

## [Essays in Medieval Studies 2](#)

[Page numbers of the printed text appear at the right in bold. Works cited appear at the end of the file.]

**page 182**

### **Pseudo-Dionysius' Metaphysics of Darkness and Chartres**

**Cathedral Laurence J. James**

It is a given among art historians that Abbot Suger of St. Denis Abbey, just outside Paris, was a seminal figure for Gothic art and architecture.<sup>1</sup> Most would agree with the late Erwin Panofsky that Suger translated the light metaphysics of Pseudo-Dionysius and Johannes Scotus into the abbey church,<sup>2</sup> and that the church had many imitators all over France.

Abbot Suger left us poems by which his intention [to do what Panofsky says he did] can be established.<sup>3</sup> However, it seems to have passed notice that what one intends and what one accomplishes are often quite different things. Anyone who has been to St. Denis Abbey church knows that most of the light in the sanctuary is dependent upon the clerestory windows, which were not set in until the 13th century. In other words, if Suger was father to the idea<sup>4</sup> which culminates in lantern churches, the idea comes round again, after his death, to produce what his words suggest; but what his words suggest did not exist, could not have existed, in the monument during his lifetime.

There is a danger in taking any one feature of a given age and attempting to maintain that the feature is characteristic or typical of the whole. There was, after all, a certain light metaphysics in Christian thought since the Gospel according to St. John. And, whatever light's value as a symbol, it is

**page 183**

insufficient to explain the occasion for combining various Gothic elements into an aesthetic system.<sup>5</sup>

Pseudo-Dionysius was introduced to the West in the 6th Century.<sup>6</sup> Pope St. Martin honored him at the synod of the Lateran, in 649,<sup>7</sup> and his writings came to be venerated as sacred.<sup>8</sup> In the course of time, Pseudo-Dionysius was associated with St. Denis, the founder of the Gallic Church.<sup>9</sup> Sometime between 830 and 835, Abbot Hilduin of St. Denis caused the *Vita Dionysii* to be written in such a way as to "prove" that St. Denis and St. Dionysius the Areopagite were the same man.<sup>10</sup> It became a crime the equivalent to treason to deny it in France. Dionysius the Areopagite was probably a fifth century Syrian monk whose work is little more than "a superficially Christianized version of Proclus."<sup>11</sup>

Despite their great influence, Dionysius' works are few; what he said about aesthetics can be put into even fewer paragraphs. His longest statement is from *On the Divine Names*, chapter IV, paragraph 7, quoted here *in toto*:

This Good is described by the Sacred Writers as Beautiful and as Beauty, as Love or Beloved, and by all other Divine titles which befit Its beautifying and gracious fairness. Now there is a distinction between the titles "beautiful" and "Beauty" applied to the all-embracing Cause. For we universally distinguish these two titles as meaning respectively the qualities shared and the objects which share therein. We give the

**page 184**

name of "Beautiful" to that which shares in the quality of beauty, and we give the name of "Beauty" to that common quality by which all beautiful things are beautiful. But the Super-Essential Beautiful is called "Beauty" because of the quality which It imparts to all things severally according to their nature, and because It is the cause of the harmony and splendor in all things flashing forth upon them all, like light, the beautifying communications of its originating ray; and because It summons all things to fare until Itself (from whence It hath the name of "Fairness") and because It draws all things together in a state of mutual interpenetration. And It is called "Beautiful, because It is All-Beautiful and more than Beautiful, and is eternally, unvaryingly, unchangeably Beautiful; incapable of birth or death or growth or decay; and not beautiful in one part and foul in another; nor yet beautiful in one place and not in another (as if it were beautiful for some and not beautiful for others); nay, on the contrary, It is, in Itself, and by Itself, uniquely and eternally Beautiful, and from beforehand It contains in a transcendent manner the originating beauty of everything that

is beautiful. For in the simple and supernatural nature belonging to the world of beautiful things, all beauty and all that is beautiful hath

**page 185**

its unique and pre-existent Cause. From this Beautiful all things possess their existence, each kind being beautiful in its own manner, and the Beautiful causes the harmonies and sympathies and communities of all things. And by the Beautiful causes the harmonies and sympathies and communities of all things. And by the Beautiful all things are united together and the Beautiful is the beginning of all things, as being the Creative Cause which moves the world and holds all things in existence by their yearning for their own Beauty. And It is the Goal of all things, and their Beloved. as being their Final Cause (for 'tis the desire of the Beautiful that brings them all into existence), and It is their Exemplar from which they derive their definite limits; and hence the Beautiful is the same as the Good, inasmuch as all things, in all causation, desire the Beautiful and Good; nor is there anything in the world but hath a share in the Beautiful and Good, for Non-Existence is itself beautiful and good when, by the Negation of all Attributes, it is ascribed Super-Essentially to God. This One Good and Beautiful is in Its oneness the Cause of all the many beautiful and good things. Hence comes the bare existence of all things, and hence their unions, their differentiations, their identities, their differences, their similarities,

**page 186**

their dissimilarities, their communions of opposite things, the unconfused distinctions of their interpenetrating elements; the providences of the Superiors, the interdependence of the Coordinates, the responses of the Inferiors, the states of permanence wherein all keep their own identity. And hence again the inter-communion of all things according to the power of each; their harmonies and sympathies (which do not merge them) and the coordinations of the whole universe; the mixture of elements therein and the indestructible lineaments of things; the ceaseless succession of the recreative process in Minds and Souls and in Bodies; for all have rest and movement in That Which, above all rest and all movement, grounds each one in its own natural laws and moves each one to its own proper movement.[12](#)

Dionysius characteristically speaks as a dedicated, deliberate obscurantist, which leaves what he says open to various interpretations. For example, he speaks of Non-existence as being beautiful and good "when, by the Negation of all Attributes, it is ascribed Super-Essentially to God "and this Non-existence is a higher state than that which is reflected in the light of material things.

Given the monistic aesthetic system which Dionysius established in the foregoing, it would be difficult to have imitative art, since

**page 187**

such art, being reflective of material existence, would necessarily be but the shadow of a shadow. As such, it would be morally untenable. It could only be "good," if it participates with the Beautiful/Good in reflecting Itself.

Though the Beautiful/Good is an impersonal principle, we are nevertheless to see Dionysius (who may have been a Monophysite) as "Christian." In his system of thought, the Beautiful/Good can reveal Itself to whomever It will. If, therefore, Dionysius was a Monophysite, it would be strange that he could think of making an image of God-as-Christ; nevertheless, using Dionysian thought, it is possible, whether he did or not, and:

... in sensible images, if the painter looks without interruption at the archetypal form, neither distracted by any other visible thing or splitting his attention toward anything else, then he will, so to speak, duplicate the person painted, and will show the true in the similitude, the archetype in the image, the one in the other, except for their different essences (or natures)."[13](#)

It is this that gives the Byzantine aesthetic system a foundation; such statements as this were gratefully received by the Eastern Church, as a means of bolstering the veneration of icons.

In the disputed Epistle X, Dionysius says: "... visible things are images of

**page 188**

invisible things."[14](#) And in *Celestial Hierarchy III*, he says: "phenomenal beauties become images of invisible beauty."[15](#) That is essentially the same thought.

It is true that in the Middle Ages various western thinkers held light to be an attribute of God, and a sign of His working, because light, like God, can penetrate substances without breaking them.<sup>16</sup> Hence, what is called the *lux continua* of Gothic architecture is a conscious control of the condition, quality, and distribution of light within Gothic structures, to give interiors a distinctive ethos. However, that "continuous light" does not exist in all Gothic churches.

Gothic churches in France, with the notable exception of the preaching churches of the Cistercians, were basically the same. They consist of ribbed vaults, stained glass windows, pierced walls so high they require buttressing, and the chevet.<sup>17</sup>

The flying buttresses are not mere aesthetic inventions; they may be looked upon as sculptural only in their decorative rib quality; their purpose was to take the stress of walls raised very high to permit huge windows, to admit more and more light. That is why the High Gothic lantern churches are seen as the culmination of the form-class begun by attempting to recreate Dionysian light metaphysics in architectural monuments. In lantern churches the walls are virtually eradicated.

page 189

It should not be supposed that a linked solution to a problem necessarily signifies the same answer. Emile Male, the French art historian, said all French cathedrals, except Chartres, "seemed intended to throw into relief some particular truth or doctrine ..."<sup>18</sup> Chartres, he said, is "the whole thought of the Middle Ages made visible."<sup>19</sup> There are estimated to be 10,000 statues outside the cathedral. That is all the more remarkable when one sees the interior which is barren, except for the aesthetically out-of-place Baroque altar. And, while some speak of the "brilliance of Chartres,"<sup>20</sup> that brilliance resides high up in the clerestories, where pencil-width edges of light-bearing glass sparkle in the gloom. In the nave itself, there is what has been called "a somber twilight."<sup>21</sup>

This twilight creates a relative myopia, which lasts for at least an hour after one has come inside. One can make things out, but not distinctly. What light there is, is strained through the famous cobalt blue and red windows, colors which, curiously enough, give the least visual acuity.<sup>22</sup>

Like other cathedrals', the windows at Chartres are enormous, and consist of twin lancets surmounted by an elaborate rose. There may be more than one hundred and forty-three windows all told, each forty-feet high;<sup>23</sup> and though this form is repeated at Amiens, Paris, Auxerre, Reims, and Ourscamp,<sup>24</sup> and though the ground plan at Chartres has no closer proximity to a standard plan than the cathedrals of Paris and Reims,<sup>25</sup> the same effects are not obtained in the other

page 190

cathedrals. At Chartres, everything is perceived in a diffused, pervasive coloristic darkness.<sup>26</sup> And, in the *ambuloire* of Notre Dame de Paris, even on a sunny day, one can scarcely see his hand before his face.

We know that the schemata for cathedrals was worked out by theologians, and that the majority of Gothic theologians held (with Dionysius the Areopagite) that the Ineffable can be expressed in concrete form. However, at Chartres, there developed a brand of hybrid Platonism which characterized human understanding and truth in such a way that it became difficult to distinguish between a mystical experience and an intellectual perception.<sup>27</sup>

If intellectual perceptions and mystical experience become indistinguishable, one can live in the mind, and thereby experience God. Dionysius may also be the source for this. In *Mystical Theology* II.1, he speaks of rising to that Void, where God is utterly Alone, as

... ascending upwards from particular to universal conceptions, we strip off all qualities in order that we may attain a naked knowledge of the Unknowing ... that we may begin to see that super-essential Darkness which is hidden by the light that is in existent things.<sup>28</sup>

There is an interesting reference in one of the sermons of John of Salisbury, bishop of Chartres from 1176 until his death in 1180, in which he speaks against those Scholastics who

doubt everything, "... even their own senses and their memory."[29](#) It may be that the bishop was speaking against sanctions held by his own monks; it is impossible to tell in context. However, we do know that later medieval mystics, notably Meister Eckhart, under what they said was the influence of Dionysius the Areopagite, referred to God as "the Great Nihil."[30](#)

*Mystical Theology* II.1 begins by saying:

Unto this darkness which is beyond Light, we pray that we may come and may attain unto vision through the loss of sight and knowledge, and that in ceasing thus to see or to know that is beyond all perception and all understanding (for this emptying of our faculties is true sight and true knowledge) and that we may offer Him that which transcends all things the praises of a transcendent hymnody....[31](#)

That is: giving up sight and knowing physical realities, or things of this world, we rise (intellectually? spiritually?) to the plane of Darkness where God is Alone, where subject and object disappear,[32](#) as we become like God:

... in proper truth we do but use the elements and syllables and phrases and written terms and words as an aid to our sense; inasmuch as when our soul is moved by spiritual energies unto spiritual things, our

senses, together with the thing which they perceive are superfluous when our soul, becoming God-like meets in the blind embraces of an incomprehensible union the rays of unapproachable light.[33](#)

What we perceive, even at that level of existence, is not God, Who is similar to Himself and to nothing else, but the greatest possible similitude. And what is the difference between "seeing" the Rays of unapproachable Light, while locked in the blind embraces of the union with them, and being on that plane of super-essential divine Darkness which is hidden by the meretricious gaudiness of the lights of created things? None. One is rendered sightless by both. The two concepts are used complementarily. What we perceive is not God, but His effects: Rays of light in the first instance, and the thick Darkness-Beyond-Being in the second.

Extramission, Plato's theory of optics,[34](#) is the source of Dionysian light metaphysics; but the light of physical things hides God from us, as we have seen. By shedding that light, we can rise to that Darkness where God is Alone.

If the theologians at Chartres were attracted to the notion that there is no difference between mystical experience and intellectual perception, does it not seem likely that they would have tried to find a way to make that mystical experience and the material world of their cathedral merge? Since they chose to use glass which gives the least visual acuity, and since they could have had clear

glass, which was also available, and since a myopic condition which lasts for an hour or more results from their color choice, does it not seem likely that the coloristic darkness is purposeful? But, if purposeful, what is its meaning?

It could be analogous to the stripping away of the senses that Dionysius discusses. However, there is another possibility, which is to be found in examining the windows themselves, the only source of what little light is admitted into the cathedral at Chartres.

Of the sixteen twin lancet formations, eight rosettes show an image of Christ, blessing. He appears in two of the windows in exactly identical form.[35](#) Since the rosettes themselves are symbolic of the Virgin Mary, does it not seem possible that Christ is to be seen as literally within His Mother's symbol; or to put it another way: Christ is symbolically present within His mother, not yet born.

The cathedral itself has nine doors, three on the west, three on the north, and three on the south, or three times three, a mystical number signifying perfection. Hence, what one enters at Chartres is an earthly example of the Heavenly Jerusalem. From the time of Fulbert, in the 11th century, scholars of Chartres identified the Heavenly Jerusalem as the Bride of Christ, whom they regarded as the Virgin Mary.[36](#)

Therefore, it is possible to interpret the interior of Chartres' cathedral as the interior of the Virgin herself, the womb of the Mother of God. The light which falls into that space,

**page 194**

in at least eight instances, is Christ Himself, blessing.

Millard Meiss, in discussing paintings of the Northern Renaissance painter Jan van Eyck, gives a similar interpretation.<sup>37</sup> He describes van Eyck's painting *The Virgin in the Church* as the first document we possess other than the buildings themselves, by which we can demonstrate "the actual appearance of a Gothic cathedral."<sup>38</sup> The difficulty, of course, was to show the coloristic darkness as well as the elements of the architecture. How could one have the darkness, and show the building?

In *The Virgin in the Church*, there is no stained glass. However, the nave of the church is in unrelieved gloom. The Virgin is shown as a hieratic form; the infant Jesus is shown as an embryonic figure, ill-formed. Behind the Virgin, there are two pools of light. Meiss has demonstrated that those two pools of light are intended to be symbolical references to the two natures of Christ, God and Man. In 1499 a copyist "corrected" Van Eyck, by painting in stained glass windows, to give a reason for the gloom, but he did away with the two pools of light. Jan Gossart made a copy. He also removed the light pools, but he shows two lighted candles at the entrance to the rood screen; thus, while he may not have understood the meaning of the two lights, he restored the symbols.

Van Eyck created a conscious *retardaire*, a copy of something from another age; in it, he creates an archeologically correct version of a thirteenth century statue of the Virgin.<sup>39</sup>

**page 195**

Was he expressing something which he perceived of the darkness in the nave of some Gothic church? Probably. He was also expressing Christ both post partum, or perhaps only embryonic, and present at His own Annunciation, as the two lights shining into the belly of the nave; likewise, the Virgin herself is shown both present in a hieratic form, and present as the structure into which the light of the Annunciation is shining. Hence, Van Eyck's church is the Virgin.

Can we conclusively demonstrate that what Van Eyck saw and what you are being asked to see at Chartres are the same thing? Unfortunately, we cannot. We can only raise possibilities, not probabilities. However, *res ipsa loquitur* is a principle recognized in law. That neither the paintings nor the cathedral have a continuous light, that the light in the paintings is a demonstration of the theological Principles of the artist and the same is true at the cathedral, that the darkness in the paintings is intentional and is doubtless so at the cathedral, since it has been possible to make changes to allow more light to enter at any time since the 13th century<sup>40</sup> since both the paintings and the cathedral are barren, except for the light which is shining in darkness, there are enough similarities to gain a conviction, if only on circumstantial evidence.

Appearance is not to be dismissed as subjective. Whatever the cathedral's symbolic reference, since one cannot distinctly see anything within the cathedral at Chartres for the length of a mass, and apparently one is not intended to see clearly, the scholastics at

**page 196**

Chartres may have intended this to be an analogue for the Dionysian metaphysics of darkness, by forcing us to strip off the qualities of sight and of knowledge. We experience what the Germans call a *Gesamtkunstwerk*, a total art experience, being immersed in the art object, so that in this instance, we experience something of that "super-essential Darkness which is hidden by the light that is in existent things."

**page 204**

## **Bibliography**

Abbot Suger, *On the Abbey Church of St. Dennis and Its Art Treasures*, ed., trans., and annotated, Erwin Panofsky. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948.

Aubert, Marcel. *The Art of the High Gothic Era*, trans. Peter George. New York: Greystone Press, 1966.

Baldass, Ludwig. *Jan van Eyck*. London: Phaidon Press, n.d.

Baumgardt, David. *Great Western Mystics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

Coulton, G. G. *Five Centuries of Religion*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1929, I.

Crombie, A. C. *Medieval and Early Modern Science*, I. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953; Doubleday and Co., 1959.

Dierick, Alfons. *The Stained Glass of Chartres*. Berne: Hallwag, Ltd., n.d.

*Dionysiaca*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer & Cie, Editeurs, 1937.

Dionysii Areopagitae, *Omnia Opera. Patrologia Graeca*. Ed. J. P. Migne. Parisiorum: Seu Petit-Montrouge, 1857, III.

Dionysius the Areopagite. *The Divine Names*

**page 205**

*and the Mystical Theology*, trans. C. E. Rolt. London: S P.C.K , 1920, rpt. 1940.

---. *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, 1.2. trans. Ernst Kitzinger, "The Cult of the Images Before Iconoclasm," *The Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 8. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

---. *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*. IV. 3, trans. Wladyslaw Tatarkiewicz. *History of Aesthetics*, II, The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1970.

---. *Epistle X*, trans. Wladyslaw Tatarkiewicz. *History of Aesthetics*, II. The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1970.

Eliot, Alexander. *Sight and Insight*. New York: McDowell-Oblensky, Inc., 1959.

Fletcher, Banister. *A History of Architecture on the Comparative Method*, 16th ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958. 18th ed., rev. J. C. Palmes New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975.

Hatecoeur, Louis. *Mystique et Architecture Symbolisme du Cercle et de la Coupole*. Paris: A. et J. Picard et Cie, 1954.

Henderson, George. *Chartres*. Hammondsworth, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1968.

**page 206**

Johnson, James Rosser. *The Radiance of Chartres*. Columbia University Studies in Art History and Archeology, No. 4. New York: Random House, 1964.

Krautheimer, Richard. "Introduction to an Iconography of Medieval Architecture." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 5, 1942.

LaCroix, Paul. *The Arts in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1964.

Ladnet, Gerhart B. "The Image Concept," *The Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 7. Cambridge: The Harvard University Press, 1957.

Lethaby, William R. *Medieval Art*. London: Duckworth and Co., 1904.

Male, Emile. *Religious Art, From the Twelfth to the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Harper and Brothers, Harper Torchbooks, 1941.

*Meister Eckhart, A Modern Translation*. Trans. Raymond Bernard Blakey. New York: Harper and Brothers, Harper Torchbooks, 1941.

*The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. F. L. Cross. London: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Panofsky, Erwin. *Abbot Suger, On the Abbey Church of St. Denis and Its Art Treasures*. Ed., trans., and annotated,

**page 207**

Erwin Panofsky. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946; rpt. 1948.

Panofsky, Erwin. *Early Netherlandish Painting, Its Origin and Character*, I. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.

---. "The Friedsam Annunciation and the Problems of the Ghent Altarpiece," *Art Bulletin*, 17, No. 4, 1935.

---. *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism*. New York: Meridian Books, 1971.

---. *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksells, Harper Torchbooks, 1960.

Pieper, Joseph. *Scholasticism: Personalities and Problems of Medieval Philosophy*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Plato, *The Symposium*. Trans. B. Jowett; intro. Louis R. Loomis. New York: W. J. Black, 1942.

Reutersward, Patrik. "What Color is Divine Light," *Light from Aten to Laser, Art News Annual*, 35. Ed. Thomas B. Hess and John Ashberry. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1969.

**page 208**

Rolt, C. E. "Introduction," *The Divine Names and the Mystical Theology*. London: S.P.C.K., 1920, rpt. 1940.

Rouse, Richard H. and Mary A. "John of Salisbury and the Doctrine of Tyrannicide," *Speculum*, xlii, No. 3, 1967, p. 697.

Schaefer, Erwin. "The Origin of the Two-Tower Facade in Romanesque Architecture," *The Art Bulletin*, xxvii, No. 2, (1945), 85.

Tatarkiewicz, Wladyslaw. *History of Aesthetics*, II. Ed. C. Barret. Trans. R. M. Montgomery. The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1970.

Taylor, Alfred E. *Platonism and Its Influence*. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1963.

Van der Muelen, Jan. "A Logos Creator at Chartres and Its Copy," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 29, 1966, p. 98.

Weatherbee, Winthrop. *Platonism and Poetry, the Literary Influence of the School of Chartres*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.

Athens, Ohio

## Notes

1. Erwin Panofsky, *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art* (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksells, Harper Torchbooks, 1960), p. 187; and Emile Male, *Religious Art, From the Twelfth to the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1949, rpt., 10th ed., Noonday Press, 1972), n. trans., p. 9.
2. Panofsky, *Ibid.*
3. *Nobile claret opus, sed opus quod nobile claret Clarificet mentes, ut eanut per lumina vera Ad verum lumen, ubi Christus janua vera ... and Pars nova posterior dum jungitum anterior, Aula micat medio clarificate suo. Claret enim claris quod clare concopulatur, Et quod perfundit lux nova, claret opus Nobile, quod constat actum sub tempore nostro, Que suggerus eram, ne duce dum fieret.*
4. He may have accomplished this "inadvertently"; Whitney Stoddard, *Art and Architecture in Medieval France* (Middletown, Conn: Wesley University Press, Harper Icon Books, 1966), p. 101.
5. Erwin Panofsky, *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism*, (New York: Medidian Books, 1971), p. 20, says there is a genuine "cause and effect" relation between Gothic architecture as an artifact and the Scholastic method as a method. He cannot be correct in emphasizing light metaphysics, if the above is true.

## page 198

6. *Un Sainte, Gregoire le Grand, qui fin du sixieme annonce a l'Occident les ecrits d'un Denys presente par les Grecs comme le membre de l'Areopage converti par Saint Paul. Dionysiaca*, (Paris: desclee e Brouwer & Cie, Editeurs, 1937), p. lxxv.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Cinquante ans plus tard, c'est un Pape et un Saint, qui fonde solennell ement l'autorite doctrinale se Denys et cree son magistere. A trois reprises, au synode de Latran en 649, Denys est a l'honneur, sur les levres du Pontife Romain.* *Ibid.*, p. lxxvii. This synod established Dionysius' authority as "uncontested" (*Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. F. L. Cross, (London: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. 403).
9. Josef Pieper, quoting Hegel, *Samtliche Werke*, ed. H. Glockner, vol. 19, p. 199; from *Scholasticism: Personalities and Problems of Medieval Philosophy* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), p 48.
10. Richard Krautheimer, *Studies in East Christian, Medieval and Renasissance Art*, (New York: New York University Press, 1969), p. 245, n. 87; G. G. Coulton agrees, "... somewhere around 830 ... this identification was crystallized into a dogma"; *Studies in Medieval Thought* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1940), p. 61.
11. Krautheimer, *Ibid.*
12. Alfred E. Taylor, *Platonism and Its Influence* (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1963), p. 19.

## page 199

13. Dionysius the Areopagite, *The Divine Names and The Mystical Theology*, trans. C. E. Rolt (London: S.P.C.K., 1920, rpt. 1940), pp. 95-98; for the Greek version, Dionysius the Areopagite, *Omnia Opera*, "De Divinis Nominibus," *Patrologia Graeca*, ed. J. P. Migne, (Parisiorum: Seu Petit-montrouge, 1857).
14. Dionysius the Areopagite, *On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, IV. 3, quoted from Gerhart B. Ladner, in "The Image Concept," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 7 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 13.
15. Dionysius the Areopagite, quoted from Wladyslaw Tatarkiewicz, *History of Aesthetics*, II, ed. C. Barrett; translator, R. M. Montgomery (The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1970), p. 34.
16. Marcel Aubert, *The Art of the High Gothic Era*, trans. Peter George (New York: Greystone Press, 1966), p. 28.
17. Banister Fletcher, *A History of Architecture on the Comparative Method* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), p. 500.
18. Male, *Religious Art*, *Ibid.*, p. 94.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 93.
20. James Rosser Johnson, *The Radiance of Chartres*, Columbia University Studies in Art History and Archeology, No. 4 (New York: Random House, 1964) pursued the idea to book-length; however, he also noted the

## page 200

relative mopia (see p. 19). George Henderson, while praising the clarity of the minds which constructed Chartres, indicated he wished they had permitted one to study it in a "better light" ("Gothic," *Style and Civilization*, ed. John Fleming and Hugh Honour, (Hammondsworth, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1967), p. 151).

21. Patrick Reutersward, "What Color is Divine Light?" *Light: from Aten to Laser*, *Art News Annual XXV*, ed. Thomas B. Hess and John Ashberry (New York: MacMillian Co., 1969), p. 109; he suggests: "to enter the cathedral of Chartres on a sunny day is an unforgettable experience. At first one experiences only darkness."
22. Johnson, p. 19.
23. Paul LaCroix, *The Arts in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1964), p. 258; however, Alfons Dierick, *The Stained Glass of Chartres*, (Berne: Hallwag, Ltd., N.D.) p. 8, says there are one hundred and seventy-three.
24. William R. Lethaby, *Medieval Art*, rev. David Talbot Rice (New York: Greenwood Press, 1950), p. 130.
25. Hetwin Schaefer, "The Origin of the Two-Tower Facade in Romanesque Architecture," *The Art Bulletin* 27, No. 2 (1945), p. 85.
26. Alexander Eliot, *Sight and Insight* (New York: McDowell-Oblensky, Inc., 1959),

## page 201

suggests that looking from the nave into the clerestory windows at Chartres is analogous to looking at "a dark night sky lighted by constellations."



(p. 183).

27. Winthrop Weatherbee, *Platonism and Poetry, the Literary Influence of the School of Chartres*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), p. 60.

28. Rolt; see n. 13.

29. Richard H. and Mary A. Rouse, "John of Salisbury and the Doctrine of Tyrannicide," *Speculum*, 42, No. 3 (1967), p. 697.

30. David Baumgardt, *Great Western Mystics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), p. 46; *Meister Eckhart, A Modern Translation*, trans. Raymond Bernard Blakney (New York: Harper and Brothers, Harper Torchbooks, 1941), pp. xi, 185, and 231.

31. Rolt; see n. 13.

32. Louis Hatecoeur in *Mystique et Architecture Symbolisme Cercel et de la Coupole* (Paris: Editions A. et J. Picard et Cie, 1954), says: "Cette doctrine de l'ignorance infinie, de la nuee divine se retrouve chez tous les mystiques ... Plotin et son ecole, Origene, Evagrius, Gregoire de Nysee, et le Pseudo-Denys" (p. 177).

33. Rolt, *Mystical Theology* II.1, p. 103.

34. A. C. Crombie, *Medieval and Early Modern Science*, I (Cambridge: Harvard

**page 202**

University Press, 1953; Doubleday and Co., revised, 1959), p. 14} Plato, "The Timaeus," trans. R. G. Bury, *The Loeb Classical Library*, VII, ed. T. E. Page (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928), Section 46, paragraphs B/C.

35. Jan van der Meulen, "A Logos Creator at Chartres and Its Copy," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 29 (1966) p. 98, n. 41.

36. Henderson, "Gothic," p. 74. Hatecoeur suggests the first attachment to the idea of the church as Heavenly Jerusalem is: "D'apres la mystique de saint Maximin le Confesseur" (p. 229. n.2).

37. Millard Meiss, "Light as Form and Symbol in Some Fifteenth Century Paintings," *The Art Bulletin*, 17, No. 3 (1945).

38. Meiss, p. 180; Ludwig Baldass, *Jan van Eyck*, (London: Phaidon Press, n.d., 1951) says van Eyck's use of light in *The Virgin in the Church* allows him to "give correct values to everything" (p. 28).

39. 39Meiss, p. 181, indicates that he is not certain the statue is from the 13th century, just that it is "of an earlier style." However, Panofsky, in "The Friedsam Annunciation," *Art Bulletin*, 17, No. 4 (1935), p. 449, is certain this painting is one in which van Eyck "felt his way to an almost archaeologically correct ... thirteenth century Gothic...."

**page 203**

40. The clerestory windows were all set between 1200 and 1240. (Alfons Dierick, *The Stained Glass Windows of Chartres*, p. 9).