The Codex Calixtinus and the Shrine of St. James
The *Codex Calixtinus* as an Art-Historical Source

Serafín Morales

The Pilgrim’s Guide constituting the fifth book of the *Codex Calixtinus* is justly recognized as an art-historical source of the first water. As well as a detailed description of the City and Cathedral of Santiago as they were between 1130 and 1135, it contains information on other monuments and works of art to be found on the ways to Compostela. These descriptions are moreover accompanied by explanations that are invaluable testimony of the reception of the iconographic programs by a viewer of that time. Purely aesthetic judgements are scarce and topical, betraying the author’s rhetorical training rather than his personal taste.¹


This is the case of the much-celebrated passage on the emotional effects caused by the view of the
However, the fifth book is not the only Calixtine text of art-historical interest. The Pseudo-Turpin and various sermons also feature references to real or imaginary works of art, and in the compendium of literature, liturgy and Jacobean doctrine making up the Codex, the art historian can find abundant clues to the interpretation of the architectural and sculptural programs of the Compostelan basilica. Because of these figurative implications, it likewise seems probable that, before or after being collected together, these texts also served as a source to the artists and art patrons of the time, both in Compostela and other places. In this regard, I have pointed elsewhere to the possibility that the architectural conception of the Pórtico de la Gloria itself may reflect the mystic *ekphraseis* of the Cathedral in the sermon “Veneranda Dies”, which echoes the description of the Heavenly Jerusalem in the Apocalypse.4

---


The documentary value of the Guide has been questioned on more than one point. Like all historic evidence, it must be approached with a full understanding of the literary genre to which it belongs, including comprehension of prevailing usage concerning stylistic formulae and interests, and the intentions behind the choice or presentation of information. But besides this, no critical or philological approach to this text should overlook something much more simple and obvious: that it is a human creation and as such subject both to error and to the personal preferences of its author as regards its subject matter. If in addition we take into account the author’s being a foreigner who communicated with his local informants in Heaven knows what kind of Latin, and that the text as we know it seems to be the end result of compiling notes made from direct observation, memories that were perhaps not as reliable as they ought to have been, and written or oral hearsay that was not always truthful or properly understood; then the Guide’s mixture of precision and vagueness, and even its flagrant contradictions, are hardly surprising.

Chronological questions

Among the artistic information supplied by the Guide, there is perhaps none that has given rise to so much controversy as the passage on the “ingens basilica veneranda” of Saint-Martin in Tours, of which it is stated that “ad similitudinem scilicet ecclesie beati Jacobi miro opere fabricatur". The support that the “pilgrimage churches” theory found in this contemporary testimony was vitiated by implicit chronological inconsistency in the view of those for whom the prototype of this architectural family was the church constructed in Tours by the treasurer Hervé between 1003 and 1014. The text of the Guide does indeed seem to suggest that the basilica of Saint-Martin was at the time being constructed “in imitation of the church of Santiago”, which would of course place the latter at an earlier date. This not only defied the lost building’s privilege of being proclaimed as the prototype of its class; it was also at odds with the evidence that the region of Tours had attained an artistic maturity with which it is hardly likely that Compostela could compete.

It is therefore not surprising that the literal interpretation of this passage has been vigorously opposed. Both G. Gaillard and P. David have in fact amassed ample evidence that the Guide’s author was in the habit of erroneously using the present passive with past sense; of the north doorways of the Cathedral of Santiago, for example, he writes that they “pulere sculpturæ”, though no-one would make so bold as to conclude that they were being worked on at the time the Guide was


written. Thus the assertion that the church of Saint-Martin "miro opere fabricatur" does not mean that it was being built with admirable work, but that it was built with admirable work.

As for the claimed similitude with the Cathedral of Compostela, John Williams has rightly pointed out that it might refer to the fact that both at Santiago and Tours a new basilica was erected over the sepulchre of the respective saint, for the disputed passage begins with a relative pronoun immediately following a description of the tomb of St. Martin: "Super quem [i.e. sarcopagum] ingenis basilica veneranda sub eius honore ad similitudinem scilicet ecclesie beati Iacobi miro opere fabricatur". Turns of speech such as "ad similitudinem" or "ad instar", even when referring to conscious "copies" of renowned buildings such as St. Peter's in Rome or the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem, were not employed in the strict art-historical sense that we should give them: a vague formal, symbolic or functional resemblance was sufficient to justify their use, as was probably the case of the sepulcher of St. Front in Périgueux, which is reported in the Guide as "rotundum tamen ut dominicum sepulcrum". It is also necessary to take into account the personal experience of the beholder. In the late 15th century, for instance, Hyeronimus Münzer went so far as to compare the Cathedral of Santiago with the Sebaldiskirche in Nürnberg, a rapprochement that no handbook would so much as take the trouble to refute. What Münzer wanted to tell his fellow citizens was simply that the Cathedral of Santiago was up to the standards of the best in his home town.

The testimony of the Codex Calixtinus Guide is equally involved in the debate on the commencement of the Cathedral of Santiago. The date given in the Guide, 1078, is the same as that reported in the Historia Compostelana, which furthermore specifies the same day and month as are afforded by one of the proposed readings of the polemical epigraph on the Platerías doorway. This dating contradicts the date 1075 implied by an inscription in the Capilla del Salvador, according to which this

---


8 Véillard (note 1) p. 58-59 and n. 1. The Calixtine testimony having been ruled out as irrelevant, elucidation of the relative chronology of Tours and Compostela must rely on other arguments. Leloon initially appears to have supported the priority of Compostela when on archaeological evidence and stylistic analogies he placed the commencement of the pilgrimage church at Tours in the final years of the 11th century. See his articles in Bulletin Monumental 131 (1973) p. 87-100 and 297-310; 133 (1975), 113-129, and 205-231. However, a reconsideration of his own arguments later led him to conclude that work had already begun in the years between 1070 and 1080, though he failed to speculate on the effects that the fire of 1096 would have had on this early structure (Barilique Saint-Martin [note 5] p. 78). In this case, the basilica of Saint-Martin would be practically coetaneous with that of Santiago, though the latter went up more slowly.

9 Edited by L. Palmi, itinerarium Hispanicum Hieronymi Monetarii, Revue hispanique 48 (1920) p. 1-179, esp. 95; J. García Mercadal, Viajes de extranjeros por España y Portugal (Madrid 1952) 1, p. 386.
chapel was consecrated "thirty years after the commencement of the works", and the *Historia Compostelana* refers to the same chapel as dedicated in 1105. It has been suggested, moreover, that the date 1078 mentioned in the Guide and the *Historia Compostelana* may be the result of their authors having misread the Platerías epigraph, for both are known to have been Frenchmen who may well have been unfamiliar with the Spanish custom of writing the numeral L as a V-shaped tail to a preceding X. When this is taken into account, the Platerías inscription is found not to refer to the year 1116 of the Spanish era (A.D. 1078), but to the year 1141 or 1142 (A.D. 1103 or 1104), and hence to some event quite different from the founding of the basilica.10

Whatever the correct interpretation of the Platerías inscription may be, new evidence appears to confirm that 1075 was the year in which the Romanesque basilica was begun or planned at least, and that the Historia Compostelana and the Guide are both mistaken on this point. A charter recently discussed by B.F. Reilly and published in full by F. López Alsina proves that Alfonso VI held a "concilio magno" in Compostela in January 1075, on his return from an expedition to the Kingdom of Granada to demand tribute.11 As Reilly suggests, the reason for the monarch's journey may have been to endow the Church of Santiago with part of the 30,000 dinars booty that had been obtained, in which case the coincidence with the start of work on the new basilica would have allowed the latter to benefit from the

---


11 B.F. REILLY, The Kingdom of León-Castilla under King Alfonso VI 1065-1109 (Princeton 1988) p. 84; F. López ALMAIA, La ciudad de Santiago de Compostela en la Alta edad Media (Santiago de Compostela 1988) p. 410-411. Both authors attribute the charter to January 1075, but it cannot be later than 1 January. If some figure before the kalendas were lost, its date should be delayed to the last days of December 1075, which conflicts with another charter that places then the court in Castrojeriz (see Reilly p. 86).
regal munificence. Later traditions attributing to Charlemagne the enlargement or construction of the Compostelan basilica with the spoils he took from the Muslims possibly preserve a transfigured memory of its initial finacing with moorish gold, which could not fit better the shrine of the saint patron of the Reconquista. Of no less significance seems to be the subsequent presence of King Alfonso and his court in Oviedo (March 1075), allegedly to assist to the revelation of the hoard of relics of the Arca Santa. The sudden promotion of this claimed Ark of the Convenant of the reconquest might be interpreted as a jealous reaction of the old Asturian capital to the monumental rise of the Compostelan Church.

The content of the charter brought forward by Reilly and López Alsina, which specifies the domains of the obscure monastery of San Isidoro de Montes, by no means justifies the convening of the "concilio magno" referred to in its exordium, nor the gathering of such numbers of prelates, abbots and nobles as are mentioned as co-signatories. Yet more noteworthy is the fact that the wording of the initial clause dating the document, which mentions both the monarch and the prelate currently occupying the see, recalls that of the inscriptions accompanying their epigraphs on two capitals that commemorate the commencement of the works in the Cathedral itself (figs. 1 and 2). Thus the epigraphs read:

---

12 The collection of the tribute is recorded in a meaty passage of the memoirs of King Abd Alláh of Granada, whose chronology has been convincingly revised by Reilly (note 11) p. 83-84, n. 60. See E. León-Provençal, E. García Gómez (trans.), El siglo XI en 1ª persona. Las “memorias” de ‘Abd Alláh, último rey zirí de Granada, destronado por los almorávides (Madrid 1980) p. 157-162. Prior to the publication of Reilly’s book, López Alsina had already drawn my attention to the Compostelan charter referred to above and its probable connection with the foundation of the Romanesque Cathedral.

13 Münzer, Itinerarium, in: Pfandl (note 9) p. 94-95; García Mercadal, Viajes (note 9) p. 385. His source is surely the ch. v of the Historia Turpini (Wattshall, Liber Sancti Jacobi [note 1] p. 306), which reports that “ex suro quem Karolo reges et principes Yspaniae dedere, beati Isaci basilicam tunc per tres annos n illis horis commorantes augmentavit”. In this connection, the same Historia furnishes a more striking parallel to the historic circumstances that the charter of 1075 allows us to guess at. If this refers to a “concilio magno” held then in Santiago “ad restauracionem fidei ecclesiae” and attended by “pontifices... cum principes eius comes magnos” (López Alsina [note 11] p. 410), which could comprise the decision of the rebuilding of the basilica, the Historia attributes to Charlemagne the call to an “episcoporum et principium concilio” in Compostela for the reorganization of the Spanish Church, during which the shrine of St. James was dedicated on “kalendis Junii” (ch. xix; Wattshall p. 325). Taking into account that the 1075 council was held on “kalendas Ianuarii”, an hypothetically abbreviated dating formula like “kal. ian.”, with the visigothic open “a”, on some charter referring to it, might well have been misunderstood as “kal. ianum”, the date of the apocryphal meeting. For other instances of epic transfiguration of historical facts in the Historia Turpini see Larcara, Las peregrinaciones (note 1) i, pp. 484-489.

and the diploma: "In tempore domini Adefonsi principe regnante... et in loco apostolico sancti Iacobi gratia Dei Didacus aepiscopus".15

As I have said, the solemnity of the document goes far beyond what is warranted by its content. It therefore seems likely that the scribe may have copied a heading composed for diplomas of greater importance signed at the same curia or "concilio magno", such as the minutes recording its resolutions or an endowment of the new basilica. The latter of these possibilities would better explain the similarity between the formulae employed in the heading and the epigraphs, for whoever composed the latter may have had the hypothetical deed in mind, or may even have been the person who drew it up. The execution of both the inscriptions and the capitals that bear them at a date close to that of the extant charter is suggested by the title "princeps", which had originally been adopted by Alfonso to intimate his precedence over his brothers García and Sancho but was gradually replaced by "rex" or "imperator" after Sancho's death in 1073 made it irrelevant.16 It is worth noting that in another charter related to the beginnings of the new basilica, the so-called Concordia de Antealtaires, dated 1077, the monarch signs as "Adefonsus rex".17

I find no contradiction here with the fact that on the capitals Alfonso and Bishop Diego Peláez are both accompanied by angels and in an apparent state of beatitude - especially Bishop Peláez, who even seems to be shrouded in a winding-sheet - for both these scenes are to be understood as of a prospective or propitiatory nature; in other words, as showing the persons represented in the state to which they would attain by virtue of their initiative and munificence with regard to the new basilica (figs. 1 and 2). A capital in the church of Volvic, Auvergne, has an analogous scene of angels attending on a donor (fig. 3), and the corresponding inscription also reads, as Z. Swiechowski has pointed out, like the heading of an endowment charter:

15 Lopez Alsina (note 11) p. 410. For the epigraphs, see A. Lopez Ferrerero, Historia de la Santa A.M. Iglesia de Santiago de Compostela III (Santiago 1900) p. 42.


17 Lopez Ferrerero, Historia (note 15) III, appendix I, p. 3-7. On the charter see F. Lopez Alsina, Le concordat de Antealtaires, in: Santiago de Compostela. 1000 ans de Pèlerinage Européen, Europe-lia 85 Espafia (Gern 1983) p. 203-204. The fact that this important document has left no trace in the Cathedral archives - it is only known through later copies coming from the monastery of Antealtaires can help to explain the loss of the endowment charter we guessed at for the beginning of the works. The deposition of bishop Diego Peláez in 1087 and the subsequent confiscation of the estate of his Church - referred to in the Historia Compostellana, I, III, ed. Falques Rey (note 10) p. 16 and 24 - surely caused the loss of a certain number of its title deeds. The documentary gap in such a decisive period in the history of the Compostelan see seems to be eloquent enough.

See Williams, 'Santiago or Toulouse' (note 10) p. 560.
“incipit donalia sancti pre[sec]ti que recit gvillelmes de
bezac pro anima sva et co[njugis].” The auvergnat filiation recognized
in the compostelarian capitals make this parallel still more significant.

Finally, it may be noted that the san Isidoro charter cites among its co-
signatories one “undesindus presbiter” and one “se[ge]redus tesaurario”, whom
its is possible to identify as the persons referred to by the guide as administrators
of the cathedral works. Their attendance at the “concilio magno” adds a supplementary
support to the hypothesis that the founding of a new basilica might have been
reckoned in its agenda.

Just as controversial as the question sketched above is the guide’s mention of the
placing of the “last stone” of the church, which it states took place forty-four years
after the laying of the first stone: “Ab anno quo primus lapis in fundamento eius
ponitur usque ad illum quo ultimus mittitur xliii anni habentur.” Counting from
the year in which the guide’s author believed the cathedral to have been founded,
1078, this quotation apparently dates the conclusion of the works in the year 1122,
which at first sight seems difficult to reconcile with either the abundant archaeological
evidence that the cathedral was still unfinished at the time the guide was
written or the guide’s own declaration that “ex his que diximus alia sunt iam
omnino adimpleta, aliisque adimplenda.” The contradiction can nevertheless be
removed by a careful reading of the passage that puts the accent on the phrase “in
fundamento”; thus the “last stone”, like the first, belonged to the foundations of the
edifice and the completion it implies is to be referred to the closure of the ground
area originally assigned to the basilica.

19 See z. swiechowski, La sculpture romane d’auvergne (Clermont-Ferrand 1973) p. 228, pls. 245-
245.
20 See galliard, débuts (note 10) p. 172-174; p. dischamps, Etude sur les sculptures de sainte-Foy de
Conques et de saint-Sernin de Toulouse et leurs relations avec celles de saint-Isidore de León et
de saint-Jacques de Compostelle, Bulletin monumental 100 (1941) p. 239-264; J. Bouquet, La
sculpture à Conques aux XIe et XIIe siècles. Essai de chronologie comparée (Lille 1972) p. 581-
587; Moralejo, Notas Conant (note 10) p. 103-104.
21 Lopez AlExa, Ciudad de Santiago (note 11) p. 411 and 409 (for another mention of Sagederus in a
charter dated 1072); Vielleard (note 1) p. 116-117. For their career and the role they played in the
cathedral works, see Moralejo, Notas Conant (note 10) p. 107 and 223; Lopez AlExa, p. 37-38, n.
26. One “Dacaredus presbiter” who also appears as a co-signatory can be identified as the person
with the same name and title whose sculptural slab was found near the north doorway of the Pre-
Romanesque basilica. See J. Guerra Carmona, Exploraciones arqueológicas en torno al sepulcro del
Apóstol Santiago (santiago de Compostela 1982) p. 453, fig. 141. Unfortunately enough, the date
of his death was left incomplete (“era IC”), which deprives us of a valuable testimony to the
progress of the building campaigns.
22 Vielleard (note 1) p. 116-117. The date 1122 is also marked by the epigraph on the monumental
fountain built in front of the north façade by the operarius and treasurer Bernardus (Vielleard p.
94-95). Once more the Historia Compostellana, III, I, furnishes a parallel passage stating that the
cathedral was almost complete forty-six years after its beginning, i.e. by 1124 (ed. Falque Rey
23 Vielleard (note 1) p. 104-105. For archaeological and textual evidence against the alleged com-
pletion of the cathedral before the intervention of master mateo, see J.M. Caamaño Martínez,
Contribucción al estudio del Gótico en Galicia (Valladolid 1962) p. 18-20; azcarate (note 4) p. 18-
20; S. Moralejo, Esculturas compostelanas del último tercio del siglo XII, Cuadernos de Estudios
Galgles 28 (1973) p. 294-310; M.L. Wark, Studies on the Pórtico de la Gloria at the Cathedral of
Santiago de Compostela, (Ph.D. Diss. New York Univ. 1978). For the traditional views, J.M. Pita
89-112.
A clear indication that the Guide describes an unfinished building is its stating the number of its windows. According to my calculations, the number mentioned accounts for the work done as far as the fifth or sixth bay of the tribunes of the nave. This is precisely the point at which the capitals begin to exhibit a different style, the abaci a different profile and the paired columns more slender proportions. However, this and other questions concerning the last phase of the Cathedral’s construction will be dealt with more knowledgeably by James D’Emilio.24

Terminological Problems

Other doubts about the reliability of the evidence provided by the Guide have concerned its use of terms whose meaning is uncertain, or which appear to be at odds with archaeological facts. A case in point is its description of the basilica’s original roof as being of tiles and lead (“teolis et plumbo”).25 Remains of a stone roof of primitive appearance led to its formerly being accepted that the term “teolis” must have been used in an approximate sense to indicate tile-like stone shingles or slates.26 This scholarly reconstruction of the past became material reconstruction when in the 1960’s extensive restoration included roofing of the whole building with stone.

However, the literal truth of the Guide’s testimony has been vindicated by recent restoration work on the roof of the main chapel, which uncovered the original tiled roof (fig. 4). This was buried under a thick layer of mortar and a covering of stone slabs which must have been laid down as paving as part of the military transformations undergone by the Cathedral between the 12th and the 14th centuries.27 Unfortunately, the discovery of the true nature of the original roof has been completely ignored in restoration work of a yet more recent date, in which a stereotyped notion what a Romanesque Cathedral must have been like has led to stone again being used where once there were tiles.

“Teolis”, from teola, is evidently a Latinization of a romance form related to the French tuile, which derives from tegula and is recorded in the form tiule around

24 See Moralejo, Noras Corbán (note 10) p. 114, n. 45. Conant (note 1) p. 28-30, had already realized that the forty-three glazed windows recorded by the Guide in the tribunes (Vieillard [note 1] p. 92-93) could not include those of the westernmost bays, but he preferred to guess at some mistake or error in the text and limited the incompleteness of the building to the upper west front. For the capitals on these bays of the tribunes, see J. D’Emilio’s paper in this volume and his Romanesque Architectural sculpture in the Diocese of Lugo, East of the Miño (Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of London 1988) p. 73-93 and 158-176.

25 Vieillard (note 1) p. 104-105.

26 López Ferrero (note 15) III, p. 141-142 was the first to state that “teolis” should be “baldosas de pizarra asentadas a manera de las tejas”. Conant (note 1) p. 54, n. 7, keeps “teolis” untranslated and suggests they probably were “stone slabs”. Vieillard (note 1) p. 105, and Moralejo/Torres/Fiez (note 1) p. 563, correctly translate “teolis” as “tuiles” and “tejas”, as do Herbers (note 1) p. 148, and Cauchi (note 1) p. 127.

27 The research that J.A. Puente Míguez is carrying out on the Gothic additions to the Cathedral will surely throw a new light on the chronology of these military structures. I have to thank him for his kind help in the interpretation of these findings.
1170. A similar history belongs to the term “cindrie” or “medias cindrias”, the same as the Catalan cindria (French: cintre; Spanish: cimbra), naming the semicircular framework upon which an arch is constructed. The author of the Guide, however, applies this word in apposition to pillars or columns. For this reason, K.J. Conant preferred to relate the term to cylinder, and to translate “columne cindrie” as “cylindrical columns” and “medie cindrie” as “semi-cylindrical columns”, whereas other authors suggested “colonnes engagées”, “arcs”, “demi-berceaux”, or the “piles” dividing the bays of the tribunes. If we substitute colonnettes for “piles”, the latter interpretation, due to E. Lambert, seems to be the most likely. All the contexts in which the “cindrie” are mentioned fit indeed the paired columns dividing each span of the triforium in two: these provide a point of reference for the height reached by the aisles (“navicule usque ad medias cindrias tantum ascendent”); they are found in the tribunes (“sed in navibus paciunc inter pilare singulos, duos simul colunpe sempere sunt, que vocantur colunpe cindrie”); and they contribute to the bearing of their vaults (“ex uno quidem latere eas tenent parietes, et ex ali pilares... et dupciles pilares qui a lapicidibus vocantur medie cindrie”).

It is the adjective “medie” that gives a clue as to why and how this term is used in the Guide. As in classical Latin or medio in the Spanish arco de medio punto, “medie” does not mean half, which would make “medie cindrie” half-cindrias or halves of cindrias, neither of which has much sense in this context, but rather median, placed in the middle. The columns in the middle of the triforium spans are in fact functionally analogous to permanent “cindrie” in the usual sense because they and their arches hold up the main triforium arcades. The term “ciborios” to designate the doorways arcades (fig. 7) attests to a similar extensive or approximate use of the technical vocabulary.


29 Vieillard (note 1) p. 8-91.

30 Conant (note 1) p. 50-51. Moirer (note 1) thought that “medias cindrias” were the “colonnes engagées dans les piliers, lesquelles supportent les arcs-doubleaux sectionnant la voûte de forme cindrie”, and referred the “colunpe cindrie” to the columns in the tribunes, both engaged and free standing (note 1 p. 399-400, n. 4). Vieillard first followed E. Lambert’s suggestion identifying the “cindrie” as the “piles supplémentaires qui divisent en deux les baies des tribunes et peuvent être considérées comme des renforts”. However, she later accepted Puig i Cadafalch’s advice to translate “medias cindrias” as “demi-berceaux”, as an alternative to “renforts medians” (note 1 p. 88-89, n. 3, and 148).

31 See Morañez, “Ars Sacra” (note 3) p. 221-223, where other debated terminological questions concerning the liturgical furniture are discussed. See esp. p. 212, n. 81, for the “picturis et debuxaturis” decorating the Compostelan “ciborius”, which led some authors to argue for a monumental use of enamels and niello work as early as 1105.

As for the term “vites”, referred to the substructures of the two towers found in the SW and NW corners of the transept crossing (Vieillard (note 1) p. 104-105), I see no reason to relate it to the Spanish term cepe, in the sense of buttress or pillar, as J.M. Zepedano and J. Carro Otero have claimed, through a hazardous semantic path: from Lat. vitis (vine) to Span. cepo (stock; fig.: buttress). See J.M. Zepedano and Carniero, Historia y descripción arqueológica de la Basílica Compostelana (Lugo 1870) p. 99, n. 2; J. Carro Otero, Las fortificaciones de la Catedral de Santiago, La Voz de Galicia (La Coruña 25 July 1973). “Vites” and its more frequent variant “vices” are terms widely documented in medieval texts to designate tower staircases, and all the translators of the Guide have rightly understood the passage in this way. See Du Cancl, s.v. “vis”;
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The vulgar forms of some of the technical terms used by the author of the Guide and his own invocation of the "lapicidas" authority suggest that stonemasons, presumably Gallic or with a Gallic training, were among his informants in Compostela. On the other hand, the references to parts of the church yet unfinished - even perhaps not begun - and the detailed account of its measurements could reveal awareness of graphic or written records of the architectural project. This later possibility is also to be taken into account as regards the description of the iconographic programs.

Iconographic problems: The description of the façades

The Guide's description of the façades of the Cathedral poses problems of two kinds: as well as the suspicions aroused by the few vague lines devoted to the west front, which I will refer to later, there is a different sort of difficulty related to the vicissitudes suffered over the centuries by the other two portals, which are described in great detail. As far as we can judge from the Platerías façade - the only survivor - as it stands today, the Guide is generally descriptively accurate. The passage that has given rise to most doubts is a matter of interpretation rather than description, namely the affirmation that the woman with a skull on the left-hand tympanum (fig. 5) represents an adulteress condemned by her husband to kiss her lover's rotting head twice daily. The scepticism provoked by this explanation - which Philip Verdier qualified as a "roman" - has encouraged the proposition of a number of other readings, including the presentation of the relief as "Eve, Mother of Death" - an opinion to which I adhered for some time - or as an even more anachronistic penitent Magdalene.
Interpretations such as this one, that are so clearly wide of the mark, make one reflect that it is perhaps temerarious to think that modern scholars can understand a medieval image better than the contemporaries to whom it was addressed. More than ten years ago, and incidentally in this University, John Williams convincingly argued in favour of the Guide’s interpretation of the relief as an exemplum libidinis. It is a very early exemplum to be sure, and I too am inclined to see it as a sculpted equivalent of the exempla that the preachers of the time borrowed from secular literature in order to dress up their moral message. The Guide’s closing words on this figure, which make an abrupt transition from prosaic description to rhetorical apostrophe—“Oh, how great and admirable a punishment the adultress’s to be told to all!”—seem to echo the oral explanations of some clerical cicerone addressing the pilgrims, like the loquacious aeditus who guided Prudentius in the basilica of Imola. Another version of this legend has been pointed out on a capital in the church of Santa Marta de Tera, Zamora (fig. 6), but the bearded head the woman exhibits there in her bosom, instead of a skull, casts doubt on her identity in favour of Salome.

This was also Weiβbach’s opinion, arguing for an allegory of luxuria which lately came to generate its self-explanatory story (note 32 p. 121-123). The interpretation of the woman as Mary Magdalen, wrongly attributed to Galliard (Etudes [note 6] p. 292-293) by some scholars, is reported to, though not assumed, by J. Villa-Amel y Castro, La Catedral de Santiago (Madrid 1909) p. 32. “Eve as Mother of Death” was proposed by Azcarráez (note 4) p. 10-12, whom I followed in Primitiva fachada (note 32) p. 643, and Saint-Jacques de Compostelle (note 32) p. 98-99. T.W. Lyman, surmises that the north portal was the former emplacement of this relief, where it could have provided a contrasting pendant to the Virgin of the Annunciation. Its later deployment on the Platerías doorway, neighbouring the Temptation scene, would have invested it with a new meaning, as an image of lust, and given rise to the story told in the Guide. See Motif et narratif: vers une typologie des thèmes profanes dans la sculpture monumentale sur les romerias, Les Cahiers de Saint-Michel de Cuxa 10 (1979) p. 59-78, esp. 71-78. W. Sauerlander stresses the sensual treatment of the figure, paralleling the spirit of the troubadours, which makes ambiguous whichever content it might be intended to convey. See Nisi transmutetis mores. Riflessioni sull’ambiguità dell’iconografia románica, in: Wiligelmo e Lanfranco (note 14) p. 151-154. Knowlton seems to have thought of Apocalypse 17, 4 (Pita Andrieu (note 32) p. 452-453, n. 27). Nørregaard (note 32) p. 46-47, discussed the relief in the framework of the interpretation given in the Guide, pointing out some textual parallels.

Independently of its intended meaning, an antique source may be guessed at for the style and some iconographic features of the piece. The long, untidy hair and the exhibition of one breast are characteristic of maenads and barbarian captives or personifications of conquered provinces in Roman iconography. See E. Esperandieu, Recueil général des bas-reliefs de la Gaule romaine (Paris 1907-1955), X, supplément, nr. 488; XI, supplément, nr. 7655; G.C. Picard, Les trophées romains. Contribution à l’histoire de la religion et de l’art triomphal de Rome (Paris 1957) p. 270-273, pl. X; J.-J. Hatt, Los celtas y los galo-romanos (Barcelona 1976) pl. 95.

5 My later discussions of the woman with the skull are greatly indebted to Williams’ arguments. See S. Morello, Artes figurativas y artes literarias en la España medieval: románico, Román y roman, Boletín de la Asociación Europea de Profesores de Español 17 (1985) p. 61-70, esp., 66; idem, Origini del programma (note 14) p. 42 and fig. 24, where I suggest a possible literary background for the neighbouring relief, which is in the same style, showing a man astride a lion and blowing a horn (see here fig. 5).

36 See Peristephanon, IX, 18ff. In the 13th century, an inscription on the Hereford map recalls for the onlookers that its images also are to be “heard”. See C. Morello/D. Bannister, Antique Maps (Oxford 1986) p. 20-21.

37 M. Gómez-Moreno, Catálogo monumental de España. Provincia de Zamora (Madrid 1927; reprint
The frieze at the Platerías façade in Santiago (fig. 7) has been likened to a “collection of casts hanging on the walls of a musée de province”. Setting aside the supreme quality of the sculptures, this perjorative description reflects quite rightly the alluvial process by which part of this disparate collection was formed, by accumulation of relics coming from other parts of the building. But even before the incorporation of a certain number of reliefs from the destroyed north portal, the sculptures there and in the Platerías façade already looked to an early seventeenth-century eyewitness like spoils from an earlier church, and some of the puzzling disorder they present today is recorded in the pilgrim’s Guide around 1130.

Two groups of apostles above the Platerías doorways – four at the left and five at the right – seem bear to witness to an original frieze-like arrangement for these areas of the façade, but problems arise regarding the central area. The blessing Christ on the axis of the trumeau is possibly a local version of a French Beau Dieu that can hardly be dated earlier than the 1230’s (fig. 8), but this figure replaced an earlier one of similar type referred to in the Guide as “rectus”, standing, with Saint Peter on its left and Saint James and Saint John to its right. Of the figures mentioned in the Guide as belonging to this “ordo mirabilis ex lapidibus albi marmoris”, only James and John remain (figs. 7 and 8), but we must also include the plaque showing Abraham on the central spandrel (fig. 9), even though the Guide does not refers to it, for it is by the same sculptor who carved the relief of James, and the texts inscribed on both have in common their reference to the Transfiguration of Christ: one of the texts accompanying James is “HIC IN MONTE IHESVm MIRATVR GLORIFICATVm”, and “TRA[n]SFigu[rati]O: IHEVS is inscribed on the Abraham plaque.

---

38 1980) p. 185; Porta Pilgrimage Roads (note 32) p. 214. A better parallel than the Toulousan and Platerías women holding animals on their breasts, which have frequently been compared to the adulteress, is furnished by a capital at the south end of the Compostelan transept. It shows a crouching long-haired woman holding a lion’s head under her dress – apparently a dissuasive metamorphosis of her own sex as the mouth of Hell. See Moralejo, Artistas (note 4) p. 422-423, fig. 13; M. Ciammo, Galice romane (La Pierre-qui-Vire 1973) pl. 55. As in the case of the adulteress, the sensual appearance of the figure is violently contrasted by a deterrent attribute in apposition to – or as a metaphor of – her womb.


40 J. Del Hoyo, Memorias del Arzobispado de Santiago, ed. A. Rodríguez González/B. Varela Jácome (Santiago n.d.) p. 52.

41 For the Christ, J.M. Pita Andreu, En torno al arte del maestro Mateo: El Cristo de la Transfiguración en la Portada de Platerías, Archivo Español de Arte 23 (1950) p. 12-25; Gailhard, Estudio (note 6) p. 105; S. Moralejo, Escultura gótica en Galicia (1200-1300) (Santiago 1975) p. 21-22. The Christ shown in niello work on the ara of Celanova can give us a vague idea what the former Compostelan figure might have looked like. Some of its stylistic features relate it closely to the St. James and Abraham figures on the Platerías frieze (Moralejo, Arts somptuaires (note 3) p. 296, fig. 13; ‘Ars Sacra’ (note 3) p. 227).

42 For a recognition in this figure the image of “God the Father” reported by the Guide on the west portal (Pilgrimage Roads (note 32) p. 213), but he later identified it rightly as Abraham (Escultura (note 32) p. 17). Gailhard guessed at the same provenance, arguing it represented St. James attending the Transfiguration (Débuts (note 10) p. 211-212). Though absolutely untenable, because of the epigraphic evidence, his opinion could be apparently backed by some Byzantine versions of
This group nevertheless poses two problems: first, the unusual presence of Abraham in the episode of the Transfiguration of Christ; secondly, the presence of the Transfiguration itself on the Plateras portal, when the Guide attributes the same subject to the western façade.43

As regards the association of Abraham with the Transfiguration, A. López Ferreiro and E. Bertaux agreed in pointing to John 8, 56, as its scriptural basis: “Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my Day: and he saw it, and was glad”.44 But neither of them pursued the meaning and implications of these words in relation to the Compostelan reliefs. The main occasion on which Abraham saw the Lord was no doubt the Theophany in Mamre (Gen. 18). In the most common exegeses, this episode is interpreted as a vision of the Holy Trinity, but some authors recognized in the three angels that appeared to Abraham a mystical image of Christ in his Transfiguration, between Moses and Elijah.45 With this latter interpretation, the representation of Abraham at the feet of Christ would parallel those of the prophets or other Old Testament figures as witnesses of the New Testament events they prophesied.46 However, another inscription on the same plaque establishes that the presence of the Patriarch in this episode is not just mystic or premonitory: “SVRGIT HABRAHAM DE TVMULO”, Abraham has resurrected, and he indeed appears emerging from what seems to be his sepulcher.

The resurrection of Abraham associated with the Transfiguration can reasonably be explained in terms of the eschatological projection of the latter. The sermons of the Codex Calixtinus repeatedly refer to the Transfiguration as a foretaste of the Glory of Christ both in his Resurrection and his Second Advent. “O mira res. Vivi apparuerunt qui iam inter mortuos computabantur!” says the Pseudo-Calixtus
	his episode in which the apostles, namely James, adopt similar attitudes. See, for example, the corresponding illustration in the Parisinus Gr. 510: D. Talbot Riche, Arte di Bizanzio (Firenze 1959) pl. 85. The Transfiguration group is there provided a setting by two palm-trees recalling the “duas arbores cypressinas” that flank St. James on the Plateras frieze. For this figure and its certain attachment to the Transfiguration, see Moraldo, Patronazgo artístico (note 4) p. 252-254, esp. n. 20.

43 VIELLIARD (note 1) p. 102-105.
45 See Anacreus, Commentarii in Evangelium secundum Lucam, I, Opera V (Paris 1569) col. 1622; idem De fide, I, 13, in: J.A. McGuckin, The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and Tradition Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 9, (Lewiston/Queenston 1986) p. 262-263; Ismaeus, Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum, In Genesim, xiv, P.L. 83, col. 243; Beda, In Gencsim expositio, viii, Opera V, col. 654; Biblia Sacra cum Glossa Ordinaria (Anvers 1634), I, col. 232, V, cols. 1161-1162. Typological biblical illustration also matched both episodes [see Die Wiener Biblia Pauperum. Codex Vindobonensis 1198 (Graz/Vienna/Cologne 1962) fol. 4r] and their respective iconographic formulae are very close in Early Christian art. See W.C. Lorrain, Observations on the Representation of Doxai in the Mosaics of Santa Maria Maggiore, Rome, and St. Catherine’s, Sinai, Gest 20 (1981) p. 15-22, comp. figs. 5 and 7. Abraham’s vision of the day of the Lord was related as well to his faith in the promise: “And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed” (Gen. 22, 18), a theme which is also implied in the Compostellan program. As López Ferreiro (note 15) p. 107 pointed out, the branch sprouting at the left of the patriarch surely alludes to his messianic offspring.
46 See, for example, the half-length figure of Habakkuk at the bottom of two Rhenish ivory plaques showing the Ascension of Christ, in the Victoria & Albert Museum: W. Goldscheider, Die Elfenbeinskulpturen aus der romanischen Zeit. XI-XIII. Jahrhundert. III (Berlin 1923) p. 12, nrs. 5 and 7.
commenting on the presence of Moses and Elijah in that episode; and he concludes: “Transfiguratio Salvatoris nostri tipice formam resurrectionis future et speciem perhennis vite manifestat”. Whereas Elijah was supposed to have descended from Heaven to attend the Transfiguration, an actual resurrection of Moses, delivered from Hades or the “Gates of Death”, was in fact assumed by some biblical interpreters. As far as I know, no text exists according Abraham such a privilege on a historic level, but the apocryphal account of the Transfiguration known as Apocryphe of Peter refers to him as if expected and missed in the retinue of the glorified Christ. After having been made aware of Moses’ and Elijah’s presence, Peter asks the Lord: “Where then are Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and the rest of the righteous fathers?”.

In any event, Abraham’s vision of the Day of the Lord was to be fulfilled by the Resurrection of Christ, which the Transfiguration foreshadows just like the latter was prefigured by the Theophany in Mamre. The Compostellan Abraham indeed parallels the formula that shows Adam emerging from his sepulchre at the feet of the Crucified. As in the case of Adam, his resurrection summarizes, pars pro toto, that of all the righteous fathers, the saints risen after the death of Christ on a day he only was accorded to foresee. The inspiration of the Compostellan program on John 8, 56, goes further than López Ferreiro and Bertaux had thought. As Jesus refers in the same passage to his glorification by the Father, an allusion to the Transfiguration/Resurrection might there be intended and both events should represent the most eloquent answer to the Jews’ objection that “Abraham is dead, and the prophets” (John 8, 52), say, Moses and Elijah among them. The Transfiguration is thus represented in Santiago with all its implications. Only the concrete, absolute presence that is given to images allowed full expression of an exegetical theme in which, as in Eliot’s Quartets, “all time is eternally present”. In terms of medieval biblical interpretation, the typological and analogical levels of meaning become fully historic or factual.

47 Whitworth, Liber Sancti Jacobi (note 1) p. 43-44, 128-129, and 175; Morales/Torrente/Frido, Liber Sancti Jacobi (note 1) p. 59-60, 169-170, and 233. For the Transfiguration as a foretaste of the Resurrection and the Parousia, see also McGuinness (note 45) p. 3-5, 121, 124, 163-164 (Origen’s text relating the presence of Moses and Elijah to the resurrection of the patriarchs), 181, 205, 208, 219, 261-266, 273-274, 292; Christen (note 3) p. 97-104. It is noteworthy in this connection that the Guide’s author also defines an eschatological context for the Platerías frieze as he sees the four angels blowing trumpets on the spandrels as “judicia diem prænunciante” (Vieillard [note 1] p. 102-103).


50 See, particularly, a German base of a Cross reproduced by H. Swarzenski, Monuments of Romanesque Art (Chicago 1967) pl. 105, fig. 240. The gestures of the rising Adam exactly parallel there those of the Compostellan Abraham. For the risen saints or patriarchs in similar attitudes, associated both to the Crucifixion or the Anastasis, see A.D. Karayanni, Anastasis. The Making of an Image (Princeton 1986) pls. 49 and 57; G. Cames, Byzance et la peinture romane de Germanie (Paris 1986) pl. 17, fig. 62. Abraham’s burial place is reported as a “sepulcrum... pulcherrimo instructum marmore” neighbouring Adam’s sepulcher in Hebron, See Ioannis, De ortu et obitu patrum, VI, 16, P.L., col. 133; Timodhricke (note 49) p. 52-53.
The grieving horned figure emerging from a hole in a scaled surface underneath Abraham confirms that his resurrection was intended as real, for similar scaled patterns were frequently used for earth in Romanesque repertory, and this figure coming from the underworld is probably Hades, Lord of the Dead, conquered and bemoaning the deliverance of one of his subjects (figs. 9 and 11). A miniaturized initial in a manuscript from Nevers, showing the resurrection of a young man by Saint Benedict, features a similar horned figure below the sarcophagus (fig. 10), and Hades is also represented in Byzantine versions of the Resurrection of Lazarus, whose soul he tries to retain in the kingdom of the dead.\(^{51}\) The source of the attention paid to the infernal circumstances of resurrection seems to be a curious talk

\(^{51}\) For the manuscript from Nevers, containing the Dialogues of St. Gregory the Great (Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, cod. W. 16, f. 32v), see E.G. MILLAR, The Library of A. Chester Beatty: A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts I (Oxford 1927) nr. 16 p. 62-64 and pl. XXXVIII, a; C. NORDENFALK, Heaven and Hell in a Bohemian Bible of the Early Thirteenth Century, in: The Year 1200: A Symposium (New York 1975) p. 283-294, fig. 4. The text it illustrates (P.L. 77, col. 149) does not make any reference to the horned figure and the corresponding versions on capitals in Vézelay and St.-Benôit-sur-Loire omit it, adopting more realistic formulas. See C. JEAN-NESTY, Vézelay (La Pierre-qui-Vire 1970, pl. 20); J. BERLAND, Hagiographie et iconographie romane à Saint-Benoit-sur-Loire, Les Cahiers de Saint-Michel de Cuxa, 16 (1985) p. 117-174, fig. 16 A; St. GREGORY THE GREAT, Dialogues (New York 1959) p. 100-101. Thus we have surely to deal with a generic, though infrequent, motif literally expressing resurrection as deliverance from the captivity of Death, which is paralleled by the Byzantine representations of Hades trying to retain Lazarus’ or Adam’s soul. See G. SCHELLER, Iconography of Christian Art I (London 1971) p. 182, fig. 568; KARSTENS (note 50) pls. 44a, 44b, and 46. For some western parallels of Satan as Death, see A. HANNAK, Three Illustrations from the Bury St. Edmunds Psalter and their Prototypes. Notes on the Iconography of some Anglo-Saxon Drawings, Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 29 (1966) p. 39-59, esp. 41-44, pls. 7a and 9a. From a strictly formal point of view, the head of the Compostelanian Hades finds its closer parallels in some marginal motifs in Languedocian miniature. See D. GABORY-CHOPIN, La peinture du Sacramentaire de Limoges, Les dossiers de l’archéologie 14 (1976) p. 108-115, esp. p. 111 [Bible of Saint-Yrieix, fol. 212]; M. VINZI, Quercy roman (La Pierre-qui-Vire 1969\(^{2}\)), fig. 59 [De bello judaico from Toulouse-Moissec, fol. 7]. As for the use of scales or imbrications to denote the ground, see M. PARK, The Crucifix of Femando and Sancha and its Relationship to North French Manuscripts, Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 36 (1973) p. 77-91, esp. 78 and n. 6, for parallels on other pieces of the Platerías portal, GAILLARD (note 10) pls. XCIII, XCIV, Cl. and XXVI. López Fierro’s interpretation of this figure as Hagar (note 15 p. 106), did not take into account its horns, which led GAILLARD (note 10 p. 212) and NASSAARD (note 32) p. 81-92 to identify it as Moses. Setting aside its beardless and grimacing face, which barely fit the decorum of a patriarch, R. MEILINKOFF has shown that the horned Moses is exceptional before 1130, particularly in the context of the Transfiguration [The Horned Moses in Medieval Art and Thought (Berkeley 1970) p. 62-70, figs. 47, 48, 50 and 71]. Even taking into account the rare examples this author seems to have missed, as an one-horned, satyr-like Moses attending the Transfiguration in the Uta-Codex [reproduced by Ch. CAHIER, Nouveaux mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire 1 (1874) p. 15-46, esp. 43] or a very dubious instance in the Beatus of Gerona [N. MOUSSONI, Le tympan de Moissac: études d’iconographie, Les Cahiers de Saint-Michel de Cuxa 9 (1978) p. 171-200, esp. 189], the claimed Compostelanian Moses would remain both anomalous and isolated in his time. Moreover, the figure is carved in the same plaque showing Abraham, as my fig. 11 shows, which makes it difficult to attribute it a fitting place in a Transfiguration ensemble. Gómez-MURUGA was surely closer to the truth as he identified it as a “demonio vencido” (note 10 p. 132). KNOWLTON followed him, though the wings he pointed out on the devil’s shoulders look rather like the edges of a mantle. See PITA (note 33) p. 452; B. PUCKETT/J.H.B. KNOWLTON, review of GAILLARD’S Débuts, Art Bulletin 21 (1939) p. 192-198, esp. 198.
maintained by Hades and Satan in the apocryphal Acts of Pilatus, just before the descent of Christ into hell.\textsuperscript{52}

As for the problem posed by the presence of the Transfiguration in both the Platerías façade and at the western portal, I have argued elsewhere, as others did, against the reliability of the description of the latter in the pilgrim’s Guide. Its vagueness contrasts with the detailed information supplied about the numbers of columns, steps and other features of the north and south façades, which are described at much greater length in spite of their claimed lesser importance. The archaeological evidence also challenges the existence of a sculptured portal at the west end of the Cathedral around 1130.\textsuperscript{53} Thus, its description in the Guide is perhaps that of a project that never reached its end; a work to be included among the “adimplenda”, the unfinished parts of the building that the author of the Guide recognizes himself to have incorporated into its description. The evangelical phraseology he used to depict the Transfiguration scene seems to be further proof that it is a project that is being described or imagined, not a finished work.\textsuperscript{54}

It is even possible that the Platerías Transfiguration reliefs were originally intended for the west front, and were redeployed when the first project of its doorways was abandoned. This idea is supported by the fact that the format of the Abraham plaque does not fit the space it occupies (fig. 9), and the broken tree flanking Saint James seems to have been substituted for an earlier decorative plaque, one of whose fragments is still visible beside the apostle’s head (fig. 8).\textsuperscript{55}

In describing these pieces, the author of the Guide was apparently not aware that they were part of a Transfiguration, and therefore did not realize that the west façade Transfiguration he had heard or read of had been afforded another destination. The apparent reduplication of programmes thus seem to stem from the use of contradictory sources of information.

\textsuperscript{52} Acta Pilati, II, iv (xx), in: A. De Santos, Los evangelios apócrifos (Madrid 1979) p. 446-448.
\textsuperscript{53} See above n. 23.
\textsuperscript{54} See Moraño, Esculturas compostelanas (note 41) p. 296, n. 7; Saint-Jacques de Compostelle (note 32) p. 103.
\textsuperscript{55} The provenance of the Abraham plaque (including the “Moses” or Hades) from the west portal was guessed at by Porter, Gaillard and Naesgaard (note 51). As far as I know, Knowlton was the first to propose the same original location for the St. James, in spite of its mention in the Guide as part of the south portal decoration, which he obviates by supposing that another version of this figure previously existed on the Platerías frieze (Pita [note 32] p. 457, n. 41). Azeb&eacute;ate (note 4) p. 15-20, suggested the possibility of a partial duplication of programs: an extended version of the Transfiguration on the west façade — whose completeness he seriously questions — and a reduced one, with James as the only witness, on the Platerías frieze, which he tried to back with some passages of the Calixtine liturgy and sermons. Onao Torre (note 10) p. 966 takes for granted a restoration of the Platerías portal after the Cathedral’s assault and fire of 1117, in which the Transfiguration pieces that had been carved in advance for the west façade should have been used. In my opinion, the simple fact of an interruption or long delay in the progress of the works could explain the decision to display these sculptures on the completed parts of the building.
Fig. 1: Cathedral of Santiago. Capital representing King Alfonso VI (from a cast in the museum)

Fig. 2: Cathedral of Santiago. Capital representing Bishop Diego Peláez (from a cast in the museum)

Fig. 3: Volvic, Auvergne. Capital representing a donor (after Z. Swiezchowski, La sculpture romane d’Auvergne)
Fig. 4: Cathedral of Santiago. Tiles from the primitive roofing of the main chapel.

Fig. 5: Cathedral of Santiago. Left-hand tympanum of the Platerías portal. The Woman with the Skull.

Fig. 6: Santa Marta de Tera, Zamora. Capital representing a woman with a man’s head.
Fig. 7: Cathedral of Santiago. Frieze of the Platerías façade

Fig. 8: Cathedral of Santiago. Frieze of the Platerías façade. Saint James and Christ

Fig. 9: Cathedral of Santiago. Frieze of the Platerías façade. Abraham and Hades
Fig. 10: Dialogues of St. Gregory the Great, Nevers, 11th cent. (Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, cod. W. 16, f. 32v). Risen young man and Hades (drawing: author)

Fig. 11: Cathedral of Santiago. Frieze of the Platerías façade. Hades
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