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**Geography:** “The study of the earth and its features and of the distribution on the earth of life, including human life and the effects of human activity.”

**Cultural Geography:** “The study of ways of life, issues of distribution, systems of meaning, questions of practice, and notions of power.”

**Geography of Art:** “The place of art in relation to the environment, culture, and nature;”

**Geography of Material Culture:** “A theory of cognition and a system of classification; a mode of location; a site of collective national, cultural, linguistic and topographical histories.”

The ideas and themes encompassed in this volume under the title “Placing the Middle Ages: Towards a Geography of Material Culture” have a history that, as the definitions above suggest, evolve out of the discipline of Geography, but they also come from the history of art.

---


Combining geography’s scientific methodologies with the social emphasis of cultural geography facilitates an incorporation of the artistic milieu explored in Thomas DeCosta Kaufmann’s groundbreaking *Towards a Geography of Art*. To be useful to the field of medieval studies, Kaufmann’s reconstitution of the significance of geography in art history’s history requires expansion to include the full spectrum of cultural production. In addition, in coinining the phrase, “geography of material culture” we acknowledge the legacy of historical as well as contemporary cultural and spatial turns that have informed geography as well as art history and visual and material culture. In this issue, we highlight the ways some of these developments open the lines of inquiry regarding the subjects and objects of the medieval world. As we draw attention to related art historical implications, both the introductory essay and the papers that follow intend to familiarize the medievalist with relevant theoretical literature and its concepts, identify their potential benefit to our fields and illustrate how they are being productively employed within Medieval Studies.

At the outset, it is important to explain that this volume results from an engagement with major developments across the arts and sciences as perceived and discussed between two art historians specializing in vastly different areas. While the papers resulted from a session at the 2008 Congress on Medieval Studies in Kalamazoo Michigan, the ideas binding them came to light through conversations held between Mickey Abel, a medievalist, and Jennifer Way, a postmodernist. By coincidence, we discovered our mutual engagement in projects employing a geography component. Our ensuing examination and appreciation of the geographical line of inquiry in each other’s work resulted in a shared awareness of the spatial turn in that work, and acknowledgment of the broader implications in art history, visual studies, material culture and cultural geography.
The details of our philosophical debate involved a realization that in general, developments in cultural geography and attention to space and place in art history, along with the interrelationship of these developments have been theorized by post-modernists and practiced by medievalists. We sought to challenge this bi-lateralism by undertaking an extensive examination of geography theory and practice and identifying points of common perspective in our own work and in the work we foster in our students. Taking our foundational cue from Kaufman’s *Towards a Geography of Art*, and building on corresponding ideas in the work of Immanuel Kant, Erwin Panofsky, and Michel Foucault, we studied an extensive bibliography including Henri Lefebvre’s *Production of Space*, Tim Creswell’s *Place*, and Don Michell’s *Cultural Geography*; these and additional titles gave us insight regarding implications that the spatial turn in the literatures of geography and art history had for our respective areas of specialization and common field. Alert to art history’s longstanding interest in time, space, and place, we queried its definitions and methodological approaches to interpreting landscape, practicing cognitive mapping, and representing spatiality, and subjectivities in relation to gender and memory, and in the context of travel, diaspora, static dwelling, as well as in regard to embodied and cognitive states including the liminal, virtual, and mystical. We came to the conclusion that to advance our individual work it would be fruitful to collaborate in teaching and research. Moreover, in an effort to contribute to our discipline we determined to configure our teaching to mentor younger
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scholars in working intra- as well as inter-disciplinarily, as our review of existing literature indicated these skills were prerequisite to working with the material.

Thus during 2008 we organized a seminar and two conference sessions. We taught a graduate art history seminar consisting of students specializing in medieval or post-modern art, all of whom we required to read the same materials for in-class analysis as they produced area-respective papers. Our primary objective was to engage the students with the range of geographical concepts we were examining in regard to our own work. Our greatest challenge lay in the intra-disciplinary aspect, in other words, in provoking the medieval students to find new depth in their subjects by exposing them to the theoretical analysis of cultural geography and postmodernism’s involvement with it, while encouraging students devoted to post-modern studies to re-discover their object and practice empirical and material culture methodologies. We mentored the students in producing research papers as well as abstracts they could submit to calls for papers for scholarly conferences.

Concurrently, we organized two conference sessions each having an explicit goal of exploring our colleagues’ engagement with the potential we were perceiving in the literature of geography. At the annual conference of the College Art Association, scholars in our session, “Common Terrain: Surveying Geography in Histories of Art, Architecture, and Visual Culture,” delivered eight papers and concluded in a roundtable discussion demonstrating that the references to geography and geographic literatures were finding varied and vibrant application in art history, visual studies, and material culture. Similarly, the papers delivered in “Placing the

---

Middle Ages: Contextualizing towards a Geography of Material Culture,” the 43rd International Congress of Medieval Studies session that forms the basis of this volume represented a broad range of research areas covering the breadth of the medieval world. Here too, discussion following this session suggested that there was much more to elaborate. It also signaled that a concise introduction to the theoretical models was in order.

Consequently, we invite readers to consider some of the foundational questions we posed to each other and to our students and the participants of the both conference sessions. The questions require explicit enumeration because they contextualize the papers that follow. One group of questions involves reflecting on the ways geography enriches the traditional interests if medieval art history including attention to space.

- What is it about the practice of medieval art history today that invites engagement with subjects and techniques of geography?
- How might medievalists use geographic concepts to identify new problems or reconfigure existing ones?
- What is it about geography that may facilitate a medievalist’s reflecting historiographically, for example, to re-examine how we have identified space, place, and location in relation to works of material culture?
- How are medievalists using empirical approaches to understand location and its significance in terms of production, distribution, and use of material culture?
- In what ways does cultural geography’s treatment of space—its identification, location, material properties, ideologies, uses and representations—affect the work of medievalists?
- What opportunities does the literature of geography offer in re-evaluating the place of the observer, who is integral to reception-oriented methodologies, but is often neglected?
- How do we “place” the art of the medieval world in the context of mythical, mystical, or ritualized space?
- In what ways does geography aid the medievalist wanting to engage psychic space, personal space, or social space—or help us define a global reality?
- How do spaces correlate with notions of power based on locational topography, a type of topography that is specific to a particular perspective?

Marquardt, “The Regions of the Zodiacque Series on Romanesque Art;” and Diane Favro, “Plowing the Geographical Field: Response and Summation.”
What insights might cultural geography afford medievalists redressing expectations that a natural region reflects a cultural region?

Other questions link geography to language and time.

- What types of relationships exist between notions of space, place, and location in regard to the narratives we study, as well as the narratives we write to discuss what we study?
- What can studies in geography teach us about the spatiality of language and spatiality of language?
- What promise does geography have to enrich our understanding of context, including our sensitivity to difficulties in cleaving texts, or representations from contexts?
- How is a geographic turn in art history enriching or unsettling the tradition of document-based chronologies so fundamental to medieval studies?
- Can unsettling this practice re-frame our subjects of study?
- How might we use the analytical tools of geography to augment or revise discussions about art and architecture cast in a historical chronology, or a narrative genre?
- Do they make it possible for us to achieve non-historical or a-historical readings?
- To what ends might we approach non-geographic topics geographically?

A brief recitation of the historiography underlying these questions begins with some disciplinary definitions. Very generally defined as the intersection of the humanities with the social and environmental sciences of geography, cultural geography of the early twentieth century was studied through cultural landscapes. The cultural geographer sought to identify the ways cultures and societies developed from and shaped those landscapes. This type of geography was relational, in other words, it emphasized space as existing in and creating relationships between things or places instead of occurring as a discrete and stable shape between them.9 Foundational to this movement was the work of Carl Sauer. In his 1925 article, “The Morphology of Landscape,”10 Sauer suggested that the material and the symbolic bound together are evidenced in a landscape that does not necessarily correspond to physical boundaries; that
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these landscapes represent peoples’ activity. Reversing environmental determinism, or the idea that the physical environment determines culture, Sauer viewed landscape as a record of cultural change, but a factor in the creation of culture.\(^\text{11}\) Nonetheless, the land did write is effects on culture and through culture, and this could be perceived in the very forms constitutive of landscape, which he understood to contain cultural memories and characteristics recognizable within a region. Significant in this focus on the human interaction with place was Sauer’s engagement with anthropological categories that concerned human society. Developing this “cultural turn,” geographers of the 1960s continued to emphasize the humanizing of the earth, but expanding Sauer’s phenomenological approach,\(^\text{12}\) they specified culture as the active agent in shaping landscape. Their inquiry embraced the science of maps, topography, and methodologies for understanding ‘peoples,’ their ‘land tenure,’ and their built forms, thus relating social life with customs of the environment.

A more critical approach came in the 1970s as scholars identified myriad globalizations they thought were eroding local cultures and related dimensions of space.\(^\text{13}\) One premise for these developments was the lack of a clear distinction between nature and culture, which undermined a belief that human agency was the primary, if not sole force shaping features of the earth’s surface. Correspondingly, the critical examination of geographies through cultural studies, the geography of art, and the core of cultural geography expanded to address these developments. By the 1980s Sauer’s notion of landscape was being consulted to illuminate

\(^{11}\) Mitchell, 21.

\(^{12}\) Mitchell, 27-29, explains Sauer’s phenomenology as “that which can be perceived as objects, occurrences, or facts.” See also, P. Wagner and M. Mikesell, “General Introduction: The Themes of Cultural Geography” in Readings in Cultural Geography, P. Wagner and M. Mikesell eds. (Chicago, 1962), 1-24.

ideas, practices and concepts of the culture that produced it. Within the context of the cultural and social production of landscape, questions of social relationships, work, and ideology arose. Termed a “radical cultural geography,” the questions of this era circled around issues of power and dominance, the control of space and culture by the elite.

Like other fields in the arts and sciences, cultural geography took another critical turn during the late 1990’s when it opened itself to a new set of theoretical modes and practices. The expansion facilitated an exploration of the ways knowledge is constructed and exposed the study of landscape to a broad range of politicized subjects to include gender, ethnic identity, cultural territories, and imaginative geographies. Rather than locating their studies within a chronology as an interpretive framework, new cultural geographers stressed “culture understood as space and constituted through place.” In their work, culture is a system of signification and a discourse on spatiality.

The Marxist theorist Henri Lefebvre is considered the father of spatiality. Proposing a “trialectics” of spatiality, to challenge binary notions such as objectivity/subjectivity, material/mental, real/imagined, Lefebvre explored the “entwining of cultural practices,

---


16 Mitchell, 57.

17 Atkinson, *et al.*, *Cultural Geography*, 3, see the “trinity of space, knowledge, and power” as central to the ways cultural geographers make sense of society.


19 Mitchell, 63. It is here that we get spatial metaphors like “realm, medium, level, sphere, and zone.”

20 Lefebvre, *Production*, 27-38.
representations, and imaginations” and highlighted the “synergism” of the perceived, the conceived and the lived space.\textsuperscript{21} Drawing on philosophies of existentialism and phenomenology\textsuperscript{22} to incorporate the experiential properties, geographers following Lefebvre, like Edward Soja, began to signal the sensual, aesthetic, and emotional dimensions of space.\textsuperscript{23} They initiated a shift in the notion of social space as a context for material activity to space which is produced by subjectivities, something on the order of a spatiality of connectivity.\textsuperscript{24}

Geography, space, and subjectivities have long been the inquiry of literary criticism.\textsuperscript{25} Irit Rogoff suggested that when we introduce questions of subjectivities and spectatorship into the discourse of geography, we move the inquiry to the margins “where identities are constantly being formed.”\textsuperscript{26} Stressing difference rather than universal truth, she looks at the rhetorics of “deterritorialized” subjects within what she calls “unhomed geographies.”\textsuperscript{27} Important in this analytic stance is postionality.\textsuperscript{28} Being alert to relationships between her own position and that of the particular position of the subject facilitates understanding how they are refracted through

\begin{thebibliography}{99}

\bibitem{22} L. Holloway and P. Hubbard, \textit{People and Place: The Extraordinary Geographies of Everyday Life} (Harlow, 2001).


\bibitem{24} Rogoff, \textit{Terra}, 23. See also, Cosgrove and Martins, 106.


\bibitem{26} Rogoff, 20.

\bibitem{27} Rogoff, 1-8.

\end{thebibliography}
structures and orders of belonging. In this, an examination of community and a “sense of place,” Rogoff points to the ways landscape and place are imbued with meaning. Therein, dichotomies of self and other play out within conditions of “emplacement” and “displacement.” Slippages between the boundaries of “exclusive objecthood and coherent subjecthood” help to determine inclusion and exclusion, and importantly, they signal existential difference between the inside and outside, and insider and outsider. It is therefore through the lens of landscape that subjectivities develop identity discursively as they are constructed in contrast to an “other.” These geographically placed identities are articulated by way of gender, ethnicity, and age, and are equally embodied with emotion, morality, and sexuality.

In this sense, place and space are subjectively opposed concepts. Michael de Certeau suggested that space denotes a “lack of unvocality,” while place implies “an indication of stability.” Experientially perceived through all the senses, the awareness of space is enhanced.

---

31 Rogoff, 8.
32 Rogoff, 34; T. Creswell, In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology and Transgression (Minneapolis, 1996) also explores exclusionary aspects of place and landscape, as does D. Sibley, Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West (London, 1995).
35 T. Creswell, “Moral Geographies” in Cultural Geography, 128-134.
37 M. de Certeau, The Practice of Everyday Life (Berkeley, 1984), 117.
through “kinesthetic” movement.\textsuperscript{38} Place, however, goes beyond this perception and is created through distinct activities associated with particular social spaces.\textsuperscript{39} Creswell expands the notion that places are constructed by people doing things in suggesting that the structure of subjectivity is given in and through the structure of place.\textsuperscript{40} Building on Lefebvre’s trialectics of space, David Harvey looked at the construction and experience of place as material artifact. He questioned how places are represented in discourse, and conversely considers how they evoke discourses and signify cultural identities.\textsuperscript{41}

Landscape is a key term in this discourse. It has a long history in both art history and geography, when these histories, their trajectories in current practices and innovations are brought together interdisciplinarily, the concept takes on new and multifaceted connotations. Commonly equated with a \textit{work}, a look, or a style, Don Mitchell expanded this definition of landscape to stipulate that in cultural geography, landscape is a “product of human labor and thus encapsulates the dreams, desires, and injustices of the people and social systems that make it.”\textsuperscript{42} In this sense, landscape is a “contextual horizon of perceptions” insofar as it has both a foreground and a background.\textsuperscript{43} Moreover, landscape can also act as a “social agent in the development of place.” Here, landscape is activated--it does something. Recognizing the dichotomy between work and working, art historian W.J.T. Mitchell specified that landscape is


\textsuperscript{39} Soja, \textit{Thirdspace}. Page #?

\textsuperscript{40} Creswell, \textit{Place}, 31, 37.

\textsuperscript{41} D. Harvey, \textit{The Condition of Post-Modernity} (Oxford, 1989).

\textsuperscript{42} Michell, 94.

\textsuperscript{43} P. Stewart and M. Strathern, \textit{Landscape, Memory, and History: Anthropological Perspectives} (London, 2003), 1-14.
mediated by culture; it is both represented and presented, signifier and signified.\(^{44}\) Like Sharon Zukin, he saw landscape as both revealing and concealing, and possessing the potential for mystification.\(^{45}\) Landscape can be both a “place” and a “way of seeing.”\(^{46}\) As a form of “visual ideology,” landscape represents a selective system of meaning that reads as real or true, and thereby encodes value and codifies history.\(^{47}\) Landscapes control and channel this meaning in order to structure and illustrate the material social relations that made them. They represent “a built morphology,”\(^{48}\) expanding Sauer’s term. In this, landscape can be seen as a system of social reproduction that is not static, but is characterized as an “ongoing relationship between people and place.”\(^{49}\) Thought of in terms of phenomenology, landscapes record how people live in place, as well as how they shape place.\(^{50}\) These relationships can read as a fertile text or as a discourse that reveals a constellation of knowledge and practice. Interesting for art historians and medievalists in particular, is the idea that this rich discourse can be traced and recorded by way of the map.\(^{51}\)

Mapping was a key feature of this critical turn. Geographers have used mapping as a medium for deconstructing the binary of nature and culture. Moreover, it has become a


\(^{45}\) S. Zukin, Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disney World (Berkeley, 1991), 16, 19.


\(^{50}\) I. Cook, “Positionality/Situated Knowledge” in Cultural Geography, 16-26.

paradigm for describing and evoking many cultural forms and practices, such as topography, space and place, as well as events, behaviors, and themes. In some cases mapping practices are used to reveal, if not “locate” phenomena not necessarily visible in reality.\textsuperscript{52} Encompassing the theoretical position that landscapes incorporate history and represent people in motion,\textsuperscript{53} recording that history by way of a map is tantamount to creating a cultural artifact.\textsuperscript{54} The analysis of the map as artifact should account for its use as a tool by those with wealth and authority.\textsuperscript{55} Moreover, because maps have been studied as cultural texts, it is important to understand not only the context of the map-maker—the “authors” of maps, but also the process of “distanciation” between the observer and the space observed.\textsuperscript{56} This distance causes maps to be understood as metaphorical, making reference to the non-objective knowledge of the world rendered through signs and symbols.\textsuperscript{57} Blurring the distinctions between the “map” and the “territory”\textsuperscript{58} or the image and the real, the post-modern discourse has opened the definition of these symbolic spaces to the conditions of linkages, networks, flows, interactions, hybridity,

\footnotesize


\textsuperscript{53} Mitchell, “Landscape,” 49-56.

\textsuperscript{54} P. Lewis, “Common Landscapes as Historical Documents” in \textit{History from Things: Essays on Material Culture} (1993), 115-139.


\textsuperscript{56} Cosgrove, “Mapping/Cartography,” 29 calls these “thick texts” as they are socially constructed forms of knowledge. B. Harley, \textit{The New Nature of Maps: Essays in the History of Cartography} (Baltimore, 2001), builds on Michael Foucault’s “Sociology of Knowledge,” and the idea that this type of knowledge represents social power.

\textsuperscript{57} P. Jackson, \textit{Maps of Meaning} (London, 1989).

\textsuperscript{58} G. King, \textit{Mapping Reality} (New York, 1996), 4-5. Looking to Baudrillard, King defined the real as “that of which it is possible to give equivalent reproduction.” It is “always, already reproduced.” See Jean Baudrillard, “The Reality Gulf” in \textit{The Guardian} (1 January 1991).
constituencies, and fields of opportunity where the subject is implicated in the map and the map considered the agent creating a subject.⁵⁹

Cognitive mapping or performative mapping—the mapping of spatialities and knowledge—is quite different from the scientific or quantitative mapping of space and is considered to render conventional geographic practices based on logic and fixed co-ordinates obsolete.⁶⁰ Used in the presence of existing representations of place, these maps are intertextual.⁶¹ They invite analysis of cultural terrains encompassing topographies of gender, race, sexuality, and they highlight the inherent politics of writing land as frontier, horizon, and boundary. This type of accounting acknowledges the empirical position of the subject, providing that subject with a critical distance while signifying the power entailed in map-making process.⁶² Contextualized maps recognize the active construction of reality through the experiential perspective, but they also acknowledge the passive coloring of these experiences that comes through sensual stimulation and the imagination.⁶³ Triggered by both emotional responses and mnemonic recollections, a cognitive map can record the intimate experiences of the individual with place.⁶⁴

---


⁶⁰ Cosgrove, “Mapping/Cartography,” 31; Cosgrove and Martins, 105-107.


⁶² King, 13-17. Cosgrove, “Mapping/Cartography,” 30 defined a cognitive map as “the spatial images we carry in our heads that serve to guide spatial behavior.”


Cognitive mapping has also facilitated an illustration of particular cultural movements. As embodied, moving practices, the positionality of the nomad, the tourist, the pilgrim, the migrant, the expatriate, and the refugee as subject—their bodily engagement and particular gaze—are key to the “writing of the earth, labeling it and filling it with meaning.” These maps are cognizant of the heritage of the subject and recognize the impact of memory in belonging or “re-membering” community. Within this type of study there is a perceived need to articulate the intellectual and cultural discourses of “inbetweenness,” “double consciousness,” and the “no-man’s land” that separates material space from metaphorical space. And thus, the sacred, the transitional, and the liminal are recorded in the effects of diaspora, rites of passage, crossing borders, and transcending boundaries, as well as static dwelling.

66 Chang, 35; Del Casino and Hanna, 23-46.
72 Rogoff, 15.
74 Atkinson et al, Cultural Geography, 153-54; S. Lavie and T. Swedenburg, “Between and Among Boundaries of Culture: Bridging Text and Lived Experience in the Third Timespace, Cultural Studies 10/ 1(1996), page #s?
It is at this juncture that the disciplines of art history and cultural geography meet as the critical turn in both draws upon similar bibliographies and adopts the same vocabulary. While generally not foregrounding the theoretical models of cultural geography delineated above, medieval scholarship has certainly engaged with the concepts of space, place, landscape and mapping. We see this featured in studies oriented around ideas of staging or framing such as Chris Wickham’s epic *Framing the Early Middle Ages*; Michal Kobialka’s “Staging Place/Space” in *Medieval Practices of Space*, and Barbara Rosenwein’s *Negotiating Space*.76 Mapping has been particularly useful in accounting for the medieval awareness of the world and the cosmos. This is seen in scholarship focusing on maps and map-makers such as Evelyn Edson’s *Mapping Time and Space*, Dan Connolly’s “Imagined Pilgrimages in the Itinerary Maps of Matthew Paris,” Dan Birkholz’s *The King’s Two Maps*, Marcia Kupfer’s “The Lost Mappamundi at Chalivor-Milon,” and Alessando Scafi’s *Mapping Paradise: A History of Heaven on Earth*.77 It is also found in studies using a mapping scheme including Daniel Smaïl’s *Imaginary Cartographies* and Valerie Ramseýer’s *The Transformation of a Religious Landscape*.78 Additionally, space and place appear in studies concerned with larger social


concepts such as Barbara Rosenwein’s *Emotional Communities*, Susan Boynton’s *Shaping a Monastic Identity*, and Robert Maxwell’s *The Art of Medieval Urbanism*.  

The papers that follow take on the ideas derived from geography from a variety of avenues. Eileen McKiernan González’ uses a site-specificity to analyze the gendered patronage of a Spanish queen attempting to reflect her own genealogical heritage and the expansionist ideology of her husband’s court. Maureen Quigley textually-constructs an “experiential geography” defined more by human actions than the specificity of a particular place. Tracy Chapman Hamilton re-constructs the point of view of the moving traveler to examine a female royal identity publicly constructed by way of ritual processions along self-referential processional routes. Janet Marquardt looks at the geography of nationalism, pilgrimage and the spiritual domain as they apply to a modern monastic order making a claim on the past. By way of a conclusion Kim McCarty and Brittany Gregory preview a project they initiated, which takes on the challenge of combining the disciplines of geography, archaeology, and art history in a more literal way. Their study catalogs the relationship between a set of buildings and their physical environment, making specific use of electronic tools employed by cartographers.

In asking questions of material geography, we wonder whether medievalists are responding to this “spatial turn” as our post-modern colleagues have defined it? Or are we

---


The editors wish to thank Dr. Joan Holladay of the University of Texas at Austin for her thorough editorial reading of this volume. We called on her to perform this task primarily because we knew we could count on her insight and wisdom. We would be remiss, however, if we did not also acknowledge the pseudo-genealogical relationship of the editors, the contributing authors, and Dr. Holladay. While Jennifer and Mickey were both doctoral students at the University of Texas, Mickey worked directly under Dr. Holladay’s tutelage. Moreover, and quite by happenstance, three of the papers submitted for the 2008 Kalamazoo session came from former Texas classmates—Eileen, Maureen, and Tracy—who were also students of Dr. Holladay. Embracing this reunion-of sorts, we have perpetuated the generational passing-of-the-baton by including the work of Mickey’s students, Kim and Brittany. Jan Marquardt, as the only non-Texas alum amongst us, has been good natured about being the odd woman out. But even Jan recognized the appropriateness of looking to the “grand” mother of the clan for the final word. With a sense of homage and great appreciation, we dedicate this volume to Joan Holladay.
intuitively inclined to this analytical mode because of the nature of the material we work on? In other words: Is there something implicitly spatial about the material culture of the Middle Ages? We invite the reader to consider the essays presented here in relation to these questions.

Local and Imported: Conjunctions of Mediterranean Forms in Romanesque Aragón
Eileen McKiernan González
Berea College

Romantic Geography and the Crusades: London, British Library, Royal ms. 19 D I
Maureen Quigley
Saint Louis University

Sur la Route…Topographic Patronage and the Genealogy of Location in Late Capetian France
Tracy Chapman Hamilton
Sweet Briar College

La Pierre-qui-Vire and Zodiac: A Monastic Pilgrimage of Medieval Dimensions
Janet Marquardt
Eastern Illinois University

Geography, Archaeology, Art History: A Case Study for a Multidisciplinary Approach to Mapping Architectural Heritage
Kim McCarty, Brittany Gregory, and Mickey Abel
University of North Texas