lantern
tower is 6.30m long on the plan, but 5.75m in reality. These varied
miscalculations are sufficient proof that one has good reason to be
skeptical about all the other measurements; as a general rule no
dimensions whatever should be accepted from the 1825 drawings or any
other designs which derive from them. The only reliable source is
the church itself.

The Coronation Portal of the west facade was not better represented
in elevation than the rest of the church (Fig. 133): it was drawn
without any sculpture, so the tympanum, lintel and column-statues (?)
are missing. Moreover, since Gencourt's restoration project called for
trimming off the voussure figures, in their places we see roll mouldings.
Such an oddly vacant scene is even more disquieting because all the
columns in the portal embrasures and the porch, which rise to the same
height, repose on the same level and their bases are in direct contact
with the pavement. The only socle represented carries the porch walls.

Fortunately the plan of 1825, a truly priceless document, is more
instructive about the Coronation Portal than the 1825 elevation (Fig.
132). But masses are generalized to the extreme, and it cannot be
repeated too often that the dimensions should not be taken literally:
e.g., the tympanum is drawn 5.10m wide, whereas it has been demonstrated
the original was not larger than 3.96-4.00m. In spite of this problem,

113. Page 96.
114. For example, two tracings in the Archives Nationales dated
January 1836 (F21-1875, Aisne, AN IX-1848, calque 36); also Taylor,
Voyages, II, 1840 (Figs. 16-18).
115. Pages 52f.
the diagrammatic old plan does represent five important elements not
drawn on the cross-section:

1. The Coronation porch projects 1.40m beyond the
   lateral porches.
2. All ten columns of the portal embrasures have
   socles which form a chevron pattern.
3. Six large columns decorating the porch also rest
   on socles, and they are somewhat larger in diameter
   than four others in the nave which support the narthex
   tribune.
4. The lintel is supported by a trumeau and one column at
   each end, the latter about 3.60m apart. (On the 1825
   elevation these columns carry the innermost voussure.)
5. The walls of the porch are massive buttresses some 1.40m
   wide, and thus comparable to buttresses on the transept
   facades actually measuring 1.30m wide.

Other, more elegant embrasure designs may be ruled-out if one
respects the 1825 documents, since there is no evidence in either one
of frankly diagonal movements below the columns or above (baldacchinos):¹¹⁶
i.e. capitals, column bases and socle all repeated the ancient chevron
pattern. Therefore, the classic elements of the column were stated
clearly by six large isolated porch columns, then maintained throughout
the portal embrasures.

Since excavations in the parvis of Saint-Yved have revealed the
structure of the west facade up to the level of the pavement of the
portals (Pls. IX-X),¹¹⁷ and the tympanum, lintel and voussures of the
Coronation already have been reconstructed, the foregoing observations
about the 1825 drawings can be employed to develop an experimental plan
and elevation of the Coronation Portal (Pls. XXXIV, XXXVI). In

¹¹⁶. Baldacchinos do not effect the measurement for column bases in
portal embrasures; these bases will be the same size as the surface
required by the voussure profile above, which at Braine actually was 0.39m².
¹¹⁷. See Site III, pp. 32ff.
elevation the restored west wall of the facade is seen to repose on a 0.69m-tall socle that is continuous in the porch and portal embrasures. All the columns of the porch and portal attain the same height, being level with the base of the tympanum and voussures. This height was determined by a single factor: the giant porch columns, which were copied from two columns existing today and used after the 1832 demolition in the nave beneath a new organ loft. Beyond doubt these are two of four depicted on the 1825 plan which supported the original narthex tribune, and being independent of the narthex wall, they have chamfered socles 0.32m high. When exact copies of the narthex columns—complete with their bases, capitals and abacuses—are placed above the 0.69m socle in the Coronation porch, the distance from the pavement of the porch to the abacus is 5.50m, including mortar. This height is equal to that of the old narthex columns on their socles inside the church; and it is comparable to the height of existing nave and transept capitals, varying from 5.33m to 5.52m above the original pavement, in agreement with the 1825 elevation.

However interesting these relationships may be, there are still others to be discovered. Since the width of one-half the central porch almost certainly was 5.48m, this dimension equals the height of the restored Coronation capitals and makes a square figure in the porch.

118. The origin of these columns has never been remarked (pp. 127f).
119. Consult Pl. XLVI, a longitudinal section of the restored facade. Despite different volumes in this group of columns, the heights of bases (0.32m) and abacuses (0.11m) remain the same, being standard throughout the church.
120. Pages 100f.
The total height of the restored portal from pavement to vault is 9.93 m, or the length of the sides of the crossing square, which actually measure 9.88-9.92 m. Furthermore, the porch frieze attains the level of the exterior side-aisle frieze (10.54 m), and that dimension is equal to one-half the combined width of nave and aisles on the interior of the church (10.59 m). All these harmonious relationships and proportions are so fundamental and guilelessly arrived at—simply by inserting the old narthex tribune columns into the Coronation Porch—it is reasonable to think they indeed do accurately approximate those of the original west facade.

Aside from the structure of the facade wall socle, there are three elements of the modern plan and elevation which deviate remarkably from the 1825 drawings. As for the first, unequivocal evidence still exists that the original embrasures of the Coronation Portal were approached by two steps, not one. Secondly, two columns about 3.60 m apart support the lintel on the 1825 plan, and a voussure on the 1825 cross-section, both designs producing ten embrasure columns. Since there could have been no more than eight columns supporting the voussures, the two extra supports—if they ever existed—would have had to be located beneath the lintel, as on the 1825 plan, not below the voussures. However, their purpose is so confused in the 1825 drawings, one is tempted to reason that having drawn the eight embrasure columns too far apart to abut the tympanum (5.10 m instead of 3.96 m), the draftsman gratuitously inserted these extra columns to help make up the difference. Therefore, their
inclusion or omission from a modern reconstruction of the Coronation Portal should be entirely a matter of practicality. Finally, the restored embrasure columns are designed with statues 2.20m tall.

Because of its size, central importance and sculptural richness, the Braine Coronation Portal should have had statues in the tradition of Gothic portals, the ill-conceived 1825 elevation being no proof to the contrary. If it did, then a head from Saint-Yved now in the Soissons Museum could have belonged to one of the eight column-figures (Figs. 134-136). A rough-cut area at the back of this head on the right may have been caused by separation from a column; however more compelling arguments for a provenance from the Coronation Portal are stylistic, there being other heads of the same character in the voussures (Figs. 137-139), and iconographic: the distinctive mantle drawn over the hair would permit an identification with the priest Samuel, who is represented in the Coronation embrasures at Chartres.

122. Discussed below, pp.118f. The effect of two short columns supporting the lintel is shown in Pl. XXXIX.
123. The Soissons Head has been attached to a gisant, also from Saint-Yved, since 1840; the effect is bizarre, but this arrangement protected both stones from destruction at a time when the Braine tombs were still a subject of concern (Appendix A, letter of the architect Danjoy dated March 21, 1840).
124. See A. Katzenellenbogen, The Sculptural Programs of Chartres Cathedral, 1959, pp. 61f. About 1750 a canon of Saint-Yved remarked "que le portail de l'eglise de Braine a été fait sur le modèle de celui de Notre-Dame de Laon avec les figures des douze apôtres" (Prioux, Monographie, 1859, p. 19, and an extract from the original manuscript in the library at Soissons, Perin 1031). Since at Braine there were no more than eight column-statues, this must be a reference to the Burial of the Virgin of the lintel of the Braine Coronation Portal where twelve apostles are indeed represented.
There is also additional evidence linking the Coronation Portal to the Soissons Head. First, the head still has one trace of gold leaf on the back left-hand side, and the same color and application, a preparatory layer of red ocre, is found on the Soissons Angel's left sleeve. Since the angel's sleeve was repainted gold, using the same yellow-colored support employed about 1838 to restore the Burial of the Virgin, this means the red ocre coat and gold leaf mark a pre-1832 (re-) coloration of both the head and angel. Thus it is probable that two stones important enough to have been gilded, and probably at the same time, belonged to the same decorative scheme.

Secondly, the Soissons Head is somewhat smaller than the heads of two contemporary column-statues in the Museum at Laon. Since the Laon figures measure 2.32m tall, the complete Soissons statue could not have been taller than approximately 2.20m, at the very maximum 2.50m with a console figure. The groundplan of the restored Coronation Portal clearly shows that if there were column-figures at Saint-Yved, then they could have been no wider than 0.55m (Pl. XXXIV). Since the Laon statues are 0.61m wide, they are too broad to have been part of the facade of Saint-Yved, but being smaller than the heads at Laon, the Soissons Head

125. Monuments Historiques, Cellule Scientifique, report on Saint-Yved de Braine. Where the analysis of coloration is concerned, however, unsolved problems are at least as important as the data observed so far (cf. n.93).

126. The height of the modern statues in the side portals flanking the Laon Coronation, which itself has statues 2,60m tall (restored). Comparing dimensions of the Soissons and Laon heads: from the top of the head to the mouth, 0.22m and 0.28m; the width of the head, 0.14m and 0.23m. The beard of the Braine head is broken off and the neck is missing.

127. Boeswillwald, the architect who restored Laon Cathedral, thought the Laon figures could have belonged to Saint-Yved (cf. p. 64). The original embrasure statues of the Coronation Portal at Laon Cathedral were no wider than 0.65m (Pl. XXIX).
would have had not only a shorter, but a narrower body than the Laon Figures. In sum, column-statues reconstructed about 2.20m tall are proportionate to the Braine Coronation embrasures.

Having proceeded this far, the only factor remaining to be discovered about the Coronation Portal embrasures is precisely how the embrasure columns were supported. If one refers only to the Gencourt drawings, there can be no indisputable answer to this question. According to the 1825 elevation the bases of the embrasure columns reposed on the floor of the portal: more precisely on the socle course which excavations in the parvis clearly showed was continuous from the porch into the portal embrasures (Pl. XXXVI). However, we cannot be certain this was the same socle which the 1825 groundplan represented beneath the jamb columns. Where the porch socle does exist today, none is drawn; thus the embrasure socle shown on the plan may not be the porch socle, but a second socle in the portal embrasures, perforce superimposed above the first as in Pls. XXXV, XXXVII. A two-socle system will be discussed more thoroughly in the following pages. One good argument for it can be deduced from the 1825 plan itself, which is perfectly consistent where socles are concerned: columns always have them but walls, be they exterior or interior, never do. Therefore, the socle represented beneath the portal columns on the old groundplan was not the socle which carried the porch walls.

The two basic embrasure designs which can be deduced from the 1825

128. Page 33.
documents have been illustrated by Plates XXXIV-XXXVII. These should be compared with the embrasures of the Coronation Portal rebuilt in 1970 because the latter salvaged as many elements as possible—and all but one unquestionably medieval—from the nineteenth century porch of Saint-Yved: a 0.94m-high wall, four columns and capitals, the abacus above the southeast porch column, a frieze and two corbel figures (Figs. 3-4, 6-7). The 1825 groundplan clearly shows the original embrasure walls lay diagonally behind the columns, not in a chevron pattern as actually rebuilt. We recall this chevron wall pattern resulted from miscalculating the end profile of the voussure rows, which was 0.39m² and not 0.39m x 0.44m. The four rehabilitated porch columns never were part of the Coronation Portal either; if they belonged to the Gothic facade, then they came from a lateral portal or porch. The capitals are 0.32m², not 0.39m², and the shafts 0.21m in diameter fit these capitals. Moreover, the capitals have three and four faces,

129. Two variations on these basic designs are shown in Pls, XXXVIII-XXXIX: one deliberately imitates the transept portals at Chartres Cathedral, although the contrariness of Saint-Yved with respect to Chartres is otherwise remarkable; the second has short columns the length of the statues (2.50m), thus the columns are supported on an excessively high wall some two meters above the socle. Neither variation represents a reasonable improvement and both should be rejected.

130. Pages 50f, 55f.

131. Two shafts are slightly conic. The foliage designs of the capitals vary in richness; four-faced capitals of the same size do exist in the triforium gallery, but these have still another design which is standardized.
not the two used in portal embrasures; and the abacuses once belonged
to a porch, but are too small for the Coronation porch columns. As
for the two charming corbel figures, they cannot by any means be
deduced from the 1825 drawings, but this evidence should not be considered
decisive; the frieze, however, is original. Finally, if a 0.94m-high
wall did exist below the embrasure columns in the old Coronation
Portal, then it would have reposed on—not below—the original socle
course, which continued from the porch into the portal. One must
conclude that only the frieze, and possibly the corbel figures and 0.94m
wall, should have been salvaged to restore the design of the Coronation
Portal. 132

132. Until evidence to the contrary is presented below, we must
assume that the wall might have been a XIXth century reference to the
original height of a second socle beneath the embrasure columns: as
Pl. XXXVII shows, the wall produces column shafts about 3.05m high,
i.e. the height of the four medieval columns employed in the XIXth
century porch. Thus were these columns restored to a side portal,
the column shafts in all three west portals would be the same height.
See below, pp. 113ff.
CHAPTER III

RESTORATION OF THE THREE WEST PORTALS

The Architectural Context of the Coronation Portal:
the West Facade in Early Documents

The foregoing observations have revealed two important questions about the Coronation Portal which remain to be answered: precisely what was its groundplan, or how were the embrasure columns supported; and what was the portal's architectural context, thus its plan and elevation in relation to the west facade of Saint-Yved. Because the documents and archaeological data pertaining to the first have been investigated already, let us examine now those sources specifically relative to a reconstruction of the architectural context of the Coronation Portal.

Of five documents representing the west facade before the 1832 demolition, \(^{133}\) three are perspectives depicting Saint-Yved from the southwest, and the two others are drawings previously discussed which Monsieur Gencourt made in 1825. The earliest perspective of the church is an unpublished drawing by Pierre Lelu (1741-1810) made before the nave vaults collapsed in 1808 (Fig. 19). \(^{134}\) A well-known lithograph

\(^{133}\) See p. 82f and n. 110.

\(^{134}\) Chateau, op. cit., pp. 89f. The drawing is now in the collection of Paul Prouté, Paris; dated 1810 by Prioux, Monographie, p. 21. Monsieur Jean Liger, who made the sketch in Fig. 19, called my attention to this document.
perspective of Saint-Yved portrayed in a glorious state of ruin by Dauzats, and an anonymous watercolor copy of this print, were executed between 1820, after the lantern tower fell, and 1832 (Figs. 20-21). Lelu's drawing is thoroughly unsophisticated compared to Dauzats' lithograph, which is so remarkably accurate, the general outlines of the church may first have been traced on a glass placed between artist and subject. Afterward, probably in the studio, the building was reconstructed with the two-point perspective system illustrated in Plate XL (cf. Fig. 140). We know this system of mensuration was precise because those heights represented on the south transept facade for the gable (E), the two friezes (A-B), and the wall buttresses (D) correspond to actual measurements for the transept.\footnote{135}

\footnote{135. The lithograph is in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Cab. Est., Ub 21c, the watercolor in the Archives Monuments Historiques 10684; neither work is dated. The stones of Saint-Yved were put up for sale by a royal ordonnance dated October, 1820 (effective 1822) to prevent debris from the fallen lantern and vaults from being stolen. The order was rescinded in 1823 at the instigation of the fanatical Curé Beaucamp. Doubtless from 1820 on fresh interest in the church was stimulated on all sides— including the artistic— with entrepreneurs like Brunet buying and selling against a valiant defense mounted by the Curé and Fabric. See Chateau, \textit{loc. cit.}; Beaucamp, \textit{Mémoire}, 1825, and Prioux, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 31.

Because the watercolor shows workmen carting away the stones of Saint-Yved, a poignantly realistic detail, one may wish to argue that this watercolor, not the lithograph, was sketched \textit{in situ}. The problems discussed below caused by the obstructed west porches, however, would remain the same.

\footnote{136. See Pl. XLI, a design of the actual south transept in perspective which concurs with measurements taken from the lithograph and from excellent engravings published by Prioux in 1859. I wish to thank Monsieur Liger who executed Pls. XL-XLI; without his precise analysis, our knowledge of the lithograph would be as vague now as it always has been.}
When the larger dimensions of the south transept in the lithograph are developed to a scale of 1:150 (Plate XL), this document can be utilized today to re-establish the relative heights of certain elements which composed the demolished west facade. According to the lithograph, the cornice on the south transept was some 0.60m lower than its counterpart on the west facade (B-C); and this disparity did exist, although it is somewhat exaggerated in the print. Since the cornice of the transept and choir walls actually is 0.40m lower than that of the nave, doubtless the nave and west facade cornices were level at 20.03m (19.63m + 0.40m). Moreover, the gables facing the narthex, nave and south transept roofs (E), thus the roofs themselves, originally attained the same height; and the centers of the two rose windows were level on both facades, or 14.96m on the south and 15.07m on the west (G-g).

Despite its remarkable sophistication this perspective system was not perfect. The gable and walls of the Coronation porch were badly misconceived, indeed they were left incomplete. For the artist could not intelligently represent the projection of this porch from a southwest angle where almost all the portal area of the facade, and the entire north porch were hidden either by a wall of the château, by trees as shown, or by both. A land registry made in 1782 for the last Count of Braine clearly shows the château's north wall once joined the southwest corner of the Coronation porch. In fact, part of this high wall stands today as far as 8.50m west of the site of the old porch, and the rest probably was not dismantled until 1832 when the facade
was demolished (Figs. 9, 141).\textsuperscript{137} As for the trees which obscure the west porches in the lithograph, according to the 1782 registry they were planted between the château and church before the Revolution, a site now occupied by a private garden.

Precisely where the Coronation porch was misrepresented in the lithograph becomes obvious when the porch's lines are drawn out in perspective to their logical conclusion. The decorative frieze which originally attained the height of the side-aisle frieze, or 10.61m, is depicted 0.64m too low (A-a, Pl. XL). But far more important is the fact that the junction of the central and lateral porches is confused, thus the Coronation gable is drawn much narrower than the original. According to the lithograph, this gable reached a height of 12.94m above the floor of the porch, or the same height attained by the capitals supporting vault springers on the church's interior. The gable also is represented \textit{tangent} to the porch frieze, so it necessarily would have descended as far as the Coronation capitals, or 5.50m above the pavement (Pl. XLII). The hidden impracticality of this system rebounds on the south porch roof which is drawn level with the side-aisle windows 8.84m high. Beyond any reasonable doubt the Coronation gable originally dropped no lower than 8.84m; otherwise, the gable would have cut in front of the facade wall in a precipitous descent 3.07m below the roofing of the lateral porches (cf. Pl. XLIII). As unorthodox and

\textsuperscript{137} The "Atlas perpetuel de la seigneurie" is in the Archives Départementales; the château itself was sold in 1798 and destroyed soon thereafter (Archives Départementales, "Renseignements sur Braine" in Dumas, "Braine, textes").
impractical as the lithograph design is when the Coronation porth is completed, the Lelu perspective shows the same system, this time frankly stated (Fig. 19). The only possible explanation for such confusion is that the portal area of the west facade was concealed from view. As for the artist of the watercolor copy of the lithograph, he not only repeated the faults of the model but added some on his own (Fig. 21). While re-arranging the trees to vary the landscape, this man disclosed the area on the north porch which he had not studied and quite obviously did not know how to represent. He drew the north porch wall without a portal, and it appears on the same plane with the central porch because the projecting wall separating the two porches was omitted altogether.

The preceding discussion permits us to conclude that the relative heights of major elements composing the Gothic facade of Saint-Yved should be restored as in Pl. XLIV.138 The nineteenth century lithograph has been modified by aligning the Coronation porch gable and the roofing of the lateral porches (8.84m above the porch paving), the cornices of the facade and nave (extant, 20.03m), and the rose windows of the facade and south transept (extant, 14.96m). This design also reconstructs the relative widths of all three west porches at Saint-Yved. The following analysis of how these dimensions, as well as relative depths, can be re-established today recalls our attention to the Gencourt groundplan and cross-section dated 1825, the only other documents

138. See Pl. XLV; this was the model for the restored facade elevation and it adheres strictly to the heights depicted in the lithograph perspective as determined by Pl. XL.
describing the Gothic facade before the 1832 demolition.

Measurements of the west porches presented on Gencourt's groundplan cannot be taken seriously because some dimensions are obviously incorrect (Fig. 132). For example, the north porch is drawn 1.90m deep but actually measures 1.53m; and its north wall is shown 2.75m wide, whereas this mass originally was 3.19m with socle included. The utter simplicity with which the lateral portals were designed also causes skepticism. The total mass of each one is outlined without any detail whatever except a socle for the door embrasures; thus bases for six columns are indicated, but no columnar decoration is shown either in the portal embrasures or porches. However, the 1825 groundplan does acquire a unique value in relation to the lithograph and watercolor perspectives of Saint-Yved: the old plan reveals that the Coronation porch projected about twice as far as the lateral porches from the west portal embrasures, which were aligned; thus its depth was 3.06m (1.53m x 2) as illustrated by Pl. XLVI, a cross-section through the Coronation Portal of the restored west facade. Moreover, the Gencourt plan shows the walls of the central porch and the corners of the facade wall enframed the side porches, and that these porches were symmetrical. Since the left wall of the north porch still exists in situ, were the maximum width of the Coronation porch to be determined precisely, then the width of all three west porches could be reconstructed.

More than any other subject, the wall buttresses on the west facade bring into focus the fact that comparing elements from the transept and

139. Three columns on each side of the Coronation porch were evenly spaced, the central column being aligned with the entrance to the side porches.
west facades is a practical method of restoration, and furthermore a necessary prologue to discussing the groundplan of the porches.

According to Gencourt's cross-section of the church (Figs. 133, 140), the buttresses which rose above the three porches were the same narrow type as those existing today on the east and west faces of the transept. However, the Dauzats lithograph perspective clearly reveals the wall buttresses were as salient and massive as those at the angles of the transept facades (Fig. 20). Because the 1825 drawings always will be less authentic than the lithograph whenever proportions and measurements are in question, the three facades should be compared; and that they originally were comparable can be demonstrated even today.

The span of the wall enframing the south transept rose actually measures 8.36m wide; two flanking wall buttresses each 1.30m wide increase the width of the south transept to 10.96m, which is also its length inside the church. When these motifs are centralized in the upper half of the west facade as in Pl. XLV, one realizes the total span of the Coronation porch itself was 10.96m. The porch walls began 4.06m from each side of the central axis, whereas superior buttresses copied from the transept will rise at 4.18m. Since these lines almost coincide, the maximum width of the porch walls and the superior wall buttresses must have been aligned vertically in a formal relationship: the buttresses being 1.30m wide, both upper and lower

140. One need only recall that the Gencourt elevation represents the west facade projecting as far as 7.30m from the narthex wall, but the 1825 plan only 6.20m.
141. Consult the restored groundplan, Pl. XXXV.
masses once extended 5.48m from the church's axis (4.18m + 1.30m).142

Doubtless the reason why this correspondence existed between the facades is the fact that all the spatial vessels of the interior of Saint-Yved are equally wide at the lantern crossing, the distance between the nave walls, the transept walls and the choir walls being 9.30m. Furthermore, the height of the triforium gallery was 9.30m above the original interior pavement, thus the medieval architect's rigidly systematic development of space is beyond all question.143

Now we are in a good position to estimate the width of the symmetric lateral west porches (Pl. XLV). The north porch was flanked by one wall on the north which still exists on a line 0.135m south of the aisle wall. Its south wall, belonging to the Coronation porch, was located 5.48m from the church's axis. Thus the north and south porches were no wider than 4.975m,144 or one-half the side of the lantern square (9.90m/2).

From the foregoing analysis of all the documents relative to the Gothic facade of Saint-Yved before 1832, it may be concluded that the heights of major elements composing the facade were recorded accurately by the Dauzats lithograph, because the same measurements, with minor adjustments, today exist on the south side-aisle, nave and transept. Moreover, originally certain widths were comparable on all three facades

142. The width of each wall of the Coronation porch was 1.93m at the base; on the 1825 plan, 2.00m.
143. Discussed below, pp. 119ff.
144. 10.59m (½ the nave and aisles) = 0.135m - 5.48m = 4.975m.
at Saint-Yved, a systematic disposition of exterior masses doubtless resulting from the systematization of spatial vessels on the interior of the church, the nave, transept and choir all being equally wide between their walls. As for the relative depths of the west porches, this factor can be accurately calculated from the 1825 groundplan in conjunction with actual remains of the north porch. The one point on which the old documents either are silent or confused is the precise angle of the Coronation porch gable; it must be reconstructed from building methods which are both practical and typical of that epoch.

All the documents dating prior to 1832 discussed heretofore were available to Thomas King who published in 1857 an interesting reconstruction of Saint-Yved as it would have appeared in the sixteenth century, and this series of scale drawings is historically important as the first and only attempt to reconstruct the demolished west facade in its entirety (Figs. 22-23). The most famous design is a perspective of the church from the northwest, the monastery side of the building, which restores in detail what the earlier lithograph by Dauzats presented in ruin from the southwest, the château side. From the lithograph also were adopted columnar decoration in the lateral west porches and the impressively large rose windows of the west facade, which King enlarged from 6.20m to 8.00m, or 1.50m wider than the transept roses. This shows his respect for the 1825 drawings was not

145. Études pratiques tirées de l'architecture du moyen âge en Europe, I, Bruges; most recently republished in Ministère des Affaires Culturelles, Principes d'analyse scientifique, Architecture, II, Paris, 1972, Chap. XIII.
blind; therein the lateral porches had no columns, and the Coronation porch was represented 0.70m higher than the clerestory windows, leaving only 5.25m in which to design a rose window. But King certainly knew the two Gencourt drawings and his reconstruction of the west facade is the third recorded reference to them. In fact, King adhered too closely to the ill-conceived 1825 elevation, thus his restoration of the Coronation Portal became thoroughly outdated when the portal was rebuilt in 1970.

On the other hand, King's design of the west facade deviates significantly from authentic elements reproduced either by Dauzats' lithograph or the 1825 groundplan, and this also makes the quality of his reconstruction unreliable. First, his plan of the west facade is symmetrical and the embrasures of the west portals are not aligned. Secondly, the opening of the western rose is some 1.50m too wide and its stone tracery has no relation whatever to the transept roses. Finally, the facade was incorrectly restored with narrow wall buttresses copied from the east and west faces of the transept, in fact the same

146. Page 11, n. 15.
147. Figs. 6, 133.
148. Still other errors exist which are no less difficult to explain. Because a cloister once adjoined the north side of the church, wall buttresses here were constructed on top of the aisle wall, which had a thick base, level with the glacis for each window (Fig. 142). Since this system is completely visible even today, there is no reason why the 1857 reconstruction should have drawn buttresses continuous to the cloister pavement.
type drawn on the 1825 cross-section, and as a result the three west porches are no longer physically integrated with the superior level of the facade. This frankly contradicts all the early perspectives of Saint-Yved, wherein the character and disposition of the west facade's masses are shown to have been related to a modest church near Braine at Glennes, and even to the church belonging to the Premonstratensians at Zsambek in Hungary (Figs. 143-145). 149

The documents relative to the west facade before 1832 did not lead to any new conclusions about the groundplan and elevation of the lateral west portals, except that their porches originally were 4.975m wide. We recall the only scale drawings of the facade known to have been calculated from the actual church, the Gencourt, King and Prioux designs, all mislocate the plan of the left embrasure of the north portal with respect to its extant foundations excavated in 1971. 150 And neither Gencourt nor Prioux prepared an elevation of the lateral portals. King's elevation derives from Gencourt's groundplan and restores each side portal with six embrasure columns on socles; also all three tympana of the facade are designed at the same height, or 4.40m (Fig. 22).

149. The Zsambek photograph is found in Acta Historiae Artium, XVIII, 1972, "Les cent ans de la protection des monuments en Hongrie," p. 8. Regarding Prioux's groundplan for the Coronation Portal and porch (Monographie, 1859), the restoration of ten embrasure columns beneath the voussures, porch columns no larger in diameter than those of the portal, and a short porch less than twice the depth of the lateral porches cannot be substantiated from data accurately describing the west facade before it was demolished. See Fig. 24.
150. Page 42, Pl. XV.
However, the Coronation tympanum once stood a full meter higher at 5.50m above the porch floor, thus King's restoration is misconceived. His idea that all three tympana reposed at the same level, nevertheless, is provocative. It would mean the embrasures of the central and lateral portals originally were designed to form a coherent pattern across the facade. This pattern, if one existed, cannot be established without knowing the relative heights of the embrasure columns of the west portals. Fortunately, one architectural element from the lateral west porches or portal embrasures may be extant today: the four medieval columns complete with capitals, abacuses and bases which were rehabilitated to decorate the nineteenth century porch of Saint-Yved. Their provenance has never been investigated; but the possibility they once belonged to the Gothic west facade should be considered seriously and precisely because they were employed in the nineteenth century porch.

151. Page 87. King's error does not refer back to Gencourt's groundplan, where the central tympanum is 5.00m above the pavement. Probably it resulted either from reconstructing the roofing of the lateral porches, to which the Coronation gable is joined, one meter too low; or from making the large Coronation Portal conform in height to small side portals (see n. 153).

152. Pages 50f,92f.

153. This must have been King's opinion since he apparently restored these columns to the side portals; the 3.05m shafts are designed 3.10m tall.
Beyond any doubt Gencourt fabricated the nineteenth century porch out of material garnered from the old facade, and most conspicuously from the Coronation porch, whose general outline was in fact reproduced on a smaller scale (Pl. XLVII). Even certain large dimensions appear to have been deliberately preserved: the emplacement of two buttresses flanking the modern porch is comparable to the total width of the Gothic porch (11.10m, 10.96m); the exterior width of the modern porch equals the interior width of the original, being also the height of the old Coronation tympanum (8.10m); furthermore, the Coronation voussures were salvaged and the depths of the two porches are comparable (3.11m, 3.06m).

Relative heights are more difficult to judge because Gencourt might have referred either to heights measured from the floor of the church interior and west portals, or to distances from the paving of the west porches, which was 0.36m lower.155

As for the medieval columns decorating the nineteenth century porch, a provenance from a lateral portal or porch of the Gothic facade

154. Plate XXXV.
155. Plate XLVI. Thus the modern gable descends to 5.47m above the porch floor, where the Coronation capitals once stood; but its peak is 9.40m high, or approximately as high as the Coronation's outer voussure measured from the floor of the old portal, this voussure being level with the triforium gallery (9.34m, 9.30m). However, 9.40m is exactly ten times the height of the socle of the modern facade, so that relationship and not the triforium gallery may have been foremost in Gencourt's mind.
is not only probable, but quite logical if one considers the financial circumstances under which the present facade developed. A quick glance at the expensive facade project conceived in 1825, before Saint-Yved's royal patron was exiled, shows a modern porch design distinguished from the actual one by its impressive scale duplicating the original, and an astonishing lack of authentic medieval decoration (Fig. 146). For example, there are no columns whatsoever, and even though the medieval rinceaux was available, a splendid frieze was to be carved expressly for the new porch. However, after the revolution and Bourbon exile in 1830, the respect Saint-Yved had received because of its royal tombs abruptly terminated. Restoration work already contracted was not discontinued, but debts were to be partially liquidated by demolishing all the church west of the giant rubble partition wall near the lantern tower. This ugly wall itself was substituted for a facade and the porch that finally was built, for which no preparatory drawings exist, was modest and unpremeditated. Precisely for this reason it has greater historical value than the 1825 project, because the Coronation frieze and other Gothic decoration had to be salvaged in the economic crisis. That is, the little porch was pieced together from odds and ends, so

156. The drawing is in the Archives Monuments Historiques (Appendix A, 1825). Measurements of the church are badly misrepresented: e.g., the cornice of the west facade is shown 17.70m high, whereas that of the south transept actually is 19.63m.
history was vindicated but inadvertently.157

This explains why the four columns were useful to Gencourt. But the argument for a provenance from the Gothic west facade cannot be completed without discussing the subject to which we now turn, the relationship between these columns and a sculpted tympanum representing The Inferno located in the Musée Saint-Leger at Soissons. Indeed, here is the key to restoring the plan and elevation of the lateral portals of Saint-Yved, moreover to resolving the problematic embrasure design of the Coronation Portal.

The Three West Portals Restored: the Lateral Portals and the Soissons Tympanum

The most important question which remains to be answered about the Gothic facade of Saint-Yved is whether or not a tympanum representing The Inferno now at Soissons originally belonged to one of the lateral portals; and if it did, then precisely what were the groundplan and elevation of this portal (Fig. 5). The answer indeed is quite simple, but in order to appreciate it the problems involved in restoring the Soissons Tympanum to the facade of Saint-Yved should be exposed first.

As it exists today, the Soissons Tympanum is designed with a circular arc which joins a lintel 0.96m tall, the complete structure measuring 2.68m wide by 2.07m high. However, the original dimensions

157. Ludovic Vité, the Inspecteur-général des travaux historiques at whose instigation the Soissons Museum was created for The Inferno, and whose contact with Gencourt at Braine began in 1830, probably inspired the archaeological character of the XIXth century porch; see Vité, Rapport sur les monuments de l'Aisne..., Paris, 1831, and Gencourt in L'Argus Soissonais, 1833 (Appendix A, 1833).
are impossible to judge without some other point of reference because the tympanum is composed of seven odd wedge-shaped stones, suggesting it either was broken during the 1832 demolition as the documents relate, then carved-up to facilitate transport to Soissons, or damaged at some date before 1832. This curiously wedged composition is not typical of stone construction, which consists of horizontal courses; but until its original size is known, one can neither determine how many courses there once were, nor state that the entire tympanum was carved from a single stone.

Vivid accounts of the battle between Braine and Soissons over the ownership of The Inferno are recorded in local documents of 1833-1841, where the sculpture is said to have belonged to the west facade of Saint-Yved. According to Gencourt's description of the bas-relief, in 1832 it depicted two episodes from the "fin dernière" in a single setting. The one reference to the state of this sculpture prior to

158. See "Pièce V" of the dossier in the Musée Saint-Leger, Soissons (Appendix A, 1841).
159. The cutting of the peripheral edges is uniform, but the stone representing Leviathan in the lintel is slightly irregular on the left outer edge. The Inferno was dismantled in 1961 for transport to the Paris exhibition "Cathédrales," and for some reason no one bothered to check the condition of the interior edges of the seven stones after the XIXth century mortar had been removed.
160. In particular, see letters of 1841 in Appendix A. Braine lost and the tympanum went first to the city hall of Soissons, then to a new museum which at Vitet's instigation was created for it and a few other priceless possessions (Gencourt, ibid.).
161. Ibid.
1832 is Prioux's remark that at some time before the demolition, The Inferno had been attached to a wall of the narthex gallery (beneath the clerestory windows). Thus, the records are ambiguous about its provenance: certainly The Inferno came to Soissons from Saint-Yved, where it had been salvaged from the narthex tribune in 1832; but this fact is no proof the sculpture ever decorated a lateral portal of the facade. Indeed, the unusual iconography has led one scholar to propose that The Inferno belonged to a tympanum. Moreover, if the sculpture originally was a tympanum, then lurking in the shadows of the past is a possibility it was deposited at Saint-Yved from one of Braine's other churches destroyed after the Revolution, or came from a door to the

162. Monographie, 1859, p. 22, and Répertoire archéologique, 1863, p. 20: "On a wall of the organ tribune one still saw, before the destruction of the facade, a curious representation of Hell or the Last Judgment."


164. A provenance from the Benedictine nunnery of Notre-Dame should not be ruled-out, although this convent church was not sold by the Fabric until Saint-Yved became serviceable in 1837, and in order to pay for its restoration. As early as 1791 the property of the nunnery had been placed at the disposition of the town, as were all ecclesiastical holdings, and it immediately was evaluated for sale. When the tide of revolution rose in 1792-1793 Braine's churches were pillaged of anything valuable which could be moved; in fact, Notre-Dame's continued existence from 1806 to 1837 was insured only because the town had no other parish, Saint-Yved being still a ruin. Described as a small chapel capable of holding about one-half the town population (700), Notre-Dame's ancestry was just as noble as Saint-Yved's; the chapel was founded with the Hôtel-Dieu in 1201 by the same Countess Agnès and dedicated to Saint Anthony. See Archives Nationales F19-662, letter of the Bishop of Soissons dated September 20, 1824 (Appendix A); Abbé Pecheur, loc. cit.; Aubry-Polyn, Saint-Yved alias Notre-Dame de Braine, 1962, pp. 6f; M. Buffenoir, "Les registres de la Municipalité de Braine pendant la Revolution," Bulletin de la Société Archéologique de Soissons, V, 1931-1932.
Premonstratensian monastery, which was sold to Bruneteau in 1803 and whose precise measurements are no longer known.  

For the moment, let us put aside all the questions which have not been answered about provenance, the fragmented composition, and the original dimensions of the Soissons Tympanum in favor of reconstructing a portal at Saint-Yved to contain the sculpture as it exists today. This is, in fact, a reasonable enterprise because in order to fit The Inferno into the restored facade, its present width would have been the original. From excavations made in the parvis of Saint-Yved, it is clear that the tympanum of the north portal and presumably the south also, there being no evidence the two were not symmetrical, could have been no wider than approximately 2.76m. The width of the Soissons Tympanum is 2.68m, thus if restored to a lateral portal its present width, for all practical purposes, is the original. In brief, the tympanum once may have been slightly narrower than 2.68m, because two thick mortared joints exist in the lintel today; but if it ever was more than some 0.08m wider than 2.68m, then this sculpture belonged to another building.

There are three directives which can be applied to restoring the embrasures of the north portal of the Gothic facade: the Gencourt groundplan of 1825 (Fig. 132); Plateau E on which the socle course of the left embrasure once reposed; and four medieval columns that Gencourt employed to decorate the nineteenth century porch of Saint-Yved (Fig. 3). An experimental plan of the lateral west portals which

165. Archives Départementales Q189, "Procès-verbal" dated April 12, 1803.
166. Discussed pp. 26f, 33 (Pl. VI, Fig. 56).
incorporates these directives is presented in Plate XLVIII: the socle for six column bases forms a chevron pattern in accordance with the 1825 document; this pattern is designed in such a way that the originally invisible rubblework at Plateau E is concealed entirely by the socle course; and in order that the tympanum be as wide as possible, the outline of the socle adheres strictly to the edge of the rubblework. However, bases and capitals $0.32m^2$ copied from the four medieval columns in the nineteenth century porch will produce a tympanum only $2.50m$ wide, and The Inferno is too wide for this embrasure design. We remark that the necessary space cannot be created unless capitals and bases approximately $0.25m^2$ are used ($2.70m$), and certainly the originals were not this small. In fact the only embrasure design which does produce enough space for The Inferno is a design with two socles superimposed: i.e. a span $2.64m$ wide using capitals $0.32m^2$ (Pls. L-LI); or $2.76m$ wide with capitals $0.29m^2$—a mean between $0.32m$ and $0.25m$ (Pl. LII).

Ultimately a decision about the size of the old capitals and bases will depend on whether or not the medieval columns placed in the nineteenth century porch—columns having elements of the same

167. For the elevation, cf. Pl. XLIX.
168. Plate LIII: capitals $0.25m^2$ are disproportionately small because the lateral portals were nearly two-thirds as wide as the Coronation Portal, with capitals $0.39m^2$ ($4.98m$, $7.07m$); and the lateral capitals stood at least four-fifths as high.
169. A two-socle system can be inferred from the 1825 drawings; cf. p. 91.
dimensions, which are standard at Saint-Yved—originally did belong to the Gothic facade. This question has not been resolved, but we can be certain of the following circumstances which relate to it. Beyond doubt the column shafts did not come from a lateral porch: as Plate LIV illustrates, porch column shafts 3.05m tall would have made the lateral portals disproportionately low and quite thoroughly ugly. Thus the medieval columns can be restored only in a lateral portal; and the Soissons Tympanum cannot be restored with bases fitting these columns unless, as demonstrated above, a two-socle embrasure system is employed (Pl. L). Finally, if the Soissons Tympanum belonged to the Gothic facade of Saint-Yved, then its lintel probably dropped below the voussures; were it designed level with the voussures, the shape of the lateral portals would have had no relation whatever to the Coronation Portal (Pl. LIV). Using a two-socle system shown in elevation by Plate LI, the lintels of all three west portals will be level when the 3.05m column shafts of the nineteenth century porch are reconstructed above a short chamfered socle 0.33m high.

To sharpen our critical judgment at this point, let us refer to Plate LVI which represents the Gothic facade of Saint-Yved in elevation as it would have appeared before 1832, with all three west portals restored. The dimensions of the lateral portals were reconstructed in

170. The bases, capitals and abacuses; see nn. 119,131. As for the 3.05m shafts, this dimension corresponds to the height of the lantern gallery columns (3.00m), the width of the west facade's north wall (3.05m), and the distance of the south aisle buttresses from the aisle wall (3.03m); cf. Pl. I.

171. See also Pl. LV; it should be remarked that a socle added here to raise the porch columns higher does not coordinate the elevation of the west portals.
the following experimental manner. First, the facade originally had been divided by one-third at the roofline of the lateral porches (8.85m), and by fourths at the level of the narthex windows and cornice (6.67m); because simple fractions also exist in the proportions of the church's interior elevation, as discussed in detail below, the apexes of the lateral tympana were placed 6.67m above the porch floor to express the dimension one-fourth in the lower half of the facade (Point B). Then, the tympana were aligned vertically with narthex windows drawn 2.64m wide, the width of windows in the existing clerestory of the south transept and nave (Line A).

Thirdly, all the arches of Saint-Yved either are pointed arcs with the center located on the span and on the interior of the arc, or pointed arcs raised above the span, the center still being on the span and well inside the arch (cf. Pl. LVII). The Coronation tympanum provides a perfect example of the first category: the center is near the axis and less than one centimeter below the span, which is the tympanum base at the level of the embrasure capital abacuses. If an arc of the same type is described for the lateral tympana between Point B and Line A, the height and width of the arc as determined above, the center Point C is

172. See p. 98 and Pl. XLIV.
173. Pages 123-125.
174. For the terminology, see Ministère des Affaires Culturelles, Vocabulaire de l'Architecture, Paris, 1972, II, Chap. IX, 17, 24. The arcade of the lantern gallery is an exception: composed with a very high arc in proportion to its width (lancet), the center lies outside, not inside the arc.
discovered on a span which is 4.92m above the porch floor. According to the formula apparent in the central portal design, the lateral abacuses originally rose to the height of this span: thus, the capitals were level with the necking of the Coronation capitals, which also is 4.92m high. It follows that when the lateral lintels are dropped level with the necking of the lateral capitals, the lintels of all three portals are aligned perfectly.

By using these simple methods the west portals of Saint-Yved can be designed to create a harmonious pattern. But the most astonishing fact that was learned from making this experiment, indeed the definitive test for this new reconstruction of the Gothic facade, is that the Soissons Tympanum is perfectly suited to the restored design of the lateral portals. The lintel of The Inferno being 0.96m tall and some 2.65m wide without mortared joints, a circular arc described from the lintel's center at F on the span will recreate Line A and Point B. Furthermore, the same lateral portal design just produced by geometric methods was obtained earlier from The Inferno, when column shafts copied from those Gencourt salvaged in 1832 were reconstructed above two socles on the excavated foundations of the north portal (Pls. L-LI).

175. Of course any number of arcs could have been drawn between two given points, for example arcs with centers at D and E; however, Center D is located beside the arc it describes, not near the axis, and Center E lies outside the arc. Thus, the choice of Center C is unavoidable, and furthermore it creates a harmonious facade design.

176. As further evidence of systematic design, there are five prominent square figures in the elevation of the west portals (Pl. LVIII).
Thus, the puzzle of the provenance of the Soissons Tympanum and the medieval columns finally is solved. All once belonged to side portals of the Gothic facade of Saint-Yved.177

Having gained this new vantage point, the embrasure design of the three west portals can be completed quite precisely. Since the embrasure columns of the Inferno Portal were supported on two short socles each 0.33m tall (with mortar), all three portals were designed with two socles. This placed their column bases on a line 1.35m above the porch floor, which is one-sixth as high as the Coronation tympanum, or 8.13m (Pl. LVI-G). As for the sculpted tympanum representing The Inferno, it was carved from one block of stone and is some 0.18m shorter than it was originally; thus, its height has been reduced from 2.25m, as calculated from the restored facade design, to 2.07m (Pl. LIX, Fig. 5). We recall that the tympanum was dismounted before the facade was demolished in 1832 for unknown reasons; having no trumeau, possibly it developed dangerous structural faults like the tympana of the lateral west portals of Laon Cathedral.178 In any case, at some date the

177. According to the Lelu and Dauzats perspectives of Saint-Yved, the arced opening of the south porch was pointed, not round, so The Inferno necessarily would have been located in the north portal. But this argument alone is not conclusive, because the porch area of the facade was concealed by trees or the chateau wall, and probably by both (pp. 96f).

The north portal, however, did adjoin the monastery of Saint-Yved. In fact it was the main entrance to the cloister from the west, via a door leading from the narthex into the north stairwell of the facade; cf. Gencourt's plan of 1325 (Fig. 132), and descriptions of the monastery in Martène and Durand, Voyage littéraire de deux religieux bénédictins, 1724, and Broche and Sars, Histoire de Braine, pp. 117f. Since restoring The Inferno as an entrance to the monastery would explain why a conspicuous group of clerics is being herded into the cauldron of Hell, where as a moral lesson the Deadly Sins suffer, there is good reason to think that the north portal of Saint-Yved was the original site of the Soissons Tympanum.

178. Note 83.
composition was damaged, then cut into wedges and pieced back together again in its present form. All this probably occurred either when the tympanum was moved from the facade and displayed in the narthex tribune, or during the 1832 demolition, at which time the Inferno may have been carved-up for transport to Soissons.

The question whether or not the lateral porches should be reconstructed with columns is of secondary importance but not without interest, because columns restored to these porches would permit us to rehabilitate the actual bases, capitals and abacuses used to decorate the nineteenth century porch. 179 According to the Lelu and Dauzats perspectives of Saint-Yved, a roll moulding outlined the arcuated opening of the south porch and it would have reposed on a column (Figs. 19-20). If these documents are faithful witnesses, then there were two columns flanking the entrance of each lateral porch—their bases necessarily standing against the socle of the facade, not on it—which would explain why Gencourt designed a porch with this motif and where the material came from. Certainly there were no more than two columns; the porches being shallow, others can hardly be squeezed in west of the steps, and if they were, they would conceal the outer voussoirs (Pl. L). 180

179. See Pl. XLVII; the original porch columns are lost, probably because they were too tall to be used in the modern porch design of Saint-Yved.

180. King reconstructs two pairs of columns in each porch, however the side porches are drawn deeper than they actually were (Fig. 22). As for the material salvaged by Gencourt, the abacuses originally did belong to porches; and quite probably the capitals as well, since they have three and four faces, but are not the same style as triforium capitals. Finally, the bases re-employed against the socle of the modern porch were not standard squares, but originally 0.32m x 0.28m. This
When the restored Coronation and Inferno Portals are reproduced in elevation at a scale of 1:20, their structure can be examined more carefully (Pls. LI, LX). The only element which needs to be explained is why the two sculpted corbel figures salvaged to decorate the nineteenth century porch are better suited to support the Coronation lintel than two columns shown on the 1825 groundplan (Fig. 147). One compelling argument for a provenance from the Coronation Portal is the fact that the head type of the righthand figure belongs to the same family as the Soissons Angel (Fig. 148). Another argument is a matter of practicality. The most economic method of supporting the lintel is on corbels above walls projecting only 0.27m from the two column bases flanking the door—as determined by data relevant to the lateral portals in Site IV (Pl. XLVIII)—because this will produce the widest doors possible. A wider extension of the embrasures below the lintel has no practical effect whatsoever; indeed, it is positively detrimental, absorbing precious space for the doors already diminished in the central portal by a trumeau. Finally, the Burial and

adjustment can be explained because the Gothic facade socle was 0.07m wide; had the bases been 0.32m^2, the abacuses above would not have been tangent to the porch walls.

181. For the plans of these two portals, see Pls. XXXV, L; the longitudinal sections are detailed in Pls. XLVI, LXII; the pendant to the Inferno Portal is shown in elevation by Pl. LXI. Whether the voussures of the lateral portals had sculpture or roll mouldings is not known; they are restored arbitrarily with mouldings copied from the XIXth century porch. The question of column-statues in the lateral embrasures also is unresolved.

182. The elevation and precise measurements of the Coronation trumeau cannot be reconstructed from data available today.
Resurrection of the Virgin are enframed by clouds both below and above which deliberately separate the lintel from mundane affairs; thus, it is difficult to imagine a more appropriate support for these scenes, and for the Coronation itself, than the two angels represented on the corbels. Having robust and broadly conceived forms, these angels also are perfectly in character for the corbels of a large portal.

The Use of Mathematics to Restore the West Facade of Saint-Yved

The foregoing analysis of the Gothic facade of Saint-Yved brings into focus the question whether or not the reconstructed measurements of the three portals can be confirmed, or in certain instances actually obtained, by referring to the general proportions of Saint-Yved as it stands today. How do we know the old west facade in fact was designed as rationally as the modern restoration? The answer is, of course, that we cannot know beyond all doubt. But the existing half of the building was composed systematically and this is a directive which merits serious attention. Indeed, it reveals why the demolished facade would not have had a separate character from the body of the church.

Viollet-le-Duc was Saint-Yved's first sympathetic admirer in modern times. Above all he was acutely sensitive to the logical method whereby Saint-Yved's groundplan was conceived—ampley illustrated

183. See the Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture, VIII, pp. 511ff; Ludovic Vitet had remarked during an official visit to Braine what a "belle disposition" and perfect regularity Saint-Yved had, but he found it all a little boring (Appendix A, 1831).
by his well-known design in Volume VIII (Fig. 149)—which method he called "symmetrie." Quite justifiably mocking modern parlance which he traced to banal sixteenth century notions about like halves, Viollet-le-Duc was referring to Vitruvius' symmetria, meaning a rapport of unequal numbers achieved with the aid of a formula; furthermore, a harmony deducible or sensible from one of its parts, as the symmetry of ancient temples may be calculated from the diameter of a column. Always astute, Viollet-le-Duc observed the diagonal of the lantern square (7 toise) and the intercolumnation of nave bays (16 feet or 4 x 4) are unlike numbers (mutually indivisible), yet they were arranged systematically within a large square comprising the lantern and adjoining bays on all four sides—and in all this he certainly was right. It follows that he thought the medieval architect of Saint-Yved, and Greeks and Romans before him, chose the numbers seven, four and three specifically to create a symmetrical design—and here he was surely mistaken. The most obvious method by which the Gothic architect could have drawn the groundplan of Saint-Yved is illustrated by Pl. LXIII where actual dimensions of the building are represented; there we discover a systematic spatial development of figures derived from the geometric properties of the lantern square, and proceeding geometrically from the crossing.

The crossing was the spiritual center of the church's body, 184

184. It was also the entrance to the XIIIth century choir. Sites XII-XIII revealed that the two east piers of the lantern originally were
and at the outset a lantern $9.90m^2$ was conceived with spatial extensions of equal width on all sides.\(^{185}\) Then a diagonal of one-half the lantern, 11.10m or the hypotenuse $1 \times \sqrt{5},^{186}$ was traced circularly to determine

designed to accommodate a choir screen between them on the north-south axis (Figs. 150-151); thus, here the pier surfaces were flat walls supported on a socle course visible today some 0.34m below the present pavement. There was no membrification with responds for the transverse arches below the level of the nave capitals. The two western piers, however, were once membrified on this axis (Figs. 152-154, Pl. LXIV). The columns were later removed and the piers resurfaced like the eastern piers, but the octagonal foundation which supported the socles of the column bases still remains intact. Doubtless this alteration occurred at the epoch (XVIth century ?) when choir stalls were constructed inside the crossing, and a jubé sheltering small chapels was erected between the western piers. This arrangement is illustrated by Prioux, Monographie, 1859 (Fig. 24). Therefore, the entrance to the choir during the XIIIth century was on the east side of the lantern square, as it is at Laon Cathedral today, with a crown of chapels encircling the choir between the lantern and high altar.

The earliest tombs at Saint-Yved were located on the axis of the church in front of this altar, not in the chapels, according to Curé Beaucamp who unearthed the sarcophagi of Robert II, his wife Iolande, and his mother Agnes who died in 1204. The precise location of these and other XIIIth century graves is, I think, anything but certain; both the Gencourt and Prioux groundplans show gravesites, but do not agree on who was buried where, and neither one corresponds to Beaucamp's description. Furthermore, a tombslab bearing Marie de Bourbon's name is visible today just east of the southeast lantern pier, not inside the Chapel of St. Sebastian as recorded by Gencourt. To complicate matters, it may have been (mis-) located there ca. 1840 when Danjoy began his short-lived project to restore the sepulchral character of which Saint-Yved had been deprived since the Revolution (see Appendix A, March 11, 1826 and March 21, 1840).

185. The width between the choir walls, transept walls and nave walls is 9.30m.

186. Calculated mathematically the hypotenuse would be 11.088m ($2.24 \times 4.95m$); however at its conception, the groundplan was traced geometrically. On the theme $\sqrt{5}$, see Georges Jouven, Rythme et architecture, Paris, 1951, pp. 29f.
the transept arms (D); whereas the square figure of this number—turned askew and drawn diagonally at a $45^\circ$ angle to the crossing axes—produced the 5.50-5.55m bays surrounding the lantern on all four sides (A, in conjunction with B-C).\(^{187}\) Now an eastward extension of the crossing square diagonals is the necessary property of a church designed geometrically with two chapels, not necessarily circular, at a $45^\circ$ angle to each transept. But the use of a diagonally oriented second square, the larger figure 11.10m\(^2\), as the generating motif instead of the lantern square itself was a matter of choice, not necessity. Since the number 1110 is produced by 9.90m—and the series of 11.10m\(^2\) contains the numbers 99, 198, 277, 390, 555, 780—this explains why Viollet-le-Duc realized the groundplan achieved symmetric.\(^{188}\) That symmetry was a deliberate achievement of the Gothic architect is not improbable, but at least a moot question. Certainly it was not desired as an end in itself, since the primary advantage of using a figure 11.10m\(^2\) was that it created larger chapels and a longer choir in proportion to the lantern, indeed more liberal spaces in the cross all around, than could otherwise have

---

187. The south transept actually measures 10.96m. Calculations made from drawings at one-hundreth or even one-tenth cannot, of course, be absolutely precise: e.g., 0.55-0.555m could be either 5.50m or 5.55m; thus 1.10m, either 11.00m or 11.10m. Doubtless this matter could be cleared up if the "foot" used during the construction of Saint-Yved were known. Carlier, Valois, does not mention it; I judge it was 0.31m or 0.33m.

188. 5.55m is Viollet-le-Duc's 16 feet, or a multiple of four. The series of 11.10m\(^2\) and 9.90m\(^2\) was generated by halving a square, the method Plato taught and Villard de Honnecourt knew which produces a sequence of squares geometrically; see Pl, LXV and Von Simson, The Gothic Cathedral, New York, 1964, pp. 14ff, 49 n. 70, Fig. 3. However, this simple process should not be confused with the task of designing the Braine groundplan, as analyzed above.
been attained geometrically from the lantern square itself. Had the lantern square been turned askew at a 45° angle to the axes of the church, the result would have been bays 4.96m long and chapels 7.00m instead of 7.80m wide.

A quick glance at the groundplan of a poor cousin of the same family, Saint-Michel-en-Thiérache (Fig. 155), reveals the length of the five western nave bays is 5.30m, the diagonal of one-half the lantern square (10.60m), so the same method was employed here that was used at Braine. However, this hypotenuse traced circularly also created the larger easternmost nave bay (5.95m), the exterior, not interior wall of the north transept, and the pier between the choir chapels—all of which was consciously avoided at Saint-Yved. Moreover, departing from the number 1060, the north transept and choir of St.-Michel both reproduce the lantern square (9.40m); also the choir chapels were traced from the lantern drawn diagonally to the axes of the crossing. In sum, the generating design of Saint-Yved is at once more pure, systematic and creates more space; it is also more elegant, the lucidity of form and space being insured by thinner piers and circular chapels.

After the architect of Saint-Yved had established a scheme for geometric progression from the lantern, he abstracted certain figures and numbers of the two crossing squares to produce measurements elsewhere in the building. This explains why the character of the church is remarkably coherent and sober (Pls. LXIII, LXVI). Deriving from the large 11.10m square, the figure 2.77m² inscribes the lantern piers and 1.10m², the nave column bases. The length of the nave, equal to the width of the transept between the rose window walls, is 3 x 11.10m and this
dimension also is the height of the lantern vault. The nave bays are 5.50-5.55m long and the nave capitals 5.50m high, squaring the vertical surface of each bay; and since the triforium capitals are 11.10m high, the bays are coupled by a square figure. Moreover, 3.90m is the distance from the nave column bases to the abacuses of the capitals; and the \( \Phi \)-rectangle of the hypotenuse 11.10m appears in the two bays adjacent to the lantern on the longitudinal axis (expressed by column bases), again at the extremities of the transept, and, finally, in the Coronation porch of the Gothic facade.

The lantern itself also was employed to create the Coronation porch, the central entrance containing an equilateral triangle 7.08m on each side. This dimension is the diameter of a circle (7.00m) inscribing a square one-half the surface of the lantern, or 4.95m. It is not surprising that the lateral porches of the old west facade once measured 4.98m wide. As for the circular chapels between the lantern and choir, their interior diameter is 6.60m, or two-thirds the lantern square, and this dimension plays an important role in the elevation: it is the distance between the nave capitals and the top of the triforium, whereas the height of the clerestory is 2 x 6.60m (actually 13.25m).

189. The easternmost nave bay had to be lengthened some 0.25m in order to disengage the aisle windows there from the transept walls, as Viollet-le-Duc already remarked (op. cit., p. 519). For this reason the nave actually measures 33.44m not 33.30m. Neither this difference nor, for that matter, perfectly equal numbers would be sensible inside such a large building; what is sensible is any change in the manner of articulating like spaces. In this the architect was systematic, employing a continuous triforium gallery.

190. The capitals vary from 5.33m to 5.52m, the average being 5.42m above the original paving.
The interior elevation was not created with a diagonal scheme like the groundplan but, in the most elementary aspect of its form, with the proportions of the crossing figures oriented vertically (Pl. LXVI). Precisely how they were organized is not clear: the elevation's simple beauty is a perfect complement to the pellucid structure of the plan; but the elevation reveals no single spatial pattern, be it geometric or arithmetic, and probably it was designed by using both methods. Evidence that the elevation was calculated in part arithmetically comes from two sources. First from the use of fractions such as one-fourth and one-third which, however, could easily have been produced geometrically. Secondly, from the probable use of the numerical sequence of the formula \( \frac{1 \times \sqrt{5}}{2} \) at certain critical points. Calculated from the lantern square, the numbers 800.9, 1295.9 and 2096.9 are represented in the nave arcade, which averages 8.06m from the nave column bases; the capitals which are impost for the nave vault springers (12.95m); and the base of the lantern gallery at 20.80m, or more probably

191. Although a geometric diagonal development presents itself formally, it is not continuous; in any case it does not have, and could not have, that trenchant character of the plan where the pier alignment makes a diagonal structure sensible.
192. \( 495 (1+\sqrt{5}/2) \) or \( 1.618034 \times 495 = 800.926830 \) etc.; see Jouven, loc. cit.
193. Also the width of the interior of the Coronation porch.
194. One-half the height of the reconstructed west facade is 13.35m (p. 98, Pl. XLV), whereas 12.95m + 0.36m, the difference between the exterior and interior pavements, totals 13.31m. Moreover, the apex of the Coronation gable attained 12.94m.
the column bases there at 21.00m. Of these three numbers, only the height of the impost below the vault springers—as important as this structural element is—cannot be developed by simple means. It is the most unusual of all significant heights in the nave: the 12.95m-high capitals are 7.00m from their bases reposing on the nave capitals, not from the abacus of the nave capital itself; or one-half as tall as the lantern gallery is high, if we measure from the base of the nave columns and not the floor. None of this is very convincing and it is certainly circuitous. In fact, at the crossing piers where the columns of these capitals continue to the floor, the necking of the capitals, not the abacus, is attained in a roundabout way by multiplying 3 x 3.90m, and only then by measuring from the column base and not the pavement. In brief, 12.95m has no direct relation to the pavement of the church unless it is calculated by the formula given above, and this constitutes an excellent recommendation for the formula. 195

The question whether or not the reconstructed dimensions of the west portals of Saint-Yved can be verified, or in certain instances

195. The situation described above also applies to the west facade where the Coronation gable attained 12.94m. A practical reason for using the formula suggests itself: the numbers it produces are well-suited to the elevation, being larger than those formed in the lantern crossing unless the latter are doubled, as 9.30m was for the nave vaults. Also it provides intermediate numbers such as 8.00m between 5.55m and 9.30m (triforium). However, Viollet-le-Duc's remarks about "symmetrie," or Von Simson's on proportions in general (op. cit., pp. 19f., 31ff, 209), should not be forgotten. For the 12.95m-high capitals beneath the vault springers could have been level with the clerestory, but were deliberately spaced 0.30m lower. This difference is so slight that Prioux, whose measurements of the extant church are otherwise remarkably exact, failed to observe it (cf. Fig. 25).
actually restored, by referring to the mathematics of the existing church has been answered by the foregoing analysis, which may be summed up as follows. The remarkable unity of Saint-Yved has been a recorded subject of conversation since the nineteenth century, and we now know the Gothic architect employed certain fundamental magnitudes, most of which are neither difficult to spot nor to recreate, in order to achieve his purpose. Precisely what this means with respect to the demolished Gothic facade was demonstrated in this study when the Coronation tympanum and voussures had been restored, and the original elevation of the portal was being investigated. We recall that two columns which Monsieur Gencourt presumably had salvaged from the old narthex tribune to support a modern organ loft were chosen to reconstruct the six which once decorated the Coronation porch. Because that choice led to virtually all later developments resulting in the restoration of the west portals as designed in Plate LVI, its history is worth retelling at this point. The 1825 drawings show that four columns which had existed beneath the narthex tribune measured about 0.30m in diameter, and the two under the new loft are 0.28m. But more significantly both shafts are 3.87m tall, with abacuses, bases and socles of standard height throughout the church. Therefore, they must be the original tribune columns: the dimension 3.90m is standard at Saint-Yved because of

196. Pages 86ff; also consult Pls. XLVI, LVIII. All measurements given in the analysis of the extant church vary not more than 0.05m from actual dimensions; the margin of error on the reconstructed facade is approximately 0.10m.
its geometric origins at the lastern crossing; so is 5.50–5.55m, and these columns fully equipped with abacus, capital, base and mortar—stood upon their 0.32m-high socles—are 5.50m tall. The same reasoning obviously can be applied to reconstructing the west portals of Saint-Yved. For when the tribune columns are designed inside the Coronation porch above the 0.69m-tall socle of the Gothic facade, the Coronation capitals are aligned 5.50m above the pavement because the west porches were 0.36m lower than the narthex. It follows that the tympanum is elevated to 8.11m, whereas the porch itself measured 8.08m from wall to wall; this height, deriving from the formula \( \frac{1 \times \sqrt{3}}{2} \), is equal to the nave arcade measured from its column bases (8.06m); and the outermost voussure is level with the triforium gallery (9.30m). Finally, the Coronation frieze attains 10.61m, or one-half the combined width of the nave and side-aisles (10.59m). Thus, the missing stones of the west portals could be accurately restored because elements composing the Gothic building have standardized dimensions which were employed systematically. Once these magnitudes have been identified, they yield sufficient proof that the design of the demolished facade of Saint-Yved indeed was related to the entire church.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION: THE HISTORICAL POSITION OF THE FACADE
SCULPTURE AT SAINT-YVED de BRAINE

The thesis of the foregoing study was that the original plan and
elevation of the west portals of Saint-Yved are today unknown, but that
they have been restored accurately because a maximum number of fragments
from the demolished facade were recovered and correlated. The
circumstances were a perplexing situation wherein documents relative
to the facade before the 1832 demolition, and reconstructions after
1832 all varied at essential points; and where the accuracy of none of
this information had ever been assessed, or could it be unless a new
reconstruction of the facade was made using actual stones from the
church as the principal source of evidence.

Presuming that the thesis has been satisfactorily confirmed,
than modern scholarship is prepared to address itself to other problems
and to three major undertakings: to continue the recovery of stones from
Saint-Yved and the demolished monastery to which it was attached; to
incorporate the west facade into future studies of the church, and
thus the whole church into the literature concerned with medieval
architecture; and, finally, to re-evaluate the position of the sculpted
west portals in the history of French Gothic art. The last of these
should be forthcoming now that the fragmentary Coronation and Inferno
Portals have been restored to their old architectural context. Will this
new perspective in some way modify current evaluations of the Braine sculpture? Let us examine here certain data relevant to the question.

At the present time the art historical significance of the Coronation and Inferno Portals is being determined entirely on the basis of stylistic evidence. The most coherent theory may be summed up as follows. Both the Coronation Portal and The Inferno were carved during the decade preceding the consecration of Saint-Yved in 1216. This position was established when models were found by comparing the Braine Coronation to the sculpted west portals of Laon Cathedral and to illuminations in the Psalter of Queen Ingebourg, the date proposed for the commencement of these seminal works being ca. 1195. The stylistic sources for the Laon sculpture itself never have been pinned down. But according to Deuchler, the Psalter was a remarkable and distinctively French fusion of Byzantine, English, Mosan and North French stimuli, which at that time had no clearly circumscribed locale.198 If the Psalter was the earliest example of this phenomenon in manuscript painting, the Coronation at Braine numbered among its earliest sculpted manifestations. However, Deuchler also has stipulated that at Braine all the models used were not "reduced to the same common sculptural denominator;"199 that is, the large central figures of the tympanum, Christ and the Virgin, have measurably different stylistic personalities (Figs. 89-90). Thus the fusion was incomplete. About this interpretation there can be said to be general agreement, if we understand that for Sauerlaender

the sculpture does reveal a common style, but one with distinct "nuances," none of which originated with the Braine Coronation and all of which existed earlier at Laon Cathedral. That he concedes these nuances did in fact create a highly inflected language at Braine was illustrated in his recent publication where not only Christ and the Virgin, but two other figures from the old Coronation Portal were meaningfully juxtaposed: an angel in the tympanum and "Solomon" from the Tree of Jesse. In sum, whereas in 1962 it was still thought the Coronation and Inferno were carved at different epochs, today the focus of attention has shifted to the character of this sculpture seen as one body, and to what should be termed the composite form of the Coronation Portal itself. It is to this recent development in stylistic analysis that evidence made available by the foregoing reconstruction of the west portals can, I think, be applied.

For the moment let us reverse the procedure used so far in studying Saint-Yved, i.e. to present the evidence first, and direct our attention to propositions about the logic of decorative design

200. W. Sauerlaender, Gothic Sculpture in France, 1140-1270, pp. 428f. The 1205-1216 date for the Braine sculpture here is derived from dating the commencement of the Chartres Coronation to 1204: Laon sculptors are said to have been active both at Chartres and Braine, thus the Laon portals were substantially completed by 1204.

201. Ibid., PIs. 74-75.

202. Musée du Louvre, Cathédrales, following Boinet, op. cit., 1911, pp. 259f, who thought The Inferno was added to a side portal of Saint-Yved some fifty years after the Coronation Portal was carved. As a result of this theory, The Inferno was compared to the jubé of Bourges Cathedral instead of to the Braine Coronation with which it belongs, as Sauerlaender correctly perceived by stylistic analysis.
underlying the Coronation Portal and the "Braine style" before elaborating on the phenomena to which they are related. This approach can be justified on technical grounds because its primary object is to establish a practicable terminology.

A fundamental observation about the Braine Coronation was made when Willibald Sauerlaender remarked that the Virgin Mary conveys to the viewer a simple, generalized quality which he described as "tenderness." However, the figure of Christ also conveys a generalized quality, the dignity or self-possession of his being. Now scholars today would agree that Christ lacks the Virgin's pervasive grace and that she does not have his noble character. But no one has drawn the obvious conclusion that the intention of the Braine designer was to describe these persons as having two different natures, the attributes of which were "dignity" and "grace." Thus when the sculptor carved the statue of the Virgin Mary, he gave a particular form or pattern to the attribute (grace) of an underlying reality: he tried to reveal the very essence or nature of Mary. Moreover, one readily perceives that Mary and Christ exist in a conceptual realm, not only as individuals but in their relation to each other: they are as a student is to a teacher, for Mary's beauty is Virtue which is pleasing to God.

In sum, the Braine designer was charged with the task of describing essences by their attributes in a language of visible forms; he was imitating the philosopher. For didactic purposes, and because "attributes" were not objects like crowns and sceptres, this language had to be both sufficiently flexible and precise to permit an observer to distinguish each essence by its form.

Beyond doubt the designer's method of approaching every aspect of
his task was logical, and here he imitated the scholastic: content, its form, style, and the composition all underwent a careful analysis. First, just as the universal "Virtue" had been divided into particular forms to express cause and effect (Christ and Mary, the Church), the entire composition was affected by this analytical method: the specific meaning or role of each basic constituent of the Coronation was defined, and it acquired a distinct value in relation to all the other elements. For this reason the Coronation Portal can be said to have a composite form comparable to polyphony in music. For example, the tympanum was arranged systematically in parts classified as primary and subordinate; and the voussures and the tympanum also had definite roles which, we recall, contrasted the moral inadequacy of the past to the redeeming power of Christ affecting the present.

Secondly, to insure that the form of each constituent would convey the essential meaning or role prescribed, the Braine designer adhered faithfully to a precept that sculpted decoration should appeal to the mind, not to the senses. This precept may be called the "spirit" of the Braine style and it functioned on a moral level. The sculpted figure was deprived of patently sensual qualities; and if some personage had a sensual or evil nature, then one deduced it by reasoning, not by sympathetic response. The viewer is confronted with "exanimated" figures whose biological vitality is so curtailed that meaning is presented like a sign, not by physical or emotional activity. Simple, clear didactic patterns devoid of distracting decoration are standard. Thus form and content are in perfect accord: both are reduced to the essential, the minimum necessary to give each figure an idea and integrity within the total design.
The injunction to abjure the senses and lead an ascetic life engaged in virtuous conduct was the moral ideal unifying the composite form of the Coronation Portal. Thus analytic logic, which functioned abstractly without any necessary practical application, merely served as a method to make moral philosophy intelligible to the observer on a conceptual level. In sum, the Coronation Portal does have a unity of character on the moral and intellectual levels, but the effect is not pleasing to the senses; there is an agreement of parts, but this harmony is not poetic in nature.

Thirdly, the Braine designer analyzed the components of style that created forms: he established a principle of structure to produce formal agreement among the portal's constituents, or "syntax," then he broke down the visual vocabulary into "terms" comparable to words and phrases. These terms, any one of which may have predominated in the style of another twelfth century monument—e.g., soft swelling corporeal forms/rigid inorganic forms, fluent movement/sharp accent—had a dual function: to create unity (syntactic term) and to characterize the integrity of particular forms (qualifying term). In general, syntactic terms are swelling and fluent, whereas qualifying terms are limiting because of their accented rigidity.

Now the words "soft swelling forms" constitute only one term in the Braine vocabulary, and virtually every term had a counterbalancing term appearing in the same figure. For example, the torso and arms of Christ make a flat, erect, inorganic shape which is descriptive of his personal dignity and his integrity. But Christ's right leg is a soft swelling form, cylindrical and corporeal like the Virgin Mary's two legs, and this is a syntactic term: it established a formal link between Christ
and the Virgin. Thus, the underlying structural principle of the Braine style was counterbalance: operating on the formal level to produce agreement in the composite form of the Coronation Portal, its function was the same as moral philosophy and analytic logic. But by its own terms it reveals that the larger issue of the Coronation was to express an ideal equality of two opposite magnitudes, offsetting the one by the power of the other: to fix the relation between the Particular and the Universal, between human nature and Virtue or the Good, in a perfect timeless equilibrium. But for its unrealistic view of human nature, Saint-Yved would have been more classical than medieval.

Who determined the character of the Coronation Portal and had authority over all artistic matters at Saint-Yved? In my judgment this person was the abbot of Saint-Yved representing the Premonstratensian Order itself. For the Coronation's logical and formal methods, their deft concordance, and their clear moral implications are remarkably consonant with the architectural structure of the church; indeed, it is conceivable that the architect designed the sculpted decoration for the west portals. Moreover, there is no evidence that the monastery did not bear a major share of the financial burden which building Saint-Yved entailed, and thus it would have had a substantial control over the design.203

Before developing additional evidence in support of the foregoing proposals, it should be remarked that misconceptions about the "Braine style" have resulted from transferring to Saint-Yved a terminology applicable in other circumstances. Thus, Sauerlaender used the terms

203. See note 4.
"soft swelling forms" and "fluent movement" to describe the character of the Braine sculpture in general; and Deuchler's view that it reflects an imperfect fusion of different prototypes is equally untenable. Thus, the door is now open to certain fruitless speculations that are irrelevant to the Coronation Portal at Saint-Yved: e.g., the design attempted to fuse a group of models as in the Ingebourg Psalter; its supposed lack of unity reveals several dates of execution wherein some form of stylistic evolution took place; or it exhibits no qualities of artistic leadership, being dependent upon the imagination of others.

Having completed these preliminary observations let us now analyze the composite form of the Coronation Portal's design more carefully, because this phenomenon provides reliable information about the historical position of the sculpted portals of Saint-Yved. As for the tympanum, we know nothing precise about the style of the two missing angels which flanked Christ and the Virgin (Pl. XVIII, Figs. 88-90). But we are certain their poses were, as they are not in other Coronation Portals of 1170-1220, significantly differentiated and thus magnified the contrast already existing between the central figures. This group of four was embraced by the arched canopy of heaven and composed what can be termed the central theme. Quite obviously the two small angels isolated behind columns at the corners of the tympanum functioned as mere subordinates to the main theme. It is equally important to realize, however, that the very fact they do play a precisely formulated role in the tympanum explains why their formal personality is measurably distinct from the particular forms employed for the Virgin and Christ; and that the subordinate role these
angels were assigned explains why their pose and drapery design are so remarkably restrained. As for two angels sculpted on corbels supporting the Coronation lintel, they reveal yet another expressive form deriving from the same concept of specific roles that applied to the tympanum figures (Fig. 146). They are angels because scenes above them are represented in the clouds of heaven, caryatids because they literally support, and the very embodiment of strength in order to be commensurate with such a large portal and porch.

The sum of these initial observations indicates that Coronation Portal design underwent a process of careful analysis at Braine: by varying the language of form, the constituents of the portal acquired a pronounced, even particular value which was thought desirable for the sake of clarity. This is not to say that analytical thought was peculiar to Braine at that epoch. But definite stylistic conclusions did result from it and authority over aesthetic matters was firmly established. The entire portal thus being separated into distinct parts, or functions, one cannot reasonably speak of a stylistic evolution which developed in one part of the portal and spread to another, as from the tympanum to the corbel figures. Once established, the concept of analytic separation would not have permitted this fusion to occur. Indeed, the only change it will be possible to measure with certainty is the degree of perfection with which the role assigned to each constituent of the portal has been realized. And some variation in the quality of the voussure figures does exist, as a comparison of Figures 127 and 138 will show; but this is not essentially related to the phenomenon in question, the stylistically composite form of the Braine Coronation.
It could have resulted from unequal talent in the Coronation workshop, dating either from the time it was composed or from an accidental influx of sculptors later. In brief, the composite form of the Coronation did not result from a lack of artistic leadership or from several dates of execution. Nor was the fusion of models incomplete at Braine. It was never intended.

Quite obviously the pattern just described does not fit Coronation Portal design at Chartres and Paris. As for the Coronation and Incarnation Portals of Laon Cathedral, that body of sculpture now linked with Saint-Yved in modern thought,204 abundant stylistic evidence exists that they were carved almost, if not exactly simultaneously, and by some of the same sculptors. Both Laon portals are characterized throughout by the same expressive multiformity one finds at Braine; but of particular interest is the fact that an analytic approach to decorative design strictly governed the Incarnation Portal,205 and the result was a composite form which recalls the Braine Coronation. However,


205. With respect to the Laon Coronation Portal, I propose that the enterprising sculptor of that day was preoccupied with making new formulations, both in the technical and expressive sense, for drapery carved in stone. However, he did not realize only one, that is a general style as at Chartres; rather he undertook several, with the same exacting spirit which has been observed so often on the neighboring Incarnation Portal. There is, thus, less unity within the structural divisions of the Coronation than is recognized today.

The context within which the sculptor worked was an unusual architectural setting of unparallel scale, an iconographic tradition which had to be renewed, and a vast fund of artistic prototypes made available to stimulate him to rise to the occasion. On the other hand, the basic parts of the body—the trunk, arms and legs—and their natural organic relationship were well understood already. Some knowledgeable
particular forms adopted for the Incarnation tympanum, lintel and voussures—in some cases for individual figures—are not the same as

examples in the Coronation voussures even may be compared to masterpieces on the Incarnation Portal (BII,7). But another figure by the same sculptor (BII,3) clearly shows this phase of the conquest of human form—which had taken place somewhere else—no longer was a living problem for him. If additional proof be needed, it is not hard to find, because an amusing little prophet in Row V demonstrates just how fascinating to another man the problem of drapery could be (BV,4). Indeed, this fascination is so typical that even the two halves of the same figure can explore very different territories in drapery effects (BV,5-5a).

The ambitions of that moment can be better appreciated in a brief comparison of the Coronation and Incarnation Portals. Between the two one sees a standard figure type emerge: of medium height, with solid rectangular torso set diagonally against the voussure; and the arms and legs, fleshy and fully round, covered by varieties of antique wet-fold drapery. For example, compare BV,2,11,12,13 and BIV,4 to the Prophet Simeon, the Sibyl and the Annunciation Angel of the Incarnation Portal (Figs. 156-157). Even the amusing prophet mentioned above belongs to this group (BV,4). Moreover, the language and technique of the Sibyl’s drapery are so similar to figures BIV,8, BV,1,9 and BII,1,3 of the Coronation, that no one would be surprised to find all these figures assembled together in either one portal or the other. What is surprising is that they are not, for they make a more homogeneous group than that which does exist on the Coronation Portal. Obviously, the same models were relative to all these inventions. In sum, here and in the case where the same sculptor worked on the two portals—compare BII,3 in the Coronation to his Dream of Nebuchadnezzar (Fig. 158)—whatever variation we see among these figures did not result either from the use of different models and sculptors, or a significant time lapse in execution.

If it is not a fruitless task, it is certainly an endless one trying to count the number of men who carved the Coronation Portal and isolate the oeuvre of each. One man designed all the voussure figures, as any large sample from the voussures will demonstrate: e.g., the ten lowest figures seated above the daises. Because each figure is individualized, the poetry of line and expression is richly varied. Thus, what at first glance appears to be the execution of many sculptors is at last the work of only a few—four—including the Coronation Master who carved the tympanum (excepting Christ?); his figure style, monumental and heavy, which was developed for the tympanum is found also in the voussures (BV,4,12,BIII,6), where talented and mediocre artists were working side by side (BV,6-8, BIV,5-7,10). Thus, the time needed to carve the entire portal would have been longer than for a large workshop. The same working conditions existed on the smaller Incarnation Portal, except its decoration would have taken much less time to execute. Given the rapport
those employed at Braine, nor is the effect each structural part has as simplex and unified. All this suggests the Braine Coronation was sculpted later since the principle of design is more clearly stated. Yet the question of relative dates should not be resolved on this evidence alone. We need some proof the direction of influence was not from Braine to Laon, for reasons which are better explained when the Braine Coronation has been more fully examined.

Now let us turn to the voussure cycle at Saint-Yved, which is particularly revealing. The cycle repeats the Senlis model so faithfully that scroll-bearing prophets are located within the Tree of Jesse on the innermost row; the Tree itself makes a series of ornate 8-shaped forms; the evil King Joram re-appears with legs crossed in a conspicuous scissor pattern; and a moral typology very probably was embedded in the Kings of Judah series of both portals. Since all these iconographic elements dating to the 1170's are quite foreign to Coronation Portals at Laon, Chartres and Paris ca. 1200, one is tempted to conclude that their function at Braine was to create a virtual characterization of the old Senlis Tree of Jesse. This interpretation is supported by the fact that the expressive form adopted for figures within the Tree of Jesse actually belongs to a different category from those used for tympanum, lintel and corbel figures; and one outstanding motif of the drapery composition can be readily identified with a sculptural tradition existing in the 1170's and 1180's. All the figures that one sees between the Coronation and Incarnation Portals, it is almost certain that the nucleus of a single workshop sculpted an important part of both portals, and virtually simultaneously.

206. Pages 79ff.
wear mantles designed with moderately varying degrees of curvilinear activity. But frequently motion either accelerates or is terminated when folds of the mantle are pulled through the figure's hand, and make there a loop or knot (Figs. 119, 127-128, 114-115, 122, 126). Near the turn of the century this was as clearly anachronistic in Coronation Portal design as the crossed legs of King Joram and the 8-shaped stem of Jesse's tree.

This is not to say the voussure figure style remained the same at Braine; indeed, it was relatively modern as a result of principles governing the portal's design. In the foregoing examples the hand holding the mantle and the attribute-bearing hand, or gesturing arm, create two contrapuntal nodes dominating the figure design. (This simple but sophisticated formula had been eloquently stated in the column-statues on the north portal of Saint-Denis.) Furthermore, the armature for the drapery, the body of the voussure figure, is the most simple of structures composed of a flat upright chest decorated sparcely with a few pleated folds at the waistline, and contrasting tubular legs (Figs. 110, 112). As a result of this formula and the one adopted for the mantle, the overall complexity of figure composition was sharply reduced and flattened in order that the specific gesture, attribute or facial expression of each personage would emerge without contest as the dominant theme. These elements were projected with a degree of clarity and sharpness not found in other Coronation Portals from Senlis to Chartres, because through them alone could all three series

207. See the Coronation voussures at Senlis (Rows IV, 9, I, 8, II, 1-2) and at Mantes (Row I, 3-4).
composing the Braine Tree of Jesse become the distinct entities we see today. We recall that Laon and Chartres eliminated any perplexity the Senlis cycle may have caused a viewer by excluding one series, the prophets, from the Tree of Jesse, and creating stereotypes for the other two. Rather than change the old pattern, the Braine designer found another solution.

In sum, the function and iconographic structure of the Tree of Jesse itself prescribed the particular expressive form of the voussure figures. Thus, the same concept of design was applied here as in other parts of the Braine portal; and it is now evident that the portal's constituents both were ingeniously bound to tradition, and improved tradition in some intelligible way. So much is clear. But did the sculpting of the Coronation begin in the 1190's when construction of the church is thought to have begun, or was it a reactionary statement made after the turn of the century? This is, I think, a very pertinent question. The answer can be approached by evaluating the currently-held theory that the Braine Coronation, for some reason as yet unexplained, was dependent upon the decoration of the west portals at Laon Cathedral.

In the foregoing observations it was pointed out the expressive form employed for the Braine Tree of Jesse was not archaistic; in fact the reduction of figure design from complex structure to simple pattern is a phenomenon typical of the decades spanning the year 1200. It is found, for example, at Chartres and in the voussures of the Coronation Portal of Laon Cathedral (BIV,5, BIV,9). However, the bodies of the Laon figures, with certain important exceptions, are structurally organic and they are not at Braine. One need only compare the most extraordinary
example of this principle in the Laon Coronation, the seventh figure on Row II (BII,7), with personages from the Braine voussures (Figs. 113, 116, 125, 127, 131) to realize that not only do the latter lack a candidly biological vitality, but their bodies often assume unbalanced and oscillating positions. In extreme cases at Braine form is fragmented, broken and incomplete (Fig. 116). But in all cases the human body has been exanimated. This phenomenon is particularly significant because it was used deliberately to focus attention on the only real life the Braine figure has, its didactic meaning; in other words, the measurable quantity of idea the figure projects through its gesture and attribute. Thus, the idea was not acted out literally in a lifelike manner, but presented in the form of a sign.

From the perspective we have now, it is possible to establish the independence of the Braine Coronation sculpture from the Coronation at Laon on the basis of two principles, whatever nuances these portals may have in common. First, the voussure figures of the Laon Coronation are virtually swathed in drapery, the components of which often are fused and hard to define (BIII,7). By the sheer number of folds and a powerful rhythmic scheme, many figures achieve a decorative richness and scintillating life of such beauty that these qualities engage the observer more profoundly than the theological program. In fact, drapery design frequently became an end in itself. The result of such a fascinating enterprise might be imaginative to a bizarre degree (BV,4), or a remarkably advanced invention (BV,5-5a), but it is almost never dull. Obviously this kind of spirit is impossible to correlate with the Braine Coronation; the only affect it could have had on the Braine designer
would have been negative. Secondly, exanimated bodies do exist in both west portals at Laon Cathedral, for example the twelfth personage on Row IV of the Coronation voussures. But none of these figural designs managed to achieve an aesthetic value equal to that attained by organic composition at Laon; and none can compare in conceptual value with the average Braine voussure figure. Thus, the process of reduction used so purposefully at Saint-Yved to communicate ideas could, in other circumstances and in hands less carefully guided, bring all matters of consequence to a halt (BV,7-8).

The Incarnation Portal of Laon Cathedral contains evidence which is no less revealing about the problematic relationship of Braine to Laon, and its implications deserve careful attention. Let us compare the extant angel at the righthand corner of the Braine tympanum to the well-known Prophet Simeon in the voussures of the Incarnation Portal (Figs. 88, 156). The pose and elementary drapery vocabulary of Simeon and the Braine angel are so similar that one must ask why, in the same epoch and geographic situation, the expressive forms of these two figures would be absolutely contrary? Simeon is a masterful and original sculpted formulation of the striding pose in union with drapery designed primarily from Byzantine sources. Since it has been proposed that the west

208. The relationship of the Braine Coronation to a more opulent "French court style" as represented by the Ingebourg Psalter and stained glass in the choir of Laon Cathedral is, despite Deuchler's opinion, quite untenable (Ingeborgpsalter, pp. 154ff, 167).

209. BIV, 12; also BIII,9, BIV, 7, 10, BV, 7-8 and Christ in the tympanum.

portals of Laon Cathedral provided a model for Braine and sent sculptors
to work there as well, then why did the Braine sculptor not copy the
Laon Simeon?

The reason why Simeon was not the prototype used at Saint-Yved for
the Coronation angel is that the striding pose so effectively delineated
by Simeon's drapery would, as an idea, have been totally out of context
in the Braine tympanum. If Simeon had been copied there, the Braine
angel would have exceeded its proper place in the larger scheme as a
mere subordinate to the central figures, a personage of no remarkable
character, physically restricted and isolated. Moreover, in the final
analysis this studied propriety follows and serves tradition so
faithfully that, as a type of figure, the angel evokes other angels
flanking Christ in the Senlis and Mantes Coronations more than the Laon
Simeon. We cannot doubt it was meant to do so. Had a Laon sculptor
joined the Braine workshop, he would not have been permitted to
reproduce the handsome Simeon or, for that matter, any of those superior
qualities, as well as many of the prototypes, which have made the two
Laon portals so justly famous today. The contrary also is true. What
Braine achieved by its precepts and models is not characteristic of Laon,
unless we postulate that the Laon sculptors were stimulated to discipline
the use of their own vast resources and inventive genius by a principle
of design established at Saint-Yved.

It is now clear that the sculptors in the Braine workshop were
employed to realize a prescribed theological program embodied in a
specific portal design. Guided by fixed precepts, a man's old artistic
associations and personal inclinations would have been reshaped.
Precisely for this reason it will be virtually impossible to determine whether or not the Braine shop included any Laon sculptors. It could have contained men whose previous training, as in the case of the Laon workshop itself, is not known today.

These observations project into high relief a question which has not yet concerned modern scholarship. Since the Braine Coronation design was distinctive among early Gothic Coronation Portals, is it logical to think it could not have been formulated and executed until after the Laon (and Chartres) concepts had materialized? Rather should we not ask ourselves first if the demolition of the Gothic facade of Saint-Yved either removed or obscured so much evidence about the Braine sculpture, that the true historical position of the remaining old stones has been concealed from us. We recall that the architect of Saint-Yved perfected a groundplan of which some essentials had appeared earlier at Saint-Michel-en-Thiérache, and historians now date the construction of Saint-Yved from 1190 or 1195. Whoever designed the Braine Coronation was a kindred spirit. One can imagine him sifting through some of the same prototypes used at Laon and for the Ingeborg Psalter, drawing his own conclusions, and completing a decorative

---

211. For the varying iconography of these portals, pp. 73ff.
213. Deucher, Ingeborgpsalter, pp. 65f, 161f, remarks that prototypes for the Virgin seated in profile with Christ enthroned as at Saint-Yved existed prior to the date of the psalter.
scheme which modernized the old Senlis Coronation during the same
decade that these other unusual works were begun, the 1190's. But
did he in fact do so at that time or later, ca. 1205? The way we
respond to this question will have a significant effect upon future
evaluations both of the quality and historical position of the Braine
sculpture.

My own response is the following. The Inferno Portal was
located on the north side of the Gothic facade against the monastery,
and it served publically as an admonition to Christian conduct and a
sign of monastic ideals. Those who deserved eternal damnation for
sins proscribed by the church, and among them a conspicuous number
of clerics, are its predominant subject; thus, the choice of this
theme destroyed a traditional balance found in old Last Judgment
portals with the act of separating the damned from the blessed.
However, that one step in mankind's redemption which could be
incorporated logically was included on The Inferno's lintel, where
Christ descends into Limbo to save those otherwise barred from
Heaven through no personal fault. The composite form of this tympanum
and the obvious characterization of parts, the (awkward) use of the
formal principle of counterpoise, and the moralizing prohibition of
patently sensual qualities even among sinful figures introduced
concepts of design which were to be employed more skillfully in the
Coronation Portal. 214 Also, the Inferno is the less successful of the two portals because it was the more original; this, together with its particularized function at Saint-Yved, explains why no sequence of portals of the same type emerged later.

The use of a circular arc to design the Inferno Portal indicates to me that at the time when the facade was begun, west porches were thought to require rounded vaults (Pl. LVI). This created a formal harmony with the rose window above and produced a desirable geometric separation between the Coronation porch and its triangular gable. Indeed, one remarks the deep porches at Laon Cathedral are so nearly arcs of a circle that a stone filler had to be added between the porch vaults and the pointed arch of the voussoirs. Originally all three porches at Saint-Yved were to have had rounded vaults, and the construction of the west entrances began with the Inferno Portal and porch. They were almost, if not entirely completed when a change from round to pointed arches was introduced in the other two portals. This alteration, however, did not effect the design of the central and south entrances, because the facade's elevation already had been established according to fixed measurements which applied to the entire church.

Thus, building activity at Saint-Yved began ca. 1190 on the north side of the west facade. Since the north aisle wall was designed to be one side of a cloister, either the cloister was planned at this time, or its existing south wall had to be torn down. In any case, construction

214. Sauerlaender, op. cit., p. 429, misinterprets the depiction of Hell as a humorous burlesque; it was a serious attempt to communicate doctrine quickly and clearly by using typical forms.
of the choir was completed in 1216 and the new church was consecrated. A sculptor's workshop was formed at Saint-Yved ca. 1190 to carve the Inferno Portal, and remained active at the church for about five years. The shop initially was small, but added one or two members when the large Coronation was begun. These men, whatever their origins, quite probably had colleagues at Laon who had been engaged to sculpt the Coronation Portal of the Cathedral; and at this time the Laon shop contained two or three outstanding men who set the pace for a few others of mediocre talent. The exchange of views between Braine and Laon during the 1190's about facade design and sculptural decoration may have ranged all the way from informal and polite colloquies to passionate dispute. Yet those inflexible principles of design applied everywhere at Saint-Yved, and perfected in the Coronation Portal sculpture, were experimented with most successfully when the Laon Incarnation Portal was begun after ca. 1195.

This historical perspective of the sculpture of Saint-Yved gives a new lustre to the old west facade, which should now share in that general respect traditionally shown the church itself. We cannot be surprised that a youthful, strong monastic order, and the royal family who made Saint-Yved a tomb chapel attesting its piety, could have commanded and acquired the talent necessary to cause this church

215. Statues representing Saints Peter and Paul now on the north transept facade, and two angels relocated at the entrance to the choir on the eastern crossing piers—all four of which are related in style—must have been carved in the 1180's and their original location is not known. The angels are mentioned by Ludwig Schreiner, Die frühgotische Plastik Sudwestfrankreichs, Cologne, 1963.
to play a vital role in history and in art. Thus, the dawn of the age of Phillip Augustus was both beautiful and cold, it awakened both court and cloister, and this moment inspired alike a sparkling elegance and quiet meditation.
APPENDIX A

Annals of the Restoration of Saint-Yved de Braine.
1822-1853

1822

Beaucamp to the Ministre des Affaires Ecclésiastiques et de l'Instruction Publique. 216 Archives Nationales F19-662, March 28, 1825.

"In 1822, while Curé of Bucy-le-long, I received a flattering letter about my two published works defending the cause of the holiness of religion and the monarchy, Crimes de la révolution française... and Du liberalisme à la vérité vengée.

1823

July, 1823
Beaucamp to the MAEIP. Archives Nationales F19-662, March 28, 1825 and November 21, 1826.

Curé Beaucamp came to Braine and he described his activities there from 1823 as follows:

"When I arrived at Braine I suppressed posters announcing the sale of the material and grounds of the church of Saint-Yved; and I interested civil and ecclesiastical authorities in the conservation of this church, furnishing them with information about it which I found by consulting books on French history, ancient manuscripts and charters of the church. What otherwise would have become of the remains of the descendants of Louis VI, one of which is our so well-loved King?"

1823
Chateau, "Histoire de Braine depuis son origine...," Soissons, 1829, pp. 89ff.

216. Hereafter referred to as the MAEIP.
M. Chateau, Secretary of the Council of the Fabric of Saint-Yved in 1826 (cf. March 11, 1826), writes that when Beaucamp arrived at Braine in 1823, Saint-Yved was being used as a barn (grange).

1823
S. Prioux, Monographie, 1859, p. 34, following Chateau, 1829, pp. 101-110.

Prioux reprints a petition by Curé Beaucamp to the Ministry of the Interior, in the name of the Council of the Fabric and the Municipal Council of Braine, here dated 1823. The original document has not been located; it may have been dated 1824 because this is the first year—as signaled by other documents—in which vigorous official activity was taken to conservation of Saint-Yved.

1824

September 10, 1824
Prefect to the MAEIP. Archives Nationales F19-662.

"I wrote to the King on September 8 to tell him about Saint-Yved which is of special interest to the royal family. Doubtless my letter will be sent on to you, so I will present here some details, hoping to fix your attention on this church and its need for conservation. Saint-Yved is a XIIth century church of the Premonstratensians (founded by Robert I) and is now in ruin. It should be restored because of the royal tombs there. Also because the cult is now celebrated in a small chapel hardly sufficient to contain the faithful, and the commune wishes to contribute to the restoration of Saint-Yved."

September 20, 1824
Bishop of Soissons to the MAEIP. Archives Nationales F19-662.

"The cult meets in an insufficient chapel today. Because of this and the fact that Saint-Yved contains royal tombs, I approve of the restoration of this church."

November or December, 1824
Beaucamp petitions the Ministry of the Interior in the name of the Council of the Fabric and the Municipal Council of Braine for the restoration of Saint-Yved. Original document unlocated; manuscript copy by Chateau, 1829, pp. 101ff, published by Prioux, Monographie, 1859, p. 34, where the date 1823 must be a typographical error.
"During the Revolution the village of Braine was despoiled of its parish church (St.-Nicolas) which was sold, and the cult practice was transferred to Saint-Yved. Since the restoration of the cult, we have been relegated to a small chapel of the Benedictines (Notre-Dame) which can scarcely hold one-half the town. A royal order (March 17, 1809) gave to the Fabric the material and land of Saint-Yved to its profit; but why doesn't the King know of the royal tombs at Saint-Yved?

To rebuild the fallen parts and make other repairs, the cost would be 70,000F. We have had an estimate and plan drawn-up by the architect of the department,217 following the advice of the Bishop of Soissons and the Prefect who both have visited Braine.

Regarding the financing of the restoration, the Council of the Fabric voted 20,000F (arrêté dated November 13, 1824) which comes from a rent of 340F on a capital of 6800F, combined with the sale of the present church estimated at 12,000-15,000F."218

1824

King Charles X passes through Braine after the Coronation ceremony at Reims, and he promises Curé Beaucamp to repair the church of Saint-Yved with its royal tombs. This event inspired Beaucamp's Mémoire of 1825 wherein the Curé attested the piety of the church's royal founders.

1825

February 8, 1825
First devis of 114,981.76F for the complete restoration of Saint-Yved, signed by Gencourt (architect) and Louis Duroché (expert). Archives Nationales F19-662.

"Restauration proposé de l'ancien église de Saint-Yved qui était le dépôt sacré des tombes royales des princes et princesses dépendant de Louis VI et aieux de Henry IV.

The restoration of the church of Saint-Yved is important and indispensable at this time. It is found among the first class of monuments to which are attached precious souvenirs, both of religion

217. "We" here refers to the Council of the Fabric. The estimate and plan were sent to the MAEIP (Archives Nationales F19-662, Beaucamp to the MAEIP, letter of March 28, 1825).

128. See Beaucamp's Mémoire, 1825. The capital of 6,800F came from a sale of materials belonging to Saint-Yved which had occurred before Beaucamp arrived in 1823. See also a letter dated December 14, 1826 (Archives Monuments Historiques): "The Council of the Fabric offers 20,000F coming from two sources, the sale of material from the old collegiate church of Saint-Yved, and from the sale of the present parish church."
and the monarchy. This restoration is indispensable because of the abandoned state of the church, aging day after day since the degradation it suffered during the Revolution. For some years, and at this moment above all, it menaces to fall on neighboring properties. This monument, when restored to its original purpose, would add a further brilliance to the glory of its author, and would extinguish forever in the hearts of the inhabitants of Braine that feeling of sadness which they experience daily...."

Doubtless Beaucamp's influence was responsible for the tone of this introduction. The central portal of the west facade is mentioned twice: with regard to the wooden door (dimensions not given) and to painting the door (pp. 10f). The sculpture of the west facade is mentioned only once (p. 6): "Recutting of the stone figures in the branches of the ogives of the facade which are entirely mutilated; rejoining (raccordement) of these branches; rejoining work on the entire facade as well as for the gable, 80OF."

There are three drawings which belong to the first devis:

1. "Plan de l’église de Saint-Yved de Braine...achevé en 1216 du temps du Comte Robert II," February 1, 1825. Signed Gencourt and Duroché. Unlocated (Archives Photographiques 201937); Fig. 132.
3. "Projet de la restauration de l’église Saint-Yved de Braine. Coupe longitudinale sur la ligne AB du plan." March 11, 1825. Gencourt and Duroché. Archives Monuments Historiques 29051; Fig. 133.

The second devis for a project of partial restoration costing 70,000F consisted of suppressing the west facade and nave, and conserving only the choir, radiating chapels and the transepts. The second devis has not been located; however, it was prepared at the same time as the first, and it shared the same plan and longitudinal section of Saint-Yved. One new drawing is included, and additions written on the older drawings resulted from advice given by the Conseil de Batiments Civils when the two projects were reviewed. See June 4, 1825.

1. "Projet de la restauration de l’église Saint-Yved de Braine. Elevation du nouveau portail proposé indiqué au plan par une tint de vermilion et faisant partie du 2eme devis." March 11, 1825. Gencourt and Duroché. Archives Monuments Historiques 28880; Fig. 146.
2. "Coupe longitudinale..." March 11, 1825. The new facade with wall buttresses extending the full height of the bell tower, is shown between the two western crossing piers. Later the facade was moved back to the western columns of the second nave bay: "Great wall to construct in rubble stone according to the advice of the Conseil de Batiments Civils" is written here.
3. "Plan de l'église de Saint-Yved de Braine...,
February 1, 1825. Two additions were made to this plan. "Part to reconstruct in the partial restoration" is written in the fifth and sixth bays of the south side-aisle. "Pillar supported by a wood strut since 1826" is written beside the north columns of the second and third nave bays.

4. Copy of the "Plan de l'église Saint-Yved de Braine...,
February 1, 1825, to which a strip of paper has been added over the third and fourth nave bays and is dated February 1, 1827, with Gencourt's signature. Unlocated; Archives Photographiques 200-026 (Fig. 14). This paper carries the title: "Plan of the provisional facade to construct for the partial restoration, proposed by the departmental architect." To it was appended the following legend:
   a. "All the parts without tint are conserved" (i.e., the choir, radiating chapels, transept and the last two bays of the north side-aisle).
   b. "The parts tinted in rose are to reconstruct" (i.e., the last two bays of the south side-aisle).
   c. "The parts tinted with pale rose are to demolish." (This includes the rest of the nave and side-aisles which, excepting the first bay of the north aisle, were in a state of ruin when the restoration project was conceived in 1824. These parts were not demolished by Gencourt before the adjudication of the project in September, 1827.)
   d. "The parts tinted with yellow are to be demolished" (the west facade and the first bay of the north aisle, which were not in ruin).

May 15, 1825
Beaucamp to King Charles X. Archives Nationales F19-662.

Beaucamp pleads for the restoration of Saint-Yved because of the royal tombs, the proof for which (at this time) rested upon the description given in a manuscript by Mathieu Herbelin ("Histoire," Braine, Archives Municipales). On May 11th Beaucamp had sent a similar letter to S.A.R. Madame La Dauphine.

June 4, 1825
"This church needs extensive repairs estimated in the first devis at 114,981F. But if one wants to put the church back into its original form, this sum certainly will be exceeded. It seems to me that one has forgotten to estimate some articles like the lead-work and painting, and there is no mention of altars for the choir.

The architect in charge thought he had decreased the expense by suppressing the vaults of the nave and replacing them with wood beams. And he replaced the tower with a belfry. But one (still) pays a considerable sum in order to have a church too large for the population. And even then it will be defective as a work of art.

Because of this, the architect was asked to make another estimate for a project which consists of demolishing the nave and conserving only the choir with the tower. This came to 70,152F. All the royal tombs are contained in the choir; and the church still would cover about 800m, certainly large enough for 1300 individuals.

The parvis to be created with the demolition of the nave was a fine idea. But why doesn't the width of the parvis correspond to the entire width of the church, minus the thickness of the walls? Apparently because the walls of the parvis are founded upon those of the nave. Also the porch is not in harmony with the church. The tower is cut into horizontally by a wood floor under the windows, thus darkening the upper part of the tower from the interior of the church. The belfry which reposes on this floor is not solid, and I've yet to discover where one could climb it! Finally, the church is without purpose. It is no longer a parish, nor a monument destined to collect royal tombs.

Moreover, the expense of this estimate is not calculated with precision. It does not mention the cost of demolition, lead-work, the walls of the parvis or the planting of trees. One will still have a building too large to be used for a parish and it will cost more than a new church.

In sum I believe that it would be best to demolish Saint-Yved entirely and build a new church, putting the royal tombs in it. If, however, one prefers to conserve the old church as a historical souvenir, then it should be restored in its entirety with vaults, not a ceiling, over the nave; a tower, not a belfry; and a sacristy on the interior and not the exterior, where it masks the lines of the church. This would cost more than 150,000F.

If one is held back by the expense, I think that the four nave arcades and the circular chapels of the choir (!) can be suppressed; demolish the existing porch and put it in front of the two conserved arcades of the nave. Then make a sacristy and a salle des marquilliers in two circular chapels which have been suppressed, and conserve the tower. This is basically what is in the second estimate, but the cost will be greater because of the omissions I mentioned above."

After considering the evidence above, the council advised that because of the importance of works of art, the church of Saint-Yved should be conserved in its integrity. The restoration should be total, thus, and conform to the original system of construction and decoration. The church was thought doubly interesting because of its antiquity and "belle disposition," and because of the royal tombs. It would be expensive to restore, even if only partially, and the council advised that if the commune can't pay for the restoration, then the state should.
August, 1825

Beaucamp's Mémoire is published at Soissons and during the months of August and September he sent copies to the King, the Duchesse de Berri and to the MAEIP.219

Beaucamp pleads for the restoration of Saint-Yved which is of importance both to religion and the monarchy.

"Can we abandon Saint-Denis—of course not! Saint-Yved, a thirteenth century church, was founded by King Louis the Fat who was its first benefactor. The Premonstratensians were guardians of the royal tombs in Saint-Yved; and whereas Saint-Denis has a royal chapter, Saint-Yved does not, even though Saint-Yved is not a parish church but a royal church like Saint-Denis.

After the Revolution Saint-Yved was in such a state of ruin that the cult has been using a small chapel. I propose that this chapel, now serving as the parish church, be sold for 15,000F and the money used to restore Saint-Yved. In an arrêté of November 13, 1824, the Council of the Fabric of Braine voted 20,000F for the restoration. I now ask that the Emperor order the conservation of Saint-Yved. The plans and estimate are in the hands of the Conseil de Batiments Civils: the first project costs 150,000F; the second for 70,000F, wherein the facade and nave are suppressed, conserving only the choir and lateral chapels with the royal tombs, is the very least one could ask. The Fabric derives the sum of 20,000F from two sources: the rent on a capital of 6800F and the sale of the parish church (Notre-Dame)."

1825

Chateau and Prioux are correct in saying that aided by the protection of Monseigneur de Simony, Bishop of Soissons, the Prefect, M. le Comte de Floirac, M. de Duc Matthieu de Montmorency and M. le Baron de Wolbock, then Inspecteur-général de la Maison du Roi, Curé Beaucamp was able to obtain the promise of the government for money to restore Saint-Yved.

The role played by Baron de Wolbock is elaborated in an essay by his son; see Baron de Wolbock, Mémoire présenté au Congrès de l'Association Bretonne, séant à Dinan le Iere Septembre 1890, Paris, 1890 (Bibl. Num., Soissons, Region 64). Here Wolbock attempts to show his family's interest in Saint-Yved began much earlier than the XIXth century; indeed, it contributed to the construction of the Gothic church! As for its part in the conservation of the church, Wolbock cites two pieces of evidence. The first is an extract from a Deliberation of the Council of the Fabric of Braine dated December 27, 1827, and signed by Chateau, the Secretary: "Wolbock has done so much with Beaucamp to get government funds for the

219: See also Beaucamp's "Notice sur l'église royale de Saint-Yved de Braine...," Archives Départementales, "Braine, textes," Ms. fr., 1824.
restoration we vote to inscribe his name on a stone of one of the remaining pillars of Saint-Yved." The second is a letter from Curé Lecomte to Wolbock dated October 27, 1856: "You were the most active promoter of the restoration; I have conserved all your correspondence with Beaucamp in the Archives of the Paris." These documents have not been located.

October, 1825
A third project emerged which consists of building a new church at Braine. Archives Nationales F19-662, letter of Curé Beaucamp to the MAEIP dated October 14, 1825 (see July 22, 1826).

1826

March 11, 13, 14, 1826
"Registre des Délibérationes du Conseil de la Fabrique de Braine," March 16, 1826, procès-verbal of the discovery of the royal tombs at Saint-Yved. The original minutes have not been located; copies are found with letters of Beaucamp dating June 10, 1826 (Archives Nationales F19-662) and in Prioux, 1859, pp. 24f.

Beaucamp said he already had researched the archives of Saint-Yved (various texts), but that now one has proof of the existence of royal tombs because he and the Fabric excavated four graves: those of Agnes, wife of Robert I, Robert II and his wife Iolande de Coucy, and Marie de Bourbon.

"According to the Bull concerning the Holy Year Jubilee, and to the mandate of the Bishop of Soissons, I designated four places in the town of Braine where the faithful could make their stations before the cross, and pray according to the Pope's intentions. I designated the fourth station at Saint-Yved, and a cross was planted before a large stone where the old high altar was. Breaking through about 3 feet of earth, I and the Fabric found a large long stone and we planted the cross before it. On March 13 we returned and noted that the stone was made of plaster and cement (mastic), harder than stone itself, and it measured 20 x 8 or 9 feet. It had not been disturbed and had no inscription. Beneath it were the remains of two lead coffins in the middle of the sanctuary. In these were two skeletons, feet toward the altar: Robert II and Iolande de Coucy, who finished the construction of Saint-Yved in 1216. We left the bones undisturbed. Then on March 14 we found Agnes 2 feet deep in the mid-choir, and covered with another uninscribed stone which had been disturbed by the Spanish in 1650. Marie de Bourbon was discovered in the Chapel of Saint Sebastian, the skeleton undisturbed (d. 1274). These excavations were carried out after consulting histories of Braine and certain citizens who saw the tombs before the Revolution."
July 22, 1826
Prefect to the MAEIP. Archives Nationales F19-662.

"The Conseil de Batiments Civils, to which the two projects for Saint-Yved were sent by the Ministry of the Interior, find both imperfect, having many omissions which will augment the expense. I think it would be preferable to construct a new church on the site of the old one. I have asked M. Gencourt, architect of the Aisne Department living at Soissons, to prepare a project for a new church which has been approved by the Bishop of Soissons (135,000F). I send you two plans and an estimate (these documents are lost).

The entire restoration proposed by the Conseil de Batiments Civils would conform to the intention of the Ministry of the Interior, but it is too expensive. The partial plan is too bizarre."

August, 1826
Beaucamp and the Fabric of Saint-Yved campaign against the project for a new church.

The progress of this campaign is outlined by the following documents:

1. In a letter to the Director of MAEIP, the Abbé de la Chapelle, dated August 18, Beaucamp rejects the idea for a new church on the grounds that all of Saint-Yved is truly royal (Archives Nationales F19-662).

2. The Council of the Fabric of Braine had voted for the new church on August 18; but on October 1, it changed its mind and voted for the restoration, giving 5,000F (Archives Départementales ID7, Deliberation of July 30, 1827).

3. On August 26 the Fabric voted 20,000F for the entire restoration project (Archives Nationales F19-662).

4. On November 21, 1826, Beaucamp wrote to the MAEIP (Archives Nationales, F19-662):

"Saint-Yved, a XIIIth century church, was founded by Robert I and Agnes, aided by the munificence of Louis VI their 'royal father' and the first benefactor of Saint-Yved, who had contributed a great sum for its construction. Robert II was the last benefactor, finishing the construction before his death in 1218. All the church is truly royal. The stained glass was a gift of the Queen of England, a relative of Countess Agnes. Saint-Yved shows the piety of the monarchy; there are ten royal tombs, the descendants of Louis VI to Robert IV of Braine. Why is this monument of religious art and respect owed to royal majesty so near to total demolition!"
November, 1826
MAEIP votes in favor of the partial restoration project at 80,000F, and against projects for a new church and the complete restoration of Saint-Yved. This decision was definitive and was based on insufficient funds to do otherwise. But according to the "general plan", the partial restoration was to be only temporary (see also March 30, 1828).

References to this decision are given below:
1. Letter of November 28, 1826. The Prefect, addressing the MAEIP, noted there were three alternatives: the entire restoration at 150,000F; the partial plan at 80,000F; a new church at 135,000F. The Bishop of Hermopolis pronounced in favor of the partial plan.
2. Letter of December, 1826. The Chief of the 2nd Division of the Ministry of the Interior states Saint-Yved, founded by Robert I and Agnes, is one-half destroyed today. Friends of religion and the monarchy stimulated the zeal of the authorities of the Aisne Department, which resulted in the preparation of several restoration projects. The MAEIP has pronounced in favor of the partial project and promises 25,000F in five years. With the 25,000F offered by the township of Brainne, this makes a total of 50,000F. He suggests that the Ministry of the Interior give 25,000F also payable in five years as Curé Beaucamp suggested.

1827

January, 1827
King Charles X promises 2000F. Archives Nationales F19-662, letter of Beaucamp to S.A.R. Madame La Dauphine dated January 21, 1827.

April 13, 1827
Ministry of the Interior votes to give 20,000F payable over five years. Archives Monuments historiques, letters of October 11, 1828, and March 12, 1830.

September 11, 1827
The adjudication of the devis costing 72,319F. Archives Nationales F19-673, report presented to the MAEIP dated September 13; Archives Monuments Historiques, letter of October 11; Prioux, 1859, p. 34. The original document has not been located.

The report of September 13 states the Conseil de Batiments Civils had adopted a project costing 80,000F (with honoraires) which the Bishop of Soissons approved. The estimate and plans were sent to the Prefect,
who fixed the adjudication for September 11, 1827. To this letter the Prefect answered that work would begin soon so it would be necessary that the MAEIP give him the first credit of 5000F promised for 1827.

According to Prioux, the government opposed the demolition of Saint-Yved and the sale of materials to the Fabric's profit. In June, 1827, the plans and estimate of 80,000F were sent to the Prefect to be adjudicated. This occurred at Laon in the Prefecture on September 11, for the amount of 72,319F. The work to be executed comprised the restoration of the apse, radiating chapels, transepts, two nave bays and a new bell tower.

- 20,000F—Ministry of the Interior
- 5,000F—Ministry of the Interior, Division of Fine Arts
- 25,000F—MAEIP
- 2,000F—Liste civile
- 5,000F—Commune, impôt extraordinaire
- 4,000F—Commune, impôt volontaire
- 19,000F—Fabric of Braine, rent on a capital of 6300F, and the sale of the parish church of Notre-Dame estimated at 12,000F-15,000F.

February 28, 1828

March 30, 1828

This meeting was called to consider a letter of the Under-Prefect informing the Council of the following:

"You voted 5000F on October 1, 1826, for the execution of a project for the complete restoration of Saint-Yved costing 150,000F. Because the clause concerning a complete restoration was attached, your vote was annulled, since this plan is not being executed. You know that the authorities have thought it necessary to confine themselves to executing provisionally only one-half the restoration project. The adoption of this 'general plan' leaves no doubt of the intention of the ministry to complete the restoration; however, the execution of the first part of the project obtaining immediately a church in rapport with the needs of the commune, is of greater importance than the second."

After deliberation, the Council voted 5000F again for the partial restoration project.

May 8, 1828
Ceremony of the placing of the first stone of the restoration. See Chateau, 1829, pp. 97ff, where the complete procès-verbal is copied; published in Prioux, 1859, p. 27.
"Madame de Senneville, the Duchesse d'Angoulême, represented S.A.R. Madame la Dauphine and placed the first stone, under which were put several coins of 1828. M. Gencourt's name, as architect, was inscribed on the commemorative plaque...."

October 11, 1828

"The work of restoration, adjudicated September 11, 1827, is going along fast. For this we must thank the entrepreneur. So far over 19,000F have been spent."

1829

September 11, 1829

The Curé requests marble for six altars, presenting the following history of Saint-Yved:

"The first church at Braine originated with Clothaire, son of Clovis, and existed up to the time of Louis VI. It was rebuilt by Robert I and Agnes, aided by the munificence of King Louis VI. (Here Beaucamp inserts a genealogy of the Counts of Braine.) During the Revolution, the wall ornaments were mutilated or destroyed and the outer parts (metal) of the tombs were carried off. When I came to Braine (1823), the church was so degraded that it was resolved to destroy it. The materials and grounds were to be sold, and this sale had been officially announced. Yet because of my opposition to the demolition, there was a royal order for the restoration. And the decision was made that the royalty buried in various places in the church should be assembled in a funerary chapel, and represented by ten new tombstones. The expense would be paid from the general restoration funds.

November 6, 1829
The MAEIP announces its approval of the estimate and plans for the creation of a sepulchral chapel re-uniting the royal tombs at Saint-Yved (4663f). The original document has not been located; however, see Prioux, 1859, pp. 34f, where the date 1827 is a typographical error. The only financial evidence known for this project dates February 1, 1830.

The history of the project is as follows:
1. On September 10, 1829, the Prefect sent an estimate of 982F for five altars to the Ministry of the Interior (Archives Monuments Historiques).
2. On September 11, 1829, Beaucamp requested the marble for six altars.
3. On January 12, 1830, another communication from the Prefect concerns five altars (Archives Monuments Historiques).

4. On February 1, 1830, the Direction des travaux de Paris informed the Ministry of the Interior that marble for four altars costing 1800F was sent to Brainé: a grey-blue stone (Pyreneese); a brèche de sauveterre (Pyreneese); a brèche du Tholonet (Pyreneese); a black-veined marble.

5. According to Prioux, 1859, pp. 34f, in March, 1830, the Ministry of the Interior decided it would provide the following items for Saint-Yved:
   a. Necessary marbles for the reconstruction of five altars.
   b. Flooring for the entire sanctuary, choir and the tomb chapel.
   c. Ten black marble tablets to be engraved in gold letters with French and Latin epitaphs.

6. The project was abandoned with the July Revolution in 1830.

November 8, 1829
The King names Beaucamp an Honorary Canon of the Chapter of Saint-Denis and Guardian of the Royal Tombs of Saint-Yved. Archives Monuments Historiques; see also the letter of Curé Lecomte, below, 1853.

1829
Prioux, Monographie. 1859, p. 34.

"In March, 1829, on the advice of the Conseil de Batiments Civils which, after having sent two of its members to inspect Saint-Yved de Brainé, requested the complete restoration of this church, a new plan and a new devis were adopted by the Ministry des Affaires Ecclesiastiques et de l'Instruction Publique. A new allocation of 43,448F was promised for rebuilding four nave bays up to the facade which itself was in good condition. The entrepreneur who submitted this work promised to execute the work within eighteen months. He was authorized to use the money which had been allowed in the first adjudication (1827) for the pavement, glass and metalwork. In 1831 this sum was to have been made up by an allocation of 43,448F."

Prioux's statement is the only record known to me of a plan and devis dating 1829 for the restoration of the western nave bays. In any case, the project was never executed.

1830

July, 1830
The July Revolution halts the work of restoration at Saint-Yved until 1832.
December, 1830 (see January 10, 1833)
The Prefect requests that a commission be formed at Braine to judge the
work of restoration already executed.

1831

Ludovic Vité, Rapport à M. le Ministre de l'Intérieur sur les monuments...
des départements de l'Oise, de l'Aisne..., Paris, 1831 (Soissons,

"During a visit to Braine I was charged to note the stylistic
character and archaeological interest of the church of Saint-Yved, as
well as its state of conservation.

Regarding the first, from a historical viewpoint Saint-Yved always
has been of interest; but it is not less interesting as a work of
architecture. The belle disposition, a perfect regularity, the delicate
details which become a little monotonous, and finally the date of the
durch, with its remarkable unity of plan (attesting to a single campaign
of construction), reveal an architect of particular genius in that
epoch of transition.

As to the present state of Saint-Yved, the last government began
the restoration probably because of the royal tombs there. Up to now,
the work has cost 51,549F, but it will be necessary to give another
60,000F to complete the restoration. At this moment, it would be unwise
to engage in this new expense. But we cannot dispense with continuing
payments on the devis adjudicated in 1827 (71,319F). In this way the
church can be put in a state of conservation, at least temporarily.

1832

Prioux's summary of the restoration work (Monographie, 1859, p. 28).

"Restoration work followed the adjudication with great activity
when the Revolution of 1830 suspended it from 1830 until 1832. At this
time, in order to be acquitted of debts contracted under the old
administration, the architect had four bays of the nave and the (west)
facade demolished. Today only the foundations remain. After this time
only the most indispensable work was undertaken, and in 1837 the church
was given back to the cult." (Prioux also states that only in 1830,
when work was halted on the two adjudications, was it decided to honor
only the 1827 adjudication. Thus, the temporary rubble wall which closed
off the restored part of the church was conserved, and the church given
a new facade with buttresses. This account is correct, although other
evidence for the 1829 adjudication has not been located.) "The architect
in charge demolished the old facade, a masterpiece of architecture and of
art, despite Beaucamp's protests that the facade and ruins of the nave be allowed to stand. The evil deed was, unfortunately, already done when the Commission des Monuments Historiques became aware of it."

(The Prioux's explanation here is incorrect, as the documents above show.)

"The 'architect devastateur' was replaced by a man of talent and taste, M. Danjoy, and on his report of Saint-Yved, the church was classed among the monuments historiques. He was charged to continue the restoration, and it was under his direction that the real work at Saint-Yved began."

1832
The west facade and four western nave bays of Saint-Yved were demolished. See 1833 (letter of Gencourt); January 10, 1833 (Deliberation of the Municipal Council) June 3, 1840; April 28, 1841; May 8, 1841; June 21, 1841.

1833

January 10, 1833
"Registre des Délibérations du Conseil Municipal de Braine," Archives Départementales ID8, pp. 11f.

"By his letter of September 21, 1831, the Under-Prefect informed the Council that Saint-Yved would be restored only partially, within the limits of what it was indispensable to do, in order to make of it a parish church and one suited to the needs of the inhabitants of Braine.

The Prefect, without consulting the government about what to do in this circumstance, authorized the Under-Prefect to have Gencourt, the architect who had prepared the estimate and plans as well as directed the restoration work up to the point where it is today, proceed with the 'verification' of this work (i.e. determine the state of the restoration and what it was still necessary to do).

This operation (the verification) was made on January 5, 1832, by the architect and a commission composed of the Mayor, two members of the Municipal Council and two marquilliers of the Fabric, conforming to letters of the Prefect on December 20, 1830, and January 24, 1831. The entrepreneur, M. Bruneteau, was present. The architect prepared a 'procès-verbal de verification' on April 1, 1832.

This 'procès-verbal' says that the above commission met on January 5, 1832, at the church of Saint-Yved. After examining the building, and finding many obstacles on the site, both materials and utensils necessary for construction, and ruins covering the ground of the interior and entrance to the church, the commission decided unanimously that the work had been done conforming to the estimate and to the 'Etat de situation' written by the architect on March 28, 1832. In this letter, the expense of the restoration up to the present was given as 48,312.54F with honoraires of 2,415.62F, or a total of 50,728.16F. And it was agreed that in order to put the building in harmony with the needs of
solidity, ... it was urgent to execute the work detailed in an estimate prepared by Gencourt and attached to the same "procès-verbal." This work consists of demolishing the old facade (portail) which menaces ruin, especially since it had been shaken (or shocked) by the fall of the grand vault of the nave; and it would be necessary to reduce, and cover with a chaperon (top course of a wall) at 264cm high, the walls in front of the new facade of the church. As detailed in the above-mentioned estimate, this work would cost 10,961.68F with honoraires of 548.08F, making a total of 11,509.76F.

In order to conform entirely to the letter of the Under-Prefect of September 21, 1831, it is necessary that the "procès-verbal de verification" be communicated to the Municipal Council for its observations, and that it propose the means of payment for the work indicated in the estimate."220

January 11, 1833

The Mayor presents the "procès-verbal de verification," which was approved by the members of the appointed commission, along with the following observations of this commission.

The commission approved the minutes, but regarding the estimate for the partial restoration of Saint-Yved, it made these remarks:

1. That the church of Saint-Yved was declared by the preceding government to be a royal monument because of the royal tombs which it contains.

2. That the restoration of the church was ordered, undertaken and executed by the government with the advice of the Conseil de Batiments Civils.

3. For the partial restoration of Saint-Yved, the Municipal Council voted on March 31, 1828, a sum of 5,000F payable to the commune in seven years, starting in 1828. The Fabric voted a rent of 340F on a capital of 7318.30F, together with the value of the present parish church estimated at 15,000F. To this the commune added another sum of 2819F.

4. The commune cannot make any more sacrifices in order to pay for the devis of 11,509.76F.

1833
Letter to the editor of L'Argus Soissonnais by the architect Gencourt;

220. The "État de situation" and the "procès-verbal de verification" have not been located.
see "Indication des monuments antiques et modernes...," Soissons, Bibl. Mun., Perin 5183.

"Conforming to the advice contained in the report addressed to the Minister of Public Works by M. Ludovic Vilet, Conseiller d'Etat and Inspecteur-général des Travaux Historiques de France, in 1831 and on his verbal invitation, I (Gencourt) had the precious remains coming from the demolition of the portail (facade) of the church of Saint-Yved at Braine taken off in order to be placed in the Museum at Soissons, of which M. Vilet was the founder. These remains consisted of two bas-reliefs, of which one contains two episodes from the 'fin dernière' in a single setting. The second is the image of an angel with wings of gold and blue, covered with a tunique, and making part of a larger bas-relief representing the Assumption of the Virgin (Coronation of the Virgin) which was destroyed during the demolition activity. The Mayor of Soissons, giving proof of his desire to protect the stones at Soissons, voted the necessary funds for their transport and placing in the museum, which itself was founded for the purpose of receiving them. Soon I hope to be able to increase the number of these stones which attest the greatness and the faith of our ancestors."

1836

July 1, 1836


The Mayor, M. Masure, communicates a copy of a letter addressed to him by the Under-Prefect, written by the Prefect on June 20, 1835:

"The Ministry of the Interior, following the advice of the Conseil de Batiments Civils, had approved the 'procès-verbal' describing the restoration work at Saint-Yved, mounting to the sum of 89,443,04F. Of this sum 65,836.10F has been used by the architect and the entrepreneur; there remains 23,606.94F to be paid. Of this sum all but 692.69F has been pledged through various resources. It remains for the commune to take possession of Saint-Yved; and it is indispensible, therefore, that the present parish church be sold."

Another letter of the same date from the Prefect to the Curé of Braine was read, wherein the Prefect said that the government was disposed to accord funds to cover the deficit of 692,69F after the sale of the parish church. Also that the church of Saint-Yved could not be considered as other than a parish, and shall be administered according to the rules for churches of this class. The restoration of Saint-Yved was not executed in the name of the government, which has been the major donor of the funds, but in the sole interest of the commune.

Following this, the Municipal Council prepared a list of the following deficits:
1. 692,69F according to the letter of the Prefect.
2. 1373,25F which remains on the voluntary subscription.
3. 2500F for certain repairs which are indispensable for Saint-Yved
   a. Repair of four pinnacles which are in a state of ruin.
   b. Repair of diverse parts of the stairwells of the tower.
   c. Covering for the supporting pillars in front of the facade.
   d. Repair of the exterior galleries.
   e. Paving of the road leading up to the church.
4. 7341F deficit from the sale of the present parish, estimated too high at 15,000F.
5. 1500F to demolish the cellar of M. Bruneteau which threatens, by its dampness, to ruin one of the side-aisles of Saint-Yved.

The sum total of these items came to 13,406.94F, without taking into account the expenses of installation, such as the furniture needed for the church. At this point, the Mayor stated he could not permit the taking into possession of Saint-Yved for reasons of security for the inhabitants of the village, because this church, closed for some twelve years, had not been inspected by anyone other than the architect charged with its restoration. Then follows this history of Saint-Yved.

"After the Revolution of 1793, the church of Saint-Yved, then entirely standing, was offered to the commune in compensation for the parish church which was sold by the government and destroyed (St. Nicolas). The commune preferred the present parish (Notre-Dame), because it judged that the expense of repairing Saint-Yved was more than it could afford; also the size of Notre-Dame was more in harmony with the needs of the population. These motives still exist today.

In 1827, using the ancienne liste civile, and in the interest of the fine arts and for the most monarchic reasons, it was decided that Saint-Yved would be restored since it contained tombs of the ancestors of the ruling dynasty. The liste civile itself contributed to the restoration costs. Furthermore, the Curé was named Honorary Canon of Saint-Denis and made conservator of the royal tombs of Saint-Yved, with the government's promise of 1500F for the upkeep of the tombs....

Thus it was at this period, and with the desire to restore the ruins of a monument precious to religion and the arts, that the commune voted to contribute to the cost of the restoration. This was carried out totally by the government, without the participation of the commune in regard to the plans, the estimate, the adjudication, direction or execution of the work. Then with the Revolution of July (1830) the state of things changed, and the ancienne liste civile fell....

In conclusion, considering that the moment has arrived to decide if the commune or the government will be considered owner of Saint-Yved, and thus charged with the expenses of its restoration and upkeep, the Municipal Council unanimously adopts the following conclusion. That the church of Saint-Yved cannot be considered a simple parish church. Only the government is capable of paying the expenses of such a monument.
The commune wishes to maintain possession of the present parish church; and, for reasons of security, Saint-Yved should be inspected before the cult can be safely exercised in it."

1837

January 6, 1837

This meeting was called to consider the letter of the Under-Prefect to the Council of the Fabric concerning the taking into possession of Saint-Yved. The Ministers of the Interior and Cults received the deliberations of the Municipal Council of July 1 and October 7, 1836, in which the council declared itself opposed to the Fabric taking possession of Saint-Yved as a parish church. However, the Council of the Fabric persisted in wanting Saint-Yved, despite the opposition of the Municipal Council. The latter now decides to make a final effort to stop the government and Fabric, and the following history of Saint-Yved is presented as evidence for its cause:

"Before the Revolution of 1793 there were three churches at Braine: the parish (St. Nicolas), which was sold and destroyed; Saint-Yved, which belonged to an old convent of the Premonstratensians; and, finally, the little church of Notre-Dame, which belonged to a convent of women at Braine. The last two still are standing. With the re-integration of the Catholic cult, the commune, deprived of its parish church, had to choose between Saint-Yved and Notre-Dame. The latter, being more in harmony with the size and resources of the commune, was chosen and the commune took possession of it. As for the church of Saint-Yved, it remained abandoned up to the time of the decree of May 30, 1806, which gave to the Fabric those churches and chapels not already sold and formerly belonging to the convents. Following this decree, as well as that of March 17, 1809, the Fabric of Braine, without any participation on the part of the commune, took possession of this building and sold it to its profit materials coming from its partial destruction. After the sale, matters remained in this state up to 1827, the époque when the government decided to restore Saint-Yved in the interest of the fine arts, and because of the royal tombs there.

The commune and the Fabric contributed as much as they could to the restoration, with the promise that they would have the right to exercise the cult there freely. The rebuilding originally concerned only the part of Saint-Yved which was standing at the time of 1827, but the government had earlier drawn up a plan for its entire restoration. The Revolution of 1830 was an obstacle to this latter restoration project. The commune of Braine, with a population of 1400 inhabitants, had no desire to rebuild a church of such importance because of the financial strain. Moreover, the plan, estimate and the work were executed in the name of the government and without any participation of the commune. The placing of the first stone of the restoration occurred only in the name
Duchess of Angouleme, in the presence of the Bishop of Soissons and the first civil and military authorities of the department. At this occasion, the Curé of Braine was named Honorary Canon of Saint-Denis and Guardian of the Royal Tombs of Saint-Yved.

By two earlier resolutions of February 9, 1834, and July 1, 1836, the Council had declared itself opposed to taking possession of Saint-Yved as the parish church. These deliberations were sent to the Prefect. But he, in a letter of November 17, 1836, noted the letter sent by the Under-Prefect to the President of the Council of the Fabric on November 27, 1836, inviting the Fabric to take possession of Saint-Yved, and said nothing about the objections of the Municipal Council. In view of this invitation, which left no choice in the matter, the Council of the Fabric of Braine asked for the possession of Saint-Yved according to the law of March 17, 1809. But also that a new investigation of the restored church be made by some architect other than the one who executed the restoration, in order to be certain of the solidity of the building. On this point the Fabric was in accord with the Council, which had first brought it to the attention of the authorities. But the Fabric exceeded its rights in demanding the possession of Saint-Yved as a parish church. In effect, if the fabrics are allowed to make the acts of taking possession of the churches a means of selling or renting the buildings to their profit, then the result of this decree can only be to force the commune into accepting the churches as parishes, and thus bearing financial burdens which are capable of absorbing all their revenues. This was, it seems, what the Fabric and the Prefect wanted to see in the decree.

Up to this moment the government has paid more than 60,000F for the restoration of Saint-Yved in the interest of the arts. It should complete its work by declaring this church a monument of art. And to repay the commune and the Fabric for the sacrifices they have made, they should have the right to exercise the cult without other charges than those of the upkeep. If the government refuses to accept this supplication, then the Municipal Council asks not to be forced to sell its present parish church which suffices for the needs of the cult. This deliberation, as well as the two earlier ones, will be sent to the Ministry of the Interior."

March 21, 1840
Letter of the Architect Danjoy to the Minister of the Interior (?).
Archives Monuments Historiques.

"I spoke to the Prefect about the tombs. All the ancient sepulchral stones except one have disappeared. With the help of an old plan, very well executed, which gives eye-witness proof of the original state of the church, we can establish with all certainty the location of the tombs as well as the original inscriptions. Some sculpted fragments coming from the old portail (facade), or from excavations, together with
some capitals of the XIth or XIIth centuries could be utilized in one or several tombs (during their reconstruction), and would thus be preserved from certain destruction. The surplus of the fonds employed in the preceding work could be used to repair the tops of the four spires on the lateral facades, the top wall courses around the church, and the covering of the great tower, which all are equally in need of repair. I await your answer to this question."

June 3, 1840
"Registre des Délégations du Conseil Municipal de Braine,"
Archives Départementales ID9, pp. 52f.

This meeting was authorized by the Under-Prefect in a letter of May 8, 1840, saying he had informed M. Bruneteau of the reclamation made by the Council of the Fabric and the Municipal Council of Braine for the fragments of the old "portail" (facade) of Saint-Yved, which had been transported to the Museum of Soissons. M. Bruneteau already had responded to the Undre-Prefect that the ownership of the stones had been transferred to him at the time of the restoration of the church. In a meeting of May 14, 1840, the Council of the Fabric had made the following resolutions:

1. That the Fabric had no knowledge that the material of the old facade had been ceded to the entrepreneur, M. Bruneteau, as he claims for the "prix de travaux" relative to the reconstruction of Saint-Yved.

2. That the demolition of the facade as well as the ceding of the material coming from it did not take place legally to M. Bruneteau's profit, that is with a decision made by the superior authorities of art, and a proper adjudication. At that time no one had a legal right to demolish this old facade, which the Conseil de Batiments Civils had judged worthy to be conserved as a monument of art.

3. In the absence of a regular title establishing his ownership of the material, M. Bruneteau cannot dispose of—or do anything else with—the objects of art and sculpture which had been used in the church.

4. That the Council of the Fabric wants M. Bruneteau to exhibit to the superior authorities the adjudication of the material coming from the demolition of the old facade; or a legal title which ceded to him the ownership, for a price which

221. Etienne Bruneteau, a member of the Municipal Council always excused himself from meetings such as this, or parts of meetings where his interests were involved. The above text is the clearest statement of the careless treatment the facade sculpture received and why; see also May 8, 1841.
certainly would have been considerable. At Braine it is a public scandal that Bruneteau himself sold the material for a considerable price, and that he is powerless to justify himself, having illegally disposed of material which he never legally possessed.

5. As for the objects of art found among the material, consisting of two bas-reliefs and other precious fragments which ought to have been conserved or ornament the church during the restoration, it is Gencourt's fault, as architect charged with the direction of the work, that the sculpture was transported to Soissons.

6. The Council of the Fabric asks for the restitution of the sculpture now at Soissons.

After reading through these texts, the Municipal Council being of the same mind as the Council of the Fabric, resolved to ask for the restitution of the sculpture.

1841

April 28, 1841
Copy of a letter by the architect Gencourt dated April 28 to the Under-Prefect in response to his letter of April 26. Braine, Archives Paroissiales, manilla folder, "Documents sur Braine et son église."

Gencourt wishes to inform the Under-Prefect that he had collected certain information relative to the transferal of the sculpted stones coming from the old portail (facade) of Saint-Yved. Here follows a history of the affair, with sections underlined by Curé Beaucamp which he called lies. A formal response by Beaucamp emerged in the "Deliberation of the Council of the Fabric" on June 21, 1841.

"By authorisation of the Minister of the Interior on November 25, 1830, M. Ludovic Vitet came to Soissons to visit that which was related to history and the fine arts. The discovery of a mosaic in 1827, a medallion in stone in the cloister of St.-Jean-des-Vignes, and a marble group representing the family of Niobe suggested to Vitet the idea of founding a museum at Soissons. He stated this in his report to the Minister of February 20, 1831. M. Guinette, Mayor of Soissons, wishing to second M. Vitet in this project, put at his disposal one of the rooms of the town hall. On the invitation of M. Vitet, who delegated me to do so, I had put there all the fragments which I had held for you, M. the Under-Prefect, as well as other fragments coming from the demolition of the Chateau of Anizy. Later, on November 26, 1833, I wrote Vitet that the government having ordered the demolition of the old facade of Saint-Yved, it would be good to have several fragments of the precious remains transported to the Museum of Soissons. But that one would experience some difficulty because the Doyen of Braine claimed that the stones belonged to him (i.e. to the parish)."
M. Vitet responded on December 2, 1833, in these terms to me. It is absolutely necessary that you transport this precious debris to Soissons. The Curé is not the owner of these stones. They belong to the state. I am writing to the Under-Prefect to give you the authorisation. If this isn't sufficient, I will have the Minister write. The authorisation of the Under-Prefect arrived and I communicated it to the Doyen before I had the stones carried off. The Doyen made no demonstration to oppose the action. I think one must add that M. Guinette, Mayor of Soissons, obtained from the Municipal Council of Soissons a vote to get the necessary funds for transporting the stones, and establishing them in the museum."

May 8, 1841
Copy of a letter from the office of the Mayor of Soissons to the Under-Prefect. Braine, Archives Paroissiales, "Documents sur Braine et son église." Sections were underlined by Curé Beaucamp which he called errors.

"At the insistence of the Curé of Braine or of the Fabric of Saint-Yved to obtain the sculpted stones coming from the old facade of the church, (a reclamation has been made which ) it appears to me could not be worse-founded; and I am going to respond to this new reclamation exactly as I responded to an earlier demand. That the municipal administration of Soissons has no intention of giving up the stones which are the town's incontestable property.

Indeed, you yourself (Under-Prefect) are convinced that the material of the old facade was sold to M. Bruneteau, entrepreneur de batiments at Braine. Up to the time of the sale, and during the time of the sale, the Fabric of the church never dreamed of conserving the stones (of the facade), which were sold as material along with all the rest. These (sculpted) stones today would be embedded in the foundations of some building if the architect M. Gencourt had not brought them to our attention, and had not requested in our name that M. Bruneteau spare them and turn them over to us. M. Bruneteau was very obliging when this proposal was made to him in the name of the municipal administration of Soissons. He gave us the stones, which were his property. He had the right to dispose of them. Thus they are in our possession justly. I confess I do not understand why the Fabric keeps on requesting from us the objects which are not its property. We are not going to send back to Braine, or to the Fabric which sold it, property which is uncontestably that of the town of Soissons."

May 25, 1841
Letter of the Under-Prefect at Soissons to the Mayor of Braine. Braine, Archives Paroissiales, "Documents sur Braine et son église."

"I sent the Prefect letters concerning the reclamation of the Fabric of Braine for the sculpture coming from the old facade of Saint-Yved. In his letter of May 21, 1841, the Prefect told me that the rights
of the town of Soissons to the conservation of the sculpture seem to him sufficiently well established, and that he thinks there is no reason to give the reclamation further attention. I have the honor of sending you copies of the letters which have been sent to me by M. Gencourt and the Mayor of Soissons, and which contain the motives justifying the rights of Soissons. Please send them on to the President of the Fabric of Braine (i.e. Curé Beaucamp)."

June 21, 1841
"Délibération du Conseil de la Fabrique de Braine." Braine, Archives Paroissiales, "Documents sur Braine et son église."

The Council of the Fabric of the Church of Braine met at the convocation of the President in the presbytery. Members present included the President, Curé Beaucamp, and M. Chateau, the Secretary. The President read the letter of April 28, 1841, by M. Gencourt, architect of the arrondissement, to the Under-Prefect concerning the sculpted stones taken to the Museum at Soissons. He also read another letter of May 8, 1841, from the Mayor of Soissons to the Mayor of Braine, because the stones were there said to have been given to Soissons by M. Bruneteau; and secondly because these objects, as well as the material of the old facade, were said to have been sold to Bruneteau by the Fabric of Braine.

After deliberating on these letters the Council of the Fabric decided to maintain that the demolition of the old facade of Saint-Yved took place illegally, and that one knew of no superior order which had authorized this demolition.

1. That the sale of the material of Saint-Yved never took place, neither by the commune nor by the Fabric, to the profit of M. Bruneteau.

2. Consequently, M. Bruneteau cannot dispose of, or do anything else with, any stone sculpted for this facade in favor of the town of Soissons.

3. Moreover, at Braine it is a public scandal that no adjudication of the material of the old facade ever occurred, and no poster was ever put up announcing the adjudication.

4. From these incontestible facts it is quite evident that Bruneteau, in the absence of a legal title making him the owner of the material in question, cannot dispose of the sculpted fragments in favor of the Museum of Soissons.

5. Under these circumstances, the Council of the Fabric considers that the material from the facade was, for the most part, of considerable value. And that it is certain that M. Bruneteau sold it to his own profit for an important sum.
6. Since M. Bruneteau cannot produce any act of adjudication or title conceding to him the ownership of the material of the facade, he must repay either the Fabric or the government which have spent so much on the restoration of Saint-Yved.

7. Respecting the intentions of the town of Soissons, the Council maintains that Bruneteau had no right to dispose of the sculpted fragments from Braine.

(1841)
"Tympan du portail de l'église Saint-Yved de Braine représentant une scène du Enfer...." Soissons, Musée St.-Leger, dossier.

"Pièce II" of the dossier is a letter from the Under-Prefect to the Mayor of Soissons dated April 27, 1841. "Concerning the reclamation by the Fabric of Braine of the sculpture now at the Museum of Soissons, according to M. Bruneteau the material of the old facade of Saint-Yved was ceded to him for the sum of 408F, and he gave the sculpture to the Museum. I ask that you inform me as to what you think our posture should be relative to this reclamation."

"Pièce V" of the dossier, which concerns the Inferno, is a copy of a handwritten note about the museum (n.d.). "This bas-relief decorated the tympanum of a side portal of Saint-Yved, and was part of the area demolished when the nave bays were suppressed. It lay pell-mell amid the rubble of the demolition and was going to be sold as a simple stone without value, when the architect M. Gencourt saved it from destruction for the sake of the arts, by re-buying it for the town of Soissons."

December 12, 1853
Report of Curé Lecomte of Braine to the Commission des Monuments Historiques for the purpose of obtaining funerary stones with inscriptions to be placed on the tombs of historic personnages at Saint-Yved.

"Saint-Yved, a lovely monument of the XIIth century consecrated in 1216...is of special interest because of the tombs of the descendants of Louis VI:

1. Agnes de Baudimont, wife of Robert I who died in 1182 and was buried at the Abbey of St.-Pierre de Vienne (Dauphiné) which he founded. Agnes died in 1208 and was buried in the mid-choir of Saint-Yved.
2. Robert II, who died in 1218, and who had consecrated the church in 1216.
4. Robert III, called 'the Devil,' who died in 1233.
5. Pierre de Dreux, brother of Robert III, and called
'Mauclerc,' who was celebrated for his campaigns with Saint-Louis. He died in 1250 while returning from the Holy Lands, and in his will ordered that he be buried at Saint-Yved near the tombs of his parents.


8. Jean I, son of Robert III, who died ca. 1253 during the first crusade of Saint-Louis. Only his heart is buried at Braine, in a niche near the tomb of his wife Marie.

9. Marie de Bourbon, wife of Jean I, who died in 1274 and who had the richest tomb of all: gilt copper with thirty-six statuettes of the same metal showing alliances with princely houses.

10. Robert IV, son of Jean I, who died in 1282. Here ends the male line of the Counts of Dreux and Braine.

Regarding the history of these tombs, we know of their existence through records and the (eye-witness) proof of the excavations of 1826. The tombs were desecrated during the civil war by the Spanish under Archduke Leopold in 1650. Then in 1793 Saint-Yved was used as a stable for cavalry, thus preserving the church. The government recognized the value of the tombs, and in 1829 the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs wrote Curé Beaucamp, approving in principle the project for the translation of the tombs into the Chapel of Saint-Denis (south transept). Work on the tomb project was to cost 4663F. On November 8, 1829, the King made Beaucamp Honorary Canon of the Chapter of Saint-Denis, and on the same day Guardian of the Royal Tombs of Saint-Yved de Braine. With the July Revolution (1830), the project for the translation of the tombs was abandoned. In 1834 (1839?) the architect Danjoy revived the project. He hoped to locate each tomb and have it covered with a new stone bearing the name of the royal personnage and a literary inscription (derived from ancient sources). This project still is not realized today.

Meanwhile Saint-Yved has lost its attraction from a historical viewpoint. Most travelers are ignorant of the royal tombs there. Only the most educated know that Saint-Yved is second only to Saint-Denis. However scholars continue to be interested in this church; recently a scholar working on a study of the arms of the Ducs de Bretagne wrote to me. The Commission des Monuments Historiques must change this sad state of things and bring to light these historical documents, that is the tombs, the arms and inscriptions. I request the marble for tombstones, the funds for engraving the inscriptions, ...and for three or four marble tablets engraved with the names of the Counts and Countesses of Braine, in chronological order and showing where each one is buried at Saint-Yved. The tablets can be placed on
the wall of the Chapel of Saint-Denis. The government would bear the expense of this project.222

222. Curé Lecomte was nominated Honorary Canon of Saint-Denis in October, 1862 (Soissons, Bibl. Mun., Perin 1037).
APPENDIX B

Catalogue of the Restored Sculpture of the Coronation Portal of Laon Cathedral

A1—— Angel: genuflects; carries a candlestick (without candle), at the base of which are three feet.
Restored: basin of candlestick; right toes, right index finger; fragment of drapery between the feet.
Original: large volume of the basin (see fragment on the chest of the angel).

A2—— Angel: stands; carries navette and censor with four chains attached to a ring.
Restored: right hand with navette and bottom half of censor (see B1,10).

A3—— Virgin: with aureole, seated on the throne.
Restored: crown; sceptre; the two hands; small fragments of drapery; bottom of the robe and the two feet.

A4—— Christ: with cruciform aureole; seated on the throne with the book of prophesy in left hand.
Restored: crown; the fingers and thumb of right hand; left index; drapery on the left knee; left leg (resurfaced); bottom of the robe and both feet.

A5—— Angel: standing; carries censor and navette (see A2).
Restored: left hand with navette and basin of the censor (see B1,10); shoulder and part of the left wing; the tips of both feet.

223. Consult Pl. XXIX.
224. All the heads have been restored except that of the angel on the keystone (B, partially). The category "Original" is used to signal original details which either cannot be seen very well in the photographs, or not at all. A few restored fragments are not mentioned.
A6---- Angel: genuflects; carries candlestick (see A1).
Restored: both hands and candlestick (except part of the base against the body); small fragments of drapery; two toes of each foot.

A7---- Tympanum.
Restored: two sections of the arc (above the wings of the two standing angels); the half of the inclined base upon which which the figures feet are resting.

B ---- Angel: keystone; carries scroll.
Restored: scroll (except three points of contact with the wall and the angel's chest); the hands; the head (except the skull and part of left side).

BI.225 Angel: carries navette and censor with four chains attached to a small pyramidal clasp.
Restored: the entire lower part of the censor (except chain against the body); right lower area of the voussure, against lintel.
Original: clouds between tympan and lintel.

BI,2---- Angel: carries censor.
Restored: fragment of the right shoulder; right thumb; upper part of the right wing; left corner of the voussure (above).

BI,3---- Angel.
Restored: palm; both hands; upper part of right wing; part of right sleeve; left toe with base; large section of the voussure (left and upper areas).

BI,4---- Angel: carries crown.
Restored: crown (except fragment against wall); right thumb; right wing (above).

BI,5---- Angel: carries sun.
Restored: surface of sun above the hands; tip of left wing; right foot with base; two large sections of the voussure (left edge) with one-half of right wing of the angel (above).

BI,6---- Angel: carries crescent moon.
Restored: left thumb; left wing (above).
Original: clouds (above and below).

225. The restored areas of the clouds framing Row I were copied from the original clouds (see BI,6).
BI,7— Angel: carries crown.
Restored: crown (except fragment against wall); left forearm and hand; left shoulder; left wing (above); drapery near left knee; lower part of clouds.

BI,8— Angel: carries Book of Seven Seals.
Restored: left shoulder (above); left thumb; tip of left wing.

BI,9— Angel: carries censior and navette.
Restored: right hand with upper part of censor and one chain; palm and thumb of left hand; base between feet; upper part of clouds.

BI,10— Angel: carries censior and navette.
Restored: three chains of the censor; left finger and tip of navette; both feet and the base; tip of left wing; left edge of voussure against lintel.
Original: clouds between tympanum and lintel.

BII,1— Figure: carries scroll.
Restored: large part of scroll; both hands; right toes; large section of voussure and branch (left); stem of flower (left, above); right branch (above); foliage of corners (below, above partially); foliage beneath feet.

BII,2— Figure: carries scroll.
Restored: left hand; upper part of scroll; stems of flowers.
Original: flowers (above, both sides, upper parts); foliage of corners (below, both sides); foliage beneath feet.

BII,3— Figure: carries scroll.
Restored: shoulders; right thumb and index; two fingers of left hand; stems of the flowers; left flower.
Original: grapes (below); right flower (above).

BII,4— Figure: carries roll.
Restored: fragment of left sleeve; branches around the head and right branch.
Original: foliage of corners (below) and beneath feet.

BII,5— Figure: carries scroll.
Restored: fragment of right sleeve; branches around the head and right branch.

226. The Tree of Jesse forms the background for Rows II-IV; the branches and foliage are stylized but several flowers, fruits and vegetables can be identified.
BII,6— Figure: carries scroll.
Restored: part of left hand with tip of scroll; right hand; stems of the flowers; left flower; branches around head.
Original: right flower.

BII,7— Figure: carries roll.
Restored: left hand with roll (except tip of roll touching the body); stems of the flowers.
Original: right flower, remade after the original and resembling the left flower (partly restored).

BII,8— Figure.
Restored: left hand with roll; fingers of right hand (thumb resurfaced); left corner of voussure (above); stems of flowers; left flower.
Original: right flower.

BIII,1— King: carries flowered sceptre.
Original: flowering sceptre; right flower.
Restored: left hand and sceptre (except both extremities); right hand; stems of flowers; left flower.

BIII,2— King: carries flowering sceptre.
Restored: right hand; two fingers of left hand; all the sceptre (except part against left thumb); stems of the flowers.
Original: flowers (both sides, partially).

BIII,3— King: carries flowering sceptre.
Restored: large part of sceptre and two fingers of left hand; right forearm and hand; left toe; drapery near right elbow; stem of left flower.
Original: flowers (both sides); foliage of corners (below).

BIII,4— King: carries flowering sceptre.
Restored: large part of sceptre and three fingers of left hand; fingers of right hand; fragment of left knee; stems of flowers; left flower.
Original: right flower and foliage of corners (below); foliage beneath feet.

BIII,5— King: carries flowering sceptre.
Restored: all the sceptre (except part held in left palm); left thumb; right hand; edges of drapery (right sleeve and beside right foot); branches around the head.

BIII,6— King: carries flowering sceptre and scroll.
Restored: large part of sceptre; right index; fragments of scroll; stem of right flower.
Original: foliage around the body.
BIII,7--- Figure: carries scroll.  
Restored: part of scroll; fingers of right hand; left toe; stems of flowers; central part of left flower.  
Original: right flower, copied after fragment against the wall; foliage around body.

BIII,8--- Figure: scarries roll.  
Restored: thumb and finger of right hand; fragment of right sleeve; stems of flowers.  
Original: flowers (right, left partially); foliage around body (left) and beneath feet.

BIII,9--- Figure: carries scroll.  
Restored: fragments of scroll; left index; edges of voussure (left and below); stem of right flower.  
Original: flowers (both sides); foliage around body and beneath the feet.

BIII,10--- Figure: carries scroll.  
Restored: large part of scroll; left hand; all the right shoulder, arm and hand (except fragment of the sleeve, interior); large section of the voussure (left edge) with branch; two stems and flowers.

BIV,1--- Jesse: holding two branches of the tree, the trunk between the legs and the stump between the feet.  
Restored: right shoulder; right hand; branch and stem of flower on left side; fingers of left hand; edge of drapery beneath left hand.  
Original: foliage (above, both sides).

BIV,2--- David: carries harp with seven cords and large sounding board.  
Restored: lower half of harp; right hand (except thumb and index); right foot; left toes.  
Original: flowers (both sides, artichoke on the right).

BIV,3--- Bathsheba: carries flowering sceptre.  
Restored: large part of sceptre above left hand; right wrist and hand; stem of left flower.  
Original: flowering sceptre; flowers (right, left partially); foliage around body.

BIV,4--- Solomon: carries the Temple.  
Restored: right hand with base of temple; part of right sleeve; fragment of mantle near left hand.  
Original: flowers (both sides).
BIV, 5— King: carries flowering sceptre.  
Restored: all the sceptre (except fragment in palm of hand);  
fingers and thumb of left hand around the sceptre; right  
hand (except thumb); stems of flowers; left corner of  
voussure (below).  
Original: flowers (left, right partially).

BIV, 6— King: carries flowering sceptre.  
Restored: large part of sceptre; two fingers of left hand;  
right hand; left toe; edge of mantle near right hand;  
branch at right (above); stems and flowers (above).  
Original: foliage around body and beneath the feet.

BIV, 7— King: carries flowering sceptre.  
Restored: large part of sceptre; left index; right toe.  
Original: foliage around the body and beneath the feet.

BIV, 8— King: carries flowering sceptre.  
Restored: sceptre (except fragment above the right hand);  
fragment of left sleeve; left foot with corner of voussure;  
stems of the flowers; left flower.  
Original: right flower.

BIV, 9— King.  
Restored: sceptre; forearm and right hand; two fingers of  
left hand; stems of flowers; right flower.  
Original: left flower (partially); foliage around the  
body and beneath the feet.

BIV, 10— King: carries flowering sceptre and globe.  
Restored: large part of sceptre (except extremeties);  
right index; stem of right flower.  
Original: flowering sceptre; left flower; foliage around  
the body and beneath the feet.

BIV, 11— King: carries flowering sceptre.  
Restored: stem of sceptre; right thumb; right corner of  
voussure (below).  
Original: flowering sceptre; flowers (both sides).

BIV, 12— King: carries flowering sceptre.  
Restored: part of the flower of the sceptre; right  
thumb; left hand and wrist; corner of voussure with stem  
and flower (right, above).  
Original: left flower; flowering sceptre; foliage.
BV,1---- Figure: carries scroll.  
Restored: part of scroll; left hand; edge of left sleeve; sections of voussure (edges).

BV,2---- Figure: carries scroll.  
Restored: tips of scroll; right hand; edge of drapery between the legs; right corner of voussure (above).

BV,3---- Figure: carries scroll.  
Restored: parts of scroll; left toe; fragments of drapery between the legs and beside the right leg; base (right corner); right corners of voussure (above and below).

BV,4---- Figure: carries roll.  
Restored: right hand; small fragment of drapery against right foot.

BV,5---- Figure: carries scroll.  
Restored: part of scroll; left thumb; two fingers of right hand; small fragment of drapery near the right toe.

BV,6---- Figure: carries scroll.  
Restored: part of scroll; left thumb and index.

BV,7---- Figure: carries scroll.  
Restored: fragments of scroll; thumb and two fingers of left hand; right index.

BV,8---- Figure: carries scroll  
Restored: tips of scroll; thumb and two fingers of left hand.

BV,9---- Figure: carries scroll.  
Restored: tip of scroll.

BV,10---- Figure: carries scroll.  
Restored: fragments of scroll; right hand and left index.

BV,11---- Figure: carries scroll.  
Restored: tip of scroll; sections of bench (right).

BV,12---- Figure: carries scroll.  
Restored: right index; large sections of the voussure (both sides).

227. The figures on Row V are seated on chairs and benches.
BV,13— Figure: carries scroll.  
Restored: right fingers; right foot with drapery and base.

BV,14— Figure: carries scroll.  
Restored: part of scroll; large section of voussure (right edge).

C——— Lintel of the XIXth century.

D,1-12— Dais beneath the abacuses of the voussures, each one representing part of a city (New Jerusalem). D11-12 are entirely restored. Dais D1-10 were partially restored, in particular the upper area with towers and roof tops, but so carefully they are perfectly authentic.
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Figure 1
Figure 2
Parvis of Saint-Yved. Before 1922.
Figure 4
Detail. XIXth Century Porch of Saint-Yved.
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Portal, Elevation
1969.
AISNE

BRAINE

ÉGLISE S. YVED

PLAN DU PORTAIL

DATE:

M. BERRY Architecte en chef des M. H.

ÉCHELLE: 5 cm pour 1 M.

PARIS. VI

Figure 7
COUPE SUR PIEDRIT
Coupé sur V
COUPE SUR VOUSURES
AISNE

BRAINE

ÉGLISE S.-YVED

COUPE DU PORTAIL

DATE :

M. BERRY. Architecte en chef des M.H.

ÉCHELLE : 5 cm pour 1 m

PARIS.
Remblai avec fragments de moulures et sculptures
Figure 10
Land Registries of 1782 and 1931
Superposed.
Figure 11

Land Registry of Braine, 1813.
Figure 13
"Initial L."
Soissons, Bibl.
Mun., 239.
Figure 15
Gencourt. Section of the Saint-Yved, 1825.
Figure 16
Plan of Saint-Yved, 1836.
Figure 17
Section of Saint-Yved, 1836.
Figure 19
Lelu. View of Saint-Yved, Before 1808.

Eglise de Brame
Pierre LELU  Paris 1741 - 1810
114/52 -
Figure 21
View of Saint-Yved. Watercolor. n.d.
Figure 22
King's Facade of Saint-Yved, 1857.
Figure 23: King's Perspective of Saint-Yved. 1857.
A. le grand Autel moderne, d'où part est la Chaire de St. Veed.
B. Représentation du Sépulcre de J.C.
C. L'Agle.
D. Bâton des Chanteurs.
E. Tribune ou Ludi.
F. Chapelle St. Anne.
G. St. Théodore.
H. Trésor.
I. Chapelle de la Vierge.
J. St. Sébastien.
K. des Comte de Braine.

Tombeaux

0. Tombeau de la Fondatrice.
A. Pierre de Braine.
B. Robert II.
C. Tombeau d'un Comte Robert de Brue.
D. et de Clémence sa Femme.
E. Robert III, Comte de Brue.
F. Pierre de Brue de Minclero.
G. Due de Bretagne.
A. Le grand Autel au-dessus duquel est la Chaire de St. Yvel.
B. Répétition du Sépulcre de S. E.
D. L' Agrafe.
E. Basse des Chantres.
F. Tribune ou Jubé.
II. Chapelle St. Amour.
I. S. Norbert.
K. Trésor.
L. Chapelle de la Vierge.
M. S. Sébastien.
N. des Comtes de Braine.

Tombéaux
0. Tombeau de la Fondatrice.
Agnus de Braïne.
F. Robert II.
9. Tombeau d'un Comte Robert de Druz
et de Clémence sa Fiance.
S. Robert III Comte de Druz.
1. Pierre de Druz dit Montlure.
... Duc de Bretagne.

E. telleau del.  
Redan rouy.
ÉGLISE ST. YVED DE BRA
ÉGLISE ST. YVED DE BRAINE  COUPE LONGITUDINALE
Figure 26
Figure 27
Sites I-II. General View toward West. 1972.
Figure 28
Sites I-II. View toward Northwest.

Figure 29
Site I. View toward Northeast.
Figure 29
Site I. View toward Northeast.
Figure 30
Site I, View toward North. Rubblework.
Figure 31
Site I. Rubblework
View from Above.

Figure 32
Site I. Rubblework
Strata from Above.
Figure 33
Sites I-II. View toward East.

Figure 34
Site II. Rubble Below Central Porch.

Figure 35
Site I. Footing Beneath Central Porch.
Figure 36
Site I. Grave in Footing, North Porch, View Westward.

Figure 37
Site I. Grave in Footing, North Porch, View Eastward.
Figure 38
Site I. Masonry
Below North Porch Wall.

Figure 39
Site I. Socle of North Porch. North Wall.
Figure 39
Site I. Socle of North Porch, North Wall.
Figure 40
Site I. North Wall Stairwell Entrance, Narthex.
Figure 41
Site II View
toward Northwest.

Figure 42
Site II View
toward West.
Figure 42
Site II. View toward West.
Figure 43
Site II, Burial Area at Western Extremity.
Figure 44
Site II. View
toward West.

Figure 45
Site II. View
toward South.
Figure 45
Site II. View toward South.
Figure 46
Site II, Western Extremity from the West.

Figure 47
Sites I-II, View toward South.
Figure 48
Site II. Child's Coffin. View toward West. 1971.

Figure 49
Figure 50
Site II. Burial Area (South Side).
View Westward.

Figure 51
Site II. Burial Area (North Side).
View Westward.
Figure 54
Capital from Braine, Soissons, St.-Leger.

Figure 55
Capital from Braine, Soissons, St.-Leger.
Figure 55
Capital from Braine, Soissons, St.-Leger.
Figure 56
Figure 57
Site I. Masonry and Rubble. Entry to North Porch. View Eastward.

Figure 58
Site I. Masonry and Rubble. Entry to North Porch. View NE.
Figure 58
Site I, Masonry and Rubble, Entry to North Porch. View NE.
Figure 59
Site I. Stratification of South Wall. Fill I.

Figure 60
Site II. Stratification of West Wall. Fills II-III.

Figure 61
Site II. Stratification of North Wall. Fills II-III.
CENTRAL PORCH

REMAINS OF BUILDING IN FRONT OF THE GOTHIC CHURCH
Figure 62
Site II, Diagram of Strata Showing Fills II-III.

NORTH PORCH

SITE II

FILL 3
MIXED

stone trimmings

(sand)

BUILDING IN FRONT
NIC CHURCH
Figure 63
Site II. Diagram of Strata of North Wall. Fill III.

ORCH

paving

FOOTING
SITES I–II: STRATIFICATION

PARVIS 1832—

A

REMBLAI (fill) 2
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footing—central porch
SITES I-II: STRATIFICATION OF SOUTH WALL IN 1832

Figure 64
Sites I-II. Diagram of Strata, South Wall, ca. 1832.
FIGURE 65
Sites I-II. Diagram of Strata.
South Wall, 1972.

STAGES I-II: PRESENT STATE OF SOUTH WALL
Figure 66

Figure 67
Parvis of Saint-Yved. South Wall. Area of Sites III-IV.
Figure 67
Parvis of Saint-Yved, South Wall, Area of Sites III-IV.
Figure 68

Figure 69
Site IV, Southwest Angle of Narthex. View Southwest.
Figure 70
Site III. View toward South.

Figure 71
Site III. Detail. View toward South.
Figure 72
Site XI, North
Transept, Door
Threshold, North
Wall, 1972.

Figure 73
Site XI, North
Transept, Door
Threshold, View
North.
Figure 73
Site XI, North
Transept, Door
Threshold, View
North.
Figure 74
Site I.Northwest
Angle of Narthex.
View Northward.

waterline
Figure 75
Site IV. View toward East. 1972.

Figure 76
Site IV. View toward West.

Figure 77
Site IV. Masonry Below Entry to Stairwell from Narthex.
Figure 78
Site IV. Masonry and Rubble Below Angle Pier. View SW.

Figure 79
Site IV. Rubble Behind Facade Wall. View Westward.
Figure 80

Stairwell entrance
Figure 81
Site V. South

Figure 82
Site V. South
Aisle Pier of Narthex. View Westward.
Figure 83
Site V. South
Aisle Pier of
Narthex. View
Southward.
Figure 84
Site VI. North
Aisle, 2nd Wall
Pier East of
Facade, 1972.

Figure 85
Site VI. North
Aisle, 2nd Wall
Pier East of
Facade, View N.
Figure 85
Site VI, North
Aisle, 2nd Wall
Pier East of
Facade, View N.
Figure 86
Site IX. North
Adale Pier Adjoining Modern Wall. 1971.
Figure 87
Figure 88
Coronation Tympanum. Angel at Right hand Corner. 1969.
Figure 90
Coronation Tympanum Virgin. 1969.
Figure 91
Coronation Tympanum, Virgin.
View toward Left.
Figure 92
Chris Stone, Top
Right Corner,
Traces of Lobed
Arc.
Figure 93
Virgin Stone. Top
Left Corner,
Traces of Lobed
Arc.
Figure 94
Angel Stone, Top Left Corner, Support for Lobed Arc.
Figure 95
Angle Stone.
Left Corner.
Lobed Arc from the Left.
Figure 96
Model Lobed A:
Before-After Restoration.
Figure 97
Coronation Lintel
Removed from
Altar, Left Corner, 1970.
Figure 98
Coronation Lintel
Removed from
Altar. Right
Corner.
Figure 99
Coronation Lintel
Removed from
Altar. Right End.
Figure 100
Figure 101
Angel Stone, Detail of Boss on Column Shaft.
Figure 102
Angle Stone.
Detail of Boss on Capital.
Figure 104
Christ Stone.
Bottom Left Side.
Space to Insert Cloud.

Figure 105
Virgin Stone.
Bottom Right Side.
Space to Insert Cloud.
Figure 105
Virgin Stone.
Bottom Right Side.
Space to Insert
Cloud.

Figure 106
Virgin Stone.
Bottom Left Side.
Space Cut into
Clouds.
Figure 108
Rebuilt Coronation Portal, Row I-Stone
Figure 109
Rebuilt Coronation Portal. Row I-
Figure 110
Rebuilt Coronation Portal Row
I-Stone 4.
Prophet.
Figure 111
Rebuilt Coronation Portal Row I-Stone 5
Prophet.
Figure 112
Rebuilt Coronation Portal.
Row I-Stone 6.
Prophet.
Figure 113
Rebuilt Coronation Portal.
Row I-Stone 7.
Prophet.
Figure 114
Rebuilt Portal.
Row II-3, King Jo-
athan or Ezekias
(Stones 1 or 3).
Figure 115
Rebuilt Portal.
Row II-4, King Jo-
tham or Ezekias
(Stones 1 or 3).
Figure 116
Rebuilt Portal.
Row II-5, King Josias.
Figure 117
Rebuilt Portal.
Row II-6. King Jechonias or Zedekiah.
Figure 118
Rebuilt Portal.
Row II-7. Ancestor (position below Stone 8).
Figure 119
Rebuilt Portal.
Row II-8. Ancestor
(position above
Stone 7).
Figure 120
Rebuilt Portal.
Row III-4, Jesse
(Stone 1).
Figure 121
Rebuilt Portal.
Row III-4. Jesse.
View from Right.
Figure 122
Rebuilt Portal.
Row III-2. Queen
Bathsheba. (Stone 3).
Figure 123
Rebuilt Portal.
Row III-3, King
Solomon (Stone 4).
Figure 124
Rebuilt Portal.
Detail of
Solomon's Beard.
Figure 125
Rebuilt Portal.
Row III-5, King Roboam.
Figure 126
Rebuilt Portal.
Row III-6. King Abia.
Figure 127
Rebuilt Portal.
Figure 128
Rebuilt Portal.
Row III-8, King Joram (Stone 9).
Figure 129
Rebuilt Portal.
Figure 130
Rebuilt Portal.
Figure 131
Rebuilt Portal.
Position Unknown.
Plan de l'Eglise de St. Trophime à Arles

Cette Eglise est en 80 pieds de largeur et un quart de l'arche.

Cette Eglise est un très bel édifice de 15 mètres sur 15 mètres, avec des murs épais de 5 pieds. Les arcades en bois ont un diamètre de 15 pieds. La coupole est de 12 pieds en hauteur et 12 pieds en largeur. La coupole est un cube de 12 pieds de hauteur. La coupole est un cube de 12 pieds de hauteur.

Les murs des caves en roche et celle de la nef sont des murs épais jusqu'au plafond, ainsi que les murs latéraux côté, mais les murs des bas côtés de l'église sont en bois de noyer conçu. Le plafond de l'église est en bois de noyer conçu. Le plafond de l'église est en bois de noyer conçu.

Le sommet du chevet de l'église est en verre, mais il est 3 pieds de l'église.

Le sommet du chevet de l'église est en verre, mais il est 3 pieds de l'église.

La couverture de l'église est en fer, mais elle est 3 pieds de l'église.
Plan de l'Église de St. André d'Aubières à la main de J. Bernard

Cette Église est en Brique, Entre de 12 pieds de largeur le pourtour de l'église, pour l'endroit du sanctuaire moindre. L'intérieur de l'église est de 24 pieds de largeur et de 32 pieds de profondeur.

Le sanctuaire de l'église est de 22 pieds de largeur et de 28 pieds de profondeur. Il est élevé de 30 pieds.

La nef est de 30 pieds de largeur et de 10 pieds de profondeur. Elle est longue de 20 pieds sur 10 mètres. Elle est élevée de 12 pieds sur 10 mètres. Elle est longue de 20 pieds.

La voûte de l'église est de 20 pieds sur 10 mètres. Elle est élevée de 15 pieds sur 10 mètres. Elle est longue de 20 pieds.

La nef est de 20 pieds sur 10 mètres. Elle est élevée de 10 pieds sur 10 mètres. Elle est longue de 15 pieds.

La voûte de l'église est de 15 pieds sur 10 mètres. Elle est élevée de 10 pieds sur 10 mètres. Elle est longue de 15 pieds.

A dessiner le 1er février 1783.
Figure 132
Figure 132: Court Plan of St-Yved, 1825.
Figure 133
Gencourt. Section of Saint-Yved. 1825. 1:100.
Figure 134
Head of Statue from Saint-Yved, Soissons, St.-Leger.
Figure 135
Head of Statue from Saint-Yved. Frontal View.
Figure 136
Head of Statue from Saint-Yved. View from Right.
Figure 137
Head of King. Row III-5, Coronation Portal.

Figure 138
Head of Prophet. Row I-5, Coronation Portal.
Figure 138
Head of Prophet.
Row I-5, Coronation Portal.

Figure 139
Head of Ancestor.
Row II-7, Coronation Portal.
Figure 140
Choir and Transept of Saint-Yved.
View from North-east.
Figure 141

château wall
Figure 142

Wall buttress
Figure 143
West Facade of Church at Glennes
Figure 144
West Facade of Church at Glennea, Detail of Portals
Figure 145
Facade of Abbey at Zsambek, Hungary.
Figure 146
Gencourt. Project for Modern Facade of Saint-Yved. 1825.
Figure 147
Two Corbel Figures Employed in Rebuilt Coronation Portal.
Figure 148
Heads of Right Corbel Figure and Tympanum Angel.
Figure 149
Viollet-le-Duc.
Plan of Saint-Yved.Dict.,VIII.
1-7 toises
2-16 feet (4 x 4)
Site XII, South-west Lantern Pier of Saint-Yved, 1970.
Site XII. Southwest Lantern Pit Octagonal Foundation.
Southwest Lante Pier. Octagonal Foundation from Above.
Figure 155
Trouvelot, Plan of
St. Michel-en-
Thierache, 1944.

SAINT MICHEL

EN

THIERACHE

EGLISE ET BATIMENTS ABBATIAUX

J. TROUVELOT, ARCH. EN CHEF DES M.M.
D'APRES UN RELEVE DE J. CANONNE.
Figure 156
Prophet Simeon.
Incarnation Vousssures, Laon Cathedral.

Figure 157
Sibyl. Incarnation
Vousssures, Laon Cathedral.
Figure 157
Sibyl, Incarnation
Voussures, Laon Cathedral.

Figure 158
Dream of Nebuchadnezzar, Incarnation Voussures.
Laon.
PARVIS OF SAINT-YVED 1/100

Plate I
1:100
Plate I
Parvis of Saint-Yved. Plan, 1971. 1:100
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Plate IV
Sites I-II. Plan.
1:20.
Sites I-II. Elevation 1:20.
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 SOCLE
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 FOUNDATION

 FOOTING
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 (water level) -228
entrance to stairwell

SIDE-AISLE WALL OF NARTEX
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north portal
central portal
AISNE - BRAINE - PARVIS DE L'ÉGLISE SAINT YVES
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PLAN

Plate VI
Site I: North
A -- SOCLE of LEFT EMBRASURE of PORTAL
B -- DRESSED STONE - EMBRASURE
C -- FOUNDATION STONE
E -- RUBBLE supporting EMBRASURE
F -- RUBBLE behind EMBRASURE WALL
J -- RUBBLE (supporting paving of portal)

SITE I
NORTH PORTAL
E - RUBBLE supporting EMBRASURE
F - RUBBLE behind EMBRASURE WALL
J - RUBBLE (supporting paving of portal)

SITE I
NORTH PORTAL

left wall of porch

-103 footing
Plate VII
Site III. Plan
Superposed on
Site I, 1:20.

AXIS OF NAIVE PIERS

OUTH A
west porches

entrance to lateral west portals
West porches 1/20

DRESSED STONE COURSE

FOUNDATION COURSE
PAVING of LATERAL PORTALS

Plate IX
Reconstruction of Paving, West Portals.
LATERAL PORCHES WITH TWO STEPS
Reconstruction of Two Steps, West Porches

Paving of Portal-33

STEP 1 - 33 Dressed Stone Course

STEP 2 - 51

FOUNDATION COURSE - 69
PAVING of PORCH-69
SOUTH AISLE WALL, NARTHEX

- A stairwell

- B pier, socle on dressed stone

- C mortar bed

- D mortar joint at facade wall

- E rubble behind facade wall
If facade wall

modern wall

C mortar bed

D mortar joint at facade wall

E rubble behind facade wall

F facade wall

scale 1/20

SITE IV

Plate XI
Site IV. Plan 1:20
SITE VI

NORTH WALL

scale 1/20

Sites IV-VI Comparative Plans. 1:20.
Plate XIII
Foundations, Angle
Piers, Narthex.
Superposed Plans, 1:20
RESTORED PIER FOUNDATION - dressed stone at northwest angle
SITE 1 - NARTHEX

FACADE WALL -- SOUTH
Plate XIV
Reconstruction of Angle Piers, Narthex 1:20
waterline

northwest pier restored with 3 colonettes

FACADE WALL, NORTH
porting
TYMPANUM RECONSTRUCTED, 3.96 m

ACTUAL LOCATION OF EXTANT VOUSSURE STONES, actual dimens
TYMPANUM RECONSTRUCTED, 3.96m

ACTUAL LOCATION OF EXTANT VOUSSURE STONES, actual dime

ACTUAL LINTEL STONE, 1.825m
Plate XVI
Reconstructed
Tympanum, Coronation Portal. 3.96m Wide. 1:10.
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actual dimension = __
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Plate XVIII
Coronation Tympa-num Reconstructed with Six Figures.
1:20.
Plate XIX
Original Voussure
End Profiles Compared to Recut Profiles.

original profiles
row II-2.3

profile recut in XIX century
Diagram. Formula for Radius of an Arc, 1:10
Comparison of Voussure Arches. Rows I-III. 1:10.

comparative heights, ROWS 1-3
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UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS
Plate XXIII
Study for Distributing Irregular Stones by Row. 1:10.
Plate XXIV-A
Original Scoring of Vousures.
Row I, 3-4.

Row I-4, bottom
Row I-3, top

Plate XXIV-B
Original Scoring of Vousures.
Row I, 5-6.

Row I-5, bottom (cut)
Row I-6, top (cut)

Plate XXIV-C
Original Scoring of Vousures.
Row I, 6-7.

Row I-6, bottom (cut)
Row I-6, top (cut)
Row I-3, top

Plate XXIV-D
Original Scoring of Vousures.
Row I, 2-4.

Row I-4, bottom
Row I-2, top
Row I-2, top

A-C scored B = 23
A-C = 9.4 cm B = 23
A-C = 9.5 cm B = 23
A-C scored B = 23
A-C = 9.5 cm B = 23
A-C scored B = 23
A-C = 9.5 cm B = 23
A-C scored B = 23
Plate XXV-A
Comparison of Voussure End Profiles. Row II, 7-8.

Plate XXV-B
Comparison of Voussure End Profiles. Row II, 8-7.

Plate XXV-C
Comparison of Voussure End Profiles. Row II,
Plate XXV-C
Comparison of
Measurements End Profiles.Row II, 6-7.
Plate XXVII-A
Comparison of Voussure End Profiles, Row II, 3-4.

Plate XXVII-B
Comparison of Voussure End Profiles, Row III, 4-5.
Plate XXVII-C
Comparison of Voussure End Profiles, Row IV, 8-14.
Plate XXVII-C
Comparison of Voussure End Profiles, Row IV, 8-14.
BRAINE. CORONATION PORTAL
LAON. CORONATION PORTAL
Plate XXX
Voussure Cycle
Pattern, Senlis
Coronation.

Cathédrale de Senlis, Coronation Portal.

According to Autroot
Initial Wings
Plate XXXI
Voussure Cycle
Pattern: Chartres
Coronation.

CHARTRES. CORONATION PORTAL
Plate XXXII
Braine Voussure Cycle. Identity
Extant Figures
Restored.

BRAINE. CORONATION PORTAL
Plate XXXIII
Restoration of Voussure Figures on Row III (Left)

ROW 3 left STONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Roboam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>David missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 actual     Returned

STONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

alternative positions

- a — ends do not match
- b — improper attribute
scale 1/20

CENTRAL PORTAL

Preliminary Study
Coronation, Plan.
One Scale 1:20.

1 column of 1825 plan
Project Study
Plan. 1:20
Plates XXXV
Reconstructed
Plan. Coronation
Portal. Two
Socles 1:20.

CORONATION PORTAL: RESTORED WITH TWO
SOCLES 1:20.
Embrasure wall 27cm after side portals
ELEVATION OF CORONATION PORTAL

support of embrasure columns uncertain - STUDY 1
PORTAL certain—STUDY 1

Preliminary Study Coronation. Elevation. One Socle.

Plate XXXVI

WITH MORTAR

[Diagram with measurements and notes]
ELEVATION-STUDY 2
Plate XXXVII
Preliminary Study
Coronation, Elevation, Two Socles.
Plate XXXVIII
Preliminary Study
Coronation. Elevation. Short
Columns.
Plate XXXIX
Preliminary Study
Coronation, Elevation, Spiral
TRACING OF LITHOGRAPH PERSPECTIVE
Tracing of Lithograph with Two-Point Perspective System.
Plate XLII
Reconstructed Coronation Porch Showing Angle of Gable.

STUDY OF GABLE
present level
present level of pavement 69
Plate XLIII
Lithograph Completed with Angle of Coronation Gable.

LITHOGRAPH—tracing of central porch
CENTRAL PORCH---gable restored
1496 transept

(according to Prioux)
1– transept wall
2– wall according to lithograph
Plate XLVII
XIXth Century
Porch of Saint-Yved, 1:20.
RESTORATION OF THE LATERAL PORTALS

CAPITALS
TYMPANUM
One Socle

scale 1/20

Plate XLVIII
Preliminary Study
North Portal. Plan.
Bases 0.32m².
1:20.
Plate XLIX
Preliminary Study
North Portal. Elevation, Bases
0.32m².

ELEVATION WITH ONE SOCLE 1/20
ON WITH ONE SOCLE 1/20
north portal

restored with two socles

CAPITALS 32

TYMPANUM 264

scale 1/20

Plan: North Portal
Bases 0.32 m^2. Tymp. 112
Socles 1:20.
Plate LI
Reconstructed
Elevation, North Portal with Inferno, 1:20.
North Portal Plate
Bases 0.29m²
1:20.
STUDY 1—ELEVATION OF INFERNO PORTAL
Plate LIV
Preliminary Stud
North Porch.
3.05m Columns.
1:20.
Plate LV
Preliminary Study
North Porch.
Dropped Lintel.
Plate LV
Reconstructed
Elevation, West
Facade, Portals
Restored, 1:100.
Soissons tympanum, actual lintel and width
Soissons tympanum,
actual lintel and width
Plate LVII

1 - nave, southeast bay
2 - nave, southwest bay
3 - south transept, east wall, north bay
4 - south transept, formeret

1 2 3 4 5 6
east wall, north bay
east bay
sept., formeret
west bay

5 - triforium
1/20
ADE RESTORED 1/100

Reconstructed Facade. Elevations with Square Figures, 1:100.

portions
1 - 1060^2, \frac{1}{2} \text{ width of nave (1059), height aisle frieze}

2 - aisle windows (881), transept (889)
Soissons tympanum,
actual lintel and width
Soissons tympanum, actual lintel and width
Inferno Tympanum after Reconstructed Side Portals.
Plate LX
Plate LXI
Reconstructed
Elevation, Pendant to Inferno Portal
1:20.
Reconstructed Longitudinal Section. Side Portals 1:100.

LONGITUDINAL SECTION of the LATERAL PORTALS
OF SAINT-YVED WITH GEOMETRIC ORIGINS OF DESIGN
Plate LXIV
Site XII. Southwest Lantern Pier Foundations, 1:5.
HORIZONTAL
495
247.5
123.7
61.8
30.9

DIAGONAL or CIRCULAR
700
350
175
87.5
43.7
$990^2 \text{ cm}^2$
HORIZONTAL
495
247.5
123.7
61.8
30.9

DIAGONAL or CIRCULAR
700
350
175
87.5
43.7
$1110^2 \text{cm}$

**Horizontal Series**

- 555
- 277.5
- 138.7
- 69
- 34.5

**Diagonal (or Circular) Series**

- 785
- 392.5
- 196
- 98
- 49
THE CROSSING FIGURES

HORIZONTAL
495
247.5
123.7
61.8
30.9

DIAGONAL or CIRCULAR
700
350
175
87.5
43.7
Plate LXV
Two Crossing Squares, Geometric Figures 1:50.
LANTERN VAULT (length of transept)
EXTERNAL SQUARE and INTERIOR ELEVATION
Plate LXVI
Interior Elevation. Geometric Figures of Crossing Squares.
930^2 \text{width between walls of Latin cross} \\
\text{height of triforium} \\
II10^2