



BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Bacile, R. and Mcneill, John and Vernon, Clare (2022) Venosa, Acerenza and 'Norman' architecture in southern Italy. *Arte Medievale* , ISSN 0393-7267. (Submitted)

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/45159/>

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html>
contact lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk.

or alternatively

VENOSA, ACERENZA, AND ‘NORMAN’ ARCHITECTURE IN SOUTHERN ITALY

Rosa Maria Bacile, John McNeill and Clare Vernon

The following paper considers two buildings in southern Italy; the cathedral of Acerenza, and the unfinished church (l'incompiuta) laid out behind the apse of the earlier late Antique basilica at Venosa. Both churches are in the modern region of Basilicata (ancient Lucania) and were begun under Norman patronage to a virtually identical plan. That plan, an apse ambulatory with three radiating chapels, is so unusual in southern Italy that a variety of non-Italian sources have been proposed, for the most part consisting of lists of 11th-century buildings with apse ambulatories in France. It will be argued here that there is nothing 'generalised' in the realisation of this plan, but that its detailing, in particular the wide spacing of the apse piers and the method of receiving pairs of transverse arches on their aisle side faces, indicate the churches share a common Norman or Anglo-Norman model. The sculpture has elicited less comment, but despite the capitals having been carved by quite different workshops, both similarly point to an awareness of Norman carving even if the sculptors may have been southern Italian. The paper is divided into four sections, dealing respectively with the architecture, sculpture, documentary history and European context.

Discussion of the ecclesiastical architecture of Norman southern Italy over the last three quarters of a century has attached considerable, one might even say unusual, importance to the adoption and dissemination of particular plan types.¹ From a European perspective, the most distinctive are churches with T-transepts. These seem to have been specially favoured in the Terra di Bari,² but can also be found at Otranto, Salerno and in Sicily.³ Their formal taxonomy is varied but the plan proved durable, with examples, such as Bitonto Cathedral, being built into the 13th century.

Tri-apsidal and apse-echelon designs are more numerous and more contentious. Ever since Eugène Lefèvre-Pontalis associated apses *en échelon* with monastic architecture of the 11th and 12th centuries and coined the term 'Plan Bénédictin', there has been a tendency to view in-line and staggered apses as a monastic design category.⁴ But Lefèvre-Pontalis's definitions were so broad as to encompass virtually all monastic churches which were neither built to aisleless cruciform designs, nor employed semicircular ambulatories. As far as southern Italy is concerned the definition can be applied to buildings as dissimilar as SS Niccolò e Cataldo at Lecce and Cefalù Cathedral. This tendency to bundle large numbers of varied buildings into a single category has arguably hampered understanding of southern Italian Romanesque. It has certainly coloured discussion of the architecture built for Norman patrons in Calabria and Sicily. Early examples of buildings with deep central apses, such as Sta Maria di Sant'Eufemia and Mileto in Calabria, have been represented as belonging to a tradition which can be traced back to Cluny II and Bernay.⁵ But Cluny II, which arranged seven apses of different form *en échelon*, and Bernay, which has a two-bay presbytery and springs three apses more or less in line across the east end, were built to very different plans. The proposition that they are related to Mileto is as misleading as the proposition they are related to each other. Much has been written about this recently in the light of new insights into the plans of San Bartolomeo in Lipari and the Sicilian cathedrals of Mazara del Vallo and Troina, all of which appear to have been variations on aisleless cruciform plans and all of which both precede and are separate from the adoption of the Sant'Eufemia or Mileto type of plan at Cefalù Cathedral.⁶ But regardless of disagreements over the detailed interpretation of sites such as Mileto or Troina, it is evident from general discussion that received classificatory systems are still a barrier to a more rounded understanding of the dissemination of tri-apsidal plans in the south.⁷

Churches with apse-ambulatories constitute another plan type, though not one which enjoyed great popularity. Surviving examples are restricted to just three sites – Aversa, Acerenza and Venosa, three churches in Campania and Basilicata - and though it has been suggested there were others, the plan only ever seems to have been used for a limited period in a fairly restricted area.⁸ As with tri-apsidal and apse-echelon designs, sources have been sought in France, though potential models have not been examined in any detail. The following paper is concerned with the origin and eventual marginalisation of this latter type of church in southern Italy, specifically as embodied at Acerenza and Venosa. Neither of the two buildings at issue are securely dated, though both clearly postdate the arrival of the sons of Tancred de Hauteville in southern Italy and the adoption of Melfi as a secure *caput* in the course of the 1040s. Monks were introduced to the surviving late Antique basilica at the northern edge of Venosa while Drogo (died 1051) was leader of the Normans in Basilicata, and Acerenza was granted archiepiscopal status in 1068.⁹ There is no reason to suppose these changes in institutional status immediately precipitated new building campaigns. However, the change in status might have affected the types of building that were subsequently planned.

ARCHITECTURE

The apse ambulatory at Aversa Cathedral sits at some remove from Acerenza and Venosa, which it may be helpful to establish at the outset.¹⁰ Aversa was originally built with five exceptionally large radiating chapels and a broad rib-vaulted ambulatory [1].¹¹ According to an inscription on the lintel of a displaced and now blocked north transept portal, the cathedral was begun while Richard was prince (1058-78) and was continued by his son, Jordan (died 1090).¹² Like Venosa, there seem to have been no windows in the bays between the chapels at Aversa, but the detailed relationship between the two ends there. At Venosa a fully articulated ambulatory bay defined by separate transverse arches separates each radiating chapel, whereas at Aversa a single tapering transverse arch links the apse pier with a broad pilaster respond. Moreover, the ribs of Aversa's ambulatory vaults are unmoulded and constructed in the manner of rib vaults in Lombardy and the Empire. Each quadripartite vault was assembled as a single semi-circular arch abutted by two quadrant arches. As Mario d'Onofrio pointed out, this particular form was also known in Normandy, exemplified by the square rib vaults of the north-west tower at Bayeux Cathedral, though in Anglo-Norman circles the method was increasingly eclipsed by moulded ribs with integrated keystones or bosses, at least after *c.* 1090.¹³

Given the patronage, and the adoption of an apse ambulatory – a plan type which emerged in France in the decades to either side of 1000 - a northern source for the design of Aversa Cathedral is highly likely.¹⁴ The detailing of the plan is difficult to parallel precisely, however [2]. None of the apse ambulatory designs known from 11th-century Normandy are like Aversa, and neither does it closely resemble surviving examples further south. The one caveat is St-Aignan at Orléans.¹⁵ The complication is that only the crypt survives at St-Aignan, and Aversa has no crypt. Thus, we cannot compare like with like. Despite that, both buildings were designed with compound piers, a semi-circular ambulatory and five radiating chapels. In an alteration that Pierre Martin has dated to 1031-32, pilasters and arches were inserted into the ambulatory at St-Aignan, so that the chapel entries were framed by transverse arches supported on broad pilasters and there were no windows in the bays between the radiating chapels.¹⁶ It is not identical to Aversa but it is closer than anything else to survive.¹⁷ By contrast, the sculpture at Aversa does not seem to look north. This compares to work at Carinola Cathedral (Campania), some 40 km away, as well as to work in Apulia.¹⁸ Most of the capitals facing into the ambulatory have been cut back and are sadly beyond recovery, but a number of those above the inner faces of the turning bays survive. Several are Corinthian, with spiky, flattened leaves. Two even have console heads, not unlike those at Venosa, though the overall shape of the capital differs.¹⁹

Aversa Cathedral is at a formal remove to Venosa and Acerenza. But then it is at a formal remove to other buildings patronised by Richard or Jordan of Capua. There is nothing in Capua itself like Aversa Cathedral, nor does it resemble Sant'Angelo in Formis, cities and institutions in which Richard took a close interest.²⁰ The architecture of Capua Cathedral and Sant'Angelo in Formis share in the re-engagement with late Antique forms associated with Desiderius of Montecassino and the mid-to-late-11th-century reform papacy, both of them close to hand. Indeed, from an architectural point of view, Aversa Cathedral sits apart from every other known 11th or early 12th-century church in Campania. Granted the impossibility of recovering the precise circumstances of its creation, it is difficult to see it as anything other than a cuckoo in the nest - best understood from a Norman perspective, as a new cathedral in a Norman-settled town. As Graham Loud put it, 'Aversa was, certainly in the eleventh century, an almost exclusively Norman town, perhaps the only one of its sort in southern Italy.'²¹ This characterisation of Aversa Cathedral as a cuckoo in the nest obviously doesn't of itself explain anything, but it does help to frame a question. How and why do a handful of buildings in southern Italy look to Norman, or northern French, models in their architectural planning, while most do not?²²

Venosa and Acerenza are smaller than Aversa. Each consisted of an ambulatory with three radiating chapels, a two-bay presbytery, aisleless transepts with single eastern chapels, and aisled naves [3-4]. From the point of view of their laying out the two are very similar, extending to substantial stair vices between the transept chapels and crossing, and small lateral entrance doors positioned directly opposite each other in the second straight bay of the presbytery aisles. The major variation is that the entrances to the radiating chapels are narrower at Acerenza while the intervals between them are wider, presumably to facilitate windows in the curving wall between each chapel entry. Venosa restricts windows to the straight bays and chapels only.²³

Viewed from the aisles, both plans give rise to two straight bays west of the apse chord, while four small bays frame the entries to three radiating chapels around the apse hemisphere. Since there are only six piers, this means that the piers defining the apse are composed with two half-columns on their ambulatory faces, carefully designed to receive the two transverse arches which respectively define the trapezoidal bays framing the chapel entries [5-6]. It may sound complicated as a verbal description, but it is easy to see on a plan.

Although we cannot be sure how the upper elevation would have developed at Venosa as the church was famously left unfinished,²⁴ and caution attends assessment of the internal elevations at Acerenza,²⁵ it is telling that differences between it and Acerenza do not impinge on this plan. The most important of these differences is that the sculpture is formally distinct, for which reason it is discussed below. Otherwise, perhaps the most significant divergence is material. Venosa is faced with reused and recut stone, much of it taken from the nearby Roman amphitheatre, while Acerenza was built from roughly finished limestone laid in narrow courses [7-8].²⁶ This has a constructional impact. For the most part the exterior pilaster strips at Venosa are flat and were cut from the Roman stone as vertical lengths. The same is true of the internal responds, which were shaped as half-columns. But because the blocks of Roman ashlar used to face the walls are large, the narrow vertical pilasters or half-columns disrupt the horizontal bedding, meaning that the east end was not continuously coursed, unlike the nave.²⁷ Each panel within a bay, or around the external face of a radiating chapel, must have been faced separately at Venosa. At Acerenza, the half-columns still impose a discipline, but the constructional constraints are mild by comparison and many of the narrow courses of stone run continuously, regardless of vertical pilasters or half-columns. The point is that vertical articulation is used with great deliberation at Venosa. It runs against the facility of the stone. That places a premium on its deployment.

There are other differences in detailing between the two sites, but they tend to minor. The south apse chord pier at Venosa has a chamfered north-west angle, for example. It is the only chamfered angle evident at Venosa, and it is this same pier that is also marked out for special treatment at Acerenza, though there the north-east face carries the chamfer.²⁸ Both sites employ a variety of base types – those at Venosa being appreciably more varied than Acerenza's – many of which were carved with integral claw spurs [9-10]. As Venosa remains unfinished it is difficult to develop the comparison further. We cannot be certain what was planned for its upper elevation, nor whether such niceties of finish as the tapering of the voussoirs of the aisle and ambulatory transverse arches visible beneath the vault webbing at Acerenza would have been followed at Venosa. The remarkably ample stair vices at Venosa suggest a significant crossing tower was intended, but, again, it is impossible to say whether this would have borne any resemblance to the reconstructed crossing tower at Acerenza.²⁹ There is also the question of what relationship was intended between the pre-existing basilica at Venosa and the new work to its east? The two share the same axis, and their width seems to have been co-ordinated. Yet the intended pavement level of the new church is several metres above the earlier church, and where the footings for the south nave walls have been exposed, they are deep. Was it intended to retain the earlier church, demolishing its apse but building a flight of steps to link the two constructions?

Consideration of this is complicated by the existence of a second campaign of construction, consisting of a new south-west crossing pier and five columns and four capitals from an intended south nave arcade, together with alterations to the south nave aisle wall. These are usually dated to the middle or second half of the 12th century and they strongly suggest the intention then was to demolish the earlier church to their west. This is also borne out by the horizontal run of putlog holes in the outer wall of the nave [11]. These holes extend across the south nave portal and, where the west wall of the transept survives to the requisite height, they continue into the transept. The putlogs are 3.50 m. above the level of the bench plinth at the base of the south nave wall and vary between approximately 250 mm square and 300 mm by 220 mm. They are far larger than the scaffolding putlogs used elsewhere at Venosa, and their positioning, height and type make it highly likely they were intended to receive the principal timbers for the roof of the north cloister walk. Thus, it is probable that the conventual precinct was to have been rebuilt and the monastery moved to the east of the old church. However, this obviously never happened. The second construction campaign was no more successful than the first. Moreover, the second-phase south-west crossing pier is incompatible with the earlier apse as well and so cannot represent a revival of whatever was intended for the nave and upper elevation when the new church was initially laid out.³⁰ Thus, although the second phase does seem to have envisaged the demolition of the old church – the *chiesa vecchia* – the initial plan for *l'incompiuta* could easily have foreseen its retention.

To return to the east end plan, much the most remarkable feature of the ambulatory is the treatment of the hemicycle proper. The apse chord is roughly aligned with the west face of the middle pair of arcade piers, while the ambulatory proper alternates four narrow trapezoidal bays with three larger bays opposite the chapel entries, enabling the designer(s) to both enhance the definition of the chapel entries and increase the relative complexity of the ambulatory. One might compare it to Cunault (Maine-et-Loire), in Anjou, where the apse ambulatory probably dates to around 1100-10, but similarly employs compound piers, varies the spacing between the piers to favour the radiating chapels, springs the western chapels from the outer wall at an obtuse angle and restricts the apse hemicycle to just four supports.³¹ However, the great difference is that at Venosa and Acerenza, the lateral radiating chapels have been pushed eastwards, an initiative which puts them in good company. This is clear if one compares their plans to other three-chapel ambulatory designs of the 11th century.

Early three-chapel ambulatories, as survive in the crypts of St-Philibert, Tournus (Saône-et-Loire), or the cathedrals of Chartres and Orléans, for example, spring the outer chapels from a point east of the apse chord, so that the curving outer wall of the ambulatory could theoretically accommodate four window bays and three chapel entries.³² This type of design continued through the second half of the 11th century. However, having a greater number of bay dividers for the outer wall (eight) than the inner (six if one includes the apse chord piers) becomes a compositional challenge if the bays are articulated and outlined by transverse arches – something which had become commonplace by the last quarter of the 11th century. The surviving evidence suggests that in order to reconcile the inner and outer ambulatory walls the main alternatives were either to slim down the apse supports and substitute six columns for four piers (as was generally the case in the Auvergne and southern Burgundy, and in England at St Augustine's, Canterbury), push the outer ambulatory chapels west and abolish the western ambulatory bays - as was possibly the case as early as the second quarter of the 11th century at St-Eusice at Selles-sur-Cher (Loir-et-Cher), but was certainly adopted *c.* 1070 at St-Jean Montierneuf in Poitiers and subsequently at Loctudy (Finistère), Cunault (Maine-et-Loire), and Norwich Cathedral - or find a means of receiving the extra transverse ribs along the inner ambulatory elevation.³³ That the question of how to align apse openings with radiating chapels while maintaining a fully articulated ambulatory preoccupied architectural designers in the late 11th and early 12th centuries is clear from the varied results they obtained. A peculiarly ingenious example of reconciling transverse arches and apse piers, for instance, is provided by St-Eutrope at Saintes, where the transverse arches arising from the western responds of the outer radiating chapels are intercepted at the centre of the outermost hemicycle arcade arches.³⁴ However, Saintes appears to have been a one-off. Venosa and Acerenza are also concerned to find a means of receiving the extra transverse ribs along the inner ambulatory elevation, though theirs is a method they share; one which merged the apse chord and western apse piers to create four elongated piers each of which received two transverse arches. The one other firmly dated example of this to survive is the abbey of St Peter at Gloucester (now Gloucester Cathedral), as begun under Abbot Serlo in 1089 [12].³⁵

Gloucester Cathedral employs elongated apse piers which are each capable of receiving two transverse arches. The precise arrangement differs slightly at crypt, main pavement and gallery level, though the principle remains the same [13-14].³⁶ The apse piers in the crypt were reinforced after the building showed signs of movement, perhaps before the upper walls had been completed, so the original piers are now hidden behind a later skin of masonry, but the original plan is easily seen in F.S. Waller's crypt plan of 1876.³⁷ The arrangement at gallery level is also striking, where the ambulatory transverse arches are received by shallow respond shafts on the rear face of the apse chord piers. If one considers apse ambulatory designs between *c.* 1050 and *c.* 1120 across Europe as a whole, it appears that the various experiments resulted in the creation of design families. Venosa, Acerenza and Gloucester form one such family. The question of how and where this was generated is pursued in the final section.

SCULPTURE

Venosa

The sculpture at Venosa has received far less scholarly attention than the architecture.³⁸ This is unfortunate because analysis of the sculpture could add considerably to our understanding of Hauteville patronage in early Norman Italy. There are two phases of sculptural decoration evident at the *Incompiuta*: a first phase comprising the ambulatory capitals together with one (or possibly two) examples of reused spoliated Roman funerary sculpture, and a second phase, when a set of very large Corinthian capitals were carved for the piers in the nave. The following analysis is exclusively

concerned with the first phase, and more specifically the ambulatory capitals, which reveal an interesting mixture of local Lombard and Norman influences.³⁹ The ambulatory capitals constitute a coherent group, carved in a single campaign by a single workshop. A majority are composite Corinthian capitals, with volutes springing from foliage, and rosettes or human and feline masks used as consoles. Some have interesting carved abaci and one displays a single human figure. The compositional formulae and repertoire are, of course, generic in international Romanesque, but there are some striking details that help point towards the models used by the sculptors.

The ambulatory capitals are rooted in a local tradition. This can be seen particularly clearly in the two avian capitals [15-16]. The first features a spindly eagle with a small head and delicate talons, flanked by small, awkward volutes. Although the carving is slightly flattened, there is no mistaking the similarity to the numerous eagles in eleventh-century Apulian sculpture, especially those on ambos carved by *Acceptus* at Monte Sant'Angelo and Canosa. Other parallels in Apulia are to be found on the façade of Santa Pelagia in Bari; the nave capitals at Taranto Cathedral; and the crypt capitals at Otranto Cathedral. The second Avian capital features pairs of affronted birds at the corners and is very Apulian. Affronted mammals and bicorporal mammals are extremely common in late-eleventh and early-twelfth century Apulia, most notably on the crypt capitals at San Nicola di Bari (1087-9). Affronted birds can also be found at Sant'Andrea dell'Isola and San Giovanni Selpolcro (both in Brindisi); at Santa Pelagia in Bari; and on the Borradaile Oliphant in the British Museum, possibly carved in Apulia, given other iconographical forms it shares with sculpture in the crypt of San Nicola di Bari. Another clear link to local sculpture is found on a composite capital decorated around the base with 'basketweave' [17]. These geometric interlace designs originated in Byzantine sculpture and are found in the Byzantine areas of Apulia, most notably on two capitals in the crypt at Otranto.⁴⁰

As such, the ambulatory capitals reveal an unmistakable tie to southern Italian sculpture. But this was not the only resource available to the sculptors. Other aspects of the sculpture seem to have been based on models from Normandy or Anglo-Norman England. The most striking is the single capital with a human figure [18]. Sculpture in medieval Apulia was strongly aniconic. Even in the twelfth century, when Romanesque sculpture in much of Europe had wholeheartedly embraced figurative scenes, sculptors in Apulia resolutely continued with a repertoire of vegetal and zoomorphic designs. To find a human figure on a Romanesque capital in southern Italy is therefore noteworthy and hints at influences from the north. At the centre, a human figure with arms outstretched, embraces the volutes. To each side a seated figure turns inwards, while the angles of the capital are articulated by feline masks with open mouths and bared teeth. A decorated band near the base of the capital weaves between the figures' feet. The closest parallels to this design are found in Normandy. At Cerisy-la-Forêt (Manche), forty kilometres from Coutances, and at Lion-sur-Mer (Calvados) we find human figures with outstretched arms clinging to foliage [19-20].⁴¹ Compositions similar to that at Venosa can be found elsewhere in Normandy as well, as at Lion-sur-Mer, where the foliage transitions into the volutes in the same manner as at Venosa. In Apulian sculpture, where a capital has a carved abacus, it is usually decorated with a vegetal scroll, whereas several abaci at Venosa are decorated with a distinctively Norman chequer pattern [21-22]. Close parallels to this are found at Gravelle-Sainte-Honorine (Seine Maritime).⁴²

One of the most distinctive features of the ambulatory sculpture is the extensive use of masks, both human and feline. This too seems to be a Norman feature. Masks are much rarer in Apulian sculpture than in Normandy. Human masks are found on the ambos carved by *Acceptus* at Canosa, Siponto and Monte Sant'Angelo in the early eleventh century but these are different. To start with, they are not on capitals. Furthermore *Acceptus*' masks are fleshed the mask at Canosa, for example, has a full head of hair and three-dimensional facial features [23]. The human masks at Venosa are flat and

much simpler [24]. Masks are also found on the mausoleum of Bohemond I at Canosa, another Hauteville burial site [25], though it is possible these are later than the Venosa ambulatory capitals and were carved in allusion to them.⁴³ What is most striking about the use of three-dimensional human masks in Normandy and Anglo-Norman England is their frequent appearance at the upper centre of capitals, in a position comparable to that of a console on a Corinthian capital. This is how they are found at, for example, Rouen Cathedral or Blyth Priory (Nottinghamshire) [26-27]. Masks are also found in western Normandy; at Lessay (Manche) and Cerisy-la-Forêt (Calvados) [28-29]. On balance, it seems likely that the Venosa masks are a feature derived from Norman sculpture.

Thus, the *Incompiuta* ambulatory sculpture displays a mixture of southern Italian and Norman influences. We can only speculate as to how this mixture came about. Perhaps the workshop was 'mixed', comprised of both Apulian and Norman sculptors, but that seems unlikely as the style of the carving is coherent and uniform. Nor was the number of capitals required unusually large. More likely it is the work of either a local workshop influenced by Norman designs (perhaps from a Norman pattern book) or an immigrant Norman workshop who drew inspiration from the sculpture they found in their new home. Less than a hundred metres from the abbey are the remains of a Roman amphitheatre that provided many of the building materials for the intended new church. Embedded in the walls are several fragmentary Roman reliefs and inscriptions, as well as reliefs from an ancient Jewish cemetery.⁴⁴ The most prominent pieces of spolia are two Roman funerary reliefs, positioned respectively above the entrance to the north transept and to the right of the north transept chapel [30], a position which led Lucilla de Lachenal to suggest that it indicated the north transept was intended to house the Hauteville family tombs.⁴⁵ Although de Lachenal's speculation as to plans for tombs cannot be substantiated, it is clear that the use of spolia is another example a type of hybridity, often seen as characteristic of the southern Italian Normans. The opportunity to harness the prestige and authority of Roman spolia has not been missed.

Acerenza

The capital sculpture at Acerenza Cathedral is very different, consisting of an unvarying sequence of cushion capitals [6, 31]. This restriction of the sculptural repertoire to a single capital design is unusual in Romanesque southern Italy, and the basic form is deployed throughout the eastern arm, both for the ambulatory respond capitals and for the capitals above the exterior half-columns of the radiating chapels. Within that, the proportions, and therefore the geometry, of the capitals varies slightly, with a notable tendency to elongate the main face of the capitals which articulate the inner face of the ambulatory. Cushion capitals were widely used across northern Italy, the Empire and in Anglo-Norman England and it is worth stressing that at Acerenza, as was usually the case in Italy, the basic form of the cushion is respected. The curved underside of the capital effects the transition between a square upper section and the supporting half column. There are no sub-divisions, ridges or creases to interrupt the smoothly curving surface of the cone.⁴⁶

The one caveat is that the capitals at Acerenza have been scraped. Indeed, they must have been scraped at least twice. It will have been necessary to abrade the surface before stucco and plaster was applied in the 18th century, and again when the stucco was enthusiastically removed in 1951.⁴⁷ As such, one has to approach the capital geometry with caution. There is, however, one unusual feature which could be original. Many of the capitals have a raised horizontal band just below the abacus. It is very occasionally encountered in the Empire, and is also found on one of the arcade capitals at San Giovanni al Sepolcro in Brindisi [31-32].⁴⁸

DOCUMENTARY HISTORY

L'abbaziale di SS. Trinità di Venosa

The abbey of the Holy Trinity at Venosa seems to have been among the earliest Norman monastic foundations in southern Italy. A tradition, accepted as reliable by Hubert Houben and Graham Loud, maintains that monks were introduced by Count Drogo between c. 1045 and 1051.⁴⁹ The monastery was subsequently favoured by Robert Guiscard, and, following his investiture as Duke of Apulia and Calabria at Melfi in August, 1059, Pope Nicholas II consecrated the church of the Holy Trinity at Venosa, issuing a privilege making the monastery directly subject to the papacy.⁵⁰ Guiscard's decision to include Venosa in the ceremonies which accompanied his investiture was probably motivated by more than its proximity. It was already enmeshed in Hauteville family religiosity. Not only had Guiscard's brother, Drogo, established the old church as a monastery, William of Apulia tells us that another of his brothers, Humphrey, was buried at Venosa in 1057 just as Guiscard became the leader of the Normans in Basilicata.

‘At this time Humphrey, Prince of Apulia, fell ill and ordered his brother to come quickly to him. Robert hastened there. [...] Humphrey died. All Apulia cried, lamenting the death of a father. [...] He was buried next to his brothers who had died before him at the monastery of Venosa.’⁵¹

William of Apulia was writing in the late 1090s, and although he implies that the elder Hauteville brothers had already been buried in Venosa prior to Humphrey's death, he may have been mistaken. A charter of 1069 makes clear that Robert Guiscard himself arranged to have his elder brothers reburied at Venosa, having them translated from *diversis Apulie locis*.⁵² Venosa was effectively transformed into a family mausoleum as the Norman conquest of Apulia was nearing completion at the behest of Guiscard. That Guiscard was thinking of Venosa in family terms and as the preeminent Hauteville monastery by the late 1060s is borne out by other evidence as well.

The fullest account of this comes from the Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis. Orderic tells us that Drogo's monastery at Venosa was reformed around 1068x70 when a new abbot was drafted in from Robert Guiscard's own foundation of Sant'Eufemia in Calabria. This abbot was called Berengar.⁵³ Prior to his arrival in southern Italy, Berengar had been a monk at Saint-Évroul in southern Normandy, and had accompanied Robert de Grandmesnil, himself the former abbot of Saint-Évroul, on his journey south after Robert found it prudent to leave Normandy following the exile of his brother, Hugues, by William, Duke of Normandy, in 1061.⁵⁴ On his arrival in southern Italy Robert seems to have initially approached Richard of Capua, but was instead taken on by Guiscard, who presented him with a former monastic site near Nicastro (Calabria) where Guiscard and Robert de Grandmesnil founded the monastery of St Eufemia.⁵⁵ Robert de Grandmesnil's half-sister, Judith, went on to marry Roger (the future count of Sicily) the following year.

Whatever monastic community existed at Venosa before Berengar's appointment – Orderic maintains there were 20 monks ‘entirely given up to worldly vanities’⁵⁶ – the monastery was reformed by the new abbot.⁵⁷ Orderic Vitalis tends to treat Sant'Eufemia, Venosa, and a monastery founded at Mileto by Guiscard's youngest brother, Roger (future count of Sicily), *en bloc*, and the parts of his *Historia Ecclesiastica* which concern southern Italy were written between 1114 and 1123x24, so his testimony should be approached with caution.⁵⁸ Monks and monastic customs originating at Saint-Évroul were not introduced at all three monasteries simultaneously, for instance, nor, necessarily, with

the same depth or intensity. However, Orderic's assertion that the monastic rule and liturgical chant followed at Venosa was that of Saint-Évroul is plausible, as is his assertion that during Berengar's abbacy the number of monks at Venosa increased to 100.⁵⁹ These links proved enduring. Berengar's obit was celebrated at St-Évroul on 25 December and the Norman monastery's *liber memorialis* reveals that prayers were said for monks of Venosa following their death as if they were monks of Saint-Évroul.⁶⁰

Berengar's abbacy witnessed an enormous expansion in the resources available to the monastery.⁶¹ In 1074 Guiscard awarded the abbey a half share in the city of Venosa and continued to grant the monks property up to his death, particularly to the north, around Ascoli Satriano.⁶² Relatives of Duke Robert Guiscard also contributed. Guiscard's younger brother, William, count of the Principate, was buried at the SS Trinità in 1080 following which the family of the counts of the Principate made donations through to 1112.⁶³ Count Geoffrey of Conversano, Richard the Seneshal, and the lords of Montescaglioso, Monte Sant'Angelo, Marsico and Lavello all made donations, stretching from 1064 until 1111.⁶⁴ By the time of Guiscard's death in 1085 and his subsequent burial at SS Trinità, the abbey had a monastic community large enough to be able to provide 12 monks for the foundation of a priory at Sicignano in the old Lombard principality of Salerno.⁶⁵

The years of Berengar's abbacy were the years in which the greatest number of grants and privileges were made to Venosa. When Hubert Houben plotted the number of donations made in favour of SS. Trinità for each decade between 1000 and 1220, the decades which showed the greatest number of donations were 1080 (19), 1090 (22) and 1100 (18). No other decade rises above 11.⁶⁶ The exceptional status of SS. Trinità in relation to most Benedictine monasteries in southern Italy was also recognised during this period in a bull which Urban II issued on 24 September 1089, in which the pope confirmed to the abbot privileges over the city of Venosa and the right to wear a mitre during the celebration of the mass on feast days.⁶⁷ It is also at around this date that we hear of the translation of relics of the martyrs Senatore, Viatore, Cassiodoro and Dominata from San Marco Argentano (Cosenza) to Venosa, and of the arrival of two relics of St Nicholas of Myra.⁶⁸ The first of the St Nicholas relics arrived courtesy of a certain Christopher, one of the participants in the translation of St Nicholas from Myra to Bari.⁶⁹ According to Orderic Vitalis, Christopher 'retained a rib for himself in his sleeve', but took refuge in Venosa after he fell ill and following his recovery he presented the rib of St Nicholas to SS. Trinità and himself became a monk at the abbey.⁷⁰ The second Nicholas relic was of an arm of the saint, stolen by Stephen, the former cantor of St Nicholas at Angers. The source for this *furta sacra* is again Orderic Vitalis, who relates how Stephen took refuge at Venosa on his journey back to France, but that one Erembert, a monk of Venosa, became suspicious and challenged Stephen, thereby acquiring the relic for SS. Trinità.⁷¹ The arrival of the relics of St Nicholas in Bari in 1087 was an event of European importance, and Orderic incorporated an account of the translation in a section of his *Historia Ecclesiastica* thought to have been written between 1130 and 1133.⁷² Orderic's account of the 1087 translation is based on John of Bari's 1089 narrative, but the addition of two stories of the dissemination of relics to Venosa (there is a third concerning the acquisition of relics of St Nicholas for the abbey of Noron in Normandy) draws attention to the importance of Venosa to his own abbey in Orderic's eyes.⁷³ Such acquisitions bring lustre to the monastic network of which Saint-Évroul is *fons et origo*. Orderic maintains that the relics continued to attract pilgrims when he was writing. It is also significant that Orderic stresses Venosa's place in the orbit of Saint-Évroul at a time – the 1130s – when other evidence suggests the ties were loosening.

Berengar died at Christmas, 1095, having been elected bishop of Venosa the previous year. The years following Berengar's death are less well documented and mostly concern the identity of the

abbots. Berengar's successor, Abbot Peter I, was elected in 1096. Previously the *prepositus* of Aquevelle, a tiny daughter-house of Venosa, Peter I was probably the last Norman to be elected abbot and died at some point between 1108 and 1114.⁷⁴ In 1114 the monks turned to Hugh (Ugo or Ugone), the administrator of one of the monastery's estates near Ascoli Satriano, about whom the sources are ultimately negative.⁷⁵ Accused of the reckless dispersal of the abbey's wealth, Abbot Hugh was summoned to appear before Pope Innocent II, but, rather than face a papal interview, Hugh went into exile in Calabria and Innocent II invited the monks to elect a new abbot.⁷⁶ Given the contested papacy of the 1130s, Abbot Hugh was not formally deposed until sometime after the death of Anacletus II in 1138. However, the monks of Venosa chose one Gratian as abbot.⁷⁷ Described as *noviter electus* in 1131, Gratian went on to become bishop of Venosa in 1137, like Berengar before him. But it seems Abbot Gratian was unable to arrest SS. Trinità's decline, something perhaps aggravated by a lack of support from the Norman rulers.⁷⁸ In 1133, King Roger II reproached the abbot and the abbey for giving their support to Tancred of Conversano, the king's principal opponent in Apulia. Thus, in 1141, we learn that Roger II in partnership with Pope Innocent II instructed the Abbot of Cava dei Tirreni to send 12 monks under the stewardship of a new abbot, Peter, to reform SS. Trinità at Venosa.⁷⁹ It appears that in Peter II, the abbey of Cava had released one of its most experienced and learned monks. He was characterised by the Venosa chronicler as having 'the utmost understanding of both temporal and spiritual matters' and was praised for being 'learned and wise'.⁸⁰ Despite this revival, on Peter II's death in 1158, the election of another Cava monk as abbot, Constantine, was a disaster, and the Venosa chronicler summed him up as 'malevolent, untrustworthy and variable'.⁸¹ So, at the next vacancy in 1167 the monks asked Pope Alexander III, in consultation with the royal administration, to select an abbot for them. Thus arrived Egidius, a former member of the household of Queen Margaret of Navarre, who had arrived with her from Spain and went on to profess as a Cistercian monk at the abbey of Fossanova.⁸² Praised for his efficient administration, Egidius seems to have been remembered as a good abbot by the monks, increasing the abbey's endowments and commissioning a new cartulary and chronicle. But on his death in 1181, the abbey's fortunes seem to have sunk once more. Under Emperor Henry VI, the usurpation of its possessions began, eventually culminating with the suppression of SS. Trinità as a monastery between 1267 and 1274.⁸³

In addition to the above, largely institutional outline, it may be helpful to summarise what is known of Hauteville burials at Venosa. Ingo Herklotz asserted that nine of the Hauteville brothers must have been buried in the abbey, although the sources mention by name only Humphrey, Drogo, William, and Robert Guiscard himself.⁸⁴ William of Apulia maintains that Humphrey was buried in the abbey on his death in 1057 (see above). William, Count of the Principate, was buried there in accordance with his will in 1080, together with his wife Maria.⁸⁵ Confirmation that Drogo was buried at Venosa comes from a document of 1080 in which Drogo's son, Richard the Seneschal, made a large donation to the abbey for the salvation of the soul of his father 'who was buried at Venosa'.⁸⁶ As we have seen, Guiscard arranged to have some of his brothers reburied at Venosa and since Humphrey and William seem to have been buried at SS Trinità at their own request, Guiscard's translations may have included Drogo (d. 1051) and William Iron-Arm (d. 1045x46), possibly along with others whose dates of death are unknown. Robert Guiscard himself died on the island of Cephalonia on 17 July, 1085.⁸⁷ William of Apulia tells us that the body was first taken to Otranto, where the viscera were removed, and the cadaver was embalmed. The cortege then moved to Venosa where Guiscard was buried. William goes on to say, 'The city of Venosa is made resplendent by such burials. Since the time of Charlemagne or Caesar never has the earth produced such brothers as these. They are buried in the church built on their orders, the beauty of which illuminates the town. May the Heavenly King three and one give pardon to them.'⁸⁸

A tomb was established for Robert Guiscard, with an inscription reported by Ralph de Diceto as: 'Per mare, trans mare, cis mare, victrix, dextra putrescit / Henrici terror, Venetum mors, victor Alexis

/ Hic terror mundi Guiscardus hic expulit urbe / Quem ligures regem, Roma, Lemannus habet / Parthus, Arabs, Macedumve falanx non texit Alexim / At fuga, sed Venetum, nec fuga nec pelagus'.⁸⁹

Acerenza Cathedral

A bishopric had existed in Acerenza since the late 5th century, though nothing is known of the late Antique or early medieval cathedral.⁹⁰ This bishopric came under the jurisdiction of the Greek archbishops of Otranto after the latter seat was raised to the rank of an archbishopric in 968 and notwithstanding a late-10th-century papal attempt to reassert Latin control of Acerenza under the archbishops of Salerno, it was the Norman conquest of Lucania that opened up the possibility of real papal reform of the local church.⁹¹ The impetus to reorganize the Lucanian bishoprics under a local Latin-rite archbishop may have been launched by Nicholas II at or around the time of the Council of Melfi of 1059, though in the event it was in 1068 that Pope Alexander II formally instituted the ecclesiastical province of Lucania. Arnold was confirmed as the metropolitan archbishop in Acerenza, with five suffragans at Venosa, Potenza, Tricarico, Gravina and Tursi.⁹²

Nothing is known of Arnold's origins, other than that his name indicates he was most likely from northern France, the Low Countries or Normandy. He was evidently trusted by both the papacy and the Hauteville family, and in 1076 acted as an emissary between Pope Gregory VII and Roger, count of Sicily. The Annals of Lupus Protospatarius contain two entries which have a bearing on the building of a new cathedral at Acerenza. Under the year 1080, we are told that Archbishop Arnold discovered the body of St Canius and began the construction of the new cathedral of Mary, mother of God.⁹³ Under the year 1090, we learn that the city of Acerenza was destroyed by fire.⁹⁴

Arnold is recorded as having died in 1101 in a papal confirmation of Peter as his successor as archbishop. Other than this, surviving documents are few and have little to say about the 12th century. In 1203, Matera was granted co-cathedral status with Acerenza, and the principal residence of the archbishops effectively moved to Matera.⁹⁵

The documentary evidence points to a date in the last quarter of the 11th century for the start of work at Acerenza and Venosa. For Acerenza Cathedral this is explicit, albeit complicated by the record of a city fire in 1090. Pina Belli D'Elia suggested that the scatter of abraded or replacement stones on the southern exterior elevation might be the result of fire damage, although this seems unlikely.⁹⁶ The pattern of damage looks too diffuse to be the result of a fire. Conversely, a lack of evidence of fire damage could be used to argue that whatever work had been completed by 1090 was effectively destroyed and that a new start was made, but as we know nothing about the nature of the fire further speculation in that direction is pointless.

Hauteville family interest, the growth of the monastic community and the weight of external support as measured by the frequency of donations all point to the last quarter of the 11th century as the period in which a new church was started at Venosa as well. The temptation at *l'incompiuta* is to scour the documents for hints as to why work was interrupted as much as to search for a generative beginning. Either way the documents say nothing about building.

EUROPEAN CONTEXT

The constructions themselves are certainly compatible with a date in the last quarter of the 11th century. Only the use of spur bases calls that into question – but as their deployment is so insistent it requires some sort of comment [9-10]. The difficulty in establishing a plausible rationale for the appearance of an apparently novel base type in northern Basilicata is that the definitive history of the medieval spur

base has yet to be written.⁹⁷ There is no phased distribution map of spur-bases to which one can turn. Architectural historians generally regard bases as mouldings and produce sectional profiles, while historians of sculpture only notice bases if they are elaborately carved.⁹⁸ As such, what follows should be regarded as provisional.

The vast majority of bases at Acerenza Cathedral consist of two rolls flanking a hollow – ie they are attic bases. This seems in keeping with the tendency towards production in series notable in the use of cushion capitals. The bases at Venosa are more varied, again like the sculpture, ranging from the extravagant triple rolls to the north of the axial chapel, to simple incised rectangular blocks beneath some of the exterior pilasters. Not all the bases are given spurs at either site, though many are. The spurs themselves are near identical, linking the lowest roll moulding of the base proper to a corner of the supporting rectangular sub-base. In form they resemble beaks. They rise from a triangular base and are ridged, unlike the strap-like spur bases that proliferate in northern Europe from the second quarter of the 12th century.

As far as can be ascertained there are no precedents for Acerenza and Venosa's spur bases in southern Italy. Spur bases (*basi unghiate*) were widely used in northern Italy, and in many instances were carved with the same beak-like form as those at Acerenza and Venosa. Good examples can be found in Santa Fede in Cavagnola (Piemonte), SS Maria e Sigismondo at Rivolta d'Adda (Lombardia) and throughout the atrium of Sant' Ambrogio in Milan, though none of these are usually dated to before 1100.⁹⁹ The situation is moderately more encouraging in the Anglo-Norman world. Three sites in England are known to the authors that possibly employed spur bases before 1100, though one of these, the cathedral priory at Bath (Somerset), may not be quite that early.¹⁰⁰ The only securely dated in situ 11th-century spur bases in England are those at Shrewsbury Abbey, where that attached to the south-west crossing pier will have been set into position between the abbey's foundation in 1083 and Roger de Montgomery's death in 1094.¹⁰¹ Stuart Harrison has also recently published a reused spur base at Lincoln Cathedral whose size and shape mean it will have come from the cathedral built under Bishop Remigius (1067-92).¹⁰² In Normandy spur bases (*bases à griffes*) don't seem to make an appearance until the beginning of the 12th century, in the synagogue at Rouen and at the abbey of Saint-Georges de Boscherville.¹⁰³ To find early instances of spur bases in northern France one has to head south, to the Loire valley and Berry. They were extensively used throughout the new eastern arm at Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire, and as this was begun under Abbot Guillaume (c. 1067-80) these may have been the earliest instance of their use in France.¹⁰⁴ To find early instances of spur bases elsewhere one has to turn to the Empire, where the chapel of St Emmeram within Speyer Cathedral would seem to be an early example.¹⁰⁵

Thus, there is a potential formal objection to an 11th-century date. Spur bases are not impossible before 1100, but their appearance in southern Italy is unexpected and if they were deployed in Basilicata as early as the 1080s or 1090s they hint at a more complex picture than that of the straightforward reception of an Anglo-Norman or north-western French plan.

Leaving spur bases aside, the immediate origin of the three-chapel ambulatory plan is a puzzle. A formal relationship between Venosa, Acerenza and Gloucester is clear [3-4,12], and it may be that there were other examples of the plan type in western England. Tewkesbury Abbey is the outstanding candidate, begun sometime after 1087 and complete in its eastern parts by 1102.¹⁰⁶ Just the lower parts of Tewkesbury's Romanesque apse and presbytery survive, with four columnar piers defining the apse, as was the case at Gloucester though at Tewkesbury the piers are cylinders. The upper superstructure and ambulatory were replaced in the 14th century. The eastern parts of Tewkesbury have never been

fully excavated, but if there were radiating chapels sprung from the ambulatory, as is generally assumed, there is only room for three.¹⁰⁷ Since the scarring on the aisle side of the columnar pier immediately south-east of the crossing shows the aisle bays were originally articulated with transverse arches, it follows that the most likely compositional arrangement for the ambulatory bays will have been to spring two transverse arches from the back of each of the apse piers [33].

Given the limited direct traffic between Basilicata and the Severn valley in the late 11th century it is more likely the above buildings are linked by a common source than that the relationship is direct. The one characteristic these institutions share is that neither their patrons nor the leaders of their religious communities were local. Serlo, abbot of St Peter, Gloucester had been a monk at Mont-Saint-Michel (Manche).¹⁰⁸ Tewkesbury's first abbot was Gerald of Avranches, previously a chaplain in the household of Hugh, first earl of Chester and lord of Avranches (Manche).¹⁰⁹ The abbey itself, according to Tewkesbury's late medieval founder's book, was founded by Robert *fitz* Haimo at the request of his wife, Sybil, daughter of Roger de Montgomery and Mabel de Bellême.¹¹⁰ This particular family link is worth pursuing for Roger de Montgomery's own burial church, Shrewsbury Abbey, can be connected to a cluster of monastic houses in southern Normandy with links to Saint-Évroul.¹¹¹ Not only was Roger himself from central Normandy, where his patronage included religious houses at Troarn (Calvados), Séez (Orne) and Almenèches (Orne).¹¹² His first wife, Mabel, was a member of the powerful Bellême family, on the borders of Normandy and Maine. Another who was intimately involved in the establishment of Shrewsbury Abbey, Odelerius, was the father of Orderic Vitalis and clearly knew of Saint-Évroul as he sent Orderic to be an oblate there when his son was ten years old. It is Orderic who then tells us that in 1083 two monks, Rainald and Frodo, came from Séez to Shrewsbury, where 'they began to found the monastic offices' (*monachiles officinas ... condere ceperunt*).¹¹³ The monastery from which they came, the abbey of Saint-Martin at Séez, had been founded shortly before 1057 by Roger de Montgomery and Mabel de Bellême on the advice of Mabel's uncle, Ivo bishop of Séez, and was first colonised by three monks from Saint-Évroul.¹¹⁴

On the southern Italian side, Berengar, abbot of the SS Trinità at Venosa, had belonged to the Benedictine community at Saint-Évroul, and although a biography cannot be reconstructed for Arnold, archbishop of Acerenza, his name indicates he came from northern France while his political contacts, as well as the monasteries he favoured with donations, suggest he was Norman.¹¹⁵ Everything points back to Normandy and particularly to Saint-Évroul. However, Saint-Évroul itself can be ruled out as an architectural source. The monastic church was reconstructed in the later middle ages with a tri-apsidal east end, but site surveys preclude the possibility of the 11th-century church having been built with an apse ambulatory.¹¹⁶ Moreover, none of the semi-circular ambulatories constructed before 1100 in Normandy quite fit the bill. Just four are known: the Romanesque ambulatory at Notre-Dame Jumièges is thought to have been built without radiating chapels; this was probably also the case for the apse ambulatory at Mont-Saint-Michel; too little is known of the 11th-century ambulatory crypt at Saint-Wandrille to reconstruct its geometry; while the majestic Romanesque crypt at Rouen Cathedral springs the western radiating chapels from the apse chord (like Selles-sur-Cher or St-Jean-Montierneuf) and is fundamentally different to any other crypt ambulatory known in Romanesque Europe.¹¹⁷

Thus, we are reduced to speculation. It seems most likely that the type of ambulatory plan used at Venosa, Acerenza and Gloucester was devised in southern Normandy or – just possibly – the Loire valley or Maine. The spur bases point south, to the Loire valley, though these could have been developed independently of the plan. Several sites in Normandy suggest themselves as the potential originator. Saint-Martin at Séez is one, though little is known of 11th-century fabric since the abbey was substantially rebuilt in the 18th century and by the time the late 17th-century view in the *Monasticon*

Gallicanum was created the east arm had been demolished.¹¹⁸ Coutances Cathedral is another, though, again, the form of its east end is unknown. A new cathedral at Coutances had been started before Geoffrey de Montbray was consecrated bishop in 1049, though little had been achieved and it was only after Geoffrey visited the Hauteville family in southern Italy in 1050, returning with gold, silver and precious gems, that much was done.¹¹⁹ The cathedral was then consecrated in the presence of Duke William in December, 1056. This seems a little early for the type of articulated ambulatory design in question but is not impossible. Geoffrey de Montbray's career after 1066 would put him in an excellent position to broker contacts between southern Italy, the Severn valley and Normandy – the estates he was granted by William the Conqueror were focused on south-western England and he donated the manor of Winterbourne in Gloucestershire to Coutances Cathedral.¹²⁰ The area around Le Mans is another where a lot of building was undertaken over the last third of the 11th century and where apse ambulatory plans were favoured. The irregular spacing of the apse hemicycle columns and deployment of non-radial transverse arches in the ambulatory of Saint-Pierre-de-la-Couture (now N-D-de-la-Couture) at Le Mans make clear that the architectural culture of the late-11th-century city was favourable to experiments with the articulation of apse ambulatory plans.¹²¹

Short of an unusually detailed archaeological discovery, the source of the Venosa-Acerenza-Gloucester east end plan will remain a mystery. But there is one aspect of the reception of this ambulatory design that should be stressed. The plan exists independently of its realisation. The sculpture, masonry and pier design differ across all three buildings, and differ to a significant degree. It is simply the laying out and the method whereby the apse and ambulatory are related that is shared. Thus, we are not looking for an architectural model that touches upon elevations or plastic values. We are actually looking for something rather technical and abstract; a way of relating a semi-circular arcade to an ambulatory with chapels which has to be provided for from the ground up. This particular approach to ambulatory design could be carried in the mind of a reasonably experienced architect. The fact that the execution of Venosa and Acerenza was entrusted to different teams of masons and sculptors with no evident overlap, while their plans are so similar, strongly suggests that they were conceived, and probably laid out, by the same designer. It is the laying out of Acerenza and Venosa that is critically important in their resemblance, and this could only have been done by a skilled practitioner imported from northern Europe. The circulation of specialist architectural overseers is associated with Cistercian building in the 1130s. Geoffroi d'Ainai is the best known, who 'set in order and established many monasteries, especially those whose members by the counsel of the holy man [Bernard] changed their habit for the greater perfection of their life and submitted themselves to the monastery at Clairvaux'.¹²² But it is likely the practice predates the Cistercians and goes back into the 11th century. This may have been the role assigned to Rainald and Frodo when they were sent from Sées to Shrewsbury in 1083.

As such, the adoption of apse ambulatories at Venosa and Acerenza involved the long-distance transmission of an architectural plan. It is fair to assume this was organised by or on behalf of the patrons, and though it is possible it entailed two separate initiatives, it is fundamentally more likely that Venosa and Acerenza were undertaken in concert – either as the result of a joint decision taken before work started at either site or because the opportunity afforded by the arrival of a Norman architect at one site inspired his recruitment at a second. The problem in providing an answer to a question posed earlier - why do these buildings look to Norman, or northern French, models in their planning, while most southern Italian churches do not – is that very little is known about Arnold of Acerenza and the date at which the churches were started is open to doubt. However, if the date given in the *Annals of Lupus Protospatarius* for the start at work at Acerenza is accepted – 1080 – then the beginnings of an answer can be sketched out.

1080 is still early in the consolidation of the Norman conquest of southern Italy. Bari fell to the Normans as recently as 1071 and Salerno in 1076. It also predates the arrival of the relics of Saint Nicholas from Myra and the beginnings of the construction the pilgrimage church of San Nicola at Bari in 1087. Moreover, Salerno and Bari were populous cities with significant architectural resources and traditions on which to draw.¹²³ Basilicata was different. It was sparsely populated and, unlike Campania or coastal Apulia, there were few pre-existing monasteries with Benedictine communities which the new Norman overlords might patronise.¹²⁴ It was probably this - the absence of a viable local architectural tradition coupled with a powerful network of first-generation Norman patrons - that led to the importation of a Norman plan. It was necessary to draw in expertise from outside and in 1080, Abbot Berengar of Venosa or Arnold of Acerenza, perhaps in the company of an Hauteville family administrator in Melfi, may have felt more comfortable recruiting a designer from Normandy than in looking to Campania or the Apulian seaboard. In the event, the strength of the indigenous architectural traditions of the Mediterranean cities coupled with the prestige which attached to the design of San Nicola at Bari were overwhelming. Lacking a follow through, the ambulatories at Venosa and Acerenza have no long-term importance for southern Italian architecture, unlike, it should be said, Acerenza's simple nave.¹²⁵ If more were known about Arnold of Acerenza and the staffing of the cathedral of Acerenza, it might be possible to take this further, or at least deduce something about how the planning of Acerenza and Venosa were coordinated. But in the absence of a biography for Arnold, or a keener sense of why the new church at Venosa remained unfinished, this tantalising episode in the Norman conquest of southern Italy will remain little more than a footnote in Romanesque architectural history.

¹ See, among others, S. BOTTARI, *L'architettura della Contea: studi sulla prima architettura del periodo normanno nell'Italia meridionale e in Sicilia*, «Siculorum gymnasium», n.s. I (1948), pp. 1-33; C. BOZZONI, *Calabria normanna. Ricerche sull'architettura dei secoli undicesimo e dodicesimo*, Rome 1974; M. D'ONOFRIO, *Comparaisons entre quelques édifices de style normand de l'Italie méridionale et du Royaume de France aux XI^e et XII^e siècles*, in *Les Normands en Méditerranée dans le sillage de Tancrede*, ed., P. Bouet and F. Neveux, Caen 1994, pp. 179-201; K. KAPPEL, *S. Nicola in Bari und seine architektonische Nachfolger*, Worms 1996; E. FERNIE, *Romanesque Architecture*, New Haven and London 2014, pp. 96-99; M. TABANELLI, *Beyond 'Plan Bénédicтин': Reconsidering Sicilian and Calabrian Cathedrals in the Age of the Norman County*, in *Designing Norman Sicily*, ed., E. Winkler et al, Woodbridge 2020, pp. 167-83.

² P. BELLI D'ELIA, *Alle Sorgenti del Romanico: Puglia XI Secolo*, Bari, 1974, *passim*.

³ On Catania Cathedral, see C. BRUZELIUS, *The Norman Cathedral of Sant'Agata in Catania*, in *L'officina dello sguardo. Scritti in onore di Maria Andaloro*, ed., G. Bordi et al. (Rome 2014), pp. 121-26. T. BELLA, *Bâtir face à la mer. La cathédrale normande de Catane en Sicile. État de la question*, «Les cahiers de Saint-Michel de Cuxa», 48 (2017), pp. 23-38; ID., *Ansgerius quod ego... Ecclesiae primus fundamina ieci. La cattedrale normanna di Catania: materiali per un riesame*, «Arte Cristiana», 909 (2018), pp. 404-21. Most unusually for a T-Transsept design, Catania Cathedral arranges the apses *en échelon*, in the sense that the apse springing points are staggered so that their western re-entrants form a shallow V and all three apses are set back from the transept behind a narrow lateral passage.

⁴ E. LEFÈVRE-PONTALIS, *Les plans des église romanes bénédictines*, «Bulletin Monumental», 77 (1912), pp. 439-85.

⁵ D'ONOFRIO, *Comparaisons entre quelques édifices*, pp. 168-71, plans of Cluny II and Bernay on p. 170. As recently as 2020, Margarita Tabanelli likened Mileto to plans as different as Bernay and St Albans Cathedral. TABANELLI, *Beyond 'Plan Bénédicтин'*, pp. 167-68, n.5.

⁶ The most important reappraisal of architecture under the Normans in Sicily is F. GANDOLFO, *Le cattedrali siciliane*, in *Medioevo: l'Europa delle cattedrali*, ed. A.C. Quintavalle, Milan 2007, pp. 191-207; See also M. TABANELLI, *Architettura sacra in Calabria e Sicilia nell'età della Contea normanna*, Rome 2019, ID., *Beyond 'Plan Bénédicтин'*, especially 167-74; T. BELLA, *The Cathedral of Catania and the Creation of the Norman County of Sicily: Transregional and Transalpine Models in the Architecture of the late Eleventh Century*, in *The Regional and Transregional in European Romanesque*, ed., J. McNeill and R. Plant (Milton Park forthcoming).

⁷ For Mileto, see F. CUTERI, *La città di Ruggero. Ricerche archeologiche a Mileto Vecchia de Calabria (1999-2005)*, «IV Congresso nazionale di Archeologia Medievale», ed., R. Francovich and M. Valenti, Borgo San

Lorenzo 2006, pp. 173-79. For Troina see, most recently, F. LINGUANTI, *La cattedrale di Troina tra 1643 e 1785. Nuove acquisizioni documentali*, «Lexicon», 25 (2017), pp. 31-50; ID., *La cattedrale di Troina: prima sperimentazione architettonica normanna in Sicilia*, «Hortus Artium Medievalium», 25 (2019), pp. 579-90. One can only hope that the reappraisal of Romanesque architecture in Sicily launched by Francesco Gandolfo will eventually result in a more nuanced view of the dynamics of the architecture of the Normans in mainland southern Italy as well

⁸ D'ONOFRIO, *Comparaisons entre quelques édifices*, pp. 159-67 ; ID., *L'abbatiale Normande inachevée de Venosa*, in *L'architecture normande au Moyen Age*, ed., M. Baylé, Caen 2001, I, pp. 111-24; L. DE LACHANAL, *L'incompiuta di Venosa : Un abbaziale fra Propaganda e Reimpiego*, «Mélanges de l'école française de Rome», 110 (1998), pp. 299-315; P. PISTILLI, *Tra Incompiute e Inesistente*, in *Cantieri e Maestranze nell'Italia medievale*, ed., N. Somma, Spoleto 2010, pp. 375-412. Pio Pistilli suggested that the cathedrals of Melfi and Bovino may also have been built with apse-ambulatory east ends, though the argument rests on the partial survival of two-bay presbytery arcades and does not make a particularly strong case. PISTILLI, *Tra Incompiute e Inesistente*, pp. 396-400.

⁹ See below and H. HOUBEN, *Die Abtei Venosa und das Mönchtum im normannisch-staufischen Süditalien*, Tübingen 1995, pp. 135-9, 234-35 no. 4; G. LOUD, *The Latin Church in Norman Italy*, Cambridge 2007, p. 84; H. HOUBEN, *Acerenza, metropoli ecclesiastica della Basilicata normanno-sveva*, in *La cattedrale di Acerenza mille anni di storia*, ed., P. Belli d'Elia and C. Gelao, Venosa, 1999, pp. 21-25.

¹⁰ D'ONOFRIO, *Precisazioni sul deambulatorio della cattedrale di Aversa*, «Arte Medievale», 2 Ser., 7 (1993), pp. 65-79. ID., *Comparaisons entre quelques édifices*, pp. 159-66. V. PACE, *La scultura della cattedrale di Aversa*, «Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte», 3.Ser., 25 (2002), pp. 231-257

¹¹ The average internal width of the ambulatory at Aversa Cathedral is 5.72 metres. By comparison, the width of the ambulatory at Venosa varies between 4.77 m and 4.91 m, while at Acerenza it varies from 5.08 to 5.11 m. Most striking is the scale of the radiating chapels. The south-east radiating chapel entrance at Aversa is a majestic 7.25 metres wide. The corresponding widths of the flanking radiating chapel entries at Venosa and Acerenza are 5.60 m. and 4.89 m. respectively.

¹² The portal is no longer in situ and neither its original location nor the date at which it was moved are known. The cathedral was damaged by an earthquake in the mid-14th century and was remodelled by Bishop Innico Caracciolo (1697-1715). The inscription reads *Princeps Iordanus Richardo principe natus/quam pater incepit prius haec implenda recepit*. Pistilli has argued that since the apse ambulatory projects outside the line of the first circuit of walls at Aversa, it represents an extension to the first cathedral and will not have been constructed before a new larger enceinte was built between 1078 and 1090. P. PISTILLI, *Castelli normanni e svevi in Terra di Lavoro. Insediamenti fortificati in un territorio di confini*, San Casciano Val di Pesa (2003), p. 5. Carlo Tosco has also cast doubt on the late 11th-century dating of the east end of Acerenza Cathedral, and suggests a date closer to 1120 for the ambulatory vault, more or less ruling out a start in the 11th century. C. TOSCO, *L'architettura medievale in Italia 600-1200*, Bologna, 2016, p. 281.

¹³ D'ONOFRIO, *Comparaisons entre quelques édifices*, p. 165, figs 8 and 9. M. THURLBY, *The Abbey Church of Lessay (Manche) and Romanesque Architecture in North-East England*, «Antiquaries Journal», 94 (2014), pp. 71-92. An exception are the rib vaults added beneath the original groin vaults at St Peter's Gloucester (now Gloucester Cathedral). These are constructed so that all four ribs converge on a common central stone – but like Aversa they are unmoulded. C. HEIGHWAY and R. BRYANT, *The Romanesque Abbey of St Peter at Gloucester*, Oxford 2020, pp. 9-11.

¹⁴ For a recent and full discussion of early apse ambulatory designs, see P. MARTIN, *Les premiers chevets à déambulatoire et chapelles rayonnantes en France Occidentale*, «Bulletin Monumental», 178 (2020), pp. 67-82

¹⁵ P. MARTIN, *Les premiers chevets à déambulatoire et chapelles rayonnantes de la Loire moyenne (Xe-XIe siècle)*, thèse de doctorat, université de Poitiers, 2010, (theses.univpoitiers.fr/notice/view/11062), pp. 29-78.

¹⁶ IBID, pp. 75-76.

¹⁷ How the 11th-century church above St-Aignan's crypt was treated is sadly unknown.

¹⁸ D. GLASS, *Romanesque Sculpture in Campania*, University Park 1991, pp. 43-53.

¹⁹ Valentino Pace favours a strong link between Aversa and 11th-century sculpture in Apulia. See PACE, *La scultura della cattedrale di Aversa*. Most recently, see V. PACE, *D'Aversa à Brindisi: Images d'Italie Normande à la fin du XI^e siècle*, «Les Cahiers de Saint-Michel de Cuxa», LI (2020), 131-134.

²⁰ M. D'ONOFRIO AND V. PACE, *La Campania*, Milan 1981, pp. 171-178; For Richard's involvement with both Capua Cathedral and Sant'Angelo in Formis, see G. LOUD, *A Calendar of the Diplomas of the Norman Princes of Capua*, «Papers of the British School at Rome», 49 (1981), pp. 99-143. Jordan was not closely associated with either church, and if one follows Pistilli's argument that the east end of Aversa Cathedral was a modification of the earlier cathedral begun under Jordan, then it is possible that the architecture was intended to signal a change in cultural orientation initiated by Jordan.

²¹ LOUD, *Latin Church in Norman Italy*, p. 91. The overwhelming majority of patrons of Aversa Cathedral were Norman, as were the patrons of the monastic houses of St Lawrence and St Blaise at Aversa. See also G. LOUD, *Church and Society in the Norman Principality of Capua, 1058-1197*, Oxford 1985, p. 89

²² A simple equation of patronage, date and outcome may not be the answer. The patrons of the abbey of St Lawrence at Aversa, for example, were almost entirely Norman – many of them the same people who supported the building of Aversa Cathedral. The plan of the east end of St Lawrence is unknown, so we cannot compare like with like, but the surviving 11th-century west portal of St Lawrence (the medieval interior doesn't survive) is composed from a mix of Roman spolia and recarved marble – much like Montecassino, and most 11th-century building in Campania. On the patronage see LOUD, *Latin Church in Norman Italy*, pp. 91-92.

²³ The entrances to the south-east and north-east chapels at Venosa are 5.60 m. wide, while the axial chapel entrance is 6.16 m. At Acerenza the figures are 4.89 m. and 5.22 m. respectively. However, the length of the outer ambulatory wall between the north-east and axial chapel at Venosa is 3.09 m. (and between the axial and south-east chapel 2.99 m.), while at Acerenza the measurements are 4.00 m. and 4.01 m. respectively. Thus, the chapels have been favoured over the sections of wall between them at Venosa, while the reverse is the case at Acerenza. Other measurements are comparable. The clear internal straight bay lengths are 3.48 m. at Venosa and 3.37 m. at Acerenza. The average ambulatory width is 4.84 m. at Venosa and 5.09 m. at Acerenza, and the ambulatory transverse arches spring at a height of 4.11 m. at Venosa and 3.94 m. at Acerenza (measured from the bottom of the sub-base to the top of the abacus). Overall, the ambulatory is wider and very slightly lower at Acerenza. The above measurements were taken in early September, 2020. I would like to record my gratitude to Dottore Antonio Mantrisi for authorising photography at the site and the staff of the complesso dell'Incompiuta for their help.

²⁴ Only the outer envelope wall and apse piers were built in the initial building campaign at Venosa, while a new set of columns and capitals intended to form the south nave arcade date from a second phase of work. The first campaign seems to have got no further than the outer walls (completed to the aisle parapet around the east arm but left unfinished around the transepts and nave), though it also included the raising of the main arcade arches on the south side of the presbytery, the south presbytery aisle entry and the semi-hemispherical vaults over the radiating chapels. Thus, it is possible to determine the height of the presbytery and apse arcade and ascertain the intention to vault the presbytery and ambulatory aisles. In neither phase is there any indication that the building of the intended new church at Venosa reached a point at which roofs could be installed. Lucilla de Lachanal suggested that the exterior arched corbel table around the east end belonged to an early 13th-century resumption of work – phase C in her account. However, the vertical pilaster strips employed from the base of the walls upwards imply an arched corbel table, and there is no compelling archaeological reason to date them after the first building campaign (Lachanal's 'Phase A'). LACHANAL, *L'incompiuta di Venosa*, pp. 314-315 and Fig. 5.

²⁵ The east end of Acerenza Cathedral was modified by the insertion of a crypt, following on from repairs occasioned by the earthquake of 1456. This was completed in 1526 and entailed the creation of a new shrine for San Canio, the raising of a platform east of the transepts to support the presbytery and choir, and by extensive remodelling of the radiating chapels. A major remodelling of the entire church followed between 1755 and 1776, which was subsequently reversed by a radical removal of the post-medieval stucco in 1951-54. As such, the internal surfaces at Acerenza have been scraped, and the ambulatory floor lowered, though the high platform remains, occupying the apse and presbytery. P. BELLI D'ELIA and C. GELAO, *La cattedrale di Acerenza: Mille anni di storia*, Venosa 1999, *passim*.

²⁶ Some spolia is used around the east end at Acerenza, for the most part consisting of lengths of Roman or Longobard columns recut to act as responds. On the use of spolia at Venosa see DE LACHANAL, *L'incompiuta di Venosa*, pp. 304-14.

²⁷ Vertical articulation is confined to the east end and the eastern face of the transepts at Venosa. The same is true of Acerenza. The only disruption to the coursing of the south nave wall at Venosa is caused by the south portal, for which provision must have been made when this was first built.

²⁸ What significance attaches to this, if any, is unclear.

²⁹ Mario d'Onofrio published a graphic reconstruction of a hypothetically complete Venosa by superposing the exterior upper silhouette of Acerenza over Venosa's lower walls, though qualified this as 'un peu trop forcée'. D'ONOFRIO, *L'abbatiale Normande inachevée*, Fig. 10. The Romanesque crossing tower at Acerenza had been replaced by a cylindrical tower in the 18th century, a tower which was in turn demolished following an earthquake in 1931 after which the present octagonal tower was built. BELLI D'ELIA and GELAO, *La cattedrale di Acerenza*, pp. 39-46.

³⁰ Detailed consideration of the second campaign is beyond the scope of this article

³¹ J. MALLET, *L'art roman de l'ancien Anjou*, Paris 1984, 126-32, plan at plate XXXVIII. Mallet's dating model is later than would now attract a consensus.

³² For convenient plans, see E. VERGNOLLE, *L'art roman en France*, Paris 1994, figs 46, 65 and 81, and MARTIN, *Les premiers chevets à déambulatoire*, figs 6 and 7.

³³ For the Auvergne, there are plentiful plans in B. CRAPLET, *Auvergne Romane*, La Pierre-qui-Vire 1955. The best example of the six-column plan in southern Burgundy is the abbey of Paray-le-Monial. For St-Eusice at Selles-sur-Cher see D. KAHN, *The Politics of Sanctity: Figurative Sculpture at Selles-sur-Cher*, Turnhout, forthcoming; on Poitiers see R. FAVREAU, *Poitiers: Saint-Jean-de-Montierneuf*, Poitiers 1996, plan at p. 35; for Loctudy see E. Vergnolle, *Loctudy, église Saint-Tudy*, in *Congrès archéologique de France: Finistère*, Paris 2009, pp. 191-202; for Canterbury see R. GEM, ed., *St Augustine's Abbey Canterbury*, London 1997, pp. 113-15; for Norwich see E. FERNIE, *An Architectural History of Norwich Cathedral*, Oxford 1993, plan at p. 20 and discussion at pp. 122-25.

³⁴ St-Eutrope at Saintes was begun at some point after 1081 and was largely complete by April, 1096. See J. MCNEILL, *Extra-Mural Developments: The Eleventh-Century Reconstruction of St-Eutrope at Saintes*, in *Romanesque Saints, Shrines, and Pilgrimage*, ed., J. McNeill and R. Plant, Milton Park 2020, pp. 137-56.

³⁵ C. WILSON, *Abbot Serlo's Church at Gloucester (1089-1100): Its Place in Romanesque Architecture*, in *Medieval Art and Architecture at Gloucester and Tewkesbury*, ed., T.A. Heslop and V. Sekules, Leeds 1985, pp. 53-83 and figs 5-6; HEIGHWAY and BRYANT, *St Peter at Gloucester*, pp. 7-34. A later example may have been King Henry I of England's new foundation of Reading Abbey, begun c. 1121. R. BAXTER, *The Royal Abbey of Reading*, Woodbridge 2016, plan at plate XXII. The plan is not entirely secure and is based on incomplete excavations.

³⁶ HEIGHWAY and BRYANT, *St Peter at Gloucester*, plans at p. 7 and p. 17.

³⁷ At the same time, the original ambulatory groin vaults were strengthened with unmoulded ribs and the transverse arches were deepened. This may have been done before the consecration in 1100. HEIGHWAY and BRYANT, *St Peter at Gloucester*, pp. 7-11.

³⁸ The notable exception is the work of Ingo Herklotz. I. HERKLOTZ, 'Lo Spazio Della Morte e Lo Spazio Della Sovranità', in *I Normanni: Popolo d'Europa, 1030-1200* ed., M. D'Onofrio, Venice 1994, pp. 321-26; ID., 'Sepulcra' e 'Monumenta' Del Medioevo: Studi Sull'Arte Sepolcrale in Italia, Naples 2001.

³⁹ As noted in D'ONOFRIO, *L'abbatiale Normande inachevée*, pp. 118-20.

⁴⁰ M. DENNERT, "Übersehene" Kapitelle. Anmerkungen Zur Mittelbyzantinischen Architekturplastik Aus Konstantinopel in *La Sculpture Byzantine VIIe - XIIIe Siècles. Actes Du Colloque International Organisé Par La 2e Éphorie Des Antiquités Byzantines et l'École Française d'Athènes (6 - 8 Septembre 2000)*, ed. C. Pennas and C. Vanderheyde, Athens 2008, figures 1-3; P. BELLI D'ELIA, *Otranto*, in *Puglia XI Secolo*, Bari 1987), Figure 196.

⁴¹ M. BAYLÉ, *Les origines et les premiers développements de la sculpture romane en Normandie*, Caen 1991, pp. 138-41 and figs 531-38, p. 102 and figs 652-56.

⁴² Maylis Baylé, *Aspects de La Sculpture Normande Autour de 1100: À Propos de Gravelle-Sainte-Honorine*, «Annales de Normandie», 29 (1979): 157-78.

⁴³ Bohemond, the eldest son of Robert Guiscard, died in 1111. It will be argued below that Bohemond's mausoleum postdates the ambulatory sculpture at Venosa and that the Canosa masks are modelled on those at Venosa, as a nod to Bohemond's heritage and to the family burials at Venosa.

⁴⁴ LACHANAL, *L'incompiuta di Venosa, passim*

⁴⁵ IBID., 308.

⁴⁶ For a discussion of the formal qualities of cushion capitals and their variants, see R. PLANT, *English Romanesque and the Empire*, «Anglo-Norman Studies», 24 (2001), pp. 177-202, esp. 183-86.

⁴⁷ BELLI D'ELIA and GELAO, *La cattedrale di Acerenza*, pp. 44-63. See particularly, figs 10, 16-17.

⁴⁸ A loose example of a cushion capital with a raised upper horizontal band survives in the Imperial palace at Goslar (Lower Saxony).

⁴⁹ HOUBEN, *Die Abtei Venosa*, pp. 135-39. LOUD, *Latin Church*, p. 85. The claim made in the *Chronicon Cavense* that monks were introduced in 972 by Prince Gisulf of Salerno can be discounted as a later forgery.

⁵⁰ LOUD, *Latin Church*, p. 87. HOUBEN, *Die Abtei Venosa*, pp. 238-41, No. 8.

⁵¹ GUILLAUME DE POUILLE, *La Geste de Robert Guiscard*, ed., M. Mathieu, Palermo 1961, Book II, p. 153.

An English translation of William of Apulia by Graham Loud is available at <https://ims.leeds.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/29/2019/02/William-of-Apulia.pdf> [accessed 9 December 2020]. The passage quoted is on p.25.

⁵² 'Anno 1069, duce Roberto dominante universe Apulie regioni atque Calabrie, fratre suo comite Rogerio oppugnante Siciliam, perquisivit dictus dominus Robertus ossa fratrum suorum qui in diversis Apulie locis fuerunt comendata et ea transmutavit in monasterio civitatis Venusine. Et propterea donat eidem monasterio ecclesiam sancti Petri de Olivento.' L.-R. MÉNAGER, 'Les fondations monastiques de Robert Guiscard, duc de Pouille et de Calabre', in «Quellen und Forschungen aus italien Archiven und Bibliotheken» 39 (1959), pp. 80-81; HOUBEN, *Die Abtei Venosa*, pp. 248-50, no. 14.

⁵³ 'Idem princeps coenobium Sanctae Trinitatis in civitate Venusia praedicto patri commendavit. Ille autem Berengarium, filium Ernaldi, filii Helgonis, Uticensem monachum elegit, et ad suscipiendum regimen

Venusiensis coenobii Alexandro papae praesentavit. Qui post perceptam benedictionem, quamdiu Alexander et Gregorius ac Desiderius apostolicam sedem rexerunt, curam Venusiensis abbatae honorabiliter tenuit; deinde temporibus Urbani papae a plebe electus episcopatum eiusdem urbis suscepit. Hic nobila parentela exortus, ab infantia sub Theodorico abbate apud Uticum Christo militavit peritiaque legendi et canendi optimeque scribendi floruit. Deinde, ut diximus, abbatem suum secutus et ab ipso ad pastorem curam adsumptus, pusillum gregem xx monachorum, quem recepit, mundanisque vanitatibus vehementer occupatum, et in Dei cultu valde pigrum invenit, postmodum gratia Dei juvante, ad numerum centum monachorum augmentavit. Tanto etiam bonarum studio virtutum nobilitavit eos, ut ex ipsis plures episcopi et abbates assumerentur, sanctaque matri ecclesiae ad honorem veri Regis pro salute animarum praeficerentur'. *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed., M. CHIBNALL, 6 vols, Oxford 1968-81, II, p. 91.

⁵⁴ Ibid, II, p. 96.

⁵⁵ LOUD, *Latin Church*, p. 85.

⁵⁶ *Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, II, p. 102.

⁵⁷ The previous abbot, Ingelbert, had been Norman, and it is possible that the monastic community introduced by Drogo had also been Norman.

⁵⁸ For a recent treatment, see D. ROACH, *Saint-Évroul and Southern Italy in Orderic's Historia Ecclesiastica*, in *Orderic Vitalis: Life, Works and Interpretations*, ed., C. ROZIER, D. ROACH, G. GASPER and E. VAN HOUTS, Woodbridge 2017, pp. 78-99. On dating Orderic's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, see *ibid.*, xiv.

⁵⁹ *Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, II, p. 102. M. CHIBNALL, *Les moines et les patrons de Saint-Évroul dans l'Italie du sud au XIe siècle*, in *Les Normands en Méditerranée dans le sillage des Tancrede*, pp. 161-70.

⁶⁰ ROACH, *Saint-Évroul and Southern Italy*, p. 98; J. LAPORTE, *Tableau des services obituaires assurés par les abbayes de Saint-Evroul et de Jumièges*, «Revue Mabillon», 46 (1956), 141-88, at p. 173.

⁶¹ MÈNAGER, *Les Fondations*, pp. 40-44.

⁶² For the half share of Venosa see HOUBEN, *Die Abtei Venosa*, pp. 254-56, no. 21. For the Ascoli Satriano grants, see HOUBEN, *Die Abtei Venosa*, p. 207. The half-share of Ascoli Satriano was granted by Guiscards's widow, Sichelaita, and son, Roger Borsa in 1088. HOUBEN, *Die Abtei Venosa*, pp. 284-87 no. 54.

⁶³ LOUD, *Latin Church*, p. 90.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 90. HOUBEN, *Die Abtei Venosa*, p. 245 no. 12 (1064), pp. 266-68 no. 13 (1066), pp. 256-57 no. 22 (1075), pp. 259-60 no. 25 (1077), pp. 260-61 no. 27 (1077x78), p. 263 no. 30 (1078), pp. 264-66 no. 32 (1080), pp. 269-70 no. 37 (1081), p. 282 no. 52 (1086), pp. 291-93 nos 58-59 (1089), p. 296 no. 63 (1092), pp. 298-99 no. 66 (1093), pp. 320-22 nos 86-87 (1105, 1108), pp. 331-34 nos 96-97 (1118).

⁶⁵ HOUBEN, *Die Abtei Venosa*, p. 277-79 no. 47.

⁶⁶ HOUBEN, *Die Abtei Venosa*, p. 212, fig. 3; MÈNAGER, *Les Fondations*, pp. 40-44.

⁶⁷ HOUBEN, *Die Abtei Venosa*, pp. 145, 288-91 no. 57.

⁶⁸ H. HOUBEN, *La «Passio SS. Senatoris, Viatoris, Cassiodoris et Dominatae»: un esempio per traduzioni dal greco in latino a Montecassino nel sec. XI*, in *Tra Roma e Palermo Aspetti e momenti del Mezzogiorno medievale*, Galatina, 1989, pp. 142-44.

⁶⁹ ROACH, *Saint-Évroul and Southern Italy*, pp. 94-97.

⁷⁰ *Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, IV, pp. 68-70.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, IV, pp. 70-72.

⁷² ROZIER et al, *Orderic Vitalis: Life, Works and Interpretations*, p. xiv. The account of the translation of St Nicholas is in book VII of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

⁷³ ROACH, *Saint-Évroul and Southern Italy*, pp. 96-99.

⁷⁴ HOUBEN, *Il 'libro del capitolo' del monastero della SS. Trinità di Venosa (Cod. Casin. 334): una testimonianza del Mezzogiorno normanno*, Galatina, 1984, pp. 37-39.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 39-42.

⁷⁶ MÈNAGER *Les Fondations*, pp. 49-51. For an overview of a confusing period see HOUBEN, *Die Abtei Venosa*, pp. 148-53.

⁷⁷ HOUBEN, *Il 'libro del capitolo'*, p. 41.

⁷⁸ HOUBEN, *Medievo Monastico Meridionale*, Napoli, 1987 p. 95.

⁷⁹ HOUBEN, *Die Abtei Venosa*, pp. 154-57.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 439; 'non solum in temporalibus sed etiam in spiritualibus summe intelligentia cellebat doctus ut sapiens et in divinis et humanis legibus famosissimus'.

⁸¹ LOUD, *Latin Church*, p. 463.

⁸² HOUBEN, *Die Abtei Venosa*, p. 440.

⁸³ HOUBEN, *Ibid.*, pp. 170-71.

⁸⁴ HERKLOTZ, 'Sepulcra' e 'Monumenta', pp. 76-77.

⁸⁵ MÈNAGER, *Les Fondations*, p. 91.

⁸⁶ MÈNAGER, *Les Fondations*, p. 92.

⁸⁷ G. LOUD, *The Age of Robert Guiscard*, Harlow, 2000, p. 223.

⁸⁸ WILLIAM OF APULIA <https://ims.leeds.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/29/2019/02/William-of-Apulia.pdf> [accessed 13 December 2020]. p. 67.

⁸⁹ HERKLOTZ, 'Sepulcra' e 'Monumenta', p. 86.

⁹⁰ BELLI D'ELIA and GELAO, *La cattedrale di Acerenza*, p. 21.

⁹¹ C. FONSECA, *L'organizzazione ecclesiastica dell'Italia meridionale tra l'XI e il XII secolo. I nuovi assetti istituzionale in Le Istituzioni ecclesiastiche della 'Societas Christiana' dei secoli XI e XII*, Mendola 1977, 334-45.

⁹² BELLI D'ELIA and GELAO, *La cattedrale di Acerenza*, pp. 21-23. H. HOUBEN, *Il papato, i Normanni e la nuova organizzazione ecclesiastica della Puglia e della Basilicata*, repr. in idem, *Tra Roma, e Palermo*, Galatina, 1989, pp. 121-35.

⁹³ '1080: Inventum est corpus beati Canonis in Acheruntinia ab Arnaldo archiepiscopo, et idem archiepiscopus construere coepit novum episcopium, id est ecclesiam sanctae Dei matris Marie.' LUPUS PROTOSPATARIUS, *Annales 855-1102*, ed., G.H. Pertz, in MGH SS, 5 (1844), p. 60.

⁹⁴ '1090: mense Augusti Acheruntia cremata est a se ipsa'. Ibid., p. 62.

⁹⁵ BELLI D'ELIA and GELAO, *La cattedrale di Acerenza*, pp. 29.

⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 92.

⁹⁷ Until a reliable catalogue is compiled, the best account, albeit one confined to examples in France, can be found under the entry for 'Griffe' in E. VIOLLET-LE-DUC, *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XIe au XVIe siècle*, Paris 1875, VI, pp. 47-52. On northern Italy, see the remarks in G. RIVOIRA, *Le origini della architettura lombarda*, Rome 1907, II, pp. 635-40.

⁹⁸ See, for example, S. RIGOLD, *Romanesque Bases, in and south-east of the Limestone Belt*, in *Ancient Monuments and their Interpretation: Essays presented to A.J. Taylor*, Chichester 1977, pp. 99-138. This is the most searching analysis of Romanesque bases in England published in the last 50 years, and yet the bases examined are almost exclusively seen as profiles.

⁹⁹ For Cavagnolo, see M. VESCOVI, *Transregional Dynamics, Monastic Networks: Santa Fede In Cavagnolo, Conques, and the Geography of Romanesque Art in The Regional and Transregional in European Romanesque*, ed., J. McNeill and R. Plant (forthcoming). For problems in dating the Lombard buildings see, C. TOSCO, *Arthur Kingsley Porter e la storia dell'architettura lombarda*, «Arte Lombarda» 112 (1995), pp. 74-84. For Rivolta d'Adda, see G. MILANESI, *Romanico Cremonese*, Mantova 2018, pp. 227-47.

¹⁰⁰ Spur bases have been found in excavation from the crossing and north nave arcade at Bath. The creation of a cathedral priory at Bath came about after King William Rufus (1087-1100) gave Bath Abbey to Bishop John of Tours (1088-1122). John of Tours then replaced the earlier building with a new church, but though this is recorded as being under construction in 1106 it is not known when work started. P. DAVENPORT, *The Cathedral Priory Church at Bath in The Archaeology of Cathedrals*, ed., T. Tatton-Brown and J. Munby, pp. 19-30.

¹⁰¹ My thanks to Richard Gem for discussion on this point. R. GEM, *The Patronage of Earl Roger and Countess Adalais: Much Wenlock Priory, Shrewsbury Abbey and Quatford College, c. 1070 to c. 1094/1102 in Medieval Art, Architecture and Archaeology in Shrewsbury and Central Shropshire*, ed., J. McNeill and E. New (forthcoming). Construction of the new abbey was entrusted to two monks from the abbey of St-Martin at Sées in southern Normandy.

¹⁰² I am very grateful to Richard Gem for drawing this to my attention. S. HARRISON, *The Romanesque western bays of Lincoln Cathedral nave and their relationship to the west front reconsidered*, in *A Medieval Legacy*, ed., J. Mace, Toronto 2020, Fig. 24, p. 192. Lincoln Cathedral was not begun until after the diocesan seat was moved from Dorchester to Lincoln in 1072. The base can be matched to the 11th-century nave piers and so will not be from the later phases of a building reportedly complete in 1092.

¹⁰³ BAYLÉ, *Sculpture romane en Normandie*, p. 177.

¹⁰⁴ See E. VERGNOLLE, *Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire : L'Abbatiale Romane*, Paris 2018, pp. 180-236, and figs 327, 329, 338 and 365. Another striking early example of the use of spur bases is the crypt at Saint-Aignan-sur-Cher (Loir-et-Cher). M. BAYLÉ, *Saint-Aignan-sur-Cher*, «Congrès archéologique de France», 139 (Blésois et Vendômois), Paris 1986, pp. 310-33.

¹⁰⁵ Spur bases are used throughout the Bau II campaigns at Speyer Cathedral, but as the double chapel built in the exterior angle between the south nave aisle and south transept was built before the recladding of the transept exterior, it is probably no later than c. 1080.

¹⁰⁶ J. BETTEY, *The Benedictine Foundation and Monastic Life*, in *Tewkesbury Abbey: History, Art and Architecture*, ed., R.K. Morris and R. Shoesmith, Logaston 2003, pp. 41-52.

¹⁰⁷ A new suite of radiating chapels was constructed and the ambulatory and presbytery aisles vaulted between c. 1315 and c. 1328. Tewkesbury's Romanesque elevation was unusual, however, and combined the arcade and gallery within a giant order. This entailed springing the arcade, and any arches which extended across the aisles and ambulatory, from a collar capital. Responds on the aisle side survive for the straight bays, but the piers are plain cylinders. There is insufficient evidence to determine whether the 11th-century aisles were vaulted and a case has been made for a wooden-floored gallery. The existence of aisle responds, however, demonstrates that even with a wooden gallery floor, transverse arches will have connected the apse arcade with the outer walls. R. MORRIS, *The Gothic Church: Architectural History*, in *Tewkesbury Abbey: History, Art and Architecture*, pp. 117-18. For a summary of views on the 11th-century form of Tewkesbury's east end, see E. FERNIE, *The Architecture of Norman England*, Oxford 2000, pp. 160-65.

¹⁰⁸ WILSON, *Abbot Serlo's Church at Gloucester*, pp. 53-54.

¹⁰⁹ J. GREEN, 'Robert fitz Haimo', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford 2004), online edition (odnb/9596), [accessed 30 December, 2020]. It may be significant that Gerald's original patron, Hugh, earl of Chester, favoured St-Évroul, and sent his illegitimate son, Robert, to train as a monk there. C.P. LEWIS, 'Avranches, Hugh d', first earl of Chester', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford 2004), online edition (odnb/14056), accessed 30 December, 2020

¹¹⁰ W. DUGDALE, *Monasticum Anglicanum*, ed. J. Caley et al, London 1817-30, II, p. 60. The passage is a transcription of a late medieval Tewkesbury chronicle in the British Library; MS Cotton Cleopatra C.III. Sybil's role in petitioning her husband to found the monastery at Tewkesbury is repeated in a second Tewkesbury manuscript; Oxford, Bodleian MS Top. Glouc. d.2. See J. LUXFORD, *The Founders' Book*, in *Tewkesbury Abbey: History, Art and Architecture*, ed., R.K. Morris and R. Shoesmith, Logaston 2003, p. 57.

¹¹¹ Unfortunately, there is insufficient secure archaeological evidence to reconstruct the east end plan of Shrewsbury Abbey, though it is another late 11th-century Anglo-Norman monastic church where a short presbytery and ambulatory with three radiating chapels is compatible with what is known. GEM, *The Patronage of Earl Roger*, fig. 9.

¹¹² GEM, *The Patronage of Earl Roger*, p. ?? (forthcoming).

¹¹³ For the full account of the foundation of Shrewsbury Abbey, see *Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, III, 142-51.

¹¹⁴ *Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, II, 46-49, and Apdx I, 362-65. A brother of Mabel became a monk at St-Martin.

¹¹⁵ The two Benedictine abbeys Arnold favoured with donations, SS Trinità at Venosa and San Lorenzo at Aversa, were both staffed with Norman monastic communities. BELLI D'ELIA and GELAO, *La cattedrale di Acerenza*, pp. 26-28.

¹¹⁶ A-S VIGOT, *Archaeological Investigations at the Abbey of Saint-Evroult-Notre-Dame-des-Bois*. in *Orderic Vitalis: Life, works and interpretations*, ed., ROZIER et al., Woodbridge 2016, pp.375-84.

¹¹⁷ For Jumièges, see M. BAYLÉ, *L'architecture normande au Moyen Age*, Caen 2001, II, pp. 32-36. For Mont-Saint-Michel, J. VALLERY-RADOT, *La crypte du chœur roman de l'abbatiale du Mont-Saint-Michel*, «Bulletin de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France» (1965), pp. 70-77; J. CHAZELAS, *Fouilles faites dans l'église Saint-Pierre de Saint-Wandrille en 1938*, «Bulletin de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France» (1965); G. LANFRY, *La cathédrale dans la cité romaine et la Normandie ducal de Rouen*, Rouen 1956, pp. 20-36. The 11th-century crypt of Rouen cathedral was partially razed and filled in during the building of the present choir, leaving no trace of the east end it supported.

¹¹⁸ The view was taken from the east and shows a Romanesque church with a central tower and two-storeyed transepts without projecting chapels; the roof lines of the east arm are depicted and suggest a central vessel with flanking aisles but no more. M. GERMAIN, *Monasticon Gallicanum*, ed. M. Peigné-Delacourt, Paris 1870-71, II, pl. 132.

¹¹⁹ M. CHIBNALL, 'Geoffrey (d. 1093), bishop of Coutances', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford 2004), online edition (odnb/10528), [accessed 31 December, 2020].

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ For a plan, see M. DEYRES, *Maine Roman*, La Pierre-qui-Vire 1985, p. 224.

¹²² Quoted from Hugh of Kirkstall's account of the foundation of Fountains Abbey. W. WALBRAN, *Memorials of the Abbey of St Mary of Fountains*, Durham 1862, I, pp. 46-47.

¹²³ For Salerno, see P. Delogu, *Mito di una città meridionale (Salerno secoli VIII-XI)*, Napoli 1977, and the remarks in V. Pace, *La cattedrale di Salerno: Committenza, programma e valenze ideologiche di un monumento di fine XI secolo nell'Italia meridionale*, in *Desiderio di Montecassino e l'arte della riforma gregoriana*, ed., F. Aceto, Montecassino 1997, pp. 189-230. On Bari, see ?????

¹²⁴ See, for example, the discussion of the Norman patronage of the pre-Norman monasteries of Cava, Santa Sophia at Benevento, or Santa Maria on the Tremiti islands. LOUD, *Latin Church*, pp. 92-94.

¹²⁵ On the nave see S. CALDANO, *Il cantiere medievale della cattedrale di Acerenza: alcune osservazioni sulla prassi costruttiva*, in *Le diocesi dell'Italia meridionale nel medioevo*, ed., M. Rossi and V. De Duonni, pp. 237-46. I am very grateful to Dr Caldano for sending me a copy of his article.