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SAINT MARTIAL OF LIMOGES AND THE MAKING OF A SAINT

Claude Andrault-Schmitt

The purpose of this paper is to comment on the case of St Martial in Limoges, an understanding of which should be refreshed by discussion arising from the recent archaeological campaigns. In 2019, it appears more clearly than ever that the church dedicated to the Saviour was only one of the buildings in a complex that demonstrated that this really was the burial site of the saint. While the Carolingian period seems decisive, various layouts were created between the 3rd and the 18th century, so forming a continuous Christian memory. A principle of accumulation derived from legendary cults affected the funerary furniture and consequently the building sequence. This paper discusses the lost main church as both a building of the supposed ‘Pilgrimage roads’ as well as in its regional Romanesque context.

THE LOST ABBEY CHURCH

The design of the Romanesque church of St Martial consisted of an ambulatory with five radiating chapels; two aisled transept arms made short by the presence of small churches to the north, with an apse on each transept; numerous nave bays, with upper galleries, and a western tower that was heightened with picturesque gables.1 On its northern side, it was completed by a beautiful Gothic cloister and its ranges.

Despite being entirely demolished, the building can be analysed thanks to numerous and remarkable 18th century drawings: first, the ‘plan Legros’ of 1784 (Figure 9.1), which is very useful for the structure and the liturgical functions, but misleading for the axis and dimensions; second, an unexpected cross-section which also represents the ornament of a principal shrine, drawn in 1726 (Figure 9.2).2 We have also a view of the apse. But we must place in the first rank the plan produced in 1765 by Trésaguet, a town-planner.3 These drawings, especially the dimensions included in its minutes, were made in the according to modern requirements with an attitude informed by the Enlightenment (Figure 9.3). Their dimensions, their layout, and their axes are very reliable, as was demonstrated by the recent excavations of 2012–17.4 The scale, however, is that of the entire town, and therefore the brief 1960s excavations and plans focused rather on Canon Legros’ work.5

I would only retain a few dates of those cited concerning the Romanesque building sequence. Some facts do not deserve to be repeated here, such as the fires in 1043, 1053, 1060, 1122–23, 1167: these sorts of events, as many know, are generally overestimated in their importance. In 1018–30, a cult for Martiali primo Galliarum patroni;6 or Martial as an Apostle, was promoted through all possible media. According to the musicologist James Grier, the most important event of this period was ‘an outrageous ecclesiastical fraud’.7 On 3 August 1029, the monks of St Martial inaugurated in the cathedral St Etienne a new liturgy proclaiming their patron a 1st-century saint, intimate of Christ, and also the first of the evangelising bishops.8 The author of the texts was Ademar de Chabannes.9 This historian, musician, draughtsman, well known as a forger, was a traveller-monk who lived more or less less under the obedience of the abbots Geoffrey († 1019), Hugo († 1025 ?) and Odolric († 1040). Alain Dierkens considers that Ademar had inherited his ideas from his uncle ‘Roger the cantor’ and took up the tradition of the scriptorium. The polemical liturgical compositions correspond to the writing of the Vita prolxiior Martialis secunda (also by Ademar) and to a new mise-en-scène of the tomb in the abbey. This was placed beyond the western end of the little church of St Pierre (to the north of the great church), the dedication of which reminds us that Peter was reputed to be Martial’s mentor and cousin. Consequently, we must be interested in this little church and its western Sepulchre, the remains of which can be seen today inside an archaeological crypt, as much as in the beginnings of the Romanesque abbey church. Most likely the connection between the burial place and the Romanesque ambulatory were planned at the same time, because Ademar de Chabannes also reported that between 1017 and 1021 the abbots ordered a sumptuous new building: a novo basilicam Salvatoris magnifico opere instauravit.10 The work began
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Limoges: St Martial, plan by Legros (1784)
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Limoges: St Martial, Tressaguet plan; arch. dép., C 65 (Arch. dép.)
just after a journey by the relics of St Martial to celebrate
the discovery of St John’s head at St Jean d’Angely11 and
after the death of more than 50 pilgrims at Limoges inside
a church supposedly too narrow to accommodate them.
Whenever the fabric was begun, it is absolutely cer-
tain that a dedicatio took place on 19 November 1028:
fece dedicare caput istius ecclesie cum magno honore.12
The ceremony was celebrated by eleven bishops: from
Bordeaux, Limoges, Poitiers, Angoulême, Périgueux,
Gérone, Cahors, Albi, Rodez, Carcassonne, and Saintes.
The saint was then ‘elevated’ but he returned to his
‘proper’ sepulchre after eight days.13 It is interesting to
note that the event seemed significant enough to enter as
a day of celebration in a later obituary list before being
suppressed by Cluny.14 It was roughly contemporary to
the writing of a new and longer Vita, to the introduction
of the new liturgy, to the gathering of synods to proclaim
Martial’s apostolic status,15 and to the foundation of an
altar of St Martial in St Peter’s in Rome by John XIX.16
Nevertheless, we must conclude that Ademar’s tactics
failed partly because he was forced to return to his proper
abbey in Angoulême and then to leave for Jerusalem,
where he died. Most of his letters and sermons ‘were left
in his habit’ and not widely published.17 Fortunately, the
architectural consequences were durable.
Half a century later, in 1063, when Cluny violently
annexed St Martial,18 a marble altar bought at Narbonne
by Odolric was supposedly left outside, waiting for its
proper place. The first Cluniac abbot, the Limousin Ade-
mar de Laurière,19 completed the building between
proper place. The first Cluniac abbot, the Limousin Ade-
mar de Laurière,19 completed the building between
-the main archaeological surprises open up larger subjects
than the architecture of the abbey church itself.

THE SINGULARITY: A MISE-EN-SCÈNE
OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY WITH
SEVERAL MAUSOLEA

As one of the two medieval towns of Limoges (the other
was La Cité around the cathedral), Le Château was sur-
rounded by its own walls (Figure 9.4), which included
a Carolingian palace in the higher area and a religious
community in the lower one. In this lower part, at the
edge of the Place de la République, archaeologists have
recently cleaned the archaeological crypt arranged in the
1960s, studied the oldest and unknown remains of the lit-
ttle northern churches, found some other early Christian
graves, and offered a new historical survey. They have
also begun to propose an extensive interpretation of the
urban fabric, up to then poorly understood. Unfortu-
nately, the doors, stairs, and all connections between the
small northern churches and the huge pilgrimage church
were not found. But it is certain that these older build-
ings, which were modernised from century to century,
explain some of the features of the Romanesque church:
first of all the size of the crossing and the shortness of the
transept.

South: a mausoleum to diversify
the relic cult

At least three mausolea seemed to have crystallised the
relic cult.22 This part of Limoges was mostly a necropolis.
The recent Carbon 14 dating for one of the tombs to 253
AD is earlier than the usual estimate. However, contrary to
what has previously been thought, the place was not only
a funerary area during the first millennium; it was also
more or less densely urbanised.

Concerning the south section of the neighbourhood,
more than 200 sarcophagi were found in 2012, which
must be added to the 150 unearthed in 1892. Funerary
practices are testified until the beginning of the Roman-
esque period, in spite of an interruption lasting the whole
of the 9th century. Fortuitously, a little building has been
discovered under a shop, 70m from the abbey church.23
It corresponds to a chapel recognised in old town maps
as Sainte-Marie-de-la-Courtine, which belonged to the
abbey and was razed to the ground in 1742. In the 12th
century, this church was supposed to shelter the grave of
the architect of the tomb of St Martial, Amasius, but the
cult of the Virgin later prevailed.24 It initially had a central-
sised square design and was built as a funerary spot. Then
(c. 400–550) it was Christianised, housing a favoured
grave, painted, with stone vaults, and two or three apses
(north, south, west). It was extended to the east and con-
verted into a church c. 600 (the same period as the Roman
Pantheon was converted into Sancta Maria ad Martyres); at
that time the south and north apses were removed.

North: St Pierre as the first basilica joined to
the apostolic mausoleum

Against the north end of the Romanesque transept, which
consequently received an oblique north wall, we can still
recognise St Pierre du Sepulcre also called the Basse-
Eglise (Low Church). This was actually the basilica
described by Gregory of Tours. The church was first built
with a square chevet and was initially separated from the
mausoleum by an atrium (perhaps as a recollection of Jeru-
salem). Beyond the atrium, the western part of the Low
Church was shaped like a double or triple cave, and was
from an early date (c. 680) named domuncula, ‘the little
house’ (Figure 9.1).25 Legendary sources said that it was
required to house the grave paid for by Valeria and pre-
pared for herself and the famous bishop she had assisted.
St Valeria was a rich friend of Martial and a decapitated
martyr, invented in the Carolingian Vita antiquior of Mar-
tial (c. 850), whose ‘ring’ would help to make Richard
the Lion-Heart a duke of Aquitaine. The funerary spot assigned to Valeria (and consequently to Martial) was probably located in this same place 150 years at least after the historical death of Martial; the cult of Martial existed in 572 among a community of priests. The whole church including the atrium and the mausoleum was possibly built by Bishop Rurice I (c. 480-after 506), but the main sarcophagi had been moved earlier.

In this section of Le Château, the funerary practices stopped as early as the 8th century. In c. 974, the Sepulchre was supposedly destroyed by a fire. At the beginning of the 11th century, possibly in accordance with the acts and texts by Ademar, the site where Martial was evoked was adorned with a hanging crown made of gems and gold (which has disappeared) and with an authentication carved recto-verso on a pink marble slab (which has been rediscovered) (Figure 9.5). Nearby an unexpected mosaic (two birds and a vase) was found in the 1960s (Figure 9.6). In 1220, 195 painted golden stars were ordered for the blue vault of the Sepulchre by the chronicler, cantor and armarius Bernard Itier. It seems that the aedicule had for a long time the title cripta aurea, either because it was the funeral spot of several saints with rich liturgical furniture or because it was used as a treasury – which reminds us of a sermon by Ademar, who justified the use of jewels by saying they signified spiritual wisdom, eloquence, and virtue. In the 17th and 18th centuries, this section was still called ‘the Sepulchre cave’ or ‘the sacred Sepulchre of St Martial which is closed by an iron door and is vaulted’. As an 18th-century account has it: ‘At the end of the crossing [of the Saviour church] on the left is a staircase to go down to two big chapels parallel to the great church. In the first one we will find tunnels where one finds the tomb of the famous Limousin Apostle’. The ceremonial recorded just before the French Revolution for the Ostensions included the place where the pilgrims used to kiss the relics of St Martial’s arm, which was always kept inside a cupboard in the domuncula. The durability of the cult practices is therefore remarkable. From 1028 to the razing of the churches, a complex route enabled pilgrims to go down to some surviving half-buried buildings which the monks left visible as a demonstration of the authenticity of the saint’s grave.

St Pierre was filled with sarcophagi made from granite which corresponded to the various burials ad sanctos. One of them was said to be the sarcophagus of Valeria (near and opposite to the supposed Martial tomb), two others of the bishop’s two companions. The bigger one (now in the
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Limoges: Museum, authentication slab (CIFM, Poitiers)
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Limoges: St Pierre du Sépulcre, mausoleum (Claude Andrault-Schmitt)
museum) was in the west niche of the west cave; it was that of the legendary Duke of Aquitaine, the pagan fiancé of Valeria. The numerous early medieval sarcophagi that were clustered there increased the drama of the site. The most ancient are monolithic and very big (almost 3 metres long); intended, perhaps, to impress the pilgrims (as what is bigger is older?). Interestingly enough, the earliest sources report that it was very difficult to distinguish the Apostle’s grave from those of his two fellow priests in the narrow space, and that nobody could lean over far enough to light a candle on the proper stone lid.

Archaeologists now consider that this mausoleum has never been studied in a proper fashion, and, moreover, that dating is impossible because of the numerous reorganisations, century after century. But they have discovered another amazing funerary space at the opposite, east, end of St Pierre. A sarcophagus had been integrated in the masonry of the apse that replaced the earlier square chevet. Then it was encased in a sarcophagus made of four limestone blocks cramped together, which itself contained pieces of a lead coffin and an empty sarcophagus-shaped reliquary: a cenotaph made like a Russian doll!

The axial sarcophagus was flanked by two later sarcophagi. The southern one is well-dated to between 602 and 674. Was this the grave of saint Loup († 634), a bishop still venerated every seven years during the famous Ostensions in Limoges? There is no doubt that an accumulation principle was at work here. The cults of local and legendary saints who were neither Martial nor Valeria reinforced the sanctity of the famous pair and promoted urban patriotism.

**Centre: a surprising mausoleum at the heart of the Romanesque Church**

To further complicate the questions, the latest clearance unearthed a fascinating building under the basilica of the Saviour itself. It is important before proceeding to note that unlike the *pars orientalis*, the crossing and the nave of the main church are very difficult to grasp, because of the deep cutting works for the theatre and because of the many earlier walls.

Lying directly beneath the crossing was a half-buried building with a western apse, each cut-off corner featuring a cruciform recess (Figure 9.7). At its exact central point is a well, far too deep to be investigated, that might give a key to the interpretation of the Romanesque geometry. Its dating is between the 7th century and that of the Romanesque foundations. Unfortunately, its eastern parts are lost, so we can understand neither its connection to the presbytery nor the different ground levels: were the levels of the Romanesque crossing and main apse raised by this strange crypt?

Other questions arise. Did the cruciform recesses symbolise the cult of the true Cross, which was favoured by the Carolingian kings? Was the central mausoleum contemporary to the donations by Louis the Pious and Charles the Bald? It is necessary here to recall the importance of the Carolingian princes for Limoges. These princes conferred the title of ‘Royal Basilica’ on the church. Louis the Pious, king of Aquitaine as a child (781) before becoming emperor, was supposedly present at the dedication and the transfer of Martial’s body in the 830s; he had previously signed a diploma in the ‘monastery of St Martial’, as early as 828.

As for Charles the Bald, he crowned his son Charles the Child in the basilica called *St Sophia* or *St Saviour* in 855 as the king of Aquitaine. The Carolingian guardianship was still powerful under Louis IV d’Outremer and until the year 994, when the new patron, the duke of Aquitaine, asked Abbot Uzerche and some of his monks to rule the abbey.

Should we identify the excavated central spot with a ‘crypt’ behind the high altar in which the body was placed during that period according to Ademar? Was it the ‘new sepulchrum’ he alluded to several times? Ademar said that this *sepulchrum* was planned just before the removal of the relics to Solignac (Haute-Vienne) to escape the Normans (845–51). He added that Martial did not want to stay in this new place, an opinion he expressed through imposing a cold winter and torrential rains. The loquacious monk tells us that *in Francia* the weather became fine again, but that *in Aquitania* the rain did not stop until Martial was returned to his former place. Ademar displayed in his first written works the stubborn determination to justify the principles he acted on during his whole life. He later wrote: ‘we kept the body of our great patron hidden elsewhere than desired by God’s will’.

**THE ARCHETYPE: A ‘PILGRIMAGE CHURCH’?**

The archaeological discoveries: the Carolingian precedent and the ambulatory foundations

The ‘royal’ Carolingian basilica was set out under the Romanesque church between Ste Marie and St Pierre,
nearer St Pierre of course. Some substructures may correspond more or less to the 830s building reported in the textual sources. However, it is difficult to evaluate accurately not only the masonry remains, but also the dating of the main events: it is impossible to distinguish between the first appearance of a basilica dedicated (or not) to the Saviour (830–2) and the adoption of the Benedictine rule in 848. It is certain that the prejudice against simple priests (identified as canons) fits with the ‘reform’ promoted by Louis the Pious and Benedict of Aniane, but the application of the label Benedictine by medieval historians seems a little anachronistic and biased.

The first relevant structure found by the archaeological team under the church of the Saviour was converted into a church (if it was not already a church) with a half-buried polygonal central mausoleum and a proper chevet, probably during the 9th century. This credibly Carolingian church seems to have been surrounded by new houses and streets. The ground between it and St Pierre was left largely open,41 with several tombs and another well, later encased in the Romanesque church. A few years later the nave foundations were reinforced, two aisles were built, and the access to the central mausoleum was altered. Still later, one of the Carolingian walls was strengthened so as to form a grid to support the eastern aisle of a north transept (Figure 9.8). All these sequences are very intricate and difficult to apprehend, apart from a sequence in the 10th century with pits to melt metal and glass against the mausoleum, which gives some chronological insights.

Concerning the eastern arm of the Romanesque church, partly unearthed, as I have said the Trésaguet drawings are accurate. The geometry of the ambulatory and its radial chapels was perfect, as if drawn with a compass. The church caput was freely planned on a completely razed section of land, and suggests a dating in the early 11th century – with the same design as at Orléans (St Aignan) or Tours (St Martin).

The surprise came from the foundations which stand to a considerable height, more than 4 metres under the supposed medieval ground level. The masons dug down as far as the bedrock, which was very deep because of the natural slope. This was not in order to plan a crypt, because afterwards they filled up the excavation with the material removed; there are no windows but only putlog holes (Figures 9.9 and 9.10). Given these observations,
the high quality of the masonry is quite amazing. There is coursed rubble with ashlar dressing, Roman spolia, reused coloured stones and stained concrete, perfect covering joints and ‘buttered’ joints to protect the walls from dampness: all sophistications which are unexpected when found under the ground. In spite of the lack of definitive evidence, the features suggest an undertaking of the period of Ademar, and represent a building of unexpected ambition.

It is likely that the new chevet and its ambulatory extended far beyond the Carolingian nave, the half-buried mausoleum and a related broad transept built largely before the 1020s to join the abbey church to St Pierre. Its later extension by a new nave suited to its dimensions remains unclear. The elevation opens up the same questions as those for Conques: the galleries and vaults probably belong to a later phase (after the 1043 fire?). These points will never be clarified. Let us now, then, comment on the entire church as finished at the end of the 11th century, as it was seen by the Galician bishop Diego Gelmirez during his trip to Limoges.

The Romanesque church as part of a series?

Without any doubt, the scheme belongs to a series of buildings improperly called ‘pilgrimage churches’ (Tours, Limoges, Conques, Toulouse, Compostella). The formula assigns six structural features, all of which are present in those five churches and only those five: an ambulatory with five radiating chapels; an uninterrupted set of aisles; upper galleries, also uninterrupted except inside the apse; no clerestory; a barrel vault for the main nave; a round-headed design for all the arches and vaults.

I don’t want to comment on this much-discussed concept, which is now recognized as a specious and outdated construction, and I will confine myself to mention two points. Firstly, the building series and the famous Liber sancti Jacobi must be disconnected, because this part of the codex also praised St Eutrope at Saintes, St Hilaire at Poitiers, and St Gilles-du-Gard, which are very differently shaped, and above all because the author avoided a stage at St Martial and preferred St Leonard-de-Noblat (maybe he hated Cluniac monks!). Secondly, an intentional type would imply that the builders were obsessed by a Compostellan model and wished to pre-figure it at earlier points on the route to Santiago. But the truth is that the five churches were more or less contemporary, and that the Spanish example was not the first, but the last to use the ambulatory system. The exchanges and filiations are now considered as complex, often in a two-way process: three of these cases were built in two separate campaigns at least (Limoges, Conques, and Tours). Actually, the upper levels, which have disappeared at Tours and Limoges, raise the most crucial questions. But what distinguishes St Martial from its sister churches are its short and wide transept arms. That is precisely the consequence of the first campaign, when the monks wished to visualise either the reliquaries on the altar or the sarcophagus in its ’proper’ place.

Cult practices and the question of the reliquaries

Can the architectural points be enlightened by what we know about the liturgy and the shrines? Sometimes, at pilgrimage sites, the remains of the saints had been forgotten. This was not the case in Limoges, where the relics as well as the sarcophagus were known without a break until the French Revolution, even if the grave had probably been cleared out and the saint dismembered to fill reliquaries. The sequence of this story is surprisingly well-recorded. Nevertheless, it remains a little bit contradictory; obviously, mystery was required to preserve the myth of the saint’s presence in several sacred spots – and also to manage the discovery of relics!
In 974 a golden seated statue of the saint was made, which was converted 20 years later into a reliquary, either for the head or for the entire body – it is not clear. It was as precious as the two famous contemporary golden altarfrontals, one for the sepulchre, one for the abbey church. This transformation was contemporary with the building works, but the making of another container was probably necessary for the relics to travel, for example to honour the invention of the head of St John the Baptist at St Jean d’Angely. In 1028, during the dedicatio, it seems that the body was once more brought up, and ab initio sepultum jacet.46

One century later, c. 1130, the head of Martial was ceremoniously recognised behind the altar, and was put inside a golden reliquary (the entire body was henceforth forgotten).47 But once more it is suggested that ‘the saint was put again in his tomb’. Some trips were still organised with little bits of relic to help other monks: to Grandmont for example, so as to solemnise the church at its consecration on 4 September 1166. Most of the precious reliquaries and altarfrontals disappeared in the plundering by the Young King in 1183, but the old urna aurea sancti Martialis, which was by then only used to collect alms, was still mentioned in 1207 when a sapphire was given. In 1211 the capsula was replaced by a new work, possibly made by the goldsmith Chatard who also promised to give a gold Eucharistic chalice. It is supposed that it was a large sarcophagus-shaped one (like the contemporary shrines from Agaune), because the silver plates with gilt reliefs of the Apostles were reused in the 17th century.48 The relics were solemnly displayed to the faithful in the shrine, while the old one served to gather alms. It is interesting to note that the new reliquary was itself soon emptied; the Apostle’s head was usually sheltered in another saint’s reliquary.

Obviously the monks needed to reinvent their relics to imitate other pilgrimage sites and to give a greater fame to their Apostle. These ceremonial events are sometimes numbered under the title inventio by the chroniclers in an impenetrable chronological system: in a way they represent the first Ostensions which are still popular and held every seven years.

ST MARTIAL’S ARCHITECTURAL SCHEME AS A MODEL IN THE DIOCESE?

Beyond the multiplication of the funerary spots, another singularity must be pointed out: the St Martial type is isolated in the Romanesque landscape of the Limousin. For example, the pattern of the gallery level had absolutely no success in the area, nor the piers with four half columns, or, indeed, some other salient features.

Ambulatories as an early trend in the Romanesque region

Ambulatories are very numerous in the Limousin. In this context, it is impossible to prove that the St Martial design had an influence on the other cases. Toulux Ste Croix49 and Chambon-sur-Voueize50 are daughters of St Martial: at Toulux the Apostle is said to have begun his preaching journey; at Chambon St Valeria’s head was kept and venerated. However, two other ambulatories can be added to St Martial and Toulux from the early 11th century, which have neither religious nor formal connections with the church of the Saviour: the crypt ambulatory of the cathedral of Limoges (very difficult to grasp) and the double-level ambulatory at Uzerche51 (Figure 9.11), which is the best preserved and most interesting, but which is also a building which did not house any kind of saint’s cult!

We must conclude that the ambulatory system was fashionable, and that at least five of them were built more or less contemporary to the well-known examples of Tournus, Auxerre, Chartres, Orléans, and Tours before the 1040s: in the cathedral, St Martial, Uzerche, Toulux, and Chambon.52 This background makes any accurate relative dating very difficult.

How, then, did monks and canons formulate architectural strategies to make a Limousin saint? Was St Martial a model for emulation during the 12th century?

Le Dorat: an ambulatory to forge saints by suggesting pilgrimage

As with St Pierre at Uzerche, Le Dorat housed no famous saints. The church was set in a little town with trade fairs and a college of secular canons which flourished near the castrum of the count de La Marche. To increase the attractiveness of their church, the canons decided to proclaim
that two earlier members of their community were saints: Israël († 1014) and Théobald († 1070), who are now the subjects of famous and very kitsch Ostensions. It is important to note that the two priests are not cited as saints before the 14th century. However, it is generally said that an elevation of relics took place in December 1130 after being prepared for by two short vitae that included miracles, but the liturgical sources in which we find celebrations of their cults date from 1614 and 1639; so we have to contemplate a single oral tradition. Given the weakness of the case for sanctity, it is likely that the architectural choices were at the heart of the matter.

It seemed necessary to build (c. 1130) two ambulatories, one around a large new crypt, the other in the church above it. The canons set in the crypt two stone reliquaries (less long than true sarcophagi), each of them raised on two piers and initially closed by iron bands – now the only evidence of the 12th-century strategy to create saints. Other features connect the building and the pilgrimage church type. For example, the piers with one semi-column only (towards the middle of the nave) are more similar to those at Toulouse than those at Limoges (Figure 9.12). Above all one can admire the high crossing tower, which is a lantern tower that can be identified from afar, thanks to its height and its golden angel.

St Léonard-de-Noblat: a quotation of St Martial’s Storeys?

As mentioned, the author of the Liber Jacobi preferred a visit to St Léonard and overlooked Limoges. In St Léonard a 6th century hermit was buried, whose relics were supposed to free prisoners (like Ste Foy at Conques) and to aid pregnant women. The cult flourished from the beginning of the 11th century through several churches built on the same spot, among which the main and only durable one was initially dedicated to Trophime (perhaps a reference to a distant and more famous pilgrimage). Bohemond of Antioch and Richard the Lion Heart visited the church to thank the saint after their imprisonments, the first visit during Lent 1106 during a recruiting drive.

The canons established there under the authority of the bishop were as conservative as the monks of St Martial: they did not want to demolish the older walls. The new parts of the buildings were added to the older parts or integrated into them in an accumulative way, so it is difficult to puzzle out the church (Figure 9.13).

The collegiate church has the remains of a wooden-roofed structure including a transept and an aisleless nave built before the 1050s. These walls were preserved partly because of the numerous chains, irons, or fetters given as votive offerings, and partly because of a paradox: the site had no true and deep past, unlike St Martial. The stones were considered as proofs; the heterogeneity served to evoke the succession of several centuries. At the end of the 11th century but before the First Crusade, a rotunda was built against the northern arm to evoke the Holy Sepulchre. The eastern part of the nave was then embellished, stone vaulted, and connected with two domed arms and a lantern crossing (c. 1100). Afterwards a very high and famous gabled tower was added on the north side.

The 11th century chevet is unknown since the east arm was substantially enlarged c. 1130 by an ambulatory, five radial chapels, and a clerestory. The ground plan seems somehow disproportionate and contorted, but the whole structure is carefully designed and would appear to have been very elegant before the 17th century reinforcement.

The most interesting point is not the ambulatory, but the elevation, with a plain clerestory and low galleries (Figure 9.14). Those galleries are limited to the first bay of the new presbytery, exactly like those of the so-called Pilgrimage churches, where they do not continue around the apse. Perhaps these spaces served to lead the canons from their upper-level convent, but one cannot help thinking that these features (which thereafter became unfashionable) display an intentional resemblance to St Martial in the context of a publicity competition, Léonard emulating Martial.

St Junien: an architectural reliquary to suggest the presence of a tomb-shrine

Let me end with the case of St Junien, which proves that architectural strategies are always specific and sometimes unexpected, and which opens the discussion up to gothic types.

We remain convinced that the major part of the monumental Romanesque church was built just before a dedicatio celebrated on 21 October 1100, although the use of pointed arches raises doubts among scholars. It has a beautiful crossing-lantern and very interesting capitals. That the first eastern arm was already abruptly square-ended is well attested: a gable-end was described as partes orientalis ultimus. A hundred years later, the three aisles were lengthened in a conservative way (barrel and
groin vaulted), and a new gable end was built further east (Figure 9.15); the presbytery was changed into a sort of big box suitable to announce the presence of another box, the famous tomb-shrine, which encased the holy bones of the 6th-century founder and also the relics of his bishop, Rurice II, and those of his friend the hermit Amand.

The relative dating of the embellishments of the sanctuary and the transept due to the numerous and rich canons (and probably the bishop of Limoges) is difficult to establish within the three last decades of the 12th century, while the limestone carved sarcophagus dates from c. 1175–80. Parallel to the shrine, the nave was embellished to announce the saint’s glory in the Heavenly Jerusalem to the common faithful: both by a tower built to heighten the first bay and by a splendid painted program on the eastern bay vault. The nave paintings echo the shrine’s iconography, since they represent the Elders and the Paschal Lamb, not the saint’s life on Earth.

Beyond the crossing, the tomb-shrine was partly built into the high altar (and therefore for a long time hidden behind the canons choir), as was supposed to be the case in the 6th century in the church built by Rurice II for a community of priests. Following an inventio and elevatio in 990 (a date celebrated every year), connected with the making of a wooden painted reliquary, the reliquary, the shrine, and the altar were intimately associated. As at Santiago, the original aedicule (probably half buried) was removed, either in 990 or in 1100, but its walls, which were used in the new foundations, corresponded
to the area of the canons choir. Above all, the site of the high altar always preserved the exact topographical point of the tomb.

It is worth noting that the setting of the famous carved shrine was turned into a sort of historical certification, based once more on a Russian doll system. For inside the shrine, through an oculus, one can see the internal sarcophagus of Junien. Behind it, a stone slab is carved with archaic letters (Figure 9.16). The technique of the letters suggests that the true 6th-century sarcophagus is housed in the carved shrine while the words suggest that the carved shrine was made for the dedicatio in 1100: that is, a sort of double forgery. The cover of the internal sarcophagus, a big stone ad modum dorsi asini fabricatum, is still used as a surface on which to place several small reliquaries: the shrine, apart from during Ostension periods, is now a kind of treasury.

Furthermore, at St Junien, thanks to the lengthening of the church, the liturgical subdivisions correspond to the architectural subdivisions. Thus, as at Rievaulx (Yorkshire): 'By amalgamating the monastic choir, high altar, tombs and shrine, the community reciprocally linked them'. Contrary to Rievaulx, and as in Poitiers cathedral, the east front of St Junien cannot be considered as a cliff elevation or cliff-east-end strictly speaking because it is of a sort of hall type: the aisles are not lower or not much lower than the central vessel and consequently only one gable joins the three vessels together. A real cliff-east-end elevation is rare in France, but it does exist, as, for example, at Laon cathedral. During the Gothic period, we can evoke in Poitou the lengthening of the Cistercian church of Les Chatelliers, a daughter of Clairvaux, made to house a stone tomb-shrine for the founder Géraud de Sales, whose monks tried in vain to obtain his canonisation. There the lost shrine had six little columns, exactly the same number as the big columns of the new eastern part of the church. Perhaps the type of the recessed gable for the east wall of Les Chatelliers came from other Aquitanian experiences, such as the church of St Jean d’Angely, which displayed the head of St John the Baptist, but this abbey church is much too ruined to be discussed.
However relevant the term *cliff-east-end* for the buildings is, the cases of Saint-Junien at the end of the 12th century, Rievaulx a little later, and Les Châtelliers at the end of the 13th century, demonstrate that the architectural formula used to suggest the strong presence of a saint needed neither a crypt nor an ambulatory, thanks to the files of the piers which housed the sanctuary. Moreover, their sarcophagus-shaped architecture worked to announce their sarcophagus-shaped reliquaries.

**CONCLUSION**

Various strategies have been highlighted. For example, the Romanesque churches of St Martial and St Junien are roughly opposite in regard to the formal and liturgical features, even though they both represent a memorial for a 6th-century mausoleum.

After considering the monks’ or canons’ historicist strategies – a rich debate – we must point to a surprising common thread: the ways to lead pilgrims to the saints are rarely very practical – either behind an altar or beyond an uncomfortable staircase. What this demonstrates is that ambulatories did not represent utilitarian answers. Architecture is first and foremost image-making. The Limousin Ostensions, which are organised every seven years by 20 little towns and have been listed by UNESCO as *Patrimoine culturel immatériel* since 2013, revive medieval practice (Figure 9.17). On these days we can see that the crowd is not properly channelled by the building structure. We can also understand that the faithful are mostly attracted by gorgeous ceremonies on certain designated days. During the Middle Ages, contingent events such as a supposed *inventio* or *elevatio* were essential.

Whatever the scheme for the medieval pilgrimage churches, they all deserve the beautiful words concerning Tynemouth: *Egrigii martiris protectio et venuste ecclesie pulcritudo, simile conjuncte efficiunt quod fratres ibi habitantes simul ambulantes in domo domini cum consensu et ore et corde alacriter decantavant.*
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