Welcome to the Autumn 2013 issue of *Peregrinations: Journal of Medieval Art & Architecture*. This is a truly stellar issue (if we say so ourselves) devoted to examples of complex, layered iconography and ritual practice throughout the Middle Ages. Feature articles include three inter-related works by distinguished scholar Roger E. Reynolds focusing on Eucharistic practice in the Carolingian period and beyond. Informed by a ninth-century tract that described the recommended appearance of host wafers, how they were to be laid out on the altar, and most importantly what they symbolized, Reynolds presents this edited tract as a basis for two essays on how the hosts became “Christ’s Money” and how that translated into elaborate Eucharistic adoration during the Carolingian period.

The adoration of the essence of Christ is also examined in an article by David Boffa examining how the image of the Holy Face was created in the Psalter and Hours of “Yolande of Soissons” to induce deep introspection through a deliberately difficult manner of access. Further investigation of seemingly simple iconography by Hanneke van Asperen reveals that generalized pilgrim souvenirs of the Annunciation are actually intricate constructs that link them firmly to the active cult site of Aachen. Layers also play a role in uncovering the destroyed Barking Abbey in the article by Donna Alfano Bussell and Joseph M. McNamara, who use GIS (Geographical Information Systems) to present different kinds of historical and geographical information. Using this, they layered maps and satellite photos to recreate a sense of what was once a thriving nunnery. New ways to approach old art are the essence of the Material Collective, a new creative scholarly society presented by Rachel Dressler.

This issue also includes in-depth book reviews on *Memory and Commemoration in Medieval Culture* by Luke A. Fidler and on *Die Sammlung Mittelalterlicher Französischer Pilgerzeichen des Kunstgewerbemuseums in Prag und des Nationalmuseums Prag* by Hanneke van Asperen.

This issue’s Discoveries section includes accounts of re-discovered treasures (9th-century paintings in the Sudan, Crusader hospitals in the Holy Land), archaeological discoveries of jewelry made of glittering gold and a bronze ring that was used to poison inconvenient...
political opponents, and 3-D reconstructions of important monuments, from lost Swedish medieval towns to Tudor royal tombs.

Photobank

The Photobank database continues to serve as a resource for scholars and teachers. Recent uploads include details of English parish churches. Please note that our Photobank has undergone considerable renovation and is now part of Digital Kenyon at Kenyon College. You can search by typing in a key word or name in the search box (e.g. Canterbury). The Photobank continues to grow with copyright-free images all downloadable for use in research and teaching.

The Future

For future issues we are actively seeking articles on any aspect of medieval art and architecture, including: long and short scholarly articles, scholarly book reviews, review articles on issues facing the field of medieval art history, interesting notes and announcements, useful website recommendations, new archaeological discoveries, and recent museum acquisitions. We are interested in publishing articles that will undergo double-blind review as well as those which are subject only to regular editing processes, including articles that are the result of preliminary research. We are also looking for images to add to our photobank, to be shared and used by anyone in the classroom and in their research. To round out the scholarly portion of the journal, we are also seeking short, amusing excerpts from medieval sources, comments on the Middle Ages in movies and popular culture, etc.

Again, welcome to Peregrinations. Any suggestions or comments you have concerning the journal would be most welcome. Please feel free to e-mail us at: Sarah Blick (editor).
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During the central and high Middle Ages the Eucharistic host was often said to be Christ’s money. In his enormously popular *Rationale* William Durandus wrote: “… the name
and image of our emperor is often written on this bread [the host] since through him [Christ] we are reformed in the image of God and our names are written in the book of life.”

A century before Durandus, Honorius Augustodunensis, now generally known as Honorius of Regensburg, also said of the Eucharistic host: “Moreover, with letters the image of the Lord is pressed into this bread because the image of the emperor is written on the coin and through this bread the image of God is restored in us and our name is written down in the book of life.”

Both of these authors took great pains to explain how Christ’s money was to be made, what its shape should be, and what should be stamped on it. Durandus, for example, wrote: “The host is made round because: the earth is the Lord’s and the fullness thereof; the world, and all they that dwell therein [Ps. 23.1], and its very form signifies him who lacks a beginning and an end, although he himself is the Alpha and Omega, that is the beginning and end of beginnings [Apoc. 1]. On the other hand, since a round figure is formed from a point to a point, through this is acknowledged that from that one [Christ] all things and to him all things are bent back, whence the psalmist: Thy truth is round about thee [Ps. 88.9].”

Some also represent a lamb there, first,

---


5 Honorius is said to have spent some time in England, studying with Anselm, and ending his life in the Irish monastery in Regensburg. See Valerie I. J. Flint, Honorius Augustodunensis, Authors of the Middle Ages: Historical and Religious Writers of the Latin West 2, 5-6 (Aldershot, 1995). That he was of Irish origins is suggested in the title of my “Further Evidence for the Irish Origin of Honorius Augustodunensis,” Vivarium 7 (1969), pp. 1-7. This title was unfortunately substituted in my early article entitled “An Irishism in the Work of Honorius of Autun” by the editors of Vivarium after final proofs had been submitted. But the “Irishism” is still there, whether he picked it up in the Irish manuscripts in Regensburg or elsewhere or from his fellow monks in the Schottenkloster St. Jakob at Regensburg, on which see my The Ordinals of Christ from their Origins to the Twelfth Century (Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters 7, ed. Horst Fuhrmann: Berlin-New York, 1978; repr. Walter de Gruyter, 2013), and forthcoming “The Priest/Bishop as Imago Christi” Chapter 7 in Priesthood and Holy Orders in the Middle Ages, ed. G. Peters (Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition: Leiden).

6 Gemma animae, PL 172.555.

7 Durandus, iv.xxx.8, pp. 382 f.
because he who is sacrificed is a true lamb, but also for the sake of the text that reads [Exod. 29]:

This is what you shall do upon the altar: you shall offer lambs continually and wine for the libation unto the lamb.”

“But the bread is thus formed in the manner of a denarius, first because the bread of life was betrayed for the sake of denarii, also because [the bread of life] ought to be given as a reward to those laboring in the vineyard [Matt. 20.1-15].”

This was not unlike Honorius, who earlier said: “Which bread, moreover, is formed in the manner of a coin [denarius] because Christ, the living bread, was sold for the price of coins and he himself is the true coin, which according to the Decalogue of the law shall be given as a reward to those laboring in the vineyard of the Church.”

“And thus we remember clearly that the bread of Christ is formed in the shape of coins because he was betrayed for thirty coins by the hands of the wicked, he who is the true coin that is given as a reward to the just who labor in the vineyard until evening.”

“And because since the people were not taking communion it was not necessary that such a large bread should be made, it was established that it [the bread] should be made and formed in the form of a coin [denarii]; and the people offer coins for the offering of flour so they recognize that the Lord was betrayed for [coins]...”

Long before Honorius and Durandus wrote about Christ’s money, there appeared in the ninth century an oblique brief reference to the king’s denarius to that of the cross of the heavenly...
king in Walafrid Strabo’s *Commentary on Psalms*.\textsuperscript{12} But far more important was a little ninth-century tract on the same subject attributed to a mysterious Bishop Eldefonsus of Spain. Not only did it have descriptions of Christ’s money, of what it was to be made and in what type of host presses, but illustrations on what was to be imprinted on it, and how the hosts were to be laid out on the altar for various feasts of the Christian year. This little tract has long been known and commented on by liturgiologists and sacramental theologians, especially because they see in it the first very firm textual and visual evidence showing that azymes or unleavened Eucharistic hosts were used in the Western church. Other contemporary authors had hinted at this use, but in our little tract this is graphically and abundantly clear.

In his immensely popular historical novel, subsequently made into a motion picture, *The Name of the Rose*, the noted semiotics and Thomistic scholar, Umberto Eco, introduced his readers to this unusual ninth-century text on Eucharistic hosts first published by the seventeenth-century Benedictine scholar, Dom Jean Mabillon. Eco reports that he had attempted to find in Austrian libraries a copy of a volume containing this text with the extended title: *Vetera analecta, sive collectio veterum aliquot opera & opusculorum omnis generis, carminum, epistolarum, diplomaton, epitaphiorum, &, cum itinere germanico, adaptationibus & aliquot disquisitionibus R.P.D. Joannis Mabillon, Presbiteri ac Monachi Ord. Sancti Benedicti e Congregatione S. Mauri. Nova Editio cui accessere Mabilloni vita & aliquot opuscula, scilicet Dissertatio de Pane Eucharistico, Azymo et Fermentatio ad Eminentiss. Cardinalem Bona. Subiungitur opusculum Eldefonsi Hispaniensis Episcopi de eodem argumentum. Et Eusebii Romani ad Theophilum Gallum epistola, De cultu sanctorum ignotorum, Parisiis, apud*

Levesque, *ad Pontem S. Michaelis, MDCCXXI, cum privilegio Regis*. Failing to find the volume, Eco went on to say that he had found it in the Bibliothèque Sainte Geneviève in Paris, but the date and publisher did not match the reference he had been given. Hence, in an attempt to find the volume, Eco, who has recently in 2009 been awarded an honorary doctorate from the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies in Toronto, consulted “the dear and unforgettable Étienne Gilson,” the great Thomistic scholar and one of the founders of the Pontifical Institute.13

![Figure 1](left) Umberto Eco, 2013, at Silos with codices of Beatus; Photo. author; (right) Étienne Gilson of the Pontifical Institute. Photo. author.

---

13 Umberto Eco, *The Name of the Rose*, Engl. trs. W. Weaver (San Diego, New York, London, 1980), p. 2. This work had immediate effect at Toronto’s Pontifical Institute, as my late colleague, Fr. Leonard Boyle, before becoming Prefect of the Vatican Library, recommended it widely and enthusiastically to students and professors alike, who held many seminars to discuss the work. Another enthusiast was my good friend, the late Horst Fuhrmann, also an honorary doctor at the Pontifical Institute and President of the Monumenta Germaniae historica in Munich, who not only wrote numerous pieces on Eco and his work, but also invited him to be the featured speaker at the great Monumenta congress in 1986, eventually published in the proceedings, *Fälschungen im Mittelalter, Internationaler Kongress der Monumenta Germaniae historica, 16.-19. September 1986. MGH, Schriften* (Hannover, 1988).
To Eco’s disappointment, Gilson could not help him. Eco’s novel continues from there with no further reference to the *Opusculum Eldefonsi Hispaniensis Episcopi de eodem argumento* but with references to the work of another Spanish cleric in Carolingian times, the *Commentary on the Apocalypse* by Beatus of Liébana. Nonetheless, the *Opusculum Eldefonsi Hispaniensis Episcopi* has continued to fascinate liturgical scholars and many specialists in other fields since Mabillon’s day for its unusual and puzzling features.

First, the *Opusculum* itself, whose Latin text and illustrations of Mabillon can be conveniently consulted in Migne’s *Patrologia Latina* 106.881-890. It begins boldly by stating that it is a “Revelatio” to a bishop Eldefonsus of Spain, given early in the morning of seventh day of the tenth month, 845, on the bread of azymes or unleavened bread. The beholder sees a pair of circles, which are illustrated in the text, inscribed with a series of words and abbreviations:

![Figure 3](left) Mabillon’s illustration of azymes; (right) Mabillon’s illustration of reverse of coin with Altissimus Photo: author.

---

14 For Eco’s earlier interest in Beatus see *Beato di Liébana : miniature del Beato de Fernando I y Sancha (codice B.N. Madrid Vit. 14-2) testo e commenti alle tavole di Umberto Eco; introduzione e note bibliografiche di Luis Vázquez de Parga Iglesias* (Parma, 1973).

On the first side within two circles are the words Veritas/Truth, Mathew, John, Rex/King, God, Jesus, Christ, Lux, Pax, Gea [sic], Vita, Mark, Luke and Vita again. Then he turns to the other side of the coin with the words Altissimus Deus/Highest God, Peter, Sion, and Paul, two lines enclosing between the lines the three persons of the Trinity represented by three points, Pater, Eilium [sic], Spiritus Sanctus, and below them Andrew, Jerusalem, IACR [sic], and Omnipotent Lord all giving tributes.

Eldefonsus then goes on to say that these circles represent a host, the money of the celestial King, which excel in dignity the forms of money of earthly kings. Looking to the five points in the first circle (four around the fifth of the cross) it is said that in their unending circular form they are like God who has neither beginning nor end. Jumping briefly to another “Revelatio,” the prophecy of Ezechiel, Eldefonsus cites the five wheels and four animals.

The “Revelatio” continues on with the azymes and breastplate of Aaron, presumably because azymes belong to the Aaronic priesthood, while simple bread is associated with the priest Melchizidek. He returns to his illustrations by saying that just as the apostles Andrew and James [IACR] beneath the lower line were colleagues on earth, so Peter and Paul above the upper line were joined with the most high God and the other saints, as were the four evangelists (being represented by Ezechiel’s four animals) on the other side of the host.

Turning to the hosts themselves Eldefonsus says that just as the thumb of a man can cover a coin, with three fingers especially three representing the Trinity, one host can encompass three coins touching one another, and he presents an illustration of this with three hosts inside a larger circle.

---

16 It is interesting that the Orthodox in their controversy with the West over azymes have always insisted that Christ is a priest after the order of Melchizedek [Ps. 109:4; Heb. 5:6, 10, 20], not Aaron [Heb. 7:6]. Azymes belong the Aaronic priesthood, while Melchizidek is said to have offered bread (artos), not azymes (azuma) [Gen. 14:18].
After a short diversion regarding the rejection of Christ, the Father, and the angels, Eldefonsus returns to his main theme, the host, and how it is to be arranged on various feast days of the Church.

At Christmas, when there are the three traditional Masses, twelve hosts are to be laid out in a round circle representing the choir of angels. In the midst of these twelve are to be five hosts placed in the form of a cross, four signifying the four evangelists and the central one signifying the unique Son of God who redeemed man on the cross. These all equal seventeen, and if one separates these one will find the septiform Holy Spirit and ten as the Man-God. Inserted into this is a phrase on the nine orders of angels (something also found in the nearly contemporary *Collectaneum* of Sedulius Scottus), which perhaps might have been originally placed after the reference to the choir of angels above. On the other hand, the text here is confused and the meaning might have been that when one adds nine orders of angels plus the septiformity of the Holy Spirit and the one Man-God, the total is seventeen. Putting the hosts together for three Masses of Christmas there are, says the Mabillon text, forty-one (fifty-one?) hosts (seventeen times three), the “one” representing One God and the “fifty” the plenitude in God, also found in the numbers one hundred and one thousand.

On Easter or the feast of the Resurrection forty-five hosts are to be arranged in the form of a cross, making 135 for the three traditional Masses of Easter, and an elaborate diagram of this
is presented. This diagram presented at this point by Mabillon perhaps refers to the layout of the Christmas hosts of fifty-one, but there are pictured fifty-three, not forty-five, hosts.

**Figure 5** Mabillon’s illustration of host for Masses of Easter. Photo: author.

For the Ascension it is to be the same as Easter. And for the Transfiguration (said to be on the sixth Kalends of August) the same configuration as at Christmas is to be used, and the illustration, which perhaps also should have been inserted with Christmas, is presented.

**Figure 6** Mabillon’s illustration of host configuration for Transfiguration/Christmas. Photo: author.

Picking up on the number seventeen, Eldefonsus refers to the 153 fishes of the miraculous draught of fishes caught by Christ’s disciples, that is, \(17 \times 3 = 51 \times 3 = 153\).

Regarding the number three, Eldefonsus deals with the unity of the Trinity and the relation of the
three persons, citing brief lines, often cited by other eighth and ninth-century writers, from Sedulius’s *Carmen Pascale*.\(^{17}\)

Returning to the arrangement of hosts on other feast days, Eldefonsus says that on Pentecost forty-five hosts are to be arranged in a rectangle representing the figure of the four-square heavenly Jerusalem (whose title, Sion, he had seen on one of the sides of his original vision).

Mabillon’s illustration accompanying this shows forty-four hosts, ten hosts on three sides, nine on the lowest side,\(^ {18}\) and five in the center arranged as a cross with the largest host in the center of the cross.

---


\(^{18}\) It is curious that when this diagram was reproduced by Paul Deschamps the lowest side has ten hosts. See his “Tables d’autel de marbre” *Mélanges d’histoire du moyen âge, offerts à m. Ferdinand Lot par ses amis et ses élèves*. (Paris, 1925), p. 165, fig. 11.
Following this it is said that on Sundays and Saints Days five hosts are to be arranged in cross form with the largest in the middle, representing the Lamb of God.\textsuperscript{19} There follows a diagram of this arrangement. For daily Masses only one host is used and a diagram of this is also given.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{sunday_hosts}
\caption{(left) Mabillon’s illustration of host configuration for Sundays and Saints Days; (right) Mabillon’s illustration of host configuration for daily Masses. Photos: author.}
\end{figure}

There then follows a recapitulation of these arrangements: Christmas, seventeen hosts at each of three Masses; Easter, forty-five at three Masses; Pentecost, forty-five at three Masses; (there is no summation for the Ascension); Transfiguration, seventeen hosts at three Masses like Christmas; and Sundays and Saints’ Feasts, five hosts with the largest in the middle of a cross.

A discussion then follows as to what is to be inscribed on the hosts: XPC, IHC, or DS, but not DNS, REX, PAX, OMNIPOTENS, VITA, or PANIS. This is illustrated by two diagrams of hosts, one with XPC with capital omega $\Omega$ (or abbreviation mark?) above it and the other with a cross surmounting the letters capital alpha $\Delta$ and small omega $\Omega$.

\textsuperscript{19} On the central portion of the Eastern prosphoron as a lamb see \textit{The Blackwell Dictionary of Eastern Christianity}, eds. Ken Parry and David Melling (Malden, MA, 1999), p. 88, 368.
Turning to the making of the hosts, Eldefonsus says that the iron in which the hosts are made should be constructed so that in the center is a large host surrounded by four smaller. The four hosts can be inscribed with the letters XPC at the top, IHC below, REX to the left and DS to the right.

The quality and measurements of the hosts is then described. “Blue wheat” or the finest wheat is to be used. The large host equals three coins, but when cooked loses a sixth of its weight. The smaller hosts equal one coin. There follows a comparison of the Trinity in three in one and a return to the theme of the 153 fishes. Finally, there is a strange discussion of the weight of the hosts, something that puzzled Mabillon and most economic, numismatic, and metrology specialists since his time, in which it is said that in antiquity twenty-five solidi equalled one pound. With this there is a conclusion stating that tract has considered the weight, form, and measure of the hosts.

Dom Mabillon in his brief preface to the text was concerned especially with the question of the monetary equivalents given in the text, wondering why it was said that twenty-five solidi equalled one pound, speculating that it may have come from Hispanic practice. But there are many other intriguing features of the text. Who is this bishop Eldefonsus, who is unknown in the
ancient lists of bishops of Spain? Why is he called a bishop of Spain rather than a bishop of some
diocese or city? What is the significance of the date, 845, of the “Revelatio”? If the bishop is
from Spain, why is not the Hispanic era used? What is the meaning of “Revelatio”? What is the
significance of the numerological “games”? Why the concern with hosts, which were only in the

Figure 10 Jean Mabillon (1632-1707), bénédictin français. Gravure de Loir d’après Hallé,
Bibliothèque Nationale. Photo: Revue Mabillon.
ninth-century beginning to be used instead of bread in the Western Church? Why the interest in a particular type of wheat to be used in the making of the hosts? What is the significance of the irons used to make the hosts? And why were the hosts to be arranged on the altar in such complex patterns? Many of these questions have led scholars in the past to doubt the veracity, accuracy, and usefulness of the text as early evidence for the usage of azymes in the western Church. But the text is clearly there in early manuscripts, some written in the ninth century, and this leads one to answer or at least suggest answers to some of the questions raised above about the text. But first one must look to the “editions” of the text and the manuscripts thereof.

The text was first published by the great Benedictine scholar, Dom Jean Mabillon, (Figure 10) often called the father of modern palaeography. Among his magnificent works was his Analecta Vetera, whose first volume was published in Paris in 1675. Three volumes were to follow, with the fourth being published in 1685. Earlier the great Cistercian liturgical scholar, the so-called father of modern liturgiology, Giovanni Cardinal Bona, had written on the use of unleavened bread in his Rerum liturgicarum libri duo (De Rebus Liturgicis) (Paris, 1672).²⁰ Bona greatly admired the scholarship of Mabillon and had asked him to compose a treatise on the use of azymes or hosts in the Mass and Mabillon did so in a treatise entitled Dissertatio de pane eucharistico, azymo et fermentum. This treatise came to be appended to the fourth volume of the Analecta Vetera (originally entitled Libri Germanicarum, later Iter Germanicum) with other small tracts of Mabillon. Added to Mabillon’s treatise was our text of Eldefonsus, which he repeatedly cited in his Dissertatio as evidence for the ancient use of azymes dating back to the Last Supper on the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Mabillon is widely known for his extensive travels throughout Europe to investigate and obtain manuscripts for his Maurist convent of St.-
Germain-de-Prés in Paris, but for our text he relied only on a report sent him by Cardinal Bona based on a manuscript in the Vatican Library, which he did not identify. The text appears also to have been known to other eminent scholars of the time, including Emery Bigot and Lukas Cardinal Holste, the Custos of the Biblioteca Vaticana. After Mabillon’s publication of our text it made its way into his revised version of the \textit{Analecta}\textsuperscript{21} and a number of collections of liturgical and medieval texts thereafter, among them the great liturgical collection of his Benedictine Maurist confère, Dom Edmund Martène, \textit{De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus libri tres} 1 (1763), p. 140 f.\textsuperscript{23} and eventually into Migne’s \textit{Patrologia Latina} 106.881-890.

Because Mabillon had relied for his text and their illustrative diagrams on Cardinal Bona’s report from an unidentified Vatican codex, it was difficult for scholars to check its accuracy, and hence Mabillon’s text continued to be used and cited. But if one looks to that Vatican manuscript and others that contain the text, not only can one control for the accuracy of Mabillon’s text, but also discover clues regarding the questions on its origins raised above.

The Vatican manuscript that Cardinal Bona apparently used is Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 1341. This manuscript is well known to canon law historians for its text of the so-called \textit{Collectio Hispana Gallica Augustodunensis}. This is one of the four primary collections compiled by the forgers of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals in the middle of

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Analecta Vetera}, p. 524 and 542. The text was also known later to the great Spanish Jesuit scholar, Faustino Aréal who said he had seen the manuscript, Vat. Lat. 1341, with the text following a collection of conciliar canons. He reported this in his edition of Sedulius (see PL 19.447).

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Analecta Vetera}, p. 548.

\textsuperscript{23} \textit{De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus libri tres} : ex variis insigniorum ecclesiariurn pontificialibus, sacramentariis, missalibus, breviariis, ritualibus, sive manualibus, ordinaris seu consuetudinaris, cum manuscriptis tum editis : ex diversis conciliorum decretis, episcoporum statutis alissque probatis auctoribus permultis collecti atque exornati a ... Edmundo Martene Antuerpiae : Prostant Venetis in bibliopolio Jo. Baptistæ Novelli ...,1763. Editio novissima ad eodem auctore tertiam ultra partem aucta, & novis uberrimis indicibus locupletata.
the ninth century, using as a basis the Spanish *Collectio canonum hispana* in its Gallican form.  

Although the canonical collection bears the traditional title of “Augustodunensis” referring to Autun, the provenance of the manuscript, Bernhard Bischoff has shown that it was actually written at Corbie in the late ninth century – the monastery where Mabillon had spent some years before going to the Maurist house at Saint-Germain-des-Prés! Following the text of the *Collectio Augustodunensis* is our little tract on fols. 187v-188v.

The quaternion of four bifolios on which our text is written is the last in the manuscript. Our text is in a slightly smaller hand than that of the foregoing text. Beginning on fol. 187v there are forty-two ruled lines and 188r has forty-two to forty-three ruled lines. Strangely fol. 188 has been stitched together with two vertical pieces. They were stitched before the writing was done since the writing on the right column of fol. 188r is carefully placed so as not to overlap the stitching. For most of the circles a compass was used showing the prick marks, but occasionally the circles seem to have been done free-hand.

---


25 Other extant manuscript with the *Collectio Hispana Gallica Augustodunensis* either in whole or in part are either of the second recension or fragmentary. Antwerpen, Musaeum Plantin-Moretus, M 227 (saec. XII, England?) (form HGA²) (on which see the LMS thesis at the Pontifical Institute of Michael Kulikowski, “The *Collectio Canonum Antwerpensis*: A Chronological Excerpta of the *Collectio Hispana* at Antwerp” (Toronto, 1995); Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Hamilton 132 (saec. IX ca. med., Rheims) (additions from the *Collectio Hispana Gallica Augustodunensis*); Eton, Eton College Library 97 (B.I.I.6) (saec. XII; provenance Exeter Cathedral) (form HGA²). There were manuscripts of the collection, now lost, at Beauvais, Noyon, and Laon, on which see *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum, et quae ad eos scriptae sunt a S. Clemente I. usque ad Innocentium III* ed. Pierre Coustant (Paris, 1721) cxix, para. 145. On the Laon manuscript, whose text I identified for him, see John Contreni, “A new description of the lost Laon manuscript of the ‘Collectio Hispana Gallica,’” *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law* n.s. 7 (1977), pp. 85-89.
In the first of the first pair of circles on fol. 187v there are five dots in the center, four surrounding the cross in the center with its dot in the center. Surrounding the whole are fifty-one small dots or circles, something Mabillon omitted. The fifty-one circles, corresponding to the fifty-one hosts at the three masses of Christmas described later, were not carefully planned to encompass the circle entirely, there being a line between two of them, at the base, used as a space filler.
Regarding the circles on the edge, lines, and dots, it is interesting to compare examples of Carolingian coins with their dotted edges, lines, dots, and simple names of the earthly king.26

---

26 For examples of many coins of the time of Charles the Bald, see D. M. Metcalf, “A Sketch of the currency in the time of Charles the Bald,” in Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom (rev. edit) eds. Margaret T. Gibson and Janet L. Nelson (Aldershot, 1990), p. 95. Especially important and interesting in relation to the origins of our tract is the coinage minted from the Aquitainian mines at Melle.
The rim with dots or “pellets” within and the cross in the manuscript illustration are important to note. Regarding the dots around the borders of coins, numismatists give several reasons. It is said that the dotted border of coins, ancient and medieval, was the outer edge of value— in other words, the dots on Carolingian coins fix the value. If compromised (since the metal value of the silver coin was the real worth of the coin), the coin still had some metal value but no representational or exact exchange value. By this standard, Charlemagne’s denarius from Melle displayed here has lost its representational value since its dotted border has been compromised.27

Figure 14 Host press with cross and Alpha and Omega, 11th-12th century, Museu Episcopal de Vic 9722. Photo: Museu Episcopal de Vic.

---

27 I owe this valuable information to Paul Dutton, who has kindly written me “The rim (often raised as on our coins today) or outer edge of a coin is always subject to degrading over time. It delimits the coin as an object but does not define its worth, which is determined by the beaded or dotted border which lies inside it. In the ancient and medieval worlds, it is my understanding [that] it was common practice to test the metallic worth of a coin by testing its rim, often with a knife or teeth. It was also common practice to shave off that material beyond the border, since it was excess or superfluous to the coin’s nominal value. But to shave, cut, or infringe upon the beaded border inside the rim was to destroy the nominal value of the coin--it became useless as a representational object (i.e., was no longer a denarius for purposes of exchange)."
Another reason for the dots is that the pellets around the perimeter were to prevent people from trimming the outer edges off and reducing the value of the coin. That the dots on the coin in the Eldefonsus tract are not simply an artist’s creation, but representative of actual hosts can be seen in the extant host press from the eleventh century from Vic that not only has the same imprint as one of Eldefonsus’s hosts’ Alpha and Omega (with capital omega bumps over it), but also a ring of dots around the perimeter of the host on the press.

**Figure 15** (left) Host Press, 11th century Vic, Museu Episcopal. Photo flip: Author; (center) Vatican BAV Vat. Lat. 1341. Photo: Author; (right) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2855. Photo: author.

It is interesting, moreover, that one side of Christ’s money in the Eldefonsus revelation has a “long cross,” a device common in later medieval English coins to prevent the coin from being clipped, thus reducing the weight and value of the silver content of the coin. The idea was that an extended “long cross” on the coin would make it much clearer to the user if coin had been tampered with, and thus one should refuse it if the ends of all four limbs were not visible. It is interesting, also, that the sign of the cross came to replace imperial portraits of coins largely in the 840s. In short, the dotted border and “long cross” on our money of the heavenly

king emphasize its eternal worth and value. As well as the dots or pellets missed by Mabillon, the manuscript also has the correct GLA for Gloria not GEA.

On the obverse side of our coin there are clearly three dots, and the fourth line of names has the abbreviations ANDR, NERL, ICAB. Also there is the correct FILIUS not Mabillon’s EILIUS and Jacobus IACB not Mabillon’s ICAR.

Figure 16  Comparison of Mabillon’s illustration and the original Vatican BAV Vat. Lat. 1341. Photo: author.

Figure 17 Comparison of Mabillon’s illustration of three circles within a larger circle and the original Vatican BAV Vat. Lat. 1341. Photo: author.
In the next illustration of the three circles within a larger circle each circle has been made with a compass, showing the prick holes. In the text thereafter it is found in the Vatican manuscript that Mabillon’s “quadraginta et unus” actually reads “L et unus” (51 = 17 x 3).

The next illustration for Easter is the most complex one in the tract and must have caused the illustrator (or later correctors) difficulties in trying to harmonize it with the text. This complexity is reflected in Mabillon’s (or his Vatican correspondent’s) illustration. In Mabillon’s illustration there are twelve circles (plus the cross) on the vertical shaft of the cross, twelve on each diamond-shaped arm of the cross, four in the upper diamond, two in the lower support, and eleven on the extremities, making fifty-three. In the manuscript itself there are fourteen circles (plus the cross) on the vertical shaft, twelve on the arms, four in the upper diamond, four in the lower support, and eleven on the extremities, making fifty-seven. But there are several erasures of circles: the two highest on the vertical cross, the two on the right side of the right diamond, four on the left horizontal of the left diamond, and two on the lowest support of the cross.

Figure 18 Mabillon’s illustration of the Easter Cross and the original Vatican BAV Vat. Lat. 1341. Photo: author.
For the Transfiguration the next illustration, which logically should have followed Christmas but also belongs here, there are compass pricks for some of the circles but not all. Originally there were only eleven circles (one in the upper left in heavy ink) drawn around the five in the center, but realizing that this did not equal the twelve of the text a scribe crudely drew in an extra heavy circle overlapping two of the original.

Figure 19 Mabillon’s illustration of arrangement of hosts for the Transfiguration and the original Vatican BAV Vat. Lat. 1341. Photo: author.

The rectangular illustration for Pentecost also caused both Mabillon and the manuscript illustrator difficulties. Mabillon pictured ten circles on the upper and vertical sides of the rectangle, but only nine on the lower side. The manuscript illustrator also had difficulties. First, the left circle in the center of the rectangle laps over into the border. The circles on the borders number ten on the upper and vertical sides, all linked with lines. But in the lower side there were difficulties. There are erasures along this side. Then ten double circles linking each other, except for the last, were added to make the necessary forty. All together this would equal the forty-five hosts for Pentecost.
The illustration for Sundays must have been drawn in before the text, since the text before it overlaps the upper circle.

The illustration of one circle for everyday masses seems to have presented no difficulties for the illustrator of the Vatican manuscript.
There is then the last pair of illustrations depicting what should be stamped on the hosts.

Figure 23 Comparison of Mabillon’s illustration design that should be stamped on the host with the original Vatican BAV Vat. Lat. 1341. Photo: author.

Mabillon reversed these and placed a cross above the Alpha and Omega rather than the two bumped capital omega lines above these two letters in the manuscript.

Beyond the Vatican manuscript used by Mabillon there are two more extant manuscripts with our text, both in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France. Both have, for many years, been more famous for other texts and illustrations in them than ours. The first of these is Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2855, with our text on fols. 63r-68r. The manuscript itself is a composite one. The first section contains the Eucharistic works of Radbertus of Corbie,

---

29 One can consult the extensive on-line bibliography for these manuscripts in the metadata for each on the website for manuscripts in the Bibliothèque nationale de France: http://archivesetmanuscrits.Bibliothèque_nationale_de_France.fr/cdc.html.
his *De corpore et sanguine Domini* and his *Versus ad Pacidum de corpore Christi*, and has been said to have been the presentation copy to Charles the Bald, thus likely dating this section of the manuscript to the ninth century. The last section of the manuscript is equally famous. It contains a copy in beautiful Visigothic script of the *De virginitate beatae Mariae* of Ildefonsus of Toledo, written by the scribe Gomez of St. Martin de Albelda *ca.* 951 and presented to Bishop Godescalc of Le Puy as he traveled, as has been said, as the first non-Hispanic pilgrim to Santiago de Compostela. The volume was kept, until 1681, in the cathedral library at Le Puy.

Our text falls between these two sections as a libellus on fols. 63r-68r. The first blank folio has two carefully drawn circles with a stylus. There then follows our text in a beautiful hand, probably of the late ninth or early tenth century. There are several things that differ in this manuscript from the Vatican manuscript used by Mabillon. First, and most important, it begins by citing the year 845, but does not mention Eldefonsus. Second, one variant in the text of the tract in the manuscript that could be of major importance in locating the origin of the text is that the words in the Vatican manuscript, “CLIII maxima caerulei grana quod triticum dicitur” now read “centum quinquaginta tria grana cerulei Aquitaniae tritici nostri” (italics mine). Third,

---


31 According to Jean-Paul Bouhot, *Ratramne de Corbie : histoire littéraire et controverses doctrinales* (Paris, 1976), 83 n. 21, this manuscript should be dated to the ninth century and was perhaps the exemplar of Radbertus’s work offered to Charles the Bald.

32 It is interesting that in medieval manuscripts a number of pieces of Radbertus went under the name of Ildefonsus of Toledo, on which see Franz Brunhötlz, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1975), p. 194; and Robert Maloy, “The Sermonary of St. Ildefonsus of Toledo. A Study of the Scholarship and Manuscripts,” *Classical Folia* 25 (1971), pp. 137-99 and 243-301.


in the summation of the feasts, the statement for the Ascension missing from the text in Mabillon and Vat. Lat. 1341 is given: ”Sic in Ascensione Domini, decem et septem panes tribus vicibus.”

Fourth, after the conclusion of the text is written in capital letters in a slightly different ink, FINIT FINIT FINIT LUDENDO DICIT. And fifth, there are only two major illustrations, both in brown and red/orange ink, with parallels to those in the Vatican manuscript, but they have their differences.

![Comparison of Vatican BAV Vat. Lat. 1341 and Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2855, fol. 63v. Photo: Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France.](image)

**Figure 24** Comparison of Vatican BAV Vat. Lat. 1341 and Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2855, fol. 63v. Photo: Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France.

First, in the left-hand circular diagrams of the host the Paris manuscript does not have rings of circle and rings as does the Vatican manuscript, but a ring of nineteen black dots connected by lines, and in the right-hand ring one circle, not two. One wonders in the left-hand image if there should have been seventeen circles corresponding to seventeen in the text. In that diagram the word Vita, found below the cross in the Vatican codex, has been replaced with the word Via, thereby avoiding the doublet found in the Vatican manuscript and reflecting Christ, who said “I am the lux,” and “I am the via, the veritas, and the vita” and ”My peace I leave you.” The image also corrects the strange abbreviations in the Mabillon text, GEA and IACR, replaced with the abbreviations GLA for Gloria and IAC for Iacobus. There are not the five dots of the Vatican manuscript, but only four in red/orange, the one that should have been in the upper right
being omitted. In the right-hand circular diagram there are two large dots, and the lower line separating the members of the Trinity has mistakenly been placed above Omnipotens Dominus, thereby conflating the Trinitarian names with those of the apostles Andrew and James and Jerusalem.

In the final pair of diagrams, the abbreviation XPS is now ringed with twelve black circles connected with lines, and the obverse has a typical Visigothic cross with pendant Alpha and Omega.

**Figure 25** Comparison of Vatican BAV Vat. Lat. 1341 and Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2855, fol. 63v. Photo: Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France.

There is one minor illustration that does not appear in the Vatican manuscript, three host-like circles with rims after the words “tangentes quasi ita.”

**Figure 26** Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France. lat. 2855, fol. 64v. Photo: Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France.
Naturally, since the text does not contain the many illustrations found in the Vatican manuscript it lacks such directions as “ut ostenditur” or “videtur in subsequenta figura,” except for the “quasi ita” before the three small circles.

The other Parisian manuscript is Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2077 with our text on fols. 122r-123r. This manuscript is also well known to historians of canon law for its Penitential of Halitgar of Cambrai. Our section of the manuscript, an inserted libellus, was written in the end of the ninth century according to the catalog of the Bibliothèque nationale de France or the second half of the tenth century according to Bernhard Bischoff. Our text, which is inserted on two bifolia into the manuscript with a blank page on fol. 123v, lies between Radbertus of Corbie’s Versus ad Placidum de corpore et sanguine Christi and his De corpore et sanguine domini. Our text here differs from that published by Mabillon in that, like Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2855, it does not mention Eldefonsus and, like 2855 begins with the date 845 and concludes with “fatigati diueamus.” Like 2855 it describes the host as being made of “centum quinquaginta tria grana cerulei Aquitaniae tritici nostri.” It lacks all illustrative diagrams, except for a small triangle of circles after the words “tangentes quasi ita.”

This manuscript is, for our purposes, interesting since it originated in the south of France in Moissac.

There may have been another manuscript, now lost, besides those in the Vatican and Paris with our text. In 1681 the Maurist and good friend of Dom Mabillon, Dom Claude Estiennot de la Serre, who had actually collated Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat. 2855


for Mabillon,\textsuperscript{37} published a list of manuscripts of the ancient abbey of Lerins off the southern coast of France. This list is conserved in Paris at the Bibliothèque nationale de France, fr. 17679, fols. 7-8 (lettre à Mabillon du 9.3.1681). Dom Estiennot’s manuscript No. 6, likely a small libellus not unlike those inserted into Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2077 and 2855, contains a “Revelatio Ildefonsi,” with the incipit “Revelatio ostensa venerabili viro Ildefonso Hispalensi episcopo in Spiritu Sancto, mense decimo anno CCCCCCCC XLV Incarnationis Domini nostri Jesu Christi … sicut auditum est superius prout protinus scribendo definimus,” with the additional words “Et variis distinguetur figuris quae desunt in Analectis.” One immediately wonders if Dom Estiennot mis-transcribed the name Eldefonso for Ildefonso.

Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz has noted that Estiennot did mis-transcribe words, especially those in Visigothic script, and this could have been the case with Ildefonsus/Eldefonsus.\textsuperscript{38} And what the figures in the manuscript were that differed from those in the Analecta is not explained -- whether there were additional figures or the same figures with different arrangements. Either is possible. In the Analecta (and the Vatican manuscript), for example, there is no diagram after the description of Christmas, but it is placed after the description of the Transfiguration distribution. Could it have been placed after Christmas in the Lerins manuscript? And it has been seen that the lower word “Vita” in the Vatican manuscript has been changed to “Via” in Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2855. And finally, there is the minor illustration of three circles after the words “tangentes quasi ita” in the Paris manuscripts, but not in Vat. Lat. 1341. The Lerins

\textsuperscript{37} See CCCM, 16, p. x. It appears that in his \textit{De liturgica gallicana} (Paris 1685) Mabillon knew of our libellus in this manuscript since he notes it was taken from Spain by Gotescals to Le Puy (as the Ildefonsus text in Visigothic script indeed was). Nonetheless, he attributes the text to Eldefonsus. Did he know of it from Dom Estiennot, who transcribed the Paris manuscript for him? (See PL 72.118.)

manuscript, with no additional information, was mentioned in 1862 in “Rapport de M. de Guilhermy sur diverses communications et sur des envois d'inscriptions,”39 dating the manuscript to the eleventh century. More recently Dom Estiennot’s catalog has been published by Anne Chalandon in “Un témoignage sur la bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Lérins en 1681.”40

What possible clues regarding the origin of our text can be teased out of the three extant manuscripts? First, in all of them there are Visigothic connections. Vat. Lat. 1341 contains a version, although a Gallicanized and augmented one, of the Visigothic Collectio canonum hispana.41 Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2077 originated far in the south of France in Moissac, where there continued to be a strong Visigothic presence in the ninth and tenth centuries. And Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2855 contains the work of the Visigoth Ildefonsus of Toledo in Visigothic script. Second, in two of the manuscripts, Vat. Lat. 1341 and Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2077 our tract is combined in the same codex with canon law texts, suggesting that our text, like many other Mass commentaries of the ninth century, was considered in a sense a para-canonical one.42 Third, it may be significant that the two manuscripts originating in southern France, Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2077


40 Scriptorium, 60 (2006), pp. 269-289, esp. p. 276. Chalandon, p. 269, n 29, notes that the text appears in Vat. lat. 1341, and dates the conciliar texts to 10th century and the Revelatio to the 11th century. It is interesting that Estiennot’s list of manuscripts contains: Nr. 5, Halitgar’s penitential; and Nr. 8, a very old legal codex whose title is De legibus canonum constat; CXLI capitulis, primum est De homicidiis clericorum … De continentia paenitentibus de uxore sua. Other manuscripts among the Lerins manuscripts are mystical or dream texts including the Visio Baronti.


and 2855 do not ascribe the text to Eldefonsus. Further, the text in Vat. Lat. 1341 ascribes the
text to a bishop of Spain rather than to a bishop of a precise diocese as is the usual case,
suggesting ignorance, some doubt, or other intention on the part of the compiler. But beside the
Visigothic connections of the manuscripts, there are connections with Corbie. Vat. Lat 1341 was
written at Corbie, which in 845 was the center of the famous Eucharistic controversy between
Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus, and both of the Paris manuscripts contain the Eucharistic
tracts of Paschasius Radbertus of Corbie. Let us look more closely at the possibilities of a
composition of our tract, first, in Corbie, then in territories with Visigothic connections.

That Vat. Lat. 1341 was written at Corbie in the late ninth century and that a major
component of the Pseudo-Isidorian forgeries and our little tract were combined in it, might
suggest that our tract was also part of a “forgery” produced there. It has now been almost
conclusively shown that the Pseudo-Isidorian forgeries were produced at Corbie in the second
quarter of the ninth century, perhaps by Paschasius Radbertus,43 and it is interesting that the
name of the great Visigothic father, Isidore, was attached to the Decretals, perhaps in an attempt
to lend them some authority. The same might have been the case with our tract in attributing it to
an Eldefonsus, a name not distant from Ildefonsus. Not knowing where this Eldefonsus came
from exactly, the compiler, recognizing the Spanish features of the text, simply called him a
bishop of Spain. That this liturgical tract was appended to the “forged” Collectio hispana gallica
Augustodunensis, is perhaps not so surprising either since liturgical or para-liturgical letters

43 See e.g. Klaus Zechiel-Eckes, “Auf Pseudoisidors Spur. Oder: Vesuch, einen dichten Schleier zu lüften” in W.
Hartmann and G. Schmitz (eds.) Fortschritt durch Fälschungen? Ursprung, Gestalt und Wirkungen der
pseudoisidoreen Fälschungen (MGH, Studien und Texte 31 (Hannover, 2002), pp. 1-28, and Wilfried Hartmann,
Kirche und Kirchenrecht um 900. Die Bedeutung der spätkarolingischen Zeit für Tradition und Innovation im
kirchlichen Recht (MGH Schriften 58, Hannover, 2008), p. 52 f. David Ganz has agreed that Corbie was the place
where Pseudo-Isidore was composed, but not by Paschasius Radbertus, on which see Alan G. Zola, Radbertus’s
attributed to Isidore of Seville had been attached somewhat out of place in the Decretals, the *Epistula ad Leudefredum* and *Epistula ad Massonam*. These letters had been compiled, likely in Visigothic territories, sometime before the Decretals were forged, but they were nonetheless early incorporated into the Decretals manuscripts themselves, including New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, 442, parts of which were copied in Corbie in the third quarter of the ninth-century, and also in the ninth- or early tenth-century manuscript, Rennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 134 (112) from Rheims or Rouen. So our tract without attribution might have been composed sometime before the *Collectio hispana gallica Augustodunensis*, given an appropriate “Spanish” attribution at Corbie, and tied to the *Collectio*. On the other hand, if the text represented in the missing Lerins manuscript described by Dom Estiennot had the attribution to an Ildefonsus or Eldefonsus, and was written before the mid-ninth century, there is the possibility that the tract with attribution was taken to Corbie and copied there. There is the alternative possibility that a text like that of Corbie was transported to Lerins and copied there with the Corbie attribution in the eleventh century, if the dating of this manuscript to the eleventh century is correct.

---


47 This manuscript, which I uncovered, is reported in Schafer Williams, *Codices Pseudo-Isidoriani: a palaeographico-historical study* (Monumenta Iuris Canonici, series C, subsidia 3; New York, 1971), p. 149 addendum.

48 Bernhard Bischoff once pointed out to me – as I studied manuscripts at Albi -- that manuscripts dated long ago to the eleventh century, especially in southern France, were actually written in the ninth century.
It is, of course, impossible to pinpoint precisely the person or persons at Corbie who may have used or composed a text like this. One thinks of someone familiar with Visigothic practices, and we know of such figures working in the north of Francia such as the Visigoths Theodulf of Orléans or Benedict of Aniane (Vitiza). But there are also indications that point to a circle of monks at Corbie involved in the controversy on the meaning of the Eucharistic elements made famous by the monks there, Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus. This well-known controversy certainly dealt with the Eucharistic hosts, the subject of our tract, and miracles and visions involving hosts were reported by Radbertus in his writings. Further, Radbertus himself was later accused by Ratramnus of falsifying documents. It is interesting, too, that the second version of Radbertus’s *De corpore et sanguine Domini* is included in our manuscripts from Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2855 and 2077. One wonders if our tract was inserted into these two manuscripts because it had, at some time, been associated with Radbertus or with the Eucharistic tracts coming from Corbie. Further, the date of 845 given in our tract, in all of the manuscripts, fits well within the time-frame of the Eucharistic controversy at Corbie. Ratramnus dedicated his *De corpore et sanguine Domini* to Charles the Bald likely in 843 and Radbertus his *De corpore et sanguine Domini* in its second version to Charles in 844. This latter tract is liberally sprinkled with words that appear on our hosts: vita, veritas, lux, and pax. It is further significant that the year’s date of our tract, 845, is given not according to the Hispanic era

---

49 See Paschasius Radbertus, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini Liber*, c. 9, CCCM 16, pp. 52-65, esp. p. 62.


appropriate to an Eldefonsus of Spain but that used in the Carolingian empire. The exact day and month, the seventh day of the tenth month, may reflect the number seventeen and its multiplied products, so significant in the tract itself and its illustrations.

Looking to other possible connections with Corbie, it is known that the monastery itself was founded by monks from the Irish Columbanian monastery at Luxeuil, that Irish Christians visited the monastery, and that manuscripts with Irish connections were there. For example, the famous Beta text manuscript of the *Collectio canonum hibernensis*, Oxford, Bodl. Hatton 42 was early there.\(^5\) It is also interesting that a practice in distributing the hosts not unlike that in the Eldefonsus text was used in Ireland and is found in the famous Stowe Missal of the ninth century, Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, MS. D.ii. 3, (No. 1238). There two fractions are described, the first into two halves with a re-uniting and a commixture, the second into a number of particles varying with the rank of the day. The common division is into five, for ordinary days; seven for saints and virgins; eight for martyrs; nine for “the oblation of Sunday as a figure of the nine households of heaven and nine grades of the Church”; eleven for the Apostles; twelve on the circumcision and Maundy Thursday; thirteen on Low Sunday (*minchase*) and Ascension; and the sum of all the preceding, sixty-five on Easter, Christmas, and Pentecost. Directions are given to arrange the particles in the form of a cross within a circle, and different parts are apportioned to different classes of people. This intricate arrangement described might suggest that our tract, if written in Corbie with its Celtic influence might have been composed there – except for the fact that it is ascribed to Eldefonsus of Spain.

Prominent in our text is the concentration on numbers:

---
1: one God, one host, one thumb

2: two sides of the coins or hosts, the two names of God the King; the pairs of Peter and Paul and of Andrew and James; two names of Christ as truth and life; the two attributes of God and the Lord (highest and omnipotent); two names of Jesus and Christ; two names of Sion and Jerusalem

3: the triune Godhead of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; three hosts; three digits

4: four beasts of Ezekiel; four Evangelists; four arms of the Cross

5: five wheels of Ezekiel

7: septiform Holy Spirit; the seventh day of the dream

9. nine orders of angels

10: the tenth month of the dream

12: the number of the apostles

17: the total of five plus twelve or seven plus ten

51: the total of 17 times 3

153: the total of 51 times 3, the number of fish in the miraculous draught of fishes.

In the eighth and ninth centuries, this fascination with numbers is often associated with the Irish, whether they be in Ireland, England, or the Continent. And with its Insular influence, one immediately thinks of the monastery of Corbie.

Dom Mabillon was especially exercised about the values given to the solidi and pound, speculating that it might have been something known in Visigothic Spain. And scholars specializing in Carolingian monetary values have for years cited and have been puzzled by

---

values given in the tract.\textsuperscript{54} There are, however, several possibilities. First, the values given may have been due to a mistaken transmission of the text. Second, from the reign of Charlemagne, well into those of his sons and grandsons, there was controversy over the weights and values given to coins and weights and measures, and the values in our tract might be a reflection of these contemporary controversies or may reflect local or regional practices in some area of the Carolingian realm, such as Aquitaine.\textsuperscript{55} Indeed, the terms at the conclusion of the tract, “Etenim modius aequus et justus debet esse,” may well reflect the desire in Charlemagne’s \textit{Admonitio generalis} of 789 “ut aequales mensuras et rectas et pondera iusta et aequalia omnes habeant.”\textsuperscript{56} We know also that Abbot Adalhard of Corbie dealt with the value of weights reflected in his statutes dating before 826: “Volumus ut illa modia anteriores coram illis molinariis ad istum novum modium aestimare facit cum omni aequalitate, quanta modia de illis faciant ista, et secundum haec modia quantum eis convenit,”\textsuperscript{57} and “modius publicus noviter statutus .. ad istum novum modium quem dominus imperator posuit.”\textsuperscript{58}


\textsuperscript{55} On this see Pierre Portet, “Remarques sur les systèmes métrologiques carolingiens,” \textit{Le Moyen Age} (1991), pp. 5-24, who cites our tract on p. 21. In this article he also deals frequently with the situation at Corbie under the abbot Adalhard in the 820s. Also on local variants see Harald Witthöft, \textit{Münzfuss, Kleingewichte, Pondus Caroli und die Grundlegung des nordeuropäischen Mass- und Gewichtswesens in fränkischer Zeit} (Sachüberlieferung und Gewichte: Siegener Abhandlungen zur mittelrheinischen Kirchengeschichte 80; Mainz, 1997), p. 244 f.

\textsuperscript{56} \textit{MGH, Capitularia regum francorum} I (Hannover, 1883) cap. 74, 60; and \textit{Die Admonitio generalis Karls der Grossen}, eds. Hubert Mordek (†), Klaus Zechiel Eckes (†), and Michael Glatthaar, \textit{MGH Fontes iuris germanici antique in usum scholarum separatim editi} XVI (Hannover, 2012), cap. 72, p. 226.


\textsuperscript{58} \textit{Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum}, p. 375.
One of the more important aspects of our tract in Vat. Lat. 1341 is that it is the only early medieval tract specifically on the Eucharist that is illustrated. The Corbie manuscript has ten illustrative diagrams, while the others have fewer, Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2855 with five and 2077 with only one. What might this mean? The first possibility is that the Corbie version was the original text and when copying it in the south of France later the scribes there were unable to do this. Another possibility is that the text originally had no diagrams or only a few or had lost the ones it had, and when it was copied in the ninth century at Corbie, a major scribal center in the Frankish empire, it was thought appropriate to add illustrative diagrams to the text. Either of these theories is possible, but it is important to remember that Corbie was known for its interest in geometrical study, and a text of the *Corpus agrimensorum romanorum* was copied there in the mid-ninth century. Clearly our diagrams in the Vatican manuscript illustrate this concern with geometry with their circles drawn with a compass and straight lines. Indeed, one of the greatest illustrated manuscripts of the early Middle Ages, the Corbie Psalter, is especially famous for its geometrical patterns. (Figure 27)

Let us now look at several reasons suggesting an authorship in the south of Francia or Aquitaine as suggested by “Aquitaniae tritici nostrī” in the Paris manuscripts, both of which were written there. That wheat rather than other grains should be used is because in Carolingian

---

59 Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August Bibliothek Gud. Lat. 105; on which see David Ganz, *Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance*. (Beihefte der Francia 20, Sigmaringen, 1990), p. 60.
times a modius of wheat was worth three or four denarii as opposed to one for oats and two for barley.⁶⁰ The “blue wheat” in our text is specifically said to have come from Aquitaine and is

---

⁶⁰ See Garipzanov, *Symbolic*, p. 34 and literature therein.
called “nostri.” Whether or not this was in the original text or was added by a scribe proud of Aquitanian wheat is not certain. Indeed, this reference to our Aquitanian wheat led Jean Lebeuf centuries ago to state on the basis of manuscript Colbert 3682, Reg. 43575 (now corresponding to Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2855) that the author of the tract was Aquitanian.61

Another possible clue as to the Aquitainian origin of the text is found in the cruciform monogram on the face of the host. It has been pointed out that such monograms had deep roots especially in Aquitainian coins.62 Then there are other aspects of the text that indicate that the text in the Paris manuscripts was closer to the original and in some ways better than that in the Vatican manuscript. This is seen especially in the summation of the diagrams where the Paris manuscripts have the description of the Ascension layout lacking in the Vatican manuscript. Also, there is the small three-circle diagram in the Paris manuscripts missing in the Vatican manuscript. Beyond this, there is the concentrated numerology, and this might have come from the nearly contemporary Commentary on the Apocalypse of Beatus written in Liébana in the late 780s in the Asturias, not distant from the Carolingian border of Aquitaine in the northeast corner of the Iberian peninsula. Also in Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2855 on one of the depicted hosts there is a typical Visigothic cross with pendant Alpha and Omega. The design of the cross with pendant Alpha and Omega is not unlike that in the eleventh-century host press

---

61 Jean Lebeuf, Recueil de divers écrits pour servir d’éclaircissements à l’histoire de France et de supplément à la notice des Gaules (Paris, 1738) vol. 2, p. 81, n. a. In his footnote Lebeuf was dealing with the question of weights and measures in our tract.

62 See Garipzanov, Symbolic, p. 195.
from the Museu Episcopal in Vic with its cross and reversed Alpha and Omega surmounted with a line having double capital omega bumps resembling that pictured in the Vatican manuscript or resembling the form commonly found in Spain, especially in the Beatus Commentary manuscripts, such as the Facundus Beatus with its surrounding Pax, Lux, Rex, and Lex. Indeed, in his Commentary on the Apocalypse Beatus four times mentions the cross and the Alpha and

---

63 The figures on this press also resemble those specified in our tract: XPS, IHS, DNS (not DS) and PANIS. In all three manuscripts of the text it is clear that the text reads DS not DNS. But there may be the possibility that behind these there was a mis-transcription and reversal of DNS for DS. As was earlier noted, there are many errors in the three manuscripts, and perhaps this is one. In the text the words XPC, IHC, DNS, (deriving perhaps from, e.g., “per Jesum Christum Dominum Nostrum”) would have made much better sense than XPC, IHC, DS, and this may be mirrored in the Vic host press with its DNS. The press itself has been dated to the twelfth or thirteenth century in the Vic catalogue and eleventh or twelfth century by other scholars. I would prefer the earlier date (or even earlier) since it seems to reflect the ninth-century Eldefonsus text, and presses of the high and later Middle Ages often bore more complicated images such as lambs, fish, etc. Further, it must be remembered that in the Carolingian era Catalonia was part of Aquitaine, where the Eldefonsus text may have been first compiled. It has been suggested that perhaps the Vic press was a “fake” of some sort, but one wonders why a “fake” press should have been made at all, unless to mirror something like the Eldefonsus text.
Omega,\textsuperscript{64} as well as once in his letter with his confere at Liébana, Bishop Heterius of Osma, against Elipandus.\textsuperscript{65}

But the most important possible connections with Visigothic areas are the complex designs in which the hosts are to be distributed on the altar, something that Mabillon pointed out. This practice likely arose out of canon 3 issued at the Synod of Tours in 567, which directed that the particles must be arranged “non in imaginario ordine sed sub crucis titulo.”\textsuperscript{66} In some churches this practice must have been followed well into the twelfth century because we find it in three Beneventan-script missals written at Montecassino: Montecassino MS 127, p. 317 and Vatican BAV lat. 6082, fol. 140r, where it is said, “tunc ordinet oblationes super corporale immodum crucis (+ sign) dicens. In spiritu humilitatis ...,” and in the mutilated Montecassino Compactiones VII and XXII, fol. 99, where it is said, “Et tunc faciat crucem (+ sign) cum obl<ationibus> in altare. et patena; < iusta <... ... ...> Domine <iesu christe fili dei uiui qui in cruce> passionis ...”\textsuperscript{67} Even in the ninth century a practice not unlike this was hinted at by the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{64} Praef, cap. 2; L.1, cap.3; L.12, ss; L. 12, cap. 2. \textit{Beati in Apocalipsin libri duodecim}, ed. H. A. Sanders (Rome, 1930).
\item \textsuperscript{65} Adv. Elipandum libri duo, L. 1, cap.114; CCCM 59 (1984).
\item \textsuperscript{67} On these manuscripts see Virginia Brown, \textit{Beneventan Discoveries: Collected Manuscript Catalogues, 1978–2008: Preface and comprehensive indexes by Roger E. Reynolds (Studies and Texts 179; Monumenta Liturgica Beneventana 6; Toronto, 2012), TBS\textsuperscript{2}.70; TBS\textsuperscript{2}.152; and TBS\textsuperscript{2}.92, (I).262, (V).345n, 346n. On the “Dold Missal” of Compactiones VII and XXII Richard Gyug is preparing a new study. It is also interesting that much later in the Middle Ages the hosts could be laid out in various patterns. Dr. Rob Dückers has kindly pointed out to me that in the Ordinarius Custodum of St. Saviour's or Oudmunster (Old Minster) of Utrecht it is ordered that for November 2 (All Souls): “Item ponentur in antiquo libro collectarum in medio chori xxx hostiae non consecratae magnae, in quolibet latere xv.” The ordinal goes on to explain that these are offered to the canons, but returned later on, after being broken, and, with the approval of the verger or sacristan, are to be distributed amongst the choristers. This sacristan’s ordinal displays on its title-page the rather cumbersome title “ordo ornamentorum exponendorum secundum exigentiam cuiuslibet festi candelarum lampadumque ardere consueturam in ecclesia Sancti Salvatoris Trajectensis per totum annum.” It survives in three manuscript copies: Utrecht, Rijksarchief, Archief van het kapittel van Oudmunster, inv. no. 392-1, 392-2 and 392-3. The first and earliest copy dates from around shortly after 1540, and was edited by A. A. J. Van Rossum, “Kerkelijke plechtigheden in de St. Salvatorskerk te Utrecht,” in \textit{Archief voor

\end{itemize}
liturgical commentator, Amalarius of Metz, who had spent some time in Lyons with its heavy Visigothic influence. Amalarius says in his Liber officialis, “Sacerdos facit oblata duas cruces iuxta calicem, ut doceat eum depositum esse de cruce, qui pro duobus populis crucifixus est.”

In the Old Spanish or Mozarabic rite the particles were not simply laid out in cross form but each was to be designated by the priest as an event in the life of Christ and his reign thereafter. This has led commentators to find parallels in the works of Aspringius, Ildefonsus, the mysterious Visigothic “Pseudo-Alcuinian” De septem sigillis, and Beatus, where before citing Vicit leo (used in the Visigothic Eucharistic fraction/commmixture) Beatus comments on the seven seals of the Apocalypse as representing events in the life of the divine savior: ipsa septem signa, quae in Christo soluta sunt, id est, per omnem mundum manifestata, haec sunt: primum

---


70 On the use of the term Old Spanish rite rather than Isidorian, Antique Hispanic or Mozarabic rite see my “The Ordination of Clerics in Toledo and Castile after the Reconquista according to the ‘Romano-Catalan’ Rite,” Estudios sobre Alfonso VI y la Reconquista de Toledo: Actas del II. Congreso Internacional de Estudios Mozárabes: Instituto de Estudios Visigótico-Mozárabes, 4, ed. R. Gonzálvez-Ruíz (Toledo, Spain, 1990), pp. 47-69. In the discussion, often heated, following the oral presentation of this paper in Toledo in 1985 members of the Mozarabic families stressed, naturally, that only the term Mozarabic should be used since it was they who had preserved this rite since antiquity, at times under persecution. They were also annoyed that the Vatican-appointed committee in Rome for the revision of the Mozarabic rite, to be instituted on Pentecost Sunday 1985 in the Cathedral by Cardinal Archbishop Marcelo González Martín in the presence of the Reina Sofía and Infanta Cristina, had been “chaired” by Joan Pinell Pons (Jordi Pinnell), a Catalan liturgical expert -- this and that despite the fact that the revised rite (Novus Ordo) had been based on early manuscripts representing the two ancient rites of Toledo and Sevilla, it would replace the late medieval-modern rite of Cisneros that they had preserved over the centuries. At the splendid and moving celebration in the Cathedral, where I was seated directly behind the queen, the Mozarab inhabitants of Toledo, turned out in their finest Mozarabic traditional costumes, were extremely proud of “their” Mass, however ‘new’ -- or old -- it was. Perhaps paradoxically, I was made there a charter member of the Cofradía Internacional de Investigadores de Toledo (to process in full regalia in the later Corpus Christi procession) and, perhaps even more ironically, later elected as a member of the Societat Catalana de Estudis Litúrgics (Barcelona).

corporatio, secundum nativitas, tertium passio, quartum mors, quintum resurrectio, sextum gloria, septimum regnum. These commentators have suggested that these texts reflect the elaborate fraction of the Eucharistic host in the Visigothic/Mozarabic liturgy, where the consecrated host is broken not into seven, but into nine particles, first into two parts and then five and four to be distributed on the paten (with its *Vicit leo* text?) and altar. They have then shown diagrams of these nine fragments as they appear in later medieval and modern Mozarabic liturgical books: in a cross with the vertical shaft as corporatio, nativitas, circumcisio, apparitio, passio, the arms of the cross as mors and resurrectio, next to which are gloria and regnum, something seen even today in the Mozarabic Eucharist.72

But in the thirteenth century Jacques de Vitry, in his description of the Mozarabic rite, noted that the Mozarabs distribute sometimes nine, sometimes seven fragments.73 And indeed, if one looks to the earliest representation of the distribution of hosts in the margin of the tenth- or early eleventh-century Visigothic-script *Liber ordinum* of Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia 56, fol. 139v there are precisely the seven fragments Beatus designated as: I. Corporatio, II.

---

72 The diagram often appears in printed texts of the Mozarabic liturgy, down to the current text in use, inaugurated in 1985 in the Cathedral of Toledo during the II. Congreso Internacional de Estudios Mozárabes. The ancient diagram here comes from the program for a rare concelebrated Mozarabic Mass I attended in the old Cathedral at Salamanca during the Fifth International Congress of Medieval Canon Law (Salamanca, 1976). Among the Roman-rite concelebrants there were prefects of the Vatican library, Alfons Cardinal Stickler and Fr. Leonard Boyle, as well as Canon Astrik Gabriel and Fr. Michael Sheehan. The illustration here of the present distribution of the hosts in a paten is from *Ordo Missae Pontificalis Ritu Hispano- Mozárabo Peragendae* (Notes, Rubrics, and Introduction by Antonio Cabrera Delgado y Silveira) (Toledo, 1975) 20 pl. For contemporary practice of this fraction and distribution see the YOU TUBE presentation, Misa Mozárabe, from the Iglesia de San Pascual en el Paseo de Recoletos, Madrid, at min. 2:41-48.

73 Jacques de Vitry, *Histoire orientale/Historia orientalis. Introduction, édition critique et traduction par Jean Donnadieu* (Turnhout, 2008), cap. 81, pp. 324 and 507. Jacques included the Mozarabs in his enumeration of Christians living under Muslim rule. He says of them, “The Christians who dwell in Africa and Spain among the Saracens of the West are called Mozarabs; they use the Latin alphabet, read the Scripture in the Latin tongue, and like all the other Latins humbly and devotedly obey the Holy Roman Church without deviating in any way from its articles of faith and sacraments. They celebrate the Eucharist with unleavened bread, as do the other Latins. However, some of them divide the Eucharist into seven parts, and some into nine, whereas the Roman Church and its other subjects divide the Eucharist into three portions only. But as this division has nothing to do with the substance of the sacrament, it does not alter it or hinder its value.”
**Figure 29** (left) From *Ordo Missae Pontificalis Ritu Hispano-Mozárético Peragendae* (*Notes, Rubrics, and Introduction by Antonio Cabrera Delgado y Silveira*) (Toledo, 1975), pl. 20. Photo: Author; (right) Distribution of Nine Hosts, Program, Libellus Missae, V. International Congress of Medieval Canon Law. Salamanca, 1976.

**Figure 30** Distribution of Seven Hosts, Mozarabic Liber ordinum, 10th century, Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia 56, fol. 139v. Photo: Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia.

Nativitas, III. Passio, IIII. Mors, V. Resurrectio, VI.
Gloria, VII. Regnum, and called the *septem signacula*.

In later Mozarabic directories it is mandated that the priest, when he consumes the host, does so from the last Regnum particle (Omega) to the first,
Conceptio (Alpha) thereby consuming Christ from end to beginning as the Alpha and Omega. The hosts in our tract attributed to Eldefonsus are not designated by these names, but they are associated with the feasts of Christmas, Easter, the Ascension, Pentecost, the Transfiguration, Sundays, and Saints Days. The patterns of hosts used in our tract are not exactly like those in the Old Spanish rite, suggesting that our tract may not have been written in Spain itself, but in an area where elements of the Old Spanish rite might have been known but not practiced precisely as it was in Spain. That this might be the case would not be surprising since the Old Spanish rite with its associations with Ildefonsus and Eugenius had been condemned at the Council of Frankfurt in 794, but elements of the rite continued to be used with the Roman rite, especially in southern France and Catalonia, which in Carolingian times was part of Aquitaine. Indeed, there existed for centuries in this area what is known as the Narbonne rite or use with its mix of Visigothic and Roman elements.

Regarding the presence of the Old Spanish rite in Frankish territories and its unusual fraction of the host in the period of Charles the Bald, there is the oft-repeated story of how Charles, curious about the Eucharistic practices of his ancestors, invited priests from Toledo to say Mass at his court in 870. We know from his intervention in the Eucharistic controversy


between Radbertus and Ratramnus and from his interest in coins and their imprints,\textsuperscript{77} that he was particularly curious about the liturgy and Eucharist. Indeed, in the Coronation “Sacramentary” of Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 1141 made for him, Charles is pictured, on fol.2v, so it is proposed by Éric Palazzo,\textsuperscript{78} standing between the nimbed ”originators” of the Roman liturgy, Popes Gelasius, and Gregory, who is mentioned in the text on fol. 1r and pictured on fol. 3r. (Figure 31)

It is likely that Charles was as interested in the Roman liturgy promoted by Charlemagne in his empire as he was in the liturgies practiced by his ancestors – the Gallican and Mozarabic rite that he may have confused. It has generally been said that 1) Charles asked to have the Mozarabic Mass said, or that 2) he had confused the Mozarabic with the Gallican rite of his Frankish ancestors, or that 3) he knew that these rites were closely related, or that 4) he knew that the IV Council of Toledo, in the seventh century, had mandated the rite practiced in Hispania should also be that for Gallia, or that 5) he wanted to hear the chant used in the Old Spanish rite. We do not really know his ultimate motives. But it would seem strange that he would ask priests from Toledo to say Mass as it was practiced in that city likely knowing that the rite practiced by Elipandus of Toledo had been attacked earlier in the Adoptionist controversy in which Charlemagne and his court theologians had been so closely involved. But if the priests from Toledo did say or chant the Mass as used in their city, Charles may have been interested or

\textsuperscript{77} See, e.g., his Edictum Pistense (864) in which he says in c. 11, “And on the denarius of our new money there should be on the one side our name in a circle and the monogram of our name in the center, and on the other side the name of the state and a cross in the center,’ and later mentions in c. 12 the Aquitainian mints at Melle and Narbonne, “Following the custom of our predecessors, just as it is found in their capitularies, we decree that in no other place in all our kingdom shall money be made except in our palace, and in St. Josse and Rouen … Melle, and Narbonne.” On this see MGH, Leges 2.2, (Hannover, 1897), pp. 314-319 and A Source Book for Medieval Economic History, eds. Roy C. Cave and Herbert H. Coulson (Milwaukee,1936; reprint ed., New York, 1965), p. 133 f.

Figure 31 Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat.1141, fol. 2v. Photo: Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France.
surprised with many aspects of that Mass, such as: the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed repeated at the Communion and not after the Gospel as it was in the Roman Mass that had been spread in the Carolingian realms; or by the “et filio” in that creed in the Old Spanish rite rather than “filioque,” which we know was said in the court of Charlemagne from the report of two monks from Jerusalem who had visited Charlemagne in 807-808 bringing gifts from the Caliph of Bagdad; or by the Greek word “homoousion” rather than the Latin word “consubstantialem” in the creed; or by the unusual distribution of the hosts, although he may have known of similar distributions in Aquitanian churches at that time such as those in our Eldefonsus text.

There is also the possibility that the more complicated designs used in our tract might have been related to round lobed patens or rectangular portable altars with lobes such as one still finds in later medieval liturgical objects. (Figures 32-33)

Figure 32 (left) Round lobed paten of Last Supper with Lamb in center from St. Peter Salzburg, 1160-80. Photo: Kunsthistorisches Museum, Wien; (right) Paten of St. Gauzelin (before 962), Nancy Cathedral Treasury. Photo: author.

---


80 On the portable altars see Éric Palazzo, L’éspace rituel et le sacré dans le Christianisme : la liturgie de l’autel portatif dans l’Antiquité et au Moyen Âge (Turnhout, 2008).
Figure 33 Rectangular portable altar from Hildesheim, 12th century, Victoria and Albert Museum. Photo: Marie-Lan Nguyen.

While the less complicated patterns of distribution would fit on a paten, such as that of the Visigothic paten now in the British Museum, the more complex distributions pictured in our tract more were more likely laid out on the mensae of cusped or lobed altars known in southern France and Visigothic Spain. In a fundamental article in 1925 in the Mélanges F. Lot, Paul Deschamps dealt briefly with this subject and mentioned our tract, attributing it to an Ildefonsus and noting that it could be found in the Vatican manuscript of Mabillon and in Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat. 2855.81 (Figure 34)

---

In this article Deschamps described numerous lobed altar mensae in southern France and Catalonia reaching back to the late ninth century and going through to the celebrated St.-Sernin altar mensa by Bernardus Gelduinus at Toulouse consecrated by Pope Urban II in 1096.\textsuperscript{82} Relying on the work of Charles Rohault de Fleury, \textit{La Messe, études archéologiques sur ses monuments}\textsuperscript{83} he suggested that the function of the lobes was to order the consecrated hosts for the communion of the faithful, and he reproduced the rectangular diagram in the Eldefonus text from Mabillon’s edition.\textsuperscript{84} To bolster his position he cited a directive in the Ordo Romanus IV of


\textsuperscript{83} (Paris, 1887) 1.160-164, IV.30-33.

\textsuperscript{84} See above, n. 18.
In some of the Aquitainian lobed altars Deschamps pictured there are decorations in the lobes or in the St.-Sernin altar raised buttons or knobs in each lobe, which would have interfered with placing the host in each lobe. (Figure 35)

To this he responded that by the time the St.-Sernin altar was made in the late eleventh century, the practice of distributing the hosts in the lobes had been abandoned but the lobe tradition was carried on. While his suggestions may be correct, it is just as possible that the

---


86 Deschamps, p. 167, n. 4.
hosts were laid out by the priest in a ritual form saying descriptive words, as they were (and are) laid out in the Mozarabic liturgy. As for words spoken as the hosts were distributed in patterns,

**Figure 36** (left) Mabillon’s illustration of host arrangement for Pentecost; Geneva Apocalypse, MS. Lat. 357, fol.291r. Bibliothèque de Genève. Photo: author

there is the example of the Mozarabic fraction/commixture rite in which, as each of the hosts was placed in cross form in sevens or nines on the paten or altar, the priest repeated the mysteries or signacula of Christ, such as found in the works of Ildefonsus of Toledo, Beatus of Liébana, or the *Liber Ordinum* of Madrid Real Academia de la Historia 56, fol. 139v: I. Corporatio, II. Nativitas,
III. Passio, III. Mors, V. Resurrectio, VI. Gloria, VII. Regnum. (Figure 36) One wonders, therefore, if the priest of our tract would repeat descriptions of the particular feast, Christmas, Easter, Ascension, or whatever, as he distributed the hosts in specific patterns. Such might have been the case with the rectangular pattern for Pentecost, the celebrant saying that the distribution represents the heavenly four-square Jerusalem (as pictured in many Beatus manuscripts).

Figure 37 (left) Altar Mensa, Saint-André-de-Sorède (Pyrenees) 11th century. Photo. Deschamps, art. cit. p. 152, fig. 8; (right) Detail of Altar from Pyxis Depicting Women at Christ’s Tomb, ca. 500, ivory, Byzantine. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art. Photo: MMA
or for Easter when the triumphal cross form was placed on the flat surface or slab of the altar representing the corpus Christi in the tomb (something seen in an early Byzantine pyx with Christ as the Gospels on an altar/tomb)?

(Figure 37)

Figure 38
(left) Mabillon’s illustration of host configuration for Pentecost. Photo: author; (right) Lobed Altar of Capestang, 9th century. Photo: P. Deschamps, art.cit. fig. 3. Inserts: author

The more unusual forms of the diagrams in our text, such as that for Easter, might also suggest that the flat surfaces of the mensa would have had such designs etched on them that have now disappeared. In any event it is entirely possible that the Eldefonsus text referred to these lobed altar mensae, not only in their rectangular shapes but in circular or semi-circular forms

87 Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gallery 300. The catalog notes that in the early church the altar was understood as the symbol of Christ’s tomb; this conflation is partially based on the fact that the Eucharistic elements were placed on the altar during the liturgy.

88 See Deschamps on designs on the flat surfaces, p. 148, pl. 1. Early medieval altars tables might have had all manner of things designed or written on them, such as the Libri memoriales, on which see Das Verbrüderungsbuch der Abtei Reichenau: Einleitung, Register, Faksimile, eds. Johanne Autenrieth, Dieter Geuenich and Karl Schmid. MGH. Libri memoriales et necrologia; 1 nova series (Hannover, 1979). On a Merovingian altar mensa from Vix
found in southern France and Catalonia. (Figure 38) And this would suggest that our text originated in Aquitaine or thereabouts and not in Corbie. This would have been the case especially with the rectangular pattern for the feast of Pentecost for rectangular altar mensae, such as that of the late ninth-century mensa of Capestang:89 or circular pattern for the circular altar mensa of Besançon. (Figure 39)

Figure 39 (left and bottom) Lobed Round Altar of Besançon, Cathedral of Saint-Jean. Photo: author; (right) Lobed Round Altar of Besançon. Photo: Deschamps, art. cit. p. 139, fig. 2. Inserts: author

(Burgundy) there is inscribed a Chi Rho cross within which are the words XPS HIC EST, reported in the Revue de l’art chrétien (a reference sent me by Susan Keefe).

89 On this see Alex J. Denomy, C.S.B, “Concerning the Accessibility of Arabic Influences to the earliest Provençal Troubadours,” Mediaeval Studies 15 (1953), p. 147.
or for the semi-circular six-lobed altar mensa of Vienne, which if placed together with another
would form a circular twelve-lobed altar mensa.\(^90\) (Figure 40)

Figure 40 (left) Lobed Semi-Circular Altar of Vienne. Photo: author;
(right) Lobed Semi-Circular Altar of Vienne Doubled. Photo: Deschamps, art. cit. p. 138, fig. 1. Inserts: author

There is even a rectangular lobed altar at the cathedral in Gerona,\(^91\) and one wonders if the altar mensae of the T- or Tau-shaped

\(^{90}\) The small marble tabletop or “sigma-shaped” lobed mensa in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (Accession Number: 47.100.50) (Gallery 300) is said to be from the fifth or sixth century. Whether or not it was an altar mensa is unsure. The museum description says it was a table to celebrate feasts for the dead at grave sites and labels it as coming from Rome and as a form of Byzantine art. For other circular and semi-circular altar mensae found in Europe and Mediterranean locations see, especially, A. A. Barb, “‘Mensa Sacra,’ The Round Table and the Holy Grail,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 19.1-2 (London, 1956), pp. 40-67. In this article Barb notes the use of circular or semi-circular altar mensae with compartments or divisions early in southern France and cites the Eldelfonsus text (p. 55, n.19), the Mozarabic or Old Spanish rite, and the Celtic rite. On the round lobed altar of Besançon, see Joseph Braun, Der christliche Altar in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung (Band 1): Arten, Bestandteile, Altargrab, Weihe, Symbolik (Munich, 1924), p. 246, pl. 42. For additional circular and semicircular/sigma shaped altar mensae, see Eugenia Chalkia, Le Mense paleocristiane: Tipologia e Funzioni della Mense Secondaire nel Culto Paleocristiano (Studi di antichità christiania XLVI, Vatican 1991); and X. Barral I Altet, “Menseae et repas funéraire dans les nécropoles d’époque chrétienne de la péninsule ibérique: Vestiges archéologiques,” Atti del IX congresso internazionale di archeologia cristiana, Roma 21-27 settembre 1975 vol. II, (Studi di antichità christiania XLVI, Vatican 1978) 49-69.

\(^{91}\) Deschamps, p. 148, pl. II.
Figure 41 (left) Lobed Altar of Gerona. Photo: Deschamps, art. cit. p. 148, pl. II; (center) Girona, Museo de Catedral Girona, Núm. Inv. 7 (11), fol. Photo: Author; (right) Semi-Circular Altar of Sant Feliu de Rubí. Photo: author
altars\textsuperscript{92} of the Gerona Beatus manuscript might have been in this form\textsuperscript{93} or even in a semi-circular form of the altar mensa of the Catalan Sant Feliu de Rubí. (Figure 41)

\textbf{Figure 42} St.-Sernin Altar, Toulouse. 11\textsuperscript{th} century. Photo: Wikipedia

\textsuperscript{92} The Tau, of course, was early associated with the cross of the Crucified. It is interesting that in Mozarabic manuscripts the “croziers” of bishops are often pictured as Tau staffs, on which see the canon law Codices Vigilanus and Aemilianensis, El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo d.I.1 and d.I.2, passim.

\textsuperscript{93} On the date of the arrival of this Beatus in Gerona see \textit{Beatus of Liébana: Codex of Gerona} (Barcelona, 2004).
In this connection it is interesting that the massive St.-Sernin altar mensa rests now on a substantial single supporting column, suggesting not the spindly stripes of the Gerona Beatus illustrations but more like many thick Visigothic altar supports or pedestals to be found in the museums of Spain and like those in the early Beatus fragment from Silos, the Najera fragment, or even that in the newly found Beneventan-script Beatus in Geneva. (Figures 42-44)

It is interesting, also, that in several of our diagrams in the Eldefonsus text there is a double circle on the exterior suggesting a rim or lip of an altar mensa. Further, there was a tradition that a golden lobed Byzantine dish (or altar mensa or paten?) was prized in Visigothic Spain, and ultimately lost to Syria, and something like this could have suggested the arrangement of circular patterns of hosts in our tract.

94 This fragment, considered now by scholars to be closest to the original illustrations by Beatus in the late eighth century, was discovered in Silos by my late friend and Harvard professor, Walter Muir Whitehill, who reported it in “A Beatus Fragment at Santo Domingo de Silos,” Speculum 4 (1929), pp. 102-105. This fragment is now reproduced in a beautiful facsimile published by Testimonio among other Fragmentos de Beatos (Madrid, 2009).


96 See Barb, “‘Mensa Sacra,’ the Round Table and the Holy Grail,” p. 49. For a Visigothic bronze circular paten with the words, Xps h(ic) est, in Madrid Museo arqueológico, see José Vives, Inscripciones cristianas de la España romana y visigoda (Biblioteca Histórica de la Biblioteca Balmes) II.18 (Barcelona, 1969) p. 171 f., nr. 514. fig. 14.
One of the most significant aspects of our tract is that it presents the hosts as azymes or unleavened bread. In the ancient church the use of unleavened loaves, still in practice in the Orthodox churches of the East, was the norm. The same was true in the Western church in some places until the eleventh century. Such loaves can be seen in illustrations in such ancient manuscripts as the Corpus Christi Gospels and Ashburnham Pentateuch, and in the ninth-century Augsburg Gospels, Drogo Sacramentary, and Raganaldus Sacramentary. But a new practice had begun at least by the ninth century in the West, and this later led to the Eucharistic controversies and schism between the Eastern and Western churches in the eleventh century. A

---

97 On these see my article in this issue: “Eucharistic Adoration in The Carolingian Era? Exposition of Christ in the Host.”
new practice like this in the West is said to be hinted at in the works of Bede, Alcuin, Radbertus, and Rabanus Maurus\textsuperscript{98} and one wonders if in the dating of our tract to 845, there is an attempt to justify or bolster this new practice. To make these unleavened hosts our tract speaks of the baking irons or presses used. Extant bread stamps used in the Eastern Church are numerous. The use of stamps like these in the making of Eucharistic bread is known far back into patristic antiquity, where they continued the use by Roman bakers to identify their breads. Most of these bread stamps are a reverse stamp attached to a handle so that the top of the bread dough could be stamped before being heated and as the leavened dough rose, so the image would expand. Rarely, however, would there be a stamp for the underside of the loaf, which would flatten the image, I am told by bread makers, as the bread rose, thereby destroying the image. But for azymes with no leaven there could be obverse and reverse sides with patterns for the baking irons. It is thought that until the eleventh century the azymes were fairly large, although our treatise talks of both large and small hosts. Stamp patterns on the Eucharistic breads are known from ancient mosaics and frescoes, and there are many extant ancient and medieval bread stamps from the Byzantine east.\textsuperscript{99} Such extant presses for azymes in the West exist, to my knowledge, only from the central and later Middle Ages, but those used earlier must have operated somewhat like our modern waffle irons with patterns on the obverse and reverse presses and with tongs or handles for the baking process.\textsuperscript{100}

\textsuperscript{98} See the entry on “azymes” in the \textit{Dictionnaire d’archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie} (Paris, 1924) I.2, 3257.

\textsuperscript{99} George Galavaris, \textit{Bread and the liturgy: the symbolism of early Christian and Byzantine bread stamps} (Madison, Wis., 1970); and E. S. Drower, \textit{Water into wine: a study of ritual idiom in the Middle East} (London, 1956).

\textsuperscript{100} On some of the medieval presses see "Rapport de M. de Guilhermy sur diverses communications et sur des envois d'inscriptions." \textit{Revue des sociétés savantes de départements} 7 (2e sér.) (1862), 220-221 (a reference kindly sent me by Professor Aden Kumler); and Jules Corblet, \textit{Histoire dogmatique, liturgique, et archéologique du sacrement de l'eucharistie} (Brussels-Geneva, 1885), p. 181 ff. Corblet deals with our text on p. 169, 181. He also
The text is attributed to a bishop Eldefonsus of Spain. There is nothing known of a bishop with this name in Spanish sources, and it is somewhat unusual that he is not designated with diocese. Perhaps figures in southern France or Spain were better informed on this than we are. On the other hand it is possible that the tract was by or at least attributed to the seventh-century Ildefonsus of Toledo, the primatial see of Spain, something suggested by the lost eleventh-century Lerins manuscript. But that name may simply have come from a sixteenth-century mis-transcription made by Dom Estiennot. While there is no evidence that Ildefonsus wrote a tract on the Eucharist, he did write on baptism in which he alludes to the names of the particles laid out in the Visigothic rite: primum incorporatio, secundum nativitas, tertium passio, quartum mors, quintum resurrectio, sextum gloria, septimum regnum. But there is little evidence that azymes were used in Spain in Ildefonsus’s time in the seventh century, although Mabillon argued at length that c. 6 of the Council of Toledo (693) referred to this.\textsuperscript{101}

One of the puzzling questions about our tract is why Eldefonus of Spain is not designated with a specific see in Vat. Lat. 1341, the only appearance of this name (other than the Ildefonsus of the Lerins text, which might have been a mis-transcription for Eldefonsus). But there are other possibilities, however remote. Perhaps Eldefonsus was not an ordinary bishop with a see, but a chorbishop, who did not rule over a see. This clerical grade, the chorepiscopate, was well known

\textsuperscript{101} \textit{Vetera analecta}, p. 538.
in the East and in use in the West until the middle of the ninth century and sporadically beyond. The grade is described in the *De officiis* of Isidore of Seville. But the chorbishops, sometimes called “episcopi vocati,” had become so pesky in the ninth century because of their rather irregular status, that they were “suppressed” in the Pseudo-Isidorian forgeries – made at Corbie – especially in the forged epistles of Pope Damasus and reduced to simple presbyters in the forged *Collectio canonum hispana Augostodunensis*. So, it is possible that Eldefonsus was such a chorbishop in Hispania or the Marca Hispana and was not thought to have been attached to a particular see. Another possibility is that he was a bishop who in southern France was not assigned a see in known documents. In the early tenth century there is a document citing a bishop El(d)efonsus listed without see along with another bishop, Agambertus, also without see, but together with Agius specifically called bishop of Narbonne: *Venerabilis Agamberto, nec non et Elefonso Episcopis. Agio Narbonæ sedis Episcopus multimodas orationes. Audiuimus quod vos curtim pergere his diebus debetis.* There are bishops in related areas of southern France who are without the names of a see, like, for example, a bishop Erifons (Eldefonsus?) who signed a document dated in the Hispanic era, who after perhaps being dismissed from his diocese of Vindaque or Carpentras, was given the church of St-Quentin in Narbonne. It is interesting also that there is a subdeacon named Eldefonsus (with Vitiza, a Visigothic name) in charters from the Abbaye Sainte-Marie de Lagrasse in the county of Barcelona, Besalú and Urgell in the

---


104 *Histoire de Languedoc, avec des Notes et les Pieces justificatives* (Paris, 1733) II. XI. p. 50 n. 86, XII, p. 61.
tenth century.\(^{105}\) All of these tantalizing clues, although postdating our little tract, again point to southern France and the Marca Hispana in relation to our text.

There is another possible but admittedly highly speculative explanation for Eldefonsus of Spain. That is, the tract was written in the late eighth and early ninth century by Elipandus of Toledo. Elipandus was, after all, an acknowledged expert in liturgical matters, and by his time azymes may have been used not only north of the Pyrenees, but also in Spain. We have, to my knowledge, no extant hosts or host presses from the ninth century in Spain, but we do have the ancient host press from the eleventh century still in Vic in the Iberian peninsula with its design similar to one in our Eldefonsus text. As for the variety of patterns of hosts reported in the tract, the layouts of seven and nine hosts we saw earlier in Spain might have been for certain normal feasts, but there may have been others especially for important feasts such as reported in our tract. Also looking to a Spanish origin of our tract is the unusual equivalency of pounds to solidi, which Mabillon speculated was an anomaly in early medieval Spain.

Now, back to our Elipandus as a possible author of the original text seen in Vat. Lat. 1341. It was widely recognized that Elipandus of Toledo had recently been condemned as a heretic in 794, and after his recantation of his Adoptionist views _ca. 799_ had spent his last days at Lyons under “house arrest” by Leidrad among his Visigothic compatriot-refugees, where he was suspected of carrying on covertly his liturgical practices. Hence, rather than using the heretic’s name as author, the first part of his name _EL_ was combined with the latter part of Ildefonsus (DEFONSUS), whose prayers had been scorned by the bishops of France for their

---

\(^{105}\) See _Recueil des chartes de l’abbaye de la Grass T. 1, 779-1119_, eds. Elisabeth Magnou-Nortier and Anne-Marie Magnou (Paris, 1996) 121, Act No 72; and 123, Act No 73.
The result of this combination resulted in ELDEFONSUS, styled not as bishop of Toledo but of Spain, as was claimed for Elipandus’ hierarchical jurisdiction in the battle with Beatus of Liébana and Heterius of Osma. Of course this explanation of the name in the tract is highly speculative, and one must explain the date of 845 given in the preface to the tract. But here, one must remember that this preface is found in the Vatican and Paris manuscripts, likely from Aquitaine, where a Carolingian, not Hispanic era date was used. Could it be, as was earlier suggested, that a version of the text was composed by Elipandus or in Hispanic lands? It was found in southern France in which our two Paris manuscripts were written. There a Hispanic date was altered to 845 and a reference to “grana cerulei Aquitaniae tritici nostri” added. It may have been here in this area noted for its coinage and mints at Melle where the unusual concluding section on coinage was added, and where lobed altar mensae were plentiful on which to distribute the hosts. The text was sent to Corbie where there was intense debate on the Eucharist involving Radbertus, Ratramnus, and Charles the Bald. There, it can be speculated, Radbertus, thick in the fight over the Eucharist, took the tract, came up with “Eldefonsus” and the preface, removed the “Aquitaniae tritici nostri,” and had diagrams added by the geometry experts at Corbie. Klaus Zechiel Eckes showed in his study of the St. Petersurg Corbie manuscripts that whoever composed the Pseudo-Isidorian forgeries – Radbertus, he suspected – was a master in weaving bits of texts and names together. The text with its Spanish attribution was then appended to the collection of Hispanic canon law in

---

106 See the comment by the bishops of France on Ildefonsus: “It is better to give credit to the testimony of God the Father as to His own Son than to your Ildefonsus, who composed such prayers for you in your Mass as the holy and universal Church of God knows not. Nor do we think God listens to you when you say them. And if your Ildefonsus in the prayers he wrote called Christ ‘adoptive,’ our Gregory, Pope of the Roman See and Doctor renowned throughout the world, in his prayers never hesitated always to call Him the Sole-begotten One.” MGH Conc. II.145. Also see Alcuin’s Adversus Elipandum, PL 101.264-267, written for Leidrad and his companions on the occasion of their journey to Spain. See my The Visigothic Liturgy in the Realm of Charlemagne, pp. 919-945.
Vatican BAV Vat. Lat. 1341, the *Collectio Hispana Gallica Augustodunensis* that had been tinkered with by the Pseudo-Isidorian forgers, to give appropriate Spanish flavor to our text.107

There is finally the question as to why our tract was presented as a “revelation” or dream. Here one can only speculate, but the early introduction of Ezekiel’s revelation of the wheels within wheels and the four beasts might have suggested to the author that he use a similar device in his description of the circular hosts.108 On the other hand, there was, in the ninth century, a considerable number of treatises in dream form, and reports of visions abound in ninth-century works.109 Especially famous are the visions in the 840s of Audradus of St-Martin recorded in his *Book of Revelations*.110 There is even the famous illustrated ninth-century illustrated *Visio Baronti*, perhaps made by Hincmar of Rheims for Ebo.111 Although visions, revelations, and dreams in the ninth conveyed different meanings – narratives, divine revelations, or future prognostications or warnings -- they tend to blur as a genre. Hence, our tract is not out of place in this context.

107 Radbertus not only had contacts with Spanish texts like the *Collectio hispana*, in whatever form, but in his self-imposed retirement from Corbie to St.-Riquier until 865 when he returned to Corbie, he seems to have had contacts with other Spanish texts (principally the Spanish Bible), on which see E. Ann Matter, “The Lamentations Commentaries of Hrabanus Maurus and Paschasius Radbertus,” *Traditio* 38 (1982), p. 158 f.

108 It is interesting that Beatus in his Commentary on the Apocalypse, III.3 (5), also uses Ezekiel and his wheels. See *Commentarius in Apocalypsim*, ed. Henry A. Sanders. (Rome, 1930), pp. 306-314 and *Beati Liebanensis Tractatus de Apocalypsim*, ed. Roger Gryson, CCSL 107C (Turnhout, 2012) e.g. p. 391 and 433.

109 See, e.g., Paul Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming in the Carolingian Empire* (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1994), and the more recent work of Isabel Moreira, *Dreams, Visions, and Spiritual Authority in Merovingian Gaul* (Cornell, 2000), citing our text on p. 139.


During the late eighth and first half of the ninth century a number of commentaries, both small and large, were produced explaining various elements of the Mass. Among the shorter ones were the famous *Expositio brevis* describing a Gallican-rite Mass,\(^\text{112}\) the *Quotiens contra se*,\(^\text{113}\) *Primum in ordine*,\(^\text{114}\) *Dominus vobiscum*,\(^\text{115}\) and the Pseudo-Damasus-Pseudo-Jerome exchange of letters on the time of the Mass.\(^\text{116}\) And of course there were the more extensive commentaries by Amalarius of Metz, Rabanus Maurus, and others.\(^\text{117}\) Most of these commentaries, both short and long, can be found in multiple manuscripts, likely because they reflected the Roman (or more exactly the Romano-Frankish) rite becoming dominant not only in the north, but also in Aquitaine, Catalonia, and even Spain in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Ours, however, is confined to a few manuscripts. Whether it was considered too bizarre, not reflecting actual practice in Carolingian and post-Carolingian times, or associated with elements of the Old


\(^\text{113}\) PL 96.1481-1502, and see Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 446 (saec. IX\(^\text{2d}\); Lyons) fols. 71v-78r, with the text of the early ninth-century Collectio Dacheriana.

\(^\text{114}\) PL 138.1173-86, and see Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Pal. lat. 485, fols. 17v-27; and St. Petersburg, Rossiyskaya Natsional'naya Biblioteka, Q.v.1.34, fols. 23v-42v; where this tract written in one ninth-century hand is bound together in the manuscript with the Penitential of Halitgar written in another, fols. 45r-88r; on which see Kottje, *Die Bussbücher Halitgars von Cambrai*, p. 33 f.


\(^\text{117}\) On these see my “Guillaume Durand parmi les théologiens médiévaux de la liturgie,” *Guillaume Durand, Évêque de Mende* (v. 1230-1296), p. 165.
Spanish rite condemned in the late eleventh century, but still practiced in Toledo, and hence not frequently copied is unclear. Simply put, distributions of hosts of such complexity took too much time, especially in the Roman rite, always said to contrast in its “simplicity, practicality, great sobriety and self control, gravity, and dignity” with “Gallican” extravagant liturgical practices in their heavy symbolism, dramatism, and flowery verbal prolixity. By the time that Durandus of Mende in Languedoc penned his *Rationale* in the thirteenth century the idea of the Eucharistic azymes as coins of the heavenly king was still as bright as it had been in the twelfth century for Honorius Augustodunensis, but the unusual ritual distribution of hosts so carefully illustrated in our tract had disappeared. Nonetheless, the subject our little tract, the use of azymes in the Eucharistic liturgy, was and has been one of the most sensitive topics of debate between the churches of the East and West since the eleventh century and was one of the causes of the schism between those churches in the mid eleventh century. It would not be until Mabillon’s treatise on azymes with its appendix that our little tract would seem to have exerted any influence at all on the subject of Eucharist practice, of what hosts are to consist and how they are to be made, and especially how early they were used in the Western church. Although its influence may have been slight in terms of manuscript copies after the eleventh century, our little tract on Christ’s money was nonetheless a harbinger of what became Eucharistic practice throughout the centuries still in use today in the Latin church.

---

Eucharistic Adoration in the Carolingian Era? Exposition of Christ in the Host

By Roger E. Reynolds, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies

Eucharistic adoration has become a contentious topic in the past few decades. The controversy has occasionally hit the front pages of Catholic newspapers and journals, and even the pages of the venerable Boston Globe. Perhaps it should also have been reported on the entertainment or even the medical pages. The fuss is about whether Eucharistic adoration should be encouraged or not. In one corner of the controversy or battle are the “heavyweights” who argue forcefully for the maintenance, development, and promotion of Eucharistic adoration. In the other corner are the pesky tsetse-flyweights who argue that the practice should be reduced or even retired.

1 For their observations and valuable suggestions I am grateful to Peter Klein, John Williams, Lawrence Nees, Éric Palazzo, Aden Kumler, and Paul Dutton. I am especially indebted to Herbert Kessler, who has kindly confirmed with close inspection many of my observations on the illustrations of hosts in the Carolingian manuscripts and has generously given me additional examples not previously known to me to support my ideas. He has also kindly shared with me the draft of his forthcoming article, “Dynamic Signs and Spiritual Designs,” with its wealth of material.
Among the heavyweights in one corner are popes -- Pope Francis I, Pope Benedict XVI, the soon-to-become Pope St. John Paul II, and the list goes on back to Pope Urban IV, who in 1264 instituted the Feast of Corpus Christi and also had St. Thomas Aquinas compose the awe-inspiring Office of Corpus Christi. (fig. 1)

The heavyweight theologians supporting and promoting Eucharistic adoration are too numerous to mention, but one must certainly number St. Thomas himself, one of the greatest minds and theologians of all time and the author of the Office of Corpus Christi. (fig. 2)

In the same corner of the ring supporting Eucharistic adoration are many assistants. Chief among these are the many musical composers who have put St. Thomas’s *Tantum ergo sacramentum* and *O salutaris hostia* to music, and then the countless choirs that have sung these.
There are also those who have added verses to the *O salutaris hostia* invoking the host’s help for, among other things, peace to the lily of France. Also in the heavyweights’ corner are the thousands of artisans who have created host monstrances and tabernacles, some humble and others magnificent and enormous, gracing churches throughout Christendom. (fig. 3, 4)

Also in this corner of the ring are the “promoters” of the great Corpus Christi processions each year that draw hundreds of thousands of onlookers, who perhaps have not entered a church for years, but who humbly and reverently bow or kneel as the Eucharistic host passes. (fig. 5) Then there are the thousands of actual participants in these
Figure 4 (left) Host Tabernacle, S. Lorenz, Nurnberg by Adam Kraft, 15th century, 61 feet tall; (right) Corpus Christi Monstrance (The Great Monstrance of Arfe) by Enrique de Arfe, 1517-1524, Toledo, Spain. Photos: Creative Commons.
Corpus Christi processions at Toledo Cathedral, Spain. Photos: Creative Commons

processions, the clerics, politicians, military, bands, confraternities, and individuals, the author included.

These processions can be simple ones in small villages, or such magnificent ones such as those in Toledo Spain, or even in Corpus Christi procession of ships on the Rhine, the “Mülheimer Gottestracht.” (fig. 6)
And who can forget the spectacular displays of colored flower petals lovingly and patiently placed on the streets of Italian villages and towns over which the Corpus domini processes – the l’infiorata decorations that draw tour buses by the hundreds and thousands of tourists to the processions. Finally, Eucharistic adoration in its many forms can be a private devotion but it can also draw tens of thousands of the faithful to mass meetings. (fig. 7)

Moreover, one must not forget that the feast of Corpus domini is a holiday in many countries. To put it in direct terms, if one suppresses Eucharistic adoration in the feast of Corpus Christi, some people will lose a lovely spring holiday from work. So much for the heavyweights who favor Eucharistic adoration.

Now, in the other corner of our ring (the “squared circle”) are those who contend that Eucharistic adoration is misdirected and that the Eucharistic celebration should be focused not on a small wafer but on the celebration of the life of community, leading then to communal action, social activism and programs, and the like. Among the pesky tsetse-flyweights in the United States opposing Eucharistic adoration are, as one might expect, theological members of the Fightin’ Irish of Notre Dame. (fig. 8)
Richard McBrien, condescendingly acknowledges that some Catholics find adoration “spiritually enriching,” but many liturgists, he says, see it as a “step back into the Middle Ages.” (To which, of course, one responds “What’s wrong with the Middle Ages? Notre Dame has one of the finest Medieval Institutes in the world.”) According to McBrien, adoration distorts the meaning of the Eucharist: “It erodes the communal aspect, and it erodes the fact that the Eucharist is a meal. Holy Communion is something to be eaten, not to be adored.” For that reason, McBrien says, the practice should be “tolerated, but not encouraged.” One wonders if Christ is present in the sacramental celebration only when he pops in at the “Hoc est corpus meum” and pops out after the “Ite missa est.” McBrien’s colleague at Notre Dame, Liturgist Nathan Mitchell wants Eucharistic piety to be “socially conscious.” Mitchell’s chief worry is that “…one sometimes gets the impression that enthusiasm for practices like perpetual adoration ... embody a flight from the world’s woes rather than pro-active engagement in solving them.” Perhaps he means that time spent in adoration of the Eucharist is time wasted, that it should be spent in social action.  

If holy communion is something to be eaten, not adored, as McBrien argues, then what exactly is to be eaten? This has led to another contemporary controversy, a cause as it were, as to

---

2 As reported in the *National Catholic Reporter*, June 16, 2011. In the article McBrien sniffs at the Eucharistic adoration of the simple, cloistered nuns at the Shrine of St. Clement’s in Back Bay Boston, saying “Now that most Catholics are literate and even well-educated … there is little or no need for extraneous eucharistic devotions.” He did not mention that in Boston’s nearby Church of the Advent on Brimmer Street, Beacon Hill – the parish of my (and my two brothers’) friends, the “illiterate,” “uneducated” Harvard professors, Admiral Samuel Eliot Morison, Naval Commander Walter Muir Whitehill, and earlier “Mrs. Jack” Isabella Stewart Gardiner (who once celebrated Mass with the pope in his private Vatican chapel) – Eucharistic adoration and outdoor Corpus Christi processions have been and still are a tradition. On Morison and Whitehill at the Advent see the memorial for the latter in *The New England Quarterly*, 51/2 (1978), p. 253; on “Mrs. Jack” at the Advent see Louise Hall Tharp, *Mrs. Jack: A Biography of Isabella Stewart Gardiner* (repr. Graphics, 2010); and on Corpus Christi and processions there see the photo page on www.theadventboston.org. It was there, the air heavy with incense that my late wife fainted into the arms of Samuel Eliot Morison, and where my first-born was christened in the gothic font as Michele (for St.-Michel en Normandie).

3 As reported by James Hitchcock of St. Louis University in the *Adoremus Bulletin* 15/7 (October, 2009), n.p.
what should be eaten. This is a major issue addressed by my former student and professor of theology at Marquette University, Wanda Zemler-Cizewski, who is gluten intolerant. The Vatican has ruled that the host must be of wheat, something the gluten-free person cannot tolerate. But to compensate the Vatican has pointed out that partaking of the wine alone does qualify as fully communing since Christ is in every crumb of the host and every drop of the consecrated wine – as medieval theologians asserted. The response is, of course, what about the person who is both gluten intolerant and alcohol-abstinent who can neither eat the host nor drink the wine? The response, naturally, is that such a person should commune spiritually in Eucharistic adoration. But to counter this it is argued that Christ said “Take, eat” and “Take drink” not “Sit and stare.” And what about the gluten-free priest, who by canon law, must partake of both the body and blood? The solution is to bar such persons from the priesthood?

Whatever the solutions to these modern theological and liturgical issues, most scholars trace them back to medieval theology and liturgical practice. They all agree and repeatedly say that the practice of Eucharistic adoration goes back at least to the early thirteenth century certainly in the Lowlands and then somewhat later in the century in Rome and throughout western Christendom, where in 1264 the Feast of Corpus Christi was the first officially mandated feast for the universal church by Urban IV in his bull Transitus.4 Also it was in that century that the doctrine or theology of transubstantiation was mandated in the Fourth Lateran Council to explain how the real presence came about.5 It was also in this century that St. Thomas Aquinas


5 On the meaning and motives behind the decision of IV Lateran see Gary Macy, The Theologies of the Eucharist in the early Scholastic Period: a Study of the Salvific Function of the Sacrament according to the Theologians, c. 1080-c. 1220 (Oxford, 1984).
composed his magnificent Eucharistic hymns, the *Tantum ergo sacramentum* with its suggestive words “Therefore we, before him bending, this great Sacrament we revere,” and his *O salutaris hostia* with its equally suggestive words, “O saving Victim, opening wide the gate of heaven to man below.”

Some scholars then push the issue of Eucharistic adoration back to the eleventh century with the controversy over the meaning of the Eucharist by Berengar of Tours, who argued against the “real presence” and was condemned and forced to retract his idea with a profession repeated not long ago by Pope Paul VI (as the successor to “our predecessor,” Gregory VII) in his Encyclical *Mysterium fidei.* The case of Berengar, who took his support in the writings of Ratramnus of Corbie (whom he called Bertramnus), then leads scholars to push the issue back to Carolingian times with the debates between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie over the meaning of the Eucharist, which even involved the intervention of the king, Charles the Bald, who after examining the positions of Radbertus and Ratramnus gave his “official” royal approval to Radbertus’s theory of the “real presence.”

---

6 It has at times been argued that St. Thomas, O.P., may not have composed the office, on which see the discussion in the study of my late colleague, James Weisheipl, O.P., *Friar Thomas D’Aquino: his Life, Thoughts, and Works* (Oxford, 1975). It has been all but conclusively proven that he did. See the doctoral thesis done under my direction by Ronald John Zawilla, O.P., “The Biblical Sources of the *Historie Corporis Christi* attributed to Thomas Aquinas: A Theological Study to Determine their Authenticity” (Ph.D. diss. Toronto, 1985). His argument was fully persuasive to his examining committee made up of such Thomistic and Corpus Christi specialists as Fr. Pierre-Marie Gy, O.P. (Institut supérieur de liturgie, Paris) Fr. Leonard Boyle, O.P. (Prefect of the Vatican Library), and Fr. Walter Principe, C.S.B. (of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies). For the impetus of that study, see my “Corpus Christi in Agnone,” *Miscellanea Beneventana, Mediaeval Studies* 60 (1998), pp. 307-313. There have been since then, of course, many excellent studies of the office of Corpus Christi, including Jean-Pierre Torrell, O.P., *Saint Thomas Aquinas, The Person and his Work* (Washington, D. C., 2005); and Barbara R. Walters, Vincent Corrigan, Peter T. Ricketts, *The Feast of Corpus Christi* (College Park PA, 2006).

In the thirteenth century the doctrine of the “real presence” found in transubstantiation was reinforced visually in Eucharistic adoration. Could there have been something similar in the ninth century, in the Carolingian Age? It can be suggested that there likely was. Naturally, there was no doctrine of transubstantiation, and one immediately objects to the idea of Eucharistic adoration in the age of Charlemagne by pointing out that the term “adoratio” was condemned during the Iconoclastic controversy by Charlemagne through Theodulf of Orléans in the Libri Carolini (Opus Caroli regis contra synodum) and by numerous other court theologians. Through a mistranslation of the Greek word “proskunesis” the Carolingians believed that the Easterners favored worship of images and condemned them. On their side they said that “Istae [imagines] ad ornamentum vel ad res gestas monstrandas fiant,” often interpreted as approval of images for ornamentation and for what they represent, but not for veneration of the reality behind them. How then could the Carolingians have had a Eucharistic “adoratio”? Despite the stance of the Westerners, they continued to use the term “adoratio” and its derivatives in terms of appreciation of images in artistic media. There is a text attributed to Alcuin, who favored words over images,\(^8\) who speaks condescendingly of an “amator vel potius adorator imaginum” using words found in the Libri Carolini.\(^9\) One wonders if he secretly had Charlemagne in mind, who could not read but was clearly an “amator vel potius adorator imaginum,” as can be seen in his sponsorship or at least appreciation of such glorious books as the Godescalc Gospels made for him. Then there is Theodulf of Orléans, the “author” of the Libri Carolini, who nonetheless created the striking

---


mosaic image in his oratory at Germigny-des-Prés of the Ark of the Covenant with its four cherubim significantly hovering over and suggesting the altar below.\footnote{10} In short, the Carolingians, at least at the highest level, seem to have had an appreciation of images somewhat beyond that of simple ornamentation or didacticism.\footnote{11}

In a recent stimulating article on “Art, Liturgy, and the Five Senses in the Early Middle Ages,” Éric Palazzo demonstrates how Carolingians located sacred space and the divine in liturgical objects and rites.\footnote{12} The consecrated church with its candles, wall decorations, and chants was not simply a building but the Apocalyptic heavenly Jerusalem inhabited by the Lamb of God to be interiorized in the hearts of the faithful. A portable altar was not simply a highly decorated slab of stone, but a sacred space, an extension of the sacred space of a church, the Mensa domini of the Last Supper on which the body of Christ is consecrated to be consumed by the faithful. A paschal candle (pictured in the ninth-century Raganaldus Sacramentary) after its blessing, insertion of grains of incense representing the wounds of Christ and the Alpha and Omega was no longer a tall decorated beeswax candle, but the Lux mundi, the Lumen Christi to be reverenced by the faithful. The Gospel book read at Mass by the deacon, in the \textit{imago Christi},\footnote{13} after it had been blessed, censed, and reverenced with bows, was no longer a highly


\footnote{11} It could, of course, be argued that the artists who created these images had not “gotten” the official message from “above,” but this is unlikely given their continuous output of such images seemingly approved by their royal patrons.


\footnote{13} In the Ordinals of Christ the \textit{imago Christi} in the deacon is usually seen in Christ’s pedilavium, but at times he is associated with reading the Gospel, as in the Ste-Geneviève Ordinal, “Unde dicitur dyaconus de ablucione pedum discipolorum suorum dominus. Unde idem dominus levita dicitur. Consuetudo antiquiorum de tribu Levi levita facere erat, est proprium levitarum evangelium legere”; or in the Ordinal of Milan Ambrosiana T 62 sup. “Hoc officium Christus tunc inplevit quando pedes discipolorum lavit et ut alter alterius pedes lavet docuit. Ideo in eodem. Ideo diaconus evangelium legere quia sicut dominus donec evangelium predicavit minister fuit ut ipse ait. Non veni ministriari sed ministrae.” On this see my \textit{The Ordinals of Christ from their Origins to the Twelfth Century}
ornamented and decorated book both inside and out, but the Verbum domini, the Word made flesh. And finally, the host after consecration by the priest, in the *imago Christi,* with the words “Hoc est corpus meum” was no longer a morsel of bread or even a symbol, but the true body of Christ *in presentia.* It is in this intersection of art, theology, and liturgical practice that Eucharistic adoration in the Carolingian age can be discerned. It can be found in the Eucharistic illustrations in liturgical manuscripts, in the theology of the “real presence” developed by Paschasius Radbertus and approved by Charles the Bald, and in the use of azyme hosts popularized in the ninth century. The theological component of this mix, the real presence, has been adequately explored by theologians for centuries, so the focus here will be on the other two components, Eucharistic illustrations in the manuscripts and the use of azyme hosts during the Carolingian age.

---

14 See *The Ordinals of Christ,* passim.
Before turning directly to the Carolingian age itself, a look back to earlier Eucharistic illustrations in ancient western manuscripts is appropriate, with special attention as to the hosts on the altars or tables. What is styled as the earliest depiction of the Last Supper in western art is found in the Corpus Christi Gospels or the St. Augustine Gospels, dating to the sixth century. In one of the small square illustrations of the passion of Christ there is depicted the Cena domini: Christ is shown blessing a golden round object as he and his disciples are gathered around a semi-circular table (altar?) on which are arranged a chalice and six golden round objects with dots in the center. In the low center is a large round object, perhaps a rimmed paten, with an indistinct object in it, perhaps a fish or lamb. Are the six round objects with dots hosts or
loaves?\textsuperscript{15} Their rather large size likely means that they are loaves.\textsuperscript{16} (\textbf{fig. 9}) Also, it is interesting that they bear no Christian symbols, although one would not expect this for a scene at the Last Supper.\textsuperscript{17} But what of the small round disks held by Christ and the two figures to his left, Christ’s in gold and the others in white? Are the white disks pieces of the broken bread or possibly smaller azyme hosts? Also, it is unclear if these disks have small dots around them – to which we shall return.

While a Eucharistic illustration in a Gospel book such as the Corpus Christi Gospels is not totally unexpected, it can perhaps be found in an ancient manuscript with the Old Testament, the Ashburnham Pentateuch or Pentateuch of Tours, made in the late sixth or early seventh century in an area disputed by art historians – Spain, Rome, Syria, or North Africa. Several scenes have been carefully examined by Dorothy Verkerk in an older article and more recently in her book on the Ashburnham Pentateuch for Christian scenes with Eucharistic references.\textsuperscript{18}

In the Noah’s ark scene on fol. 10v Noah is shown before an altar blessing three vessels (ciboria or chalices?) in which small round objects are placed. They are likely not loaves but possibly hosts, although their violet color likely indicates grapes or other objects. (\textbf{fig. 10})

\textsuperscript{15} In the fresco of the Last Supper in San Angelo in formis (11\textsuperscript{th} century) there are twelve hosts laid out before the disciples, but that for Judas is separated from the others in the semi-circle.

\textsuperscript{16} One must, of course, be cautious about using the size of an object to judge whether it is a loaf or host, since even into the eleventh and twelfth centuries there could be large hosts, on which see Jules Corblet, \textit{Essai historique et liturgique sur les cibores et la réserve de l’eucharistie} (Paris, 1858), p. 19, 22. Even in the later Middle Ages there are depicted priests elevating a very large host with both hands; see the Tiptoft Missal, New York, Pierpont Morgan Library M 107, fol. 142r (14\textsuperscript{th} century); or Christ at the Last Supper in M 200, fol. 177v (14\textsuperscript{th} century).

\textsuperscript{17} There is a possibility, of course, that the six round circles with dots represent neither hosts nor loaves, but platters or dishes with the dots as remnants of compass prickmarks.

There are other altars that may be seen as Eucharistic altars in the Ashburnham Pentateuch. One of these is in the Moses scene on fol. 76r where three tents are pictured, 19 the largest being the tabernacle with a large block-shaped altar with a cavity in the front, which Verkerk interprets as a reliquary cavity. (fig. 11) On this altar is a round golden object, perhaps representing the Old Testament shewbread on the table of shewbread. Seen in Eucharistic terms, this might represent the host, its size probably indicating that it is a loaf, not an azyme host.

---

19 On the tents and tabernacle here and a similar scene in the tenth-century Mozarabic canonistic manuscripts, Codex Vigilanus and Codex Aemilianensis, see my “Rites and Signs of Conciliar Decisions in the Early Middle Ages,” Segni e Riti nella Chiesa Altomedievale occidentale, XXXIII Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo, Spoleto, 11-17 Aprile 1985 (Spoleto, 1987), pp. 207-249.
The other altar with more clear Eucharistic reference is on the same folio. (fig. 12)

Figure 12 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France nal. 2334, fol. 76r. Photo: Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France

Here there is a block-shaped altar with a chalice, two vessels (cruets?), and five round white objects with dots inside them. To the sides of the altar are seven white-robed individuals, who
Verkerk suggests are seven deacons. Moses holds the book of the Covenant which can be understood as the Mass diptychs (or does this represent the celebrant with some type of Mass book?). Whether or not the seven are deacons in the Roman rite, as Verkerk suggests, several do carry round white objects with black dots inside. Are all of these objects loaves or azyme hosts? Again, one cannot be certain, but their relative size in relation to the vessels and the fact that the individuals hold them in two hands suggests the former, and of course they do not bear Christian symbols because the scene is from the Old Testament.

That an illustrated Bible like the Ashburnham Pentateuch with Christian scenes was actually used in Christian liturgical services is clear in one of the annotations next to a lection on fol. 125r read in the ordination of a deacon: Lectio ordinationis diaconorum. (fig. 13)

![Figure 13](image-url)

**Figure 13** Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France nal. 2334, fol.125r. Photo: Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France

There are a number of other scenes in the Ashburnham Pentateuch with tables that, although depicting Old Testament events, might have suggested Eucharistic connections. Such is the scene on fol. 21r (fig. 14) with round white disks on the table or on fol. 22r with a table with five round

---

20 See the review of this book by Lawrence Nees in *The Catholic Historical Review* 91 (2005), pp. 135-138.
disks with dots within (fig. 15) and a table and chalice with violet disks and white circles (fig. 16)

Figure 14 (left) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France nal. 2334, fol. 21r. Photo: Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France; Figure 15 (right) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France nal. 2334, fol. 22r. Photo: Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France

Figure 16 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France nal. 2334, fol. 22r. Photo: Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France
Then on fol. 25r there is a table with a vessel-like object suggesting a chalice (fig. 17):

![Figure 17](image)

**Figure 17** Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France nal. 2334, fol. 25r. Photo: Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France

Later it will be shown that Eucharistic hosts were equated with coins. Related to coins in the form of hosts is a depiction on fol. 30r of Joseph’s brothers eating or celebrating their payment for delivering Joseph, some of which white or silver coins (about thirty, the price of a slave [Exod. 21:32] or the price of Christ betrayed) look suspiciously as if they have a design resembling scoring or division marks on a loaf, (fig. 18) although this same star-shaped design surrounded by circles of dots can be found in the famous ancient Jewish Miriam ossuary. (fig. 19)

---

21 Honorius Augustodensis in the twelfth century compared the Eucharistic host to a coin because Christ the living coin was betrayed for coins. See his *Eucharistion*, PL 172: 1256.
Figure 18 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France nal. 2334, fol. 30r. Photo: Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France

Figure 19 Miriam Ossuary. s. I; Jerusalem: Photo IAA.

On fol. 44r there are two depictions of tables. (fig. 20)
The first shows Joseph’s brothers gathered around a semi-circular table resembling a depiction of the Last Supper; the second with individuals, both white and dark faced, at a table with white round disks on it. (fig. 21)

Later in the manuscript on fol. 127v there is a depiction of the Old Testament tabernacle or “Temtorium [sic] domini,” over which are
hanging lamps, before which is a hanging lamp, and within which is a table with five golden disks on the mensa – suggesting the traditional five altar crosses -- being adored by two cherubim with fanning wings (flabella). (fig. 22)

![Figure 22](image)

**Figure 22** Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France nal. 2334, fol. 127v. Photo: Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France

Let us now go to the first visual portrayals of the Eucharistic bread or hosts in the ninth century, portrayals rarely mentioned by liturgical historians. The first is seen in the Gospels from Augsburg of the first quarter of the ninth century, where on a square-shaped chest or block altar with fabric frontal decorated with an X (possibly a chrism) and dots, there is a golden chalice next to a large circular object. This may be a paten\(^{22}\) with host within, but it may also be a large a

\(^{22}\) Cf. a similar round object on the altar in the well-known fresco of the Mass of St. Clement in the lower church of San Clemente in Rome (c. 1100).
golden loaf marked with division or scoring marks, not Christian symbols as an imprinted host might have. (fig. 23)

Figure 23 Augsburg Gospels, Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 23631, fol. 197v. Photo: author

Then there is the famous ninth-century ivory back cover of the Drogo Sacramentary with scenes of the Eucharistic liturgy in Metz under Drogo himself. 23 Palazzo characterizes this as “sacred space” in a liturgical book “for it displays the liturgy and at the same time the sacred space of ritual performance.” 24 Drogo stands under a baldacchino or ciborum with hanging light or reliquary with a large round loaf on the altar. (fig. 24)


There are, as one might expect in a sacramentary, other Eucharistic images. One of these is in the great Te igitur page, fol. 15v, where two figures with lambs face a bearded celebrant at an altar with a hanging lamp above and a handled chalice and two round hosts next to it. One wonders, is the ancient bearded celebrant Melchizedek associated with leavened bread or Aaron associated with azymes? (fig. 25)

**Figure 25** Celebrant at altar, Drogo Sacramentary, fol. 15v. Photo: Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France
Then there is the crucifixion scene on fol. 43v with the chalice receiving the blood of Christ (fig. 26):

![Crucifixion Scene, Drogo Sacramentary, fol. 43v](image)

**Figure 26** Crucifixion Scene, Drogo Sacramentary, fol. 43v. Photo: Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France

The Last Supper is depicted in another scene on fol. 44v with a chalice and what appear to be two loaves with division or scoring marks on the circular table. There are only nine disciples gathered around the table, the one on the right, perhaps Judas, seems to be reaching toward the chalice with Christ reaching or pointing in that direction. (fig. 27)

![Last Supper, Drogo Sacramentary, fol. 44v](image)

**Figure 27** Last Supper, Drogo Sacramentary, fol. 44v. Photo: Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France
On a Vere dignum page, fol. 46v, there is an altar shown under a ciborium with a figure holding an open book for the celebrant, mirroring the lowest central panel of the ivory cover (fig. 28):

![Figure 28](image)

**Figure 28** (left) Vere dignum, Drogo Sacramentary, fol. 46v. Photo: Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France; (right) Drogo Sacramentary Ivory Cover detail. Photo: Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France

For the Vigil of the Nativity of Saint Paul on fol. 87v (fig. 29) a celebrant stands under a ciborium with hanging lamp behind an altar on which stand a handled chalice and what appears to be a partially shown white circular host or loaf. Figures facing him are bowed in reverence or adoration.

![Figure 29](image)

**Figure 29** Vigil of the Nativity of St. Paul, Drogo Sacramentary, fol. 87v. Photo: Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France
And finally for the feast of St. Arnulf on fol. 91r (fig. 30) the saint is shown approaching an altar with lamp hanging under a ciborium.

Figure 30 Feast of St. Arnulf, Drogo Sacramentary, fol. 91. Photo: Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France

Then there is the well-known ninth-century Raganaldus Sacramentary, produced by the Tours school, perhaps working at St. Martin of Marmoutiers for Raganaldus, Abbot of Marmoutiers (843-846). On fol. 8r there is a scene of the Cena Domini within a circle with dots around it labelled “Cum propriis Christus caenum sacravit alumnis.” There appears here a footed table around which the twelve disciples sit with Christ, with a golden chalice, a golden knife, two golden spoons, a golden vessel with white round objects inside, and a larger white round object with division or scoring marks. Christ is pictured above with a similar golden round object and a golden chalice. (fig. 31)

First, the golden objects on the table, which are liturgical since they are of precious metal. The chalice is obvious. The knife is there apparently to divide the loaf, as was (and remains) the eastern practice with lance and the próosphoron.

Figure 32a Liturgical Fistula/Straw, ca. 1230–50, silver, partly gilt; niello, jewels, Germany. Metropolitan Museum of Art. Photo: Metropolitan Museum of Art
Figure 32b Silver spoons from Sutton Hoo, Suffolk, England, Byzantine, 7th century. Photo: British Museum

Figure 32c Derrynaflan Strainer, Tipperary, Ireland, 8th-9th century. Photo: Creative Commons.

Figure 32d (left) Derrynaflan Chalice, Tipperary, Ireland, 8th-9th century. Photo: Creative Commons; (right) Armagh Chalice, Limerick, Ireland 8th century. Photo: Creative Commons.
Then, there are two golden spoons. What is the function of these? In the Eastern church they were (and are) used to communicate the bread and wine together. But in the West a liturgical straw/fistula or spoon (fig. 32a) could be used to communicate the wine from such wide-mouthed chalices as the Armagh26 or Derrynaflan chalices (fig. 32d) that would have dangerously spilled if poured directly into the communicant’s mouth.27 The other spoon (fig. 32b) may be for testing the potability of the wine or measuring the amount of wine to be poured into the chalice, or it may represent a pierced spoon or even a liturgical strainer, like the ancient Irish Derrynaflan strainer,28 (fig. 32c) used to remove impurities or insects from the wine that evaded the fanning Eucharistic flabella, such as the great Carolingian flabellum of Tournus recently described by Herbert Kessler.29 (fig. 33)

Figure 33 Flabellum for Charles the Bald, Florence Museum, Bargello. Photo: Florence Museum, Bargello

26 There is a faithful replica of this chalice at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, given by a donor who obtained it after the Chicago World’s Columbian Exposition (1893), on which Nicola Gordon Bowe “Imagining an Irish past: The Celtic Revival 1840-1940,” *Irish Arts Review Yearbook* 10 (1994), p. 106 f.

27 In his article on the Derrynaflan hoard Michael Ryan suggests that both the Ardagh and Derrynaflan chalices were “ministerial” chalices to be given to the faithful, perhaps not realizing the possibility of spilling. See his valuable “The Derrynaflan Hoard and Early Irish Art,” *Speculum* 72 (1997), p. 1003 ff. It has been argued that the spoons in the Sutton Hoo hoard could not be liturgical spoons since they bear the names of Saul and Paul, but these names, for whatever reason, would not have prevented their use as liturgical spoons.

28 On this see Ryan, “The Derrynaflan Hoard and Early Irish Art,” p. 1003.

Or it could be a spoon to sprinkle incense, as found in the objects for the table of shewbread in the Old Testament. Is the white round object on the table a leavened loaf or an azyme host? It is likely the former since it bears division or scoring marks and not distinctive Christian symbols such as a chrismon. Thus it likely represents an unleavened loaf, not an azyme host that Christ would have used in the Cena Domini, the Feast of Unleavened Bread (as Mabillon might have argued). Moreover, one would not need a knife to divide azyme hosts.

**Figure 34** Detail of Autun Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 19bis, fol. 8r. Photo: Enluminures

But what of the golden vessel on the left and what is in it? (fig. 34) At first sight it looks like a vessel with a fish or perhaps a lamb of the same color as the vessel such as one finds in some medieval illustrations of the Last Supper. But on closer inspection it appears that there are round or semi-round white disks arranged around the rim of the vessel encircling what at first looked like a fish of the same color as the vessel. Could this object be a ciborium with hosts or perhaps a footed lobed paten in which the small objects have been placed in a circle? It might be thought that these small white objects are the pieces of the divided loaf, but their circular shape makes hosts more likely. Thus, there may be a double meaning in the image as a whole, that is, both leavened bread and azymes are on the table of the Cena Domini, such as was suggested in the Corpus Christi Gospels. And what of the number of pieces or hosts within the vessel? It is

---

30 For fish see, e.g., the Codex Vssegradensis, Národní knihova České republicky XIV.A.13, fol. 38v (11th century); New York, Pierpont Morgan Library M 780, fol. 27v (11th century); the Albani Psalter, Hildesheim Dombibliothek St. God. 1, p. 41 (12th century); Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Codex Bruchsal 1, fol. 28r (ca.1220), New York, Pierpont Morgan Library M 283, fol. 15r (13th century); M 729, fol. 319v (13th century); M 739, fol. 22v (13th century); M 76, fol. 176v (15th century); M 868, fol. 27v (15th century); or the early mosaic at Sant’Apollinare nuovo in Ravenna (6th century); and for a lamb see the famous fresco of the Last Supper in San Angelo in formis (11th century); and New York, Pierpont Morgan Library M 766, fol. 37v (15th century).
now unclear exactly how many there are, but it appears that there may be as many as eight or more, that is, one for each of the disciples around the table. But there is another possibility that there are only eleven in the vessel, one for each of the disciples, excluding Judas. This possibility is suggested by the tradition depicting an unnimbed Judas and eleven pieces in the vessel, such as is found in a modern icon copy of the Last Supper above the iconostasis of the tenth- or eleventh-century church of Saint Iliya in Solnechnaya Dolina (Crimea), based on an earlier model there. (fig. 35)

**Figure 35** Last Supper Icon, Church at Solnechnaya Dolina. Photo: author

---

31 In the ninth-century Stowe Missal, Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, MS. D.ii. 3, (No. 1238) it is noted that the division of the Eucharistic fraction is “eleven for the Apostles” (the incomplete number due to the sin of Judas); on which see my “Christ’s Money: Eucharistic Azyme Hosts in the Ninth Century According to Bishop Eldefonsus of Spain: Observations on the Origin, Meaning, and Context of a Mysterious Revelation,” *Peregrinations: Journal of Medieval Art and Architecture*, Vol. IV, No. 2, p. 35.

32 In the so-called Last Supper illustration of the Albani Psalter, p. 41, Judas has no nimbus. Also see the Codex Vssegradensis, Národní knihova České republiky XIV.A.13, fol. 38v (11th century); New York, Pierpont Morgan Library G 44, fol. 80r (11th century); M 43, fol. 22v (13th century); M 440, fol. 11v (13th century); M 729, fol. 319v (13th century); M 739, fol. 22v (13th century); M 643, fol. 8v (14th century); M 485, fol. 40v (15th century); M 76, fol. 176v (15th century); M 385, fol. 18r (15th century); M 868, fol. 27v (15th century); or M 1078, fol. 88v (15th century). Elsewhere, however, he can be portrayed with a nimbus: New York, Pierpont Morgan Library M 780, fol. 27v (11th century); M 44, fol. 6v (12th century); M 283, fol. 15r (13th century); G 16, fol. 88v (14th century); M 387, fol. 300v (15th century); or even a black nimbus, M 653.4 (14th century).

33 For this information I am indebted to the parish priest of the church (Feast of St. Iliya, 2013). There may be some confusion here since a nimbed figure on the right appears to be reaching for an object that may represent a bag of coins or a sop. Clearly, however, the figure on the far left has no nimbus as do other disciples in the portrait.
As one pages through the Raganaldus Sacramentary one finds multiple images of Eucharistic apparatus and symbols, some suggesting that hosts were known and used. On fol. 8r there is a chalice and footed paten not unlike that in the Cena domini scene (fig. 36):

![Figure 36 Raganaldus Sacramentary, fol. 8r., 9th century, Bibliothèque Municipale d’Autun. Photo: author.](image)

On fol. 11v there is a circle with the Lamb of God with cross and a chalice beneath it (fig. 37):

![Figure 37 Raganaldus Sacramentary, fol. 11v., 9th century, Bibliothèque Municipale d’Autun. Photo: author.](image)

Then, there are many instances of circles with floral patterns in them suggesting lobed patens, e.g., fol. 98r, here with the Exultet candle (fig. 38):

![Figure 38 Raganaldus Sacramentary, fol. 98r, 9th century, Bibliothèque Municipale d’Autun. Photo: author](image)
In the Sacramentary there are numerous coins with portraits on them, but there are instances of golden “coins” in circles or what may be golden hosts, e.g., fol. 92r (fig. 39)

Figure 39 Raganaldus Sacramentary, fol. 92r., 9th century, Bibliothèque Municipale d’Autun. Photo: author

Among the golden altar apparatus hanging from baldacchinos are lights or reliquaries and handled flagons, e.g. fol. 96r (fig. 40):

Figure 40 Raganaldus Sacramentary, fol. 96r., 9th century, Bibliothèque Municipale d’Autun. Photo: author

Hanging lamps from baldacchinos are also pictured, e.g., fol. 94v (fig. 41):

Figure 41 Raganaldus Sacramentary, fol. 94vr., 9th century, Bibliothèque Municipale d’Autun. Photo: author

And finally on fol. 2r there is a cross with pendant Alpha and Omega above a circular golden disk with a (blessing?) right hand. (fig. 42):

Figure 42 Raganaldus Sacramentary, fol. 2r., 9th century, Bibliothèque Municipale d’Autun. Photo: author

Suddenly, at almost the same time as the Raganaldus Sacramentary was being copied and in the midst of the Eucharistic controversy between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie over the real presence of Christ in the Eucharistic host there appeared a little tract, a “Revelatio” given to a mysterious bishop Eldefonsus of Spain, on azyme hosts, with diagrams of the hosts, what should be stamped on them, how they are to be distributed on the altar, and of what they should be made. This tract has attracted the attention of liturgical scholars and numismatists since the days of Jean Mabillon, who printed it in the seventeenth century in his Analecta vetera, on the basis of an unknown Vatican manuscript, as firm proof of the use of azymes by the ninth century. I have recently dealt at length with this little tract, but a number of issues in it should be emphasized in preparation for almost contemporary scenes of the exposition of the host.

The hosts pictured appear in the tract as it was edited by Jean Mabillon in 1685 and is reprinted in Migne’s Patrologia Latina 106.881-890. It begins boldly by stating that it is a “Revelatio” to a bishop Eldefonsus of Spain, given early in the morning of seventh day of the tenth month of the year 845, on the bread of azymes or unleavened bread. The beholder sees a
pair of circles, which are illustrated in the text, inscribed with a series of words and abbreviations (fig. 43):

**Figure 43** Mabillon’s Illustration of azymes. Photo: author

On the first side within two circles are the words Veritas/Truth, Mathew, John, Rex/ King, God, Jesus, Christ, Lux, Pax, Gea [sic], Vita, Mark, Luke and Vita again. Then he turns to the other side of the coin with the words Altissimus Deus/Highest God, Peter, Sion, and Paul, two lines enclosing between the lines the three persons of the Trinity represented by three points, Pater, Eilius [sic], Spiritus Sanctus, and below them Andrew, Jerusalem, IACR [sic], and Omnipotent Lord all giving tributes.

(fig. 44)

**Figure 44** Mabillon’s Illustration of azymes. Photo:author

Eldefonsus then goes on to say that these circles represent a host, the money of the celestial King, which excel in dignity the forms of money of earthly kings. Looking to the five points in the first circle (four around the fifth of the cross) it is said that in their unending circular form they are like God who has neither beginning nor end. Jumping briefly to another “revelatio,” the prophecy of Ezechiel, Eldefonsus cites the five wheels and four animals.

The Revelatio continues on with the azymes and breastplate of Aaron, presumably because azymes belong to the Aaronic priesthood, while simple bread is associated with the
priest Melchizedek. He returns to his illustrations by saying that just as the apostles Andrew and James [IACR] beneath the lower line were colleagues on earth, so Peter and Paul above the upper line were joined with the most high God and the other saints, as were the four evangelists (being represented by Ezechiel’s four beasts) on the other side of the host.

Actually, the manuscript on which Mabillon based this text and its diagrams is now Vatican Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 1341, written in Corbie in the ninth century, where the controversy between Radbertus and Ratramnus was taking place. The illustrations in the manuscript differ from those published by Mabillon. In the first pair of circles on fol. 187v there are five dots in the center, four surrounding the cross in the center with its dot in the center. Surrounding the whole are fifty-one small dots or circles, something Mabillon omitted. The fifty-one circles, corresponding to the fifty-one hosts at the three masses of Christmas described later in the tract, were not carefully planned to encompass the circle entirely, there being a line between two of them at the base as a space filler. (fig. 45)

Figure 45 (left) Mabillon’s illustration; (right) Vatican BAV Vat. lat. 1341. Photo: author

---

35 It is interesting that the Orthodox in their controversy with the West over azymes have always insisted that Christ is a priest after the order of Melchizedek [Ps. 109:4; Heb. 5:6, 10, 20], not Aaron [Heb. 7:6]. Azymes belong the Aaronic priesthood, while Melchizedek is said to have offered bread (artos), not azymes (azuma) [Gen. 14:18].
Regarding the circles on the edge, lines, and dots, it is interesting to compare examples of Carolingian coins with their dotted edges, lines, dots, and simple names of the earthly king.\(^{36}\) (fig. 46)

**Figure 46** Carolingian Coins of Charlemagne from the Mint at Melle. Photo: CGB

The rim with dots within and the cross in the manuscript illustration, not seen in Mabillon’s diagram, are very important to note. Numismatists give several reasons for the dots or “pellets” around the borders of coins. It is said that the dotted border of coins, ancient and medieval, was the outer edge of value-- in other words, the dots on Carolingian coins fix the value. If compromised (since the metal value of the silver coin was the real worth of the coin), the coin still had some metal value but no representational or exact exchange value. By this standard, Charlemagne’s denarius from Melle displayed here has lost its representational value since its dotted border has been compromised.\(^ {37}\) Another reason for the dots is that the pellets around the perimeter were to prevent people from trimming the outer edges off and reducing the value of the coin. That the dots on the coin in the Eldefonsus tract are not simply an artist’s creation but

---

\(^{36}\) For examples of many coins of the time of Charles the Bald, see D. M. Metcalf, “A Sketch of the currency in the time of Charles the Bald” in *Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom* (rev. edit) eds. Margaret T. Gibson and Janet L. Nelson (Aldershot, 1990), p. 95. Especially important and interesting in relation to the origins of our tract is the coinage minted from the Aquitainian mines at Melle.

\(^{37}\) I owe this valuable observation to Paul Dutton, who has kindly written me “The rim (often raised as on our coins today) or outer edge of a coin is always subject to degrading over time. It delimits the coin as an object but does not define its worth, which is determined by the beaded or dotted border which lies inside it. In the ancient and medieval worlds, it is my understanding, that it was common practice to test the metallic worth of a coin by testing its rim, often with a knife or teeth. It was also common practice to shave off that material beyond the border, since it was excess or superfluous to the coin's nominal value. But to shave, cut, or infringe upon the beaded border inside the rim was to destroy the nominal value of the coin--it became useless as a representational object (i.e. was no longer a denarius for purposes of exchange).”
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representative of actual hosts can be seen in an existing host press from the eleventh century now in the Museu Episcopal of Vic that not only has the same imprint as one of Eldefonsus’s hosts with the Alpha and Omega with bumps over it but also a ring of dots around the perimeter of the host on the press. (fig. 47)

**Figure 47a**  Host Press. 11th century, Vic, Museu Episcopal. Photo: author

It is interesting also that Ezekiel’s wheels were full of eyes, perhaps represented in the circles or dots of our illustration. It is significant, moreover, that one side of Christ’s money in the Eldefonsus revelation has a “long cross,” a device common in later medieval English coins to prevent the coin from being clipped, thus reducing the weight and value of the silver content of the coin. The idea was that an extended “long’ cross” on the coin would make it much clearer to
the user if coin had been tampered with, and thus one should refuse it if the ends of all four limbs were not visible. In short, the dotted border and “long cross” on our money of the heavenly king emphasize its real worth and value. On the obverse side of our coin there are clearly three dots, and the fourth line of names has the abbreviations ANDR, NERL, ICAB. \(\textbf{(fig. 48)}\)

Turning to the hosts themselves Eldefonsus says that just as the thumb of a man can cover a coin, with three fingers especially three representing the Trinity, one host can encompass three coins touching one another, and he presents an illustration of this with three hosts inside a larger circle. One wonders if this diagram could be related to the three or Trinity of circles/hosts/patens in the contemporary Raganaldus Sacramentary (845) in the same form representing three events in Christ’s life, his nativity, baptism/epiphany, and passion in the Last Supper. \(\textbf{(fig. 49)}\)
A discussion then follows as to what is to be inscribed on the hosts: XPC, IHC, or DS, but not DNS, REX, PAX, OMNIPOTENS, VITA, or PANIS. There then follow two diagrams of hosts, one with XPC and the other with a cross surmounting the letters Α and ω. (fig. 50) Again, the original Vatican used by Mabillon depicting what should be stamped on the hosts has a different version. (fig. 51) Mabillon reversed these and placed a cross above the Alpha and Omega rather than the bumped lines above these two letters in the manuscript. (fig. 51)
Turning to the making of the hosts, Eldefonsus says that the iron in which the hosts are made should be constructed so that in the center is a large host with four smaller hosts surrounding it. The four hosts can be inscribed with the letters XPC at the top, IHC below, REX to the left and DS to the right.

The quality and measurements of the hosts is then described. “Blue wheat” or the finest wheat is to be used. Why should it be wheat rather than another grain? That wheat rather than other grains should be used is because in Carolingian times a modius of wheat was worth three or four denarii as opposed to one for oats and two for barley.\textsuperscript{38} The “blue wheat” in our text is specifically said to have come from Aquitaine in the two other Paris manuscripts in which it is found and is called “centum quinquaginta tria grana cerulei Aquitaniae tritici nostri.” Whether or not this was in the original text or was added by a scribe proud of Aquitanian wheat is not certain. Indeed, this reference to our Aquitanian wheat led Jean Lebeuf centuries ago to state on the basis of manuscript Colbert 3682, Reg. 4357\textsuperscript{5} (now corresponding to Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2855) that the author of the tract was Aquitanian.\textsuperscript{39}

But when did the use of these azyme hosts come into use in the Western church? There may have been clues in the earlier manuscripts. But there is a more positive clue in a manuscript written about the same time as our little tract. It is found in a rarely studied illustration from a Psalter manuscript now in Stuttgart. From the first half of the ninth century this psalter, made in St-Germain-des-Prés, depicts a square-shaped chest altar with a golden chalice and four round white objects on the mensa next to it. Significantly these are the only two objects on the altar and

\textsuperscript{38} See Garipzanov, The Symbolic Language of Royal Authority, p. 34 and literature therein.

\textsuperscript{39} Jean Lebeuf, Recueil de divers écrits pour servir d’éclaircissements à l’histoire de France et de supplément à la notice des Gaules (Paris, 1738) 2, p. 81, n. a. In his footnote Lebeuf was dealing with the question of weights and measures in our tract.
that the cross has been attached to the rear of the altar and the candlestick is placed in front of the altar, as was the usual practice and regulation in the West until the tenth century, when candles and crucifixes began to appear on altars.\footnote{It should be remembered that until the tenth century it was the general rule (clearly not followed in the Frankfurt Mass cover pictured below) that the only objects on the altar should be the Gospels (the Verbum domini) and the host and wine in their vessels. Even into the tenth century the \textit{Admonitio synodalis} of pseudo- Leo IV did not allow candles on the altar. \textit{Super altare nihil ponatur nisi capsae, et reliquiae, et quatuor Evangelia et pixis.} For the most recent treatment of this tenth-century text see Herbert Schneider, \textit{"New Wine in Old Skins: remarks on the Collectio Burdegalensis,"} \textit{Canon Law, Religion, and Politics: Liber Amicorum Robert Somerville}, eds. U-R. Blumenthal, A. Winroth, and P. Landau (Washington, D.C., 2012), p. 49 f., nn. 34-35. It was in the tenth century that other objects such as candles and crucifixes came to be placed on the altar, such as those of Bernward of Hildesheim. Also see my \textit{“Altar -- Altar Apparatus,”} \textit{Dictionary of the Middle Ages} 1, ed. J. R. Strayer (New York, 1982), pp. 221-225.} Whether the four round objects are small loaves of bread or azyme hosts is difficult to tell. It could be that they are four pieces that have been divided from a larger loaf, but their round form and small size suggests they are azyme hosts.

(\textit{fig. 52})

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek Cod. bibl. fol. 23, fol. 130v. Photo: author}
\end{figure}
Slightly after the 840s a clear example of the use of azymes is found in a famous ivory book cover, the celebrated Frankfurt ivory cover, studied recently by Éric Palazzo, said to have been
made at the time of Charles the Bald. 41 (fig. 53) One of the ivory covers depicts the episcopal celebrant surrounded by clerics behind him and choristers with open mouths below likely singing the Sanctus. 42 On the altar are a chalice with handles (shaped not unlike the ancient Gourdon chalice), (fig. 54) the book of the Gospels, and what is likely not a sacramentary (with all of its texts like a Sacramentary or Missal, which other clerics might read or chant) but a “Canon Libellus” that a celebrant would use. 43 Next to the chalice is a rimmed paten with objects sometimes called a “pretzel-like” host or loaf. 44 Clearly, however, there are three round objects with points placed one upon the other, not a single object. Why they are not perfectly round is puzzling, but the objects appear to have rims – something we have found in some of the hosts in Vat. Lat. 1341. It has been suggested that the three reflect Trinitarian symbolism in the work of Amalarius of Metz, 45 but in any event, they appear likely to be three hosts in a paten laid out in a pattern.

Among the Gospel manuscripts of the late Carolingian period with Eucharistic symbolism resembling the hosts of Eldefonsus is the Gospel of Gauzelin, bishop of Toul, now in Nancy, Trésor de la Cathédrale (fig. 55):


42 This cover is in the Liebieghaus Museum, Frankfurt am Main (the other being in the Cambridge Fitzwilliam Museum); on which see Kunst und Kultur der Karolingerzeit. Karl der Grosse und Papst Leo III in Paderborn (Paderborn, 1999), p. 830.

43 In my “Sacramentary,” Dictionary of the Middle Ages 10, ed. J. R. Strayer (New York, 1988), pp. 605-606, it was suggested that there were libelli with the Mass canon separate from the prayers of the sacramentary. The “Coronation Canon Libellus” for Charles the Bald, to treated later, clearly confirms this.

44 For a pretzel-like objects resembling a host see New York, Pierpont Morgan Library M 780, fol. 27v (11th century); or G 44, fol. 80r (12th century).

45 See Palazzo, op. cit. pp. 18-19.
At first sight it appears that the object in the center is a rectangular chest altar with decorated frontal or antependium with crosses and dots, something resembling the Augsburg frontal seen already. But if one flips this, it appears as the mensa of an altar with large hosts consisting of dotted circles with crosses.  

We now turn to the famous Carolingian Majestas domini pages with Christ blessing with Eucharistic symbolism. There is, first, the celebrated Evangéliaire de Sainte-Croix de Poitiers (Poitiers Médiathèque François-Mitterrand, MS 17 [65]), fol. 31r, where Christ sits with a closed or sealed book in his left hand and blesses with his right. Above him in cross form are the Greek words Phos and Zoe and outside are the Latin Lux and Vita, not unlike the words found on the Eldefonsus coin. Further, the evangelists, pictured in almost the same order as they are on our Eldefonsus coin, are within circles of dots, again not unlike those around the Eldefonsus coin in Vat. Lat. 1341.  

\[\text{Figure 55} \text{ Gospels of Gauzelin with altar, Nancy, Trésor de la Cathédrale. Photo: Herbert Kessler. Flip by author}\]

---

46 This item was kindly brought to my attention by Herbert Kessler.
But more important there is a variety of grand Carolingian manuscripts likely begun in the 840s with a variant of the Majestas pages with Christ, not blessing, but holding a circular object in his right or blessing hand. In these one can see what one might be called Eucharistic adoration in the Carolingian era. The first of these is in a grand Gospel Book made in 849-851 not long after our Eldefonsus text in 845 while the Eucharistic controversy between Radbertus...
and Ratramnus raged. It is in the Lothar Gospels, which Lothar personally directed its decoration and the monastic artist, Sigilaus, cared for the details.\footnote{On this see Garipzanov, \textit{The Symbolic Language of Royal Authority}, p. 236 n. 19.} (fig. 57)

![Figure 57 Majestas domini, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 266, fol. 2v. Photo: Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France](image)

Here Christ is seated on the orb of the earth and holds in his right hand between his thumb and fourth or ring finger a small golden disk with a rim around it. The small round object in Christ’s right hand has at times been interpreted as the orb of the earth or the cosmos, but this is somewhat curious in that the book in Christ’s left hand is larger than the orb of the earth in his
right hand. There is thus another possibility, however, that the small round object represents the Eucharistic host as a coin-like azyme, something coming into use at the time of Charles the Bald and the Eucharistic controversy. In an older article, this is precisely what the art-historian Meyer Schapiro suggested, something more recently confirmed by Éric Palazzo in his study of another manuscript, to be seen in a moment, the so-called Coronation “Sacramentary” of Charles the Bald.

What makes this manuscript of the Lothar Gospels extraordinary in terms of its Eucharist imagery are the multiple objects, many with white dots, in the decorative pages of the manuscript. These are wholly unexpected as this is a Gospel book with the text of the Gospels and not a specifically Eucharistic book such as a sacramentary or missal. Some of these are also found in the Gospels of Le Mans, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 261, and the Gospels of Du Fay, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 9385 (843-51). To the casual viewer these are simply random decorations, but on close inspection they are almost a catalogue of Eucharistic vessels and altar apparatus, many like those in the Raganaldus Sacramentary. One finds multiple examples of disks/coins/hosts some surrounded by dots, other not, some in gold, others in royal purple, some with chrismon signs, some with chrismon signs with pendant alpha and omega. Beyond these are Eucharistic vessels, chalices, ciboria, cruets, and flagons. Then there are chest altars, both rectangular and square. Then there are hanging lamps or pyxes hanging from arches reminiscent of the baldacchino in the Drogo


49 There are other Turonian manuscripts with hanging lamps: in the Rorigo Bible, Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 359, fols. 359v and 360r; and the Sacramentary of Tours, Bibliothèque municipale 184, fol. 2v. It was common to hang such vessels, especially chalices, in the arches or baldacchinos of a church, as we know from the descriptions of hanging chalices in the Roman churches reported in the Liber pontificalis, on which see Raymond Davis, The Lives Of The Eighth-Century Popes (Liber Pontificalis). The Ancient Biographies Of Nine Popes From AD 715 To AD 817 (Liverpool, 1992), p. 209.
Sacramentary. There is even a horn hanging from an arch or baldacchino, presumably a horn reliquary such as one finds today in various museums. This last might have been used to hold the relics of some saint associated with horns, such as St. Hubert or St. Blandina (martyred in the Amphithéâtre des Trois-Gaules, in Lyon by a wild steer). Hence, this Gospel book, containing the Verbum domini with its “Et Verbum caro factum est et habitavit in nobis” (fol. 172v) and placed on the altar next to the chalice with wine and paten with hosts, is a veritable treasure-trove of Eucharistic symbolism, reminding the celebrant of the centrality of the Gospels in the Eucharistic rite in the same way as Eucharistic symbols in a sacramentary, pontifical, or other liturgical book did. (figs. 58-73)

Figure 58a Lothar Gospels fol. 12v royal purple host with rims, dots and cross with four dots (also on 13r and 13v). Photo: author

Figure 58b Lothar Gospels fol. 14v round hosts with chrismon and pendant Α and ω and Π and Φ; lamps or reliquaries hanging from a baldacchino/altar canopy (cf. Drogo) (also on fol. 15r). Photo: author

50 On vessels containing the Eucharist hanging from ciboria or baldacchinos, see Jules Corblet, Essai historique et liturgique sur les ciboires et la réserve de l’eucharistie, p. 36.

51 These would not, of course, be used as a Eucharistic vessel since it was thought repugnant to keep the Corpus Christi in vessels in which had been the blood of animals.
**Figure 59** Lothar Gospels fol. 15v rectangular chest altars; golden host with point (cf. Frankfurt Ivory). Photo: author

**Figure 60** Lothar Gospels fol. 17v lobed golden paten; golden coin/host. Photo: author

**Figure 61** Lothar Gospels fol. 19r royal purple host with rims and dots. Photo: author

**Figure 62** Lothar Gospels fol. 20r flagon for wine or water for manutergium. Photo: author
Figure 63 Lothar Gospels fol. 71r
chest altars rectangular and square (cf.
Drogo) semi-circle dots around altar
(cf. lobed semi-circular altars) and
chrismons on corners. Photo: author

Figure 64 Lothar
Gospels fol. 73r
royal purple host and
flabella; lamp or pyx
hanging from altar
canopy or
baldacchino (cf.
Drogo baldacchino
with hanging lamp
or pyx). Photo: author
Figure 65
Lothar Gospels
fol. 74r chalice with handles, lamp/ciborium/reliquary hanging from baldacchino.
Photo: author

Figure 66 Lothar Gospels fol. 106 v. chest altars rectangular and square. Photo: author

Figure 67 (above) Lothar Gospels fol. 108v flat paten with decorated rim; (right) cf. Derrynaflan paten. Photo: author
Figure 68 Lothar Gospels fol. 109r pair of golden cruets for wine and water. Photo: author

Figure 69 Lothar Gospels fol. 133r oval-shaped paten with handles or feet and plate with geometric decorations and rim (cf. round host with point in Frankfurt ivory). Photo: author

Figure 70 Lothar Gospels fol. 168v triple hosts with dots and rims. Photo: author
Figure 71 (left) Lothar Gospels fol. 169r hanging reliquary horn. Photo: author; (right) (cf.) Ivory Horn Reliquary, 12th century. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gallery 304. Photo: Metropolitan Museum of Art

Figure 72 Lothar Gospels fol. 169v chalice with handles/vessel/lamp hanging from a baldacchino/ciborium. Photo: author

Figure 73 (left) Lothar Gospels fol. 172r. golden hosts/coins with chrismons and pi-psi; silver round-lobed paten; rectangular decorated altar mensa (upper) portable altar, or gold rectangular paten such as the (right) ancient Gourdon paten in the Cabinet des Médailles, Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France. Photo: author
But what do these images mean—patens, chalices, hanging lamps, flagons, golden circles and the like? Are they simply decorative, as a cursory viewing might suggest, or is there a deeper reason for them? Éric Palazzo explains: “The presence of these ornamental motifs in the manuscript, that is within the sacred space of the liturgical text, and with relation to the prayers for the consecration, would increase the sacred character of the reading of these texts in addition to their sacramental value. And it would also contribute to the creation of a ‘locus’ within manuscript itself, which would then become symbolically associated with other sacred places and spheres.”

There are other sumptuous manuscripts, most from or based on the Turonian school of illumination, that picture Christ with a host in his right hand. From the second half of the ninth-century, the Le Mans Gospels, bears a Majestas domini page with Christ holding a round disk in his fingers (fig. 74):
Figure 75 Le Mans Gospels fols. 14v, 15r hanging lamp, pyx, or reliquary. Photo: author

Figure 76 Le Mans Gospels fol. 15v hanging horn, lamp, pyx, or reliquary. Photo: author

Figure 77 Le Mans Gospels fol.16r hanging flagon, hanging lamp, pyx, horned reliquary. Photo: author.
Much more ornate than the Le Mans Gospels is the Majestas domini page of the Munich Codex Aureus of Sankt Emmeram, Clm 14000. (fig. 80)
Here again Christ is pictured seated on the globe of the earth holding the golden disk in his right hand between his thumb and first finger, this time with bright white dots or pellets surrounding the disk emphasizing its true, eternal value.

A Turonian Gospel book with a magnificent Majestas page was made under the patronage of Charles the Bald, and presented to Pope John VIII at the coronation of Charles as emperor, during Christmas night. It is now at the basilica San Paolo fuori le Mura in Rome. (fig. 81)
Again, Christ is enthroned on the globe of the earth and surrounded by a mandorla. He holds a disk surrounded by white dots in his right hand between his thumb and second finger.

So far we have seen hosts in the Majestas pages in the form of a simple circle or circle with dots. But we come to another manuscript in which the host has the imprint of Christ himself, the “First Bible of Charles the Bald” (Vivian Bible) made in 845-846, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat. 1. In the presentation folio (now bound late in the manuscript) Charles is seated under an arch with hanging chalices and lamps and, gesturing,
acknowledges or accepts the Bible presented to him by the untonsured lay abbot of St. Martin of Tours, Vivian, on the right (fig. 82).  

Figure 82  Vivian Bible, Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France  lat.1, fol. 423r Photo: Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France

52 On the figures on the folio and their meaning see Paul Edward Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming in the Carolingian Empire* (Lincoln NE, 1994), p. 147 f, citing particularly the observations of Herbert Kessler. Although Vivian may be introducing “his” monks in the procession, one wonders if among these might have been his brother Raganaldus from the nearby monastery of St. Martin of Marmoutiers eager for an audience with Charles. On Charles’s gesture of acceptance of the Bible, see Michael Patella, *Word and Image: Hermeneutics and Application of the Saint John’s Bible* (Collegeville MN, 2013), p. 63 f.
For our purposes the most important folio is the Majestas page (fig. 83):

![Figure 83](image)

**Figure 83** Vivian Bible, Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat.1, fol. 329v. Photo Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France

Christ in the Majestas Domini portrait holds a small golden disk in his right hand between his thumb and two middle fingers. Inscribed on the disk is the Chi-Rho symbol, that is, not the orb of the earth, but Christ himself in a golden coin-shaped host with a blood-red rim.
Perhaps the most glorious manuscript made for Charles the Bald is the so-called Coronation Sacramentary, or more accurately, the “Coronation Canon Libellus,”53 Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat. 1141, fols. 5r and 6r (figs. 84a-84b):

Figure 84a Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat.1141, fol. 5r. Photo: Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France; Figure 84b Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat.1141, fol. 6r. Photo: Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France

In both Christ is presented in a mandorla seated on the circle of the earth. In his left hand he holds a book and in his right hand a small round golden circle or disk-like coin with circles, dots or “pellets” around it – like Eldefonsus’s hosts -- between his thumb and middle finger. In this “Sacramentary” Christ is holding the small round object with his fingers, as one might hold an azyme – as in the elevation or exposition and adoration as later Eucharistic piety would have it. Regarding the “Coronation Sacramentary” or “Coronation Canon Libellus” it is significant that it is precisely in the Mass Canon that the celebrant repeats the letters in gold over the host, “Hoc est corpus meum.” (fig. 85)

Figure 85 Coronation “Sacramentary,” Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat.1141, fol 8r. Photo: Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France

It has been noted elsewhere that when Christ is portrayed as holding the earthly orb it is often with his left hand, as is the case with the golden Basel altar frontal, although this is surely not

---

54 In the seventeenth-century copy of the manuscript in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 9447, the two Majestas pages were not copied, on which see Palazzo, “Une copie moderne du ‘sacramentaire’ de Charles le Chauve,” p. 504.

55 See, e.g., Aden Kumler, “The multiplication of the species,” p. 183, fig. 4.
always the case.\textsuperscript{56} (fig. 86) As my friend, Lawrence Nees, has pointed out to me, “Those guys certainly knew how to portray an orb -- if they wanted to!”

\textbf{Figure 86} Basel altar frontal (detail), \textit{ca.} 1020, Fulda, Germany. Gold and copper over oak core, Cluny, Paris Musée national du Moyen Âge. Photo: author

\textsuperscript{56} In the famous Byzantine Justinianic Angel Diptych in the British Museum the angel is pictured with the orb of imperial power in his right hand. For Christ with a large orb or disk in his right hand see the Ottonian Reichenau MS, Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 4454, fol. 20v. For Christ with a large orb or disk in his left hand see Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 10077, fol. 11v (Fulda?) s.X\textsuperscript{33}, the Pommersfelden Bible (Pommersfelden, Gräflich-Schönbornsche Schlossbibliothek 333, fol. 2r), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek MS C 80, fol. 83r (St. Gall, 11th century), (Christ in Majesty with circle with cross with dots [resembling the Paris Mozarbic Psalter]), and the Libro de Jura de los Alcaldes de Pamplona, fol. 17r, on which see Soledad de Silva y Verástegui, \textit{La miniatura medieval en Navarra} (Pamplona, 1988) pp. 65-67 and fig. 28.
The visual presentations of the hosts in the manuscripts of Charles the Bald, especially those from the Turonian school, came to Spain in the following century. From the tenth century there are a renowned manuscript of the *Commentary on the Apocalypse* by Beatus of Liébana and two of the famous illustrated manuscripts with the genuine *Collectio canonum hispana*. In the Beatus Apocalypse manuscript, Girona, Museo de Catedral Girona, Núm. Inv. 7 (11), there are two illustrations with an enthroned Christ holding a round disk. One of these is on the so-called Alpha page (fig. 87):

![Alpha Page](https://digital.kenyon.edu/perejournal/vol4/iss2/23)

**Figure 87** Girona, Museo de Catedral Girona, Núm. Inv. 7 (11), fol. 19r. Photo: author

Here Christ is shown seated within an Alpha and upside down Omega from the book of Revelation holding a book in his left hand and in his right a round disk held between his thumb and fourth or ring finger. Meyer Schapiro has suggested that the little disk originally meant a
Eucharistic host, but later became interchangeable with an orb. He also noted that it could
acquire an imperial connotation, being compared by Honorius Augustodunensis to the coinage of
the emperor.  

In another scene in the Girona manuscript, fol. 2r, there is a Majestas portrait that may be
directly related to earlier Turonian models (fig. 88):

**Figure 88** Girona, Museo de Catedral Girona, Núm. Inv. 7 (11), fol. 2r. Photo: author

327, esp. 313 ff., a reference I owe to Peter Klein. As early as 1923 in his treatment of what he called "the ball of the
p. 58., noted the possibility that the disk in Christ’s hand might be a Eucharistic host, thanking the great Byzantinist
Albert M. Friend for the suggestion and citing Leprieur who proposed the same explanation (André Michel,
Here a scribe has attempted to clear up the possible ambiguity surrounding the small round golden object by inserting the word “mundus” above it. Despite this description, the small object continues to appear not as the large globe of the earth but a small flat host. As Carlos Miranda García Tejedor has noted, such a symbolic presentation might have suggested a double meaning, Christ as ruler/creator/pantocrator of the earth as well as his presence in the Eucharistic host.\textsuperscript{58}

That is, the majestic heavenly king displays his earthly wealth in a Eucharistic golden coin.

With respect to the Beatus depictions, it might be remembered that art historians generally agree that Beatus himself likely illustrated his text. It is thought that the Najera fragment at Silos, although made long after Beatus’s time, may reflect this. One wonders if Beatus had made a Majestas or Alpha page he would have portrayed a host in Christ’s hand, that is, a host used in northern Spain as far back as the late eighth century.

The first of our canon law manuscripts of the \textit{Collectio canonum hispana}\textsuperscript{59} is the Codex Albeldense or Vigilanus, El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo d.1.2, fol. 16v, copied in 976 in the monastery of San Martin de Albelda,\textsuperscript{60} where the beautiful Visigothic text in Paris

\textsuperscript{58} An Iconographic and Stylistic Analysis of the Gerona Beatus” in Beatus of Liébana: Codex of Gerona (Barcelona, 2004), p. 28 f. It is interesting that the disk in Christ’s hand is flat like a host. For a more spherical disk in Christ’s hand Cook, art. cit. fig. 41, shows an eleventh-century ivory reliquary cover from Berlin, Kaiser Friedrich Museum.


Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat. 2855 of the *De virginitate beatae Mariae* of Ildefonsus of Toledo was written in 951 and presented to Bishop Godescalc of Le Puy.⁶¹ (fig. 89)

---

**Figure 89** Codex Albeldense, El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo d.1.2, fol. 16v. Photo author

In this case Christ is shown as the Alpha and Omega holding a book in his left hand and a small round golden disk with his thumb and two middle fingers of his right hand, not unlike Christ in the First Bible of Charles the Bald. To explain this the text in the border reads: Dominus in tribus

---

⁶¹ This manuscript has the Eldefonsus text (without Eldefonsus) inserted next to the Ildefonsus text.
digitis dextere molem a(o)rbe libravit.\textsuperscript{62} Does the orb signify the earth, or simply a round circle such as a host? In this connection it is interesting that three fingers or digits are specifically mentioned, perhaps reflecting the three digits covering the host in our Eldefonsus text. It might be that the thumb, forefinger, and little finger of Christ’s right hand could be interpreted as raised in blessing, as they occasionally are presented elsewhere, but normally this blessing in the West comes with the thumb and two first fingers. That there is a rim around the circle may not be surprising either since we have seen rims in the illustrations of the hosts in the Eldefonsus text.

A scene similar to that in the Codex Albeldense appears in a slightly later manuscript of the \textit{Collectio canonum hispana}, the Codex Aemilianensis, El Escorial Biblioteca de San Lorenzo d.1.1, fol. 13v, copied in 994 at the monastery of San Millán de la Cogolla. It is often said that this manuscript is a simple copy of the Codex Albeldense, but there are numerous differences showing that although it is probably related it is not a direct copy.\textsuperscript{63}

Such is the case with the Majestas scene. (\textbf{fig. 90}) Here Christ is enthroned holding the small golden disk with his thumb and middle fingers, like that in the Codex Albeldense. In the border, however, there is no mention of the orb. Hence, this scene may derive from an earlier model in which the disk was pictured simply as the Eucharistic host, and that in the


Codex Albeldense a double meaning was intended such as in the Girona Majestas scene. On the other hand, the border text in the Vigilanus may simply have been omitted in the later Aemilianensis.

Moving to Spain in the eleventh century – the century of Berengar and the azyme controversy -- there are two different manuscripts with Christ holding a round disk. The first is in another Beatus manuscript, the Facundus Beatus, made for King Fernando in 1047, Madrid Bib. Nac. Vitr 14-2, fol. 6r (Leon 1047) (fig. 91):

**Figure 91** Facundus Beatus with Alpha and Omega, Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, MS Vit. 14-2, 360 x 268 mm, c. 1047. Photo: Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional.
In the Facundus Alpha folio Christ is standing under an Alpha with an Omega in his left hand and a disk in his right between his thumb and first two fingers.

Another Majestas portrait appears in an unlikely source, the eleventh-century Mozarabic Psalter from Silos, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France Smith-Lesouëf 2 [part II], fol. 77v. (fig. 92)

---

**Figure 92 Paris**, Bibliothèque nationale de France Smith-Lesouëf 2 [part II], fol. 77v. Photo. Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France

---

64 This manuscript was first described in detail by Walter Muir Whitehill, “A Mozarabic Psalter from Santo Domingo de Silos,” *Speculum* 4 (1929), pp. 461-468, esp. 464, 466 f. and pl. III. More recently it has been pictured by François Avril et al, *Manuscrits enluminés de la péninsule ibérique* (Paris, 1982) no. 34, pl. A, a reference kindly given me by John Williams.
Here the enthroned Christ is pictured holding a round disk in his right hand between his thumb in one or two of his middle fingers. The disk seems clearly to be a host inscribed with a large X with dots between each arm, perhaps reflecting the chrismon or Chi Rho of the First Bible of Charles the Bald.

Also from Spain in the early twelfth century on the colorful painted Catalan altar frontal from Ix (Cerdanya) Christ in Majesty is pictured with a small round disk in his right hand, perhaps referring to the host to be consecrated on the altar mensa above. It is likely that this image was taken from a manuscript depiction. (fig. 93)

**Figure 93** Painted Catalan altar frontal from Ix (Cerdanya), Barcelona Museu Nacional d’Arte de Catalunya MNAC/MAC 15802 (12th century) Photo: Creative Commons.

Moving from manuscripts to other media there is a Majestas domini portrayal with Christ holding what Meyer Schapiro called a host in the fingers of his right hand.\(^6\) This appears on an altar frontal of Rodez cathedral dated to the middle of the eleventh century. Again, this host may refer to the host consecrated above on the altar mensa. (fig. 94)

Lest one think that the Majestas domini with a host in hand was restricted to France and Spain in the early Middle Ages, there is a striking German example of Christ holding a large host with a lamb inside in the glorious Gospel book of Bernward of Hildesheim. This manuscript was recently studied by Jennifer P. Kingsley in *Peregrinations* 3 (2010)138-173, with the suggestive title "To Touch the Image: Embodying Christ in the Bernward Gospels" emphasizing the Christological corporeal, touchable nature of the book itself and images therein. It is this type of host that lead William Durandus in his thirteenth-century *Rationale* to say of the host: “Some also represent a lamb there [in the host], first, because he who is sacrificed is a true lamb, but also for the sake of the text that reads [Exod. 29]: This is what you shall do upon the altar: you shall offer lambs continually and wine for the libation unto the lamb.” *(fig. 95)*

Let us consider for a moment the involvement of Carolingian rulers in matters of theology and liturgical practice. First, Charlemagne himself. He is well known for his attempts to bring what he thought was Roman practice into his realm. In the area of canon law he did this by asking Pope Hadrian for a copy of the genuine canon law book of Rome. Hadrian sent him a copy of what he thought was the authentic *Collectio canonum Dionysiana*,66 which was copied

---

repeatedly in the Carolingian’s realm. For liturgy Charlemagne also requested a copy of the sacramentary he thought had been composed by Pope Gregory. Hadrian sent him what he thought was such a copy, and Charlemagne deposited this in his court scriptorium, to be copied repeatedly (often with later modifications by Benedict of Aniane) by scribes throughout Carolingian the empire. Charlemagne used the liturgy of baptism (sometimes forced) to bring the pagans he had conquered into his realm, and he asked the bishops of his realm to report on the baptismal practices they were using – Roman, he hoped – and they responded with dozens of
On the theological front Charlemagne was heavily involved in the iconoclastic, “Adoptianist,” and “double procession” controversies occasioned by the writings of Elipandus of Toledo. We know of his active participation in these issues from his so-called *Libri Carolini* (*Opus Caroli regis contra synodum*) and in his assembling the Synod of Frankfurt in 794. In practical, liturgical terms, his position on the double procession was bolstered by his insertion of the Credo into the Mass liturgy, and importantly, with the “filioque,” not the “et filio” as used in the Mass Credo (Credimus) used in the Visigothic liturgy. We know of Charlemagne’s involvement in this from the reports of two monks from the Holy Land who had heard the filioque used in Charlemagne’s court in 808-809 as they delivered gifts from the Caliph of Bagdad. And finally, in the production of illustrated manuscripts to be used in liturgical services, the court schools of Charlemagne are renowned for some of the most glorious manuscripts of the Middle Ages. Perhaps Charlemagne (through Theodulf of Orléans) disapproved in the *Libri Carolini* of adoration and veneration of artistic images, but the large manuscripts with their images made for him speak volumes for a more nuanced appreciation of such images.

The grandson of Charlemagne, Charles the Bald, carried on the policy of his forbearer in his involvement in liturgical and theological issues. On the liturgical side, this is clear in the illustrations for his manuscripts used in the Mass. Beyond that, Charles was concerned about the liturgical rites used in his realm, when he invited two priests from Toledo, who practiced the Visigothic rite, for liturgical celebrations. It is likely that Charles was as interested in the

---


Roman liturgy promoted by Charlemagne in his empire as he was in the liturgies practiced by his ancestors – the Gallican and Mozarabic rites that he may have confused. It has generally been said that 1) Charles asked to have the Mozarabic Mass said, or that 2) he had confused the Mozarabic with the Gallican rite of his Frankish ancestors, or that 3) he knew that these rites were closely related, or that 4) he knew that the IV Council of Toledo, seventh century, had mandated the rite practiced in Hispania should also be that for Gallia, or that 5) he wanted to hear the chant used in the Old Spanish rite. We do not really know his ultimate motives. But it would seem strange that he would ask priests from Toledo to say Mass as it was practiced in that city, likely knowing that the rite practiced by Elipandus of Toledo had been attacked earlier in the Adoptionist controversy in which Charlemagne and his court theologians had been so closely involved. But if the priests from Toledo did say or chant the Mass as used in their city, Charles may have been interested or surprised with many aspects of that Mass, such as: the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed repeated at the Communion and not after the Gospel as it was in the Roman Mass that had been spread in the Carolingian realms; or by the “et filio” in that creed in the Old Spanish rite rather than “filioque,”70 which we know was said in the court of Charlemagne; or by the Greek word “homoousion” rather than the Latin word “consubstantialem” in the creed; or by the unusual distribution of the hosts in the Toledan rite, although he may have known of similar distributions in Aquitanian churches at that time such as those depicted in the Eldefonsus text.

---

On the theological side, Charles was intimately involved in the Eucharistic controversy. Radbertus of Corbie had written a tract, *De corpore et sanguine*, in the 830s in which he propounded a “real presence” theology of the Eucharist based on the writings of many patristic fathers. Charles certainly read this and asked another monk of Corbie, Ratramnus, for his opinion. Ratramnus responded in his tract, also entitled *De corpore et sanguine*, in which he argued for a figurative or spiritual presence of Christ in the Eucharist. To this Radbertus replied with a revised version of his earlier tract, this time dedicated to Charles. Charles clearly pondered these positions and eventually agreed with Radbertus. As Patricia McCormick Zirkel has pointed out, this was no mere balancing the opinions of two quarreling theologians, but an official endorsement, like Charlemagne’s earlier theological endorsements, of a position that was to be accepted in Charles’s realm.

We return to the manuscripts of Charles the Bald with their Majestas pages and hosts. That Charles was one of the greatest patrons of art in the ninth century is well known. Multiple manuscripts were made on his command, many of these in the famous school of Tours before its destruction by the Vikings in 853. But the influence of the Turonian school lingered long in Europe, as we have seen its influence in numerous manuscripts with their Majestas pages. Many of his manuscripts must have been seen and treasured by Charles himself. They were not simply kept in sacristies for occasional use in liturgical services, but were treasured, viewed, and admired by their patrons and owners as do modern collectors of like manuscripts. They were even given as gifts to kings and popes. That Charles himself probably personally delighted in

---

71 Celia Chazelle, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian era: Theology and Art of Christ’s Passion* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 210-215, suggests that the tracts were written later, 853-856.

them is suggested in the famous portrait seen earlier of the seated Charles receiving the “First Bible” from Count Vivian, or in the brilliant “Coronation Canon Libellus” where the crowned Charles is pictured between the originators of the Roman rite, Popes Gelasius and Gregory, whose name is mentioned on fol. 1r and his portrait on fol. 3r facing Charles on fol. 2v.  

![Figure 96a](Coronation Sacramentary, Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat.1141, fols. 1r, 2v, 3r Photo: Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France)

Majestas pages in pre-Carolingian, Carolingian, and post-Carolingian times typically pictured Christ blessing the viewer, usually with thumb and two fingers. (fig. 97) Then we find

---

73 There is, to be sure, debate whether or not this image does represent Charles the Bald between these two originators of the Roman sacramentary. See Garipzanov, The Symbolic Language of Royal Authority, p. 252f. n. 176, and literature therein on this. But even if it does not represent Charles himself, there is every reason to believe that he saw and admired the portrait of a regal figure like himself in “his” manuscript. Garipzanov, p. 254 n. 178 suggests that the folio with Charles was laid open amid shimmering bright candles in the cathedral of Metz for admiration. This may have been true for political reasons, but the combination of Charles on one folio opposite Pope Gregory is odd. Perhaps the two facing pages would have signified Charles’s approval of the Roman rite of Gregory, now widely used in the Carolingian realm. How much more fitting, however, it would have been to have had open the two facing-page diptych (shown below) of the angelic beings and saints on fol. 5v chanting the Tersanctus on fol. 6r in golden letters beneath the majestic Christ with host in hand. Perhaps the pages were turned hourly or daily as the Book of Kells formerly were in Trinity College Dublin? It is interesting that the Book of Kells, (Dublin, Trinity College Library, MS A. I. (58) (c. 800) has several illustrations that may represent circular azyme hosts. On the famous Chi Rho page, fol. 34r there are two cats/kittens/mice eating a circular object with a cross and dots in it; and on fol. 48r an animal has in its mouth a circular golden object with dots around it.
in our pages Christ holding or perhaps blessing with the host. It should be remembered that objects used on the altar were blessed or consecrated – as we know from medieval benedictionals and pontificals– and hence books, including sacramentaries and gospels used on the altar, would have been blessed or consecrated in the same way. Did that consecration convey anything to the contents of the books, especially for their users? One wonders if a Majestas Domini page with

**Figure 97** Christ In Majesty Blessing: Godescalc Gospels of Charlemagne (781-83) Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France Lat. Nal 1203, fol. 3r Photo: Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France
Christ blessing would have conveyed to the user – be he cleric, Charlemagne, or Charles the Bald to whom sumptuous manuscripts were given – a blessing in the illustration. (fig. 98)

It is this type of “activation” or “realization” that Éric Palazzo speaks about with Eucharistic liturgical objects. To put it in overly simplistic terms, while a modern person might look at a Majestas page and say, “Okay, yet another beautiful Majestas page with Christ’s blessing,” the medieval individual would say of Christ blessing on a page that had been consecrated in a special ritual, “Yes, Christ is actually blessing me!” This would not be too dissimilar to the modern Russian Orthodox believer who beholds in a church or in a domestic krasny ugol, an icon of Christ blessing surrounded by angelic beings not simply a picture, but the reality behind of the image, the archetype as the Orthodox say. (fig. 98)
Regarding the images of the hosts in our manuscripts, did Charles direct his artists make them on a whim, or to substitute for the usual blessing hand of the normal Majestas pages, or were they made to indicate his official approval of the new usage of azymes coming exactly at
the time of the Eucharistic controversy in which both Radbertus and Ratramnus wrote their *De corpore et sanguine* for him?\(^7\)

But wonders if there could have been a deeper, almost iconic-like reason for their presence in the manuscripts. Could there possibly have been an inchoate “Eucharistic adoratio” in the back of Charles’ or his illustrators’ minds? Probably not in precisely those terms since in the Iconoclastic controversy during the time of Charlemagne the West had condemned the use of “adoratio,” and it would certainly not have approved of latria, worship given only to God. It is usually said that the western position on icons was that they could be venerated for what they represent, but not that they actually partook in some degree of the nature of the thing they represented. One wonders, however, as Charles paged through his glorious “Coronation Canon Libellus” manuscript, with its breathtaking double-page “diptych” of the saints and angels adoring the majestic Christ with the host prominently displayed, if, conscious of the arguments of Radbertus, he beheld or venerated an icon, as it were, of the historic Christ who had been born of the Virgin, had been crucified and resurrected, and had eventually ascended into heaven ruling in the majesty of the Apocalypse as the angelic beings and saints praise him with the triple Sanctus written in gold on the page. (fig. 99)

But just as important did he behold in the host in Christ’s hand the presence of Christ now on Earth; that is, did he “realize” in the host in Christ’s hand with its validating dots (or Chi Rho or chrismon in his First Bible) an icon, a “visual communion” or a “visual realization” in a way not unlike that which the later medieval faithful experienced the “real” Christ in gazing on the small white, wafer-like disk in Eucharistic adoration.

\(^7\) On the role of the rulers’ direct involvement in the creation of the manuscripts, their decoration, and illustration see Garipzanov, *The Symbolic Language of Royal Authority*, p. 236.
Eucharist adoration of the host in the thirteenth century and beyond was clearly not like that suggested by the illustrations of the host held in Christ’s hand in our manuscripts. The idea of transubstantiation had not yet been developed, and hosts of azymes and bread were still used in the ninth century and beyond. But add the theology “real presence” developed by Radbertus of Corbie and approved by Charles – something not present in the late eighth century during the Iconoclastic controversy – to the striking presence of the host in the Majestas pages and one can sense the first steps toward Eucharistic adoration developed in the high and later Middle Ages.
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[M549; V187v] Revelatio quae ostensa est venerabili viro Hispaniensi, Eldefonso
Episcopo, in Spiritu sancto, mense decimo.¹

[Pa122r; Pb63r] Anno octingentesimo² quadragesimo quinto incarnationis
Christi Iesu Domini nostri,³ calculus iste, id est, mensura trium digitorum anguli,
panis in rotundum azymī⁴ sic composita est,⁵ scripta sub quantitate ista,⁶ per revelationem Dei summi, in mense X, feria VII diluculo, iam opere consueto expleto, in visu apparuit mihi.

Igitur, istae rotae duae, duobus ferris incisae, ad unum panem⁷ pertinent semper, inter⁸ utramque partem factae.

Si⁹ valens ubique discurrit moneta terreni regis, cur non melius valens¹⁰ discurrat semper¹¹ ubique moneta caelestis regis? [Pb64r] Ecce puncta, quae¹² in¹³ rotis sunt picta, retro quinque acta, et rotae, id est¹⁴ puncta, ostendunt quod nec initium habet Deus in medio manens, nec finem,¹⁵ sicut nec puncta, nec rota per gyrum
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Intuemini, iuxta fluvium Chobar, Ezechielem prophetam colluctantem et colloquentem apud quinque rotas et quatuor animalia, unumquodque animal habentem per quadrum quatuor facies in unoquoque capite, dum esset rota in rotis, consistens loco medio. Infra tria etenim puncta, intra quae sunt duae quasi prae omnibus rebus columnae, Trinitas est, infra se habens omnia, quamquam in medio sedeat dum omnes in circuitu sint offerentes munera. Si est via pedum in terris, est veritas capitis in caelis, vita pectoris est in medio manens, reddenda sanctis.

Reminiscamur igitur paulisper quid superius in pectore Aaron quaesivimus, dum panes azymos effectos esse vitae sempiternae affirmavimus. Si fuerint Andreas et Jacobus socii in terris, et sunt consociati, sicut sunt Petrus et Paulus, cum altissimo Deo omnipotentissimo, et sancti omnes in caelis. Quatuor Evangelistae dant testimonia Jesu cum omnibus sanctis eius undique.

Sicut pollex hominis totum debet nummum operire, sic tres nummi, hae Trinitate, Deo regente, invicem se tot tres tangentes quasi ita triangulati, debent totam panis hostiam infra se ita cooperire, ut nec ullum nummum ex toto possit ulla ex aliis tribus partibus discoopertis capere in se,
in tantum, ut nec angustior sit panis infra, nec latior extra, tantum, quantum est albus uNGulae hominis circulus.

Et quid plura? Qui me erubuerit, dicit Dominus Jesus Christus, et sermones meos, hunc erubescet Filius hominis; subauditur, tribulantem audire, aspicere, adiuvare, cum venerit in maiestate sua, et Patris, et sanctorum angelorum. [Luc 9.26] Et qui vos spernit, me spernit; et qui vos audit, me audit; et si sermonem meum servaverint, et vestrum servabunt. [Luc. 10.16] Et ego voluntatem amantium et timentium me faciam, et deprecationem eorum exaudiam, et eos salvos faciam.

Redeamus iam ad ordinem.

In Natale igitur Domini, in prima missa, et secunda, ac tertia, offerendi sunt panes aequali numero et figura, semper in rotundum duodecim [M550] per gyrum ad significandum chorum angelicum; et in medio quinque in crucis modum ad significandos Evangelistas, et unicum Filium, quem
testantur quasi undique sustinentes, pro redemptione generis humani olim crucifixum. Divide ipsos simul mixtos per septem et decem, quia novem sunt ordines angelorum, invenies quod per septiformem spiritum sanctum [Pb65r] est decimus Homo-Deus, generando carne creatus, et creando in Maria Virgine specie humana formatus. De officiis vero ternis, junge panes simul omnes, fiunt quinquaginta et unus. Supra, invenies autem, amice Dei, in deifica significatione, quod, si unus est Deus, omnem significat in Deo plenitudinem numerus quinquagenarius, sicut centenarius, insuper et denarius, sicut et millenarius. Hoc ipsum decimo mense Natalis Domini significante, in quo Christo homine Deo est corporaliter, non habitans, sed semper manens, omnis divinitatis plenitudo, teste Apostolo Paulo.

In Pascha, resurrectionis scilicet dominica, de qua fit sermonis ratio ista, centum triginta et quinque panes sunt offerendi in modum crucis per tria trium missarum officia, videlicet quadraginta et quinque in unaquaque missa, ita.
[V188r]. In Domini Jesu Christi Ascensione, [Pa122v] eiusque kalendas Augustas, V in mense, manifesta quibusdam discipulis in monte excelso Transfiguratione, ita sunt uno eodemque numero et ipsa figura penes offerendi, sicut et in Natale Domini.

Intuentes mente, consideremus de significatione facta in piscibus centum quinquaginta tribus. Velociter innuam per Athanasium, dum non tres, sed unus; qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis Spiritus sanctus. Et ecce, omnis plenitudo et latet et patet, significata in Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto a Joanne in caelis. Sed neque Pater sine Filio et Spiritu auditur a Joanne in caelis.
neque Filius sine Patre et Spiritu videt in flumine Jordanis, neque Spiritus sanctus sine Patre et Filio aspicitur volans per spatium huius aeras, teste Christo, dicente Philippo Apostolo, qui quaerbat videre Patrem: _Qui videt me_, inquit, _videt et Patrem, quia Pater in me manens ipse facit opera._ [Io. 14.9f.] Ergo, intellige, homo, qui habes ipse tres personas in te, dissimiles inter se: animam viventem, carnem apparentem, spiritum sine intermissione exiendum et revertendum, quoniam Pater est ipse vita sempiterna, Filius ipsa locutio sempiterna, Spiritus ad instar radii solis exiens et revertens, splendor lucis aeternae. Idcirco, ne putes ipsum altissimum Deum Patrem esse confuse ipsum unicum Filium proprium. Definit sanctus Sedulius, dicens mirabiliter: _Non quia qui summus Pater est, et Filius hic est; sed, quia quod summus Pater est, et Filius hoc est._

_Dicamus de mysterio._

_In Pentecosten vero, sub quadrata, cum cruce tamen in medio, caelestis Hierusalem civitatis figura, tot panes offerendi sunt per omnia, quot in Resurrectione Dominica, prout videtur in subsequenti figura._
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[M551]In diebus autem dominicis, et Dei sanctorum festis, nec amplius\textsuperscript{121} sunt offerendi panes,\textsuperscript{122} nec minus maxime,\textsuperscript{123} nisi tantum\textsuperscript{124} quinque in modum crucis.\textsuperscript{125} Ille etenim panis medius saepe debet esse potius maius, et honestior aliis omnibus; de quo legitur in quodam loco, Agnus in medio significatus.\textsuperscript{126}

Quotidianis autem diebus, nec amplius, nec minus, [Pb66r] nisi tantum
semper unus, quia unus est Deus qui est semper supra omnes unus.

[Pa188v] Quia in sic parvo libri spatio huius, nisi sit ut latissima bibliotheca, magna non possum per ipsos panes sic pictos, sicut esse debent integre facti, et super altare positi, nec ipsas figuras ipsarum sollemnitatum, prout est supra scriptum figuris, seu quantitates, hoc est magnitudines, ostendere, ut saltem, velut per puncta, hoc debere ostendendo significare. Et, sicut supra praefigurando denotavimus, iterum ob memoriam cordis replicamus.

festis, semel tantum, hoc est vice una, quinque panes sic. Si cui forte videtur impossibile, nausea repleta mente, sic tot panes, tantos omnes aequali magnitudine, Deo simul offerre, saltem unus medius ex his quintus, ille panis dominicus, sit sic magnus, et ita scriptura plenus, utraque parte perornatus, prout in duabus rotis est demonstratum superius.

[Pb66v] Ceteri alii habeant unusquisque tertiam partem magnitudinis eius, et unum tantum nomen scriptum, nihil amplius, ex his nominibus tribus: aut XPC, aut IHC, aut DS. Aliud nomen Dei ullum nemo assumat, solum volens in hostia scribere illum, nisi unum ex his tribus: quia non solum unum, si sine altero, sed etiam vere sine multis aliis, paene nomina, sicut mihi revelatum est per Spiritum sanctum. Nihil valent in hostiis scripta sola, nisi tantum unum ex his tribus nominibus qualevis, aut XPC, aut IHC, aut DS. Non DNS, non REX, non PAX, non OMNIPOTENS, non VITA, non PANIS, ut quidam apocryphi putant; nisi tantum in una parte XPC, in altera Crux cum duabus litteris, sic.
In uno nempe ferro, tamen magno, possunt quinque simul hostiae, formari tali modo ut maior panis medius, qui primus pictus est superius scripta, et quatuor alii minores, partem eius tertiam quippe habentes, sicut istae sunt sunt hic, rotulae duae sic, parvi per quatuor angulos ipsius ferri; ita ut in uno habeat scriptum XPC sursum, in altero IHC deorsum, et ad laevam REX. [Pb67r]

Sed non est solus offerendus, aut sine illo maximo, aut sine ullo ex aliis tribus parvis, et in quarto loco, DS, quasi ad meridiem.

Ut autem scire possis, amice Dei, mirabiliter certissimam hostiarum talium mensuram, quae te non sinat in se ullatenus errare: audi, cuius sit ponderis ostensus panis primus superius in rotis maioribus. Audi, cuius et in istis et minoribus perspice. Audi, prout revelante atque regente simul sancta Trinitate, in Spiritu eius didici verissime.

Tres nummi moderni tantum pondus habent, quantum habent CLIII maxima grana ceruleia, Aquitaneae tritici nostri. Et maior illa hostia, adhuc igitur cruda, tantum pondus habet quantum tres nummi, si fuerint iuste ac recte appensi in statera. Et postquam est igne cocta, minuitur
pondus eius parte sexta. Minor etiam hostia non amplius quam tantum pondus unius nummi habeat, aut unius nummi unaquaeque sint minores hostiae, aut trium nummorum tres simul pondere, hoc ipsum sancta Trinitate non sine magno mysterio regente.

Cum enim considero de numero in piscibus, centum videlicet quinquaginta tribus, et de tot simili numero grana tritici, data in pondere in nummis tribus, et de panis hostia, quae non est maior, nec minor, si fuerit iustissime ponderata, nisi (prout scriptum est) mensuratum in mensura trium digitorum anguli panis et trium nummorum spatio superius est ostensum. Stupefactus admiror nimis vere deificam dispensationem, et praedium, et dispositionem.

Hoc enim non sit alicui dubium quod hostiae, quamvis habeant diversas et dissimiles in libro formas, id est illic maior, istic minor, cum fuerit certe uniuscuisque ponderis in ferris expressa, absque ambiguitate, statim cognoscetur in gyro certissima forma.

Dicamus de pondere.

Et ecce tres tales nummi quorum pondus nec amplius nec minus quam maior nostra suscipit hostia, si iustissimo pondere fuerit facti, nec plus, nec minus, secundum antiquam consuetudinem, suscipiunt pondus, hoc ipsum sancta Trinitate regente, nisi quantum habent in se centum
quinquaginta et tria magnitudinem grana tritici nostri. Et trecenti tales nummi antiquam per viginti et quinque solidos efficiunt libram, et duodecim tales librae, quae fiunt per tria millia, sexcentos nummos, sextarium tritici unum efficiunt. Ex quo, septem panes formari possunt, ex quibus aur per totam hebdomadam homo vivere unus potest, aut septem in una die. Etenim modius aequus et iustus debet esse per decem et septem tales sextarios aequos, qui potest in uno die, sancta Trinitate regente, centum decem et novem homines die pastui conductos sustinere.

Hactenus de pondere, [Pb68r] et forma, et mensura adiuvante Domino Christo et operante, disputavimus et sicut auditum est superius, prout potuimus, scribingeno definivimus. Tempus est lactucas agrestes demonstrandas quasi de aliis revertentes actibus, seu fatigati diveamus.
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BARKING ABBEY: A GIS MAP OF A MEDIEVAL NUNNERY

By Donna Alfano Bussell, English Department, University of Illinois Springfield & Joseph M. McNamara, Geographic Information Systems Laboratory, University of Illinois Springfield

Introduction

When we created a GIS map of Barking Abbey based on Sir Alfred Clapham’s 1911 excavation and groundplan (WebMap at http://bit.ly/VkgVOq), we had several purposes in

---

1 Donna Alfano Bussell would like to thank Dean James Ermatinger and the UIS College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for providing the support to attend the Introduction to GIS workshop at the UIS Geographic Systems Laboratory on November 4, 2011. She would also like to thank Dr. Yi-Sz Lin, Director of the UIS Geographic Systems Laboratory and Joseph M. McNamara, graduate assistant at the UIS GIS lab for their generosity and technical support throughout this project. Joe McNamara deserves special thanks for his patience, creativity, and willingness to find new ways to apply his knowledge.

Joe McNamara would like to thank the University of Illinois Springfield, the Department of Environmental Studies, and the Geographic Information Systems Laboratory for appointment to his assistantship and support for research and graduate study. He would also like to thank Dr. Yi-Sz Lin, for his countless hours of mentoring and instruction and Dr. Donna Bussell, for presenting a unique opportunity to participate in a cross-disciplinary project.

2 The abbey underwent several building programs and expansions beginning in the twelfth century. It remained one of the most prestigious and active nunneries in England until its dissolution (Bussell 2012).

3 See also the Victoria County History for Essex (1966). Stable link for WebMap at: http://univofillinois.maps.arcgis.com/apps/OnePane/basicviewer/index.html?appid=cbd139329c9e43fbaf4e87d1a3580922

---
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mind for this project: first, to make the Barking Abbey map and associated images and map layers available for personal, non-commercial use in research and teaching; second, to propose research questions that could be addressed by using this or similar maps; and third to present our project’s methodology to humanists who, like one of the authors (Bussell), may be intrigued by the possibilities of using GIS, but are unsure of how to begin a conversation with fellow scholars and GIS specialists.

This project began with questions specific to Bussell’s research interests: Could we define coordinates for the historical Barking Abbey (of the twelfth-to-fifteenth century) on the site of its ruins, which are on the grounds of the Barking Abbey green-space in East London? Could we recreate a firmly anchored position for the historical abbey including an outline of the surrounding compound and the interior as well as exterior parameters of the main church?

These research questions appealed to McNamara as they provided an opportunity to use GIS in a cross-disciplinary study that would map a medieval structure and its immediate surroundings on the basis of an early twentieth-century illustration (Clapham’s groundplan). The resulting map layers could become the basis for further two and three-dimensional studies of this space, and the process of inquiry would highlight the flexibility of problem-based methods for new applications of GIS skills and concepts.

**Why Barking Abbey?**

Clapham’s groundplan (Clapham 1913) is well known to scholars of Barking Abbey. This detailed illustration makes an excellent starting point for this study because of Clapham’s meticulous attention to detail and the accuracy of his drawing.

__________________________

174
The original abbey was founded in Anglo-Saxon England in c. 666 in Essex (near the church’s ruins in East London). Barking was a royal foundation originally established as a double monastery (i.e., as a house of monks and nuns) by Erkenwald (bishop of London 675-693) for his sister Ethelburg (d. 686/688), a nun who was the first of the abbey’s illustrious abbesses. Barking was destroyed in the Viking invasions of the ninth century and re-established as a nunnery in the tenth century (probably at a site near the original foundation) and remained a female monastic community connected to the ambitious literary cultures of London and East Anglia until its closure in 1539 during the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII.4

The abbey’s wealth placed it among the “big five” women’s communities in England during the late Middle Ages.5 It is an important site for understanding women’s roles as patrons, writers, and leaders in religious communities. Barking and other prominent women’s houses used their own building programs and property improvements to enhance the quality of their material and spiritual lives and to advance their status among their peer institutions. Because of the massive destruction of monastic houses during dissolution, however, scholars of insular religious life have much less material evidence available to them than they otherwise might have had. Today only the barest outlines of Barking Abbey (as it existed between the twelfth and

4 Studies are too numerous to cite here but notable assessments of the material culture of the lives of women religious and the conditions of book production and circulation among women’s communities in East Anglia include Doyle (1958), Wogan-Browne (2001), Gilchrist and Oliva (1993), Erler (2006), Russell (2003), and Blanton (2007, especially 173–227).

5 David N. Bell’s term for the five insular nunneries with an annual income of over £500. These five comprise 4% of the 132 houses assessed c. 1535; see What Nuns Read (1995) pp. 10–11. It was the third richest house at the time of the Domesday survey (c. 1086). Its abbesses held the rank of baron from the conquest onward.
fifteenth centuries) can be seen in its ruins. Yet physical signs of the community’s importance are still visible in the remains on the Barking Green in East London.

**Research Potential**

Before discussing methodology, we would like to address a basic question: Why create a GIS map of Barking Abbey, especially when Clapham’s groundplan is quite accurate and remains an indispensable resource for teaching and research?

---

**Figure 1** A.W. Clapham, Groundplan of Barking Abbey.

---


One of the primary reasons is that maps and illustrations provide different kinds of information. First, there is a question of preserving a sense of the abbey’s physical presence. As a survey of historical satellite imagery and the record of illustration indicate, time continues to exact its toll on the site. Beyond this, a GIS map gives us an immediate sense of the abbey’s footprint because it displays the outline of the abbey and its environs in relation to modern structures and landmarks (such as warehouses and roadways). As our GIS map demonstrates (figures below), the abbey church and surrounding grounds would still be considered quite large even by modern senses of the dimensions of modern buildings. It would have been an even more impressive structure in the high and late Middle Ages, especially if one considers the surrounding estates and properties.\(^8\) One research opportunity would be to expand the map, or create a (speculative) model based on the map, to show these properties. Such modeling might support investigations of the economic, environmental, and political impact of the abbey or generate new questions about the management challenges faced by its abbesses.

Other research topics that could possibly be addressed through this and similar maps are those concerned with the relationships between the abbey and its neighbors. One can get a sense of the abbey’s distance from other important contemporary sites or markers (e.g. St. Margaret’s, a nearby church built in the twelfth-century). By creating additional layers to the map, one might display routes for processions to a variety of locations such as the church cemeteries and neighboring churches or other sites. From this, we may get further insight into how the women of this community related to their parish neighbors and how this activity compares to women’s communities in a larger regional (East Anglian) context. Kay Slocum has already taken a step in

---

this direction by examining the distance and details of the nuns’ processions and visits to its neighboring churches.9

Another set of questions may involve the use of the spaces of the church, cloister, and graveyards during important celebrations (e.g. Easter, feast days of its founding abbesses) attested to in liturgical documents, administrative texts, and narratives associated with the abbey. The state of the abbey’s ruins can make it difficult to appreciate how integral the physical site was to the nuns’ creative engagement with the texts and practices of their religious life. The Barking ordinal, for example, contains information on orientation and movement of people and objects in the church. There were processions through the church and its surrounding complex, and between the church and other sites. Our GIS map can be used or modified to display these procession routes. By doing so, we may be able to get more perspective on nuns’ conceptions of themselves. We could, for example, enhance the study of Barking’s late-medieval Paschal Celebration, which was significantly revised by Barking Abbey’s nuns and designed for the space of the church outlined in our map.10 Likewise, we could learn something more about the actions depicted in the legends of the founding abbesses and their translations to new tombs in the church as commemorated by the Flemish monk Goscelin during twelfth-century. (The foundresses’s legends were commissioned by Ælgifu [Ælfgiva], the eleventh-century abbess of Barking (c. 1066–c.1086) as part of an extensive building program.) Even imaginary processions could be usefully represented. For example, in Goscelin’s legends one of the celebrated (and long dead) foundresses moves her tomb to its destined place under her own initiative, taking


herself away from a workman she considered unworthy for the task. The mapping of narrated movements in the physical space is not as whimsical as it may sound. The visionary choices of the dead and their translation in the church space say much about the spiritual, social, and economic goals of the living (which are at least partly pursued through a building program).\textsuperscript{11}

The case of the abbess Ælgifu makes the point. She had the task of repositioning the abbey for a post-conquest Norman episcopacy that may have been suspicious of Barking’s Anglo-Saxon heritage and was certainly doubtful about the veracity of women’s narratives.

Finally, it is possible that additional two-dimensional or even three-dimensional visualization could be undertaken using the Barking GIS map. For example, changes in the building structure or interior features over time could be delineated. So could the placement of the natural resources (e.g., waterways and roadways) central to the abbey’s economy and relationships to its neighbors.\textsuperscript{12} Another project that comes to mind is the inclusion of “text” or “illustration” bubbles within the map (or map layers) that contain information about the space available in various documents and literature.\textsuperscript{13} Additionally, it may be possible to use map information as a basis for creating three-dimensional visualizations of the internal or external spaces using programs such as Google Sketchup or AutoCAD.\textsuperscript{14} This would give a sense of the subjective experience of being in or moving through the spaces depicted.

\textsuperscript{11} Slocum (2012), pp. 110-113, 118-122.

\textsuperscript{12} Complementing studies such as Gilchrist’s (1997, 2005).

\textsuperscript{13} Staley (2006), especially pp. 39-42.

\textsuperscript{14} Visualizing the past has become much more integrated in scholarship and teaching because of tools like Google Sketchup, the basics of which can be learned in a matter of hours. Bussell has had first-year students use Sketchup for final projects in her first-year seminar. Detailed examples of the more advanced projects can be viewed in the 3-D Warehouse at Sketchup: http://sketchup.google.com. This and other tools can also be used to explore interiors and textures, for example, as these are being discussed at BlenderArtist.org for buildings in a medieval market scene: http://blenderartists.org/forum/showthread.php?249812-Medieval-Market-Scene/page3
For such research purposes, a full archeological survey is not needed. Rather, a georectified map, which involves importing historical satellite imagery from Google Earth into ArcGIS10, serves very well. In this process, Clapham’s groundplan is aligned with the ruins on the Barking Green. This map can provide a foundational tool for considering these and other questions about the abbey’s physical plant and the use of its diverse spaces. We hope this project will provide a modest starting point for interdisciplinary conversations about the history of the Barking abbey community and the concepts of space that were important to it. Such conversations are already well underway in more comprehensive projects such as, *Mapping Medieval Chester*, *The Map of Early Modern London*, *Mapping the Medieval Urban Landscape* and *Mapping the Medieval*. In terms of our methodology, we are participating in the larger scholarly project of developing spatial databases in GIS for a range of historical sites. The focus of our map, however, is purposefully narrow in scope. We wanted to create the basic mapping data for study of a women’s monastic community that has been largely destroyed, and to do so using the resources available at a small public liberal arts university (which did not allow for on-site surveys).

**Methodology**

The process we used to create the Barking Abbey GIS map is well known among those who use ArcGIS10 software, and there are many resources available for learning it.

---

15 cf. the process description for *Mapping the Medieval Urban Landscape*:
http://www.qub.ac.uk/urban_mapping/images/flowchart.gif

16 A comprehensive explanation of editing (digitizing) features in Arc10 can be found in ESRI's ArcGIS Resource Center for Desktop 10):
http://help.arcgis.com/en/arcgisdesktop/10.0/help/index.html#/What_is_editing/001t00000001000000/
On the same site, see the information on KML to Layer Conversion (folder tree with the “Shapefile Toolset” for conversion to .shp):
http://help.arcgis.com/en/arcgisdesktop/10.0/help/index.html#/00120000004w00000__For_the_information_on
Nonetheless, as Bussell has learned from several conference talks on the Barking Abbey GIS map, there is still wide variance in the knowledge of this technology among humanists. It can be a mystifying process initially for scholars who do not have the experiences, resources, or institutional contacts to pursue GIS map creation and file conversion very easily on their own. In this section, we provide a transparent account of the production of the Barking Abbey GIS Map and, by doing so, aim to make the process accessible to graduate students or scholars in the humanities who want to use or add to this map or who are beginning to work with specialists in GIS on their own mapping projects.

It is important to start with the best satellite imagery available for the site. This may not be the most recent imagery or that available in the Basemaps for ArcGIS10. Working with the archaeological remains on the Barking green (Figure 2), our first step was to obtain the optimized satellite imagery. We needed this to identify the abbey’s historic location as accurately as possible and select control points (i.e. location referents on the ground) to georectify the satellite images with Clapham’s map. We completed this step in Google Earth by aligning remnant ruins of the abbey visible on satellite images to Clapham’s map. Georectification is often performed using other suites of GIS software such as ESRI’s ArcGIS; however, we found that the most current satellite image provided by the Bing Maps Basemap in ArcGIS10 was not ideal for visualizing the ruins on the ground. Google Earth, in contrast, provides a “Historical Imagery” tool, which allowed us to isolate past images which best distinguish the outlines of the medieval structure and to perform an image overlay alignment. The image which best displayed the Barking Abbey ruins was taken on 31 December 2005, and provided the perfect display of image overlay functionality (georeferencing our image) in Google Earth, see: http://geochalkboard.wordpress.com/2007/08/02/using-the-image-overlay-tool-in-google-earth/
on-ground features due to the time of day the image was captured, sun angle, seasonality, vegetation structure, and contrast between sunlight and shadows.

**Comparison Between Satellite Imagery Used for the Overlay**

![Comparison Between Satellite Imagery Used for the Overlay](image)

**Figure 2** Showing the difference between satellite images used to locate the Barking ruins on the ground. The Google Earth “Historical Image” from 12/31/2005 is shown left; BingMaps Online Basemap Image in ArcMap is shown on the right.

This optimized satellite image provided a necessary base for overlaying Clapham’s groundplan.

(Figure 3) After the overlay was performed, a polygon of the full extent of the historic abbey grounds was digitized in Google Earth. Polygons representing other structures were also drawn using Google Earth, adding abbey buildings (e.g. the Chapter House, Infirmary, Warming House), polygons representing the abbey church and areas within

---

17 The overlay and polygons are drawn in (tracing or outlining the various building shapes and space markers) using the tools in Google Earth. For additional information, refer to the resources given in n.15.
Figure 3 Showing the image overlay process in Google Earth using Clapham’s survey image from 1913 on a satellite image from 12/31/2005.

the abbey church (e.g. the Nave, Presbytery, and Saint’s Chapel), and other areas within the historic abbey grounds (e.g. Nuns’ Cemetery, Dorter Sub-Vault, Cloister) as referenced in Clapham’s groundplan.

After a total of 26 different polygons (Figure 4, representing internal and external structures as shown on Clapham’s groundplan) were digitized, we saved each polygon as a .kml
Figure 4 Digitizing polygons of the internal Abbey church structures using the Clapham image as a reference

(Google Earth file type) and then converted these files for usage in ArcGIS using the “KML to layer” conversion tool in ArcToolbox. It’s important to note that the file conversion from .kml in ArcGIS was not robust. Conversion from .kml files in ArcMap produces placemark file types for each item, created within its own geodatabase (.gdb) and accompanied by a layer (.lyr) file. For ease, compatibility, and organizational purposes, we exported each polygon out of this format to .shp (shapefile) formats into new organized geodatabases representing the

---

19 For the conversion, go to the Arc Tool Box, choose Conversion Tool, choose KML to Layer Conversion. We recommend converting one polygon at a time.
abbey church and the rest of the abbey grounds; we then used the ‘merge’ tool in ArcMap to create two new comprehensive shapefile layers for the two collections of polygons (the abbey church and the rest of the abbey grounds).

Figure 4  Showing the conversion from “KML to Layer” in ArcMap.

One other issue emerged with the conversion from .kml to .shp file types; after the polygons were converted and displayed in .shp file type, map output files failed to draw. This was due to the different file formats and topology between ArcGIS and Google Earth (in which the polygons were originally digitized in). This means that the polygons of the church and other buildings

https://digital.kenyon.edu/perejournal/vol4/iss2/23
produced in .kml (in Google Earth and successfully displayed in ArcMap after file conversion) still had to be redrawn in ArcMap to produce sharable maps of the final product. (Figure 5)

![Figure 5 Final Barking Abbey, Essex, GIS Georeferenced Ground Plan](image)

Despite the difficulties with conversion into ArcGIS, Google Earth’s “Historical Imagery” feature provided a key advantage in this process given the state of the ruins for the church and the surrounding complex. We were fortunate that Clapham’s rendering was detailed and accurate. This made the task much faster and less labor (and cost) intensive than it would have been otherwise.

Nonetheless it would still be possible to complete the georeferencing with poorer quality images and on-ground surveys. The main limitation would be the availability of site-specific...
points of interest or location referents, as they may not always be visible or easily located using satellite imagery; in this case, our points of interest (the ruins) were easy to locate and align with Clapham’s on-ground survey. This issue may be alleviated by conducting an on-ground survey with a GPS device (when possible). We were again fortunate that multiple high-quality images of this area (taken within the last five-to-ten years) were available. Some locales have superior chronological coverage more publically available than others; having multiple quality images to choose from allows for more accurate geo-referencing.

**Conclusion: Getting Started with Mapping**

For those who are relatively new to the use of GIS and other mapping technologies, and whose access to these resources may be limited, it may be useful to focus on the problem of data-gathering first.\(^{21}\) As Louis Hamilton’s work on the “Medieval Mediterranean” demonstrates, there are many resources for mapping or expanding maps and making them accessible.\(^{22}\) Of these options, GIS has advantages for incorporating good deal of sharable data into maps.

The best way to begin may be to engage in a collaborative problem-solving approach with those who have expertise in the software and its applications. This allows one to take full account of the goals, skills, experiences and perspectives of all those involved. The first task in this collaborative approach is to articulate questions that the data could address, even if the data

---


\(^{22}\) [http://users.drew.edu/lhamilto/cincproject/Method4Map.html](http://users.drew.edu/lhamilto/cincproject/Method4Map.html)
for digitizing a structure or spatial representation does not yet exist or is only partly extant. Sometimes these questions may require novel uses of a technology and a creative synthesis of tools that have been used for other purposes. We hope this study provides additional information for such discussions as well as material for the study of Barking Abbey and other spaces of religious life and devotional practice.
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Abstract
We outline the methods that we used to create a GIS-based map of Barking Abbey, a British nunnery founded c. 666 and razed in 1539. This article includes images of a GIS map based on Sir Alfred Clapham’s 1911 groundplan of the abbey (and the map layers) as well as a link to a WebMap. We hope the map and methods discussion will be useful to humanists who are relatively new to the value of GIS (and the use of Google Earth in georectification) for studying devotional practice, liturgical performance, and the conceptualization of physical space in religious life. We also suggest how this map may be used for further research on Barking Abbey and the implications of mapping for other sites with scant physical remains for which a full archeological survey may not be feasible.
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Disfluency and Deep Processing as Paths to Devotion: Reading and Praying with the Veronica in the Psalter and Hours “of Yolande of Soissons” (M. 729)

By David Boffa, Beloit College

Among the pages of the late-thirteenth-century Psalter and Hours “of Yolande of Soissons” is an exceptional image of the Holy Face (New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M. 729; fig. 1). It stares out from its surroundings, intently fixing its gaze upon the viewer. Floating behind the face is a circle inscribed with a cross, entirely containing the head but for two trails of hair that extend to the base of the image’s frame.

My interest in the Holy Face of M. 729 originated in a paper written for a seminar on the medieval image led by Erik Thunø in 2006. I am grateful to him and the seminar participants for the thought-provoking discussions that initially guided my thinking. Since then my research on this topic has taken new directions, and several individuals have been generous enough to share ideas and suggestions along the way. I would like to thank Susannah Fisher, Rebekah Perry, and Brenna Graham for reading drafts of this article. I am also particularly grateful to the two anonymous peer reviewers, both of whom provided excellent feedback. I have done my best to respond to their criticisms and suggestions, and I look forward to examining some of their broader claims in future research.

Figure 1 Psalter and Hours of “Yolanda of Soissons,” late 13th century, France. Photo: New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M. 729A.
patterned red field fills out the remainder of the background, surmounted by an impressive
display of Gothic architecture. The text on the facing page (fol. 14v) makes explicit the
illumination’s connection to the Veronica—the *vera icon*, said to be a true image of Christ’s
likeness. Contained in the text is a short rubric in Old French as well as a prayer in Latin
allegedly composed by Pope Innocent III in honor of the Veronica.

That the image and text were intended to be used together during the act of devotion is
made apparent by their placement and thematic associations—that is, both text and image refer
to the image-relic of the Veronica. In the following paper I will highlight the importance of
certain characteristics of the text as they relate to the contemplation of the Holy Face. My intent
is a recreation of the devotional experience by outlining how this book’s user interacted with the
words and images. Furthermore, I suggest that recent studies in cognition can help us understand
the ways a medieval text could affect the responses of a reader.\(^2\) One specific phenomenon I
address is known as “disfluency,” defined as “the subjective, metacognitive experience of
difficulty associated with cognitive tasks.”\(^3\) In the case of medieval manuscripts such as M. 729,
I argue for a degree of difficulty that was an inherent part of both the script and language (in this
case, Old French and Latin written in a Gothic book hand). The impact of working with difficult

---

\(^2\) I recognize here that applying modern studies in cognition to historical objects and phenomena can be problematic. Several of the issues raised by such an approach are discussed in issue #2 of nonsite.org, “Evaluating Neuroaesthetics,” ed. Todd Cronan (http://nonsite.org/issue-2-neuroaesthetics). See especially Whitney Davis, “Neurovisuality” (http://nonsite.org/issues/issue-2/neurovisuality) and Jennifer Ashton, “Two Problems with a Neuroesthetic Theory of Interpretation” (http://nonsite.org/issues/issue-2/two-problems-with-a-neuroesthetic-theory-of-interpretation). I am grateful to one of the anonymous reviewers for pointing me in this direction.

\(^3\) Connor Diemand-Yauman, Daniel M. Oppenheimer, and Erikkka B. Vaughan, “Fortune favors the Bold (and the Italicized): Effects of disfluency on educational outcomes” Cognition 118 (January 2011), 111-115. But also see Carol L. Yue, Alan D. Castel, and Robert A. Bjork, “When disfluency is—and is not—a desirable difficulty: The influence of typeface clarity on metacognitive judgments and memory” Memory and Cognition 41 (February 2013), 229-241, for a refinement of these claims. As the authors of the latter study note (citing their own research and earlier work), perceptual difficulty may not always lead to improved memory performance, and indeed can occasionally impair performance. For the purposes of this paper, what is most important is whether manuscripts’ texts and images can engage the deep processing of medieval readers through perceptual difficulties, which I argue they can.
texts, which would have required more concentration and more in-depth processing, had the potential to generate cognitive states that might have been considered especially contemplative or devotional. Although my discussion centers on the image-text pairing in this particular manuscript, I believe the phenomena outlined here can have implications for a wide variety of texts and readers in the Middle Ages.

The Psalter and Hours “of Yolande of Soissons”

The manuscript known as the Psalter and Hours “of Yolande of Soissons” was originally intended for use as a devotional book by a female reader. The style of the illuminations and the textual evidence suggest a production in or around Amiens, an important manuscript center in the thirteenth century. In its present state, the manuscript consists of 437 numbered folios, each approximately 134 by 182 mm. Included in the manuscript are a complete Psalter, a calendar, three sets of Hours, the Office of the Dead, the Penitential Psalms, the “Psalter of Saint Jerome”, and prayers, poems, and litanies in Old French and Latin. Though it is clear that the manuscript is composed of two types of prayer books used by the laity for private devotions (the Psalter and the Book of Hours) the arrangement of the folios was disrupted at some point and thus the

4 Gould, *The Psalter*, 13-60. The inclusion of a number of Amiens saints in the liturgical calendar; the phonological, morphological, and syntactic traits of the Old French dialect used; and the stylistic similarities between this manuscript and others from the area of Amiens and northern France seem to support her claims. For the textual analysis see Gould, “The Psalter and Hours of Yolande of Soissons,” 61-76, 345, and 363; and Gould, *The Psalter*, 13-23; for the stylistic evidence see Gould, *The Psalter*, 25-60. More recently, Stones, “The Full-Page Miniatures of the Psalter-Hours,” 282, argues for the importance of German models for the decorative program of MS M. 729. She suggests that “to judge from what remains, placing miniatures within the text seems to have been a practice more prevalent in Germany than elsewhere. The unusual density of full-page miniatures in M. 729 owes more of a debt to models from the Rhine and beyond than to models closer to the region of Amiens where the book was made.”

5 The sheets of parchment are consistently ruled for 19 lines of text in a space measuring 78 by 107 mm. The decorative program includes 40 full-page miniatures, 64 historiated initials, small calendar miniatures, a number of full-page and partial borders, and smaller decorated initials. Sand, “Vision,” 8.
present order may not reflect the original state. Complicating this problem that several folios appear to be missing.  

Information on the probable patron and owner of M. 729 comes from the coats of arms used in the borders surrounding the miniatures and historiated initials. Alison Stones argues that the Book of Hours was originally begun for the widowed Comtesse de la Table (Yolande’s probable step-mother) but that with the death of Comtesse de la Table sometime before 1300, Bernard V and his wife Yolande took over the patronage of the manuscript. In light of this argument, the manuscript’s production is likely to have occurred in two phases; the first stage, done for Comtesse de la Table, can range from 1270 to around 1300, while the second stage, during which time the likely patrons were Yolande and her husband, could have started as early as 1276 and lasted until around 1304 (the probable date of Bernard V de Moreuil’s death).

6 Gould, *The Psalter*, 1, 13; Stones, “The Full-Page Miniatures of the Psalter-Hours,” 282. The current binding of blue leather was done in 1927 by Buprez Lahey after the Morgan Library purchased the manuscript.

7 Of the approximately 400 shields used, six are repeated throughout, four of which can be positively identified. Gould concluded that the identifiable combination made Yolande of Soissons the likely owner. Gould, *The Psalter*, 1-3. The identifiable coats are: azure, semy of lis or with a demi-lion argent over all (Moreuil family); or, a lion passant gules with a border of the same (Soissons counts); argent, a cross gules charged with five scallops or (Hangest family); and barruly or and gules (counts of Grandpré). These belong to the Moreuil family, the Soissons counts, the Hangest family, and the Grandpré family. Yolande was the wife of Bernard V of Moreuil; the daughter of Raoul of Soissons and his wife, Comtesse of Hangest; and possibly the granddaughter of Ade of Grandpré.

8 Stones, “The Full-Page Miniatures of the Psalter-Hours,” 281-293, esp. 291-293. Gould, *The Psalter*, 7-11, 52, dated the manuscript to roughly the same time, though her conclusions differed from those of Stones. The use of the Moreuil coat of arms and the portrayal of the married couple with two of their four children in one of the miniatures (fol. 1v) suggested a terminus post quem of around 1275, though the possibility that the other children were too young to be depicted could extend her dating to as late as 1290. See Sand, “A Small Door,” for a discussion of the problem of using the alleged family portrait to date the manuscript.

9 Little is known of Yolande aside from her marital and familial relations, all of whom were northern French nobility. She was born in either the late 1240s or early 1250s and married Bernard V by 1276 with whom she had three sons and one daughter. Gould, *The Psalter*, 4-6.
The Holy Face and MS M. 729

The face of Christ in M. 729 belongs to the centuries-old tradition of an image of God made without human hands. In the West this image was known as the *sudarium*, a piece of cloth reported to have been housed at St. Peter’s in Rome since the twelfth century.\(^{10}\) According to the account of Matthew Paris in his mid-thirteenth-century *Chronica Majora*, in 1216, after Pope Innocent III had processed the *sudarium* from St. Peter’s to the Hospital of the Holy Spirit, the image on the cloth miraculously turned upside down. Seeing this as an ill omen, the pope composed a prayer devoted to the Veronica and granted ten days’ indulgence for its recitation.\(^{11}\)

The text on folio 14v that faces the Holy Face includes both the Latin prayer composed by Innocent III—explicitly linking this image to the *sudarium* of Rome—as well as a short introductory rubric in Old French. It reads:

(Rubric) [Old French] Innocent, Pope of Rome, gave this speech in forgiveness of all sinners. Whosoever shall utter this oration at the sacrament shall have sixty days’ indulgence. (Rubric) [Latin] A Psalm of David. May God have mercy on us. Let it show [be seen]. Mark with me a token for good: that they who hate me may see how you, God, have come to my aid and have consoled me. (Rubric) Pray. God, you who wanted to leave behind for us, marked by the light of your face, a memorial of you, in the presence of Veronica, your image impressed on a [sweat]cloth. Through your passion and cross and your holy cloth, grant us that now, through the mirror, in an enigma, we may succeed to venerate, adore, and honor your image, just as then, safe and sound, we may see, face-to-face, the judge coming above us, our Lord, Jesus Christ. Amen.\(^{12}\)


\(^{11}\) Lewis, *The Art of Matthew Paris*, 126. Also see Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 220, and 291*-292* for information on the procession of Innocent III, and 294* and 297* for Matthew Paris’s text on the events of 1216.

\(^{12}\) The original text reads: “(Rubric) Ynnocens li papes de Rome fist cheste orison en remision de tous pecheurs quiconkes dira cheste orison au sacrement il ara .lx. iours de pardon. (Rubric) Psalms David. Deus misereatur nostri. Signatum est. Fac mecum signum in bono ut videant qui oderunt me quam tu Domine adivisti me et consolatus es me. (Rubric) Orato [sic]. Deus qui nobis signatis vultus tui lumine memoriale tuum ad instanciam Veronica ymaginem tuam sudario impressam relinquere volusti, per passionem et crucem tuam et sanctum sudarium tuum tribue nobis, ut ita nunc in terris per speculum in enygmate venerari adorare honorare ipsum valeamus ut te tunc facie ad faciem venientem super nos iudicem securi videamus Dominum nostrum Jesum.
This prayer’s constituent parts have been well addressed by Alexa Sand. She notes that the Old French rubric, likely composed by the manuscript authors, establishes the interdependence of word and image from the outset.\textsuperscript{13} The text’s Latin portion is then a collection of prayers and scriptural readings. Included are three references to the Psalms, likely chosen for their significance within the context of confronting the face of God. These are Psalm 66:2 (“May God have mercy on us, and bless us: may he cause the light of his countenance to shine upon us, and may he have mercy on us”),\textsuperscript{14} Psalm 4:7 (“The light of thy countenance O Lord, is signed upon us: thou hast given gladness in my heart”),\textsuperscript{15} and Psalm 85:17 (“Shew me a token for good: that they who hate me may see, and be confounded, because thou, O Lord, hast helped me and hast comforted me”).\textsuperscript{16}

Legends surrounding the idea of an image of God made without human hands first date to the sixth century with the appearance of the \textit{Mandylion} of King Abgar.\textsuperscript{17} According to this story, 

\begin{quote}
Christum. Amen.” Transcribed in Gould, \textit{The Psalter}, 82 n. 35. I am grateful to Alexander Dickow for providing a translation of the Old French and to Ryan Fowler for the Latin text. In reading the number of days’ indulgence provided I am following Sand’s translation of “sixty” (Sand, “Picturing Devotion,” 145), although the original office called for ten.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{13} Sand, “Picturing Devotion,” 145.

\textsuperscript{14 “Deus misereatur nostri et benedicat nobis inluminet vultum suum super nos et misereatur nostri diapsalma.” (emphasis added)}

\textsuperscript{15 “signatum est super nos lumen vultus tui Domine dedisti laetitiam in corde meo.” (emphasis added)}

\textsuperscript{16 “fac mecum signum in bono et videant qui oderunt me et confundantur quoniam tu Domine adiuvasti me et consolatus es me.” (emphasis added) The English translations are all taken from the Douay-Rheims 1899 American Edition. Sand, “Picturing Devotion,” 147, notes that “the Psalm references move from the metaphorical light of the face of God, to the mark it places upon a supplicant, to the supplicant’s request for a visible sign from God.” Hamburger, \textit{The Visual and the Visionary}, 355-358, notes how the prayer also quotes 1 Corinthians 13:12.

Christ imprinted his features upon a cloth after a messenger sent by the king failed to capture Christ’s portrait in a painted image. The image healed the king of an illness and subsequently copied itself onto a tile when it was walled up during a Persian invasion, events which underscored its supernatural provenance and powers. From its origins in the northern Syrian city of Edessa, the story and cult of the Mandylion image in the Byzantine East eventually passed to that surrounding the Veronica in the Latin West. In the early part of the thirteenth century, the image cult in the West became increasingly popular, likely influenced by the influx of Eastern and Western icons in the years following the Fourth Crusade in 1204.

The face of Christ in M. 729 belongs to this tradition, and its link to the Veronica of Rome is undeniably stressed by the prayer of Innocent III on the facing page. The circle in which Christ’s face is inscribed underscores this association, as its resemblance to a Host invites contemplation on what one author has termed the “profound connection” between the cult of the eucharist and that of the Veronica. As noted by Hamburger, representations of the Holy Face, and by extension, the Veronica,

---


20 Hamburger, The Visual and the Visionary, 320. See also Belting, Likeness and Presence, 541. The legend of the Veronica was not at this time associated with the Passion; rather, in its earliest forms it was simply an image of the Holy Face owned by a woman named Veronica who had been cured of a blood issuance by Christ. Like the Abgar legend, the image in this story also managed to heal a sick ruler (in this case, the Emperor Tiberius). Cf. Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha, I, 457, 484, and Belting, Likeness and Presence, 541.

21 Wolf, “From Mandylion to Veronica,” 172.
were linked to an incarnational aesthetic elaborated in and mandated by eucharistic theology. Disembodied representations of the Holy Face came to stand by synecdoche for the whole of Christ’s body, especially Christ’s body as present in the Eucharist.\textsuperscript{22}

The combination of a Host-like circle with the face of Christ in the manuscript of Yolande of Soissons seems to support this thesis.\textsuperscript{23} That the medieval mind was primed to accept this intricate relationship between image and eucharist, part and whole, and relic and copy, is attested by various other relational aspects of Holy Face images, in which they are simultaneously considered dark and light, human and divine, ugly and beautiful.\textsuperscript{24} The eucharistic association is strengthened when considered with relation to the female patron or patrons of M. 729, as eucharistic devotion was “the most prominent, characteristically female concern in thirteenth-century religiosity.”\textsuperscript{25}

If we accept that the circumscribed face of Christ stands as a symbol of the eucharist and Christ’s Incarnation and ultimate sacrifice, then we should also consider the significance behind the patterned and colored decoration that serves as a background and thus support for the image of Christ. In its reference to the cloth on which the face of Christ was impressed, the background manages to suggest both the veil of Christ’s humanity as well as the temple veil that previously

\textsuperscript{22} Hamburger, \textit{The Visual and the Visionary}, 333; this is contrasted with the Byzantine East, where “representations of the Holy Face occupied a central place in disputes over Christology and, hence, over the nature and limits of representation itself […]”

\textsuperscript{23} Sand, “Picturing Devotion,” 146, also notes the possible links between the style of Mandylion iconography and the sacrament of the eucharist.

\textsuperscript{24} Hamburger, \textit{The Visual and the Visionary}, 359-368. Lewis, “The Veronica,” discusses the so-called “black Veronicas” that exhibit an especially dark portrayal of the Holy Face.

\textsuperscript{25} Caroline Walker Bynum, “Women Mystics and Eucharistic Devotion in the Thirteenth Century,” in \textit{Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion}, New York 1991, 121. Bynum, 122, notes that “it is glaringly obvious that laywomen, recluses, tertiaries, beguines, nuns of all orders and those women (especially common in the early thirteenth century) who wandered from one type of life to another were inspired, compelled, comforted and troubled by the eucharist to an extent found in only a few male writers of the period.” For a discussion of the Eucharist within the larger context of food as it relates to medieval female piety see her seminal book \textit{Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women}, Berkeley 1987.
limited access to the tabernacle. In Christian theology allusions to veils were loaded with meaning: it was only through assuming the veil of humanity that Christ was able to erase the first sin of mankind and ensure its salvation. Additionally, the rending apart of the curtain or veil that covered the tabernacle was a key moment in humanity’s salvation. Only through Christ’s death was this plan made complete, as it was at the moment of the crucifixion that the tabernacle curtain, representative of the old covenant, was rent apart. The destruction of the old covenant allowed for the establishment of the new covenant, represented here by the face of Christ. In assuming bodily form, Christ replaced the old temple/tabernacle “with a new more spiritual covenant” that granted everyone access to the most sacred. In M. 729, the placement of the Holy Face over and in front of the curtained background seems to underscore this notion; in covering and displacing the old temple veil, the face of Christ highlights the new promise of accessibility made possible through Christ’s Incarnation and sacrifice. Given this interpretation, it is perhaps interesting to note that the Nativity depicted on fol. 246v features an image of a curtain that has literally been drawn aside to allow the reader access to the scene. Additionally, there are particularly striking examples of patterned backgrounds (which appear throughout the manuscript) in two of the Crucifixion scenes. Folios 4v and 337v, both images of the Crucifixion, have a patterned background whose color is split by the dividing line of the cross’s vertical member. In fol. 4v the background is blue on the left of the cross, red on the right; the

27 Hamburger, The Visual and the Visionary, 368.
28 Cf. Hamburger, The Visual and the Visionary, 367-368; also see 375-380, where the veil is compared to the marriage veil that Christians must assume to attain salvation. Also see Kessler, “Through the Temple Veil,” 71-75.
30 I am grateful to Erik Thunø, as well as the participants of his Spring 2006 seminar, for these suggestions.
arrangement is then reversed in the image on fol. 337v. Perhaps this unusual shift in colors was meant to underscore the above-mentioned notion of a shift from old to new covenants.

Text and Image, Reading and Seeing

As mentioned earlier, the association between the M. 729 image and the vera icon of St. Peter’s is made clear through the use of the Latin prayer that faces the image. Yet the importance of text and image goes far beyond either one serving as mere commentary or explanation; each must be considered to be in dialogue with the other, a dialogue which engaged the reader during the act of private devotion.\(^{31}\) Text and image were quite clearly intended to work in unison. That such a strong relationship exists is evidenced by the entire manuscript program. Sand has proposed that the images in the Psalter were “intentionally difficult,” and that this interpretive difficulty was a critical part of the devotional act of viewing the images and reading the text.\(^{32}\)

In the case of this prayer and image—and likely in many manuscripts’ texts and images—the viewer’s contemplation and reception of the Holy Face would have been directly influenced by the text’s inherent characteristics. To better understand the specifics of these nuances I will more closely examine several important aspects that would have affected the use and reception of this prayer and image: the languages employed in the rubric and prayer, the script in which the

\(^{31}\) Sand, “Picturing Devotion,” 148, in discussing this arrangement, notes: “Through the interpretive work of devotion, moving back and forth between the Old French rubric, the Psalm references and prayer in Latin, and the picture, the viewer comes very close to a face-to-face meeting with Christ, prefiguring her ultimate union with the godhead after death.”

\(^{32}\) Sand, “Vision,” 6. She later notes: “The resonance between the [psalms’] miniatures and the words that follow indicates the complex interplay of ideas both visual and verbal that the manuscript’s makers apparently intended the user to engage.” Sand, “Vision,” 12. For another exploration of text and image and female lay devotion, see Kathryn A. Smith, Art, Identity and Devotion in Fourteenth-Century England: Three Women and their Books of Hours (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003), especially 152-248.
text is written, and the method in which the text was likely to have been read. I suggest that the desired devotional state can be better understood when we consider the specific processes that might have been at work during the acts of reading, seeing, and contemplation.\footnote{Although we have no information on the education of Yolande of Soissons or the other possible female patron of M. 729, it is safe to assume that, as noblewomen, they would have been taught to read at the very least. See Shulamith Shahar, The Fourth Estate: A history of women in the Middle Ages, trans. Chaya Galai, New York 2003, 154-165; also see Susan Groag Bell, “Medieval Women Book Owners: Arbiters of Lay Piety and Ambassadors of Culture,” in Sisters and Workers in the Middle Ages, ed. Judith M. Bennett, Elizabeth A. Clark, Jean F. O’Barr, B. Anne Vilen, and Sarah Westphal-Wihl, Chicago 1989, 135-161.}

The use of Old French in the rubric introducing the prayer and Latin for the prayer itself is the first aspect under investigation. In the majority of the manuscript the dominant text is Latin; Old French only occurs in rubrics preceding four prayers (fols. 14v, 202v, 207r, and 208v), in two longer prayers (fols. 207r-208v), and in two poems devoted to the Virgin (fols. 217r-220r and 220r-222r).\footnote{Gould, The Psalter, 20, and Appendix A, 117.} For two of the Old French prefatory rubrics the prayers that follow are also in Old French; in those instances, the choice of Old French in an introductory context seems natural, as it results in a unity between rubric and prayer. The remaining two prayers that are accompanied by rubrics, of which the office of Innocent is one example, are both in Latin. The distinction between the two languages, further highlighted by the different color inks used, demands consideration.\footnote{Although rubrics in Latin regularly use red ink in this manuscript, I do not think that fact takes away from the effect created here via both color (red and black) and language (Old French and Latin).}

As readily as the modern reader is able to discern between the two, the medieval mind would have been even more primed to appreciate this distinction; indeed, the languages’ separate histories and associations were unavoidable.\footnote{See, e.g., Franz H. Bäuml, “Varieties and Consequences of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy” Speculum 55 (1980), 237-265, especially 263. Among other points, Bäuml notes that vernaculars, compared to Latin, “carried an entirely different set of associations: their lexicon and imagery, as well as the entire cultural context of their past use, were—although not untouched by the Latin tradition—distinctly their own.” (263) Also see Alexa Sand “Cele houre
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Latin was no doubt more esteemed in the mind of the thirteenth-century reader than the everyday speech of the early Romance languages. As the language of the Roman Church, Latin, in the West, was inherently authoritative, far above the innumerable vernacular tongues spoken across medieval Europe. Its association with antiquity, and thus with ancient knowledge and erudition, only increased its prestige. Finally, as is the case in so many instances of social or cultural stratification, the very exclusivity of the Latin language would have lent it further weight for those educated enough to read it.  

The use of Old French for the rubric and Latin for the prayer in M. 729 is thus far more than mere bilingualism; it is rather a deeply significant example of linguistic ordering, whereby the one language, Latin, is laden with far more meaning and import than the other, Old French. For the medieval reader, who spoke primarily Old French and encountered Latin during special religious experiences, the ability to appreciate different linguistic spheres would have been especially acute.

Another important consideration is that Latin—which would not have been the reader’s mother tongue—likely presented different challenges while reading. A sermon delivered at Amiens Cathedral in the second half of the thirteenth century suggests a degree of exclusivity and potential difficulty for Latin, as the overwhelming majority of the text is in Old French, with Latin used only sparingly. Yet while it is tempting to assume a greater facility in reading

---


37 As early as the ninth century the Church was aware of a significant rift between spoken, Vulgar Latin and the official, literary Latin used by the Church. In Gerhard Rohlfs, *From Vulgar Latin to Old French: An Introduction to the Study of the Old French Language,* trans. Vincent Almazan and Lillian McCarthy, Detroit 1970, 68, the author notes how the Church “recognized that the care of the spiritual needs of her flock could not be assured by means of a language no longer comprehensible to the great masses of the people.” Thus, in 813 “the assembled synod of Tours decreed that henceforth the exegesis of the holy scriptures by the clergy might be given also in Romance or in the German vernacular.”

38 For the text and a discussion see Stephen Murray, *A Gothic Sermon: Making a Contract with the Mother of God, Saint Mary of Amiens,* Berkeley 2004. Of the approximately thirty Latin fragments most are derived from scripture. Murray, citing Michael Zink (in *La prédication en langue romane avant 1300,* Paris 1976), notes how “the scriptural text that provided the theme of a vernacular sermon was commonly rendered in Latin, allowing the preacher to
vernacular texts, for a medieval lay reader this is not a foregone conclusion. There is evidence that a number of noble and aristocratic women in the later Middle Ages were patrons of vernacular literature, suggesting better abilities reading vernacular texts, although this claim depends on a number of other variables. For one, devotional texts may have been used with a confessor; it is also possible that the Latin portions of the text were known by heart. In this case, it is not impossible to assume that the reading of Old French was as or more difficult than the reading of Latin. What is of primary importance is the recognition that the different languages likely involved different mindsets and modes of reading, and that for both the Old French rubric and the Latin prayer a certain level of difficulty can be assumed.

The Gothic script in which the text was written, a highly formal type of Gothic *textualis*, might have forced the reader to move even more slowly and deliberately over the words. This type of reading, very different from that with which most modern readers are familiar, had the potential to do more than simply impart a greater degree of solemnity. Recent research in cognitive science suggests that difficult cognitive operations, such as reading something in an unconventional script, can lead to deeper processing. This phenomenon of experiencing difficulty during cognitive tasks—disfluency—can have significant and measurable effects on express respect for the language of the church. The practice also lent the speaker the aura of a learned person […]”

Both points highlight the esteem held for the Latin language in this period.

39 An earlier version of this paper did just that, and I thank the anonymous readers for highlighting some problems with that claim.

40 Smith, *Art, Identity and Devotion*, 194.


42 Diemand-Yauman *et al.*, “Fortune favors the Bold (and the Italicized)”, 112.
memory, learning, and retention. These can include deeper processing of information, more abstract and careful processing, and better comprehension of materials.\textsuperscript{43} While recognizing the inherent problems of applying modern scientific studies to historical phenomena, I would like to suggest that insights into the processes of reading and memory may have relevance for how we approach manuscripts like M. 729. Research that teases out the particulars of what, for modern readers, are relatively automatic activities can prove illuminating for the more deliberate activities of medieval devotional reading. Furthermore, as scholars like Whitney Davis have noted, ignoring experimental research may introduce its own set of problems and biases.\textsuperscript{44}

Whether the script employed in this manuscript produced the effect of disfluency, and thus potentially deeper processing, in the female patron is at least partly dependent upon the reader’s degree of familiarity with the script.\textsuperscript{45} It is critical to note, however, that the degree of difference does not need to be great (and indeed too much difficulty can be counter-productive).\textsuperscript{46} In the


\textsuperscript{44} Davis, “Neurovisuality,” writes: “On the other hand, however, art history must be just as unsatisfyingly partial as experimental neuropsychology, though for inverse reasons. Art historians writing in the main lines of formalism and historicism from Wölflin (and before) to Baxandall (and beyond) have usually addressed human beings in visuality without any direct \textit{experimental} access to the experience of many of the people they purport to survey, and whose configurations and figurations they claim to interpret, even if such access is available. Since its consolidation in the late eighteenth century, to be sure, professional art history has had many \textit{opportunities} for such experiment, notably among living human populations who have made and used the visual arts. But usually it has eschewed laboratory or clinical evidence about these experiences unless there has been a special art-historical reason—usually a biographical reason—to investigate them (for example, in the case of artists who have suffered damage to the visual brain).”

\textsuperscript{45} See, e.g., Song and Schwarz, “Fluency,” 792-794.

\textsuperscript{46} In the Diemand-Yauman study, the authors used either Comic Sans MS or Bodoni MT (both in 12-point, 60\% grey-scale) for disfluent examples and 16-point black Arial for fluent (or easy-to-read) examples. In discussing these different fonts, they note: “[…] the disfluency manipulation is quite subtle. While there is no question that the disfluent text feels harder to read than the fluent text when they are presented side by side, in the absence of a fluent
case of this manuscript, and for many contemporary manuscripts produced for lay readers, we might propose subtle difficulty or disfluency for formal Gothic scripts based on several points of evidence. For one, the inherent characteristics of the Gothic book hand make it a more difficult script compared to later cursive examples. Gothic formal characteristics favor uniformity in appearance rather than distinctive letter shapes. This uniformity increases the degree of difficulty in letter and whole-word recognition. Words with \(m\), \(n\), \(i\), and \(u\), for example, can be particularly troubling, as these letters are all written using identical minim strokes.

Additionally, it is unlikely that many lay patrons would have learned to write in a formal book hand. Instead, lay readers, when they learned to write, would likely have learned a more rapid and informal script that was used in areas of commerce, law, and administration. These scripts used outside of books were generally much looser and freer, with an eye toward speed. Perhaps significantly, the cursive hands that developed in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, as the Gothic script was becoming the choice for book hands, featured word separation (in contrast to contrast against, it is unlikely that a reader would even be consciously aware of the added difficulty that the disfluent text engenders.” (112) Examples of the fonts used are: Comic Sans MS, Bodoni (though their version was Bodoni MT), and Arial. Yue et al., “When disfluency,” chose instead to render their disfluent version via a computer program that blurred the regular font (Calibri, 44) by dispersing the pixels 10 percent. In their studies they found better or similar recall for clear versus blurred words, suggesting that not all difficulties produce the sought after effects of improved retention and recall.

---

47 Colette Sirat, Writing as Handwork: A History of Handwriting in Mediterranean and Western Culture (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 327.

48 Paul Saenger, “Reading in the Later Middle Ages,” in A History of Reading in the West, ed. Guglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane, Amherst 1999, 120-48, here 142. Saenger notes: “When in the fourteenth century noble laymen began to read to themselves, they found the Gothic textualis difficult to read. A major source of difficulty was the confusion in recognizing the letters \(m\), \(n\), \(i\) and \(u\) composed of the identical minim strokes that had troubled earlier readers of Latin.” Interestingly, Derolez, Paleography, 70, notes that some scholars have argued Gothic script was more legible than the earlier Carolingian script. Their basic claim is that the Gothic script stressed words as basic units in a line of text, which would have resulted in a “clarifying effect.” Derolez, however, is unconvincing, and his book works from the position that the Gothic script had a “complicating effect.” Per Derolez, see W. Oeser, “Das a als Grundlage für Schriftvarianten in der gotischen Buchschrift,” Scriptorium 25 (1971), 25-45.

to the far more difficult cursive of antiquity),\textsuperscript{50} which would have helped with reading fluency. As will be discussed below, word separation has been noted to facilitate reading.

What is important for my suggestion is that a female lay reader without university training would have experienced some degree of difficulty when faced with a bilingual text written in Gothic script, potentially introducing a degree of disfluency.\textsuperscript{51} It is worth noting that scribes catering to the aristocratic market at the end of the fourteenth century began using a \textit{cursiva formata} that was similar to the scripts used for the vernacular documents of the Royal Chancery; presumably, the shift came about because of a demand for a script that was easier to read than Gothic.\textsuperscript{52} This difficulty is critical for how we assess the usage and reception of medieval devotional texts. Indeed, it seems that difficulty would have been a characteristic feature for the reading of \textit{many} lay devotional texts, rather than a unique feature of this manuscript.

As noted, the higher levels of attention required for difficult texts can result in better processing. The combination of reading Old French and Latin with a formal Gothic script likely resulted in some sort of deep processing—disfluency or otherwise—leading to a state of mind that could have been perceived as one of greater sanctity within the context of medieval devotion. Furthermore, the unusual arrangement of the folios—text on the left, image on the right, in contrast to all other folios in the manuscript—had the potential to impart yet another layer of slightly more engaged processing, as it was at odds with what the reader would have expected. Thus linguistic, stylistic, and physical characteristics all contributed to a cognitive state

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Although as one of the anonymous reviewers astutely noted, this might also depend on how often a reader interacted with devotional objects that employed Gothic script.
\item Saenger, “Reading in the Later Middle Ages,” 142.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
that demanded the reader attend closely and carefully to the rubric and prayer. Perhaps the rabbit at the bottom of the page is still another component of the text’s difficulty, as it attempts to distract the reader from her higher purpose.⁵³

An additional component for understanding this text’s use and reception is a consideration of how exactly it was read. From antiquity to the early Middle Ages the primary mode of reading

---

⁵³ In Herbert L. Kessler, *Seeing Medieval Art*, Ontario 2004, 102, the author writes of marginalia in which “a hound shown chasing a rabbit and hybrid creatures threaten to distract the reader's attention from God’s word and face, thus setting up a spiritual struggle.” The margins of M. 729 are filled with images of beasts both real and mythical. For marginal illustrations in the Hours and Psalter of Yolande of Soissons see Lilian M. C. Randall, *Images in the Margins of Gothic Manuscripts*, Berkeley 1966, 34-235, passim, and fig. 383.
was oral recitation. Textual sources suggest that as late as the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries the written word was typically intended to be read aloud. This affected all areas of texts’ production and use, from the ways in which words were written to the organization and lending practices of libraries (oral reading, being slower than silent reading, required far longer loan periods). The act of reading was often conceptualized as a far more physical activity than what modern readers are accustomed to, involving not only the eyes but also the mouth, ears, and even the entire body. Bodily movements, rhythm, and sound could all contribute to the understanding of a text.

Only by the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries did the practice of silent reading begin to overtake oral recitation as the standard means of using a text. And just as the practice of oral reading had affected all areas of the literary world in the past, so too the new method of silent reading would profoundly alter the shape and nature of texts (as the texts themselves altered the nature of reading). More legible scripts, clearly defined word spacing, and libraries that catered to a silent environment (with shorter loan periods) were just some of the substantial changes that resulted from this new form of interacting with the written word. In turn, readers’

---


55 Saenger, “Silent Reading,” 379-381. Even the act of composing was oral, as authors dictated to scribes and scribes in turn dictated to their pens. See Ivan Illich, In the Vineyard of the Text, Chicago, 1993, especially 86-92.

56 Saenger, “Silent Reading,” 396, writes, “The cloister libraries of the twelfth century had been suited to a culture of oral reading. Books had been kept in closed chests and were customarily lent at Easter for a period of one year. The lengthy loan period had reflected the slow pace of reading orally either to oneself or to others in small groups. The carrels of the cloister library, divided by stone walls, had allowed monks to read softly to themselves or to compose by dictating to a secretary without disturbing their confreres.”

57 Illich, Vineyard, 54-57. On 54, Illich, speaking of twelfth-century monastic readers, notes that “reading is a much less phantasmagoric and much more carnal activity: the reader understands the lines by moving to their beat, remembers them by recapturing their rhythm, and thinks of them in terms of putting them into his mouth and chewing.” He goes on to list several accounts of “mumbling and munching” on texts, accounts which are occasionally explicit in their description of Scripture’s sweetness.

58 See Saenger, “Silent Reading,” 388-398, and Saenger, Space Between Words, 256-276, for discussions on how silent reading affected nearly all areas of textual production and use. The development of consistently separating
relationship to the symbols on the page shifted; as Ivan Illich notes, “the shapes on the pages […] became less triggers for sound patterns than visual symbols of concepts.”

The Psalter-Hours “of Yolande of Soissons” was produced during this period of change, as attested by several elements of the text, though oral components of reading remained a crucial part of its usage. The punctuation, spacing, and textual divisions employed are some of the developments that served to aid visual reading. Yet the highly formal Gothic textus did not readily lend itself to silent reading, especially for those without university training. Furthermore, the rubric accompanying the Holy Face image, along with what is known about private devotion in the late Middle Ages, suggest that the office of Innocent III was meant to be used according to the older and more established tradition of oral recitation. That the opening lines of Old French state, “Whosoever shall utter this oration at the sacrament” clearly implies that the Latin prayer was meant to be read aloud, as the verb used here is “dire” (to say) as opposed to “lire” (to read, in which case silent or oral reading is not specified). In addition, it must be remembered that prior to the mid-fourteenths century the practice of private, silent prayer was largely unknown to the laity; praying, even if done privately, meant praying aloud. The one portion of the text that might have been read silently was the Old French rubric, in which

blocks of text into words varied across England and the Continent (as well as by the language in which a text was written), though Saenger, *Space Between Words*, 44, marks the twelfth century as the point at which word separation became characteristic of nearly all Latin texts. See esp. 18-51.

---

59 Illich, *Vineyard*, 95.

60 Saenger, “Silent Reading,” 392.


62 “…quiconques dire cheste orison au sacrement…” (emphasis added)


case a clear division would have been created between how the rubric and the prayer, already distinguished by their differing languages, were used. Thus I would argue that one of the most critical elements to consider in understanding this image-text grouping is the act of oral reading.

The significance of reading the Latin prayer orally must be understood within the context of medieval recitation. When read aloud, the office of Innocent III became, as all medieval texts that were read aloud had the potential to become, a reenactment and thus a form of ritual. As Gabrielle Spiegel has noted, the goal of oral recitation and its accompanying ritual aspect is “to revivify the past and make it live in the present, to fuse past and present […] into a single collective entity.”65 The first line of the Old French rubric, “Innocent, Pope of Rome, gave this speech in forgiveness of all sinners,”66 further strengthens this argument, for Spiegel continues by noting how the “transcription of a once-live recital, commemorates both the past which is sung about and the performance itself.”67 Underscoring the importance of this ritualistic moment is the Latin language itself, as it carried with it the weight of ecclesiastical and papal authority.

This gravity of ecclesiastical and papal authority would have been further emphasized by the means in which the gothic architecture surrounding the Holy Face (and the Holy Face itself) could stand for the Church entire. Carl F. Barnes, Jr. has noted the similarities between Amiens

---

65 Spiegel, *The Past as Text*, 184. Though Spiegel’s discussion of oral recitation includes an “audience” the concept remains valid in our example of private devotion, for the audience in this case is both the reader herself as well as the Divine to whom she addresses her prayer. Also see Eugene S. McCartney, “Notes on Reading and Praying Audibly,” *Classical Philology* 43 (1948), 184-187; and Saenger, “Books of Hours,” 143.

66 “Ynnocens li papes de Rome fist cheste orison en remision de tous pceheurs…” (emphasis added)

Cathedral and the architectural borders found in a number of the miniatures. The fictive architecture thus calls to mind the real architecture of Amiens Cathedral, itself a building that—especially via its status as the seat of the bishop—was associated with the concept of the universal Church. In creating such associations the imagery reinforces the notion of specific sites of worship and the more general concept of the Church as an institution. Working within this ecclesiastical framework supplied by both text and image, the Latin lends the oration an aura of sanctity and reverence especially appropriate for an act of devotion, particularly when its recitation is contrasted with the vernacular rubric of Old French.

In speaking the words of Innocent III the reader is thus ritualistically reenacting the miracle of the *vera icon*, bringing the past to life in the present though an act of devotion that engaged the highest levels of attention and processing. The penultimate devotional act would then occur when the Holy Face, a visual representation of the image-relic associated with the miracle being

---

68 Barnes, “Cross-Media Design Motifs,” 38-40; on 39 he notes that “a certain and unmistakable relationship between manuscript and cathedral is found […] [T]he miniaturist has made a successful attempt to show the buttress pinnacles turned at 45°-angles to the buttress uprights, as in the Amiens choir buttresses; and he has carefully replicated in the correct sequence the thin tracery pattern and pointed trefoil found on the actual buttresses.” The most thorough discussion of the architecture at Amiens Cathedral is found in Stephen Murray, *Notre-Dame, Cathedral of Amiens: The Power of Change in Gothic*, Cambridge 1996.

69 Cf. Barnes, “Cross-Media Design Motifs,” 40 n.16.

70 I am grateful to Erik Thunø for suggesting these points on the ecclesiastical and papal implications of the language and imagery.
commemorated, was itself contemplated. Hamburger has already noted how the Veronica, as “an image of presence, serves as the nexus between recollection of the past and promise for the future, between creation ad imaginem domini and its restoration at the end of time.” In the context of M. 729, the recitation of Innocent III’s prayer and the meditation on the image become a means of conflating both the more recent past (the 1216 miracle of the sudarium) and the Biblical past with the present moment of devotion as well as with the promised future of salvation. Only through Christ’s Incarnation (referenced through the image’s eucharistic associations) and ultimate sacrifice (in which the temple curtain was rent apart and a new covenant made) has this salvation been made possible. Text and image thus collapse the distance between past, present, and future, as the boundaries of time are crossed through reading, seeing, and contemplation.

All that remains for the viewer at this point is for her to turn her thoughts inward, away from the baser corporal senses. Sand, in her keen examination of the owner portrait in this manuscript (fol. 232v), notes that the portrayed reader looks not at the text before her but at a statue of the Virgin and Child on an altar. The image thus shows the reader as she “moves beyond the words and images in her book to a more direct contemplation of the divine.” Only by doing this can the book’s actual reader hope to understand the full import of the prayer. In the

---

71 Contemplation of the Holy Face in this ritualistic, sacramental act would likely inspire thoughts on the ultimate sacrament, that of the eucharist, noted above as an element of special significance in the religious lives of medieval women. Sand, “Picturing Devotion,” 146, notes that the “sacrament” of the opening rubric in Old French likely refers to the eucharist. Illich, Vineyard, 109, in discussing the functions of early medieval illuminations, addresses a similar type of image contemplation: “Medieval illuminations invite the murmlier to fall silent adoring what no word could express.”

72 Hamburger, “Frequentant memoriam visionis faciei meae,” 236.

73 Hamburger, The Visual and the Visionary, 322-323, notes that the Feast of the Veronica fell on the second Sunday after Epiphany (rather than during Passiontide) linking the image “liturgically with Christ’s manifestation to the world.”

silent meditation that would ensue after the office of Innocent III had been read aloud, the reader would then be moved to approach that highest plane of seeing, inaccessible through either the written word or pictorial arts alone, a realm accessible only during the intangible and atemporal moments of ritual and devotion. Precisely how this occurred was likely the result of very tangible phenomena: the reading of the prayer aloud, the acting out of a ritual, the difficult task of working through Gothic script, and the associated memories that were called to the reader’s mind during all of the work involved. When the reading was finished and the image was contemplated the deeper processing that had been required during the act of reading potentially allowed for a better recall of the contents even when they were no longer being read. In this way the face of Christ is able to be seen in conjunction with the sacred words, whose presence in the reader’s memory might be taken as the divine presence itself.
Like so many medieval images of the Holy Face, the Veronica found in the Hours “of Yolande of Soissons” is a complex entity that must be considered within the context of its production, history, and use. The legend of the vera icon and its history, the association of image with the body of Christ, and the means of seeing afforded by pictorial representation all derive from and contribute to our understanding of medieval piety and theology. For the Holy Face in M. 729, the interplay of text and image is contingent upon these factors and a host of others, most important among them the significance of language and reading in the context of medieval theology. In the complex devotional actions allied to this manuscript the corporal senses of viewing and reading were engaged in such a way that sought to transcend and even deny their very physicality, for only then could one hope to approach the true Holy Face, the original prototype from which all copies were derived. Yet it was through responses rooted in physicality—such as difficulty, close attention, and deep cognitive processing—that medieval readers of this and other texts might have been offered glimpses of the divine.

---

75 Saenger, “Silent Reading,” 399-402. Interestingly, Saenger argues it was this new method of reading that played a part in the rise of critical thinking and, by extension, the questioning of ecclesiastical authority. Also see Saenger, *Space Between Words*, 264-265, and Illich, *Vineyard*, 93-124, for more on the significant changes brought about by texts and reading in the later Middle Ages.
Annunciation and Dedication on Aachen Pilgrim Badges. Notes on the Early Badge Production in Aachen and Some New Attributions

By Hanneke van Asperen, Medieval Badges Foundation and Radboud University Nijmegen

Aachen was one of the best-known and most-popular pilgrimage sites in Northern Europe during the high and late Middle Ages. In 1496, 42,000 pilgrims supposedly visited Aachen in just one day.\(^1\) While these kinds of numbers have been passed down only incidentally and were undoubtedly exaggerated, they underscored the importance of a site. Indeed, the large quantities of surviving Aachen badges support the notion of a massive influx of pilgrims. Demonstrably, people already visited Aachen for devotional reasons since the days of Emperor Charlemagne (742-814).\(^2\) It is a tenable claim that Aachen was one of the first sites to manufacture pewter souvenirs, following in the wake of early badge-producing

---

\(^1\) First, I would like to thank Prof. Dr A.M. Koldeweij and H.J.E. van Beuningen who have always stimulated my work on badges and who gave me the opportunity to collaborate on *Heilig en Profaan* 3. There I attributed the Annunciation badges to Aachen, but could only go into the matter briefly. To fully investigate the consequences of the new attribution, I decided to dedicate a monographic article to the early badge production in Aachen with this publication as a result. The badge collection of the Van Beuningen Family offers ample material to study the matter in detail.


sites such as Rocamadour and Canterbury. However there is much uncertainty about the production and the appearance of early pewter souvenirs from Aachen.

The variety of badges that were produced and sold in Aachen seems infinite. Simple searches in publications on badges such as the leading book series *Heilig en Profaan* and online badge databases such *Kunera* (kunera.nl) and *Pilgerzeichendatenbank* (pilgerzeichen.de) yield an enormous number of different types of badges from the city of Charlemagne. The solid plaques depicting the Madonna are the earliest surviving badges that have been tentatively attributed to Aachen. They are usually dated to the second half of the thirteenth and first half of the fourteenth centuries, but these were probably not the first badges to be produced there. Badges depicting the Annunciation that have only recently been attributed to Aachen shed

**Figure 1** Pewter badge of the Annunciation of the “Paris type,” Aachen, found in Middelburg, 50 x 46 mm, after 1240. Photo: Langbroek, collection Van Beuningen Family, inv. 3093 (*Heilig en Profaan* 2, fig. 1412).


new light on the cult there, and their Aachen provenance opens up new perspectives on the formative years of the pilgrimage site.

Annunciation Badges

The badges depicting the Annunciation (fig. 1) have been known to scholars since the nineteenth century when Arthur Forgeais first discovered one in Seine soil. Subsequently these badges have been attributed to different pilgrimage sites. In 1981 Aron Andersson suggested that the type was produced in Paris, where the first one was found. In 1987 they were attributed to Nazareth for two reasons. First, a badge of this type was found in Sour, formerly Tyre, in Lebanon, not far from Nazareth. Second, the badges show similarities with capital sculpture from the vicinity of the church in Nazareth. Both arguments are quite circumstantial: most badges of the type have been recovered in Western Europe. Since Forgeais’s dredging activities in the Seine, these badges have been found in many different locations, including on the isle of Walcheren and other sites in Low Countries (Middelburg, Dordrecht, Amsterdam, Sluis and Antwerp), France (Paris and Durfort), Italy (Rome and

---


Pisa), in the British Isles (London, Stafford) and in Sweden (Visby). One badge from Sour is hardly an argument in which to situate the production site in the Near East.9

The second argument is problematic as well. The crusader capitals in Nazareth certainly show Byzantine and Eastern local influences, but are more reminiscent of Romanesque sculpture in the West.10 That there are similarities between the badges and Nazareth capitals does not necessarily mean that they are from the East. More than that, the badges show the greater influence of Western European sculpture, especially goldsmiths’ work, as for example, in Aachen, as I will demonstrate further on. Nevertheless, scholars have reiterated the attribution of the badges to Nazareth, although A.M. Koldeweij, who first made the attribution, always had reservations.11

The trapezoid badges depict the Virgin and the Archangel Gabriel beneath a semi-circular arch separated by a slender column. The scene is surrounded by an inscription along the edge of the badge with the words of the common Latin prayer based on the angelic salutation “Ave Maria.” The badges have been found all over Europe and beyond, indicating a pilgrimage site of renown that attracted pilgrims from far and wide. The Holy Land certainly qualifies, but a provenance of pewter badges from a site in Western Europe is more probable

---

9 Most recently some badges of western European provenance have been found in Hierapolis (Pamukkale, Turkey). Sven Ahrens, "A Set of Western European Pilgrim Badges from Hierapolis of Phrygia," Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia. Rendiconti 84, nos. 2011-12 (2012).


because that is where pewter badges were produced from the twelfth century onwards.  

12 From the late twelfth century the badges rapidly came to be the most popular type of mass-produced souvenirs while ampullae remained popular in the east.  

13 Besides ampullae, pilgrims from the Holy Land brought all kinds of souvenirs with them, such as palm branches, earth and stones

---


from holy sites and medallions of different kinds. Yet, pewter badges were not among the usual souvenirs brought from the Holy Land or so it seems.\textsuperscript{14}

**The Annunciation and Aachen**

An Annunciation badge of similar design to the one from Sour was found in Dordrecht in the Netherlands, now in the impressive Van Beuningen Family badge collection in Langbroek (The Netherlands).\textsuperscript{15} \textit{(fig. 2)} The narrative scene is the same as the Sour and other Annunciation badges, although stylistically it differs in that the posture of the figures features a Gothic S-curve that is absent in the other Annunciation badges. The figures stand under trefoil arches (not semi-circular ones) and a roof-like structure once crowned the badge. The shape of the badge, too, differs in its square rather than trapezoidal shape. What is more, the Dordrecht Annunciation bears an inscription that deviates from the others, reading SIGNV(M BE)ATE (MARIE) IN AQUIS GRANI, paraphrased: “The sign of the blessed Mary in Aquisgranum.”\textsuperscript{16} \textit{(fig. 2)} The name “Aquisgranum” points conclusively to the city of Aachen. The Romans named the spa “Aquae Granni” which translates as “the sources of Grannus,” the Celtic god of water and health. The Antique name Aquisgranum continued to be used throughout the Middle Ages and in later times. The name appears in the Barbarossa charter of

---

\textsuperscript{14} Denis Bruna depicted badges of Christ crucified on a cross crosslet which he attributed to the Holy Land. Although they were undoubtedly worn by Jerusalem pilgrims, these badges were probably produced in their homeland to commemorate their pilgrimage. Bruna, \textit{Enseignes de Pèlerinage et Enseignes Profanes} (Musée National du Moyen Age - Thermes de Cluny, pp. 57-58).

\textsuperscript{15} Van Beuningen, Koldeweij and Kicken, \textit{Heilig en Profaan 2. 1200 Laatmiddeleeuwse insignes uit openbare en particuliere collecties}, 12, p. 339, fig. 1414 (as “Nazareth?”).

\textsuperscript{16} The inscription was deciphered and connected with Aachen in Van Beuningen et al., \textit{Heilig en Profaan 3. 1300 insignes uit openbare en particuliere collecties}, p. 169.
1166 and in a letter of the humanist Erasmus in 1518, for example.\(^{17}\) Aachen is still called “Aquisgrana” and “Aquisgrán” in Italy and in Spain respectively.

Moreover, the Annunciation badge from Dordrecht soil shows significant similarities to a badge of Emperor Charlemagne also found in Dordrecht.\(^{18}\) Charlemagne was buried and venerated in Aachen, although his sanctification in 1165 by Anti-pope Paschal III (1164-1168) was never accepted by the Holy See.\(^{19}\) The square badge depicts the ruler enthroned under a trefoil arch surrounded by a text done in a script similar to the Dordrecht Annunciation. The comparable rendering of architecture, of which in both cases only the lower part remains, is a stylized reference to the Palatine Chapel with its architectural extensions. The Charlemagne badge still shows the lower roof of the central dome and the lower portions of two flanking towers; the Annunciation badge only shows the base of the dome. The badge of Charlemagne is dated to the first half of the fourteenth century and the date of the Dordrecht Annunciation must be similar.\(^{20}\) The trapezoid badges of the Annunciation with their slightly divergent features probably date from the thirteenth century.

**The Marienschrein and its Relics**

A comparison of the Annunciation scene on the badges with a relief on the shrine of the Virgin [“Marienschrein”] is most illuminating. (fig. 3) This precious and impressive Rheno-Mosan reliquary chasse that housed the four great relics [“die grosse Heiligtümer”]

---


became the focal point of the pilgrimage cult of Aachen, both physically and spiritually, after its placement in the Palatine Chapel in 1238.\textsuperscript{21} The famous dress of the Virgin ["das Marienkleid"], a gift to Charlemagne by the patriarch of Jerusalem in 799 along with other important relics prior to the imperial coronation, was the main attraction.

The lower altar dedicated to the Virgin supported the upper altar dedicated to her Son. One could theorize that the lower floor was dedicated to the incarnation and the birth of Christ, the upper one to his death and resurrection.\textsuperscript{22} The level of the Virgin symbolically connected the


earthly realm with the heavenly one above. In accordance with the chapel’s dedication to Christ and his mother, a liturgical celebration of significance in Aachen was the combined feast of Candlemas, which focuses on the Virgin’s roles as Seat of Wisdom and Mother of God (*theotokos*). To further stress the importance of the Virgin and her significance in the Incarnation, Pope Honorius III (r. 1216-1227) issued an indulgence of forty days to pilgrims visiting Aachen on the day of the Annunciation. On those days pilgrims would have eagerly purchased badges with the Annunciation to commemorate their Aachen visit, and the festive and solemn elevation of the relics to the new shrine of the Virgin could have provided the occasion for the production of the first Annunciation badges. The trapezoid badges most likely date from the same period as the *Marienschrein*, around 1240 or shortly after.

**Figure 4** (left below) Pewter badge of the Madonna enthroned, Aachen, found in Dordrecht, 97 x 62 mm, 1350-1400. Photo: Breda’s Museum, inv. S09205 (*Heilig en Profaan* 3, fig. 2618)

**Figure 5** (right) Pewter badge of the Madonna enthroned, Aachen, found in ’s-Hertogenbosch, 91 x 55 mm, 1350-1400, found in a filled branch of the river Dieze, archeologically dated to the 16th century. Coll. Afdeling Bouwhistorie, Archeologie en Monumenten, gemeente ’s-Hertogenbosch (BAM), inv. I 21733 (*Heilig en Profaan* 3, fig. 2619).

---

24 Ibid., p. 92.


When these plaques, with their focus on the Annunciation, were produced the relics were still kept behind lock and key in the new shrine. It was not until 1312 that the relics would be taken out and shown to the public on a regular basis.

Around the same time the Virgin’s robe started to figure prominently on the new badges, but some of them still hint at the inscription of the Latin prayer “Ave Maria” featured so prominently on the Annunciation plaques. For example, badges of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century depict the Madonna with the initial A indicating Aachen (Aquisgranum) first and foremost, but also to the angelic salutation Ave Maria. Two badges, found in Dordrecht and 's-Hertogenbosch, (figs. 4, 5) should probably be attributed to Aachen as well because of the vase with lily to the Virgin’s right. The Virgin also holds a lily scepter in her right hand. The vase with the lily branch on the Virgin’s right side refers to the Annunciation that had become inextricably connected with the Palatine Chapel and its relics, but was slowly driven into the background. The vase is demonstrable on at least one other badge that can be firmly connected to Aachen. The presence of pilgrims seen prominently in both corners on the badge, too, are rare but not unknown on Aachen badges. (fig. 6)


28 Van Beuningen, Koldeweij and Kicken, Heilig en Profaan 2. 1200 Laatmiddeleeuwse insignes uit openbare en particuliere collecties, 12, p. 310, figs. 1315-1317.

29 A fragment of a badge of similar design should also be attributed to Aachen because of significant similarities to the two badges mentioned here; it is in the collection of the Museum of Decorative Arts in Prague (inv. UPM 4944). See Hartmut Kühne, Carina Brumme and Helena Koenigsmarková, Jungfrauen, Engel, Phallustieren. Die Sammlung Mittelalterlicher Französischer Pilgerzeichen des Kunstgewerbemuseums in Prag und des Nationalmuseums Prag (Berlin: Lukas Verlag, 2013), p. 86, no. 134.

The Palatine as a Shrine

Within the changing range of subjects, the iconography of the Annunciation was not abandoned instantly, but the theme was re-used and Annunciation badges co-existed with the “new” Madonna badges for some time. An Annunciation badge of a different design, found during excavations in Amsterdam and now in the Van Beuningen Family collection, (fig. 7) shows the Virgin and the angel in a rectangular frame with architectural features above: small towers on the left and right have broken off. Another similar badge depicts the Virgin standing with Christ on her arm and a large lily scepter that, because of its sheer size, refers to the lily branch of the Annunciation. (fig. 8) Other badges with an identical frame show the Madonna enthroned.32 Some depict the Virgin and child with a candle-bearing

---

32 Van Beuningen, Koldeweij and Kicken, Heilig en Profaan 2. 1200 Laatmiddeleeuwse insignes uit openbare en particuliere collecties, 12, p. 346, figs. 1443-1444.
Figure 7 (left) Pewter badge of the Annunciation, Aachen, found in Amsterdam. Photo: Langbroek, collection Van Beuningen Family, inv. 1070 (Heilig en Profaan 1, fig. 520).

Figure 8 (right) Pewter badge of the Madonna, Aachen, found in Dordrecht. Photo: Langbroek, collection Van Beuningen Family, inv. 3338 (Heilig en Profaan 2, fig. 1445).

An angel referring to the Christ’s birth as light, possibly in connection with the feast of Candlemas that was of such great importance in Aachen. All badges share the features of the rectangular frame surmounted by architectural elements – a large central structure with a smaller tower on each side. These stylized elements undoubtedly refer to the Palatine Chapel. Significantly, the badges are not just surmounted with an image of the church, but the Virgin is depicted within its walls.

The Palatine Chapel was built at the instigation of Charlemagne as a structure to house the relics of Christ and the Virgin, and remained important as such. On different images in

---

Aachen the emperor is depicted offering the Palatine chapel to the Virgin, for example on the dedication relief of the Karlsschrein. (fig. 9)

The emperor offers her a model of the building in an iconographical scheme reminiscent of the Adoration of the Magi. Charlemagne offers his gift to Mother and Child as the Three Kings had their treasures of gold, frankincense, and myrrh (Mt. 2:11). A dove symbolizing the Holy Ghost appears from the sky and illuminates the central cupola of the Palatine Chapel. The presence of the dove brings to mind scenes of the Annunciation: the dove linking the Virgin with the heavens through his flight embodies the moment of impregnation. Here the dove “impregnates” the chapel, symbolizing both the divine inspiration that lies at the core of the construction and the divine presence inside by means of the relics. The chapel is a shrine to the Marian relics as the Virgin had been a shrine to her son Jesus.

The link between the chapel and the Virgin is also brought to the fore in the figure of Mary who is depicted as a sedes sapientiae or the throne of Divine Wisdom that is Christ.36 The Christ child on her lap makes an eloquent gesture, indicating he is the Word that has become flesh. The Virgin on the throne is reminiscent of Romanesque depictions of Solomon’s throne, which was called the seat of judgment in the Bible and which metaphorically related to the Virgin (1 Kings 7:6-7).37 Significantly, the throne has the same architectural features as the architectural model of the chapel in the hands of the emperor. The arches are like flying buttresses supporting the body of the Virgin (who is supporting her son in her turn). Clearly, the Virgin and chapel are visually and metaphorically linked, elaborating

---


on the complex iconography of the Palatine Chapel. The badges with the Annunciation or the Madonna within the walls of the chapel seem to do the same; they link the chapel and the Virgin and thus elaborate on the complex iconography of the Virgin as the throne of Divine Wisdom.40

Dedication Badges

Besides the Annunciation and the Madonna, Emperor Charlemagne was a popular theme on Aachen badges.41 Although badges of Charlemagne are much rarer than badges


41 Van Beuningen and Koldeweij, Heilig en Profaan. 1000 Laatmiddeleeuwse insignes uit de collectie H.J.E. van Beuningen, p. 175, figs. 264-267; Van Beuningen et al., Heilig en Profaan 3. 1300 insignes uit openbare en particuliere collecties, p. 143, figs. 2398-2400. Van Beuningen, Koldeweij and Kicken, Heilig en Profaan 2.
featuring the Virgin, many badges from the fifteenth century depict the Madonna with Charlemagne (e.g. fig. 6). On these badges, Charlemagne often holds a model of the chapel as the shrine for the important relics, as he does on the dedication relief. (fig. 9) A substantial group of badges that have not been linked to Aachen until now focus on Charlemagne in a prominent role as the chapel’s donor. (figs. 10, 11) Different versions of these dedication badges have been found in Bruges, Ypres, and Valenciennes. The identification of the religious badges has been described as “problematic” and they have even been classified as “profane” a few times.42

**Figure 10** (left) Pewter badge of the dedication of the Palatine Chapel, Aachen, found in Ypres, 98 x 98 mm, 1325-1375. Photo: Ypres, Stedelijk Museum, inv. Ie-97.IVW.2.L3.H1.002 (*Heilig en Profaan* 2, fig. 1686).

**Figure 11** (right) Pewter badge of the presentation of the Palatine Chapel, Aachen, found in Valenciennes, 78 x 51 mm, 1325-1375. Valenciennes, Service Archéologique Municipale (*Heilig en Profaan* 3, fig. 2921).

The badges depict Emperor Charlemagne presenting the Palatine Chapel and, implicitly, the relics within, in a manner reminiscent of the dedication relief on the Karlsschrein.\textsuperscript{43} (fig. 9) Because of the fragility of the large badges, the religious crowning with the Crucifixion has often been broken off and lost. Still, the identification of the dedication badges to Aachen is strongly supported by two recent finds. A badge found in the drowned village Moggershil, also depicted in Heilig en Profaan 3, shows a dedication scene that is simplified, but otherwise almost identical.\textsuperscript{44} The reverse pictures the Madonna, confirming that the dedication scene is connected with a cult of the Virgin. A related small reliquary box found in Dendermonde depicts the Emperor and a bishop with the chapel on both lids.\textsuperscript{45} The box is inscribed: AVE MARIA GRATIA PLENA DOMINUS TECU referring to the Annunciation that played such a prominent role in the Aachen cult from the time that badges were first produced.

Perhaps the dedication badges were not connected with Aachen because the Virgin, such an essential element of the Aachen pilgrimage, is absent. However, the Virgin is implicitly present because of her inextricable connection with the Palatine Chapel. The chapel was not just a pilgrimage church; it was a shrine, a metaphor of the Virgin \textit{theotokos}, of birth and resurrection, and an image of the Holy Jerusalem in one.\textsuperscript{46} Furthermore, it was Charlemagne’s tomb and a monument to his devotion to the Virgin. Because of its function as coronation chapel it was imbued with associations of power. The importance of the church during the life of the emperor and afterwards when the pilgrimage cult in Aachen took on its

\textsuperscript{43} The provenance of the badges was described as “probably Flanders” in: Koldeweij, \textit{Geloof & Geluk. Sieraad en devotie in middeleeuws Vlaanderen}, p. 22.

\textsuperscript{44} Van Beuningen et al., \textit{Heilig en Profaan 3. 1300 insignes uit openbare en particuliere collecties}, p. 213, fig. 2643.

\textsuperscript{45} Koldeweij, \textit{Geloof & Geluk. Sieraad en devotie in middeleeuws Vlaanderen}, p. 24, fig. 1.13.

shape can hardly be overestimated. Many fifteenth-century badges from Aachen still present
the Church of Our Lady as an integral part of their iconography. The souvenirs are
comparable to typical Aachen badges, such as the one found in Tholen. (fig. 6) Charlemagne,
the Palatine Chapel, and the bishop appear on these too.

The identity of the bishop on the badges is unclear; probably he is Archbishop
Turpinus of Reims, Charlemagne’s counselor, who is believed to be depicted with
Charlemagne on the dedication relief of the Karlsschrein. (fig. 9) According to contemporary
tradition, Turpinus wrote Charlemagne’s vita, the Historia Caroli Magni et Rotholandi, and
his authorship was not questioned until the fifteenth century. The bishop even figures as
official representative of the Church in the famous Chanson de Roland (c. 1100) and other
chansons de geste. Irrespective of his exact identity, the bishop on the badges is transformed
into a symbolic depiction of the clergy. Emperor Charlemagne and the bishop figure are
portrayed side by side as agents entrusted by God with their ministries of profane and
ecclesiastical matters, respectively. The Palatine Chapel is their votive offering. The incense-
burning angels on both sides of Christ crucified indicate the visionary and sacred nature of the
scene.47 (figs. 10, 11) The Palatine Chapel, which was supposed to be an earthly reflection of
the Holy Jerusalem, is depicted as a locus sanctus holding a position between heaven and
earth, as did the Virgin. As the first and paramount mediator between God and mankind she
was the “gate of heaven” to use the words of the Marian hymn “Ave Maris Stella.”

47 The Holy Rood that surmounted most of these dedication badges, also appears on many other badges from
Aachen. Van Beuningen, Koldeweij and Kicken, Heilig en Profaan 2. 1200 Laatmiddeleeuwse insignes uit
openbare en particuliere collecties, 12, pp. 317-318, figs. 1350 and 1353 (fragment); Van Beuningen et al.,
Heilig en Profaan 3. 1300 insignes uit openbare en particuliere collecties, p. 172, fig. 2498, pp. 175-176, figs.
2508 and 2511.
The Palatine Chapel as a metaphor of the Virgin *theotokos*

The trapezoid badges with the Annunciation were among the first pewter souvenirs from the city of Charlemagne. The “Paris type” of Annunciation badges are early examples of souvenirs from Aachen, possibly dating to the early thirteenth century, where they might be connected to the translation of the relics to the new reliquary chasse of the Virgin in 1238. The “Dordrecht type” (fig. 8) and “Amsterdam type” (fig. 7) are thematically and formally closely related: they depict the Archangel Gabriel and the Virgin standing within the confines of the Palatine Chapel as a shrine to the Virgin and the Virgin as a shrine to her son. The badges on which Charlemagne and a bishop offer the chapel to Christ underscore the importance of the Palatine Chapel, and of Charlemagne, to the cult. (fig. 12)

The Dordrecht and Amsterdam type of badges were produced after pewter souvenirs with a different iconography, focusing on the Madonna who had assumed greater importance.

Figure 12 Pewter pendant with the Madonna (obverse) and the dedication of the Palatine Chapel (reverse), found in Muggershil, 27 x 21 mm, 1375-1425. Van Beuningen Family Collection, inv. 2870 (*Heilig en Profaan* 3, fig. 2643).
at the pilgrimage cult at Aachen, especially after 1312 when the robe of the Virgin took over as a focal point. Because of the association cloth and flesh, textile relics were of major importance in the visualization of the incarnation.\footnote{On the importance of textile relics in medieval religion, see for example E. Jane Burns, “Saracen Silk and the Virgin’s Chemise: Cultural Crossings in Cloth,” \textit{Speculum, A Journal of Medieval Studies} 81 (2006); Barbara Baert and Kathryn M. Rudy, (eds.), \textit{Weaving, Veiling, and Dressing. Textiles and their Metaphors in the Late Middle Ages} (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007); Cordelia Warr, “Clothing, charity, salvation and visionary experience in renaissance Siena,” \textit{Art History} 27/2 (2004), p. 188, 197.} At the moment of the incarnation the Virgin became the shrine of Christ, clothing him in flesh. Christ’s human nature was considered a veil that shrouded his divinity and would be lifted at the moment of his death on the cross. Despite this shift in the cult, the Annunciation badges indicate that the incarnation already played an essential role in Aachen before the great relics were taken out of the shrine and shown to the public on a regular basis. The relics did not provoke a formulation of entirely new themes, but rather visualized old ones in new ways.

The attribution of new types of badges to Aachen (see Table) leads to a revision of current knowledge of the production of pilgrimage souvenirs that might go back as far as the early thirteenth century. Additionally, the new attributions lead to new perspectives on the pilgrimage cult and on architecture as metaphor for the Virgin in medieval devotion. The reliquaries and the ways in which the relics and reliquaries were presented to the public set the tone for the badges. With Aachen as a case in point, it could even be hypothesized that the shift from plaques to open-work badges is connected with the shift from reliquary chasses to open-work reliquaries. The badges certainly seem to reflect which reliquaries were presented to the public and how they were presented. The structure of the Palatine Chapel with the ground floor dedicated to the Virgin and the second level to Christ was certainly crucial. The dedication badges show the same division, with an image of Charlemagne holding the shrine below and the vision of Christ on top. The Palatine Chapel and the monumental reliquary
chasses were the primary points of reference for the pilgrims in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, as reflected in the contemporary badges.

Initially, the Palatine Chapel was not the monumental backdrop against which the relics were displayed, but it was a shrine itself housing the relatively closed reliquary chasses and the relics within. More importantly, it was a symbol of the Virgin who was herself a shrine housing the Word that became flesh in her womb. The great relics were still relatively hidden and consequently played a minor part in the iconography of the badges. The emphasis was on Annunciation, Incarnation and enshrinement - the Palatine Chapel as a shrine to the Virgin, the Virgin as a shrine to her son. Because Mary was considered a shrine herself, the imperial chapel became a metaphor for the pregnant Virgin who brought Christ into the world. Visiting the Palatine Chapel with its great relics narrating incarnation and redemption, pilgrims would enter the Virgin’s womb, a liminal world connecting life on earth with sacred time and space. The Palatine Chapel held a position between heaven and earth as a veritable “gate of heaven.”

Table 1: Survey of new attributions to Aachen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Badges</th>
<th>Current location</th>
<th>Published (with a reference to the respective notes in this article)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annunciation badge of the “Dordrecht type” (Fig. 2)</td>
<td>Van Beuningen Family Collection, inv. 3641</td>
<td><em>Heilig en Profaan</em> 2: 339, fig. 1414 (as Nazareth?); <em>Heilig en Profaan</em> 3: 169 (as Aachen).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annunciation badges of the “Paris type” (Fig. 1)</td>
<td>Different collections</td>
<td>For example in Forgeais, vol. IV:13-14 (see n. 6); Andersson (as Paris; see n. 7); Van Heeringen, Koldeweij, Gaalman: 105-106 (as Nazareth, see n. 8); <em>Heilig en Profaan</em> 1: 236, fig. 522 (as Nazareth?); <em>Heilig en Profaan</em> 2: 339, figs. 1411-1413 (as Nazareth?); <em>Heilig en Profaan</em> 3: 170, fig. 2492 (as Aachen).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badge of the Madonna with pilgrims (Fig. 4)</td>
<td>Breda, Breda’s Museum, inv. S09205</td>
<td><em>Heilig en Profaan</em> 3: 209, fig. 2618 (unidentified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badge of the Madonna with pilgrims (Fig. 5)</td>
<td>’s-Hertogenbosch, BAM, inv. I 21733</td>
<td><em>Heilig en Profaan</em> 3: 209, fig. 2619 (unidentified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badge of the Madonna</td>
<td>Prague, Museum of Decorative Arts, inv. UPM 4944</td>
<td>Kühne, Brumme, Koenigsmarkovà: 86, no. 134 (unidentified; see n. 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Collection/Location</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-work badge of the Annunciation of the “Amsterdam type” (Fig. 7)</td>
<td>Van Beuningen Family Collection, inv. 1070</td>
<td><em>Heilig en Profaan</em> 1: 235, fig. 520 (unidentified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-work badge of the Madonna with lily branch (Fig. 8)</td>
<td>Van Beuningen Family Collection, inv. 3338</td>
<td><em>Heilig en Profaan</em> 2: 346, fig. 1445 (unidentified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two open-work badges of the Madonna enthroned</td>
<td>Private collection and Van Beuningen Family Collection, inv. 3386</td>
<td><em>Heilig en Profaan</em> 2: 346, figs. 1443-1444 (unidentified, see n. 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-work badges of Virgin and Child with a candle-bearing angel</td>
<td>Different collections</td>
<td><em>Heilig en Profaan</em> 1: 236, fig. 521 (unidentified); <em>Heilig en Profaan</em> 2: 347, figs. 1446-1450 (unidentified; see n. 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-work badges with the dedication of the Palatine Chapel (Figs. 10 and 11)</td>
<td>Different collections</td>
<td><em>Heilig en Profaan</em> 2: 398-399, figs. 1685-1688 (see n. 37); <em>Heilig en Profaan</em> 3: 285-287, figs. 2920-2925 (see n. 37); Koldeweij: 22 (see n. 38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-sided pendant of the Madonna and the dedication</td>
<td>Van Beuningen Family Collection, inv. 2870</td>
<td><em>Heilig en Profaan</em> 3: 213, fig. 2643 (unidentified; see n. 39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliquary box with the dedication</td>
<td>Gent, Bijloke museum, inv. 3538</td>
<td>Koldeweij: 24, fig. 1.13 (Flanders or northern France; see n. 40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We Are the Material Collective
By Rachel Dressler, University at Albany - SUNY

What is the Material Collective? We are a loosely organized group of historians of medieval art with diverse specialties and interests united by our dedication to the principles of agency and transparency. We believe that objects have agency: they act on us as much as we manipulate them. We further believe that, as scholars, we should be transparent, we should openly acknowledge our own subjectivity in our study of the past. We came together out of a sense that the developmental model of styles that has characterized art-historical research for so long did not resonate with our own experience of the power of artworks as things, as physical objects.

Prior to organizing, members of what would become the Material Collective made an initial public statement with a session for the First Biennial meeting of the BABEL Working Group in 2010 in which we explored the transparencies of things as articulated in a passage in Vladimir Nabokov’s novel *Transparent Things* (1972):

*When we concentrate on a material object, whatever its situation, the very act of attention may lead to our involuntarily sinking into the history of that object. Novices must learn to skim over matter if they want matter to stay at the exact level of the moment. Transparent things, through which the past shines!*
The papers and performances in this session engaged historiography, pedagogy, and experience; the end result was the Material Collective’s first publication as a group: *Transparent Things, a Cabinet*, published by punctum books (http://punctumbooks.com/uncategorized/transparent-things/). Through this panel, and the resulting book, we started to think and talk about what kind of medievalists we wanted to be. We thought more deeply about an object’s role in the encounter between the present and the past, the human and nonhuman, the animate and inanimate. And we wondered about the role of history, and our own desire as historians to somehow know the past, which is ultimately unknowable. Our frustrations with the scholarly detachment we had all been trained to develop eventually resulted in the following manifesto delivered at the BABEL Working Group session “Burn After Reading: Miniature Manifesto for a Post/Medieval Studies” at Kalamazoo 2012:

*We are the Material Collective, a group of medievalists interrogating visual materials. We seek to:*

- cooperate
- encourage
- share
- promote transparency
- touch
- desire
- destabilize
- amuse
- and blunder

*As a collaborative of students of visual culture, Material Collective seeks to foster a safe space for alternative ways of thinking about objects.*

*We strive for transparency in our practice, and we encourage the same in our institutional surroundings.*
Our project touches upon both form and content, as we pursue a lyrical and experimental style of writing along with a more humane, collaborative, and supportive process of scholarship.

We encourage spontaneity in writing art history, including an acknowledgment of our subject positions; therefore we embrace the incorporation of personal narrative and reflection in our historical interpretations.

Our specific interests vary, but we are all committed to prioritizing the materiality of things, the relationships between those things and the human beings who experience them, and the intimacy of past and present moments in time.

As we celebrate, dwell in, and embrace the basic materiality of our objects, we work to find ways to foreground the material of the objects themselves into larger historical analysis.

Central to this effort is a desire to support each other as we attempt to create experimental approaches, and to embrace both the successes and potential failures of our ventures into new ways of thinking.

We are also working to increase the legitimacy of these approaches in the academic world, primarily by practicing them, loudly and often.

We are as much a support group as a scholarly group. We share the joys and sorrows of career, life and our academic work.

For us, this is not a mere exercise — we stand by our manifesto. And we revel in this opportunity to raise a glass with all y’all, right here and now.

We value:

- experimental processes
- risk-taking
- transparency, revelation
- a blank space
- joy in faltering. Together

So say we all.
So say we all.

In this statement we acknowledge the agency of material objects and their power to act on and with us as we act on or with them. We renounce boundaries and divisions:
between human and animal, living being and object, work and the rest of life. We promote collaboration with and support of one another.

Since the public performance of who we are, the annual conference at Kalamazoo has been a major forum for the Collective and our fellow scholarly travelers to continue pushing and breaking down scholarly boundaries. At Kalamazoo 2012, in addition to our participation in the BABEL panel, we organized two ICMA-sponsored sessions of our own entitled “Active Objects,” each of which attracted standing-room-only audiences. Inspired by exhibitions of reliquaries in the Cleveland, Baltimore, and London, these sessions engaged the power of objects through two themes: visuality and agency. The presenters engaged phenomenology, optical theories, and thing-theory and demonstrated the power of devotional objects to direct viewers’ devotional performances. Four of these papers, in addition to a fifth essay by one of the session organizers, are currently being prepared for publication in a special issue of *Different Visions: A Journal of New Perspectives on Medieval Art* (www.differentvisions.org). The Introduction to this issue will discuss the current scholarly interest in “New Materialism” especially as it impacts Art History and address the resonances between the five essays, especially the tensions between historicism and materialism.

At Kalamazoo 2013, the Collective again sponsored a packed session, “Time and the Medieval Object,” in which presenters addressed objects’ refusal to remain locked into a single temporal framework. Instead, as demonstrated in these talks, they move between the originating past, the scholarly or otherwise present, and an undetermined future. Thus, objects exist within temporal instability. We hope to find an equally enthusiastic audience for our Kalamazoo 2014 session, "Faking It" in which our
presenters, some of whom are not art historians but producers of objects employing medieval methods, will explore the fine line between authentic but restored, respectfully reproduced, and consciously faked "medieval" works.

The BABEL Working Group's bi-annual conference has also provided a fruitful showcase for our mission to energize medieval art history through attention to materiality. *Hoarders* and *Hordes*, two sessions the Collective sponsored for *cruising in the ruins: the question of disciplinarity in the post/medieval university*, BABEL’s second conference in 2010, focused on the Staffordshire Hoard, the largest collection of Anglo-Saxon metalwork yet found. The papers from these sessions, in which those working from various disciplinary perspectives be they medievalists, artists, scientists, performers, poets, curators, art/historians, educators, and philosophers, were able to dialogue and collaborate, are now being prepared for a special issue of the journal *postmedieval* in the area of visual culture and art history. To further encourage collaboration, we have asked contributors to respond to one another’s work in the form of a mini-crowd review and the *postmedieval* volume will incorporate both the original papers and comments and online discussions beyond the conference. At BABEL 2015 we will sponsor "Things from the Sea" which takes advantage of the conference's location at Santa Barbara, CA, by inviting attendees to take a walk on the shore and gather objects which catch their eye. These will then be displayed in an exhibition curated by members of the Collective.

Our public presence has not been limited to Kalamazoo and BABEL, however, and in 2013 members of the Collective conducted a roundtable on “Networks of Then and Now: Medieval Objects and Their Publics: for the *Annual Symposium on Medieval and Renaissance Studies* at Saint Louis University. The roundtable format enabled
participants literally to "network," thus responding not only to the session theme but to one of the central principles of the Material Collective--collaboration. The session was kicked off with an introduction to some key methodologies--Bruno Latour's Actor-Network Theory and Ian Bogost's flat ontology. Participants then delivered ten-minute talks focusing on an object that had prompted them to think about networks between past and present, and objects and people.

As should be clear from the above description of the Material Collective's goals and actions, we are committed to reforming our chosen field of study in order to move away from solemn individuals working in isolation, whose output is judged by equally ponderous and not always temperamentally suitable reviewers, toward a practice in which scholars incorporate joy, playfulness, subjectivity, support and collaboration in their study of the past. We are not arguing for decreased rigor in the quality of our scholarship but seek greater community in its production. Anyone interested in joining us in this exciting endeavor are invited to get to know us through our website, www.materialcollective.org, our blog, and our Facebook page. We welcome all to the table.

By Louise Nugent, Archaeologist and Independent Scholar

*Sacral Geographies. Saints, Shrines and Territory in Medieval Ireland* by Karen Overbey, is an interesting and thought-provoking exploration of the topic of Irish medieval relics and reliquaries. While previous works on the topic have focused on the morphology, typology, and iconography of relics and reliquaries, this book provides an excellent critique of relics and reliquaries from an art-historical point of view, exploring the political context of their construction, and their use in defining territorial boundaries and space (secular and ecclesiastical) through procession and movement within the landscape.

Visually the book is exquisite, with ample images of the magnificent reliquaries. The lack of maps is a drawback, as they would have enhanced the reader experience especially those unfamiliar with medieval Irish history and geography.

The book is divided into six chapters. Chapter one, Making Space, examines the process of collecting relics and reliquaries by antiquarians in 18th-19th-century Ireland and how these objects were used to re-affirm Irish Identity. In particular, it provides insights into the motivations of Irish antiquarians, such as George Petrie, who collected many of Ireland’s ancient relics, obtaining them many from the families of hereditary keepers. 19th-century Ireland suffered economically, so parting with the relics which their families had, for centuries, guarded and cared for came more easily. This chapter explores how the newly acquired relics and reliquaries were housed and displayed and how they were used to dispel negative national stereotypes of Ireland by the emerging Nationalist movement. There is a fascinating discussion of how and why some genuine medieval reliquaries were displayed along with 19th-century replicas at the Dublin Great Industrial Exhibition of 1853.

The chapter provides an excellent discussion of the political mood of the time and charts the move from private collections of relics and antiquities into a national collection, with the creation of the National Museum of Ireland, undergoing a “geographical transformation or spatial rupture” becoming items of national importance. While reading this chapter, I visited the annual pilgrimage at Ballyvourney, Co. Cork, Ireland, in honor of the Irish St. Gobnait. Part of the modern pilgrimage includes the veneration of a small, wooden, 13th-century statue of the saint which is kept locally within the parish. Each year local people continue to observe a centuries old tradition called “taking St. Gobnait measure” where ribbons are measured against the statue and taken away and used for healing. The statue is also carried to local people who are ill and in hospital. It emphasized how right Overbey was in this hypothesis, because by removing the statue from community and placing it in a museum would completely change the meaning and significance of the statue, ending a number of long-held traditions. Many of the relics acquired by antiquarians were once sacred object in their own local community and most were still located in the vicinity of the church or monastery they were originally house in but by removing them from this local place they now became pieces of art, decorated container of the saints to be looked at and admired, symbols of Ireland’s golden age of craftsmanship. The move divorced the religious aspect of the reliquaries and they become in a sense empty containers housed in a Museum. Yet on the other hand if the mass collection had not taken place one wonders how many of these reliquaries would survive today.

Chapter two, Holy Ground: St. Mancháin’s Shrine, explores the creation, imagery, function of the reliquary of St. Mancháin’s shrine, honoring the founder of the monastic settlement at Lemanaghan Co. Offaly. In an intriguing discussion, the author explains the imagery of St. Mancháin’s shrine, its making, and later refurbishment within the political context of the time. In particular, Overbey makes a strong case for the shrine being commissioned by Toirrdelbach Ua Conchobair during this bid to become High King of Ireland, and that the later alterations to the shrine in the 13th century were connected to Toirrdelbach’s descendant Ruadhri Ua Conchobair. The shrine, then, had a dual function: being of a reliquary of the saint while also expressing the political aspirations of successive members of the Ua Conchobair dynasty. The small, portable shrine was probably used in ritualistic circuits to aid in defining secular and ecclesiastical territories.

Following a common early Christian tradition of mid lands Ireland, the settlement at Lemanaghan was built on an island in a bog. Overbey posits that Lemanaghan was a remote and isolated place. This is not necessarily so. Lemanaghan was far from isolated from the rest of the world and would have been linked into surrounding settlement through a complex system of roads and routeways. Bogs were no barrier to travel in early and later medieval Ireland as
excavations of the surrounding bogs have revealed a complex system of roads dating from the 6th-17th century. Their connection is also supported by placename evidence, such as the nearby village of Boher, whose name means “road.” Chapter three, Remapping Life of Colum Cille, explores the re-creation of the landscape of a saint through the 12th-century Irish text of the Life of St. Colm Cille. The Life, written in the form of homily, was designed to be read aloud on the saint’s feast day. The text expands the traditional landscape of the saint by providing additional holy sites connected Colm Cille that were not mentioned in earlier medieval texts or were founded in the centuries following the saints death, including a full list of the extent of the Columbian federation of monasteries in the 12th century. The author shows how the text was designed to allow the saint to cement links with Columban foundations such as Kells, Swords, and Moone founded long after his death. The text legitimizes the expanded Columbian territories, recounting how the saint visited certain sites and by the saint’s choosing to leave behind either relics or one of his followers to lead the monastery. Overbey also discusses the earlier landscape of the saint in earlier Latin versions of his Life Adomnán’s 7th-century Vita Columbae, & Manus O’Donnell’s 16th-century Betha Colaim Chille and also provides a sound discussion of the development of the sacred landscape of St. Colm Cille at Iona and beyond.

Chapter four, The Domanch Airgid: Inside & Out, discusses the reliquary shrine Domnach Airgid which translates as the “Silver Church.” Overbey untangles the complex story of the shrine and its subsequent association with St Patrick. The shrine began as a reliquary: a yew box with a sliding lid, this simple box was transformed into a solid shrine in the 8th century when it was covered with decorated bronze sheets. The shrine was refurbished yet again in the 14th century by the Abbot of Clones to “rearticulate the lineage of the community and the history of Clone” (p. 111). This refurbishment covered the shrine with silver-gilt panels adorned with images of various Irish saints including St. Patrick, St. MacCartan, and a gilt figure of the crucifixion. Overbey expertly discusses symbolism of this imagery, placing the shrine and its refurbishments within the ecclesiastical and political context of the time.
Chapter five, Bells Relic and the Monastic Voice, examines the role and function of medieval bell relics and reliquaries. The author provides an interesting discussion of the symbolism of the imagery on Irish bells and their reliquaries and explores the bells role as props in ritual such as liturgical procession and the promulgation of laws. Overbey charts the use and function of bells within the monastic world and the transition of some as functional objects to the relics of saints. The chapter also explore the role of the saint’s bell in hagiography. For example, St. Berach used his bell during processions round the outer limit of monastery at Glendalough. Ringing the bell, he warded off plague by singing maledictory psalms against demons. Irish hagiography also describes how saints used bells to establish a community. Bells were known to ring spontaneously to indicate where a monastery should be built.

Chapter six, Crosiers, Relics, and the Performance of Territorial Authority, provides a detailed discussion of the crosier reliquaries, and a fascinating analysis of the crosier as a relic: their function and meaning within society, and the visual narrative of their decoration. It examines the imagery, refurbishment, and symbolism of various examples of Irish crosiers such as St. Féchin’s Crosier. Like hand bells, crosiers had a dual function as symbols of ecclesiastical office and containers for the saint’s relics (here associated in the form of the Bachall, e.g. saint’s staff, or corporeal relics). She proposes that reliquary crosiers were symbols of lineage and succession, acting as physical links to the founding saint, and therefore used to reinforce the authority of the church, such as ceremonial circuits and processions to define and enforce spiritual and territorial boundaries.
The final section of the book, Afterword Open Spaces, focuses on pilgrimage. Overbey rightly points out the scarcity of contemporary historical accounts of pilgrimage in early and later medieval Ireland, leading to past neglect of the topic by Irish academics. Nonetheless, it has started to become an active field. Peter Harbison’s excellent study of early medieval pilgrimage in his book *Pilgrimage in Ireland: The Monuments and the People*, has done much to progress the study of this area. Published excavations of pilgrimage sites on the west coast of Ireland at *Illaunloughlan Island: An early medieval Monastery in County Kerry* (White Marshal & Walsh 2005), *High Island: An Irish Monastery in the Atlantic* (White Marshal & Rourke 2000), and *Innishmurray: Monks and Pilgrims in an Atlantic Landscape* (O’Sullivan & Ó Carriagáin 2008), and on-going research on the east coast at the shrine of Glendalough and its surrounding landscape, by the School of Archaeology, University College Dublin, have also added greatly to our understanding of pilgrimage in early medieval Ireland. While we can never have a complete picture of the entire pilgrim landscape at any point during the medieval periods by applying a multi-disciplinary approach that combines historical and archaeological evidence we gain a clearer image of past pilgrim landscapes of Ireland.

Overbey raises some very interesting ideas in this section, but unfortunately due to the brevity of this chapter (which is an afterward), these ideas are not developed to their fullest. She explores the development of the pilgrim landscape at Lough Derg using 12th, 15th and 16th century texts to illustrate the rites and commemorations of pilgrims at the site. There is much merit in her ideas that medieval clerics “framed traces of the saint’s bodies in the landscape primarily through biblical and Christologicical reference.”

She also briefly discusses how religious metalwork, such as reliquaries and processional crosses, could be “decommissioned” from their original monastic function and “appropriated to a new use,” as objects of personal devotion, with many uses at sites which formerly were not associated with any relics. For instance, what appears to have been a broken metal cross and fragments of a bell were venerated at Lough Derg by lay pilgrims in the 17th century, yet there are no references to relics playing a role in the pilgrim rituals by earlier medieval pilgrims to the site. Similarly Murrisk Abbey, at the base of Croagh Patrick, recorded in 1652 as possessing a number of relics of St Patrick (including his teeth and the Black Bell of St. Patrick), which were used in the pilgrim rituals of post medieval pilgrims, at the Summit of the holy mountain until the 1800’s. As at Lough Derg historical sources suggest that relics didn’t play a part in medieval pilgrimage at the site. Unfortunately the author doesn’t have space to explore how
the process happened and whether it was a result of the Reformation or had begun earlier. The pilgrim landscape of the 18th-19th century incorporates many relics of the saint in the form of holy wells, caves, and stones. Some of these features are also mentioned in medieval Lives of the some Irish saints, suggesting that some might have an ancient history. In post-medieval and modern pilgrimage traditions, many of these “natural relics” are touched by pilgrims as part of their prayers and rituals. Overbey discusses two stones associated with St. Colmcille: his pillow on Iona and the “An Glacach” or “hand stone” found on Tory Island (that has since disappeared). The later appears to have a bullaun stone which was recorded as a relic of the saint in the 16th-century text *Betha Colaim Chille* or Life of St. Colum Cille. Pilgrims have always had a desire for physical contact with the holy places or relics. Modern Irish pilgrims still take home water from holy wells which follow European accounts of medieval pilgrims taking home water, dust, or oil from holy shrines. Overbey points out that St. Colmcille’s relic pillow on Iona shows wear from pilgrim contact. She argues that the saint, through his perceived contact with the stone such as “an Glacach” on Tory Island or his pillow on Iona, turned these stone into a relics which pilgrims could touch -- process no doubt replicated elsewhere.

The chapter concludes with a brief discussion of belt shrines which, although interesting, one wonders if it would not be more effective to have discussed the reliquary earlier in the book. Given my personal interest in pilgrimage, I found this to be the most interesting section of the book. The author covers a lot of ground and raises many interesting ideas in this short section. I would have really liked the author to have expanded her discussion and examine in more detail how ordinary pilgrims interacted with relics during medieval times, if this changed over time, and what role of procession played for the lay population of medieval Ireland. Also of interest would be a discussion of how the lay population’s relationship with relics changed from the medieval to post-medieval times and the role of the Hereditary Keeper of relics. Yet, it is based on the author’s excellent work, that such research can be built.

On the whole this is a marvelous book and adds much to earlier studies of Irish relics. The book has shown relics and reliquaries are more than just beautiful artifacts created to honor the saint; they could create holy space through procession and movement. They tell the story not just of the saint and religious devotion, but also of the social and political landscape of the time they were created and refurbished. The author also shows the importance of a multidisciplinary approach which combines art history, historical sources, and hagiography to obtain the fullest picture of the role and function of these artifacts through time. The volume provides a clear and
informative discussion of Irish relics and reliquaries, while raising many new and interesting ideas.
Book review: Brenner, Elma, Meredith Cohen, and Mary Franklin-Brown, eds. Memory and Commemoration in Medieval Culture. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013

By Luke A. Fidler (Northwestern University, Department of Art History)

The study of medieval memory has been reinvigorated in recent decades by the work of scholars such as Mary Carruthers, Patrick Geary, and Jean-Claude Schmitt. Their research has prompted medieval historians to inspect more closely the means by which medieval texts and objects construct relationships between the past, present, and future. Here, one might also consider the recent writing on memoria in German-language scholarship. This wide-

* Thanks to Jason D. LaFountain, McCullough Kelly-Willis, and Anthony Opal who read and commented on drafts of this review.


ranging volume makes an important and timely contribution to the burgeoning field of memory studies.

_Memory and Commemoration in Medieval Culture_ collects sixteen essays from the fourth annual symposium of the International Medieval Society, Paris. They are grouped into five sections, each concerned with an aspect of memory or commemoration, and comprise a plurality of methodologies, subjects, and periods. Nevertheless, as the editors observe, this diversity does not extend to the social strata under discussion (p. 5). With a few exceptions, the essays analyze examples from French “high” culture.

The first section tackles the ways in which memory works both in and through images. Jean-Claude Schmitt provides a lucid historiographical overview of the section’s concerns, before concluding with a somewhat truncated analysis of the sixth-century mosaics in the basilica of Sant’Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna. Martha Easton interrogates the depiction of violence in medieval manuscripts. Although the issue has been much studied of late, Easton makes several fruitful suggestions about the locus of gender, memory, and devotional meditation in martyr scenes. Rosa María Rodríguez Porto compares thirteenth-century illuminated manuscripts of the _Roman de Troie_ and the _Histoire Ancienne_, tracking iconographic choices that point up the complex workings of cultural memory.

---

The second section considers the relationship between commemoration and oblivion. Eva-Marie Butz and Alfons Zettler’s essay on Carolingian *libri memoriales*—focusing on the surviving *libri memoriale* of the nunnery at Remiremont—explores the difficulties of reconstructing notions of past and present from recorded genealogies.

Mailan Doquang surveys issues at stake in the construction of burial chapels in northern France during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Of particular value is Christian Jaser’s analysis of ritual excommunication in light of Umberto Eco’s suggestion that an *ars oblivionalis* is always already doomed to fail. His remarkably subtle reading of the
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Roman de Troie. L’adoubement de Pyrrhus, fils d’Achille, Œuvre en vers de Benoît de Sainte-Maure, c. 1300. Photo: Creative Commons
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reversibility of anathema lends credence to Paul Ricoeur’s reflections on the intermingling of forgetting and forgiveness.\(^5\)

The third section traces the connective tissue between memory, reading, and performance. Mary Franklin-Brown considers Vincent of Beauvais’ *Speculum Maius* in light of Carolingian and Enlightenment encyclopedic projects. Joanna Fronska argues that the marginal images in legal texts might work in concert with the elaborate memorial-images investigated by Carruthers, Paolo Rossi, and Frances Yates.\(^6\) Kate Maxwell makes a welcome contribution to the scholarship on the manuscripts of Guillaume de Machaut, examining the expanded circle of performers whose memories guided the reproduction and activation of musical texts. Finally, John F. Levy probes an intriguing and understudied phenomenon: the incorporation of acrostics into written poetry. His meditations on the acrostics of Niccolò da Verona raise exciting questions about fixedness and stability, textuality and orality.

The fourth section is devoted to royal and aristocratic subjects of commemoration. Elisabeth Van Houts continues her work on the rich subject of migratory aristocratic women.\(^7\) Her essay neatly complements Anne-Hélène Allirot’s comparison of commemorative strategies at the abbeys of Longchamp and Lourcine. Allirot makes an important contribution to the flourishing literature on the ways royal and aristocratic
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Transept, Abbey Church of St-Pierre de Cluny, 11th-12th centuries, France. Photo: Wikimedia Commons

women wielded power through monastic means.⁸ M. Cecilia Gaposchkin discusses the memorializing strategies implicit in liturgical texts, examining liturgical offices as the “ritual solidification” of the memory of Louis IX (264).

The final section, composed of three excellent essays devoted to the “remembering” of the medieval past, is the volume’s most noteworthy contribution to the field. Recent years have seen calls—particularly from art historians—to critically reconsider the relationship between the medieval and the modern.⁹ If these essays don’t reach the radical methodological heights of Alexander Nagel’s and Amy Powell’s recent forays into anachronism, they nevertheless pose important questions in this vein. Elizabeth Emery revisits Pierre Loti’s 1888 late-medieval-themed dinner party through the critical lens of memory. Janet Marquardt analyzes the social and political stakes of three modern celebrations of

---


Cluny’s medieval past, and Shirin Fozi rounds out the volume with a discussion of a stained glass window in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum. Reassembled from the fragments from the ruins of Notre-Dame de Reims, the window encoded memories of “the martyr cathedral” ravaged by World War I (p. 344).

Although in many ways this volume makes a fine addition to current scholarship, it is hampered in part by its eclecticism. Despite the recurrence of canonical formulations and theoretical models (such as Pierre Nora’s lieu de mémoire), the key concepts of commemoration, history, memory, and pastness vary from essay to essay. The lack of critical reflection on these charged and unstable terms undermines the usefulness of several essays. While some authors (e.g. Schmitt, Van Houts) attend to the distinctions between individual, collective, and cultural memory, others blur these categories in confusing manner. Finally, poor copyediting mars the text (Otto von Simson’s name is routinely misspelled throughout, for example).

On the other hand, as the editors note, the volume’s eclecticism may be considered a strong point. Taken as a whole, the collection evidences the complex entanglements of memory and commemoration. It testifies to the manifold ways in which forms of pastness and futurity structured so many aspects of medieval life and death. An invitation to further speculation on these topics, it is a welcome presence on this medievalist’s shelf.


By Hanneke van Asperen, Radboud University Nijmegen

Those who are familiar with medieval pewter badges know that they open up a vast world of medieval visual language that remains unparalleled in any other medium. Because of this unique insight into the social world of the Middle Ages scholarly attention for badges is steadily increasing. Scholars who study religious and secular tokens in order to make sense of the sometimes elusive Middle Ages often hark back to the same published badges over and over again.

A large collection of badges in Prague is less well-known, although it contains almost as many badges as the impressive collection in the Musée National du Moyen Age in Paris. Fortunately, the Prague collection with its well-preserved badges has been made accessible to a large audience in a publication, beautifully illustrated and well-written in German. The authors are
well-known scholars who have won their spurs in the field of medieval badges - the German badge specialists Carina Brumme and Hartmut Kühne, and Helena Koenigsmarkovà, director of the Museum of Decorative Arts, who was also responsible for a publication in Czech on the badges of the Museum of Decorative Arts in 1986.¹

The writers too modestly recommend the book as “a hopefully useful instrument for further study” [“ein hoffentlich brauchbares Material zur Weiterarbeit”]. The catalog is certainly more than that. Highly illuminating is the contribution on the history of the Prague collections. The collection has a long past going back to the nineteenth century. In 1894 an art dealer in Paris sold the badges to Freiherr Adalbert von Lanna, one of the chief initiators of the Prague Museum of Decorative Arts (UPM). Some of the badges were sold on, but over 450 badges found a home in Prague. In 1962 the collection was distributed between two museums - the Museum of Decorative Arts, now housing 217 objects, and the National Museum holding the remaining 245 objects. Hartmut Kühne and Helena Koenigsmarkovà nuanced views of the museum treasures is enlightened with an account on the badges’ find history and subsequent vicissitudes. According to the nineteenth-century provenance, the insignias were found in the Seine, but caution is needed regarding this statement. Kühne and Koenigsmarkovà convincingly hypothesize that nineteenth-century art dealers mixed badges from different private collections to arrange for compilations that were supposedly more

attractive to future buyers. (p. 22) Reasons for this assumption are the similarities between badges from Prague and others in the Paulus-Museum of Worms, the Kunstgewerbemuseum in Berlin, the Bossard and Figdor collections – both lost for the most part – and possibly the Historisches Museum in Basel. (The majority of badges from these museums were acquired around the same time as the Prague badges). At least one badge depicting the reliquary head of John the Baptist had been offered for sale before being presented to Adalbert von Lanna. (Figure 1) An additional argument is to be found in the composite badges; these were composed of mixed and matched fragments to obtain more complete, more salable specimens. The Seine designation seems to have been used as a “mark” of authenticity of the entire group rather than a geographical indication of every single badge.

Despite their call for caution with regard to the badges’ find site, the authors do assume that the majority of the badges were derived from the Seine (p. 29), and a provenance from France does seem plausible. Most of the pilgrims’ souvenirs originate from cult sites in France, such as Boulogne-sur-Mer, Le Puy, Mont-Saint-Michel, Cléry, Vaudouan, Montreuil-sur-Mer, Luzarches, Noyon, Saint-Fiacre-en-Breuil, Saint-Josse-sur-Mer, Amiens, Sainte-Cathérine-du-Mont, Saint-Leu-d’Esserent, Saint-Maur-des-Fossés, Saint-Nicolas-de-Port, and possibly Sainte-Barbe-en-Auge, Chartres, and Marseille. Of the cult sites outside of France only a few of the most famous are represented – Rome, Santiago, Aachen, and Maastricht. This is not surprising; these sites attracted many pilgrims from France. The “foreign” badges are a minority, however. The areas of focus of the Prague collections might have been a result of the choices of the art dealer who sold the badges, and, to a lesser extent, of the collector Adalbert von Lanna who was presented with more badges than those held by the museum. Part of the shipment from Paris was sold to other collectors.
A comparison between the Prague badges and the collection of the Musée National du Moyen Age is obvious because of the many insignias from French sites of pilgrimage and their nineteenth-century provenance from the Seine. Not surprisingly, the Musée National du Moyen Age is mentioned regularly in the Prague catalog, as is the Prague collection in the 1996 catalog of the Musée National in Paris, but the catalogs are not interchangeable. There are some striking differences that merit mention. First of all, the Prague catalog contains some objects from the fourteenth century, but most date from the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

Objects of an earlier date, e.g. ampullae, are missing. Second, the Prague museums own many “profane” badges that are conspicuously lacking in Paris and in other museum collections compiled around the same time. (Figure 2) These often unusual and sometimes explicit badges possibly did not fit the view of the Middle Ages of many nineteenth-century collectors, or were considered inappropriate for a museum collection. Whatever the reason for their absence, it is both unique and enlightening that the Prague museum does possess this type of badge.

---

The authors note that the badges in the Prague collections often have a pin on the reverse for attachment, (Figure 3) as opposed to most badges of German manufacture. This immediately brings to mind English badges that also often have pins instead of eyelets. The authors propose that the presence of a pin might indicate production in France, perhaps north of the Loire, or an even more specific region of production (p. 29). This might be taking it a step too far. Many badges from France --not just the earlier plaques-- have eyelets as means of attachment, e.g. those from Saint-Antoine-L’Abbaye, Saint-Josse-sur-Mer, Saint-Quentin, and Saint-Claude. Nevertheless, the relatively large number of pins is significant and certainly merits further attention.

Because of the nature of the material – with an emphasis on French cult sites – a specialist in French medieval studies would have been a useful addition to the team of experts working on the book. The authors make a number of tentative attributions – Rue (nos. 63-67), Notre-Dame-de-l’Epine (nos. 93-102), Notre-Dame-de-Vaux (nos. 103-106), and Notre-Dame-des-Ardilliers (no. 107) – that might have been more persuasive with the insights of a specialist in French church or devotional studies. The attribution of badges to Sainte-Barbe-en-Auge (nos. 143-155) is tempting, but problematic. Pilgrims’ souvenirs will certainly have been produced in this popular site of pilgrimage, but it is difficult to pinpoint which ones. The general iconography of the proposed badges does not point to any specific site and inscriptions are lacking. Other badges in the catalog are categorized wrongly. An unidentified badge is assigned to the

---

group of erotic insignia because it shows a bare-chested woman (no. 364), but it is a religious badge of St Agatha with her hands tied behind her back while executioners tear off her breasts with pincers. (Figure 4) Parts of the pincers are still visible, if only faintly. When the authors describe a badge of an archangel (no. 260), they write that “St Michael can be excluded, and therefore also a provenance from Mont-Saint-Michel.” After comparison with two badges that were found in the Netherlands I am convinced that the badge does depict St Michael.4

Some substantiated new identifications that will meet with general approval form important contributions. An especially beautiful and hitherto-unknown badge is identified as a souvenir from Bourbon L’Archambault (no. 26) which held a relic of the cross with dynastic implications. (Figure 5) The abbess depicted on quite a few badges was reputed to be St Odile (no. 138-142), but she is now convincingly identified as St Austreberthe of Montreuil-sur-Mer. It is unclear though why the authors did not recognize a sixth badge with a similar abbess as St Austreberthe (no. 176), which is listed as St Gertrud of Nivelles instead. The badge does not have much in common with known badges of St Gertrud, but the frame does show remarkable similarities with some badges from Boulogne-sur-Mer, not far from Montreuil. One of these is, in fact, in the Museum of Decorative Arts and is included in the catalog (no. 69). The animal at
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her feet is not a mouse, which usually accompanies St Gertrud, but the wolf from a well-known miracle story of the life of Austreberthe.

A paleographer or a specialist in medieval script would have protected the authors from a few obvious mistakes. A badge with a depiction of a saint, identified as St Bernard in the catalog, (no. 156) reads S VINCENT. The inscription on an especially intriguing badge (no. 67, attributed to Rue in the catalog) reads S:SAUVOURS:DE D [Saint Saviors of D] instead of the rather cryptic S:SAUNOM:A… (Figure 6) The French inscription suggests a site of pilgrimage in a French-speaking area, but it does not point to Rue. The plural indicates a cult of more than one miraculous image or relic, which is confirmed by the badge depicting both a crucifix and a Man of Sorrows. Another badge, probably from the same site, depicts two crucifixes (no. 66). The inscription on the frame of another badge depicting St Michael from Le Mont-Saint-Michel (no. 206) reads TOM BE, perhaps referring to nearby Tombelaine, and not AD III04 as indicated in the catalog. Other minor mistakes are AW GNW S DEI which should have been AN GNU S DEI (no. 2), and the erroneous AMOR instead of AMOURE: E (no. 365).

The often-substantiated, but sometimes under-researched suggestions are both the strength and weakness of the catalog. The book opens up a range of subjects that deserve further study. Despite the points of criticism that arise when focusing on the details the book is a worthy addition to the library of historians in the field of medieval studies, whether they concentrate on devotion, pilgrimage, culture, art, or church history. Especially those scholars with an interest in France will find the book a useful tool offering, a wealth of (French) material, some interesting...
new attributions, valuable insights on nineteenth-century collection history, and many
suggestions for further research.
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By Sophie Oosterwijk, University of St. Andrews

Death has become a trendy topic among medievalists. Recent years have seen the publication of Elina Gertsman’s monograph *The Dance of Death in the Middle Ages* (2010), Kenneth Rooney’s *Mortality and Imagination: The Life of the Dead in Medieval English Literature* (2011), and the co-edited volume *Mixed Metaphors: The Danse Macabre in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (2011), to name a few. The subject of the *Danse Macabre* attracts particular interest on an international scale, although many publications are in languages other than English. Ashby Kinch’s book is a recent addition to the anglophone literature. It is an ambitious attempt to combine Middle English literature and art of the period to investigate medieval attitudes to death and to address another topical subject: community.

The book is divided into three sections: “Facing Death,” “Facing the Dead,” and “The Community of Death.” In his introduction Kinch surveys human thinking on death and its physical appearance from Socrates and Aristotle via Augustine and St Benedict to Petrarch, Jean Gerson, Julian of Norwich and John Mirk, while his epilogue presents a very sketchy “afterlife” of medieval death imagery that includes the macabre video of Robbie Williams’s “Rock DJ.” Kinch’s ultimate aim is to contextualize three specific strands of fifteenth-century death iconography through a select number of illustrations in three medieval death-related texts. The first chapter is constructed around three deathbed illustrations in two Middle French translations of Henry Suso’s meditation on death in “De scientia” (based on the second chapter in book II of
Suso’s *Horologium Sapientiae*) and in a Middle English translation of this same text in the well-known “Carthusian Miscellany” (London, BL Add. MS 37049). A number of other comparative examples serve to show that whereas the focus of the source-text is the “bad death,” the illuminators concerned chose to illustrate the positive concept of a “good death” instead. This argument is continued in the second chapter, which concentrates on Hoccleve’s poetic translation of Suso’s chapter in “Lerne for to Die” and the penitential model offered by the poet for the benefit of his aristocratic patrons.

Following his discussion of these select medieval visualizations of how the living experience Death, in his second section Kinch targets the huge corpus of medieval depictions of the Three Living and the Three Dead. This Legend can be found across Europe in a range of vernacular texts and as images in different media. The participants in this non-fatal encounter tend to be presented as aristocratic or even royal, unlike those in the *Danse Macabre* who represent a wide range of social classes and who all die: nonetheless, the Legend is often seen as a precursor of the *Danse*. Curiously the only known Middle English version of the Legend is relatively late, *viz.* *Three Dead Kings* by John Audelay (d. c.1426), a poem that Kinch juxtaposes with a selection of well-known cadaver monuments in chapter five.

The first two sections build up to a grand finale in Kinch’s third section, “The Community of Death,” which focusses on the *Danse Macabre* and centers around the two versions of John Lydgate’s *Dance of Death* poem (originally written in 1426) and a painted *Danse Macabre* cycle.

The first chapter opens with the creation in 1424-25 of the *Danse Macabre* mural in Paris that inspired Lydgate to produce his own Middle English translation of the *Danse* during a visit to that city. Yet there is no discussion of the presumed author of the French poem or of the likely patron of this impressive mural, *i.e.* Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, even though an understanding of this mural and its genesis is essential if one wishes to argue how Lydgate and the Bedford workshop supposedly “reinvented” the *Danse*, as Kinch aims to prove. Unfortunately we no longer have the earlier French poem – possibly by Jehan le Fevre – of which the text in the Parisian mural was evidently an adaptation, and scholars are unsure how such a French prototype related to the Spanish *Dança general de la Muerte*, a text that predates the Parisian mural by several decades. There was thus no “standard” *Danse* to be “reinvented.” The structure and character of the *Danse* made it easy for artists and authors to add or remove characters as they pleased: this very adaptability was the strength of this enduring motif.

The *Danse Macabre* at Les Saints Innocents was begun in August 1424 and destroyed probably in 1669, long before the demolition of the cemetery itself in 1786. However, in 1485 Guy Marchant published the text with accompanying woodcuts of all the pairs of dancers presented in the mural. This edition underlines people’s familiarity with the famous Parisian *Danse*, albeit that its illustrations are not faithful copies of the mural. Yet Marchant’s pivotal edition is mentioned only in passing by Kinch, who illustrates none of his woodcuts. Instead he builds his theory around the extensive cycle of roundels in the margins of a single manuscript (Morgan MS. M.359), while relegating to a footnote the *Danse Macabre* borders in another, slightly earlier Parisian book of hours (Paris, BnF ms. Rothschild 2535).
Kinch does a good job of presenting the historical circumstances in France in the 1420s, even if he is not the first to link the traumatic impact of the English Regency with the *Danse Macabre*. It is surprising, therefore, that he still presents the *Danse* in Paris as “a representation of an idealized community” (p. 191), but then he seems unaware of all that has been published on the political subtext of the Parisian mural since at least 2007 (e.g. by Maja Dujakovic). A nice find is the *devinette* about the absence of women in the *Danse Macabre* (p. 207, n. 57), but no date is given for this witticism, which is repeated verbatim in n. 9 on p. 267. Interesting is also his novel identification of the *Parlementaire* in his characteristic red robe in the roundel on fol. 128, yet Kinch is clearly not an art historian and thus no expert on the use of color in medieval art. This explains his naïve description of the polychromy on the tomb effigy of Philippe de Morvilliers (d. 1348) as “an aesthetic choice” (p. 234) and his assumption that the colorfully dressed laborer on fol. 147v is “dressed for a public ceremony rather than for work” (p. 241) – the latter because Kinch is keen to link this *Danse Macabre* cycle with Henry VI’s coronation procession in Paris in 1431, although here the colors are an “aesthetic choice” of the illuminator. Kinch also understands little of the commissioning of luxury manuscripts: whereas anyone who has ever studied or even just held this richly illuminated 173-folio manuscript would understand that it must have been commissioned by a wealthy patron, Kinch supposes its manufacture to have been a “gamble” and a “speculative” venture for an unknown “potential” patron in which the Bedford workshop “indulged” at a time of political crisis (pp. 246-247). In fact, although the patron remains unidentified there are interesting clues, e.g. the inclusion in the calendar of...
typically English saints such as Sts Botolph, Edward, and Augustine of Canterbury, and the highlighting in gold of St George. Moreover, the earliest recorded owner was Charles de Bourgueville (1504-1593), sieur de Bras, of Caen in Normandy – the region still held by the English long after they had been expelled from Paris in 1436. Kinch makes no reference to any of this, which is curious as he yokes this Parisian book of hours to Lydgate’s Middle English poem.

Kinch’s arguments for a revision by Lydgate himself of his original Dance of Death poem (or A-version) are based on his apparent desire to read a message of “community” in the poem, rather than on all the available evidence. His inspiration is a 2008 article by Amy Appleford, who assumed the B-version as Lydgate’s own revision for the painted cycle commissioned by London town clerk John Carpenter, but his patronage does not interest Kinch. Whereas Appleford mentioned in a footnote that Carpenter is named as the patron of the London cycle in one rubric to the A-version of the poem (Trinity College Cambridge MS R. 3. 21), Kinch ignores this altogether. In fact, there are more copies extant of the A-version and these show remarkable consistency compared to the huge textual variation in B-version copies. Scholars since Elizabeth Hammond have commented on the poor quality of the rhetorical features and the lapses in meter in the “revised” parts of the B-version. Moreover, it was the A-version that Richard Tottel chose to include in his 1554 edition of Lydgate’s Fall of Princes. However, Kinch dismisses the idea of scribal corruption because Lydgate’s authorship of the B-version is fundamental to his hypothesis of a “reinvention” of the Danse Macabre.

Kinch tries hard to impress, which is also evident from his writing style, but is his book a valuable contribution to the literature? It does contain interesting material and observations, but there are gaps in the author’s understanding and the discussion is ultimately flawed because he is blinded by his own hypotheses. The book is beautifully illustrated and many images may be unfamiliar, but Morgan MS M.359 is available online and thus generally accessible. The bibliography seems extensive, yet it contains important lacunae and is not up to date. It also does not separate primary and secondary texts or include a list of manuscripts: there is no indication that manuscripts listed in the index have actually been examined by the author.

Young scholars are under huge pressure to publish a monograph, preferably with a reputable academic publisher. Therefore, one expects expert peer-reviewing to ensure high standards of
scholarship. Brill’s books are far from cheap, which raises expectations further. *Imago Mortis* certainly looks promising, but ultimately it is like the curate’s egg: good in places.
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Archaeologists found richly equipped burials during excavations in Burdąg, Warmia and Mazury, reported project leader Dr. Mirosław Rudnicki from the Institute of Archaeology, University of Łódź. "These finds here are quite a surprise. Excavations have changed the image of the site that, in the light of previous studies, was considered quite poor." One tomb, belonging to a woman, contained a silver breastplate, carefully crafted belt elements, a necklace of glass beads, and silver fibulae of Frankish manufacture during the Merovingian Dynasty.

This year alone, archaeologists have discovered more than 40 cremation graves of the local aristocracy. Archaeologists have excavated the vessels intact with their contents, which will be removed in the laboratory, where they’ll be opened.

"Ancestors of the Prussian Galinds tribe were buried here, known as +Olsztyn group+. Its appearance, growth and disappearance are among the most interesting phenomena in the ancient history of today's Polish land," said Dr. Rudnicki. The researcher added that most materials attributed to the Olsztyn group were acquired by German archaeologists in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, and then disappeared during World War II. Hence, the present work is crucial to its understanding.

This community’s tombs reflect strong relations in the sixth - seventh centuries with the Merovingian state, Byzantium, Scandinavia, Goths, Slavs, and nomadic Avars. "Due to the fact that after all these are the frontiers of the late ancient world, the explanation of this phenomenon remains a mystery," added the archaeologist.

Lost medieval Welsh carved stone rediscovered

Whilst enjoying a bank holiday stroll, Royal Commission staff member Nikki Vousden and Dr. Roderick Bale (archaeologist at University of Wales) came across a long-lost medieval inscribed stone in a stream in Silian!

The find spot is just southwest of St. Sulien’s Church, Silian, home to two other medieval inscribed stones. The church site, thought to have been of high-status, has been in use for at least 1500 years. Although the current church building dates from 1873, it is thought to stand on medieval foundations and has an early-fifth/sixth-century inscribed stone built into its south wall.

The stone had previously been known and cast, but then was lost. It was tentatively ascribed to Silian because of the label on a photograph, also at the National Museum of Wales. The stone is referred to as ‘Silian 3’ in Nancy Edwards’ *Corpus of Early Medieval Inscribed Stones and Stone Sculpture in*
Wales, Volume II, and its decoration is thought to be ninth/tenth century in date. Measuring 70cm x 38cm, the decoration covers around a third of its face. The pattern includes a linear Latin cross with a lozenge shaped ring at its upper end. There are only a few other definite examples of crosses in lozenge shaped rings in Wales: “Llandanwg 5” from St. Tanwg’s Church, Llandanwg, ‘Llanllawer 3’ from St. David’s Church, Llanllawer, and “Llandecwyn 1,” from St. Tecwyn’s Church, Llandecwyn. How the Silian 3 stone ended up in the steam is a mystery, especially as someone obviously once knew of its significance and took a cast.

Details of all four churches and their associated stones can be found on the Royal Commissions’s searchable online database, Coflein. The stone is now being kept in St Sulien’s Church, Silian.

Re-written from http://heritageofwalesnews.blogspot.co.uk/2013/05/exciting-rediscovery-of-lost-medieval.html
Early church and burials found at Lincoln castle

Archaeologists digging under Lincoln Castle have made contact with the remains of a previously unknown church that is at least 1,000 years old. Initially finding a cemetery with several skeletons, they came across two stone walls. Further investigation revealed more burials, including at least one stone coffin, and the remains of a Late Saxon stone church.

Beryl Lott, historic environment manager for Lincolnshire County Council, said: “This is a very exciting discovery. Our knowledge of the site between the end of Roman period and when the castle was built is very scant. While the discovery was totally unexpected, it is well known that other Roman walled towns often contained some form of high-status use during the Anglo-Saxon period. This will greatly increase our knowledge not just of the castle, but of uphill Lincoln as well. It’s a major find and we look forward to future developments.”

The church has popped up in an unexpected place. Lincoln’s earliest church, St Paul in the Bail, was in the area of the Roman forum, probably built in the 7th century, but a body buried in its dedication grave was removed in the 10th century for burial somewhere else. This might be the church built by Blaecca, chieftain of Lincoln at that time. The Late-Saxon cathedral built 300 years later has always been assumed to be under the present minster, but the church under the castle is certainly showing signs of being an important high status church. Further historical research as well as the on-going archaeological work may give clues to whether it might be a Saxon minster, or belong to an adjacent monastery or palace.
One of the most intriguing findings is the bones of a person laid inside a niche in the wall foundation. The bones were originally wrapped in a finely woven textile – the tiny impressions of the cloth could be seen on the mortar of the wall. This looks like a “votive deposit” and may be the relics of a holy person placed inside the wall to dedicate the building. Archaeologists will use radiocarbon dating to try and refine the date of the remains, which from the stratigraphy and associated artifacts already uncovered they expect to be 10th century or earlier.

Medieval tower and 9th-century paintings discovered by Polish archaeologists in Sudan

A perfectly preserved fragment of a medieval fortification system and paintings inside a church from the ninth century have been discovered by Polish archaeologists in Old Dongola, Sudan. Dongola Citadel is located on the uplifted rock on the bank of the Nile, surrounded by fortifications built in the late fifth and sixth centuries. In the past, archaeologists stumbled upon its walls, but never before such well preserved fragments. This year, they unveiled the tower preserved to a height of more than 8 m.

"Towers in Dongola were massive structures built of dried bricks and crushed sandstone blocks. They were built at regular distances of 32-35 meters," noted Prof. Włodzimierz Godlewski. In order to reach the tower, archaeologists had to wade through the remnants of the seventeenth-century house built on the tower crown. The tower and fortifications were dated to the turn of fifth and sixth centuries. The exterior, brick cladding had been added in the fifteenth/sixteenth century. Desert sand quickly covered unused fortifications. Its parts were used as residential house walls.

Also discovered in Dongola were paintings located in the church adjacent to the King Joannes Palace (sixth century). The ninth-century large basilica (measuring 25 x 15 meters) has walls and circular pillars in the southern and eastern parts preserved to a height of more than 4 m. "Last season, slowly, as the conservation progressed, we have been uncovering the interior of the building. On the walls, as well as pillars and pilasters, appear more paintings on plaster made of lime," said Prof. Godlewski.

The plaster surface was severely damaged and required constant conservation during the excavations. However, the quality of the paintings, showing Christ, the Virgin Mary, saints, and
angels, is noteworthy. The paintings are accompanied by Greek inscriptions as well as Old Nubian texts, probably added later. Dongola was the capital of the Christian Makuria until the fall in the fourteenth century. The kingdom stretched from the northern area of today’s southern Sudan to Egypt.

A huge building which during the Crusader period was the largest hospital in the Middle East has been discovered in the heart of Jerusalem, the Israel Antiquities Authority (IAA) announced on Monday. Located in the Christian Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem, the 1,000-year-old hospital was identified following a decade-long reconstruction operation. According to Renee Forestany and Amit Re’em, the IAA excavation directors, the structure, only a small part of which was unearthed in the excavation, spread out over more than 150,000 square feet. Similar in size and shape to the Knights’ Halls in Acre, the hospital’s main hall, which was brought to light by the excavation, will be integrated with a restaurant which will open to the public by the end of the year.

It features massive pillars, ribbed vaults, large rooms, smaller halls and ceilings as high as 20 feet. The hospital was established between 1099 and 1291, with permission from the Muslim authorities, by the Knights Hospitalier, whose members vowed to care for pilgrims who came to
Jerusalem to die. Examples of their treatment, which survives in crosses carved into skulls, include removing evil spirits, curing headaches, and amputating legs just because of small infected wounds.

In the earthquake of 1457, the building collapsed. During the Ottoman Empire, what remained was used as a fruit and vegetable market that operated until 2000.

A 13th-Century Love Story Hidden in a Hat

The pages of this manuscript date from c. 1270, but were recycled in the early modern period to stiffen the lining of a bishop’s mitre. The cloth pasted over it hid a Norwegian translation of Old French love poetry (so-called *lais*). Lovers chase each other through dark corridors, maidens frolic in fields, while knights butcher each other over nothing. For more information about this singular survival see here.
Medieval Poison Ring Used for Political Murders

Bulgarian archaeologists have unearthed a 14th-century medieval bronze ring that might have been used for political murders some 700 years ago. Found at the site of a former medieval fortress in Cape Kaliakra, not far from the Black Sea coastal town of Kavarna in northeast Bulgaria, this finely crafted ring was probably worn by a male on the little finger of the right hand. Intriguingly, it features a round, hollow cartridge decorated with granulation and an artificial hole. “The cartridge was adapted into the ring for the poison to be poured into a glass quite seamlessly,” the Kavarna municipality said in a statement.

It would have been worn at a time in which Kaliakra was the capital of a principality in the Dobruja region, the poison ring most likely had a key role in the fight between Dobrotitsa, ruler of the independent Despotate of Dobrudja in the second half of the 14th century, and his son Ivanko Terter. Petrunova said. “It would solve many of the unexplained deaths among nobles and aristocrats close to Dobrotitca,” Petrunova said.

3D Reconstruction of 15th-century Medieval Nieszawa

In 2012, without sinking a shovel into the ground, the precise location of medieval town Nieszawa was determined. The abandoned, fifteenth-century town was located from the air. Then magnetic and electric resistance tests recorded the exact outlines of the houses. Now a 3D reconstruction of the settlement has been prepared by animation authors Jakub Zakrzewski and Stanisław Rzeźnik in collaboration with archaeological and historical consultants with Lidia Grzeszkiewicz-Kotlewska, Leszek Kotlewski, dr. Jerzy Sikora, and Dariusz Osiński.

Today’s Nieszawa is a small town situated on the west bank of the Vistula River, 30 km upstream from Toruń. Its history dates back to the thirteenth century, when it was given to the Teutonic Order by Konrad I Mazowiecki in 1228. Over the next 200 years, the town’s location changed twice. After the defeat at Grunwald, the Teutonic Knights were forced to tear down the Commandery and the castle. However, already in 1424 Władysław Jagiello founded Mała Nieszawka near Toruń. After 1460, the town was moved several miles up the Vistula, where it remains today.

The reconstruction, a visualization of the appearance of medieval Nieszawa, is an open project. As new archaeological and historical data are obtained, it will be supplemented with new elements. The reconstruction can be viewed HERE.

A metal detectorist has discovered, on the foreshore of the River Thames in London, a copper-alloy gilt badge of a boar. These badges were ordered for use at Richard III’s coronation (in July 1485) and also for the investiture of his son, Edward, as Prince of Wales (in September). It is not certain how this work was originally used -- maybe it adorned a piece of furniture or was used to decorate an item of leather once owned by a supporter of Richard III, or possibly even by the king himself.

Re-written from http://finds.org.uk/database/artefacts/record/id/530737
Originally found by a metal detectorist in 2008 Darren Hoyle in Rolleston, Nottinghamshire, the golden locket was acquired by the British Museum in 2010. Dating to 1450-1500, it is inscribed cauns [sauns] repentir (without regret), which may have been an amatory phrase. A similar piece was discovered as part of the Fishpool Hoard (also from Nottinghamshire), in 1966, which is also held by in the British Museum.

For further information, see http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=3335914&partId=1
Lost Tudor Sculptures Reassembled With Help from 3-D Scanning

University of Leicester experts have tried to recreate two Tudor monuments using 3D laser scanning and 3D prints to illuminate their historical research. The elaborate tombs of Thomas Howard, 3rd Duke of Norfolk – one for himself, and another for Henry VIII’s illegitimate son, Henry Fitzroy, Duke of Richmond – were meant for Thetford Priory, but they were not complete when the priory was dissolved in 1540. Some parts of the monuments were salvaged and later finished off in a different style and with different materials, in St. Michael’s Church, Framlingham, Suffolk. Other parts were abandoned in the ruins of the priory and were discovered by excavators centuries later; those parts are now scattered in various museums. The researchers have now brought together all these pieces and used drawings in 16th century manuscripts, 3D laser scanning and 3D prints to recreate the monuments as they were originally intended.

Dr Phillip Lindley, of the University of Leicester’s Department of the History of Art and Film, said, “Our exhibition studies the catastrophic effects of the Dissolution of Thetford Priory and of Henry VIII’s attempted destruction of Thomas Howard, third duke of Norfolk, on the ducal tomb-monuments at Thetford. Parts of two unfinished monuments were salvaged in 1540 and later moved to St Michael’s, Framlingham, Suffolk: other pieces were abandoned in the ruined priory, only to be excavated in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Using 3D laser scanning and 3D prints, we have – virtually –
dismantled the monuments at Framlingham and recombined them with the parts left at Thetford in 1540, to try to reconstruct the monuments as they were first intended, in a mixture of the virtual and the real.”