THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

NON EST HIC: FIGURING CHRIST'S ABSENCE IN EARLY MEDIEVAL ART

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY

BY

NANCY ANN THEBAUT

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JUNE 2019

CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

Please note: figures are not included in the dissertation due to copyright restrictions

.

ABSTRACT

My dissertation explores how artists figured Christ's *absence*, a seemingly paradoxical task for the visual arts. I examine objects made for use in the celebration of Christian liturgies in Western Europe ca. 950-1050, a period of time when, I argue, artists experimented intensely with new strategies for representing those moments when Christ's incarnate body is elsewhere, obscured from view, and absent on Earth. As medievalist art historians have long recognized, the complex interplay between presence and absence was a central concern of image making, liturgical practice, and theology in the Middle Ages. In their accounts of the events of Christ's life, including his resurrection and ascension, the canonical Gospels presented medieval artists with the challenge of *not* figuring Christ's body, whilst upholding the central Christian belief in Christ's enduring presence beyond the grasp of the human senses. I demonstrate that medieval artists surmounted these representational challenges to both figure and qualify Christ's absence through highly innovative formal means. In chapter one, I focus on images of the *Visitatio sepulchri*; in chapter two, the Ascension; and in chapter three, the celebration of Mass. Ultimately, early medieval artists and their patrons re-framed moments of Christ's absence in terms of ecclesiological presence, variously suggesting who and what can be representative of Christ once he is no longer on Earth. My images offer a set of propositional answers to such questions on the eve of the so-called Gregorian Reform Movement (ca. 1050-80), at which point they become codified.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to many people in both the US and Europe for their help with this project. At the University of Chicago, I found immense support from faculty and fellow graduate students in and beyond the Department of Art History. At workshops and in one-on-one meetings I received generous feedback from Matthew Vanderpoel, Alex Marraccini, Kenny Yu, Beth Woodward, Claire Jenson, Luke Fidler, Melissa Horn, Ben Diego, David Rehr, Jesse Lockard, Meekyung McMurdie, Kris Driggers, and especially Martin Schwarz. Martin's discerning eye, intellectual generosity, and friendship have been invaluable to me over the past eight years.

Beyond my committee, faculty in Chicago who have supported my project at various stages include Claudia Brittenham, Patrick Crowley, Christine Mehring, Daisy Delogu, Lucy Pick, and Ben Saltzman. Sessions at the Medieval Studies Workshop were always fruitful, and I thank the medievalist community at the University of Chicago for helping me become a more interdisciplinary scholar of the Middle Ages. A handful of other scholars beyond Chicago have helped shape my thinking on this project, notably Sarah Guérin, whose work on ivories I deeply admire and has shaped my own interest in this medium. Anne Harris and Donna Sadler have also been cheerleaders of mine throughout the dissertation; Donna was the first to draw me to the Middle Ages and art history, so I owe her tremendous thanks for opening up an entire world to me that I did not previously know. Her friendship and support are tireless, and I am so grateful for everything she has given me.

I have been fortunate to benefit from the support of several foundations and other funding sources that have supported three years of fieldwork in Europe. I thank the Kress Foundation for

a two-year grant at the *Institut national d'histoire de l'art*, the Social Sciences Research Council for a year-long Mellon International Dissertation Research Fellowship in France and Germany, and the Nicholson Center for British Studies for allowing me to spend ample time in UK libraries and museums. The Department of Art History at the University of Chicago has also been extremely generous in supporting my work: they have funded pre-dissertation trips to France and Italy, a follow-up trip to take photographs of sculptures in Belgium and Germany, and my final year of dissertation writing through the Chicago Objects Studies Initiative.

My scholarly home in Paris for the past few years would not have been the same without Isabelle Marchesin, who read chapters of my work, provided ample feedback, and generously invited me to share my work at the INHA on multiple occasions. At the Bibliothèque nationale, Charlotte de Noël allowed me to examine several Carolingian and Ottonian manuscripts and bindings, and I am grateful for our exchanges beyond the library, too, which always stimulated my thinking. At the Musée de Cluny, Isabelle Bardiès-Fronty has been my steadfast mentor, and at the Musée du Louvre, Florian Meunier graciously allowed me to examine multiple Carolingian and Ottonian ivory plaques, always pointing me to new avenues of research and bibliography I had not yet considered. The University of Chicago Center in Paris also proved to be a veritable home during my time abroad: Sébastien Greppo's never-ending jokes, generosity with office space, and bountiful supply of delicious wine were always appreciated. My friends in Paris also supported me throughout my research trials, particularly Diane Turquety, Marianne Liisberg, Linus Gratte, Olof Söderlind, Chiara Longo, Louis-Elisabeth Queyrel, Arthur Hénaff, and Sophie Ong. They were subjected to many conversations about Christ's absence and always offered a willing ear. In Paris I also met Nicole Pulichene, who has become an important interlocutor for this project and dear friend. I thank her for her feedback and incredible support,

even from afar, during the past few years of this project, and I look forward to working with her more on early medieval ivories in the near future.

Beyond France, several scholars and curators have been very supportive of me and this project, particularly by providing access to objects I needed to examine in-person and outside of their vitrines. Franziska Schnoor generously let me study the Hartker Antiphonary for several days at the Stiftsbibliothek in Sankt Gallen, Switzerland. Without Franz Kirchweger's (Kunsthistorisches Museum) support, I would not have become aware of the many carved facets of the museum's Ascension ivory that are typically occluded from view. My time with Thorsten Allscher at the Bayerisches Staatsbibliothek was also a treat; driving a three-dimensional microscope over the cover of the Sacramentary of Henry II was a definite highlight of the past year! In the UK, Lloyd de Beer at the British Museum, Michaela Zöschg at the Victoria & Albert Museum, and Vicky Avery at the Fitzwilliam Museum were also kind to give me access to ivory plaques and fictile ivories in their collections, which have proven to be important for my work.

I am very lucky to have had the support of such an astute and generous committee. I thank Willemien Otten for helping me understand the importance of ecclesiology to my project and for reading multiple drafts of my work. My project would not be as rich were it not for her input. Conversations with Wu Hung have helped shape my larger understanding of absence as both a subject and strategy in art history writ large. Although Herbert Kessler joined my committee at a later stage, he has been an avid reader of my drafts, providing both incisive comments and bibliographical references I would not have otherwise known. So much of my project directly engages his work, and thus I am indebted to him for not only his ample feedback but also for writing the scholarship that ultimately inspired the dissertation topic. And of course, I owe so much to Aden Kumler, my advisor and committee chair. I can still recall my very first

conversations about art and absence with her; she shaped this project in the best of ways, and I am so grateful for her never-ending encouragement, critical eye, and how much sheer time she has put into reading and reflecting on my work. She has made me a more rigorous scholar, enriched my relationship to medieval art history, and radically changed the way I approach our visually saturated world; words truly cannot express how lucky I feel to be her student.

I also thank my close friends outside of academia, particularly Julia Charles, Josh Feldstein, Hannah Kim, Chris Mason, Maja Tokíc, and Kelso Wyeth; their enthusiasm for my project and many conversations in museums have been edifying and kept me sane throughout this entire process. Pauline Blaise has also been tirelessly supportive of my travel, work schedule, and dissertation-related anxieties over the past three years; I thank her for her love, patience, and for constantly cheering me on. Finally, I am hugely grateful to my sister, Emily, as well as my parents, Ann and Stephen, for unconditionally supporting my educational interests and curiosities for over thirty years, particularly in the arts. I dedicate this dissertation to them.

INTRODUCTION

Christ's absence from earth was a focal point for medieval Christians: according to the Gospel accounts of Christ's life, Christ's incarnation on earth culminated and ended in his bodily Ascension. After Christ's Resurrection, he appeared repeatedly in a glorified embodied form to his followers. This period of miraculous corporeal presence came to an end with his ascension to heaven. Following Christ's bodily departure, Christians believed that Christ would remain bodily in heaven until he returned to judge the living and the dead at the end of time. A central point of access to Christ's presence on earth for most devotees came in the form of his "real presence" in the Christian ritual meal of the Eucharist. For medieval Christians (as for many today), Christ's absence from earth and presence in heaven was a central but challenging tenet that could not be confirmed by sense experience.

Around the year 1000, artists began to respond to the aesthetic and theological challenge of representing Christ's absence in new ways. At this time, I argue, artists experimented with new iconographic and formal strategies to not only figure Christ's visual absence but also to *qualify* it, not least by visually asserting that the institutional and mystical body of the Church became a christological proxy for Christ on earth. I examine this development—at once art historical and religious—in a series of objects produced for use in Christian liturgy or ritual, precisely the context in which new claims for the exclusive sacredly mediatory role of male, clerical elites were being promoted.

The dissertation begins with a close study of a tenth-century image from a liturgical manuscript known as the Hartker Antiphonary (Sankt Gallen Stiftsbibliothek Cod. Sang. 391): three holy women and an angel crowd around Christ's tomb. He has resurrected, and only his

burial cloths remain. In the contemporary liturgical reenactment of this Easter drama, an angel tells the women *non est hic*, meaning 'He is not here.' The phrase is ambiguous but crucial: it asserts that Christ indeed lives (in the present tense), but he is not here (*hic)*. How might an artist figure the *non est hic* of Christ's Resurrection and still make known his bodily existence elsewhere? The holy women's visit to Christ's tomb is one of several narrative moments from the life of Christ in which his incarnate (human) body cannot, according to Christian scripture, be seen.

Chapter one accordingly focuses on images of Christ's grave cloths in his otherwise empty tomb. Prior to the tenth century, artists frequently figured Christ's tomb as empty, but tenth- and eleventh-century artists depict Christ's grave cloths in the tomb with utmost attention to their folds. Some cloths stand upright, as if clothing an invisible body, while others are neatly folded in a circular bundle, at times appearing to spin. The peculiar forms of these cloths call attention to and qualify Christ's absence: he is not absent *tout court*, but elsewhere, alive, and still incarnate. I study these objects in relation to liturgical rites and their early medieval commentaries that detail how cloths were used during the celebration of Mass, specifically how they were folded to veil the chalice and paten during the Eucharistic rite. I am convinced that cloths in these images perform a dual representation, both figuring the cloth in the tomb and cloths used in contemporary ritual.

In chapter two, I study images of the Ascension, when Christ's body ascends to heaven. Around the year 1000, images of Christ's Ascension begin to change dramatically: in some instances, only his feet are depicted (as his upper body has already exited the visual frame), and in others, on which I focus in this chapter, Christ's back faces the viewer. The scholarly

consensus is that artists of these images dispose Christ's body in this way to suggest that his divine parts—associated with his face—cannot be seen at this moment; only his human nature can be apprehended by both the viewer and apostles figured below. My firsthand examination of these ivories has revealed, however, that Christ's face is indeed often carved. These oblique facets suggest that Christ's divine parts can be seen, in fact, but only by a privileged clerical viewer who can manipulate the object or his own body to see the holy face. This compositional play suggests something about the nature of the hypostatic union: while both Christ's divine and human parts can be apprehended, they cannot be seen simultaneously. I study this innovative figural disposition in relation to other dorsal figures of the period as well as liturgical commentaries that liken the priest's eastward turn during the Eucharistic rite to his participation in Christ's Ascension. In my interpretation of these ivory plaques of the Ascension, I argue that they elide the figure of Christ with the living medieval priest.

While I study Christ's absence as a narrative event in chapters one and two, in chapter 3, I am interested in Christ's absence as an ontological state. Following the Ascension, Christ's divine and human body is absent on Earth, present in heaven, and it remains so until his eventual return as recounted in the Book of Revelation. In the third and final chapter, I focus on this period of intermediary time, marked by what Herbert Kessler has called Christ's "real absence," and consider how this absence is mediated in image and rite through clerical bodies and actions.[1] I have discovered that images made in the early eleventh century display an increasing interest in who can be a figure of Christ on Earth, with special attention to members of the clergy. Through

[1] H. Kessler, "Real Absence: Early Medieval Art and the Metamorphosis of Vision," *Spiritual Seeing: Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art* (2000), pp. 104-148.

an array of innovative albeit short-lived iconographies, artists ca. 950-1050 explore how to articulate the bishop's Christ-like status, in particular, frequently in relation to the past, present, and future Christ, other members of the clergy, and the Church. I show how these images variously frame sacred clerical orders as figures of Christ on Earth and engage contemporary debates on the eve of the so-called Gregorian Reform (ca. 1050-80) about who and what gets to be representative of Christ upon his absence.

Figuring Absence and the Invisible: A Historiographical Overview

Absence

The proposal of this dissertation, that there are marked efforts to suggest Christ's absence in medieval art of the tenth and eleventh centuries, inevitably calls to mind Hans Belting's contrasting insistence on presence in *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image Before the Era of Art* (1990/1993).[2] Belting charts the history of the image, namely from its role as cult image in pre-modernity to a veritable work of 'art' in the Renaissance and after. The focus of his argument is on popular reception and not theological doctrine. While there is much to be gained in privileging the many uses and roles of the sacral image, his avoidance of theology altogether leaves us with an incomplete account of the place of presence and its crucial counterpart, absence, in both the making and receiving of Christian images in the medieval period.

Belting's emphasis on presence has had a profound influence upon our understanding of 'cult' images, not least by encouraging scholars to tease out how, through a reception-oriented

[2] H. Belting, *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image Before the Era of Art* (1993). Originally published as *Bild und Kult: Eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst* (1990).

history, art makes *present* the divine. Although narrative images do not have an important place in Belting's account, I would contend that it is precisely in early medieval narrative images that the stakes of Christ's corporeal presence and/or absence were made most clear.

The most significant work on visual absence by medieval art historians in recent years can be found in only a handful of articles that explicitly engage the topic. The first is Herbert Kessler's chapter, "Real Absence: Early Medieval Art and the Metamorphosis of Vision," published in his book *Spiritual Seeing: Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art* (2000), which considers the condition of Christ's absence (following the Ascension) in relation to art making.[3] Daniel Russo's article perhaps most explicitly engages the subject of my dissertation, albeit with an entirely different thesis and set of images. In his article, "Présence de l'absence: Les conceptions monastiques de l'art, IXe-XIe siècles" (2013), he identifies a repeated visual emphasis on the "présence d'un manque" in art of this period.[4] Russo studies an array of inscriptions (which Kessler has studied at length as well) that are frequently paired with images of the *Maiestas domini* and the Crucifixion and that distinguish between the visible image and invisible God. He sees these images presenting—through their very frame—the space of the Church on earth.

Russo's emphasis on the visual void—or the presence of absence—has also been the subject of several studies in medieval art history, most notably those by Elina Gertsman and Didier Méhu. Gertsman's recent article, "Phantoms of Emptiness: The Space of the Imaginary in

[3] H. Kessler, "Real Absence: Early Medieval Art and the Metamorphosis of Vision," *Spiritual Seeing: Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art* (2000), pp. 104-148.

[4] See D. Russo, "Présence de l'absence: Les conceptions monastiques de l'art, IXe-XIe siècles," *Cluny: les moines et la société au premier âge féodal* (eds. D. Iogna-Prat, M. Lauwers, F. Mazel, I. Rosé, 2013), pp. 169-184, especially p. 175.

Late Medieval Art" (2018) focuses primarily, as its title indicates, on art of the later Middle Ages, but she does consider a few objects with visual voids—like the white marble slab at the center of a portable altar piece—that date from the earlier medieval period, i.e. eleventh and twelfth centuries.[5] Closely related is Didier Méhu's work on the "emptying" or "l'évidemment" of the image, the topic of an article published in 2013 in which he focuses on the tenth-century altar from Saint Jean de Mallas and studies it alongside other objects with framed empty spaces.[6] While absence is a representational strategy in those images studied by Gertsman and Méhu, in most of the images I study in this dissertation, absence is instead the subject, but represented through figuration, or the depiction of present materials, bodies, and rites.

Christ's absence in relation to the Holy Sepulchre, both figured and built, has garnered the attention of some European scholars in recent years, notably Barbara Dieterich, Britta Dümpelmann, Elisabeth Ruchaud, and Xenia Stolzenburg.[7] Ruchaud, Dieterich, and Stolzenburg are all primarily interested in questions of absence in relation to architectural 'copies' of the Holy Sepulchre, whereas Dümpelmann engages questions of absence in her diachronic study of

---

[5] E. Gertsman, "Phantoms of Emptiness: The Space of the Imaginary in Late Medieval Art," *Art History* 41:5 (Nov. 2018), pp. 800-837. Elina Gertsman is also currently working on a book-length project about absence in late medieval art, which I am eager to read.

[6] D. Méhu, "L'évidement de l'image ou la figuration de l'invisible corps du Christ (IX^{e}–XI^{e} siècle)," *Images Re-vues* 11 (2013) online publication. Last visited January 2019. http://journals.openedition.org/imagesrevues/3384

[7] See B. Dieterich, "Das Konstanzer Heilige Grab: Inszenierte Absenz," *Medialität des Heils im Späten Mittelalter* (ed. C. Dauven-van Knippenberg, C. Herberichs, and C. Kiening, 2009), pp. 165-188. In the same volume, see B. Dümpelmann, "Non est hic, surrexit: Das Grablinnen als Medium inszenierter Abwesenheit in Osterfeier und –bild," pp. 131-164; E. Ruchaud, *Les représentations du Saint-Sépulcre* (2017); X. Stolzenburg, "Präsenz und Absenz des Heiligen Grabes und die Osterliturgie in Italien," *Architektur und Liturgie* (ed. W. Jacobsen, forthcoming) and also her article, "Non est hic. Heilige Gräber als Erinnerungsorte an die Auferstehung," *Das Münster* 60:3 (2007), pp. 171-175.

Christ's grave cloths in the tomb. I engage these scholars' work, particularly Dümpelmann's, at greater length in chapter one.

Byzantine art historians, notably Charles Barber and Bissera Pentcheva, have been interested in the relation between absence, presence and the icon.[8] Pentcheva has defined the post-Iconoclastic period icon as "the imprint of absence on matter," or an admixture of absence (appearance) and presence (essence).[9] Similarly, Amy Knight Powell theorizes Christ's absence in her study of early modern images of Christ's deposition from the cross. [10] She convincingly argues that Deposition images and the ritual removal of a sculpted body of Christ from the cross on Good Friday anticipated the permanent removal and even destruction of images of Christ's body by Reformation-era Iconoclasts.

How artists represent absence has been an important topic in areas outside of early medieval European art history in recent years. In the field of ancient and modern Chinese art history, absence has been central to the work of Wu Hung. Wu has written on absence in relation to ruins and cultural memory, and in a series of lectures given in 2012 at Cambridge University, he argued that absence can be both the subject and a representational strategy in Chinese art; this thinking has proved hugely helpful for my own work.[11] Moreover, his former

---

[8] C. Barber, *Figure and Likeness: On the Limits of Representation in Byzantine Iconoclasm* (2002) and B. Pentcheva, *The Sensual Icon: Space, Ritual, and the Senses in Byzantium* (2010). See also Pentcheva, "The Performative Icon," *The Art Bulletin* 88/4 (2006), pp. 631-55.

[9] Pentcheva, "The Performative Icon," p. 634.

[10] A. Powell, *Depositions: Scenes from the Late Medieval Church and the Modern Museum* (2012).

[11] Wu Hung's three-part lecture series, "Reading Absence in Chinese Art and Material Culture," was delivered in May 2012 at the Univesrity of Cambridge and can be found online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z4kzAsyuLtQ. The three lectures are entitled "Pillow and

PhD student, Sun-Ah Choi, completed a dissertation on sacred images of the absent Buddha, whose absence or elsewhere state is connoted through an array of formal strategies, including the depiction of footprints.[12]

The Invisible

While absence may be the subject of few studies in medieval art history, the question of how images figure the *invisibility* of a deity has been a significant focus among medieval art historians. These medievalists' incisive studies of how art figured what cannot (in theological terms) be depicted have been extremely helpful to my own thinking. To name but a few, Anne-Marie Bouché, Celia Chazelle, Robert Deshman, Jeffrey Hamburger, Aden Kumler, Karl Morrison, Jean-Claude Schmitt, and Herbert Kessler have authored works that consider how medieval images mediate an invisible God.[13] Kessler's well-known collection of essays, *Spiritual Seeing: Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art* (2000), has been vital to

---

Mirror: Absence as Subjectivity," "Representing Vacancy: Absence as Memory," and "Demolition Projects: Absence as Contemporaneity." Last visited January 2019.

[12] Wu Hung, *A Story of Ruins: Presence and Absence in Chinese Art and Visual Culture* (2012). See also Sun-ah Choi, *Sacred Images in Medieval Chinese Buddhism* (University of Chicago dissertation, 2012).

[13] See J. Hamburger and A-M Bouché (eds), *The Mind's Eye: Art and Theological Argument in the Middle Ages* (2005); K. Morrison (co-ed. With G. de Nie and M. Mostert), *Seeing the Invisible in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (2005); C. Chazelle, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era: Theology and Art of Christ's Passion* (2001), R. Deshman, *Eye and Mind: Collected Essays in Anglo-Saxon and Early Medieval Art* (ed. A Cohen) (2010); A. Kumler, *Translating Truth: Ambitious Images and Religious Knowledge in Late Medieval France and England* (2011); J-C Schmitt, *Le Corps des images: Essais sur la culture visuelle au Moyen Age* (2002); H. Kessler, *Spiritual Seeing: Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art* (2000).

understandings of how early medieval images depict the invisible by means of the visible.[14] Central to his thesis are the limits of the image, too: the early medieval image may succeed at suggesting, but never can make fully known the God to which it alludes.[15] In a similar vein, Kessler has also published extensively on how the hypostasis, or union of Christ's divine and human characters, is figured in early medieval art. He considers how images facilitate a *transitus* from corporeal to intellectual vision (using Augustine's terms).

Kessler's scholarship has been hugely influential to my dissertation, as I directly engage his line of thinking about the limits of the art object as well as how it propels dynamic, upward seeing. I argue—in the context of those tenth- and eleventh-century images on which I focus in this study—that rather than propel the viewer's sight upward and beyond the material image, my objects suggest first and foremost that figures of Christ can be found here and now in the bodies and rites of the Church. Absence is an important devotional tool, and the innovative, often short-lived iconographies created by early medieval artists suggest that Christ's absence requires close visual inspection.

Moreover, while images from the Carolingian period were made in a context in which the *Opus caroli regis contra synodum* was penned—which expresses supposed anxieties over images of divine subjects—I do not believe that such anxieties motivated the tenth- and eleventh-

[14] See Kessler, *Spiritual Seeing*.

[15] Kessler articulates this point in several publications, including in *Spiritual Seeing* as well as in his article, "'Hoc Visibile Imaginatum Figurat Illud Invisibile Verum': Imagining God in Pictures of Christ," *Seeing the Invisible in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (2005), pp. 291-325.

century artistic investment in Christ's absence.[16] Instead, I argue that early medieval artists experimented with figuring Christ's absence, both as a narrative event and an ontological state, in terms of ecclesiological presence. All the while, their artists continually underscore that Christ's absence is the condition for which the bodies of the church can become present and efficacious, i.e., mediate the absent Christ. Thus a *transitus*, or transition from the material to spiritual world, still occurs, but the viewer must pass first through the present images of the church and not, as one might initially expect, Christ's absence.[17] By requiring the viewer to attend to formal details and hidden carvings, for instance, these objects by their very nature demonstrate the importance of one's senses in apprehending signs of Christ rather than immediately suggesting the limits of human sensory perception altogether.

[16] On this topic, see A. Freeman (ed.) with P. Meyvaert, *Opus Caroli regis contra synodum (Libri Carolini),* Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Concilia, 2, suppl. 1 (1998) and T. Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians* (2009).

[17] For Kessler, the concept of "transitus" is central to understanding how an image mediates the divine. See, for instance, his article "Images of Christ and Communication with God," *Settimane di studio della Fondazione Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo* (v. 52, pt. 2, 2004), pp. 1099-1136.

CHAPTER 1

MEANINGFUL FOLDS: REPRESENTING AND QUALIFIYING CHRIST'S ABSENCE AT THE *VISITATIO SEPULCHRI*

Introduction

On page 33 of the Hartker Antiphonary (Sankt Gallen Stiftsbibliothek Cod. Sang. 391), a liturgical manuscript made ca.1000 in the Benedictine monastery of St Gall in present-day Switzerland, three women and an angel gather around the opening of Christ's tomb (fig. 1.1). Two soldiers appear to sleep on either side of the cupola, above, oblivious to the miraculous encounter below. At the center of the image, underneath the rounded arch of the tomb, is its focal point: two cloths atop a purple rectangular ground. The upper cloth stands erect, concave, as if still clothing an invisible body. The lower cloth, however, expressly denies a bodily form. Instead, with its slightly curving intersecting lines, it seems to spin, as if propelled into motion by some invisible, miraculous force. The presence of these cloths plainly calls attention to what the women were expecting to find in the tomb, or the body of Christ who has just resurrected. But these cloths do more than simply emphasize Christ's absence: their forms demand close inspection and seem to suggest something about the whereabouts and character of that divine and human body at this particular moment. In this chapter, I study this and other iconographically similar images made ca. 950-1050 to understand the meaning of these cloths' forms and how—through a simple material—these artists devised a powerful artistic strategy to figure the absent Christ in all its theological and liturgical complexity.

***

The synoptic Gospels recount that following the Crucifixion and burial of Christ, the holy women visit Christ's tomb to anoint his corpse with ointments and perfumes.[18] But having already resurrected, Christ's body is no longer in the tomb. Angel(s) greet the women instead and tell them that Christ is not here, but has risen as he said he would: *non est hic surrexit enim sicut dixit* (Matthew 28:6). The theological implications of this moment, as understood by medieval Christians, were major: the Resurrection revealed Christ's divinity and marked the first moment at which Christ was corporeally absent. To represent this encounter posed several challenges to medieval artists, namely: how to make clear that Christ has resurrected *without* depicting his body?

From the fourth century onward, artists introduced, copied, and manipulated several iconographic models to represent the discovery or event of Christ's Resurrection across media throughout Western Europe. Three broad trends emerged: the depiction of the women and angel at Christ's empty tomb (fourth through ninth century), the women and angel at his cloth-filled tomb (tenth and early eleventh century), and Christ climbing out of his tomb as he triumphs over death (late eleventh century onward).[19]

---

[18] All Gospel texts to which I refer are from the Latin Vulgate Bible, and all translations in English are from the Douay-Rheims edition. John's Gospel deviates slightly from the other three gospels' accounts of the Resurrection: in John 20, Mary Magdalene visits Christ's tomb and also sees him, initially mistaking him for a gardener. For a structural analysis of these texts, see L. Marin "Les femmes au tombeau," *Langages* 6:22, pp. 39-50 (Paris, 1971).

[19] See especially N. Brooks, *The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy: With Special Reference to the Liturgical Drama* (Urbana, 1921), in which he reproduces both the *Visitatio sepulchri* from the Hartker Antiphonary and the formally similar ivory possibly also made in Saint Gall (and now at the Victoria and Albert Museum, n. 380-1871) on p. 27; L. Réau, *Iconographie de*

Likely once covering a liturgical book, an ivory plaque made in northwestern France ca. 870 features the *Visitatio sepulchri*, or the visit to Christ's tomb, in its lower half (fig. 1.2). The scene fits snugly below a scene of the Crucifixion and praying figures within domed sepulchers who, hands clasped in prayer, mourn his death.[20] The angel sits to the right of the turreted sepulchre and gestures towards the open doorway, revealing a partial view of the empty tomb. This iconographic motif puts an emphasis on the place, or *locus* of Resurrection, as stressed by

---

l'art chrétien, Nouveau Testament (vol. II) (Paris, 1957) and "La Visite des Saintes Femmes au Tombeau dans le plus ancien Art Chrétien," *Mémoires de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France,* neuvième série, tome III (1954), pp. 109-122; J. Myslivec and G. Jászai, "Frauen am Grab," *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie*, Bd. 2 (1979), pp. 54-62; H. Schrade, "Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst. Die Sinngehalte und Darstellungsformen," Bd. I: *Die Auferstehung Christi* (1932); F. Rademacher, "Die frühesten Darstellungen der Auferstehung Christi," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 28 (1965), pp. 195-224; G. Schiller, *Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst*, 5 vol. (1971), see Vol 3: *Die Auferstehung und Erhöhung Christi*, p. 18; B. Dümpelmann, "*Non est hic, surrexit*: das Grablinnen als Medium inszenierter Abwesenheit in Osterfeier und –bild" in *Medialität des Heils Im Späten Mittelalter* eds. C. Dauven-Van Knippenberg, C. Herberichs, C. Kiening (2009), pp. 131-164. For a more focused study of images of Christ's tomb between the ninth and twelfth centuries, see E. Ruchaud, *Les représentations du Saint-Sépulcre: Dans les images, les architectures, les rites et les textes (fin du IXe - début du XIIe siècle)*. Dissertation completed at the *Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales* under the supervision of J.-C. Schmitt (Paris, 2011).

[20] For more on this particular image, see R. Melzak, "The Carolingian Ivory Carvings of the Later Metz Group." PhD diss., Columbia University, 1983. no. 20, pp. 95, 96, 181, 187, 190, 194, 199, fig. 20; U. Surmann, *Studien zur ottonischen Elfenbeinplastik in Metz und Trier: Nordenfalks Sakramentar- und Evangeliargruppe*. (Bonn,1990), p. 241, fig. 116; and D. Gaborit-Chopin, *Ivoires Médiévaux, Ve-XVe siècle*. Paris: Musée du Louvre, 2003. no. 38, pp. 146-47. Carol Heitz has written the most on Carolingian *Visitatio sepulchri* images and argues that these scenes frequently depict the Easter liturgy as it was performed in the church's *westwerk*. See especially C. Heitz, *L'architecture religieuse carolingienne: Les formes et leurs fonctions* (1980); C. Heitz, *Recherches sur les rapports entre architecture et liturgie à l'époque carolingienne* (1963). Much has also been written on how Christ's tomb is depicted in early medieval art and architecture and how it frequently alludes to the Holy Sepulchre Church in Jerusalem. For an overview of the representation of his sepulchre, see Ruchaud, *Les Représentations du Saint-Sépulcre*, especially chapter three.

the angel in Matthew 28:6 (*non est hic surrexit enim sicut dixit venite videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus*) and Mark 16:6 *(…non est hic ecce locus ubi posuerunt eum*).[21]

The initial 'D' of *'Deus qui hodierna die per unigenitum tuum'* in the Drogo Sacramentary introduces a variation of this early iconography (fig. 1.3). At the center of the word 'Deus' and a field of golden vines, this *Visitatio sepulchri* places the turquoise-clad angel at the very entrance to the tomb and so obscures our view of its interior. With his back foot behind the tomb slab, the angel stands in profile, faces the three women, and makes a sign of blessing or speech with his right hand. In this configuration, the emptiness of Christ's tomb can no longer be discerned; rather, the women's encounter with the angel—here a figure of Christ with his cross-tipped staff—is the subject of the scene.[22]

Beginning in the tenth century, the visual focus shifts to the interior of the domed Holy Sepulchre church. Unlike its Carolingian predecessors, most images made during the tenth through early eleventh centuries in Western Europe do not depict an *empty* tomb.[23] Rather,

---

[21] Rather than 'locus,' the phonetically similar word 'locutus' appears in Luke 24:6: "non est hic sed surrexit recordamini qualiter locutus est vobis cum adhuc in Galilaea esset."

[22] The angel's body could here also be a stand-in for Christ, particularly given that the angel holds a scepter with a cross. See E. Parker's discussion of the image of Christ at his empty tomb with the holy women (also in relation to the Easter liturgy) in *The Cloisters Cross: Its Art and Meaning* (1994). The placement of the *Visitatio sepulchri* within the word for God is hardly insignificant, and the vines that surround the otherwise unarticulated space within the letter 'D' speak to the presence of the divine, albeit rendered abstractly.

[23] There was likely a Byzantine stylistic precedent for the strangely configured grave cloths in Christ's tomb. R. Deshman explores this possibility in his study of the Benedictional of Saint Aethelwold (London BL MS Add. 49598), which includes an image of Christ's grave cloth in the tomb on folio 51v. See R. Deshman, *The Benedictional of Aethelwold* (1995), especially pp 57-58. For a study of Byzantine images of Christ's tomb, see P. Konis, *From the Resurrection to the Ascension: Christ's Post-Resurrection Appearances in Byzantine Art (3rd-12th c.),* PhD dissertation, University of Birmingham (2008).

Christ's tomb contains cloth, or the shroud(s) in which Christ's body was buried. These grave cloths were depicted in a variety of ways in this 'new' iconography, characterized by one, but more often two white cloths, whose forms are striking: they can be knotted, folded, hollowed out, and even spin, as if the miracle of the Resurrection has propelled them into motion. A notable example of this iconographic type is a pen drawing on page 33 of the summer volume of the Hartker Antiphonary (Cod. Sang. 391), a liturgical manuscript made ca.1000 in Saint Gall (Switzerland) that contains neumed antiphons, among them the Easter 'quem quaeritis' trope to be sung during Mass (fig. 1.1).[24]

The Hartker image, with which this chapter began, conflates primarily two aspects of the synoptic Gospels' Resurrection narratives like all of its iconographic counterparts: the meeting of the women and angel(s) (or men in bright clothing) at Christ's tomb, and the grave cloths which Peter and another unnamed disciple see upon entering Christ's tomb. The Gospels of Luke and

[24] Much has been written on the liturgical significance of this manuscript, but very few art historians have discussed its images. For the most comprehensive and succinct overview of the manuscript and its images, see A. von Euw, *Die St. Galler Buchkunst vom 8. bis zum Ende 11. Jahrhunderts* (2008), vol I and II. In particular, see catalog entry number 143, vol. I, pp. 499-502. Euw also includes a brief bibliography on the manuscript. His cataloging of MSS 390 and 391 is the most definitive to date (which I will summarize in footnotes that follow) and reproduced, like the whole manuscript, on the e-codices website, "Virtual Manuscript Library of Switzerland," Last visited February 2016. See also Dümpelmann (2009) for the most recent discussion of the *Visitatio sepulchri* image and T. Bruggisser-Lanker, "Der Mythos Gregor und die Grundlegung der musica sacra im heiligen Buch," *Das Mittelalter* 18:1 (2013), pp. 87-105 for a study of its pen-drawing of Gregory composing the antiphonary. For a brief (liturgical) introduction to the manuscript, see "L'antiphonaire de Hartker" in *Corpus antiphonarium officii* vol. II (1963-79), especially pp. vi-ix. On the manuscript's supposed author, Hartker, and its relation to another monk at Saint Gall, Notker III, see A. Traub, "Notker III und Hartker in St. Gallen," *Beiträge zur Gregorianik* 18 (1994), pp. 5-13; as well as K. Pouderoijen and I. de Loos, "Wer ist Hartker? Die Entstehung des Hartkerischen Antiphonars," *Beiträge zur Gregorianik* 47 (2009), pp. 67-96. In the footnotes that follow, I will include more complete bibliography on the Hartker Antiphonary and particularly its neumed antiphons, which have been the subject of several more studies than its images.

John alone recount this discovery. In Luke 24:1-11, two men in bright clothing greet Mary Magdalene, Iohanna, and Maria Iacobi at Christ's tomb and explain to them that he has resurrected. The women then tell the apostles what has just transpired:

> (9) And going back from the sepulchre, they told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest.
> (10) And it was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary of James, and the other women that were with them, who told these things to the apostles.
> (11) And these words seemed to them as idle tales; and they did not believe them.
> (12) But Peter rising up, ran to the sepulchre, and stooping down, he saw the linen cloths laid by themselves (*linteamina sola posita*); and went away wondering in himself at that which was come to pass.[25]

Luke 24:12 does not specify the number of grave cloths Peter saw in the tomb; we only know that there was more than one given the plural *linteamina*, linen cloths, and that they were *sola posita*, set aside or put down alone. Seeing these grave cloths caused Peter to marvel, or *mirans*, at *quod factum fuerat,* suggesting that Peter understood these cloths as signs of Christ's Resurrection.

Another account of the grave cloths is given in chapter 20 of the gospel of John following Mary Magdalene's visit to Christ's tomb:

> (3) Peter therefore went out, and that other disciple, and they came to the sepulchre.
> (4) And they both ran together, and that other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre.
> (5) And when he stooped down, he saw the linen cloths lying (*posita linteamina*); but yet he went not in.

[25] "et regressae a monumento nuntiaverunt haec omnia illis undecim et ceteris omnibus erat autem Maria Magdalene et Iohanna et Maria Iacobi et ceterae quae cum eis erant quae dicebant ad apostolos haec et visa sunt ante illos sicut deliramentum verba ista et non crediderunt illis Petrus autem surgens cucurrit ad monumentum et procumbens videt **linteamina sola posita** et abiit secum mirans quod factum fuerat." Luke 24:9-12. The narrative then turns to the story of the pilgrims at Emmaus: "et ecce duo ex illis ibant ipsa die in castellum quod erat in spatio stadiorum sexaginta ab Hierusalem nomine Emmaus." Luke 24:13.

> (6) Then cometh Simon Peter, following him, and went into the sepulchre, and saw the linen cloths lying (*linteamina posita*),
> (7) And the napkin (*sudarium*) that had been about his head, not lying with the linen cloths, but apart, wrapped up (*involutum*) into one place.[26]

In this instance, another disciple arrives at the tomb before Peter and sees only the *linteamina*; he does not enter the tomb. Peter then enters the tomb and sees not only the *linteamina*, but the *sudarium*, or head cloth as well. The *sudarium* lies apart from the other cloths and is *involutum*, 'intricate' or 'wrapped in,' and the *linteamina* cloths are *posita*, i.e. placed or set.[27]

In both narratives, Peter visits Christ's tomb and discovers the grave cloths only *after* Mary Magdalene alone (John 20) or the three holy women (Luke 24) tell the apostles about their visit to Christ's tomb. Also similar is that Peter visits Christ's tomb in part because the women's account is mistaken (John 20) or incredulous (Luke 24). In John 20:2, Mary Magdalene mistakenly believed that Christ's body had been moved: *tulerunt Dominum de monumento et nescimus ubi posuerunt eum*. Similarly, in Luke 24:11, the apostles thought the women were lying: *et visa sunt ante illos sicut deliramentum verba ista et non credebant illis*. One could argue that at each narrative moment, the cloths act—at least textually—as visual reassurance of

---

[26] "exiit ergo Petrus et ille alius discipulus, et venerunt ad monumentum currebant autem duo simul et ille alius discipulus praecucurrit citius Petro et venit primus ad monumentum et cum se inclinasset videt posita linteamina non tamen introivit. Venit ergo Simon Petrus sequens eum et introivit in monumentum et videt **linteamina posita et sudarium quod fuerat super caput eius non cum linteaminibus positum sed separatim involutum in unum locum**." John 20:3-7 (emphasis mine). The text that immediately precedes this citation is: "una autem sabbati Maria Magdalene venit mane cum adhuc tenebrae essent ad monumentum et videt lapidem sublatum a monumento cucurrit ergo et venit ad Simonem Petrum et ad alium discipulum quem amabat Iesus et dicit illis: tulerunt Dominum de monumento et nescimus ubi posuerunt eum." John 20:1-2.

[27] Lewis and Short Latin Dictionary defines 'involvo' (whose past participle is involutum) as "to roll to or upon any thing…to roll about, wrap up, envelop, involve…to cover, overwhelm…to devote one's self to…to involve or entangle themselves." The same dictionary defines the adjective 'involutus, a, um' as "involved, intricate, obscure. "

the Resurrection, an antidote to the doubt expressed by the apostles and Mary Magdalene.[28] And while the mere presence of cloth in the tomb of the Hartker pen drawing offers similar visual reassurance, the strange forms of these textiles cannot be fully understood in relation to the Gospel texts.

The Hartker drawing is one of several images made around the turn of the millennium in which Christ's grave cloths are prominently depicted in his tomb. Although each cloth is idiosyncratic, a few broad trends emerge in their forms, including the frequent coupling of a large shroud whose form is often more open than its counterpart, a small, neatly folded or wound-up cloth in a circular bundle. In addition to the Hartker pen drawing, this pairing can be found in several other contemporary images, primarily in ivory carvings and manuscript illuminations; they include, among others, a Benedictional from Regensburg (Los Angeles J. Paul Getty Museum MS Ludwig VII 1, ca. 1030-40) (fig. 1.4), the Sacramentary of Henry II also made in Regensburg (Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 4456, ca. 1002-1014) (fig. 1.5), the Bamberg Apocalypse and Gospel Lectionary (Bamberg Staatsbibliothek Bamberg Msc. Bibl. 140, ca. 1010) (fig. 1.6), the Sacramentary of Sigebert of Minden (Berlin Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Ms Theol. lat. fol. 2, 1022) (fig. 1.7), and a tenth-century ivory now at the Budapest Iparmüvészeti Museum perhaps made in Saint Gall ca.1000 (accession number 18859) (fig. 1.8). This visual trend, however, is fairly short lived: beginning in the twelfth century, the grave cloths are frequently depicted as limp, often lifelessly hanging over the side of the tomb (fig. 1.9). I focus in chapter one on this brief iconographic trend, characterized by images of cloths that are intricately folded or appear to be in movement. By and large, this new way of depicting the

[28] See Réau (1957) for a more in-depth textual analysis of these passages.

Visitatio sepulchri appears in liturgical manuscript illuminations and ivory carvings made in the areas now known as northern France, southern England, Switzerland, and especially Germany between ca. 950-1050.

The primary scholarly interest in these images has been the architecture of the Holy Sepulchre and its relation to architectural developments and liturgical furnishings, like the Eucharistic pyx.[29] The strange forms of these cloths have otherwise not piqued art historical interest, with the exception of a recent article by Britta Dümpelmann, who tracks the evolution of these cloths' forms across the Middle Ages, arguing that they initially call attention to Christ's absence and later become veritable relics, as is evidenced by the increasing tendency for the holy women to pick up and grasp a single cloth.[30] Dümpelmann's study is excellent—and I fully agree with her iconographic reading of how these images change over a several hundred-year period—but my interest is not diachronic, as I focus exclusively on those images made between ca. 950-1050 in which Christ's grave cloths are strangely shaped. This particular set of

[29] On the relationship between the pyx and the Holy Sepulchre, see especially N. Teteriatnikov, "When Art Depicts Ritual: The Salerno Plaque with the Women at the Tomb," *The Salerno Ivories: Objects, Histories, Contexts* (2016), 167-178. Other scholars have more generally focused on the history of the form of the Holy Sepulchre in two and three dimensions, including C. Morris, *The Sepulchre of Christ and the Medieval West: From the Beginning to 1600* (2005); Brooks (1921); R. Krautheimer, "Introduction to an 'Iconography of Architecture," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* (1942), pp. 1-33. Several later studies consider Easter sepulchers made in the high and late medieval periods, including those by W.H. Forsyth and P. Sheingorn, but I will not go into them here given that they postdate my images significantly.

[30] B. Dümpelmann, "Non est hic, surrexit. Das Grablinnen als Medium inszenierter Abwesenheit in Osterfeier und -bild," *Medialität des Heils im späten Mittelalter,* ed. C. Dauven-van Knipperberg, C. Herberichs, C. Kiening (2009), pp. 131-164. See also Dümpelmann's more recent article, "Visual-Textile-Tactile: Touching the Untouchable in Easter Liturgy and Art," *Noli me tangere in Interdisciplinary Perspective. Textual, Iconographic, and Contemporary Interpretations* (ed. R. Bieringer, B. Baert, K. Demasure, 2016), pp. 233-252.

manuscript illuminations (and, to a lesser extent, ivory carvings) has yet to be satisfactorily explained.

Historians of the liturgy have more often studied these images in relation to specific developments in contemporary liturgical rites, namely the use of an actual cloth to signify Christ's shroud in a highly mimetic commemoration of his entombment and resurrection that developed around the turn of the millennium.[31] The English Monastic agreement known as the *Regularis Concordia* (henceforth known as *RC*) contains the first textual account of such a rite.[32] Its authors prescribed wrapping a cross, placing it in a curtained makeshift tomb (an act known as the *depositio*) on Good Friday, secretively removing the cross prior to the celebration of the Resurrection on Easter Sunday, and then, on Easter morning at terce, monks in the guise of the

[31] These scholars follow a trend set by earlier historians of earlier Carolingian images of the *Visitatio sepulchri*, such as Carol Heitz, who read these images first and foremost as depictions of contemporary liturgical rites. For readings of Christ's cloth-filled tomb in relation to the *Regularis Concordia* in particular, see K. Young, *The Origin of the Easter Play* (1914) and his two-volume *The Drama of the Medieval Church* (1933), O. Pächt, *The Rise of Pictorial Narrative in Twelfth-Century England* (1962), M. Kobialka, *This is My Body: Representational Practices in the Early Middle Ages* (1999).

[32] For the standard edition (and facing Latin-English translation) of the *Regularis Concordia* text, see. T. Symons (ed.), *The Monastic Agreement of the Monks and Nuns of the English Nation* (1953). There is an abundance of secondary literature on the *Regularis Concordia*; recent publications include Kobialka (1999); R. Pfaff, *The Liturgy of Medieval England: A History* (2009); M. Drout, *How Tradition Works: A Meme-Based Cultural Poetics of the Anglo-Saxon Tenth Century* (2006); N. Petersen, "The Representational Liturgy of the *Regularis Concordia*," *The White Mantle of Churches: Architecture, Liturgy, and Art Around the Millennium* (2003), pp. 107-117; N. Petersen, "The Role of the Altar in Medieval Liturgical Representation: Holy Week and Easter in the Regularis Concordia," *Image and Altar 800-1300* (2014), pp. 15-25. For an inventory of Easter plays and/or the sites (sepulchers) in which they took place during the medieval period, see Brooks (1921), Young (1933); H. de Boor, *Die Textegeschichte der lateinischen Osterfeiern* (1967); D. Dolan, *Le Drame Liturgique de Pâques en Normandie et en Angleterre au Moyen-Age* (1975); W. Lipphardt, *Lateinische Osterfeiern und Osterspiele*, 9 vol (1975-90); P. Sheingorn, *The Easter Sepulchre in England* (1987); S. Rankin, *The Music of Medieval Liturgical Drama in France and England*, 2 vol (1989). D. Bevington also includes a few Easter plays in his compilation of English dramas up to 1500 in *Medieval Drama* (1975).

holy women showed congregants the very cloth that once enshrouded the cross.[33] The *RC* is a fascinating text and has been the subject of several studies, most notably those by historians of theater who have debated whether this moment constitutes the birth of drama in the West.[34] Their work has strongly influenced art historical studies of images of the *Visitatio sepulchri*, primarily those that contain images of Christ's grave cloths. With such an exciting document

[33] Symons (1953), section 51, pp. 49-51. "…four of the brethren shall vest, one of whom, wearing an alb as though for some different purpose, shall enter and go stealthily to the place of the 'sepulchre' and sit there quietly, holding a palm in his hand. Then, while the third respond is being sung, the other three brethren, vested in copes and holding thuribles in their hands, shall enter in their turn and go to the place of the 'sepulchre,' step by step, as though searching for something. Now these things are done in imitation of the angel seated on the tomb and of the women coming with perfumes to anoint the body of Jesus. When, therefore, he that is seated shall see these three draw nigh, wandering about as it were and seeking something, he shall begin to sing softly and sweetly, *Quem quaeritis*. As soon as this has been sung right through, the three shall answer together, *Ihesum Nazarenum*. Then he that is seated shall say *Non est hic. Surrexit sicut praedixerat. Ite, nuntiate quia surrexit a mortuis.* At this command the three shall turn to the choir saying *Alleluia*. *Resurrexit Dominus*. When this has been sung he that is seated, as though calling them back, shall say the antiphon *Venite et videte locum*, and then, rising and lifting up the veil, he shall show them the place void of the Cross and with only the linen in which the Cross had been wrapped. Seeing this the three shall lay down their thuribles in that same 'sepulchre' and, taking the linen, shall hold it up before the clergy; and, as though showing that the Lord was risen and was no longer wrapped in it, they shall sing this antiphon: *Surrexit Dominus de sepulchro*. They shall then lay the linen on the altar."

[34] There is a wealth of literature on the history of the *Regularis Concordia* (RC) as well as a contentious debate among scholars over whether the RC and even early Quem Quaeritis tropes constitute 'drama.' For a primer on these questions, which I will not discuss at length here, see primarily O.B. Hardison, *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages: Essays in the Origin and Early History of Modern Drama* (1965); W. Smoldon, "The Origins of the Quem Quaeritis Trope and the Easter Sepulchre Music-Dramas, as Demonstrated by their Musical Settings," *The Medieval Drama*, ed. S. Sticca (1972) pp. 121-54; C. Flanigan, *Liturgical Drama and Dramatic Liturgy: A Study of the Quem Queritis Easter Dialogue and its Cultic Context*, PhD Dissertation, Washington University (1973); C. Flanigan, "Karl Young and the Drama of the Medieval Church: An Anniversary Appraisal," *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 27 (1984), pp. 156-66; C. Flanigan (completed by N. Petersen), "Medieval Liturgy and the Arts: *Visitatio Sepulchri* as Paradigm," *Liturgy and the Arts in the Middle Ages: Studies in Honor of C. Clifford Flanigan*, ed. E. L. Lillie and N.H. Petersen (1996), pp. 9-35; ed. J. Coldeway, *Medieval Drama* (2007).

like the *Regularis Concordia* in hand, these images have often been taken as visual evidence for the existence of rites like those described in the *Regularis Concordia* in places other than tenth-century England.[35]

Late tenth-century Saint Gall is one such site. There is no extant evidence of a *Visitatio sepulchri* rite involving cloth in Saint Gall at the time of the Hartker Antiphonary's making, despite the fact that this manuscript's maker, likely the reclusive monk, Hartker[36], held a keen interest in liturgical developments (as evidenced by the inclusion of the neumed *Quem Quaeritis* trope, a recent liturgical innovation that transforms the interaction between the women and angels at Christ's tomb into a dialogue).[37] Moreover, the highly mimetic *Visitatio sepulchri* rite

---

[35] Of course, a deposition and elevation ritual may have taken place at St Gall in the tenth century even though there is no textual evidence of such a rite. Karl Young has detailed, however, that in the eleventh century at Saint Gall, there is evidence of a deposition-elevation ritual that involves a Eucharist, not cross. See Young (1933).

[36] For more on Hartker, see E. Omlin, "Hartker von St. Gallen," *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte* (1931), pp. 226-233; Pouderoijen and I. de Loos, "Wer ist Hartker? Die Entstehung des Hartkerischen Antiphonars," *Beiträge zur Gregorianik* 47 (2009), pp. 67-96; F. K. Prassl, "Muss Hartker Vergleiche fürchten? Zur Notation einer Sammelhandschrift des 10. Jahrhunderts aus St. Alban, Mainz, heute Wien, ÖNB codex latinus 1888," *Beiträge zur Gregorianik*, Band 59/60 (2015), pp. 203-219. Hartker notably spent the final years of his life in isolation and likely died ca. 1011 or 1017. Ekkehard IV also writes about Hartker in his *Casus Sancti Galli*. See B. Köln (ed.), *Die Geschichten des Klosters St. Gallen* (1958).

[37] On the origins of the *Quem Quaeritis* trope at Saint Gall (or elsewhere, although the consensus is that the oldest originates from Saint Gall), see K. Young, "The Origin of the Easter Play," *PMLA* 29:1 (1914), pp. 1-58; T. McGee, "The Role of the 'Quem Quaeritis' Dialogue in the History of Western Drama," *Renaissance Drama, New Series, Vol. 7, Drama and the Other Arts* (1976), pp. 177-191 and "The Liturgical Placements of the 'Quem Quaeritis' Dialogue," *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 29:1 (1976), pp. 1-29; D. Bjork, "On the Dissemination of 'Quem quaeritis' and the 'Visitatio sepulchri' and the Chronology of their Early Sources," *Comparative Drama* 14:1 (1980), pp. 46-49; G. Iversen, "Aspects of the Transmission of the Quem Quaeritis," *Text. An Interdisciplinary Annual of Textual Studies*, Vol. 3 (1987), pp, 155-182; C. Brockett, "Ambiguities in the Designation of Antiphons for the Tenth-Century 'Quem Quaeritis': In Memory of Clifford Flanigan," *Musica Disciplina*, Vol. 51 (1997), pp. 103-26; N. Petersen, "Les textes polyvalents du Quem quaeritis à Winchester au Xe siècle," *Revue de*

recorded in the *Regularis Concordia* does not offer a satisfactory 'source' for the way Christ's grave cloths are depicted in the Hartker pen drawing as well as its contemporary iconographic counterparts, in which Christ's grave cloths almost always take on unprecedented forms. While the mere *presence* of these cloths may point to the use of cloth in contemporary Easter rites, which were newly developing during this period, the cloths' forms in the Hartker Antiphonary pen drawing suggest something else. I argue that the whirling, upright, or neatly folded bundles of cloth in images of the women's visit to Christ's tomb made during the tenth and eleventh centuries resonate much more strongly with liturgical texts and commentaries pertaining to the preparation and celebration of the Eucharistic rite itself, both during Holy Week but also throughout the liturgical year.

In this chapter, my focus will remain on the Hartker Antiphonary's pen drawing and a few iconographically similar images also made in the tenth and eleventh centuries throughout Western Europe. The Hartker Antiphonary is a well-known manuscript: it has been tightly localized, and its liturgical content has been the subject of several studies by historians of music and liturgy; its images, however, have not received the same degree of attention. I hope to provide a more comprehensive understanding of this manuscript by closely considering the reciprocal relationship between the liturgical rites in which it participated as well as its pen drawing of the *Visitatio sepulchri*, specifically.

---

musciologie 86.1 (2000), pp. 105-118. See also G. Björkvall, G. Iversen, R. Jonsson, *Corpus Troporum III: Tropes du proper de la Messe, Cycle de Pâques, Volume 2* (1982).

The Hartker Antiphonary

Among the most important medieval choral manuscripts in existence, the Hartker Antiphonary was made ca. 980-1000 CE at the monastery of St Gall.[38] Its text and drawings have been attributed to the monk Hartker (d. 1011), who lived at St Gall between 980-1011. Once a single volume, the manuscript was divided in the thirteenth century into both a winter and summer volume: Sankt Gallen Stiftsbibliothek MS 390 and 391, respectively. Liturgists have extensively studied the manuscript, as it is the first neumed antiphonary in existence and the second oldest extant antiphonary of the divine office (following the Antiphonal of Compiègne, Paris BnF Lat. 17436, made ca. 860-880).[39] The Hartker Antiphonary notably contains the first

[38] For a full (and the most recent) cataloging of the manuscript, see A. von Euw, *Die St. Galler Buchkunst vom 8. bis zum Ende des 11. Jahrhunderts* (2008), vol. 1, n. 143, pp. 499-502. The manuscript was made ca. 990-1000 and contains in total 264 pp originally bound in a single volume. Cod. Sang. 391 was originally bound with Cod. Sang. 390 (194 pp), however, and they were split into two manuscripts sometime in the 13th century, with Cod. Sang. 390 as the winter volume, and Cod. Sang. 391 the summer volume. In Cod. Sang. 391, each folio measures 220 x 165 mm. The collation (by von Euw) for Cod. Sang. 390 is as follows: "Lagen 1^6 (p. 1-6 unvollständig), (2^2, p. 7-10) (Bifolium 12./13. Jh.), 2^8 (p. 11-26), 3^8-5^8 (p. 27-74, am Ende der Lagen oben in der Mitte signiert ·III·-·V·), 6^8-7^8 (p. 75-106), 8^8-11^8 (p. 107-186, am Ende der Lagen oben in der Mitte signiert ·VIII·-·XII·), 12^{4-1} (p. 187-192, Falz von p. 193/194 noch zu sehen)." For Cod. Sang. 391, the collation is: "Lagen 1^4 (p. 1-8), 2^{8-1} (p. 9-22, Ergänzung 12./13. Jh.), 3^8-7^8 (p. 23-102), 8^{8+2} (p. 103-122, p. 109/110 u. 115/116 12./13. Jh.), 9^6 (p. 123-136) usw." Each page has seven lines of text in dark brown ink. Accompanying the neumes are tonal indications (indicated by a letter that corresponds to a psalmodic tone). He believes the manuscript was both written and illuminated by Hartker in a Carolingian minuscule of a single hand. For an online version of von Euw's catalog description, see http://e-codices.unifr.ch/en/description/csg/0390/. Last visited Feb. 2016. For an older cataloging of Cod. Sang 390 and 391, see G. Scherrer, *Verzeichnis der Handschriften der Stiftsbibliothek von St. Gallen* (1875), p.133, which is also available on the e-codices website. For a facsimile of the manuscript, see J. Froger (ed.), *Paléographie musicale*, II^e série (1900/1970).

[39] In addition to those texts cited above (on the origin of the *quem quaeritis* more generally) and catalogs by Scherrer and von Euw, see A. Schubiger, *Histoire de l'école de chant de Saint-Gall du VIII^e au XII^e siècle, documents fournis à l'histoire du plain-chant pendant le moyen-âge* (1866); R. Steiner, "Hartker's Antiphoner and the Oral Tradition of Chant at St. Gall,"

neumed *Quem Quaeritis*, a slight variant of the simplest extant form of the Easter trope wherein two choirs sing a dialogue between the angel(s) and holy women.[40] These few lines of song have been studied by several liturgical historians, who have argued over whether the first 'Quem Quaeritis,' which likely originated from early tenth-century Saint Gall, constituted the birth of Christian drama in the West.

The 'Quem Quaeritis' trope, which appears on page 37 of the codex, was likely intended to be sung between two choirs at the start of Mass, or the Introit:

> *Question:* Whom do you seek in the tomb, Christian women?
> *Response*: Jesus of Nazareth who was crucified, o heavenly ones.
> He is not here, he resurrected just as he had said he would. Go, announce that he has resurrected from the grave.[41]

Sangallensia in Washington. The Arts and Letters in Medieval and Baroque St. Gall, Viewed from the Late Twentieth Century, ed. J.C. King (1993); K. Prassl, "Rhetorische Notation als Vermittlung liturgischer Theologie in den Codices St. Gallen 390/391 und Einsiedeln 121," *Studia musicologica* 45 (2004), pp. 201-212. For very general overviews of early medieval liturgy at Saint Gall, see J.M. Clark, *The Abbey of St Gall as a Center of Literature and Art* (1926, 2013) and W. Vogler (ed.), *L'Abbaye de Saint-Gall: Rayonnement spirituel et culturel* (1991) (or, in English: The *Culture of the Abbey of Saint Gall: An Overview*, also 1991.)

[40] The earliest extant trope actually originates from the abbey of Saint Martial de Limoges, but because Cod. Sang. 484 contains the *simplest* extant trope, some scholars believe that the first trope originated from Saint Gall (in an earlier, now lost manuscript). Scholars are not entirely certain what led to the 'troping' of the introit; Clark has conjectured that it was a way to "add color, mystical fervor, to the restrained, matter-of-fact Roman rite" (see Clark, p. 206). Moreover, because the introit was sung while celebrants processed to the altar, a longer introit was particularly welcomed in large spaces. Flannigan has argued that the procession of the monks to the altar for Easter mass alluded to the women processing to Christ's tomb, and when the introit text (or "resurrexi," which comes from "resurrexi et adhuc tecum sum from Psalm 138) was sung, it marked the resurrection of Christ as well as the words he spoke upon his Ascension.

[41] "Int[errogatio]: Quem qu[a]eritis in sepulchro [Christicolae]…Resp[onsio]: Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum O c[a]elicolae. Non est hic surrexit sicut pr[a]edixerat/ite nuntiate quia surrexit de sepulchro." Translation is my own. I have tried to be as literal as possible and even have allowed for multiple readings of the word 'hic' given that it has no accent mark here, meaning that it could be híc (this) or hîc (here).

While these few lines may initially seem to be a far cry from the plays of the later medieval period, the *Quem Quaeritis* trope is remarkable in its transformation of canonical scripture through song. It creates an explicit dialogue that exists nowhere in this form within the Gospels, and it conflates the women's reply to the angel and what is typically *his* explanation of Christ's absence in the *Responsio*.[42] Although we have no way of knowing precisely how this dialogue was performed, scholars have proposed that it was sung between two choirs, as if to represent the two speaking parties. It appears that it was from Saint Gall that the simplest, and likely the first (albeit no longer extant) *Quem Quaeritis* trope originated.

The Hartker and other contemporary *Quem Quaeritis* tropes have been the subject of much scholarship as they mark a point of origin, of sorts, for other changes made to the Easter liturgy in the medieval period. Although seemingly simple and relatively brief, the trope does important work in re-presenting the encounter at Christ's tomb as if happening within the space of the church on Easter Sunday. In terms of content, the *Quem Quaeritis* trope in the Hartker Antiphonary privileges the dialogic aspect of this encounter but also insists—perhaps unlike its images—on its finality, too. No one questions Christ's absence, no proof is given of his Resurrection, and there is notably no mention of his grave cloths, not even in the sung excerpts of Gospel texts that precede or follow the trope.

The *Quem Quaeritis* was sung on Easter Sunday, also known as *Pascha* or *Dominica Resurrectionis*, which was (and arguably still is) the most important feast of the Christian year. It is the day on which Christ's resurrection from death is annually celebrated. While scholars have

typically connected the development of Easter 'dramas' like the *Quem Quaeritis* tropes or *Visitatio sepulchri* plays (as described in the *Regularis Concordia*) to tenth- and eleventh-century images of the holy women's visit to Christ's tomb, I argue that these images' variously depicted cloths resonate more strongly with the rite of the Eucharistic celebration itself, particularly as described (and heavily allegorized) by contemporary liturgists.

Cloth and the Eucharist

On Maundy Thursday during the celebration of Holy Week, following the *Benedictiones in cena domini*, the deacon places the chalice on the altar and the paten on its left side. He then covers them with a plain *sindon* after spreading out the *corporal*, as described in the Roman German Pontifical (henceforth RGP):

> Next he takes up the paten from the subdeacon and puts it next to the chalice on the left side [of the altar], and immediately he covers it with a plain sindon which had been prepared before by two deacons in front of the altar, from the region of the pontifex, after the corporal has been laid out.[43]

[43] C. Vogel and R. Elze, Le *Pontifical Romano-Germanique du dixième siècle* in 3 volumes (1963-72), section 267 (p. 71, vol. II): "Deinde acceptam a subdiacono patenam ponat iuxta calicem de latere sinistro, et statim a duobus diaconibus utrumque cooperiatur de sindone munda quam prius preparaverant in ora altaris, e regione pontificis, post corporalem expansam." This account, from the RGP (section 267) is almost identical to that in *Ordo Romanus XXVIII*, p. 395: "deinde, accepta a subdiacono patena, ponit iuxta calicem de latere sinistro et statim cooperitur a duobus diaconibus utrumque de sindone munda, quam prius praeparaverant in ore altaris, in regione pontificis, post corporalem expansam." See Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du Haut Moyen Age* (1951), p. 395, section 17, tome III. The Roman German Pontifical was first identified (and called this name) by M. Andrieu in *Immixtio et consecratio: la consécration par contact dans les documents liturgiques du Moyen Age* (1924), pp. 59-68. Some recent criticism of Vogel and Elze's edition has been offered by H. Parkes in "Questioning the Authority of Vogel and Elze's *Pontifical Romano-Germanique*," *Understanding Medieval Liturgy: Essays in Interpretation* (eds) S. Hamilton and H. Gittos (2015) as well as Parkes' important book, *The Making of Liturgy in the Ottonian Church: Books, Music and Ritual in Mainz, 950-1050* (2015).

This text—like most *ordines* that describe the Eucharistic rite, both during and *beyond* Holy Week—only briefly evokes Eucharistic cloths when describing the preparation of the altar for the canon of the Mass. Joseph Jungmann mentions similar textiles in his study on the rites of the Roman Mass. In a section entitled "Readying of the Altar," Jungmann summarizes that prior to the offertory,

> the corporal enclosed in the burse is carried by the deacon to the altar and there spread out, while otherwise the priest carries it to the altar when he comes in, and spreads it out before Mass.[44]

There is also a brief description of the preparation of the altar with the corporal or sindon in the Roman rite (specifically the *Ordo Romanus primus*). First, an acolyte approaches the altar with a chalice covered with a corporal; a deacon then takes and gives the corporal to another deacon, who unfolds the cloth atop the altar.[45] *Ordo Romanus* V, which dates from ca. 900, specifies that a subdeacon should approach the altar with the paten and chalice; both are covered by the corporal or sindon. Two deacons then spread the corporal out atop the altar.[46]

Very few Eucharistic cloths survive from the early medieval period, and if they do, they are difficult to identify as such. Fortunately, several medieval liturgists wrote at length on the cloths used during the celebration of the Eucharist (not specific to Holy Week). Although their writings often use imprecise language (like the RGP and the *Ordines Romani* themselves) to describe these cloths, making it difficult to distinguish between different types of cloths, they all demonstrate a deep interest in the cloths' formal arrangement and their meaning in allegorical,

---

[44] J. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origin and Development* (1951), p. 34.

[45] See Andrieu, OR I, n. 64, 85 and 2:89, p. 95.

[46] See Adnrieu, OR V, n. 43 and 2:218.

often Christological terms. I hope to demonstrate that the study of these liturgical commentaries can shed light on the meaning of the various forms taken by Christ's grave cloths in tenth- and eleventh-century images of the holy women's visit to the sepulchre.

Before turning to these texts, however, a brief note on textile terminology in the RGP: although the terms 'corporal,' 'sindon,' and 'pallia' are frequently interchanged during the early medieval period, they can mean very distinct things after ca. 1200 CE. In fact, while the present-day corporal is understood to be the cloth that uniquely goes under the paten and chalice, prior to the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the corporal could cover both the area on the altar on which the chalice and paten were placed *and* it was folded over the chalice and paten to veil these vessels as well.[47] Historians of the liturgy surmise that sometime in the late eleventh or twelfth century, the cloth that covered the chalice became smaller, allegedly stiffer, and was most often referred to as the *pallium*.[48] Although varied in form, the *pallium* was typically the cloth that

[47] Several sources offer introductory accounts to the corporal, two of which are by J. Braun. See Braun, "Das Korporale," *Handbuch der Paramentik* (1911), pp. 233-238, "Das Korporale," *Praktische Paramentenkunde* (1924), pp. 38-39, and a brief mention in "Die Patene," *Das christliche Altargerät* (1932), pp. 197-246, especially p. 198, 215. The earliest of these sources is the best overview of the corporal. Thomas Izbiki also recently confirmed this thinking in an excellent article, "Linteamenta altaria: The Care of Altar Linens in the Medieval Church," *Medieval Clothing and Textiles* 12 (2016), pp. 41-60.

[48] Braun identifies the distinction between the corporal and pall in the eleventh or twelfth century. See texts cited above as well as Braun, "Die Palla," *Handbuch der Paramentik* (1911), pp. 239-242, and "Die Palla," *Praktische Paramentenkunde* (1924), pp. 39-40. For a brief mention of how the corporal and pall were handled and washed, see Braun, *Praktische Paramentenkunde*, p. 49. See also J. Emminghaus, "Corporale" in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* on how the corporal may have served as a Eucharistic veil prior to 1200; H. Thurston, "Corporal," *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908). H. Leclercq, "Corporal," *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* (ed. H. Leclercq and F. Cabrol, 1907), vol. 1 of 3, pp. 2986-2987; F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (eds), "Corporal," *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (ed. F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone, 2005), see especially p. 423. All of these brief overviews of the corporal (and the later pall) recount the same historical narrative, i.e. that sometime ca.

veiled the chalice in the later Middle Ages, and the corporal was placed directly below the chalice and paten.[49] While the text of the RGP suggests that two distinct cloths, the *corporal* and the *sindon*, were used in the consecration of the Eucharist on Maundy Thursday, several liturgical commentaries indicate that in practice the distinction was not so clear in the early medieval period.

In nearly all liturgical commentaries on the Eucharistic rite, the act of wrapping the chalice and/or paten is generally likened to historical-biblical acts of wrapping, although how the deacon is to fold the cloth is less precisely articulated. Quoting Amalarius, Agobard of Lyon (d. 840), for instance, writes in his commentary on Amalarius' *On the Liturgy* how the chalice is to be fully enveloped by the deacon's *sudarium*: "the chalice is wrapped in the deacon's *sudarium*,

---

1200 the corporal became two distinct cloths in lieu of a single cloth that covered the area both below and above the chalice and paten (and so folded in half). Much more could be said about how the different materials of the 'corporal'—whether covering the Eucharistic elements and/or underneath them—changed when the cloth was made smaller, i.e. the pall. It remains unclear to me whether the piece of cloth that independently covered the chalice and paten was different in texture than the cloth below them. The *Lexikon des Mittelalters* entry for "corporal" suggests that the smaller square pall was stiffened linen. This cloth was likely less malleable than its predecessor, which folded over the Eucharistic furnishings while covering the altar below, and thus created a very different visual effect. Braun agrees on this point.

[49] Note that the pall can also be referred to as the humeral veil, which in turn can be known as a 'sindon.' See J. Braun, "Humeral Veil," *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (1910). See also L. Beauduin, "Quelle est l'origine de l'huméral?" in *Questions liturgiques*, Vol. 3 (1912-13), pp. 179-182. On chalice veils, see N.F. Robinson, "Concerning Three Eucharistic Veils of Western Use," *Transactions of the St Paul's Ecclesiological Society*, 6 (1906-10) pp. 129-60. Braun makes clear the distinction between the pall as vestment and that which goes atop the Eucharistic chalice by referring to the former as "das pallium" and the latter as "die palla." Despite best efforts at keeping these words (in German) distinct, however, the Latin names for various liturgical cloths were entirely confused in the early medieval period. This continues to be a source of much confusion for historians of the liturgy.

just as Joseph wrapped the body of the Lord in the *sindon* and the *sudarium*."[50] Suggestively, Agobard's choice of verb for the deacon's act of wrapping the chalice ("involvitur") is precisely that word chosen to describe how the *sudarium* was found in the tomb, "involutum," in John 20:7.[51] Other commentaries more often use the word "cooperio,"[52] which can mean to cover or cover fully. The verb 'involvo,' by contrast, invokes wrapping, which could have been quite extensive given that the *sudarium*—also called maniple, or a linen cloth draped over the priest's left arm that otherwise served as a functional handkerchief—was likely about three feet long (fig. 1.10). The image of enveloping the chalice with such a long cloth—in the matter that Joseph enshrouds Christ's body—evokes an image of Christ's entombment in Paris Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal MS 592 (fig. 1.11), where Christ's body is fully covered with cloth, sharply contrasting the representation of his body in the Crucifixion on the facing page (fig. 1.12).

---

[50] "'…quare aliter panis ponendus sit in altari, et calix juxta eum. Altare, crux Christi est, ab eo loco ubi scriptum est in canone: *Unde et memores sumus,* usque dum **involvitur calix de sudario diaconi**, vice Joseph, **qui involvit corpus Domini sindone, et sudario**.' Et post pauca: 'Panis extensus super altare, corpus domini monstrat extensum in cruce, quod nos manducamus.'" Agobardus Lugdunensis, *Liber contra Amalarium* (Patrologia Latina, vol. 104. J. P. Migne, ed. Parisiis: excudebat Migne (1851), 349B-350A). Note that while Agobard of Lyon's writings do not appear in any contemporary manuscripts in Saint Gall, the writings of Florus of Lyon are included in Cod. Sang. 681. He takes issue primarily with Amalarius' tripartite conception of the Eucharist, however, rather than with his interpretations of liturgical rites. He notably does not appear to be disagreeing with Amalarius in this passage, who writes in Book 4.47 in *On the Liturgy* that when the chalice is wrapped in the maniple by the deacon, he becomes like Joseph, who wrapped Christ's body in the shroud: "…dum involvitur calix de sudario diaconi, vice Ioseph, qui involvit corpus Domini sindone et sudario [Matt 27:59, etc.]." See Knibbs, vol. II, pp. 622-623.

[51] Miller, 85 and Braun, *Die liturgische Gewandung* (1907), pp. 515-61. The sudarium was a functional handkerchief worn by the clergy and that became highly ornamental during the tenth century. See Miller, 85 on its development.

[52] Honorius, *Gemma Animae* (PL, vol. 172, J. P. Migne, ed. Parisiis: excudebat Migne, 1854), 558C: "calix cum corporali **cooperitur**, quod sindonem mundam significat, in quam Joseph corpus Christi involvebat."

Honorius Augustodunensis also considers the Eucharistic cloth, vessels, and manipulation of the cloth by the priest in relation to Christ's entombment. The corporal is the grave cloth ("calix cum corporali cooperitur, quod sindonem mundam significat, in quam Joseph corpus Christi involvebat"[53]), the chalice is the tomb ("calix hic, sepulchrum"), and the paten is the stone that covered the tomb's opening ("patena, lapidem designat, qui sepulcrum clauserat").[54]

In addition to these texts that liken the preparation of the Eucharistic vessels to the entombment, a few commentaries written between the ninth and twelfth centuries describe cloths used at the altar with increasing attention to their forms and general appearance.[55] The earliest account I can identify (following Joseph Braun) that exhibits an interest in the disposition of cloths is Pseudo-Alcuin's *De divinis officiis*, written ca. 908.[56] Following a lengthy description of why the corporal must be made of linen, Pseudo-Alcuin writes that it

> ought to be folded such that neither its beginning nor end may appear, just as the *sudarium* in the Lord's sepulchre was discovered. The sudarium is the bandage of the head. The head signifies his divinity, since the head of Christ is God. The wrapping

[53] Honorius, *Gemma Animae*, PL, 558B-C.

[54] Honorius, *Gemma Animae*, PL, 558C. Sicard of Cremona makes this analogy plain: "Ara crucis, tumulique calix, lapidisque patena, Sindonis officium candida byssus habet." Sicard of Cremona, *Mitrale sive Summa de officiis ecclesiasticis* (Patrologia Latina, vol. 213. J. P. Migne, ed. Parisiis: excudebat Migne, 1855), section 146D.

[55] Braun provides a brief overview of the various ways the corporal and pall were folded in his section on the corporal and pall in his *Handbuch der Paramentik*, although he does not always provide explicit citations from his sources, nor does he always name them (i.e. Pseudo-Alcuin, Sicard, Honorius, and Durandus, among others). See Braun, *Handbuch*, pp. 233-242.

[56] For more on this text, see J. Ryan, "Pseudo-Alcuin's Liber de divinis officiis and the Liber 'Dominus vobiscum' of St Peter Damiani," *Mediaeval Studies*, 14 (1952), pp. 159-164; M. Andrieu, "L'Ordo romanus antiquus et le Liber de divinis officiis Pseudo-Alcuin," *Revue des Sciences religieuses* 5-4 (1925); and R. Sharpe, "A Hand list of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland Before 1540," *Publications of the Journal of Medieval Latin I* (1997), p. 45.

> signifies this, who had humanity in the beginning by birth and in the end by death, but his divinity has neither beginning nor end, for it exists always.[57]

Pseudo-Alcuin adds further precision to the "involutum" cloth mentioned in John's Gospel: neither the beginning nor end of this cloth may appear, and the form of the cloth folded in this way suggests Christ's divinity. Thus a Christological truth is expressed through the very folds of the liturgical cloth; they recall not only the *sudarium* found in the tomb, but they also make clear that while Christ's humanity was finite (made possible through his birth, and ending with his death), his divinity exists always and knows neither beginning nor end ("in divinitate neutrum horum, sed semper esse habuit"). Moreover, this qualification of the cloth's forms invites us to consider a secondary meaning of "involutum," which can suggest not only the form of the cloth, i.e., "wrapped up," but also "mysterious," "obscure," or "hidden." This second sense of 'involutum' fits nicely with the contemporary understanding that Christ's divinity was hidden under the veil of his flesh during his life on Earth and, even following the revelation of his divinity, his divine nature cannot be fully comprehended by the human intellect.

---

[57] My translation. "Corporale cui superponitur corpus Dominicum, non aliud quam lineum esse oportet, quoniam Joseph linteum mundum legitur emisse, ubi corpus dominicum involvit. Nam et linum, purum germen est terrae: et Dominus purum et verum corpus habuit, non simulatum. Et sicut linum per multos sudores pervenit ad candorem, ita Jesus Christus multis affectus passionibus migravit ab hoc saeculo, et ad candorem resurrectionis atque immortalitatis perductus est. Ita ergo, qui corpus Christi in se recipere desiderat, per multos bonorum operum labores, et per castitatem mentis et corporis debet se reddere mundum et candidum. Quod ita plicari debet, ut nec initium, nec finis appareat, sicut etiam sudarium in sepulcro Domini inventum est. Sudarium est ligamentum capitis. Per caput divinitas designatur, quia caput Christi Deus. Involutio autem hoc significat, quia Christus, qui in humanitate habuit initium nascendo, et finem moriendo, in divinitate neutrum horum, sed semper esse habuit. Pseudo-Alcuin, *De divinis officiis* (Patrologia Latina, vol. 101. J. P. Migne, ed. Parisiis: excudebat Migne, 1851), vol. 101, section 125B-C. For a brief discussion of this text, see Braun, *Handbuch der Paramentik*, p. 236.

Sicard of Cremona also details how the corporal is to be folded such that its ends are not visible. Like Pseudo-Alcuin, he specifies that this mode of folding emphasizes the continuity of Christ's divinity ("corporale complicatur, ut nec initium, nec finis ejus appareat, sic ejus divinitas initio caret, nec finem habet").[58] Honorius uses nearly the exact language to describe this cloth's form ("Quod ita implicari debet, ut nec initium nec finis appareat, quia Christus quamvis in humanitate habuit initium nascendo, finem moriendo, tamen in Divinitate neutrum habuit").[59]

Several images of Christ's grave cloths made in the tenth and eleventh centuries figure cloths whose form reveals neither the beginning nor end of a fabric. The tucked-in bundle of cloth in the Reichenau Pericopes (Wolfenbüttel Herzog August Bibliothek Cod. Guelf. 84.5 Aug 2, f. 42v, early 11th c.) (fig. 1.13), for instance, evokes precisely this form, much like the lower cloths in the Hartker Antiphonary pen drawing (fig. 1.1), the Reichenau Sacramentary (Paris BNF Lat. 18005, ca. 1020-40) (fig. 1.14), the Sacramentary of Henry II (Munich BSB Clm 4456, ca. 1002-1014) (fig. 1.5), a Benedictional from St Emmeram, Regensburg (Los Angeles J. Paul Getty Museum MS Ludwig VII 1, made ca. 1030-40) (fig. 1.4), the Bamberg Apocalypse and Gospel Lectionary (Bamberg State Library, Msc. Bibl. 140, ca. 1000-1020) (fig. 1.6), and in the Sacramentary of Sigebert of Minden (Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms Theol Lat. Fol. 2, f. 132v, ca. 1022) (fig. 1.7). Notably, most of these manuscripts were made in the same 20-30 year period. The three-part or four-part fold lines give a sense of movement to each bundle, and in the case of the ivory plaque in Budapest (fig. 1.8), the cloth's composition becomes more apparent as it begins to look like a three-dimensional knot, such as a French knot, a kind of stitch (used on

[58] Sicard of Cremona, *Mitrale sive Summa de Officiis Ecclesiasticis* (PL vol. 213, ed. J.P. Migne, 1855), 120C.
[59] Honorius Augustodunensis, *Sacramentarium* (PL vol. 172, ed. J.P. Migne, 1855), 790C.

several extant medieval vestments) that reveals neither its beginning nor end.[60] One of the holy women swings her censer squarely into the tomb, recalling the incensing of the altar in preparation for the Eucharistic offering.[61]

Other contemporary representations of grave cloths are wound-up in a more circular motion; intuitively, this form suggests that one end of the cloth lies at the outer edges of the circle, and the other at its center, but neither is apparent. The cloth that fills the entrance of the tomb on an ivory plaque at the Bargello, likely made in northern France in the tenth century (fig. 1.15), for example, appears physically altered and propelled into motion by the miracle the of Resurrection.[62] The whirling form also recalls that of a vortex, which, as Joshua O'Driscoll has argued in his article on the incipit page to the gospel of John in the Quedlinburg Gospels (New York Morgan Library MS M. 755, mid-10th c.) (fig. 1.16), participates in a process of revelation, lifting the viewer's mind upward to reveal the word of God.[63] But the vortex could also allude to Christ himself, who was characterized by Florus of Lyon at the Council of Quierzy as the "vertex

---

[60] Jeremy Thompson has recently pointed out to me that this particular wound-up textile also evokes Borromean rings, a classic image of the trinity. This is a point I hope to develop further in the future, and I thank Jeremy for his feedback.

[61] Jungmann writes on the censing of the altar that "wherefore the first swings of the censer are for the gifts of bread and wine which are incensed three times cross-wise, three times in a circle. It is the fullest expression of blessing and consecration and in this way was really a re-enforcement of the Veni, sanctificator. The incense…is intended to envelop the gifts in the holy atmosphere of prayer…to symbolically represent and to fortify the primary action of the altar." See Jungmann, p. 349.

[62] This dating, however, has been contested by some scholars, including Danielle Gaborit-Chopin, who dates the ivory to the twelfth century. See D. Gaborit-Chopin, *Les ivoires du Moyen-Age* (1978).

[63] Joshua O'Driscoll, "Visual Vortex: An Epigraphic Image from an Ottonian Gospel Book," *Word & Image: A Journal of Verbal/Visual Enquiry* 27:3, pp. 309-321.

Ecclesiae," which could indicate both the "top of the church" as well as, simply, "vortex."[64] The vortex form in the *Visitatio sepulchri* images likely suggests Christ then, too, namely his ineffable divinity, which is revealed at the moment of the Resurrection (among other moments in the *vita Christi*). The Bargello cloth thus simultaneously suggests the folded Eucharistic cloth through its form, which reveals neither a clear beginning nor end, but it also self-animates to a greater extent than the bundles of cloth in the St Gall and Reichenau manuscript illuminations (fig. 1.1, 1.13), whose carefully constructed folds more precisely embody the language used by medieval liturgists to describe the Eucharistic cloth's folds that reveal neither its beginning nor end.

The forms of another cloth used to celebrate the Eucharist are also described in several liturgical treatises; typically its form is contrasted to that of the bundled cloth whose beginning and end are not visible. Pope Innocent III writes of how folding or unfolding a cloth (two corporals, in this instance) can completely change its meaning.[65] He writes:

> two-fold [in meaning] is the *palla*, which is called the *corporale*: one which the deacon stretches out on the altar, the other which he puts on top of the chalice, folded. The extended cloth signifies faith, the folded cloth signifies understanding. For this mystery ought to be believed, not to be understood.[66]

---

[64] Congar, p. 89, footnote 129.

[65] "Interim vero diaconus corporales pallas super altare disponit, quae significant linteamina, quibus involutum fuit corpus Jesu. Pars autem quae plicata ponitur super calicem signat sudarium, quod fuerat super caput eius separatim involutum in unum locum. De his itaque tantum reperitur in canone: 'Consulto omnium constituimus, ut sacrificum altaris non in serico panno, aut intincto quisquam celebrare praesumat, sed in puro lineo, ab episcopo consecrato, terreno scilicet lino procreato atque contexto, sicut corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi in sindone linea munda sepultum fuit." Innocent III, "Caput LVI: De Corporalibus, et quare una pars extenditur et altera complicatur," *Mysteria Evangelicae Legis et Sacramenti Eucharistiae*. Libri Sex *(De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*), vol. 217, 832A-B, 1855).

[66] "Duplex est enim palla, quae dicitur corporale: una quam diaconus super altare totam extendit, altera quam super calicem plicatam imponit. Pars extensa, signat fidem, pars plicata signat

Honorius also contrasts the two forms of cloth, writing that the corporal can be both "distenditur," or spread out as if "in forma corporis Christi," as well as folded so that it reveals neither its beginning nor end (as we have already seen).[67] He writes that the "corporale intentionem non fictam," suggesting—albeit opaquely—that this cloth does not hold carefully construed folds like its counterpart. Sicard of Cremona's description of the Eucharistic rite calls for "duo corporalia," one of which, as I have already described, is folded such that neither its beginning nor end can be seen. Although the other cloth's folds are not described by Sicard, he reads the two cloths together in terms of the hypostasis, i.e., the divinity and humanity of Christ ("id est multis modis declaratam Christi humanitatem, per alterum multiplicem laborem

---

intellectum. Hic enim mysterium credi debet, sed comprehendi non valet, ut fides habeat meritum, cui humana ratio non praebet experimentum." Innocent III, "Caput LVI: De Corporalibus, et quare una pars extenditur et altera complicatur," *Mysteria Evangelicae Legis et Sacramenti Eucharistiae*. Libri Sex *(De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*), vol. 217, 832B. My translation.

[67] "…altare crux intellegitur in quo corporale in forma corporis Christi distenditur. Corporale de puro lino terrae conficitur, et cum multo labore in candorem vertitur, et Christi corpus de munda Virgine nascitur, et per multas passiones in candorem resurrectionis redditur. Corporale cum complicatur nec initium nec finis eius apparet, quia Christi divinitas initio caret et finem non habet. Super quod oblata ponitur, quia caro a divinitate suscepta in cruce affigitur." Honorius, *Gemma Animae*, Caput XLVI, "De passione Christi," PL vol. 172 (JP Migne, ed. Parisiis: excudebat Migne, 1854), section 557D. Honorius also writes on how the corporal should be folded in his *Sacramentarium*: "Sindon est corporale castigatum ob omni naturali viriditate et humore; ita sit mens offerentium ab omni carnali cupiditate. Corporale lineum debet esse et purum; significat corpus Christi sumptum de Virgine. Per multos sudores pervenit ad candorem; ita Christus multis passionibus pervenit ad candorem resurrectionis. Qui corpus Christi desiderat accipere, per multos labores debet se castigare, mentis et corporis statum mundum et candidum facere. Quod ita implicari debet, ut nec initium nec finis appareat, quia Christus quamvis in humanitate habuit initium nascendo, finem moriendo, tamen in Divinitate neutrum habuit." See Honorius, *Sacramentarium* (PL Vol. 172, J.P. Migne, ed. 1854), Caput LXXXV "De oblatione seu offertorio," sections 790 B and C. Further down, in section 792B of the same text he writes "Sudarium iacens in altari significat laborem, quem habent angeli in ministerio humano, sive perfecti viri, qui non cessant orare pro nostra fragilitate. Corporale intentionem non fictam."

ejusdem").[68] The two corporals are for Sicard the two grave cloths discovered by Peter at the tomb, but his decision to read them in relation to the hypostasis has no biblical precedent to my knowledge.

Tenth- and eleventh-century images of the women's visit to Christ's tomb frequently include one cloth that appears to be opened up, a visual effect that is particularly prominent when comparing it to the neatly folded or whirling bundles of cloth studied earlier. But rather depicted as simply spread out, as if flat across an altar, these cloths typically hold a form that could not be held by an actual liturgical cloth. For instance, consider the cloth in the Prüm Gradual's (Paris BnF Latin 9448, ca. 975-1000) illumination of this narrative: a single cloth stands at the center of the tomb's opening; its folds cascade downward while mysteriously suspended mid-air (fig. 1.17). Similarly, a single textile floats at the center of the tomb's opening in the Benedictional of Saint Aethelwold (London British Library MS Add. 49598, ca. 963-984) (fig. 1.18), in a Sacramentary from Mainz made ca. 1025-50 (Los Angeles J. Paul Getty MS Luwig V2, f. 19v) (fig. 1.19), in Paris Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal manuscript 592 (made in NE France ca. 975-1000, fig. 1.20), as well as in Paris BnF Lat 10514, the Poussay Evangeliary (Paris BnF Latin 10514, ca. 980) (fig. 1.21). These cloths' folds ripple towards the ground, frequently holding a concave shape like the upper cloth in the Hartker pen drawing. It is as though this cloth continues to cover an upright, living body that can no longer be seen.

[68] "…quia, sicut corporale complicatur, ut nec initium, nec finis ejus appareat, sic ejus divinitas initio caret, nec finem habet; et sicut oblatum adjungitur corporale et ponitur in altari, sic caro juncta divinitati affigitur cruci… Qui vero duo corporalia ponit, duo significat linteamina, quibus Joseph corpus Domini aromatibus conditum, involvit; vel per unum multiplicatum, multiplicem, id est multis modis declaratam Christi humanitatem, per alterum multiplicem laborem ejusdem." Sicard of Cremona, *Mitrale sive Summa de Officiis Ecclesiasticis* (PL vol. 213, JP Migne, 1855), sections 120C-D.

These images do not always appear adjacent to the same types of texts or other illuminations in their respective codices. In most of the sacramentaries I study, for instance, typically the text that follows the *Visitatio sepulchri* image was read aloud on Easter Sunday and commemorates Christ's Resurrection. But in other instances, the image is paired with a prayer from the Canon of the Mass, or a Eucharistic prayer that is not exclusively linked to Easter Sunday. The Sacramentary of Henry II's richly illuminated scene of the women at the tomb (p. 33) is followed by an elaborate *Te Igitur* page (p. 34), a Eucharistic prayer, which only further underscores the Eucharistic symbolism of these grave cloths' forms (fig. 1.5). Notably, the knotted form of the 'involutum' grave cloth in the sepulchre evokes several of the knotted, twisting, interlace forms that compose the letter forms of the *Te Igitur* page, too.[69]

The women's visit to the tomb is also put into dialogue more explicitly through its pairing with other figurative illuminations. In Paris Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal MS 592, the *Visitatio sepulchri* illumination faces an image of Christ and the Doubting Thomas, prodding his wound. The pairing of the *Visitatio sepulchri* and Doubting Thomas occurs in a few other instances, too; while the pairing chronologically makes sense (two post-Resurrection narratives), it seems that it is more likely motivated by the way that they present two wildly different types of proof of Christ's divinity. The viewer must study the forms of Christ's grave cloths to understand the nature of Christ's absence—and the church body's presence, in Eucharistic form—as

[69] This kind of knotted, intertwining ornament has been the subject of much research, most notably by Ben Tilghman in early medieval Insular manuscripts, such as the Book of Kells. For Tilghman, these images frequently evoke the mystery of the incarnation. See B. Tilghman, "Ornament and Incarnation in Insular Art," *Gesta*, v. 55 n. 2, Fall 2016, pp. 157-177. O'Driscoll also studies the visual relationship between the vortex he identifies the Quedlinburg Gospels with other twisted, interlocking forms.

Thomas touches Christ's wound to truly see and believe in his divinity. But the medieval reader would have likely understood that one mode of apprehension is spiritually superior to the other; for as Christ tells Thomas, "Because thou hast seen me Thomas, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and have believed" (John 20:29).

But what would these cloths have actually looked like, and how were they understood beyond liturgical commentaries? While very few Eucharistic cloths from the tenth and eleventh century survive, we can surmise what they would have looked like based on manuscript illuminations as well as textual descriptions, including those by authors we have already studied here as well as canon law and stories of saints' lives.[70] Although there was likely much variation in practice, generally speaking, pallia, corporals, sindons, and sudaria were white and made of linen, evoking Christ's flesh and—in the rather forceful making of the linen—his Passion. We can surmise their forms in part from the *Visitatio sepulchri* images that I study here, but also in later illuminations that detail the rites of mass. A single surviving leaf from an eleventh-century sacramentary depicts one type of corporal, for instance, that both went below and above the Eucharistic elements (fig. 1.22).[71] Historians of the liturgy surmise that sometime in the late eleventh or twelfth century, the cloth that covered the chalice became smaller, allegedly stiffer, and was thereafter referred to as the *pallium*. Although varied in form, the *pallium* was typically the cloth that veiled the chalice in the later Middle Ages, and the corporal the cloth immediately below the chalice and paten. In several later medieval illuminations, a single cloth lies limp atop

[70] I am still in the process of trying to identify Eucharistic cloths from this period, which has proven very difficult given that it is nearly impossible to ascertain that an extant cloth was used in this way.

[71] The Index of Medieval Art correctly identifies, I believe, this cloth as a corporal given that it appears connected to the white cloth atop the altar but that remains distinct from the altar cloth.

a chalice that stands atop another cloth (fig. 1.23). Still, none of these images' artists focus on the folding or unfolding of these cloths, as many liturgical commentaries do so attentively.

At their most basic, corporals and pallia were to protect the Eucharistic elements. They were one of several instruments used to avoid Eucharistic contamination, along with the Eucharistic straw to avoid drips or the flabellum to fan away flies. Despite their deeply practical use, however, they held quasi (and sometimes actual) relic-status given their close contact with the Eucharist. Medieval canon law even regulated how these cloths were to be cared for, as Thomas Izbicki has studied.[72] Worn-out cloths that were dirty and beyond repair were to be burned, for instance (with their ashes carefully stored), but portions stained with Eucharistic wine were to be cut out and treated like relics. They were washed in specific vessels and by clergy members themselves, and sometimes by their wives. And like nearly all church furnishings used to celebrate mass, Eucharistic cloths were blessed by the bishop prior to their use.

These cloths were blessed by the bishop as he prepared for the divine office. In the Roman German Pontifical (contemporary to all of the manuscripts I study here), the bishop blesses and consecrates the *linteaminum* so that it will be worthy of veiling and enveloping the holy body and blood of Christ: "benedicere consecrareque digneris haec linteamina in usum altaris tui ad tegendum involvendumque sacrosanctum corpus et sanguinem filii tui domini nostri

[72] T. Izbicki, "Linteamenta altaria: The Care of Altar Linens in the Medieval Church," *Medieval Clothing and Textiles* 12 (2016), pp. 41-60.

Iesu Christi."[73] Interestingly, the "benedictio corporalis" evokes the "linteamina" rather than the corporal specifically, suggesting the elision between the different names for these Eucharistic cloths. Similar to the blessing of the *linteaminum*, the blessing of the corporal reads "Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, benedic linteamen istud ad tegendum involvendumque corpus et sanguinem filii tui domini nostri Iesu Christi."[74]

Practical concerns about the cloths of the Eucharistic rite were central to the writings of Regino of Prüm (d. 915), who compiled the *Libri de duo de synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis* in 906 upon the request of Archbishop Radbod of Trier. The text was meant for bishops and included various legal texts. Detailing the physical requirements to celebrate the Eucharist, Regino includes a canon that requires the corporal to be made from "the cleanest and whitest (or brightest) linen," or "Si corporale ex mundissimo et nitidissimo linteo sit, et ubi recondatur."[75] Burchard of Worms (d. 1025), the author of the widely circulated *Decretum*, draws from Regino's legal text in his own writings on the Eucharistic cloths. In book III, chapter 98, he details that the corporal must be made purely of linen and not mixed with any other kind of fabric given that Christ was buried only in a (linen) sindon: "Corporale super quo sacra oblatio immolator, ex mundissimo et purissimo linteo sit…quia Dominicum corpus in sepulcro, non in

[73] RGP, vol. I, number 74, p. 151. The blessing also evokes Moses, the tabernacle curtain, and Mary as weaver. "you deign bless and consecrate these cloths for use at your altar for covering and wrapping the holy body and blood of your son our Lord Jesus Christ."

[74] RGP, Vol. I, n. 83, p 154. "Omnipotent and eternal God, bless this cloth for covering and wrapping the the body and blood of your son our Lord Jesus Christ."

[75] Regino of Prüm, *De Ecclesiasticis Disciplinis* (PL vol. 137, 1853), 187b. "Whether the corporal is of cleanest and whitest linen, and where it is put away." Translation by Thomas Izbicki, "Linteamenta altaria," p. 53.

holosericis, sed tantum in sindone munda fuit involutum."[76] Finally, Regino (and later, Burchard of Worms) specifies that the corporal should not remain on the altar following the Eucharistic consecration; rather, it should be put into the sacramentary or with the chalice and paten in a clean place.[77] Thus there is a strong possibility that many of the sacramentaries studied here may have not only figured these Eucharistic cloths, but also were a site for storage and protection between their pages.

The recapitulation of Christ's death, burial, and ultimately resurrection in the Eucharistic rite is also evoked in the language of the blessing of other Eucharistic furnishings, namely the paten and the chalice. The "Praephatio eucharistialis, id est vasculi in quo eucharistia reconditur" describes these instruments as the "novum sepulchr[um]" of Christ's body.[78] The blessing of the paten evokes specifically the crucifixion and concludes with the bishop making the sign of the cross with chrism on the paten itself.[79] Finally, the blessing of the chalice again likens it to the tomb ("novum sepulchrum") and evokes the mystery of the Eucharistic consecration: "ut hunc

[76] The original source that Burchard is quoting can be found in Regino Prumiensis, *De Ecclesiasticis Disciplinis* (PL vol. 137, 1853), section 205C.

[77] "Corporale nunquam super altare remaneat; sed aut in Sacramentorum libro ponatur, aut cum calice et patena in mundissimo loco recondatur." Ibid., PL 137, 205C.

[78] RGP, vol. I, Number 87, p. 155: "Omnipotens Deus, trinitas inseparabilis, manibus nostris opem tuae benedictionis infunde, ut per nostrum benedictionem hoc vasculum sanctificetur et corporis Christi novum sepulchrum spiritus sancti gratia perficiatur."

[79] RGP, vol. I, Number 88, pp. 155-156: "Consecramus et sanctificamus hanc patinam ad conficiendum in ea corpus domini nostri Iesu Christi patientis crucem pro salute omnium nostrum." Number 89 continues: "Praephatio ad patinam consecrandam: Oremus…ut divinae gratiae benedictio consecret et sanctificet hanc patinam ad conficiendum in ea corpus domini nostri Iesu Christi patientis crucem pro salute omnium nostrum."

calicem, in quo celebraturi sumus sancrosancta mysteria…"[80] It is also then blessed with chrism in the form of a cross.

The special status of the Eucharistic cloths, whether the corporal, pallia, sindon, or sudarium, rests on their physical contact with the Eucharist. Because of this privileged proximity to the Eucharistic elements, these cloths were known to perform miracles, like a relic. Raoul Glaber (d. 1050) writes that the corporal could be used to fight fire, for instance.[81] Snoek has compiled several of these corporal fire-fighting miracles, among them an account from Bourges in which a fire at a monastery was extinguished upon throwing the corporal, along with the arm of Saint Gundulf, into the flames. These and other instances in which the corporal was used like a quasi fire blanket led an episcopal Synod in Seligenstadt in 1023 to forbid "certain stupid priests" from throwing corporals into fires.[82] Still, the practice persisted, with the *consuetudines*

[80] RGP, vol. I, number 95, p. 157. The prayer also evokes Moses: "Deus, qui Moysi famulo tuo in Oreb monte servanda populo tuo praecepta disponens, templum sanctum tuum qualiter aedificaret instituisti, sacra quoque vasa, quae inferri altari tuo deberent instar vasorum caelestium fieri docuisti, precamur, ut hunc calicem, in quo celebraturi sumus sacrosancta mysteria, emissione sancti spiritus tui celesti benedictione sanctifices, gratumque et acceptabilem habeas atque benedicas, ut digne sociatus vasculis tuis et acceptabilem tibi deferat famulatum et digne tuis mysteriis consecretur. Per. In unitate eiusdem spiritus sancti."

[81] G. J.C. Snoek, *Medieval Piety from Relics to the Eucharist: A Process of Mutual Interaction* (1995), p. 336.

[82] MGH Cost. I, 637, c 6: "Ut nemo corporale ad extinguendum incendium in ignem proiciat. Conquestum est in sancto concilio de **quibusdam stultissimis presbiteris**, ut quando incendium videant, corporale dominico corpore consecratum ad incendium extinguendum temeraria presumptione in ignem proiciant. Ideoque sancitum est sub anathematis interdictione ne ulterius fiat" (my emphasis). See G.J.C. Snoek, *Medieval Piety from Relics to the Eucharist: A Process of Mutual Interaction* (1995), p 337, footnote 123.

of the monastery of St Benignus in Dijon recommending that a corporal always be readily accessible on the altar in case of a fire.[83]

But miracles associated most often with corporals are those of the Eucharistic wafer itself; namely, it bleeds onto the cloth and leaves a visible trace of Christ's bodily presence. The Chapel of the Corporal at Orvieto holds one such cloth that was allegedly stained by a bleeding host in the thirteenth century when a Bohemian priest doubted Christ's presence in the wafer (fig. 1.24). Fourteenth-century mural paintings depicting the miracle now surround the holy cloth (fig. 1.25). Such corporals were akin to relics, their fleshy white linen a fitting ground for the blood stains of the bleeding host. Viewers attended to the brownish, reddened stains of these cloths to grasp their sacred status, not unlike the fold lines of Christ's grave cloths in tenth and eleventh-century images that suggest a relationship with a sacramental body and Christ's divine and/or human character. The instinct to closely examine the corporal, then, existed beyond the Eucharistic rite.

The corporal strongly resonates with a burial context, too: the synod of Clermont in 535 opposed wrapping deceased priests in altar cloths that had once enveloped the Eucharistic elements, and the Council of Auxerre at the end of the sixth century forbade the wrapping of dead bodies in altar linens, too. Such rules forbidding the use of Eucharistic cloths to wrap the dead continued into the twelfth century, suggesting that this practice must have been somewhat

[83] PL 149, 716. Abbot Giraldus (late 11th c.) is said to have done so when lighting struck his abbey in Castres: D'Achery, III, 572, *Chronicon episcoporum Albigensium et abbatum Castrensium,* SVIII: "Fulgure tacta reliquas incendit, et imber miscetur flammas: ignis et unda furit. Incassum tentant exstinguere flammas. Namque ardentem ignis provocat unda sitim. Iamque monasterium furibunda incendia volvit cum Christi oblato corpore flamma cadit." See Snoek, p. 337, footnote 126.

widespread.[84] The notion that Eucharistic cloths could be re-purposed as burial cloths strongly resonates with tenth and eleventh-century images of Christ's grave cloths; the conflation of Christ's *sudarium* and *linteamina* with Eucharistic cloths is then not only expressed in historical-exegetical language of early medieval liturgists but also—albeit in less Christologically specific terms—in actual burial practice.

But practically speaking, still very little is known about who made these textiles or how they were acquired by churches throughout Europe. Fiona Griffith's research has revealed that women frequently made and/or gifted textiles to monasteries throughout the medieval period, and it is very likely that they made or refashioned another textile (whether a bed sheet or a handkerchief, for instance) into a Eucharistic cloth.[85] At St Gall, Hedwig of Swabia gave a cope, stole, and an alb to the monastery, as recorded by Ekkehard IV in his chronicle of St Gall. Griffiths argues that giving textiles to monasteries was another way for women to gain proximity to the altar, even if they were technically forbidden to touch such cloths (although, as Izbeki and Griffiths have shown, women certainly would have washed and cared for many such cloths). Women often justified their place within the church by likening themselves to women in Christ's life, including the women at the tomb, and textile work was considered a particularly appropriate gift to the church given that Mary herself spun the thread to make the temple curtain, according to one apocryphal account. Thus with such a visually prominent interest in cloth in tenth- and

[84] See Snoek, p. 130. See also CC SL 148 A, 106-107m c 3: "Observandum ne pallis vel ministeriis divinis defunctorum corpora obvolvantur"; c. 7: "Ne opertorio Dominici corporis sacerdotes unquam corpus, dum ad tumulum evehetur, obtegatur et sacro velamine usibus suis reddeto, dum honorantur corpora, altaria polluantur." Snoek footnote 154, page 130.

[85] F. Griffiths, "Like the Sister of Aaron: Medieval Religious Women as Makers and Donors of Liturgical Textiles," *Female 'vita religiosa' between Late Antiquity and the High Middle Ages: Structures, Developments, and Spatial Contexts* (2011), pp. 343-374.

eleventh-century images of the holy women at the tomb, it is possible that representations of the holy women—who are the first to learn of the Resurrection—recall the potential proximity that women could have to the altar and its furnishings by standing directly next to the textile-covered Eucharistic body. Moreover, the insistence by Regino of Prüm and Burchard of Worms on the boundaries between the clergy and laity, particularly the clergy and lay women, may suggest—as Ian Christopher Levy has argued—that women were perhaps even distributing the Eucharist in the tenth and eleventh centuries.[86]

But perhaps an even stronger argument can be made that the holy women adjacent to the Eucharistic cloths in the Hartker pen drawing evoked not those actual women who made or were able to clothe the Eucharistic elements, but rather members of the (male) clergy. Amalarius of Metz writes of the holy women in relation to subdeacons and deacons and their role in the Eucharistic celebration:

> …the subdeacon presents himself with his paten at the Lord's tomb. He has taken the paten from the assisting subdeacon, who—as we said above—calls to mind the devoted disposition of the holy women at the Lord's tomb. It is little wonder that the holy women should be associated with the office of the deacon, since Paul joins the women to the deacons in his discussion of ordination.[87]

---

[86] See Ian Christopher Levy, "The Eucharist and Canon Law," *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Middle Ages*, ed. G. Macy, K. van Ausdall, I.C. Levy (2011), pp. 399-445. Levy further cites on this point G. Macy, *The Hidden History of Women's Ordination* (2008), and J. Leclercq, "Eucharistic Celebrations without Priests," *Worship* 55 (1981), pp. 160-168, especially pp. 165-67.

[87] Amalarius of Metz, *De Divinis Officiis*, vol. II, pp. 210-211. "…praesentat se subdiaconus cum patena sua ad sepulchrum Domini. Quam accipit a subdiacono sequente, qui ad memoriam—ut supra diximus—reducit sanctarum feminarum studiosissimum affectum circa sepulturam Domini. Non est mirandum, si sanctae feminae iungantur in officio diaconis, cum Paulus eas coniungat in ordinatione eis." In another passage on the holy women, Amalarius evokes the fidelity of the holy women since they did not turn away from Christ in fear (as others did), writing that "And whenever we enter church, we approach the heavenly mysteries after the example of those women who were devoted to God; whether because of the presence of angelic

As I will later discuss in chapter 3, the position of the subdeacon, in particular, was a subject of debate during this period (many argued, for instance, that the subdeacon should be chaste given his handling of the Eucharistic vessels). By figuring these holy women—who allegorically could be understood as subdeacons or deacons—alongside a view of those cloths viewed by Peter, first bishop (and pope) of Rome and the Eucharistic liturgical cloths seen and arranged by the clerical elite, images of the *Visitatio sepulchri* ca. 950-1050 make a strong claim regarding who and what most effectively mediates Christ upon his absence. This interest in clerical hierarchy and who and what can be figured *in persona Christi* can be understood at least in part, as I will argue in chapter 3, in relation to the so-called Gregorian Reform movement (ca. 1050-80) that follows.

A New Iconographic Source for Christ's Grave Cloths

Although tenth- and eleventh-century images of the *Visitatio sepulchri* have been studied primarily in terms of the architecture of their sepulchers and in relation to the development of Easter plays around the turn of the millennium, I would contend that the clearest liturgical 'source' for the two cloths in the Hartker pen drawing, among other images I have studied here, is the *mise-en-scène* of the altar during the Eucharistic rite itself. This particular image strongly resonates with descriptions of Eucharistic cloth(s) by Pseudo-Alcuin, Honorius, and Sicard, while other contemporary ivory carvings and manuscript illuminations appear to be more loosely inspired by the folds and forms described by these liturgists.

---

virtue, or out of reverence for the holy offering, we should enter with all fear and humility." From Amalarius, *De Divinis Officiis*, p. 211.

But for all of these images, the visual transposition of the cloth-filled Eucharistic rite makes clear that *representations* of cloth can act in ways that actual cloth cannot. For unlike the linen cloths of the Eucharistic liturgy, second-order cloth can defy gravity, retain the shape of a body no longer present, or seem to spin. Modeled on the forms of Eucharistic cloths to various degrees, these second-order cloths frequently suggest the dual character of Christ (his divine and human characters unified in the hypostasis) as well as figure his absence at this moment. The presence of these cloths does not simply call attention to his absence, however, but also *qualifies* it through the formal disposition of these cloths. He is not absent *tout court*, but elsewhere, living, and still incarnate.

In the image with which this article started, the Hartker *Visitatio sepulchri* pen drawing (fig. 1.1), the upper cloth in Christ's tomb is represented with folds affixed to its surface, as if retaining and displaying the imprint of Christ's corporeal form, the way the cloth clung to his body. It folds slightly over at its top and creates an arched, protruding lip that cascades downwards and pushes the rest of the cloth into lower relief. Folds at its center give the illusion that this cloth is at once not impervious to the effects of gravity yet independently upright and suspended. The concave structure of this cloth signals the absence of the body that purportedly created these forms. Depicted in this way, the upper grave cloth presents a material impossibility: cloth that continues to hold the shape of an upright body that is not there.

The upper cloth effectively testifies to Christ's past presence in the tomb and declares that his body is now absent from that space. For as all medieval Christians knew—and as recounted in the synoptic Gospels—Christ was not just absent at this moment, but *elsewhere*. This is explicitly *not* the moment when his incarnate body becomes definitively absent on Earth

until his eventual return. Rather, between the Resurrection and the Ascension, Christ appears as an incarnate being to the apostles on several occasions. Thus it is significant that the top cloth not simply point to an absent body, but an ever-living, incarnate body that continues to exist, albeit beyond the bounds of the frame. The upright stature of the cloth, its independent suspension, and the concave folds uniquely qualify his absence at this moment. While the top cloth does generally suggest the form of the 'corporalem expansam,' it speaks to Christ's incarnate body in a way that the actual corporal simply physically could not.

In its tightly wound-up form, the lower cloth of the Hartker pen drawing conversely insists that it does not hold the form of a human body, unlike its counterpart above. The intricate folded-in shape of the cloth suggests the veil of the Eucharistic chalice that was understood by medieval liturgists to be the *sudarium involutum* in the Gospel of John. Moreover, the manner in which it was folded, such that neither the beginning nor end of the cloth could be seen, was analogous to Christ's divinity: it exists beyond the bounds of time and is mysterious, even inscrutable. Thus the lower cloth invokes the head cloth, Christ's divinity, and the Eucharistic veil all at once. Although Christ's divinity remained hidden during most of his lifetime beneath the veil of his flesh, through a series of miracles, most notably the Resurrection, Christ's divinity became revealed. Still, the divinity is not visually accessible to those who have not resurrected themselves. Together, these cloths suggest the hypostasis, or Christ's dual character: the top cloth speaks to his humanity, and the cloth below, his (invisible) divinity, much like Sicard's description of the two corporals suggests.[88]

[88] See for instance, H. Kessler, *Neither God nor Man: Words, Images, and the Medieval Anxiety about Art* (2007); *Spiritual Seeing: Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art* (2000); Kessler,

Moreover, by figuring the Eucharistic cloths in Christ's tomb, the church body effectively becomes present upon Christ's absence. The careful framing of these cloths reinforces the importance of this moment for the church. In John's account of the Resurrection, Peter is the only one to see all of Christ's grave cloths. This is not insignificant: Peter eventually becomes the first bishop of Rome, then pope, and is thus widely understood by medieval theologians to represent a model cleric.[89] The image, then, doubly presents Peter's vision of the cloth and the presiding medieval priest's view of the veiled Eucharistic elements on the altar. The privileged access to these signs—of the absent, Resurrected Christ and the church body figured in the tomb—is for the clerical figure alone, then, as made clear in both the compositional structure of the individual pen drawing as well as by the very type of book in which it is figured. No other figure, after all, appears to look at the cloths in the tomb in the Hartker image. The women and angel look at one another, not at the contents of the tomb, and the soldiers above appear to sleep. Even their eyes have been pricked by a reader at an unknown date to indicate their figurative blindness to the miraculous events below (fig. 1.26). Thus through the careful manipulation and even framing of cloth, the Hartker image and its cloth-filled iconographic counterparts—as varied as their folds and forms may be—affirm the power of the priest to make Christ present for congregants when he is absent on Earth.

"Image and Object: Christ's Dual Nature and the Crisis of Early Medieval Art," *The Long Morning of Medieval Europe: New Directions in Early Medieval Studies* (2008), pp. 291-320; and Kessler, "Images of Christ and Communication with God," *Settimane di studio della Fondazione Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo* (v. 52, pt. 2, 2004), pp. 1099-1136.

[89] Notably, Peter appears in two other pen drawings in the Hartker Antiphonary, in each instance with a tonsure (worn typically by monks). I hope to further develop this point in the future.

Conclusion

In sum, artists likely drew inspiration from the forms, folds, and allegorical readings of the Eucharistic cloths to express Christological and ecclesiological truths through the irreducibly unique, often erratic grave cloths in images of the holy women's visit to Christ's tomb around the turn of the millennium. These cloths' forms—many of which are more loosely inspired by liturgical commentaries than others—demonstrate a broader interest in how the manipulation of materials can be a powerful means to say something about a body that cannot otherwise be depicted. The figuration of Christ's grave cloths in these formally variant, even eccentric ways constitutes an artistic strategy to figure and qualify Christ's absence in relation to specifically the church body figured as the veiled Eucharistic elements. These images make clear that upon the moment that Christ is no longer here, the church begins to mediate his otherwise absent body through the central rite of Christian worship.

CHAPTER 2

AD ORIENTEM: SEEING CHRIST'S BACK IN THE EARLY MEDIEVAL ASCENSION

Introduction

In a small ivory plaque made around the year 1000 in present-day Lorraine (France) now at the Schnütgen Museum in Cologne, Christ ascends to heaven, leaving behind his apostles and the Virgin below an undulating barrier (fig. 2.1). They gesticulate in a range of ways, turning their bodies left, right, and inward as they attempt to look up—even touch—Christ's incarnate body before it is completely gone from view. From the vantage point of the monastic viewer, too, Christ is seemingly out of reach: the artist has depicted him such that his torso is entirely turned inward as he ascends into the splayed cloud that frames the joined hands of Father and Son.

The Ascension narrative is inherently difficult to depict: how, with the resources of representation, could the medieval artist figure a body that eludes human perception but is not yet ontologically absent? To complicate matters, Christ's divinity always eluded the senses to some extent throughout the *vita Christi*. And furthermore, the Ascension was widely understood to have major theological and ecclesiological implications. For Augustine, the Ascension marked the birth of a new system of signs.[90]

In this chapter, I study an exceptional set of early medieval images whose artists engaged the visual, theological, and ecclesiological complexities of the Ascension narrative through an

[90] See A. Dupont, "Augustine's Homiletic Appreciation of the Feast of Easter," in R. Bishop, J. Leemans, and H. Tamas (eds.), *Preaching after Easter: Mid-Pentecost, Ascension, and Pentecost in Late Antiquity* (2016), pp. 158-184.

iconographic means that became popular during the late Carolingian and Ottonian periods, namely, that of the dorsal figure, or what art historians have termed a *Rückenfigur*. As I hope to demonstrate, it was primarily by way of the *Rückenfigur* that these artists were able to frame Christ's absence and presence in relational terms as well as suggest the birth of a new system of signs altogether.

***

Early medieval representations of the Ascension made in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries frequently depict the moment at which Christ becomes partially, if not completely invisible to the apostles.[91] While each evangelist recounts a handful of events between the Resurrection of Christ and his Ascension, only the Gospels of Mark and Luke provide brief accounts of the Ascension itself:

> et Dominus quidem postquam locutus est eis assumptus est in caelum et sedet a dextris Dei. Illi autem profecti praedicaverunt ubique, Domino cooperante, et sermonem confirmante, sequentibus signis. (Mark 16:19-20)[92]

[91] The most complete (albeit somewhat dated) overviews of the iconography of the Ascension in medieval art are: S. Helena Gutberlet, *Die Himmelfahrt Christi in der Bildenden Kunst von den Anfängen bis ins hohe Mittelalter Versuch zur geistesgeschichtlichen Erfassung einer ikonographischen Frage* (1934), tomes I and II. See also H. Schrade, *Zur Ikonographie der Himmelfahrt Christi* (1930). A much briefer study (and also in English) can be found in E. Dewald, "The Iconography of the Ascension," *American Journal of Archaeology* 19:3 (Jul.-Sep., 1915), pp. 277-319. Magali Guenot also recently completed her dissertation at Université Lumière Lyon II on the iconography of Christ's Ascension. It is entitled "Les images de l'Ascension du Christ dans la chrétienté latine du 9e au 13eme siècle" and was supervised by Nicolas Reveyron. The thesis has been published entirely online and is available here: theses.univ-lyon2.fr/documents/lyon2/2016/guenot_m/.../guenot_m_these_udl.pdf. Last visited January 30, 2019.

[92] "And the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken to them, was taken up into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God. But they going forth preached everywhere: the Lord working withal, and

> Et ego mitto promissum Patris mei in vos; vos autem sedete in civitate, quoadusque induamini virtute ex alto. Eduxit autem eos foras in Bethaniam, et elevatis manibus suis benedixit eis. Et factum est, dum benediceret illis, recessit ab eis et ferebatur in caelum. Et ipsi adorantes regressi sunt in Hierusalem cum gaudio magno: et erant semper in templo, laudantes et benedicentes Deum. Amen. (Luke 24:49-53).[93]

In Luke's account, Christ ascends while blessing the apostles and "ferebatur," or "was carried up" to heaven. In Mark 16, Christ ascends ("assumptus est") to heaven after speaking to the Apostles. Following the Ascension, the apostles preach the word of Christ, confirmed by "sequentibus signis."[94]

The Acts of the Apostles, also written by Luke[95], offered medieval readers, artists, and devotees a much more detailed Ascension narrative and became an oft-cited source in early medieval liturgical texts:

> Dixit autem eis: non est vestrum nosse tempora vel momenta quae Pater posuit in sua potestate: sed accipietis virtutem supervenientis Spiritus Sancti in vos, et eritis mihi testes in Hierusalem et in omni Iudaea et Samaria et usque ad ultimum terrae. Et cum haec dixisset videntibus illis elevatus est: et nubes suscepit eum ab oculis eorum. Cumque intuerentur in caelum euntem illum, ecce duo viri astiterunt iuxta illos in vestibus albis

---

confirming the word with signs that followed." (Mark 16:19-20). I should note, however, that Mark 16:8 is not authentic, although as part of the Vulgate this would not have mattered for the medieval reader. I thank Willemien Otten for bringing this to my attention.

[93] "And I send the promise of my Father upon you: but stay you in the city till you be endued with power from on high. And he led them out as far as Bethania: and lifting up his hands, he blessed them. And it came to pass, whilst he blessed them, he departed from them, and was carried up to heaven. And they adoring went back into Jerusalem with great joy. And they were always in the temple, praising and blessing God. Amen." (Luke 24:49-53).

[94] Can be loosely translated as "signs that follow." See quotation immediately above from Mark 16:20.

[95] Although medieval readers did not know Acts was written by Luke, they would not have made a firm distinction between this text and those in the Gospels. My thanks to Willemien Otten for bringing this to my attention. For an excellent account of the importance of Acts and early medieval liturgical rites, see E. Rose, *Ritual Memory: The Apocryphal Acts and Liturgical Commemoration in the Early Medieval West* (500-1215) (2009).

> qui et dixerunt: viri galilaei, quid statis aspicientes in caelum? Hic Iesus qui assumptus est a vobis in caelum, sic veniet quemadmodum vidistis eum euntem in caelum. Tunc reversi sunt Hierosolymam a monte qui vocatur Oliveti, qui est iuxta Hierusalem sabbati habens iter. (Acts 1: 7-12)[96]

In this passage, Christ preaches to the Apostles and then ascends by way of a cloud. What the apostles can and cannot see is crucial: even as they bear witness to Christ's Ascension, the Apostles, we are told, cannot see Christ once the cloud "received him out of their sight." Following this moment of disappearance, or obfuscation, the Apostles see two men dressed in white, who remind them that Christ will eventually return just as he departed.

Like the episode of the *Visitatio sepulchri* examined in chapter one, these accounts of Christ's Ascension posed significant challenges to medieval artists. How, with the resources of representation, could one depict Christ's phenomenal transformation from visible to invisible? How could a work of art communicate or mediate the central doctrine of the hypostatic union, teaching that Christ is simultaneously human and divine, in its visual description of his disappearance, particularly when his divinity was cognitively and visually inaccessible for all humans, apostles and contemporary viewers alike? For even beyond the Ascension, Christ's divinity was *always* a pictorial challenge, but to mediate the revelation of his un-seeable divinity as well as the removal of his incarnate body from Earth posed a major artistic challenge. The

[96] "But he said to them: It is not for you to know the times or moments, which the Father hath put in his own power: But you shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you, and you shall be witnesses unto me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and even to the uttermost part of the earth. And when he had said these things, while they looked on, he was raised up: and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they were beholding him going up to heaven, behold two men stood by them in white garments. Who also said: Ye men of Galilee, why stand you looking up to heaven? This Jesus who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come, as you have seen him going into heaven. Then they returned to Jerusalem from the mount that is called Olivet, which is nigh Jerusalem, within a sabbath day's journey." (Acts 1:7-12)

subject of the Ascension, as recounted in the synoptic Gospels and as widely understood by early medieval theologians, is an inherently difficult one to depict.[97]

Artists of the Late Roman, Carolingian, and early Ottonian periods often depicted the Ascending Christ as a figure who climbed up a mountain, frequently assisted by God's hand, extended down from heaven. In the initial 'C' on folio 71v of the ninth-century Drogo Sacramentary (Paris BnF MS Lat. 9428), Christ stands atop a mountain and turns his body towards the right as he climbs towards heaven (fig. 2.2).[98] As the hand of God extends from the cloud above, two angels look down at the apostles and make gestures that likely indicate speech. The apostles and the Virgin Mary, who stands immediately below Christ, gaze upward. In a rare instance, the Virgin Mary is partially adorsed. In the St Gereon sacramentary (Paris BnF MS Lat. 817) made in early eleventh-century Cologne, Christ similarly strides upward, facing the

[97] See the work of Dewald (1915), Schrade (1930), Gutberlet (1934), and Guenot (2016) cited above. In the pages that follow, I can only broadly summarize several of the dominant iconographies of the Ascension in the early medieval period; I acknowledge that there are nuances and complexities within this iconographic tradition that constraints of space prevent me from exploring.

[98] On the image of the Ascension in the Drogo Sacramentary, see K.M. Collins, *Visualizing Mary: Innovation and Exegesis in Ottonian Manuscripts* (PhD dissertation, University of Texas Austin, 2007) and p. 45; Deshman, "Another Look," p. 529. Much has been written on this manuscript. See, for instance, M.-P. Laffitte et C. Denoël, *Trésors carolingiens : Livres manuscrits de Charlemagne à Charles le Chauve*, Bibliothèque nationale de France (2007), notice 53; F. Unterkircher, *Zur Ikonographie und Liturgie des Drogo-Sakramentars (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale Ms. Lat. 9248)* (1977); L. Weber, *Einbanddecken, Elfenbeintafeln, Miniaturen, Schriftproben aus Metzer liturgischen Handschriften* (1912), p. 14. Plate 16; E. Leesti, "Pentecost Illustration in the Drogo Sacramentary," *Gesta* XXVIII no. 2 (1989), pp. 205-216; C. Chazelle, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era: Theology and Art of Christ's Passion* (2001).

right edge of the frame (fig. 2.3).[99] Here, however, the Virgin is nowhere to be seen and the two angels' massive wings and haloes appear to shield Christ's body from the Apostles. In the late tenth-century Benedictional of St. Aethewold (London BL MS Add. 49598), Christ is depicted vigorously stepping into a mandorla even as he actively ascends to heaven; the undulating bands of paint surrounding the mandorla and those immediately above the apostles' and Mary's head emphatically evoke the clouds that blocked their view of Christ according to the Acts of the Apostles (fig. 2.4).[100]

Another iconographic type of the Ascension found in eleventh- and twelfth-century continental works figures the fully frontal Christ as he ascends upwards with the apostles, angels, and Mary below. The Pericopes of Henry II (Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek MS Clm 4452) made ca. 1002-1012 depicts Christ immediately above a bank of clouds—or perhaps a mountain range—and two standing angels, Mary, and the apostles, below (fig. 2.5).[101] The angels' bodies nicely frame the notable absence of Christ's incarnate body on Earth. Within the illumination, differently colored fields mark Christ's transition from the earthly to heavenly realms, visually suggesting different fields of vision within the image. Unlike the beholder, who can see Christ's

---

[99] H. Ehl, *Die ottonische Kölner Buchmalerei* (1922), pp. 58, 59 fig. 23; P. Bloch and H. Schnitzler, *Die ottonische Kölner Malerschule*, I (1967), p. 42, pl. 105. My thanks to Charlotte de Noël for letting me consult this manuscript.

[100] R. Deshman, *The Benedictional of Aethelwold* (1995), pp. 58-62, color pl. 25, and more specifically in Deshman, "Another Look at the Disappearing Christ: Corporeal and Spiritual Vision in Early Medieval Images," *The Art Bulletin* 79:3 (1997), pp. 518-546, especially pp. 518-519. Deshman's article is foundational for the study of images of the Ascension around the year 1000, and I will return to his work in the pages that follow. See also A. Prescott, *Benedictional of St Aethelwold* (2002), pp. 15-16.

[101] G. Leidinger, *Das Perikopenbuch Kaiser Heinrichs II.* (1912), p. 23; H. Fillitz, R. Kashnitz, U. Kuder (eds.), *Zierde für ewige Zeit*. *Das Perikopenbuch Heinrichs II.* (1994), p. 124, pl. 32.

entire face and body in this image, those depicted below Christ's body can no longer see his incarnate form.

The visual absence of the upper half of Christ's body first appeared around the year 1000 in Anglo-Saxon England, and this iconographic type was christened "the disappearing Christ" by Meyer Schapiro in a now famous study of this motif.[102] The first known appearance of this iconography can be found in the Missal of Robert of Jumièges (Rouen Bibliothèque municipale MS Y.6), which was made in Canterbury in the early eleventh century (fig. 2.6).[103] With only a few exceptions, the disappearing Christ was primarily an English phenomenon in the early medieval period, but it became the iconographic norm on the continent in the late twelfth century and thereafter.[104] Following Meyer Schapiro's and Robert Deshman's groundbreaking investigations of this iconographic 'invention,' the "disappearing Christ" iconography has continued to attract considerable (art) historical work.[105]

---

[102] M. Schapiro, "The Image of the Disappearing Christ: The Ascension in English Art Around the Year 1000," *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, ser. 6, 23, 1943, 133-52, repr. in Schapiro, *Selected Papers, III. Late Antique, Early Christian, and Medieval Art* (1979), pp. 267-87.

[103] See H.A. Wilson, *The Missal of Robert of Jumièges*, London, Henry Bradshaw Society (1896) for a transcription of texts found within the manuscript. There exists no monograph, to my knowledge, that studies this manuscript. Given its very close stylistic resemblance to the Benedictional of Aethelwold, Deshman does discuss the manuscript in his book. See also A. Loisel, "Missel et un bénédictionnaire anglo-saxons de la Bibliothèque de Rouen," *Bulletin, Les amis des monument rouennais* (1911), p. 129, fig. on p. 126.

[104] As Deshman discusses, the Ascension in the Bernward Gospels (Hildesheim Dommuseum DS 18) is an exception to this rule. In this manuscript's depiction of the Ascension, we see the entire upper half of Christ's body obscured by a sun or star: Deshman, "Another Look" and J.P. Kingsley, *The Bernward Gospels: Art, Memory, and the Episcopate* (2014).

[105] Schapiro, "The Image of the Disappearing Christ" (1943) and Deshman, "Another Look" (1997).

Shortly before and after the turn of the millennium on the continent, several artists disposed the figure of the Ascending Christ in an unusual way, depicting him as adorsed, that is as turned away from the beholder, in primarily ivory carvings. His face, however, is still at least partly visible.[106] Christ is in profile in a ninth-century ivory plaque made in northern France (Liverpool World Museum M 8021)[107] (fig. 2.7), but less than half his face is visible in the depiction of the Ascension in ivory panels from Essen (Essen Domschatz Inv. Nr. 7) and Liège (Brussels Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire n. 1483) that date from the early eleventh century and are extremely stylistically similar to one another (fig. 2.8, 2.9).[108] I will discuss this group of ivories in which one or more apostles as well as the Ascending Christ are adorsed in greater detail in the pages that follow.

The makers of two ivories dated to around the first millennium took this iconography one step further. On a large ivory plaque (206 x 144 x 16 mm) made ca. 980 in Metz (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum Kunstkammer 7284) [109] and on an iconographically similar yet

---

[106] Dewald, "The Iconography of the Ascension," p. 296. In his study on the iconography of the Ascension, DeWald calls a group of ivories that share this characteristic "Carolingian type Group B" and provides a drawing (rather than photographic reproductions) of the Essen ivory to illustrate this type (fig. 9). His primary concerns are stylistic ones, and he argues that the image of Christ stepping up from a mountain and holding God's hand derives from the "hellenistic type" found in sixth-century Gaul as well as on sarcophagi from Arles and Clermont. He makes no comment, however, on the stylistic precursor for the adorsed apostles or Christ in these ivories.

[107] A. Goldschmidt, *Die Elfenbeinskulpturen*, I (1914), pl. LIV (127); London, Burlington Fine Arts Club, *Exhibitions of Carvings in Ivory* (1923), no. 39; Schrade, p. 136; M. Gibson, *Liverpool Ivories* (1994), pp. 30-31, pl. Xa.

[108] Extensive bibliography on each of these ivories will be provided in the pages that follow, in which I discuss each ivory at greater length.

[109] On the Vienna ivory, see catalog entries by M. Pippal, B109 and B110, "Elfenbeinplatte mit der Himmelfahrt Christi," *Ornamenta Ecclesiae. Kunst und Künstler der Romanik: Katalog zur*

smaller plaque (110 x 85 x 6 mm) made in the early eleventh century in Liège (Cologne, Schnütgen Museum Inv. Nr. B2)[110], heretofore known as the "Vienna" and "Cologne" ivories, Christ's back is fully visible and his face—as reproduced in frontal photographs—is completely obfuscated (fig. 2.10, 2.1). The Vienna ivory of the Ascension was in fact one of two ivories that once adorned the Sacramentary of Henry II; the other depicted the Crucifixion (Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 4456, front cover) (fig. 2.11).[111] Likely made by the same artist,

---

Ausstellung des Schnütgen Museums in der Joseph-Haubrich-Kunsthalle. Volume 1 of 3 (1985), see especially pp. 334-335. Very similar catalog entries can be found in the exhibition catalog for the show also at the Schnütgen museum, *Rhein und Maas: Kunst und Kultur, 800-1400* (1972-3), 2 vol., see namely B6, F3, and F10. J. Hanson, "The Stuttgart Casket and the Permeability of the Byzantine Artistic Tradition," *Gesta* 37:1 (1998), pp. 13-25; A. Goldschmidt, *Die Elfenbeinskulpturen*, I (1914), p. 65, fig. 25. See also H. Schrade, "Zur Ikonographie," fig. 18; A. Goldschmidt and K. Weitzmann, *Die byzantinischen Elfenbeinskulpturen*, II (1934), p. 31, fig. 10; H. Fillitz, "Die Wiener Gregor-Platte," *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien*, N.F., XXII (1962); Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, *Katalog für Plastik und Kunstgewerbe*, I (1964), cat. 3; p. 3, pl. 2; C. Nordenfalk, "Karolingisch oder Ottonisch? Zur Datierung und Lokalisierung der Elfenbeine Goldschmidt I, 120-131," *Kolloquium über spätantike und frühmittelalterliche Skulptur*, III (1974), pl. 26 (1).

[110] On the Cologne ivory, see A. Goldschmidt, "Die Elfenbeinschnitzerei," *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst* (1909), pp. 157-160. B. Kleinschmidt, "Eine Elfenbeinschnitzerei mit der Himmelfahrt Mariä aus der sog. Metzer Schule," *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst* (1909), pp. 1-10. Note that even though she writes that the ivory is from Metz, Kleinschmidt is in fact referring to the Cologne ivory when she characterizes its subject matter as Mary's Assumption (there was some confusion over the ivory's subject given Christ's long hair). See also F. Witte, *Die Skulpturen der Sammlung Schnütgen* (1912), pl. 82; A. Goldschmidt, *Die Elfenbeinskulpturen*, II (1918), p. 34, pl. xxiv (75); H. Gutberlet, *Die Himmelfahrt*, p. 173 pl. XI; H. Swarzenski, *Monuments of Romanesque Art* (1954), p. 19, 39 (also with Vienna ivory), pl. 15 (35); Cologne, Schnütgen Museum, *Rhein und Maas*, I (1972), p. 174; Cologne, Schnütgen Museum, *Ornamenta Ecclesiae* (1985), cat. B 110, p. 335; Cologne, Schnütgen Museum, *Das Mittelalter in 111 Meisterwerken* (2003), p. 70 (n. 40), fig. on p. 70. Both ivories are mentioned in several of the aforementioned publications, including, A. Boeckler, "Elfenbeinreliefs der ottonischen Renaissance," *Phoebus: Zeitschrift für Kunst aller Zeiten. Revue des Arts anciens et modernes. A Journal of Art in All Ages* (1948-49), volume 2, 1946, pp. 145-155, especially page 152.

[111] See J. Hanson, "Stuttgart Casket," p 22; *Ornamenta Ecclesiae,* I, p. 335; F. Steenbock, *Der kirchliche Prachteinband* (1965), cat. 60, fig. 83; V. Elbern, "Die bildende Kunst der Ottonenzeit zwischen Maas und Elbe," *Das erste Jahrtausend an Rhein und Ruhr*, II (1964), p. 1029; H.

the Crucifixion ivory blatantly puts Christ's body on display, while the Ascension ivory covers his flesh with a long mantle and appears, when viewed straight on, to obscure his face from view. To date, art historians have spoken of the Cologne ivory panel as a 'copy' of the Vienna ivory; its composition is quite similar, although deliberate changes—with particular theological effects—have been made by its artist, too.

Together, these ivories are the only two objects, to my knowledge, that depict the ascending Christ as a dorsal figure. As such, they are outliers, but their artists were clearly aware of earlier and contemporary iconographic trends in which the Ascending Christ's face or torso is partly obscured. In this chapter, I will consider how these ivories offer art historians a glimpse at how the *Rückenfigur* was understood—and what theological meanings it could impart—by early medieval artists and viewers. The artists of these two objects saw and exploited the visual potential of adorsing figures, I believe, as it was used in contemporary and earlier ivory carvings, in particular. Indeed, it seems that during the ninth through eleventh centuries, the *Rückenfigur* was a compositional style, if not strategy in these ivory carvings, limited to a select number of iconographic subjects. Following a study of dorsal figures in earlier Carolingian manuscript drawings and ivory carvings, I focus on those two exceptional ivories that depict Christ himself as a *Rückenfigur* at the moment of the Ascension. I explore how the makers of these objects confronted the dynamic of revelation and obfuscation that characterized this biblical event; these artists' work offers us another rich vantage onto how early and high medieval artists responded

---

Fillitz, "Die Wiener Gregor-Platte," fig. 14; H. Schnitzler, "Fulda oder Reichenau?" *Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch*, IXI (1957), p. 100; H. Swarzenski, *Monuments*, pp. 19, 40; R. Schilling, "Carolingian and Ottonian Manuscripts in the Exhibition at Berne," *Burlington Magazine*, XCII (1950), p. 82; A. Boeckler, "Elfenbeinreliefs der ottonischen Renaissance," pp. 145, 147,152; A. Goldschmidt, *Die Elfenbeinskulpturen*, I, p. 64, pl. LVI (130).

to the challenge of representing the revelation of Christ's divinity and the perceptual limits and challenges it posed to the viewer and artist alike.

Mediating Christ: Carolingian & Ottonian *Rückenfiguren*

The adorsed or dorsal figure who turns his back towards the viewer has been the subject of few medieval art historical studies, but there have been occasional mentions of these figures' appearance in more chronologically expansive art historical accounts of dorsal figures.[112] For instance, Margarete Koch's *Die Rückenfigur im Bild von der Antike bis Giotto* (1965) considers how the *Rückenfigur* affects the formal structure of images and their spatial value. Concerning art of the Ottonian period, Koch argues that the *Rückenfigur*'s primarily role is one of structuring space, namely one that is 'abstract' and 'transcendental.'[113] Koch's study is broad in scope, and thus her discussion of early medieval *Rückenfiguren* is brief, but her book does helpfully identify several iconographies in which the *Rückenfigur* frequently appears in late antique, pre-modern, and early modern art history. Still, her analysis of the primarily formal effects of disposing the figure's body so that its back is turned to the beholder does not offer a substantial, historicist

[112] M. Koch's *Die Rückenfigur im Bild von der Antike bis Giotto* (1965) remains the most comprehensive overview of the use and meaning of *Rückenfiguren* from the Late Antique period to the Italian Renaissance. See also E. Rzucidlo, *Caspar David Friedrich und Wahrnehmung. Von der Rückenfigur zum Landschaftsbild* (PhD Dissertation, Freie Universität Berlin, 1997); G. Wilks, *Das Motiv der Rückenfigur und dessen Bedeutungswandlungen in der deutschen und skandinavischen Malerei zwischen 1800 und der Mitte der 1940er Jahre* (2005); and F. Yalcin, *Anwesende Abwesenheit. Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte von Bildern mit menschenleeren Räumen, Rückenfiguren und Lauschern im holländischen 17. Jahrhundert* (2004).

[113] For Koch's analysis of the *Rückenfigur* in the medieval period, specifically, see "Die Flächenfunktion der Rückenfigur im Mittelalter," *Die Rückenfigur im Bild von der Antike bis Giotto* (1965), pp. 32-48. Although less relevant to the study of early medieval art, see also R. Prange, "Sinnoffenheit und Sinnverneinung als metapicturale Prinzipien zur Historizität bildlicher selbstreferenz am Beispiel der Rückenfigur," *Ambiguität in der Kunst: Typen und Funktionen eines ästhetischen Paradigmas* (2010), pp. 125-67.

framework through which to approach the inclusion of *Rückenfigur* in art of the early medieval period.[114]

Likely the most well-known art historical analysis of the *Rückenfigur* is that by Joseph Leo Koerner in his study of the German Romantic painter, Caspar David Friedrich (1774-1870).[115] In contrast to older deployments of the *Rückenfigur* that Koerner describes as "marginal staffage" ornamenting "earlier landscape art," Friedrich placed his *Rückenfiguren* in the foreground of his paintings, often before an open window and/or an expansive landscape.[116] Like the viewer, the figure gazes outward, and thus, in Koerner's interpretation, the painting depicts "the original act of experience itself" and defines "landscape as primarily the encounter of the subject with world."[117] For Koerner, Friedrich's back-turned figures act as "reflective foils of both artist and viewer, figures, that is, of the subject *in* the landscape."[118] In other words, Koerner understands such figures in Friedrich's paintings as mediating the beholder's experience of the painted landscape, a mediation in which the painter does not grant the beholder full visual

---

[114] See, for instance, M. Barasch, "'Elevatio': The Depiction of a Ritual Gesture," *Artibus et Historiae* 24: 48 (2003), pp. 43-56. Barasch cites Koch's work in footnote 25, page 56. He writes on her work (in the same footnote) that "This useful study concentrates, however, on aspects of style, and does not consider the importance of a figure's meaning or nature for the way it is employed in the composition." Amy Knight Powell has also written an interesting analysis of late medieval images of the elevation of the Eucharist in which the priest's back is turned to the viewer, but she does not employ the term 'Rückenfigur.' See AK Powell, "Bread/head: Morphology of an encounter," *postmedieval: a journal of medieval cultural studies* (2016) p. 7, 10-28.

[115] J.L. Koerner, *Caspar David Friedrich and the Subject of Landscape* (2009). See especially Part III, "The Halted Traveler," for a discussion of the *Rückenfigur* in Friedrich's paintings.

[116] Koerner, p. 194.

[117] Ibid., p. 193.

[118] Ibid., p. 194.

access to the vista experienced by the *Rückenfigur*. In fact, because the body of the *Rückenfigur* in the foreground of these compositions blocks part of the landscape from our view, we may only "oversee" his visual experience rather than directly participate in it.[119]

Koerner's analysis of Friedrich's *Rückenfiguren* raises several questions also salient to early medieval *Rückenfiguren*: do they both block *and* mediate the beholder's vision? Do these medieval back-turned figures perform a similar compulsive function within pictorial compositions, at once uniting disparate spaces or planes within the picture space and introjecting the dimension of loss, absence, and incompletion detected by Koerner in Friedrich's paintings? How might they call into question Koerner's relegation of historically prior *Rückenfiguren* to the impoverished state of "staffage"? And how does a marked attention to landscape—as a genre or subject of representation—in these works require a new perspective on the role played by such back-turned figures in their early medieval pictorial contexts? In the pages that follow, I respond to these questions by closely examining how early medieval artists deployed back-turned figures, sometimes but most often *not* of Christ, and by exploring how early medieval viewers may have understood the *Rückenfigur* to possess specific formal and theological effects.

***

In order to partly understand why—and to what effect—Christ was disposed as a *Rückenfigur* in the Vienna and Cologne ivories, I will first consider several visual comparanda drawn from the Carolingian and Ottonian periods. By and large, during the late eighth to the late eleventh centuries, the *Rückenfigur* appears to have been a compositional style, if not strategy,

[119] In Friedrich's paintings, the *Rückenfigur* is frequently a portrait of the artist himself.

found in ivory carvings and manuscript illuminations, and limited to a select number of iconographic subjects in both media. Christ is rarely a *Rückenfigur* himself beyond images of the Ascension, and it is instead most often others who are adorsed when engaged in an exchange with Christ. These figures include primarily Longinus and Stephaton at the Crucifixion and ecclesiastical figures during liturgical rites. Although these figures are dorsal, meaning that their backsides are all on view, their faces are visible to varying degrees, whether in profile or *profil perdu*. In what follows, I study a few illustrative examples of these iconographic subjects that I believe offer some insight into what the depiction of the ascending Christ as a *Rückenfigur* may have formally, narratively, and theologically accomplished in the case of the Ascension as depicted in the Vienna and Cologne ivories and their iconographic antecedents.

Rückenfiguren in Carolingian manuscript illumination

The Utrecht Psalter (Utrecht Universiteitsbibliotheek MS Bibl. Rhenotraiectinae I Nr. 32), made likely in the second quarter of the ninth century in Reims, features 166 pen drawings that illustrate the accompanying psalms, among other texts.[120] Within these pen drawings, there

[120] Much has been written on the Utrecht Psalter. For more recent literature, see K. van der Horst, W. Noel, and W. Wüstefeld (eds), *The Utrecht Psalter in Medieval Art: Picturing the Psalms of David* (1996); D. Migura, *Kunst der Karolinger. Die Schule von Reims. Ebo Evangeliar und Utrecht-Psalter* (2014); M. Holcomb, *Pen and parchment. Drawing in the Middle Ages* (2009); M. P. Laffitte & Ch. Denoël, *Trésors carolingiens: Livres manuscrits de Charlemagne à Charles le Chauve* (2007), see pp.17, 53, 55, 91, 168-169, 172, 181; N. Morgan, "The Utrecht Psalter and its copies," *Anglo-Catalan Psalter* (ed. M. Blanchard, 2006), pp. 17-28; L. Bessette, *The visualization of the contents of the psalms in the early Middle Ages*, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor (2005, PhD dissertation); S. Blick, "Exceptions to Krautheimer's theory of copying," *Visual Resources. An International Journal of Documentation*, 20 (2004), pp. 123-142; C. Chazelle, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era: Theology and art of Christ's*

exist dozens—I count well over sixty—dorsal figures. Their faces are frequently drawn in profile or *profil perdu*, and their back parts are fully or partially on display. In only a few instances is a figure's face also completely turned-in, and s/he is rarely the figure of Christ. Adorsed figures are frequently included in the same kinds of scenes, namely in the foreground of circular groupings or when s/he looks up at Christ or the hand of God. In only a few occasions is Christ himself adorsed, but his face in these instances remains in profile. These trends remain true for the Harley Psalter (London BL MS Harley MS 603), made in the second and third decades of the eleventh century in Canterbury and copied from the Utrecht Psalter.[121]

On folio 90v of the Utrecht Psalter, several figures sit in a circular formation around two lecterns and a handful of purportedly holy persons (fig. 2.12). The text below this pen drawing is Canticum 15 in the ordering of the Psalter and is also the Athanasian Creed, which was very popular during the Carolingian period and could be called the *Fides Catholica* or *Quicumque*.[122]

---

passion (2001); W. J. Diebold, *Word and image. An introduction to early medieval art* (2000), see pp. 107-110; W. Travis, "Representing 'Christ as giant' in early medieval art," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 62 (1999), pp. 167-189; R. Deshman, "Another look." An excellent digital facsimile of the manuscript with transcriptions of individual "word illustrations" is available here: http://www.utrechtpsalter.nl/. Last visited November 7, 2016.

[121] For more on the Harley Psalter, see J. Backhouse, "The Making of the Harley Psalter," *British Library Journal*, 10 (1984), 97-113; R. Gameson, "The Romanesque Artist of the Harley 603 Psalter," *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700*, 4 (1993), pp. 24-61; W. Noel, *The Harley Psalter*, Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology (1996), W. Noel, "The Harley Psalter," in Melanie Holcomb, *Pen and Parchment: Drawing in the Middle Ages* (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2009), fig. 9, pp. 13-14, no. 12. Online facsimile of manuscript and more bibliography can be found at http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/record.asp?MSID=18402. Last visited November 7, 2016. L. Bessette also discusses the Harley Psalter in her unpublished dissertation, along with the Utrecht, Corbie, and Stuttgart psalters, as cited above.

[122] The Athanasian Creed has notably nothing, however, to do with Athanasius. Historically, he would not have spoken at the council of Nicea (325). He was particularly beloved in the west and

The text asserts that salvation is dependent on faith in the incarnation and in the indivisibility of the trinity. In her study of this image, Celia Chazelle has argued that the illustration evokes an ancient church council debating doctrinal issues and that the central figure within the circle is perhaps Athanasius, archbishop of Alexandria, who recites the *Fides Catholica* before his peers.[123] Chazelle writes that the circular formation of figures was typical of Carolingian councils, specifically councils of bishops.[124] Curiously, dorsal figures nearly *always* appear in the foreground of circular groupings in the Utrecht and Harley Psalter as on folio 90v with the effect of creating a sense of space, and perhaps specifically a space intended for a conciliar meeting.

Dorsal figures in the Utrecht and Harley Psalters are also often individuals who are isolated and look upward at Christ or the hand of God. On f. 56v of the Utrecht Psalter, a single adorsed figure turns his head to look up at Christ, who sits in a mandorla to the upper left of his head (fig. 2.13). Similarly, on f. 88v of the Utrecht Psalter, a small child's back faces the viewer as he looks upward at Christ, who in turn shines a torch down from heaven (fig. 2.14). The

---

was considered the fourth church father of the East next to Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzen, and John Chrysostom. My thanks to Willemien Otten for helping me with this point.

[123] See C. Chazelle, "Archbishops Ebo and Hincmar of Reims and the Utrecht Psalter," *Speculum*, Vol. 72, No. 4 (Oct., 1997), pp. 1055-1077.

[124] Chazelle, p. 1058. See footnote 17 on the same page, where she cites the following sources on circular groups: "Ordo de celebrando concilio, in Paul Hinschius, ed., *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae* (Leipzig, 1863; repr. Aalen, Ger., 1963), p. 22, specifies that bishops sit in this fashion; but Paulinus of Aquileia ,*Libellus sacrosyllabus episcoporum Italiae, Concililum Francofurtense* a. 794, MGH Conc 2/1:131, describes the seating at Frankfurt of different ranks of clergy "In modum coronae." See also Walter, p. 55, on Frankfurt (794); Reynolds, "Rites and Signs," pp. 222-23, 237, 241-44. Circular gatherings are depicted in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Pal. Lat. 1564, fol. 3r (Walter, fig. 70); Vivian Bible, Paris, BnF Ms Lat. 1, fol. 423v (Beckwith, fig. 49)."

accompanying text from line 76 of Canticum 9 reads: "And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways."[125] The child's facial features are indistinguishable, and his stance serves to underscore, it seems, the visual exchange between him and Christ. Another instance of an adorsed figure who looks up at Christ can be found in a depiction of the Crucifixion on folio 51v, in which Stephaton's body turns inward (fig. 2.15); the figure of Stephaton, and in some instances Longinus, is frequently adorsed in Carolingian and Ottonian ivory sculptures as well (and which will be the subject of the following section). On folio 59r of the Harley Psalter, an adorsed figure embraces Christ by literally joining their faces together (fig. 2.16). This intimate touch illustrates, I believe, one of the central roles of the adorsed figure in the illustrations of the Utrecht and Harley Psalters: to demonstrate a visual and physical longing for Christ, and to mediate access to Christ for the reader.

Sometimes these dorsal figures appear in groups, such as on f. 89r of the Utrecht Psalter (fig. 2.17). Their visible backsides and varied gestures are similar to those of the apostles below the ascending Christ in the Ascension ivories from the Schnütgen and Kunsthistorisches Museum. Notably, a similar grouping of figures—some of whom are adorsed—appears in a depiction of the Ascension of Christ on f. 85v in the Utrecht Psalter (fig. 2.18). These figures create both a sense of spatial depth and drama through their flamboyant gestures, and they mediate access to God like the lone adorsed figure who appears so frequently throughout these manuscripts' pages.

[125] Latin translation from online version of Utrecht Psalter: "Et tu puer, propheta altissimi vocaberis; praeibis enim ante faciem domini parare vias eius."

Finally, Christ himself is adorsed in both the Utrecht and Harley Psalters, but his face is never fully turned-in. On folio 14v of both the Harley and Utrecht Psalters, a Christ-like figure is tied to a post and whipped by two soldiers on either side (fig. 2.19, 20). On folio 49v of the Utrecht Psalter, Christ is depicted adorsed but with his face in profile; the text adjacent to the image evokes the Ascension (Psalm 83), but it technically corresponds with the subject of the previous pen-drawing, according to scholars of the manuscript (fig. 2.21). This page accompanies in fact Psalm 84, and the adorsed Christ figures line 7 of that psalm, or "Thou wilt turn, O God, and bring us to life: and thy people shall rejoice in thee."[126] Two other instances of an adorsed Christ appear in the Harley Psalter, on both folios 18v (psalm 32) and 7r (psalm 12) (fig. 2.22, 2.23). In both instances, he turns his head back and looks down at the figure who beseeches him, all the while with his back parts plainly in view.

The Stuttgart Psalter (Stuttgart Württembergische Landesbibliothek Stuttgartod. bibl. fol. 23), which was made ca. 820 in Saint Germain des Prés, Paris, also includes several adorsed figures in its miniature paintings, but they do not follow the same stylistic or functional trends as those in the otherwise very influential Utrecht Psalter.[127] By and large, the majority of adorsed figures are those who are about to be or have already been killed. On folio 11r, for instance, an adorsed man is dropped into the jaws of a lion (fig. 2.24); on folio 69r, three adorsed figures

[126] Latin translation, also from online version of Utrecht Psalter: Deus tu conversus vivificabis nos: et plebs tua laetabitur in te. (Line 7, Psalm 84)

[127] Like the Utrecht and Harley Psalters, much has been written on the Stuttgart Psalter. See, for instance, E. DeWald, *Stuttgart Psalter* (1930); D. De Bruyne, "Psautier de Stuttgart (Landesbibliothek No. 23)," *Speculum* VII (1932), pp. 361-366; *Der Stuttgarter Bilderpsalter* (1965-68); L. Bessette, *The Visualization*. For a fully digitzed version of the manuscript, see http://digital.wlb-stuttgart.de/purl/bsz307047059.

(whose faces are completely obscured by a cauldron) are boiled (fig. 2.25); and on folio 74r, two adorsed figures have been decapitated (fig. 2.26). Other suggestively adorsed figures in the Stuttgart Psalter include the figure of Stephaton on folio 80v, who brings the vinegar-soaked sponge to Christ's mouth at the Crucifixion (fig. 2.27), as well as a figure of the devil at the Crucifixion on folio 102v, who stands also on Christ's left side, like Stephaton (fig. 2.28).

The most noteworthy depictions of adorsed figures in the Stuttgart Psalter, however, are those of Christ. He is a *Rückenfigur* in two instances, meaning that his back is completely visible, and his face appears to be turned-in (i.e., not depicted) entirely. The first occurrence, on f. 43v, depicts the Flagellation of Christ[128] (fig. 2.29), and the second, found on on f. 116v, depicts Christ holding up the veil of the firmament (fig. 2.30).[129] In both illuminations, Christ's face is completely obscured, and his back—albeit in one instance completely nude, in the other clothed—faces the viewer.

In the first of these two images, Christ is un-nimbed and bound to a column, and two soldiers stand on opposite sides of his wounded body. The image accompanies Psalm 35:15 (Vulgate 34:17), and the text immediately above reads "Congregata sunt super me flagella et ignoravi." Below, the inscription is from Psalm 34:15-17 (Vulgate 34:17-19):

> Domine, quando respicies? Restitue animam meam a malignitate eorum; a leonibus unicam meam. Confitebor tibi in ecclesia magna; in populo gravi laudabo te. Non

[128] For more on the Flagellation image, see E. DeWald, *Stuttgart Psalter* (1930), p. 36; pl. fol. 43v; *Der Stuttgarter Bilderpsalter* (1965-68), I, color pl. fol. 43v; II, pp. 84, 182; J. Marrow, *Passion Iconography* (1979), p. 267 n. 184.

[129] For the best discussion of this image, see H. Kessler, "Image and Object," pp. 299-301.

> supergaudeant mihi qui adversantur mihi inique, qui oderunt me gratis, et annuunt oculis.[130]

The word 'respicies' can be found under the small green mound on which Christ stands, and the representation of Christ such that we cannot see his face—and he cannot look upon us—seems to be, at least in part, a representation of the particular Psalm verse. Sight and Christ's face are also emphasized by the gestures of the men who flank Christ, each of whom hold scourges. The figure on the left raises his right hand to point at his eye, while the figure on the right points his long index finger towards Christ's head, almost touching him. This soldier is also partially adorsed; the outline of his buttocks is visible through his clothing, like many of the figures of Longinus or Stephaton we will study in the section that follows.

The image of the adorsed Christ at the Flagellation has been studied, to date, as a stylistic precursor for other images, including a Carolingian ivory now at the Musée du Louvre (Objets d'Art 6000) that depicts several scenes from Christ's Passion and his Ascension (fig. 2.31).[131] Made ca. 850 in or around Metz, the carver has depicted Christ in a similar, but not identical disposition to the Stuttgart illumination: his back faces the viewer, but his legs are spread at the

[130] Psalm 34:17-19, Douay-Rheims Translation: "Lord, when wilt thou look upon me? rescue thou soul from their malice: my only one from the lions. I will give thanks to thee in a great church; I will praise thee in a strong people. Let not them that are my enemies wrongfully rejoice over me: who have hated me without cause, and wink with the eyes."

[131] OA 6000 measures 154 x 93 x 10 mm. See D. Gaborit-Chopin, *Ivoires médiévaux, Ve-XVe siècle: Catalogue, Musée du Louvre, Département des objets d'art* (2003), number 37, pp. 140-145. Unknown provenance; acquired from Böhler (Munich) in 1905. For additional bibliography, see Goldschmidt, I, 1914, number 80, pl. XXXIII; D. Gaborit-Chopin, *Ivoires du Moyen Age* (1978), n. 107-108; J.-P. Caillet, "Metz et le travail de l'ivoire vers l'an Mil," *Religion et culture autour de l'an mil* (1990), pp. 316-318, fig. 7. For a brief discussion of this object and its relation to the Stuttgart Psalter, see D. Gaborit-Chopin, "La plaque de la Passion du Louvre: ivoire ottonien ou carolingien?" *Revue du Louvre: La Revue des Musées de France* (2003), pp. 42-51.

column's base. The most significant difference is that Christ's face is partially visible, as he turns his head upwards to the right, much like in the pen-drawings of the flagellation found in the Harley and Utrecht Psalters. The juxtaposition of these two images invites the modern scholar to consider the effects of depicting Christ at the Flagellation so that the viewer can see his back and either only part, or none of, his face.

The second image of the adorsed Christ in the Stuttgart Psalter depicts Christ holding the firmament veil, which separates the terrestrial world from the next. Adjacent to the painting is the accompanying text, "Ubi extendit caelum sicut pellem Christus Dominus noster," or "Here Christ our Lord spreads out the Heavens like an animal skin." Kessler briefly studies this image in his article on figuring the dual character of Christ and argues that Christ's body is figured as the *same* plane as the firmament as well as the actual parchment support.[132] His right foot, which is turned and just outside the frame, provides an access point to the viewer; s/he is invited to follow Christ's footsteps upward from the Old Testament text below.[133] Kessler continues, stating that

> Christ's averted visage asserts the limits of carnal seeing, and hence of art itself; a kind of behind-the-scenes *Maiestas Domini*, the depiction reminds the faithful that gazing at the Lord's face is promised only at the end of time, and then solely to the blessed.[134]

He believes this image is a precursor to Carolingian depictions of the Ascension and that it becomes "fully realized" in Anglo-Saxon and Ottonian images of the disappearing Christ. As Robert Deshman has demonstrated, these images of Christ's feet that dangle from the heavens

[132] Kessler, "Image and Object: Christ's Dual Nature," p. 301.

[133] Ibid., p. 301.

[134] Ibid., p. 301.

remind viewers of their own perceptual limits as well as that the image before them is incomplete: it depicts the human Christ, but not his divinity.[135] Through the refusal to figure Christ's face, the image initiates the "dynamic process" of spiritual, rather than corporeal vision.

In the case of the Flagellation in both the Stuttgart Psalter and the Louvre ivory plaque, Christ's wounds and broken flesh become the focus of our gaze, inviting us to consider the condition of his incarnation: his body suffered and died as a man. Both images in the Stuttgart Psalter, in fact, of Christ as *Rückenfigur* seem to boldly display Christ's flesh, albeit through different means. While the Flagellation depicts his broken, bleeding flesh, the depiction of Christ holding the veil of the firmament likens his flesh—almost completely covered with cloth—to the veil he holds as well as the parchment support, as Kessler has argued. Moreover, the image of the Flagellation faces a starkly different image of Christ on folio 44r: in this instance, Christ is depicted frontally and fully clothed (fig. 2.32). The two Christs—one adorsed and partially nude, the other frontal and fully clothed—act as a diptych, inviting the viewer to contemplate his dual character while still understanding him as one and the same person.

It is possible that the artist's decision to completely obscure Christ's face in both Stuttgart Psalter illuminations was informed by a desire to hide that part of his body most associated with his divinity. In the case of the Flagellation, those whipping Christ's back were essentially blind to his divinity, and so to obscure his divine parts at this moment underscores the faulty vision—and lack of faith—of his aggressors. And perhaps most plainly, by not depicting Christ's face,

[135] Deshman, "Another Look." I will discuss his thesis in this article at greaer lenth towards the end of this chapter.

the viewer is invited to focus solely on the other parts of his body, namely those closely associated with his incarnation.

I have identified here a few of the primary ways that adorsed figures in Carolingian Psalters (limited, albeit, to three of the most famous psalters of this period) functioned. The most important of these for my study of Ascension images in this chapter are: (1) to create a sense of circular space, perhaps alluding at times to a council of bishops; (2) to mediate visual contact with the divine for the viewer; and (3) to invite close inspection of Christ's human aspects, namely his flesh, when the figure of Christ himself is adorsed. As several art historians have studied, all three of these psalters—but particularly the Utrecht Psalter—were extremely influential in both iconographic and stylistic terms on both continental Europe and in Anglo-Saxon England in the decades, even centuries that followed.[136] However, the adorsed figure becomes far less frequent in manuscript illumination outside of the psalter between the ninth and eleventh centuries and instead appears with great frequency in ivory carvings, to which I now turn my attention. A question I hope to answer at the close of this study is why the relief format became the primary way, beyond the Carolingian Psalter, to depict the adorsed figure in early medieval art? And how might this have informed the artists' (or patrons') decision to depict the Ascending Christ as a *Rückenfigur* in a relief format?

---

[136] On the influence of the Utrecht Psalter on the Harley Psalter, among other manuscripts, see H. Swarzenski, "The Role of Copies in the Formation of the Styles of the Eleventh Century," in *Studies in Western Art: Acts of the Twentieth International Congress of the History of Art*, 4 vols (1963), I: *Romanesque and Gothic Art*, pp. 7-18 (p. 10); T. A. Heslop, "The Implication of the Utrecht Psalter in English Romanesque Art," in *Romanesque: Art and Thought in the Twelfth Century: Essays in Honor of Walter Cahn*, ed. by Colum Hourihane, Index of Christian Art Occasional Papers, 10 (Princeton: Index of Christian Art, 2008), pp. 267-90 (pp. 270-72, 279-81, figs 7, 8).

***Rückenfiguren* in Carolingian and Ottonian ivory plaques**

The earliest and most regularly occurring of medieval *Rückenfiguren* can be found in Carolingian plaques depicting the Crucifixion. Today at the Louvre[137] and Victoria and AlbertMuseums, two such carvings made ca. 870 likely in Reims depict the figures of Longinus and Stephaton, who flank the crucified Christ such that their torsos twist towards the ivory ground (fig. 2.33, 2.34). [138] Both plaques are quite thick: the V&A ivory measures 12 mm, while its counterpart at the Louvre is 14 mm in depth. When the Louvre plaque is viewed from the side, the fully carved faces of Longinus and Stephaton come into view: their torsos face the ivory ground and their eyes look up at Christ (see fig. 2.35). The sheer thickness of the plaque and its under-carving invite the viewer to inspect these figures' determined gaze, once traced by the lance and sponge they held, as they behold the body of Christ.[139]

---

[137] See D. Gaborit-Chopin, *Ivoires médiévaux: Ve-XVe siècle* (2003), entry 46 "Plaque de Reliure: Crucifixion," OA 3936, pp. 167-168. Additional bibliography includes Molinier (1898), p. 483, fig p. 487; Goldschmidt I (1914), n. 111, pl. L; Gaborit-Chopin (1978), p. 68. The plaque measures 140 x 80 x 14 mm. Acquired by the Musée du Louvre from M. Goldschmidt in Paris in 1896. Gaborit-Chopin writes that although the iconography is similar to that of the "second school of Metz" ivories or the "Liuthard group," she believes it is more closely related to ivories with which Goldschmidt once associated it, notably Crucifixion plaques at the Victoria and Albert Museum and Bargello, the first of which also figures Stephaton and Longinus with their backs turned towards the viewer. See Gaborit Chopin (1978), p. 68.

[138] For more on this plaque, see D. Gaborit-Chopin, *Ivoires du Moyen* Age (1978), p. 68; *Avori Medievali*, Museo Nazaonale del Bargello (1988), cat. n. 9; P. Williamson, *Medieval Ivory Carvings. Early Christian to Romanesque*. Victoria and Albert Museum (2010), p. 180, 1, cat. no. 43. See Williamson's catalog entry for complete bibliography.

[139] There are too many images of the adorsed Stephaton and/or Longinus to evoke here. See, for instance, volume 1 of Goldschmidt's *Elfenbeinskulpturen aus der Zeit der karolingischen und sächsischen Kaiser, VIII. - XI. Jahrhundert*, numbers 44, 111, 112, 114, 130, 133a as well as Volume 2 of Goldschmidt's *Elfenbeinskulpturen*, image numbers 3, 17, 53, 55, 57, 58, 60, 128. For a brief study on the adorsed Stephaton, see H. V. Sauerland & A. Haseloff, *Der Psalter*

Ottonian sculptors tended to depict Longinus more often as a *Rückenfigur* than Stephaton: the famed ivory on the cover of the Codex Aureus of Echternach (now at the Germanisches Nationalmuseum in Nuremberg, KG 1138), made ca. 1030-50, depicts Longinus looking up at Christ as he inserts his spear into Christ's side (fig. 2.36). Christ in turn gingerly tilts his head to return Longinus' gaze.[140] Here, Longinus and Christ engage in a dyadic, intense moment through both vision and touch, whereas Stephaton's disposition suggests a more disengaged encounter. This is surely not incidental: according to Mark 15:39, the soldier who pierced Christ's side came to believe in his divinity. Later accounts, including in the Golden Legend, elaborate on Longinus' *vita*, noting that the blood from Christ's wound fell onto Longinus' eyes and cured his metaphoric and actual blindness. Thus perhaps Longinus has or is about to undergo a conversion at this moment as he literally turns, or "*convertere*" in Latin, his body towards Christ, seeing his divinity for the first time.[141] This deeply carved composition invites the viewer to fully inspect Longinus' eyes and his turn towards Christ: s/he can act at once as a witness to this miraculous conversion as well as have access to Christ's body, too, mediated by Longinus' physical and ocular communion. These are but a few of several ivories

---

Erzbischof Egberts von Trier: Codex Gertrudianus, in Cividale (1901). See especially pp. 98-99.

[140] See Goldschmidt, Vol. II, pp. 5, 22; also Hughes, pp. 193-195. For more on this ivory, see K. Oettinger, "Der Elfenbeinschnitzer des Echternacher Codex Aureus und die Skulptur unter Heinrich III. (1039-56)," *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen*, 2. Bd. (1960), pp. 34-54.

[141] For more on this idea, see W. Dynes, "The Dorsal Figure in the Stavelot Bible," *Gesta*. Vol. 10, No. 2 (1971), pp. 41-48.

(as many as thirteen are reproduced in Goldschmidt's study) that depict both, or just one of the two soldiers flanking the crucified Christ in an adorsed position.[142]

The disposition of Longinus' and Stephaton's feet are also noteworthy in nearly all of these ivory plaques. In the Louvre and V&A ivories, for instance, both of Stephaton's feet point away from Christ's body, while Longinus' stance is more ambivalent: his right foot points towards Christ's form, while his left turns away. The disposition of the lower parts of their bodies frequently differentiates them in this way, even when only one of the two figures is adorsed: in the nearly identical ivory plaques from Brussels and Essen (fig. 2.8, 2.9), Stephaton is adorsed and both feet point away from Christ, whereas Longinus, who is not adorsed in this instance, directs not only his gaze, but also his feet in the direction of Christ's form. While Stephaton's stance would seem to indicate that he is walking away from the Crucifixion at this moment, he is in fact just as physically engaged with Christ's body as Longinus, given that both injure or taunt his body at this moment, whether through the spear or the vinegar-soaked sponge. But in every Crucifixion ivory of this subject known to me from this period, Christ always directs his gaze down at Longinus, and not Stephaton. Thus through the disposition of their bodies—the position of their heads, Longinus' feet, and on frequent occasion his adorsed form—Longinus and Christ engage in an intimate gaze, visualized in part by the spear that connects their two forms.

---

[142] There are too many images of the adorsed Stephaton and/or Longinus to include here. See, for instance, volume 1 of Goldschmidt's *Elfenbeinskulpturen*, n. 44, 111, 112, 114, 130, 133a as well as Volume 2 of Goldschmidt's *Elfenbeinskulpturen*, n. 3, 17, 53, 55, 57, 58, 60, 128. For a brief study on the adorsed Stephaton, see H. V. Sauerland & A. Haseloff, *Der Psalter Erzbischof Egberts von Trier: Codex Gertrudianus, in Cividale* (1901) – available from internet archive: https://archive.org/stream/derpsaltererzbi00hasegoog#page/n4/mode/2up, see especially pp. 98-99. He also briefly notes the recurrence of adorsed figures in the Utrecht Psalter.

In the case of the Crucifixion, the unnamed soldier who speared Christ's side is mentioned in John 19:34-37:

> sed unus militum lancea latus eius aperuit et continuo exivit sanguis et aqua. Et qui vidit testimonium perhibuit : et verum est testimonium eius. Et ille scit quia vera dicit : ut et vos credatis. Facta sunt enim haec ut scriptura impleretur: Os non comminuetis ex eo. Et iterum alia scriptura dicit: videbunt in quem transfixerunt.
>
> But one of the soldiers with a spear opened his side, and immediately there came out blood and water. And he that saw it, hath given testimony, and his testimony is true. And he knoweth that he saith true; that you also may believe. For these things were done, that the scripture might be fulfilled: You shall not break a bone of him. And again another scripture saith: They shall look on him whom they pierced.[143]

This passage has Eucharistic connotations (with water and blood coming out of Christ's side) as well as speaks to potential changes in vision for the soldier who pierced Christ's side: "They shall look on him whom they pierced." Although the final line of this passage does not fully suggest that Longinus was able to truly 'see' Christ following the injury to his side, it does connote a visual exchange between Christ and the soldier, which is figured in several of these ivories. Mark 15:39 also suggests that the soldier who speared Christ's side came to understand Christ's true identity as the son of God following his death, as he says: "Indeed this man was the son of God."[144] Although the Gospels do not name Longinus, they intimate that he became aware of Christ's identity and was able to truly 'see' his human and divine parts following the piercing of his side.[145]

---

[143] John 34:37.

[144] Mark 15:39: "videns autem centurio qui ex adverso stabat quia sic clamans expirasset, ait: Vere hic homo Filius Dei erat."

[145] Gregory of Nyssa underscores that Longinus did later become a bishop (and so clearly converted), however: "Ex hoc Nysseni loco discimus Longinum Centurionem, qui lancea Christi latus in cruce perfodit, primum Caesareae episcopum fuisse." See L.A. Zacagni, *Collectanea*

Stephaton, however, does not undergo a conversion at the Crucifixion like his counterpart, and he notably stands on Christ's left, or the side frequently associated with evil. Paschasius Radbertus (d. ca. 859) wrote that Stephaton was a figure of faithlessness, and the vinegar on the sponge he offers to Christ alludes to the "'soured' post-lapsarian human nature."[146] As Anthony Bale writes in his book on images of violence in the Middle Ages, the pair of Longinus and Stephaton "reveals the forward (salvational) and backward (sacrificial) nature of Christ's blood."[147]

The intimate exchange of gazes between the adorsed Longinus and Christ in several of these Carolingian and earlier Ottonian ivory plaques was taken up in a rare—and to my knowledge, unique—instance by the Ottonian carver of a famous diptych held today in the Bode Museum in Berlin (Staatliche Museen-Preussischer Kulturbesitz, inv. nos. 8506 and 8505). [148]

---

monumentorum veterum (1698,) p. 391. In much later sources, like the Golden Legend, Longinus, nearly blind, was healed when the water and blood from Christ's side touched his eyes. It was this miracle, according to post-Scriptural accounts, that prompted him to speak the words quoted in Mark 15:39. See J. de Vorgaine, *The Golden Legend* (trans. W. G. Ryan, 2012), p. 184. While the origin of the narrative surrounding Longinus' blindness has yet to be definitively identified, one of its earliest appearances is in Petrus Comestor's twelfth-century, widely-read *Historia Scholastica*. Although the *Historia Scholastica* does not mention Longinus by name, it does refer to the healing of the soldier's blindness by Christ's blood: "et qui lanceavit eum, ut tradunt quidam, cum fere caligassent oculi eius, et casu tetigisset oculos sanguine eius, clare vidit." Quoted in S. Sticca, *The Latin Passion Play: Its Origins and Development* (1970), 159. See also Migne, PL, vol. 100, section 986.

[146] Quoted in A. Bale, *Feeling Persecuted: Christians, Jews and Images of Violence in the Middle Ages*, (2010), p. 79.

[147] Bale, p. 81. See also W. C. Jordan, "Stephaton: The Origin of the Name," *Classical Folia*, XXXIII (1979), pp. 83-86 and Leopold Kretzenbacher, "Zum kaum noch bekannten Namen des Kreuzigungszeugen Stephaton," *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*, LV (2001), pp. 1-22. Both sources in footnote 55, page 211 of Bale, *Feeling Persecuted.*

[148] Much has been written on this diptych, and I cannot do justice to all of the literature here. Recent publications include W. Diebold, "Except I shall see…I will not believe" (John 20:25):

Beyond the Crucifixion, the perhaps most widely reproduced of Ottonian *Rückenfiguren* is the Apostle Thomas on this pair of ivories made in Trier or Echternach ca. 990 (fig. 2.37). Doubtful of Christ's identity following the Resurrection, Thomas says he will not believe in Christ until he touches his wounds. He climbs Christ's pedestal, arches back his head, and pulls open Christ's garment in order to touch his wound and truly 'see' his divinity. His gesture from a frontal perspective looks preliminary, as if gathering up the folds on either side of Christ's underarm. But upon examining the object from an oblique perspective, it becomes clear that Thomas is not just striving to touch Christ: he has actually inserted his index finger into the wound (see fig. 2.38, 2.39). Their intense mutual regard is striking, as is the way their bodies physically connect: Thomas probes the wound with one finger while the others delicately rest atop Christ's left hand. The carved detail of Thomas' face—boasting full lips and slightly plump cheeks—is an exquisite visual surprise for the first-time viewer and encourages its close study from an unusual angle.

Viewed frontally, as it is most often photographically reproduced, the bridge of Thomas' nose is visible, thus acting as an invitation to the viewer to turn the book it once likely covered

---

Typology, Theology, and Historiography in an Ottonian Ivory Diptych," *Objects, Images and the Word: Art in the Service of the Liturgy* (ed. C. Hourihane, 2003), pp. 257-273; C. Hughes, "Visual Typology: An Ottonian Example," *Word and Image*, XVII (2001), pp. 185-198; J. Hamburger, "Body vs Book: The Trope of Visibility in Images of Christian-Jewish Polemic," *Ästhetik des Unsichtbaren: Bildtheorie und Bildgebrauch in der Vormoderne*, ed. D. Ganz & T. Lentes, vol. 1 of *KultBild: Visualität und Religion in der Vormoderne* (2004-2011), pp. 112-145; H. Kessler, "The Book as Icon," *In the Beginning: Bibles Before the Year 1000* (ed. M.P. Brown, 2006), pp. 95-103; H. Kessler, *Seeing Medieval Art* (2004), p. 27; J. Hamburger, "The Medieval Work of Art: Wherein the 'Work'? Wherein the 'Art'?," *The Mind's Eye: Art and Theological Argument in the Middle Ages* (ed. J. Hamburger and A.-M. Bouché, 2006), pp. 374-412; R. Melinkoff, *The Horned Moses in Medieval Art and Thought* (1997); B. Fricke, *Fallen Idols, Risen Saints: Sainte Foy of Conques and the Revival of Monumental Sculpture in Medieval Art* (2015), pp. 167-172. My thanks to curatorial and conservation staff at the Bode Museum for letting me consult the diptych and to Joshua O'Driscoll for his excellent (unpublished) notes in the object's file.

and examine every facet of its carving. Depicting Thomas as a *Rückenfigur* at this moment encourages the viewer's own tactile experience of the ivory, like Thomas' handling of Christ. It is also emblematic of the ways adorsed figures like Longinus, or even Stephaton, were frequently engaged in moments of tactile or visual exchanges with Christ. Although the Thomas ivory was made only a few decades prior to the Codex Aureus ivory, its sculptor is—I believe—drawing on Carolingian sculptors' proclivity to figure Longinus from behind as he also 'sees' Christ for the first time.

In the Thomas ivory's counterpart, Moses receives the tablets of the law from a cruciform hand that descends from heaven. As William Diebold has argued, the two plaques together figure a widely held exegetical account of John 1:14 ("The word was made flesh, and it dwelt among us."); together, the ivories juxtapose two ways of apprehending God, through the letter as flesh, which can be seen, and through the divinity, which can be felt. Christopher Hughes has also discussed the pairing in relation to Exodus 30, in which God tells Moses he can only see his back parts and not his face. Might the decision to adorse Thomas in the Moses plaque's counterpart have been a way to formally evoke that encounter?

In Exodus 30:20-23, God tells Moses that he cannot see his face and will instead see his backside/parts:

> And again he said: Thou canst not see my face: for man shall not see me and live. And again he said: Behold there is a place with me, and thou shalt stand upon the rock. And when my glory shall pass, I will set thee in a hole of the rock, and protect thee with my right hand, till I pass: And I will take away my hand, and thou shalt see my back parts: but my face thou canst not see.[149]

[149] Latin translation, Exodus 30:20-23: "quando ingressuri sunt tabernaculum testimonii et quando accessuri ad altare ut offerant in eo thymiama Domino, ne forte moriantur; legitimum

Furthermore, others only see Moses' back when he enters the tabernacle to commune with God in Exodus 33:8.[150] To see a figure's back—particularly that of Christ—was likely associated with Moses' limited vision of God: he could see his back, but not his face.[151] Interestingly, Moses' body is often adorsed, albeit his face is depicted in profile in manuscript illuminations towards the end of the eleventh century, including in the British Library's Stavelot Bible (London BL MS Add. 28106) made ca. 1093-97. In two such instances, his adorsed form suggests a privileged encounter with the deity (fig. 2.40, 2.41).[152]

Jeffrey Hamburger writes that the diptych creates an opposition between letter and flesh rather than, in Pauline terms, letter and spirit (what one would typically expect): "whereas Moses receives the word of God in the form of the Word promulgated by Christ, Thomas touches the living Word in the flesh."[153] Kessler argues that this carving was meant to persuade the viewer of the veracity of the Resurrection, and that "touching the high relief would further have

---

sempiternum erit ipsi, et semini eius per successiones. Locutusque est Dominus ad Moysen, dicens: Sume tibi aromata, primae myrrhae et electae quingentos siclos, et cinnamomi medium, id est, ducentos quinquaginta siclos, calami similter ducentos quinquaginta."

[150] Exodus 33:8: "cumque egrederetur Moyses ad tabernaculum surgebat universa plebs et stabat unusquisque in ostio papilionis sui aspiciebantque tergum Moysi donec ingrederetur tentorium." The Douay-Rheims translates this passage as follows: "And when Moses went forth to the tabernacle, all the people rose up, and every one stood in the door of his pavilion, and they beheld the back of Moses, till he went into the tabernacle."

[151] Moses plays a key role in Pseudo-Dionysius' *Mystical Theology*, which was translated by Eriugena and thus well known during the Carolingian period. Although he does not talk about the back of God, he does say that while Moses does see God, he does see the place where he dwells. Here, Moses cannot see God, and Thomas is able to touch Christ's flesh. Thanks to Willemien Otten for this insight. For more on the back of God, see also V. Burrus, *Begotten not Made: Conceiving Manhood in Late Antiquity* (2000), especially p. 123 and p. 128.

[152] W. Dynes, "The Dorsal Figure in the Stavelot Bible," *Gesta*. Vol. 10, No. 2 (1971), pp. 41-48.

[153] Hamburger "Body vs Book," pp. 117-118.

reinforced the sense of his or her belief in the Lord's presence," much like the effect of touching Christ's side wound for Thomas.[154] Once again the *Rückenfigur* in this Christological scene is represented as absorbed in an intimate, reciprocated visual exchange with the figure of Christ.

Studying the Bode plaques from these oblique angles reveals what the sculptor could achieve, however, in these encounters that the illuminator of *Rückenfiguren*—whether in the Stavelot Bible or in a host of Carolingian and Ottonian illuminations—plainly could not: the viewer can palpably trace the tactile and ocular exchange between Christ and Thomas, or Moses and the hand of God, when viewing the plaque from multiple, variant angles.

Two liturgical plaques contentiously dated to either the late ninth or late tenth centuries from northern France stage yet another kind of relationship between adorsed figures and the Christic body (fig. 2.42, 2.43). On one of the plaques, now in Cambridge's Fitzwilliam Museum (M.12-1904), monastic figures loosely form a circle around the celebrant, who holds a book inscribed with the words "Ad te levavi animam meam," or "Unto thee I have lifted up my soul."[155] These words mark the introit to the Roman Mass for the first Sunday in Advent, sung

---

[154] Kessler, "The Book as Icon," p. 97.

[155] Much has been written on the Cambridge ivory, including in *Trotz Natur und Augenschein: Eucharistie—Wandlung und Weltsicht.* Exhibition catalog, Kolumba Museum (2013), p. 41 and 44; U. Surmann, *Studien zur ottonischen Elfenbeinplastik in Metz und Trier* (1990), p. 36; H. Trenk, "Das Oeuvre des Meisters der Wiener Gregorplatte," *Zu Gast in der Kunstkammer* (1991); P. Woudhuysen, *Treasures of the Fitzwilliam Museum*. Cambridge (1982), p. 321; A. Goldschmidt, *Die Elfenbeinskulpturen* Vol. I, no. 120-1; *Ornamenta Ecclesiae. Kunst und Künstler der Romanik.* 1985 – 1985, C.1; S. Rankin, "Carolingian Music," in *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (ed. R. McKitterick, 1993), pp. 274-5; A. Boeckler, *Elfenbeinreliefs der Ottonischen Renaissance*, p. 145. See http://webapps.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/explorer/index.php?oid=31579 for an excellent description of the ivory as well as object bibliography. Last visited July 8, 2018. My thanks to Vicky Avery for letting me study the object outside of its case at the Fitzwilliam.

while the celebrant entered the church. The right hand is raised not in blessing, but rather to indicate that Mass is about to begin. Likely made in Trier, possibly in Lotharingia (modern-day Lorraine), the plaque figures a bishop surrounded by five deacons, behind him, and seven singing canons. Notably, one of the singing canons is adorsed, and he lifts his head up towards the bishop, revealing the bridge of his nose. The position of his head recalls that of Thomas on the Bode-Museum's ivory diptych. This singing figure's hands are raised in an almost emulative gesture of the celebrant above. The crenellated walls in front of him and the other singing canons further create a sense of enclosure around the bishop's body. By craning his neck, the canon visualizes that which the Introit chant invokes, or the act of lifting oneself (or in this image, one's gaze) upward. The adorsed canon mediates the liturgical scene for the viewer by both acting out the Introit as well as drawing our attention to the body of the bishop, the primary subject of this scene.

Another ivory plaque likely made by the same sculptor or workshop in Trier around the year 1000 depicts a different liturgical scene: the choir singing the *Sanctus* hymn and the beginning of the consecration by the priest during the Canon of the Mass (Frankfurt, Liebieghaus Skulpturensammlung, on loan from the Universitätsbibliothek, MS. Barth. 181).[156] In this

[156] The Liebieghaus dates the ivory to ca. 875, but I would conjecture, as many other scholars have, that it was likely made around the year 1000. For more on this ivory, see E. Palazzo, "Le Visible, l'invisible, et les cinq sens dans le haut Moyen Age. A propos de l'iconographie de l'ivoire de Francfort," *Actes du colloque* (Oct. 2010, published in 2012), pp. 11-38; C. Nordenfalk, "Karolingisch oder Ottonisch? Zur Datierung und Lokalisierung der Elfenbeine Goldschmidt I, 120-131," *Kolloquium über spätantike und frühmittelalterliche Skulptur, III* (1974), p. 45; U. Surmann, "Der Meister der Wiener Gregortafel," *Egbert, Erzbischof von Trier 977-993. Gedenkschrift zum 1000. Todestag* (ed. Franz J. Ronig, 1993), pp. 207-229; B. Reudenbach (ed.), *Geschichte der bildenden Kunst in Deutschland, Bd. 1: Karolingische und ottonische Kunst* (2009). See also *Trotz Natur und Augenschein: Eucharistie—Wandlung und*

instance, a bishop raises both hands as he stands before the Eucharistic chalice, paten (that holds a pretzel-like Eucharist), and a liturgical manuscript, all of which lie atop the altar. Five deacons stand behind him, and five singing subdeacons are figured below, three of whom are adorsed. An oblique view of the Frankfurt plaque reveals that the faces of these figures in the foreground are intricately carved (fig. 2.44). Oblique images show individual teeth and tongues, evoking their singing prior to the Eucharistic rite (fig. 2.45). Formally, their disposition—two in profile, and one who looks directly upward—is similar to that of Longinus and Thomas. The position of their bodies suggests a yearning to apprehend those figures of the Christic body, whether the bishop or Eucharist itself.

What possibly motivated the makers of these ivory plaques to dispose Longinus', Stephaton's, Thomas', or clergy members' bodies in this way? In most cases I have discussed, the back of the figure is presented to the beholder, and yet the face is not totally obscured from view. In representational terms, these back-turned figures are frequently involved in intense situations of mutual regard with Christ. Focused upon the incarnate deity, adorsed figures are absorbed in the object of their gazes, an ocular perspective to which we, the beholder, are not otherwise privy. However, these adorsed figures do not block our view, as they do in many of Caspar David Friedrich's paintings, according to Koerner. In Carolingian and Ottonian ivories and manuscript illuminations (or pen-drawings), the beholder also can enjoy an unimpeded

---

Weltsicht (2013), pp. 41-44; M. Barasch, "'Elevatio': The Depiction of a Ritual Gesture," *Artibus et Historiae*, XLVIII (2003), p. 51; V. Elbern, "Die Bildende Kunst der Ottonenzeit zwischen Maas und Elbe," *Das erste Jahrtausend an Rhein und Ruhr*, II (1964), p. 1030; Boeckler, pp. 148-149.

vision of Christ's body at the Crucifixion, even if our standpoint does not (and cannot) coincide with that of the adorsed figure.

In these works, most of which represent moments of encounter with Christ or his clerical representatives (i.e., the celebrant) on Earth, the adorsed figure mediates our own experience of the scene by visualizing a dyadic moment between two figures whose eyes and bodies face one another. The beholder is implicated through the visual activity, even absorption of these back-turned figures, offering thus an intra-pictorial moment of mediation. S/he comes into an emulative relation with the adorsed figure by gazing at both the entire scene as well as the body of Christ, who remains in view and not at all blocked by the adorsed figure's form. Like the adorsed figure of Thomas in the Ottonian ivory diptych, these Carolingian and Ottonian Crucifixion scenes with an adorsed Longinus or Stephaton depicts a moment of privileged, theophanic vision. When both figures are adorsed, such as on an ivory plaque at the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum in Munich[157] (fig. 2.46) or on the aforementioned plaque at the Victoria and Albert Museum (fig. 2.34), each mediates a different kind of vision, too: Longinus truly 'sees' Christ upon touching him with his spear, whereas Stephaton does not see the divine aspect of Christ.[158] In this way, the two adorsed figures flanking Christ model two different modes of seeing him: each turns his body towards him, emulating the viewer's own position vis-à-vis

[157] Goldschmidt 44 vol. 1.

[158] V&A Museum, no. 303-1867. Goldschmidt vol. 122a. See also http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O88318/the-crucifixion-panel-unknown/. Last visited November 7, 2016.

Christ, but only one figure is truly able to see the hypostatic union, discerning that Christ's one person reveals his two natures, like Thomas in the ivory diptych in Berlin.[159]

More precisely, each of these ivories offers its beholder a compelling representation of an encounter with Christ in which mediated and unmediated physical touch enables spiritual sight and knowledge of Christ's divinity. The eleventh-century ivory carver who chose to depict Thomas from behind, precisely like the *Rückenfiguren* in the Crucifixion scenes I have examined, seem to have well understood the effect of disposing Thomas's body in relation to Christ's this way. In this figural composition, the arrangement of Thomas' and Christ's bodies is in fact *the* principal subject of this half of the diptych.

The configuration associates touching—whether with one's fingers or a spear—with vision of the divine as well as creates a spatial configuration that highlights the intimate, dyadic nature of this moment: Christ and the figure who touches his wound are privy to the exchange, but the beholder is—by way of the adorsed figure, in large part—invited to participate in this exchange, too. In these works, the *Rückenfigur* both mediates knowledge of Christ's divinity for the onlooker, but he also invites the beholder to participate in this vision, even if imperfect (for one should ideally 'see' Christ with no tactile or visible proof whatsoever). These figures emphatically do not deny our access like Friedrich's *Rückenfigur* in so many of the foregrounds of his paintings. Phenomenally and historically, medieval beholders were simply not at the historical crucifixion, but these works repeatedly grant the beholder access to the body of Christ.

[159] Still, we must find a way to reconcile the tactility of the ivory and revelation of Christ's Resurrection with the fact that Christ admonished Thomas, in part, for needing to touch his wound in order to believe in him.

The sightlines are perhaps dyadic and explicitly between figures in the picture plane itself, but they do not preclude the beholder from having intimate access to Christ's body. Moreover, these objects' intimate size, their relief carving, and the conditions of their beholding—they were surely touched—also underscore the visual and tactile accessibility of Christ's body to the beholder.

In sum, adorsed figures in ivory depictions of the Crucifixion made between the ninth and eleventh centuries frequently (1) mediate visual and tactile access to the body of Christ; (2) model good versus bad (namely incomplete) access to Christ's divine and human nature; and (3) appear to have been influenced, at least in part, with adorsed figures in Carolingian Psalters at both the Crucifixion and in a variety of other scenes. Beyond these general trends, the singular Moses and Doubting Thomas diptych offers art historians a glimpse of that which medieval sculptors—or at least one medieval sculptor—thought the adorsed figure could achieve in a new iconographic context, namely the depiction of the Apostle Thomas fingering Christ's side wound. By adorsing the figure of Thomas in this ivory diptych, the artist assertively declared that which the adorsed Longinus suggested: that the back-turned figure mediates access to Christ's human and divine natures for the contemporary viewer. Thomas is the access point through which the viewer may visually enter the scene and partake in the revelation of Christ's divinity. Thomas fingers Christ's wound as the viewer, in turn, runs his or her hands across the ivory support, feeling it warm to the touch as the veracity of Christ's Resurrection is made plain.

Christ as *Rückenfigur*

In addition to those adorsed figures considered thus far who engage in a powerful encounter with Christ's body, historical and liturgical, Christ himself is often adorsed in ivory plaques of the Ascension in the late Carolingian and Ottonian periods.[160] In a ninth-century plaque made in northern France now at the Liverpool Museum, Christ ascends to heaven such that his back faces the viewer but his face is in profile (fig. 2.7). An ivory plaque at the British Museum made ca. 870 in Northern France depicts Christ in *profil perdu* as he ascends; it is as though his face is about to entirely turn towards the ivory ground (fig. 2.47). In each of these ivories, several of the apostles below are adorsed, too: they strive to look upward and even touch Christ before he ascends to heaven. Their contorted bodies and varied poses express an intense desire to apprehend Christ's body like in those other plaques in which *Rückenfiguren* are frequently depicted.

In two aforementioned Mosan plaques made in the first decades of the eleventh century and now in Brussels[161] and Essen[162], Christ strides up to heaven such that his back is turned

---

[160] To my knowledge, no one has yet to focus a study on exclusively the adorsed ascending Christ. For bibliography on the iconography of Christ's Ascension more broadly during the medieval period, see S. Helena Gutberlet, *Die Himmelfahrt Christi in der Bildenden Kunst von den Anfängen bis ins hohe Mittelalter: Versuch zur Geistesgeschichtlichen Erfassung einer Ikonographischen Frage* (1934), tomes I and II; H. Schrade, *Zur Ikonographie der Himmelfahrt Christi* (1930); E. Dewald, "The Iconography of the Ascension," *American Journal of Archaeology* 19:3 (Jul.-Sep., 1915), pp. 277-319. In her dissertation, "L'iconographie de l'ascension du Christ," Guenot touches briefly on these ivories but discuses them in relation to a much larger corpus of iconographies of the Ascension in the early Middle Ages.

[161] Brussels, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire, no. 1483. See J. Borchgrave d'Altena, "A Propos d'un ivoire liégois du XIe siècle," *Bulletin des Musées Royaux d'art et d'histoire* 21 (1949), pp. 17-24.

[162] Essen, Domschatz, Inv. Nr. 7. For more on the Essen ivory, see D. Ganz, "Von Innen nach Außen: Die Verborgenheit des rituellen Texts und die Sichtbarkeit des Prachteinbands,"

towards the viewer, his face is depicted in *profil perdu*, and the undersides of his feet are visible (fig. 2.9, 2.8). Several other figures are adorsed on these plaques, too. In the case of the Brussels ivory, an apostle on the lower right is disposed such that his back faces the viewer and he looks directly upward at the angel (fig. 2.48). Below, it is oddly Stephaton alone who is adorsed as he brings the vinegar-soaked sponge to Christ's face, who in turn looks down in the direction of Longinus and Ecclesia, a female personification of the Church (2.9).

Unusually, the Ascending Christ in each plaque does not take hold of God's hand, as is the iconographic norm, but rather reaches up to grasp the doors of heaven or, in the case of the Essen ivory, two rectangles with various pseudo-inscriptions that suggestively evoke the tablets of the law. By depicting the Ascension in this way, did the sculptors intend to figure Christ as a new Moseswho bears the New Law?[163] Formally, at least, the juxtaposition of these tablet-like doors and the adorsed Christ recall Moses' vision of God's back parts in Exodus 33:20.

The Dorsal Ascending Christ

In this final section, I attempt to make sense of the artistic decision to figure Christ as a total *Rückenfigur* at the Ascension in specifically two ivory plaques that are the only objects, to my knowledge, that figure the ascending Christ in such a way. I will try to make sense of these

---

Verborgen, Unsichtbar, Unlesbar. Zur Problematik restringierter Schriftpräsenz (2014), pp. 85-116, esp. fig. 5, p. 97.

[163] On Christ as a new Moses in relation to these ivories, in particular, see G. Jászai, "Christus als neuer Mose? Zur Ikonologie des Einbandes vom Evangeliar der Äbtissin Theophanu im Essener Domschatz," *Das Münster*, vo. 66 (2013), pp. 40-49; and G. Jászai, "Was heißt 'Christliche Ikonologie'?—Ein Beispiel," *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst und Kunstwissenschaft* (2/2016), pp. 118-120. She reproduces the Essen plaque and mentions the Brussels ivory as well.

artists' isolated—but I believe very deliberate—decisions to figure the Ascension in this way by considering these objects in relation to other dorsal figures that I have previously studied here, contemporary depictions of the Ascending Christ in Anglo-Saxon England in which Christ's face is not figured, and in relation to liturgical rites and commentaries that likened, at times, the priest's eastward turn in relation to Christ's Ascension. What did the artist of these two plaques achieve in not only adorsing Christ, but also suggesting the total obfuscation of his face (when viewed from a particular perspective) in the depiction of the Ascension? And was this an effective means to mediate the hypostasis at this revelatory moment?

The sculptors of two ivory plaques, however, figured the Ascension such that Christ's body, apart from his lower legs, is entirely adorsed (fig. 2.1, 2.10). The Ascension plaque made ca. 980 in Metz now at the Kunhistorisches museum and its smaller—and likely derivative—counterpart made ca.1000 in Lorraine now at the Schnütgen Museum figure Christ no longer in profile or *profil perdu*, but with his torso completely turned-in towards the ivory ground. [164] The

[164] The Vienna ivory measures 206 x 144 x 16 mm, whereas the Cologne ivory measures 110 x 85 x 6 mm. On the Vienna ivory: See catalog entries by M. Pippal, B109 and B110, "Elfenbeinplatte mit der Himmelfahrt Christi," *Ornamenta Ecclesiae. Kunst und Künstler der Romanik: Katalog zur Ausstellung des Schnütgen Museums in der Joseph-Haubrich-Kunsthalle*, vol. 1 of 3 (1985), pp. 334-335. Very similar catalog entries can be found in the exhibition catalog for the show also at the Schnütgen museum, *Rhein und Maas: Kunst und Kultur, 800-1400* (1972-3), 2 vol., see namely B6, F3, and F10. See also J. Hanson, "The Stuttgart Casket and the Permeability of the Byzantine Artistic Tradition," *Gesta* 37:1 (1998), pp. 13-25; A. Goldschmidt, *Die Elfenbeinskulpturen*, I (1914), p. 65, fig. 25. See also H. Schrade, "Zur Ikonographie," fig. 18; A. Goldschmidt and K. Weitzmann, *Die byzantinischen Elfenbeinskulpturen*, II (1934), p. 31, fig. 10; H. Fillitz, "Die Wiener Gregor-Platte," *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien*, N.F., XXII (1962); Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, *Katalog für Plastik und Kunstgewerbe*, I (1964), cat. 3; p. 3, pl. 2; C. Nordenfalk, "Karolingisch oder Ottonisch? Zur Datierung und Lokalisierung der Elfenbeine Goldschmidt I, 120-131," *Kolloquium über spätantike und frühmittelalterliche Skulptur*, III (1974), pl. 26 (1); A. Boeckler, "Elfenbeinreliefs der ottonischen Renaissance," *Phoebus: Zeitschrift für Kunst aller*

energy of his ascent is directed upwards and not towards the upper right, as was the case in other Ascension plaques.[165]

In the case of the Vienna ivory, Christ is depicted ascending to heaven, leaving behind his apostles and the Virgin below an undulating barrier. They gesticulate in a range of ways, turning their bodies left, right, and inward; some look up, attempting to see Christ's incarnate body before it is completely gone from view. The adorsed Christ joins hands with God as he rises to heaven; their physical embrace is framed by a deeply cut cloud. As previously mentioned, the plaque was once the back cover of the Sacramentary of Henry II and was paired with an ivory of the Crucifixion (fig. 2.11).[166]

Zeiten. Revue des Arts anciens et modernes. A Journal of Art in All Ages (1948-49), volume 2 (1946), pp. 145-155. See especially page 152 where he makes brief mention of the Vienna and Cologne ivories.

[165] On the Cologne ivory, see A. Goldschmidt, "Die Elfenbeinschnitzerei," *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst* (1909), pp. 157-160; B. Kleinschmidt, "Eine Elfenbeinschnitzerei mit der Himmelfahrt Mariä aus der sog. Metzer Schule," *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst* (1909), pp. 1-10; F. Witte, *Die Skulpturen der Sammlung Schnütgen* (1912), pl. 82; A. Goldschmidt, *Die Elfenbeinskulpturen*, II (1918), p. 34, pl. xxiv (75); H. Gutberlet, *Die Himmelfahrt*, p. 173 pl. XI; H. Swarzenski, *Monuments of Romanesque Art* (1954), pp. 19, 39 (also with Vienna ivory), pl 15 (35); Cologne, Schnütgen Museum, *Rhein und Maas*, I (1972), p. 174; Cologne, Schnütgen Museum, *Ornamenta Ecclesiae* (1985), cat. B 110, p. 335; Cologne, Schnütgen Museum, *Das Mittelalter in 111 Meisterwerken* (2003), p. 70 (no. 40), fig. p. 70. Both ivories are mentioned in several of the aforementioned publications, including, see A. Boeckler, "Elfenbeinreliefs der ottonischen Renaissance," *Phoebus: Zeitschrift für Kunst aller Zeiten. Revue des Arts anciens et modernes. A Journal of Art in All Ages* (1948-49), volume 2, 1946, 145-155, especially page 152.

[166] This ivory has been the subject of much study, but I unfortunately will not study it at length here. See J. Hanson, "Stuttgart Casket," p 22; *Ornamenta Ecclesiae,* I, p. 335; F. Steenbock, *Der kirchliche Prachteinband im frühen Mittelalter* (1965), cat. 60, fig. 83; V. Elbern, "Die bildende Kunst der Ottonenzeit zwischen Maas und Elbe," *Das erste Jahrtausend an Rhein und Ruhr*, II (1964), p. 1029; H. Fillitz, "Die Wiener Gregor Platte," fig. 14; H. Schnitzler, "Folder oder Reichenau," *Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch*, IXI (1957), p. 100; H. Swarzenski, *Monuments*, pp. 19, 40; R. Schilling, "Carolingian and Ottonian Manuscripts in the Exhibition at Bern," *Burlington*

The Cologne ivory, which scholars believe to be a copy made only two decades after the completion of the Vienna plaque, figures a much more compact rendition of this scene: the apostles and Mary again gather below, but their upward gestures are more deliberately framed by the sinuous line evoking a cloudy barrier. One apostle on the lower left even touches Christ's big toe before he slips away. The long fingers of the two angels, above, barely brush his side; the right most angel's touch underneath Christ's raised arm recalls Thomas' probing of Christ's side wound. Above, a cloud cleaves in two to take in Christ's form and frame his hand with God's. Although we do not know what type of manuscript the Cologne plaque once adorned, it was likely either a stand-alone plaque or paired with three others that depicted moments from the life of Christ.

These objects have been reproduced with some frequency, but neither has been the subject of a single, focused study. They were, however, included in Adolph Goldschmidt's magisterial corpus of early medieval ivories, and both were also exhibited in *Rhein und Maas* and *Ornamenta Ecclesiae*. The Vienna plaque even graced the cover of Walter Oakeshott's *Classical Inspiration in Medieval Art*, and both ivories together have been studied alongside other Ottonian and Carolingian images by Carl Nordenfalk, Martina Pippal, Jean-Pierre Caillet, and Herbert Kessler.

Scholarly interest has largely, although not exclusively, resided in stylistic influence, their dating, and even subject matter: Christ's long hair even (erroneously) led to the belief that

---

Magazine, XCII (1950), p. 82; A. Boeckler, "Elfenbeinreliefs der ottonischen Renaissance," pp. 145, 147,152; A. Goldschmidt, *Die Elfenbeinskulpturen*, I, p. 64, pl. LVI (130).

these plaques depict the assumption of the Virgin.[167] But more recently, Herbert Kessler's 2004 article, "Image of Christ,"[168] considered the ivories in relation to other contemporary images that deny the viewer full visual access to Christ's body, including images of what Meyer Schapiro termed in 1943 "the disappearing Christ."[169]

Schapiro argued that this new way of depicting the Ascension ca. 1000 was the product of the creative medieval illuminator, who wanted—through "optical realism"—to show what the Ascending Christ would have looked like to the Apostles below (fig. 2.6). Robert Deshman later took issue with Schapiro's account in a 1997 study[170] and argued that these illuminations encourage 'spiritual seeing'; they mark the limits of corporeal vision by denying access to Christ's face, which is typically associated with his divinity.[171] Given the widespread familiarity of these illuminations and Deshman's scholarship, there might be a strong inclination to read the

---

[167] B. Kleinschmidt, "Eine Elfenbeinschnitzerei mit der Himmelfahrt Mariä aus der sog. Metzer Schule," *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst* (1909), pp. 1-10. Note that Kleinschmidt is in fact referring to the Cologne ivory when she characterizes its subject matter as Mary's Assumption. Goldschmidt then offers a corrective to this reading in A. Goldschmidt, "Die Elfenbeinschnitzerei," *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst* (1909), pp. 157-160. For more on the physical appearance of Christ (including his hair), see H. Kessler, "Christ's Fluid Face," (in press), *Festschrift für Martin Büchse*l, pp. 221-234. I thank Herbert Kessler for sharing a copy of this article with me.

[168] H. Kessler, "Images of Christ and Communication with God," *Settimane di studio della Fondazione Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo* (v. 52, pt. 2, 2004), pp. 1099-1136.

[169] M. Schapiro, "The Image of the Disappearing Christ: The Ascension in English Art around the Year 1000," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, ser. 6, XXIII, 1943, 133-52, repr. in Schapiro, *Selected Papers III. Late Antique, Early Christian, and Medieval Art* (1979), pp. 267-87.

[170] R. Deshman, "Another Look at the Disappearing Christ: Corporeal and Spiritual Vision in Early Medieval Images," *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 79, no. 3 (Sept., 1997), pp. 518-546.

[171] Ibid. Kessler has also written at length on Christ's face, including throughout his book, *Spiritual Seeing* (2000) and in his article, "Face and Firmament: Dürer's An Angel with the Sudarium and the Limits of Vision," *L'Immagine di Cristo dall'archeropita alla mano d'artista dal tardo medioevo all'età baroca* (eds. C. Frommel and G. Wolf), *Studi e Testi* 432 (2006), pp. 143-165.

Vienna and Cologne ivories in relation to 'the disappearing Christ,' in other words, to assume that the plaques also deny viewers an image of Christ's divine parts, albeit through different formal means.

In his study of the ivories in relation to other images of Christ in which his face is obscured, Kessler considers the Vienna Ascension ivory with its former counterpart, the Crucifixion plaque. He writes that while the Crucifixion ivory communicates God's human nature, the Ascension ivory suggests his divinity, which cannot be seen. Together, the plaques assert "that seeing the underlying unity of [Christ's] dual nature is a privilege denied to human eyes."[172] For Kessler, both the Vienna Ascension and its Crucifixion counterpart "transform an episode from Christ's earthly life into an essay in the communication of God's divinity; however, [the Ascension] reduces the viewer's access to Christ's human nature that is paramount on the front."[173] These images offer a visualization of those "spiritual forces [that] Hadrian imagined would carry the mind through the visible face and in turn to the invisible majesty."[174] Kessler's final comments on the ivories are as follows:

> Indeed, the fundamental point asserted in the ivories is that seeing Christ in images could engender an emotional energy but that that energy had to be redirected inwardly and toward the divine. John covering his eyes on the front and his counterpart on the back personify this process of seeing; and the material depictions themselves diagrammed the relationship between Christ's human person and his divinity, even while they asserted that seeing the underlying unity of the dual nature is a privilege denied to human eyes.[175]

[172] Kessler, p. 1130.

[173] Ibid., p. 1130.

[174] Ibid., p. 1130.

[175] Ibid., p. 1132.

Kessler's article is excellent, but his point can be developed further when considering the Ascension plaque from other angles that reveal previously unpublished carvings. For when examining the Vienna ivory at an oblique angle outside of its vitrine, we see that Christ's face is in fact fully carved (fig. 2.49). The detail of his eyes, nose, and mouth are exquisite: he stares upward as he grasps God's hand that descends from heaven. The Cologne ivory, however, features only part of Christ's face: the plaque is after all much thinner, but there appears to have been an attempt all the while to carve as much of his face as the ivory ground would allow (fig. 2.50). Two eyes and a bridge suggesting a nose are fully visible, and an upcoming cleaning of the plaque may reveal more.

My own initial experience studying these ivories both from published photographs and in their vitrines led me, and likely other scholars to date, to assume that Christ's face was un-carved and completely turned inward. After all, the bridge of Christ's nose is not visible in traditional photographs of these objects, unlike in the Bode or Frankfurt plaques, and the depth of these plaques is rarely noted. Even when viewing the Schnütgen ivory in its vitrine, I was not able to get a sense of how deeply the plaque was carved on its upper extremities given that it is at the center of the top row in the case. These ivories and their 'hidden' carvings are coy, even, as they solicit contradictory interpretations depending on one's viewpoint.[176] Indeed, many of these Ottonian plaques are considerably thick, sometimes measuring 18 mm in depth, and so allow for an exquisite depth of carving. These measurements are perhaps of no surprise to those art

[176] Jas Elsner writes in an article on ekphrasis that images "may be coy about the potential mistranslation and misrepresentation in this process [of ekphrasis], but these are themselves part of the game of soliciting meanings and encouraging often contradictory interpretations." See Elsner, "Art History as Ekphrasis," *Art History* 33.1 (2010), pp. 10-27, esp. p. 13.

historians and curators who have had the opportunity to physically manipulate these objects outside their cases. But for most, these plaques are necessarily conditioned by their photographic reproduction.[177]

With such oblique details, we might fine-tune our understanding of what can and cannot be apprehended at the moment of the Ascension and how this iconography might or might not relate to contemporary images of the 'disappearing Christ.' For all of Christ's body cannot be apprehended from a single viewpoint; when examining the ivory head-on, only his back is visible. But when the ivory is viewed obliquely and from above, Christ's face looks directly at the viewer—who, in the context of a sacramentary, was most often the celebrant (namely bishop or priest). Visual access to Christ's divine parts is for a privileged viewer, it seems, but he too can only fully apprehend Christ's parts through the manipulation of the ivory. Thus Kessler's argument about the limits of human sensory perception to apprehend all of Christ at once still holds, but not just in the juxtaposition of the Crucifixion and Ascension plaques, as he would have it. Indeed, in the case of the Ascension ivory alone, the ivory must be turned and viewed

[177] The study of photography and sculpture is extensive. See, for instance, S. Hamill and M. Luke (eds), *Photography and Sculpture: The Art Object in Reproduction* (2017); G. Johnson (ed.) *Sculpture and Photography: Envisioning the Third Dimensi*on (1998); R. Marcoci, *The Original Copy: Photography of Sculpture, 1839 to Today* (Exhibition catalog, MoMA) (2010). Chris Lakey has also recently published important work on medieval perspective, vision, and relief that has influenced my thinking in this essay, including "'To See Clearly': The Place of Relief in Medieval Visual Culture," *Optics, Ethics, and Art in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries: Looking into Peter of Limoges's Moral Treatise on the Eye,* ed. H. Kessler and R. Newhauser (2018), 119-139. See also his recently published book, *Sculptural Seeing: Relief, Optics, and the Rise of Perspective in Medieval Italy* (2018). Other medieval art historians who have done important work on the relationship between medieval sculpture and photography include J. Jung in "The Kinetics of Gothic Sculpture: Movement and Apprehension in the South Transept of Strasbourg Cathedral and the Chartreuse de Champmol in Dijon," *Mobile Eyes* (2013), ed. D. Ganz and S. Neuner, pp. 133-173. See also my forthcoming article on this topic in *West 86th: A Journal of Decorative Arts, Design History, and Material Culture*.

from multiple angles in order to apprehend those parts most associated with Christ's divine and human natures, but they can never be viewed at once.

***Ad Orientem*: Facing East during Mass**

Christ's back-turned body, carved on the surface of two ivories likely employed in Christian ritual, would certainly have "rhymed" with other privileged bodies, seen from behind, in the conduct of the liturgy, not least the eastward facing body of the priest celebrating the Eucharist. I will examine how Christ's depiction as a *Rückenfigur* in the Vienna and Cologne ivories may have evoked the posture of the priests celebrating the Eucharist, and, in turn, how the potential liturgical resonance of the *Rückenfigur* in the Cologne ivory may have powerfully re-framed the beholder's vision of the Ascension.

As early as the second century, Christians typically prayed facing east, as was typical for several contemporary religious cults (pagan and monotheistic).[178] The east came to symbolize important persons, places, and states for these early Christians: the rising sun (a symbol of Christ himself), the heavenly Jerusalem, the Mount of Olives (understood to be from where the Lord ascended and to where he would eventually return (Acts I:9-12)), as well as the site of several other eschatological events (Ezek 11:23, 43:1-2, 44:1-2, and Zech 14:4). Consequentially, most

[178] There is much literature on this topic, notably: C. Vogel, "Sol Aequinoctialis: Problèmes et technique de l'orientation dans le cultue chrétien," *Revue des Sciences Réligieuses*, tome 36, fascicule 3-4, 1962, *Archéologie paleochrétienne et culte chrétien*, pp. 175-211. Vogel provides a dates of the year 200 *or* the second century, citing Tertullian, *Ad nationes*, I, 13 (CSEL xx,83); *Apologeticum* XVI, 9-11 (CC I,1 p. 116); Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagog*. II, 8, 61 (GCS Clem I.194). See also F.J. Dölger, *Sol salutis: Gebet und Gesang im christlichen Altertum: Mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Ostung in Gebet und Liturgie*, 2nd ed., LF 4/5 (Munster, 1925), M. Wallraff, *Christus verus sol: Sonnenverehrung und Christentum in der Spätantike*, JAC.E 32 (2001), pp. 60-88.

Christian churches were built on a roughly east-west axis, with the entrance in the west, and the apse (with the altar) in the east.

The early medieval Mass, as detailed in the *Ordo romanus primus* (written ca. 700 in Rome) and its commentaries invoke the eastward turn of the celebrant and faithful, and they explain at length its significance. In the period under discussion, celebrants turned toward the east at several points during the liturgy of the Eucharist: during the first prayer of Mass, while the *Gloria in excelsis* was sung, and immediately after communication.[179] Much has been written by scholars of the liturgy on these rites and their significance, most notably Cyrille Vogel, so I will only provide a brief overview here, as it is relevant to my study of the Vienna and Cologne ivories.

As it is preserved in the *Ordo romanus primus*, the Preface of the Eucharistic Prayer (or *Sursum corda*) has celebrants lift their hearts and minds towards God, to which congregants respond "habemus ad Dominum."[180] Vogel argues that the "Sursum corda—Habemus ad Dominum" said prior to the Eucharistic rite aims to encourage the faithful to focus their thoughts on the Lord, and in so doing direct their gaze towards heaven and hold up their hands.[181] Vogel notes that this call also implies a turning towards the east, the cardinal direction strongly

[179] On the eastward turn in the *Ordines Romani*, see C. Vogel, "Versus ad orientem: l'orentation dans les Ordines romani du haut moyen age," *Studi medievali*, (196) Vol. 1 n. 2 pp. 448-469. For a study on specifically the eastward turn during the Eucharistic rite, see C. Vogel, "L'Orientation vers l'Est du celebrant et des fidèles pendant la celebration eucharistique," *OrSyr* 9 (1964), pp. 3-37.

[180] E. Thuno pp. 130-131.

[181] See Vogel, "Sol," footnote 13.

associated with the place of the Lord.[182] Perhaps this call to lift oneself upward—and thus eastward—is also evoked in the inscription on the Fitzwilliam ivory plaque, "Ad te levavi animam meam" in which an adorsed figure stands at the foreground of the scene.

Following the Eucharistic rite, however, it is the celebrant who turns towards the east, thus turning his back towards the faithful. Several liturgical commentaries liken the celebrant's eastward turn and subsequent benediction at this moment to the moment Christ blesses the apostles just prior to Ascending to heaven. In *On the Liturgy*, Amalarius of Metz compares the officiating bishop to Christ, writing "Deinde revertitur episcopus ad orientem, et dicit 'Oremus: ac dein sequitur benedictio. Sic et Christus antequam ascenderet in coelum benedicit eos..."[183] But Amalarius does not exclusively relate the eastward turn and blessing to Christ's Ascension, as he expounds on the contrast between the earthly and celestial realms associated with the west and east:

> Libet hic proferre auctoritatem sancti Augustini, quare mos ecclesiae obtinuit suas orationes versum orientem dirigere. Dicit in sermone Domini de monte: "Cum ad orationem stamus ad orientem convertimur, unde caelum surgit—non tanquam ibi sit et Deus quasi ceteras partes mundi deseruerit, qui ubique praesens est, non locorum spatiis sed maiestatis potentia—sed ut admoneatur animus ad naturam excellentiorem se convertere, id est ad Dominum, cum ipsum corpus eius quod terrenum est, ad corpus excellentius, id est ad corpus caeleste convertitur.
>
> It is well to cite the authority of Saint Augustine to explain why our church observes the custom of directing its prayers towards the east. Addressing the Lord's sermon from the mount, he says: "When we stand to pray we turn to the east, where the heavens rise up—not as if God were there, as if he, who is present everywhere, not in space but in the majesty of his power, should have deserted the other regions of the world—but to

[182] Ibid., p. 181.

[183] Amalarius, *De ecclesiasticiis officiis*, PL 1115C-116C. Caput IX, "De prima oratione missae."

> command our spirit to turn to a more excellent nature, namely to the Lord, when his body that is earthly turned to a more excellent body, namely a heavenly body.[184]

In this passage, Amalarius (borrowing from Augustine) aligns the *act* of turning east with a range of significances, each grounded in an exegetical-symbolic privileging of an *ad orientiem* orientation. To turn eastward in prayer is to turn towards "a more excellent nature," or the Lord, just as his earthly body "turned to a more excellent body, namely the heavenly body."

There exists an even more compelling passage, to my mind, from the writings of Augustine on the importance of the physical—and spiritual—turn toward the east. He makes explicit that the physical turn towards the east during Mass should coincide with an *inward* turn towards the east. At the close of several of his sermons, he frequently says "Conversi (ad dominum)," likely invoking an eastward turn, which he explains to mean:

> Does God not say, 'Be converted to me? The scriptures are full of it: 'Be converted to me, be converted to me.' Indolence is beginning to be stirred. For what does this mean: 'Be converted to me'? It does not just mean that you, who were looking toward the west, should now look toward the east—that is easily done. If only you also did it inwardly, because that is not easily done. You turn your body around from one cardinal point to another; turn your heart around from one love to another.[185]

---

[184] Amalarius, *On the Liturgy,* Book 3.9, pp. 64-65 Vol. II. It is possible that the more earthly body in this instance could also refer to the body of the church (which has a counterpart in heaven). I thank Willemien Otten for this insight.

[185] "Nonne deus dicit: Convertimini ad me? Plenae sunt scripturae. Convertimini ad me, convertimini ad me. Coepit enim movere languor. Quid est enim: Convertimini ad me? Non enim—quod facile fit--, qui adtendebas occidentem, adtendas orientem. Utinam hoc intus facias, quia hoc non est facile! Convertis corpus ex cardine in cardinem: cor converte ex amore in amorem." Quoted by U. M. Loang, *Turning towards the Lord: Orientation in Liturgical Prayer* (2009), p. 56, footnote 63. Augustine, *Sermo Dolbeau* 19, 12: Dolbeau, *Augustin d'Hippone*, 164. Augustine here is referring to Prov 1:23; Is 45:22; Jer 3:14, 22; Ezek 18:30, 33:11; Joel 2:12; Zech I:3; Mal 3:7.

Augustine thus highlights the inward turn toward the east, or towards God, and reminds his listeners that the actions of the mind should mirror those of the body during Mass. In this light, the adorsed figures in the liturgical ivory plaques at the Fitzwilliam and Liebiegehaus model not only a physical state, but a mental one, too: they hold their hands upward and crane their necks in an effort to truly 'turn' themselves to the Lord in more ways than one.

The celebrant also turns at the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the prayer sung or recited during the Mass immediately following the *Kyrie Eleison*. Erik Thuno details that during the *Gloria in Excelsis* prayer, the pope again turns away from the congregation and faces east twice: "he faces east (*ad orientem*) until the hymn is over; then the pope turns toward the congregation (*ad populum*) for the *Pax Vobis*; finally, he once again turns his back on the congregation (*regerans se ad orientem*) and, while facing East, repeats the word "oremus."[186] On the reasons for the celebrant's eastward turn during the Gloria, Amalarius writes:

> Sacerdos quando dicit, *Gloria in excelsis Deo,* **orientis** partes solet respicere, in quibus ita solemus Dominum requirere, quasi ibi propria eius sedes sit, cum potius eum sciamus ubique esse**. Non est ordo, ut qui Dominum laudare voluerit tergum ad eum vertat, et pectus ad servos**. Ipsum statum ex qualitate loci, ubi angeli cecinerunt memoratum ymnum possumus conicere. Dominu, qui ubique est, secundum formam servi in Bethleem erat, quae Bethleem nostram Ecclesiam signat, quae est "domus panis." Angeli ad Orientem cecinerunt…
>
> When the priest says the *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, he is accustomed to look towards the eastern regions, where it is our custom to seek the Lord, as if that were his proper residence, though we know instead that he is everywhere. **It is not in order for him who wants to praise the Lord to turn his back to him and his chest to his servant.** We can conclude to this stance from the nature of the place where the angels sang the aforementioned hymn. The Lord, who is everywhere, was in Bethlehem in the form of a

[186] Thuno, pp. 130-131.

> servant, the Bethlehem that signifies our church, which is a house of bread. The angels sang towards the east…[187]

In this passage, Amalarius explicitly establishes what is and is not appropriate when praying to (or praising) the Lord: to turn one's back toward God and chest toward the faithful (or here, "ad servos") is inappropriate. Thus to turn one's chest (and hence face) towards God is the ideal disposition for prayer. Moreover, it is in the east that one can find God, as well as the city of Bethlehem and singing angels.

At the very end of Mass, the priest yet again faces east at the final blessing, or "ultima benedictio," and at the dismissal of the congregation, "Ite, missa est." Yet again, Amalarius likens the eastward facing priest to Christ's Ascension in *On the Liturgy*:

> Etenim Dominus, ante ascensionem in caelos, duxit discipulos in Bethaniam, ibique benedixit eos et ascendit in caelum. Hunc morem tenet sacerdos, ut, post omnia sacramenta consummata, benedicat populo atque salutet. Dein revertitur ad orientem, ut se commendet Domini ascensioni. Dicitque diaconus: "Ite missa est."
>
> Now the Lord, before his Ascension to heaven, took his disciples to Bethany, and there he blessed them and ascended into heaven. The priest follows this practice, such that, after all the sacraments have been consummated, he blesses and bids farewell to the people. Then he turns back to the east in order to commend himself to the Lord's Ascension. Then the deacon says "Ite, missa est."[188]

---

[187] Amalarius, *On the Liturgy,* pp. 58-60, vol. II, book 3.8. Willemien Otten has helped me change the translation slightly from Knibbs' edition. In this passage, Amalarius emphasizes the importance of the church, which becomes the extension of Christ's body on earth after he leaves. Amalarius also briefly comments on the symbolism of the bishop crossing from one side of the altar to another, likening it to "Christ's passage from his passion to eternal life": "Diximus superius transitum episcopi de altari in dexteram partem significare Christi transitum de passione ad aeternam vitam." (Book 3.9, *On the Liturgy*, pp. 60-61).

[188] Amalarius, *On the Liturgy*, vol. II, Book 3.36, pp. 228-229 facing Latin-English Text.

Here, the connection between the Ascending Christ and celebrant is made more explicit: first, the priest is likened to Christ at the Mount of Olives through the final blessing, and then, he figuratively participates in the Ascension through his eastward turn, as he "commend[s] himself to the Lord's Ascension." Such language suggests that the priest's 180-degree turn enables him to contemplate, or perhaps even metaphorically participate in Christ's Ascension, in some unspecified way. The close of Mass is then like a miniature re-enactment of the Ascension, in which the celebrant recalls Christ's ascent and represents him now—*in absentia*—on Earth.

As this early *Ordo* and the writings of Amalarius make clear, although the east was not mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles or any of the Gospel accounts of the Ascension, it came to be understood as the direction in which Christ ascended and from which he would one day return. Beyond the Ascension, the east was fraught with importance for medieval Christians: Christ will return from the east, martyrs' souls rise to heaven in the East, and paradise is located in the east.[189] During the recital of the *Sursum corda*, the singing of the *Gloria in Excelsis*, and at the close of the Eucharistic rite, the celebrant turned away from the people assembled behind him. In so doing, he reminded viewers that to look eastward is to look upward, in both body and spirit, toward the divine God. Moreover, he himself became a symbol of the Ascending Christ through both his blessing of the faithful and eastward turn, recapitulating through his own bodily movement Christ's own transition from the earthly to heavenly realms.[190]

---

[189] Vogel, "Sol," p. 181.

[190] Moreover, one could also read the ascending Christ as a figure of specifically the bishop in these ivories, as Christ 'sanctions' the order of the bishop at the moment of his Ascension in several contemporary and earlier Ordinals of Christ. I will further examine these texts in the

The Cologne and Vienna ivories were each directly implicated in the Mass; the Vienna ivory was once the back cover of an evangeliary, and the Cologne ivory in all likelihood was also once on the front or back cover of a liturgical manuscript, too. They were seen, touched, and processed during the Mass; these ivories were also placed upon the altar, the site at which the celebrant would turn from west to east and back again on more than one occasion during Mass. The plain view of Christ's back and obfuscation of his face on each of these ivory plaques, then, must be necessarily understood in relation to those actual neighboring bodies in the liturgy.

The adorsed body of Christ in these plaques was in dialogue with the Mass in several ways: the adorsed Christ models the viewer's own eastward-upward turn in mind and, in the case of the celebrant, in actual body. Furthermore, the back of Christ indicates that he now looks towards that 'more excellent' body in heaven, namely that of God: his *transitus* from Earth to heaven is figured through the position of his body in the overall plaque—well above the apostles and framed by the cloudy opening—as well as through the adorsement of his body, too. His visible backside marks that he has already assumed a position in which he communes with the divine, rather than the earthly. This corresponds, I would argue, with his own dual character; it is immediately following the Ascension when Christ's incarnate body is no longer accessible on Earth.

Furthermore, in the case of the Vienna ivory, it was paired with an ivory (now in Munich) of the Crucifixion on the front cover of the codex. These starkly contrasting viewpoints of Christ's body—frontally disposed on the cross and scantly robed versus an adorsed Christ whose

---

chapter that follows. See R. Reynolds, *The Ordinals of Christ from their Origins to the Twelfth Century* (1978).

body is almost entirely covered in cloth—recapitulate the 'transitus' of the celebrant when he turned from west to east at various parts of the Mass. Moreover, I would surmise that it is not insignificant that the Ascension once occupied the back, rather than front cover of the manuscript: not only did the Ascension sequentially follow the Crucifixion in the *vita Christi*, but the closing blessing of Mass (at which point the priest turned toward the east) was understood as the moment at which the priest 'commended himself' to Christ's Ascension.

The ivories, in turn, can enrich our understanding of the eastward-facing body during Mass. As a form of visual commentary on these rites, these objects suggest that the adorsed priest—like many of the adorsed figures I have studied in this chapter—can simultaneously mediate Christ for the faithful congregants, who were frequently presented with a view of his back, as well as become a figure of the Ascending Christ through the turning of his body.

Conclusion

The oblique photographs I have shared here suggest that Carolingian and Ottonian sculptors frequently depicted *Rückenfiguren* to suggest dyadic sightlines, the importance of beholding as a theological encounter, and, more generally, to encourage the viewer's own participation—both visually and tactilely—in encountering Christ. The adorsed Christ likely rhymed with Moses' view of God's back parts as well as with actual privileged bodies, seen from behind, in the conduct of the liturgy, not least the eastward-facing priest, who turned "ad orientem" during the recital of the *Sursum corda*, the singing of the *Gloria in Excelsis*, and at the close of the Eucharistic rite. In several early medieval liturgical commentaries, the priest's eastward turn is even likened to his participation in the Ascension. As Dynes has argued in his work on the Stavelot Bible, the Latin verb 'convertere' could suggest both a turning towards God

as well as to "retire from the world" by entering a monastery.[191] What might the relationship be between the adorsed Christ, the eastward facing priest, and the monk who 'turns' towards a monastic life in the case of ivory plaques made on the eve of the Gregorian Reform movement? These are areas I continue to explore in my research.

But for now, it is clear that oblique photographs reveal not only the facture and tactility of an ivory plaque, as Cutler (among others) evoked, but also carvings that are central to its theological meaning, as in the case of the Ascension ivories. Ottonian sculptors exploited their medium to express what their illuminator counterparts frequently could not: or that parts of Christ could be simultaneously hidden and revealed, requiring that the viewer consider the object from multiple viewpoints in order to apprehend his form.

The Cologne and Vienna ivories appropriated a stylistic trend in Carolingian and Ottonian art and put it to new use, and in so doing, they figured not only Christ's Ascension, but also the moment when a new system of signs, and so image, is inaugurated. Christ's incarnate body is removed from view as it ascends, and both ivories figure the opening of the wound-like cloud as if it will completely subsume and eventually close-in around his form. The ivories suggest the forthcoming absence of his incarnate body, as he moves upward and even into the ivory support. In these ways, the plaques mediate Christ's hypostasis at this moment, or the tensions between his visible humanity and invisible divinity, both of which ascend and are soon beyond view. As the only two images that figure the Ascending Christ as a total *Rückenfigur*, they simultaneously offer a lesson in reception of previously adorsed figures as well as demonstrate how, at the turn of the millenium, artists continued to experiment with ways to

[191] W. Dynes, "The Dorsal Figure in the Stavelot Bible," *Gesta* Vol. 10, No. 2 (1971), pp. 41-48

figure Christ's dual character and explore the consequences of the Ascension for the art object itself, or when Christ as an image of God was removed from view.

CHAPTER 3

PERSONAE CHRISTI:
REPRESENTING CHRIST AFTER THE ASCENSION

Introduction

In an opening image of a tenth-century Exultet roll (Rome Biblioteca Casanatense, Ms. Cas. 724 (B I 13)), made in southern Italy and used to celebrate the local Beneventan Easter liturgy, Christ hovers above an image of a baptismal font (fig. 3.1).[192] The vertical alignment of Christ and the font suggests they bear a relationship to one another, even though this segment of the roll is clearly divided into two visual registers separated by a band of parchment. In the upper register, Christ is enthroned within a banded, star-studded sphere and surrounded by four angels. Below, a group of clerical figures surround the baptismal font: the archbishop Landulf for whom the scroll was made stands to the left of the font, while three other lower grades of clerics stand to the right.[193] There is an inscription describing the liturgical action the bishop has started to or will soon perform: *Benedictio fontis*, or the blessing of the font.

[192] This and several other iconographically similar Exultet rolls used to celebrate the Beneventan liturgy have been the subject of much scholarship to date. For the most recent (and comprehensive) work, see N. Zchomelidse, *Art, Ritual, and Civic Identity in Medieval Southern Italy* (2014), in which she studies multiple rolls commissioned by Bishop Landulf. See also N. Zchomelidse, "Descending Word and Resurrecting Christ: Moving Images in Illuminated Liturgical Scrolls in Southern Italy," *Meaning in Motion: The Semantics of Movement in Medieval Art* (ed. N. Zchomelidse and G. Freni), pp. 3-34; E. Palazzo, *L'évêque et son Image: L'illustration du Pontifical au Moyen Age* (1999), especially pp. 138-141; T. Kelly, *The Exultet in Southern Italy* (1996). Bissera Pentcheva is currently working on the rolls and their movement during the Easter Sunday celebration as well.

[193] For more on baptism during this period, see the important work by Peter Cramer, *Baptism and Change in the Early Middle Ages*, *c. 200-1150* (1993).

Despite the physical separation of almost three ruled lines (that contain no text), the two horizontal registers are undoubtedly to be understood together. The blue monochrome wash that fills the quadrilobe font stands in stark visual contrast to the figural image of Christ, but the two are spatially aligned—occupying the image's central vertical axis—and depicted with similar colors. The area surrounding Christ's body is a darker blue, surrounded in turn by a lighter blue and an outer orange frame, which is the same color as the font's quadrilobe frame below. Moreover, the particular shape of the font, as seen from above, suggests quadrilobe frames that often mark the sacred status of a Christological figure like the *agnus dei* (fig. 3.2). It also suggests the form of the cross. The hieratic frontality of this sanctioned form—the quadrilobe—lends a sacral quality to the physical object of the font, borne out in that double perspective of the mundane structure and its evocative shape. By depicting the font from this particular perspective, with these colors, and with such an evocative shape, the artist was able to suggest that this field—empty of figuration, but full of meaning—bears a close relationship to Christ above. Specifically, the image suggests that while the incarnate Christ may be absent on Earth and present in heaven, the actions of the clergy and the sacredly shaped font can make him present on Earth, albeit not in his incarnate form.

In chapters one and two, I focused on early medieval images of two narrative moments from the Gospels: the *Visitatio sepulchri* and the Ascension. In each instance, the medieval artist is tasked with creating a visual representation of these Biblical moments in which Christ's absence plays a central part. The final chapter of the dissertation acts like a postscript to these narrative images, as it goes beyond the Gospel texts and treats absence not as a narrative event,

but rather an ontological state. In other words, I focus on the liturgical present, or that period of time *after* Christ's ascension, when his incarnate body is absent on Earth.

My focus will be on images of the celebration of the liturgy, or precisely those rites, persons, and objects, variously transformed, that were understood to make Christ present anew. In the first few decades of the eleventh century, there was a real artistic interest in depicting the celebration of the liturgy in ways that did not correspond with a physical reality.[194] These 'imagined' liturgies were, I argue, powerful representational means to explore who and what could most effectively mediate the past, present, and future Christ. Focusing on select manuscript illuminations and ivory carvings, I consider how artists explored these questions through the creation of complex webs of Christological signs whose meaning hinged on Christ's real absence.

The images on which I will focus come from three distinct manuscripts that have, to date, been the subject of extensive study: the Sacramentary of Bishop Warmund of Ivrea (Ivrea Biblioteca Capitolare MS.86, ca. 966-1002), the Sacramentary of Bishop Sigebert of Minden (Berlin Staatsbibliothek MS Theol. Lat. 2, ca. 1022-1036), and a Sacramentary made in Fulda (Udine Arcidiocesi di Udine Biblioteca Capitolare MS 1, late 10th c.) whose patron is unknown. These books collectively contain three of the most widely studied Ottonian images of an imagined aspect of the liturgy, and each is iconographically idiosyncratic. The figures of Ecclesia (a female personification of the Church), the bishop, and in two instances the agnus dei are inscribed into a highly complex program of Christological signs. In my reading of each of these images, I consider how their artists, through highly innovative experiments in

[194] See, for instance, E. Palazzo, *L'évêque et son image* (1999), p. 103.

representation, were engaging contemporary debates about which persons, actions, and signs could most effectively make the absent Christ present.

In considering how early medieval artists explored ways to figure Christ after the Ascension, this chapter is in some ways about early medieval ecclesiology. I am interested in how artists figured the Church—whether as a physical site, a collective, or an individual—and its making through a variety of signs and formal strategies. As I will suggest, these images engage contemporary debates about the very structure of the Church, its members, and how it should be organized.[195] In the wake of multiple local reform movements, often spearheaded by local bishops, and on the eve of the so-called Gregorian Reform movement (ca. 1050-80) led by Pope Gregory VII, questions about who and what could most effectively represent Christ and his Church were at stake.[196]

Scholars have historically placed a significant emphasis on how those images I will study here stage episcopal power, specifically, by offering "portraits" of individual bishops that glorify their power and relation to Christ.[197] So too have historians often called the area and period on

[195] For an excellent primer on some of these questions, which I will further explore in the chapter, see Y. Congar, *L'Ecclesiologie du Haut Moyen Age* (1968).

[196] On the polemics of calling these reform efforts the "Gregorian Reform," see J. Gilchrist, "Was there a Gregorian Reform Movement in the Eleventh Century?" CCHA *Study Sessions*, 37 (1970), pp. 1-10; O. Capitani, "Esiste un 'Età Gregoriana'? Considerazioni sulle tendenze di una storiografica medievistica," *Rivista di Storia e Litteratura Religiosa* I (1965), pp. 454-481; G. Ladner, "Two Gregorian Letters: On the Sources and Nature of Gregory VII Reform Ideology," *Studi Gregoriani* 5 (1956), pp. 221-242.

[197] See E. Gatti, *Developing an Iconography of the Episcopacy: Liturgical Portraiture and Episcopal Politics in Late Tenth- and Early Eleventh-Century Manuscripts* (Dissertation, UNC Chapel Hill, 2005) and P.-A. Mariaux *Warmond d'Ivrée et ses images: Politique et creation iconographique autour de l'an Mil* (2002), for instance.

which I focus "Europe of the Bishops."[198] Bishops indeed hold an important place in all the images I study in this chapter, but it is their relationship to Christ, the *agnus dei*, Ecclesia, and—quite importantly—other members of the clergy that is continually re-articulated through a variety of formal means. My study of these images concerns first and foremost questions of clerical hierarchy and the collective effort, in actuality and artistically, to signify and make present the otherwise absent Christ through the persons and rites of his Church.

I begin by considering how the Church as a clerical collective was articulated in ninth-century Carolingian ivory carvings and manuscript illuminations, with a focus on a frontispiece in the Raganaldus sacramentary (Autun BM MS 19bis, ca. 850). Although there is an explicit hierarchy among members of the clergy that orders this image, the collective body suggests an image of the Church, if not Christ himself. But each figure also possesses a particular relationship to Christ, as I hope to demonstrate by studying this image in relation to a contemporary set of widely circulated texts, the Ordinals of Christ.

I then turn to three Ottonian sacramentary illuminations, made between the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, in which different configurations of who can make present the historical, sacramental, and future Christ and his Church are tested and explored. The bishop increasingly stands in for a larger clerical collective in highly imaginative representations of his celebration of the liturgy. In the Sacramentary of Warmund of Ivrea (Ivrea Biblioteca Capitolare cod. 86), for instance, he is present at the historical Crucifixion as he adores Christ's cross on Good Friday; in the Sacramentary of Sigebert of Minden (Berlin Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Ms

[198] T. Reuter, "Ein Europa der Bischöfe. Das Zeitalter Burchards von Worms," *Bischof Burchard von Worms 1000-1025* (ed. W. Hartmann, 2000), pp. 1-28.

Theol. Lat. fol. 2, he takes the Eucharistic chalice from Ecclesia to at once consecrate and drink Christ's blood. The bishop's relationship to the Church, whether conceptualized as the clergy, the Christian *populus*, the physical building, or a female personification, is continually re-configured in these images.

Finally, I conclude with a close study of an image in a Sacramentary from Fulda (Udine Arcidiocesi di Udine Biblioteca Capitolare MS 1) that appears alongside the liturgical commemoration of All Saints Day, which in turn also marks the day on which the local church was consecrated. Through a close study of image and rite, I consider how the moment at which the bishop (or pontiff) *gestare* the *persona* of Christ when consecrating the church offers a capacious way to think about how early medieval artists stage relationships between the bishop and the absent Christ: he can variously contain, wear, or even compose Christ through his person and actions.[199]

Representing Christ and the Church as a Clerical Collective

A closer look at the few extant images of the clergy made during the Carolingian period reveals that artists frequently figured the Church as a collective of its clergy, either in stasis or performing liturgical actions. Amidst this collective, however, a distinct hierarchy between clerics is visually articulated; access to Christ's Eucharistic body and vessels was, for instance, one way of privileging certain grades over others. In this section, I consider the frontispiece of

[199]"Scimus autem sacros pontifices domini nostri **Iesu Christi gestare personam**, sicupt ipse eis dicit "Sicut misit me pater et ego mitto vos" (my emphasis). *Pontifical romano-germanique*, Section XXXV, "Quid significant duodecim candelae," p. 92.

the Raganaldus Sacramentary (figure 3.3), made in Tours ca. 850, which depicts eight clerical figures whom we can understand to individually and collectively represent Christ.[200]

Before turning exclusively to this manuscript, however, consider three contemporary images of the Church and its clergy, each carved in ivory: the covers of the Drogo Sacramentary (fig. 3.4, 3.5, Paris BnF Lat. 9428) carved in Metz ca. 845-55 as well as two plaques (fig. 3.6, 3.7) made ca. 860 once in the treasury of St Denis and now at the Louvre (MR 368, 369).[201] Each work presents a collective hierarchy of the Church: several figures of the same approximate

---

[200] See C. Voyer, "Le Sacramentaire de Marmoutiers (Autun BM. 19bis) et l'abbé Rainaud," *La culture des comamnditaires. L'oeuvre et l'empreinte* (ed. S. Brodbeck and A-O. Poilpré), Actes de la journée d'études organisée à Paris le 15 novembre 2013, Paris, site de l'HiCSA, pp. 158-173; R. Reynolds, "The Portrait of Ecclesiastical Officers in the Raganaldus Sacramentary and its Liturgico-canonical Significance," *Speculum* 46:3 (1971), pp. 432-442; J. Décréaux, *Le sacramentaire de Marmoutier (Autun 19bis) dans l'histoire des sacramentaires carolingiens du IXe siècle* (1985); E. Palazzo, *L'évêque et son image* (1999); D. Iogna-Prat, *La Maison Dieu. Une histoire monumentale de l'Eglise au Moyen Age* (800-1200) (2006), esp. pp. 85-90.

[201] The Drogo Sacramentary plaques each measure 28.8 x 21.5 cm. On the Drogo Sacramentary ivory plaques, see R. Reynolds, "A Visual Epitome of the Eucharistic Ordo from the Era of Charles the Bald: The Ivory Mass Cover of the Drogo Sacramentary," *Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom* (ed. M. T. Gibson and J. L. Nelson, 1990), pp. 241-60; F. Unterkircher, *Zur Ikonographie und Liturgie des Drogo-Sakramentars: Paris BnF Ms. Lat. 9428*, *Interpretationes ad codices, 1 (1977)*; W. Köhler and F. Mütherich, *Drogo-Sakramentar: Manuscrit Latin 9428, Bibliothèque nationale, Paris*, 2 vol. (1974). A. Goldschmidt, *Die Elfenbeinskulturen*, I, 41-42. Each Louvre plaque measures 16.2 x 10.5 cm. Segments of these ivory plaques are not in their original order, and Reynolds deftly reconstructs their original sequence in his article listed above. The Drogo ivories also depict scenes from the *Vita Christi*. On the Louvre ivories, see the recent essay by S. Danielson, "The Bishop's Presence: Depicting Episcopal Authority in the Early Middle Ages," *Envisioning the Bishop: Images of the Episcopacy in the Middle Ages* (ed. S. Danielson and E. Gatti, 2014), pp. 127-152; D. Gaborit-Chopin, *Ivoires médiévaux V-XV siècle*, pp. 160-162 (n. 43); A. Goldschmidt, *Die Elfenbeinskulpturen*, I, 70-71; C. Heitz, "Eucharistie, Synaxe et Espace liturgique," *Segni e Riti nella Chiesa Alto Medievale Occidentale, Settimani de Studi* (33, 1987), pp. 609-38; E. Molinier, *Catalogue des Ivoires*, pp. 42-48 (1896); R. de Fleury, *La Messe*, t. I, p. 71, pl. IX. In the inventory of St Denis Treasury of 1634, two manuscripts with ivory covers are mentioned: n. 347 "Livre des épîtres" (p. 289) and n. 184 "Manuscrit des Evangiles" (p. 204). See Blaise de Montesquiou-Fezenac, *Le Trésor de Saint-Denis, Inventaire de 1634* (avec la collaboration de Danielle Gaborit-Chopin, 1978). My thanks to Florian Meunier for letting me consult these objects and their files.

height (save the bishop, who is depicted as taller in the Drogo ivories) are depicted in tandem to create an image of the Church and the clerical bodies that comprise it. In the case of the Drogo ivories (fig. 3.4, 3.5) and the second Louvre plaque (fig. 3.7), liturgical action is underscored, whereas in the first Louvre plaque (fig. 3.6) and in the Raganaldus frontispiece (fig. 3.3), figures are presented more statically with various attributes that help us identify who they are.

On folio 1v of Autun BM MS 19bis, known as the Marmoutiers or Raganaldus Sacramentary (Tours, ca. 845), there are eight clerical orders, each identified by a corresponding attribute (fig. 3.3). The image is composed such that the hierarchy of orders is made plain: arranged in a pyramidal structure, a doorkeeper, lector, subdeacon (who stands on a pedestal), exorcist, and acolyte occupy the lower half of the frame, while the presbyter, bishop, and deacon are figured above. Each of the minor orders below holds an object that further identifies his grade. These are liturgical objects that each cleric would receive during the *traditio instrumentorum*, an important part of the ordination ritual.[202] The doorkeeper holds a key, the lector and exorcist both hold books (likely representing a lectionary and a book of rituals) in veiled hands, the acolyte holds a candlestick, and the subdeacon holds a chalice and cruet.

Above, the bishop sits in his throne and makes an ambiguous but clearly marked gesture with his right hand while holding an open book in his left.[203] This book could represent the very sacramentary in which this frontispiece is figured and so offers a *mise-en-abîme*, or,

[202] See R. Reynolds, "Ordinatio and the Priesthood in the Early Middle Ages and its Visual Depiction," *A Companion to Priesthood and Holy Orders in the Middle Ages* (2015), pp. 51-52.

[203] In her study of the frontispiece, Cécile Voyer writes that this ambiguous gesture may refer to a sign of teaching or presentation of the host in the direction of the priest, who sits to his right. See C. Voyer, "Le Sacramentaire de Marmoutiers (Autun BM. 19bis) et l'abbé Rainaud," pp. 158-173.

alternatively, it could allude to the open Gospel book placed upon the bishop's shoulders or neck during his ordination.[204] To the left of the bishop, a priest sits and gestures towards the bishop with both hands, and on the right, a dalmatic-clad deacon holds a closed book, likely a representation of the Gospels, while gesturing towards the bishop with his right hand. Personifications of the four winds are depicted in each corner of the frame within dark blue medallions; their wings extend into golden medallions, and small red lilies extend even further. Finally, a seraph hovers immediately above the bishop, its two wings overlapping the frame from behind. These elements surrounding the frame do important work in presenting this clerical collective as a unified image of Christ and his Church, as I will further explain.

The sacramentary in which this image appears contains those texts spoken during the ordination of each of these clerical grades, and two inscriptions on this frontispiece suggest the image's relation to the subsequent texts: "Pontificu(m) e(st) propriu(m) conferre per ordine(m) honores/ Quos qui suscipiunt studeant servare pudice" and further below, "Pontifices caveant d[omi]ni ne mystica vendant/cumque gradus dederint videant ne munera sumant." In other words, "it is proper to the Bishop to confer honors according to rank/And those who receive them should strive to serve in a virtuous manner," and "pontiffs should take care to not sell

[204] It is not uncommon for images of manuscripts to refer to the *actual* manuscripts in which they are contained. In this instance, the open book held by the bishop could suggest the intended relationship between this very sacramentary and its (potentially) episcopal viewer. Moreover, it underscores the importance of the sacramentary in marking the figure of the bishop as the most important among the clerical orders. I will further explore the question of open books paired with bishops (and at times the *agnus dei*) in relation to episcopal ordination rites in the pages that follow.

mystical things of the Lord, and let them see to it when they have given clerical grades they do not accept gifts."[205]

The formal composition of the image suggests very plainly the *cursus honorum*, or how one must proceed, grade by grade, to become a member of a higher clerical order. The visible rulings that traverse the frontispiece further underscore this hierarchy: many of the clerical grades occupy their own *gradus*, or step. These lines differentiate members of the clergy and act as the literal steps one must ascend to reach the highest order depicted here, that of the episcopacy.[206] In addition, the prominence of the various liturgical objects held by most clerical figures in the image again recalls the centrality of the bishop to the ordination rite, for he is the one who gives each clerical order their instrument in the *traditio instrumentorum*.[207] The image's formal hierarchy as well as the first of the two inscriptions also make, according to Reynolds, explicit reference to the Ordinals of Christ ("conferre per ordinem honores").[208]

The Ordinals of Christ, a series of texts that were widely circulated throughout the Middle Ages, elucidate how Christ sanctioned each clerical order at various moments during his

[205] My translation, with thanks to Martin Schwarz for his feedback.

[206] One might understand these lines in relation to different bands of color, also horizontally aligned, that frequently appear in Ottonian manuscript painting. Different colors frequently delineate a hierarchy of spaces. These bands might also be understood in relation to contemporary climate maps, in which different bands depict the Earth's climate zones. This is an idea I hope to explore in future research.

[207] R. Reynolds, "Image and Text: The Liturgy of Clerical Ordination in Early Medieval Art," *Gesta* 22:1 (1983), pp. 27-38, especially p. 29.

[208] See R. Reynolds, *The Ordinals of Christ from their Origins to the Twelfth Century* (1978).

life.[209] In other words, Christ inaugurated these offices and roles in his own life, as the examples that follow will show. The Ordinals of Christ can be found among ordination prayers, liturgical commentaries, and canon law collections.[210] Appearing in the fifth century in the Latin West, these texts were typically structured in one of two ways: (a) a list of clerics and their dominical sanction in hierarchical order, or (b) a list of clerics ordered according to moments in Christ's life when he sanctioned each of the orders.[211] Take, for instance, this Carolingian example that presents the clerical orders in ascending order, according to ecclesiastical rank:

> Here begins the seven grades of the Church:
> The first grade is that of lector, when he opened the book of Isaiah.
> Exorcist, when he cast out the seven demons from Mary Magdalene.
> Subdeacon, when he made wine out of water.
> Deacon, when he washed his disciples' feet.
> Presbyter, when he blessed the five loaves.
> Doorkeeper, when he opened the gates of hell.
> Bishop, when he raised his hands over the apostles and blessed them.[212]

Through his actions, Christ effectively created each of the seven clerical grades during his life; he sanctioned each Order at particular moments identified in the text.[213] The Raganaldus

---

[209] In his study of this frontispiece, Roger Reynolds writes that "conferre per ordinem honores" likely references language in a ninth-century Ordinals of Christ, which underscored how clerics pass through the various grades in hierarchical order.

[210] See R. Reynolds, "The Imago Christi in the Bishop, Priest, and Clergy," *A Companion to Priesthood and the Holy Orders* (ed. G. Peters, C. Anderson, 2016), p. 141. Voyer also briefly mentions this connection in her study. This is similar to the recapitulation theory of salvation, writes Reynolds: Christ passed through all of the ages of man to redeem man, just as he fulfilled all the clerical grades. See Reynolds, p. 186.

[211] According to Reynolds, the earliest Ordinal of Christ is the fifth-century *Apophthegmata*, which were later translated into Latin in the century senior as the *Verba seniorum*. See Reynolds, "The Imago Christi," p. 142.

[212] Ibid., p. 150.

[213] The events from Christ's life that 'sanction' each of the clerical orders vary to some extent in early medieval Ordinals of Christ. Sometimes Christ was a priest when he was crucified, or he

frontispiece presents an image of these seven orders plus the acolyte, and so we might understand—alongside the Ordinals of Christ—that each clerical grade is Christ-like in his own way.

The hierarchy among each Christ-sanctioned grade, like in the Ordinals of Christ, is also made plain in the Raganaldus frontispiece. The image's inscription suggests that the bishop has the power to ordain and so make those other members of the clergy presented here; however, it also cautions against the abuse of his power: he cannot sell offices, which was a significant concern throughout the early Middle Ages. Nonetheless, the importance of the bishop, priest, *and* deacon is underscored by the two-tiered presentation of this group. This division has everything to do with who has access to the Eucharistic elements: those who sit in the top row of the image are physically distinguished by their ability to confect or, in the case of the deacon, distribute the Eucharist.

In his study of Carolingian images of the Eucharist, Roger Reynolds considers several images in which Christ's fingers are positioned in a similar way and hold—between his thumb and another finger—a Eucharistic wafer or orb (fig. 3.8).[214] Perhaps the ambiguous but clearly marked gesture of the bishop in this frontispiece has Eucharistic resonance, particularly when figured directly above the subdeacon's chalice. In this way, the subdeacon's participation in the Eucharistic rite, like those three figures above, is visually underscored.

---

was a bishop when he blessed his disciples and then ascended to heaven. See Reynolds, "The Imago Christi" and *The Ordinals of Christ.*

[214] See R. Reynolds, "Eucharistic Adoration in the Carolingian Era? Exposition of Christ in the Host," *Peregrinations: Journal of Medieval Art & Architecture* 4:2 (Autumn 2013), pp. 70-153.

In a footnote to his study of the Raganaldus frontispiece, Roger Reynolds writes that it is tempting to read the image in relation to the central panel of the so-called Harbaville triptych, a Byzantine ivory made in tenth-century Constantinople that also depicts eight major figures (fig. 3.9, Louvre OA 3247).[215] In lieu of the bishop at top and center, however, is Christ, flanked by the Virgin and John the Baptist. Below are Peter, John, Paul, James, and Andrew. Under this logic, the bishop in the Raganaldus sacramentary, who is seated upon his throne at the top and center of the manuscript's opening, is the most Christ-like among his church. Two inscriptions on the page further confirm his special status, as they attest to his power to confer orders. Cécile Voyer has in turn read the image in relation to a *Maiestas domini*, but her argument hinges in part on her misidentification of the four winds in the frame's corners as the four evangelists. The presence of the four winds do, however, invite a reading of this image as a topographical map, as it is precisely in contemporary cartographic images that the winds appear.[216] Might we understand the clerical collective, then, as a quasi-map of the Church?

Another element of the frontispiece's frame that has thus far escaped scholarly attention, however, can help further elucidate how Christ and the Church as a collective body are figured in this image. The seraph above the bishop's head notably recalls Isaiah 6:1-2, in which the prophet writes "…I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne high and elevated: and his train filled the temple.

---

[215] The ivory measures 282 x 242 x 12 mm. For more on this particular object, see J. Durand, *Byzance* (exhibition catalog, Louvre, 1992), notice 149; D. Gaborit-Chopin, *Les Ivoires médiévaux* (2003), n. 16. See also R. Reynolds, "The Portrait of the Ecclesiastical Officers in the Raganaldus Sacramentary and its Liturgico-Canonical Significance," pp. 434-5, footnote 12.

[216] On images of the four winds in Carolingian and later medieval images, see B. Obrist, "Wind Diagrams and Medieval Cosmology," *Speculum* 72:1 (1997), pp. 33-84.

Upon it stood the seraphims…"[217] We might understand the artist's decision to figure the seraph above the bishop, then, as a way to suggest his resemblance to the enthroned Christ, who sits high above, in Isaiah's vision. Furthermore, the bishop's head is alone in rising above the turquoise field of paint that covers two-thirds of the upper part of the frontispiece. This is not incidental: it suggests that the bishop is literally the head of the Church like Christ is the head of the body that is the Church (Col. 1:18).

Thus the Raganaldus frontispiece articulates a clear hierarchy among these clerical orders and acts as a topographical image of the Church with the bishop, the most Christ-like figure of the group, at its head. The painting is largely organized according to each order's ability to confect, distribute, or handle the vessels of the Eucharistic elements. Indeed, Christ's sacramental body is a principle organizing logic of this image, and the clerical collective, which comprise the Church, make him present anew, as the vessels, marked gestures, and each of their Christ-sanctioned orders make clear.

***

In his study of the Ordinals of Christ, Reynolds writes that they remained fairly similar in content until the late 11th century, when a major change occurred:

> Suddenly…the bishop and his dominical sanctions were left out of these texts, and the dominical sanctions used for almost all of the grades had Eucharistic overtones. The

[217]"…vidi Dominum sedentem super solium excelsum et elevatum; et ea quae sub ipso erant replebant templum. Seraphim stabant super illud…" Isaiah 6:1-2.

> reason was that the episcopacy had become an office, not a sacred order, and there was a new interest in the Eucharist, what it meant, and how it was to be handled.[218]

The terms 'order' and 'office' changed in meaning, it seems, by the late eleventh century. Maureen Miller writes that while 'ordo' denoted in the early Middle Ages an office or ministry (and so could describe a lector, bishop, or even monarch), in the late eleventh century, the diaconate and priesthood were at times considered the only orders sanctioned by Christ.[219] A distinction arose in the eleventh century, too, between "minor" (doorkeeper, lector, exorcist, acolyte) and "major" (subdeacon, deacon, priest) orders. [220] The hierarchy that determined the relationship between these orders rested on the order's ability to confect the Eucharist.[221] Thus while bishops are included in pre-eleventh century lists and images of the clerical orders, this is not the case from the late eleventh century onward, when the episcopate was redefined "as an office to which one was consecrated, not ordained."[222]

The following three manuscript illuminations I study all pre-date the so-called Gregorian Reform Movement, when precisely those changes that Miller and Reynolds describe were codified. Made in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, these images do, however, suggest a

---

[218] Reynolds, "The Imago Christi," p. 141.

[219] M. Miller, *Clothing the Clergy: Virtue and Power in Medieval Europe, c. 800-1200* (2014), p. 67.

[220] R. Reynolds, "The Subdiaconate as a Sacred and Superior Order," *Clerics in the Early Middle Ages*, 1-39 (Chapter IV), p. 4. Reynolds has also written on changes in the status of the subdeacon, with particular attention to the figure during the second half of the eleventh century, as there was growing concern that since the subdeacon handled the Eucharistic vessels, he should be chaste. The subdiaconate is considered a sacred order as early as the sixth century, when it is deemed a "gradus sacrati" at the Council of Toledo (527), and several subsequent decrees mandated his chastity.

[221] Miller, *Clothing the Clergy*, p. 67.

[222] Miller, ibid., p. 67.

keen interest in how a single figure, often the bishop, can represent a clerical collective or even the entire Church.[223] I will consider in the following case studies new ways of representing Christ and his Church that frequently underscore the power of the bishop, in particular, to make Christ present and mediate Christ's body for others.

The Crucified Christ and Bishop Warmund of Ivrea

The Sacramentary of Warmund of Ivrea (Ivrea Biblioteca Capitolare cod. 86) was commissioned by Bishop Warmund of Ivrea between 966 and 1002.[224] Comprised of 222 folios,

[223] Art and the episcopacy in early medieval Europe has been the subject of a number of recent studies, including M. Miller, *The Bishop's Palace: Architecture and Authority in Medieval Italy* (2000); A. Cohen, *The Uta Codex: Art, Philosophy, and Reform in 11th-century Germany* (2000); D. Reilly, *The Art of Reform in Eleventh-Century Flanders: Gerard of Cambrai, Richard of Saint Vanne, and the St Vaast Bible* (2006); R. Dunning (ed.), *Jocelin of Wells: Bishop Builder and Courtier* (2010); J. Kingsley, *The Bernward Gospels: Art, Memory, and the Episcopate in Medieval Germany*, 2014); I. Marchesin, *L'arbre et la colonne. La porte de bronze d'Hildesheim*, 2017; E. Gatti, "Developing an Iconography of the Episcopacy: Liturgical Portraiture and Episcopal Politics in Late Tenth- and Early Eleventh-Century Manuscripts" (PhD dissertation, 2005); M. McLaughlin, *Sex, Gender, and Episcopal Authority in an Age of Reform 1000-1122* (2010); K. Collins, "Visualizing Mary: Innovation and Exegesis in Ottonian Manuscript Illumination" (PhD Dissertation, University of Texas Austin, 2007); J. Ott and A. Trumbore Jones (eds.) *The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages* (2007); L. Körntgen and D. Waßenhoven (eds.), *Patterns of Episcopal Power: Bishops in Tenth and Eleventh Century Western Europe* (2011); S. Danielson and E. Gatti (eds.), *Envisioning the Bishop: Images and the Episcopacy in the Middle Ages* (2014); N. Bock, I. Foletti, and M. Tomasi (eds.), *L'évêque, l'image et la mort: Identité et mémoire au Moyen Age* (2014); R. Kaiser, *Bischofsherrschaft zwischen Königtum und Fürstenmacht: Studien zur bischöflichen Stadtherrschaft im westfränkisch-französischen Reich im frühen und hohen Mittelalter* (1981); S. Patzold, *Episcopus. Wissen über Bischöfe im Frankenreich des späten 8. bis frühen 10. Jahrhunderts* (2008).

[224] For an excellent facsimile, transcription of texts, and analysis of the manuscript, see L. Bettazzi, F. Dell'Oro, and L. Magnani, *Sacramentario del vescovo Warmondo di Ivrea: fine secolo X: Ivrea, Biblioteca capitolare, MS 31 LXXXVI* (1990). See also E. Gatti, "In a Space Between: Warmund of Ivrea and the Problem of (Italian) Ottonian Art," *Peregrinations: Journal of Medieval Art and Architecture* 3, 1 (2010), pp. 8-48; R. Deshman, "Otto III and the Warmund

the book contains sixty-two miniatures and measures 22 x 31 cm. The miniatures in this sacramentary include several images typical of sacramentaries from this period (from Christ's Passion to scenes from saints' lives), but three depictions of Bishop Warmund himself are more unusual (f. 13r, 52v, 57v).

Warmund's visual prominence in these illuminations, coupled with their artistic style, have made the manuscript the subject of significant scholarly attention. Pierre-Alain Mariaux wrote a 2002 monograph on the codex in which he developed the notion of the "l'évêque et ses doubles," or how the bishop can be both a single person as well as a figure of Christ on Earth.[225] Evan Gatti developed this line of thinking in her own work on episcopal images in the manuscript, proposing that the bishop has two bodies that perform as one, much like Kantorowicz's 'body natural' and 'body politic.'[226] Robert Deshman also made the manuscript

---

Sacramentary: A Study in Political Theology," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 34, Bd. H. 1 (1971), pp. 1-20; P.-A. Mariaux, *Warmond d'Ivrée et ses images: Politique et creation iconographique autour de l'an Mil* (2002); M.A. Mazzoli Casagrande*, I codici warmondiani e la cultura a Ivrea fra IX e XI secolo, Ricerche medievali* 6-9 (1971-1974), pp. 89-139; Mayr-Harting, *Ottonian Book Illumination*, vol. II, pp. 87-90. Evan Gatti also works on the manuscript in her dissertation, *Developing an Iconography of the Episcopacy.* Other manuscripts have been attributed to Warmundus of Ivrea: Benedictionarum, Cod. XVIII (8); Orationarium pro Missa Episcopi Warmundi, Cod. IV (9); Benedictiones Pontificum per totius anni circulum, Cod. XX (10); Evangelarium, Cod. XXVI (12); Libri Psalmorum ex hebraico caractere et sermone in latinum eloquium a Beato Geronimo presbytero editus, Cod. LXXXV (30); Sacramentarium Episcopi Warmudi, Cod. LXXXVI (31). As Gatti notes in her dissertation (p. 12), the roman numerals reference the Bollati Inventory of the Biblioteca Capitolare di Ivrea (1871), while the second set of numbers are from the Professione-Mazzatini Inventory (1894). See A. Professione, *Inventario dei Manoscritti della Biblioteca Capitolare di Ivrea* (1967).

[225] Mariaux, pp. 167-186.

[226] Gatti, "The Ordo Missae of Warmund of Ivrea: A Bishop's 'Two Bodies' and the Image in Between," *Envisioning the Bishop*, pp. 181-214, especially pp. 182-183. For a transcript of the Ordo Missae texts, see B. Baroffio and F. Dell'Oro, "'L'ordo Missae' di Warmondo d'Ivrea," *Studi medievali* 16 (1975), pp. 795-823. See also E. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (1957); P. Skubiszewski, "Ecclesia, Regnum, et

the subject of an article, in which he writes that the miniatures have a "modest, provincial style" that "contrasts sharply with the splendid, courtly appearance of the ruler portraits from the 'Reichenau' school."[227]

The Crucifixion miniature on folio 57v is one of the more enigmatic images in the sacramentary (fig. 3.10). Within a crimson frame, Christ is crucified on a gold cross; to the left of his body are the Virgin Mary and Longinus, who aims his spear at Christ's side, while to the right are Stephaton with his vinegar-soaked sponge and Saint John, who holds a codex. The other Gospel narrative depicted within the frame occupies the lower third of the image: two figures, likely Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, entomb Christ. Only his cruciform-nimbed head peeks out of the green textile or stone that now occludes the rest of his body. Strangely placed between these two narratives is the figure of a bishop, whom we can understand—in the context of this particular sacramentary—to be an image of its patron, Warmund. Wearing the pallium, a sign of his episcopacy, Warmund gestures out towards Christ's bleeding feet, which are in his direct line of sight. Although Warmund might seem awkwardly wedged between the Crucifixion and Entombment scenes, his presence is clearly not an artistic afterthought: Warmund's left foot is partly obscured by a blue halo of one of the figures at Christ's Entombment, simultaneously suggesting that we are to understand his presence primarily in

---

Sacerdotium dans l'art des Xe-XIe siècles [Idées et structures des images]," *Cahiers de civilisation médiéval*, 28th year, n. 110-111, April-September 1985, pp. 133-180; P. Schram, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio* (1930) and his other important work, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige in Bildern ihrer Zeit*, 751-1190 (1928); G. Mackie, "Warmunds of Ivrea: Episcopal Attitutdes to Death, Martyrdom, and the Millenium," *Papers of the British School at Rome* (Vol. 78, 2010), pp. 219-263. I look forward to further exploring the relationship between visual absence and Ottonian political theology in future iterations of this project, but it is beyond the scope of the dissertation.

[227] Deshman, "Otto III and the Warmund Sacramentary," p. 1.

relation to the Crucifixion and that the decision to include him in this image came before completion of the lower painting. Moreover, the similar stance of his body and that of Longinus is surely not incidental: they both face Christ and direct their gazes (and spear) towards his wounds. The pairing recalls that Longinus later became a bishop himself, namely Bishop of Caesarea, as recounted by Gregory of Nyssa: "Ex hoc Nysseni loco discimus Longinum Centurionem, qui lancea Christi latus in cruce perfodit, primum Caesareae episcopum fuisse."[228]

Within the surrounding frame are inscriptions in Latin and Greek. Above and below, a Latin inscription reads "Custodes tuto dominum clausere sepulchro," or "the custodians closed the Lord in the tomb completely." The inscriptions on the vertically aligned margins are in (slightly botched) Greek, and they read "All holy Mary" on the left and "Saint [or holy] John" on the right.[229]

On the facing page (f. 58r) is the text spoken by members of the clergy on Good Friday as they would kneel and adore an image of the cross ("Crux benedicta, peto…") as well as the beginning of the celebration of Holy Saturday ("In Sabbato S[an]c[t]o Pasc[h]ae").[230] The

---

[228] L.A. Zacagni, *Collectanea monumentorum veterum* (1698), p. 391.

[229] My sincere thanks to my friend and longtime Latin study partner Matthew Vanderpoel for help deciphering this inscription. Matthew has suggested that the scribe was likely not literate in Greek but perhaps had a sense of the sounds, hence the imperfectly spelled inscriptions. Mary's name has no consonants (perhaps either imitating a Byzantine reference incorrectly and/or out of respect for the *nomen sacrum*) and John's inscription is also incorrectly spelled. There is also an inscription, perhaps added at a later date, at the top left corner of the image. It appears to read: "Es D[eu]s o fili[e] sum…Cur daris in nece vili/Ne denture (sic) morti tecum mortaliter orti." In other words, "You are God, O son…Why are you being given over to a base execution/Should they [the executioners] not be given over to death with you, [they] born mortal." I am still not entirely clear on why the 'sum' is present in this inscription.

[230] The entire prayer for the Cross written in the manuscript is "Crux benedicta peto/Meque feras domino/Crux via syderea/Dona salutifera/Gaudia fer populo/Auxiliante deo/Gaudeat et solito/Fidens in Christo/Omnibus adde diem/Dantibus et pacem/Sis mihi crux rogito/Montis in

Roman German Pontifical provides clues beyond prayers in the Sacramentary to the choreography of the Good Friday rites, including the adoration of the Cross: "Interea venit pontifex solus et adoratam deosculatur crucem, deinde episcopi, presbiteri et diaconi et ceteri per ordinem, deinde populus."[231] In other words, the pontifex kisses the adored cross, followed by the bishops, priests, deacons, and then other members of the clergy—according to rank—and then the people. The adoration of the cross is described as a collective affair in which all members of the clergy and 'populus' participate, yet it is Warmund alone in the miniature who adores Christ's cross, thus standing in for the entirety of the clergy and other members of his church.[232]

Following the adoration of the cross on Good Friday is the Mass of the Pre-Sanctified, or the celebration of the Eucharist with a host that was consecrated on the previous day. The RGP recounts that in preparation of this rite, two subdeacons enter the sacristy: one takes the host consecrated one day prior, or on Maundy Thursday, and places it on a paten, while the other

---

exitio/Gloria sit domino/Pendenti lingo/Mihi me (sic) sucurre sacrato/Crux benedicta peto/Crux et diadematis aula/Crux via sidereal (sic)/Semper lauderis ab ipso/ Gaudia der populo/Spiritus de culmine celso/Gaudeat et solito/Veleant ut spernere noctem/Omnibus adde diem/Sis et bonitas origo/Sis mihi crux rogito/Qui nos cruce serva in aevo/Gloria sit domino." See Gatti, "In a Space Between," footnote 76, p. 43.

[231] *Pontifical Romano-Germanique*, volume II, XCIX, n. 330, p. 91. Gatti and Mariaux discuss the miniature in relation to the adoration of the Cross as well. See Gatti, *Developing an Iconography*, pp. 116-118 and P.-A. Mariaux, *Warmund d'Ivrée et ses images: Politique et création iconographique autour de l'an mil* (2002), p. 168.

[232] Moreover, this is clearly an image of a liturgical cross (rather than Christ's historical cross) in form. See B. Kitzinger, *Cross and Book: Late-Carolingian Breton Gospel Illumination and the Instrumental Cross,* Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University (2012). I thank Beatrice Kitzinger for generously sharing her dissertation with me.

subdeacon takes the chalice that contains unconsecrated wine.[233] The priest then says the typical communion prayers and consumes the host, but then he consumes the wine without saying anything: "Cum vero dixerint Amen, sumit de sancta et ponit in calicem nichil dicens…Sanctificat autem vinum non consecratum per sanctificatum panem." In other words, the priest sanctifies the wine, but does not explicitly consecrate it, by putting the sanctified bread in the chalice.[234] The directive in the RGP concludes with "Et communicant omnes cum silentio…"[235] The plural "omnes" suggests that the bishop or priest is not alone in consuming the pre-consecrated host in the canonical form of this rite.

In the context of the Crucifixion miniature, historical and liturgical time coalesce as Warmund is present at the moment Christ dies on the cross: Longinus has already speared his side, as is evidenced by the wound, and a trail of blood emerges from the wounds on Christ's feet. Although many other members of the Church participated in the adoration of the cross on Good Friday as well as consumed the pre-consecrated host, Warmund alone is depicted adoring the cross. His raised hands at once signal his active adoration of the cross, and his proximity to the blood streaming from Christ's feet underscores his privileged access to the Eucharistic elements.

The liturgical resonance of the Entombment scene, below, is less clear, and it has accordingly *not* figured prominently in art historians' analysis of this full-page miniature, to date.

---

[233] *Pontifical Romano-Germanique*, vol. II, XCIX, n. 335, pp. 92-93.

[234] *Pontifical Romano-Germanique*, vol. II, XCIX, n. 335, pp. 92-93. There was much debate during the Middle Ages about this point. It seems that some understood the wine to be consecrated by putting a piece of the bread into the wine, whereas others believed it to be completely in appropriate to celebrate the sacrament at all on Good Friday.

[235] *Pontifical Romano-Germanique*, vol. II, XCIX, n. 335, pp. 92-93.

It is, however, the sole subject of the Latin inscription on the top and bottom of the frame, and I would suggest that the entombment of Christ, like the worship of the cross, above, likely has strong liturgical connotations. We might entertain the possibility that Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus doubly represent the subdeacons that put the veiled wafer and wine on the altar prior to the Mass of the pre-sanctified on Good Friday or, alternately, the deposition of the Eucharist (or possibly cross) on Good Friday.[236] Christ's tomb is vaguely altar-like and appears to be covered by a green cloth or stone.

Wedged between these two narrative images, Warmund appears to focus his attention on the cross, but the very spatialization of his body on the page also implicates him in the events below; might it signal his participation in the special Eucharistic liturgy that day? The image is intentionally (and ingeniously) vague in this regard; Warmund cannot be confined to a single moment in time, let alone a single liturgical act. He is framed as a mediator of salvation through

[236] In her study of the Crucifixion initial on Palm Sunday in the Drogo Sacramentary (BnF Lat. 9428, f. 43v), Celia Chazelle consideres Nicodemus' presence in the lower part of this initial. Her analysis of this figure is helpful for understanding the two figures at Christ's tomb in the Warmund image, so I will summarize it briefly here. Chazelle recalls that in John 19:39-40, Nicodemus arrives at the crucifixion site following Christ's death to help Joseph remove and then entomb the body. In the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus (which is preserved in several ninth-century Carolingian manuscripts and thereafter), Nicodemus also witnesses the Crucifixion. Augustine understood Nicodemus' presence beneath the Cross in relation to Holy Week liturgy, writing that Nicodemus' relationship with Christ is like that of the catechumens who awaited baptism on Holy Saturday: they had faith in Christ but did not yet fully understand him. Nicodemus also became a 'model viewer' of the Crucifixion in later medieval art. For her study of this figure, see C. Chazelle, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era: Theology and Art of Christ's Passion* (2001), pp. 258-260. See also (cited by Chazelle) J. Sheppard, "A Devotional Diptych of the Resurrection: Oxford, CC MS 2," in *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700*, (ed. P. Beal and J. Griffiths,1990), pp. 231-256 and Z. Izydorczyk, ed., *The Medieval Gospel of Nicodemus: Texts, Intertexts, and Contexts in Western Europe* (1997), p. 4.

his access to Christ's body, specifically that historical body on the cross, figured above, and on the altar, (perhaps) figured below.

But it is the marked absence of those other clerical figures and the *populus* who would have also adored the cross on Good Friday that emphasizes the privileged status of Warmund. Their collective absence suggests at once that Warmund has uniquely special access to Christ's body and the ability to stand in for the entire Church and its members. He is the sole representative of both the clergy and non-clerical members of the Church in this miniature and so grants access to Christ's body for all Christians. His singularity and spatial positioning in this image also strongly imply, I would argue, that his representational status could be likened to that of Ecclesia herself, a female personification of the Christian church.

A single female figure, often wearing a helmet and holding a cross and banner, came to represent the Church in several earlier Carolingian and contemporary Ottonian images, particularly those depicting the Crucifixion.[237] She is frequently represented to the left of Christ in images of the Crucifixion from the ninth century onward; she appears next to Longinus, who spears Christ's side, as well as the Virgin Mary. This trio of figures to the left of Christ can be found in several Carolingian and Ottonian images, including an ivory plaque made in Metz ca.1000 for Bishop Adalbéro II (984-1005) (fig. 3.11, Metz, La Cour d'Or inv. 3550).[238] Here,

---

[237] Chazelle, p. 257. Chazelle has noted that the earliest image of Ecclesia raising her chalice to collect the blood that spurts from Christ's side wound at the Crucifixion is likely that found on f. 43v in the Drogo Sacramentary (Paris BnF Lat. 9428).

[238] See J-P. Caillet, "Metz et le travail de l'ivoire vers l'an mil," *Religion et culture autour de l'an mil* (ed. D. Iogna-Prat and J-C Picard, 1990), pp. 315-337; A. Goldschmidt, *Die Elfenbeinskulpturen*, I, n. 78. For more on early medieval images of Ecclesia (which I will discuss in further detail later), see the excellent essay by H. Toubert, "Les representations de l'Ecclesia dans l'art des Xe-XIIe siècles," *Un art dirigé: Réforme grégorienne et iconographie*

Ecclesia and Christ exchange gazes as she holds up an ampulla to collect the blood that drips from his side wound. Mary is figured further at left, and Longinus is depicted immediately below Ecclesia. Given that the presence of Mary, Ecclesia, and Longinus was not iconographically uncommon in early medieval images of the Crucifixion, I strongly suspect that clerical viewers would have *expected* to see Ecclesia among the group of figures at the Crucifixion in the Warmund Sacramentary. The visual expectation is upset, however, as Warmund appears to have taken the place of Ecclesia.

The absence of Ecclesia and presence of Warmund, then, make him not only the preeminent clerical representative of the Church body at this liturgical moment (in which we know many participated), but also a veritable representative of the Church, like Ecclesia herself. With this iconographic substitution, the artist of the Crucifixion miniature is actively exploring Warmund's representational status. The switch suggests that Warmund mediates Christ through liturgical rites, whether on Good Friday or beyond, to the members of his Church, and that he also bears an important relationship to the Church—Ecclesia—through his presence and actions. Although Christ's incarnate body is visible in this image, his death and ultimately the departure of that body are the conditions under which the image takes on meaning. As a representative of the Church and its members, Warmund is able to make the historical Christ present anew through the celebration of Mass in this highly complex condensation of different narrative moments and liturgical rites of Good Friday.

(1990), pp. 37-63. For more on Ecclesia in the English monastic reform context, see R. Deshman, "The Imagery of the Living Ecclesia and the English Monastic Reform," *Eye and Mind* (2010), pp 80-90.

Mediating the Present and Future Christ in the Sacramentary of Sigebert of Minden

One of the richest visual explorations of who and what can represent the absent Christ in the liturgical present can be found in the pages of the eleventh-century Sacramentary of Sigebert of Minden (Berlin Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin MS Theol. lat. 2, fig. 3.12).[239] Made ca. 1022-1036 at the monastery of Sankt Gallen, the manuscript contains 325 folios and is a Gregorian-Gelasian type sacramentary. A total of eight full-page miniatures can be found in the manuscript, three of which open the Canon of the Mass: the Crucifixion (f. 3v), the *agnus dei* surrounded by the four evangelists (fig. 3.13, f. 8v), and Sigebert taking the Eucharistic chalice from a female figure (fig. 3.14, f. 9r). These last two images, which face one another, form a highly complex opening and will be the primary subject of this section (fig. 3.12). Although they have at times been studied as single entities, they are clearly meant to be understood together, as they collectively make a powerful case for who and what can represent the past, present, and future Christ in the absence of his incarnate and anthropomorphic body.

On these two painted pages that face each other in the manuscript, the incarnate Christ is nowhere to be seen, but many signs of Christ are depicted in his stead. On the recto folio, we see four figures grouped around an altar. On the left are two female figures; to date, they have been

[239] For a full description, see A. Fingernagel, *Die illuminierten lateinischen Handschriften süd-, west- und nord-europäischer Provenienz der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin PK: 4.-12. Jahrhundert, 2 vol*. (1999), I, pp. 141-145, no. 131. See also R. Meyer, *Die Miniaturen im Sakramentar des Bischofs Sigebert von Minden* (1967); W. Milde, "Die Handschriften des Bischofs Sigebert von Minden," *Lectionarium: Berlin, Ehem. Preussische Staatsbibliothek, Ms. Theol. Lat. qu. 1* (ed. M. Klöckener, 1993), pp. 7-25; *Trotz, Natur und Augenschein: Eucharistie-Wandlung und Weltsicht* (ed. Ulrike Surmann and Johannes Schröer, 2013), pp. 142-143 and 150; J. Pierce, *Sacerdotal spirituality at mass: Text and Study of the Prayerbook of Sigebert of Minden (1022-1036*), Dissertation, Notre Dame, 1988, p. 384; E. Gatti, *Developing an Iconography*; Mayr-Harting, *Ottonian Book Illumination*, vol. II, pp. 91-97.

identified by scholars as Mary and Ecclesia, but we will consider their identity in greater depth in the pages that follow. To the right of the altar are two clerical figures, one of which takes a chalice from Ecclesia. This figure, who is arguably Sigebert of Minden himself, grasps the cup between his hands and makes a gesture of blessing, as if consecrating the elements presented to him.

Facing this illumination is an image of the Apocalyptic lamb, a figure of Christ at the end of time, which is in turn surrounded by the tetramorph, or four figures who are individually identified with the evangelists. The image recalls a *maiestas domini*, an apocalyptic image that became widespread in Carolingian and Ottonian manuscript painting.[240] The lamb cranes its neck to the right ever so slightly and looks over at the facing page, signalling the relationship between the two paintings. With an open book before him, the lamb stands atop an arcaded altar-like throne or pedestal and bleeds from his side. These two images invite a close reading as an integral pair through the prominent brickwork, partial gold ground, and placement of their inscriptions.

The inscription surrounding the image at left reads "+behold the conquerer of death, restorer of life + the lamb opens the seals of the wondrous book" (+ Ecce triumphator mortis vitae reparator + agnus mirifici pandit signacula libri), whereas the inscription at right reads "Drink, oh Sigebert, the gifts [charismata] of perpetual life + through which your Mother Grace

[240] See, for instance, A-O Poilpré, *Maiestas Domini: Une Image de l'église en Occident* (Ve-IXe siècles) (2005); H. Schrade, *Die romanische Malerei. Ihre Maiestas* (1963), pp. 11-84; E. Kirschbaum (ed.), "Maiestas Domini," in *Lexikon der christliche Ikonographie* (1971), co. 135-142; S. Kaspersen, "*Majestas Domini—Regnum et Sacerdotium*. Zu Entstehung und Leben des Motivs bis zum Investiturstreit," *Hafnia: Copenhagen Papers in the History of Art* (vol. 8, 1981), pp. 83-146.

mercifully restores you" (+Hauri perpetuae Sigeberte charismata vitae + his tua clementer reficit te gratia mater).[241]

The inscriptions confirm that the male cleric who takes the chalice is Bishop Sigebert and that he is encouraged to drink from this chalice by "Mater Gratia," or Mother Grace. Might we then understand Ecclesia, and perhaps the Virgin Mary behind her, as Mother Grace? In this imagined liturgical performance, Sigebert is asked to drink from the Eucharistic chalice by some unknown 'Mother Grace,' and yet the artist has chosen to depict those two figures facing him at the altar as a sainted female figure (Mary?) and Ecclesia, who can more easily be identified by her helmet, cross, and triumphal banner.[242]

The image—through its unusual iconography and physical placement within the sacramentary—makes a powerful statement about Sigebert's spiritual authority as well as the nature of the Eucharist to which he has access and thus can mediate to others. The opening immediately follows the texts for the Canon of the Mass; the final lines of text on the preceding folio are "Agnus dei qui tollis peccata mundi. Miserere nobis ter."[243] On the verso of the painting

---

[241] Moreover, the "charismata," which have ben translated to date primarily as "gifts," evokes those apostolic gifts from the Holy Spirit that are for the building of the Church, specifically. They could also refer to chrism. See Mayr-Harting, II, p. 95 for an excerpt of a tenth-century Maundy Thursday hymn that includes the words "consecrato chrismate" and that Mayr-Harting considers in relation to extant images of Sigebert.

[242] For more on this opening, see Mayr Harting, II, pp. 91-97; E. Gatti's dissertation (cited above); R. Meyer, "Die Miniaturen im Sakramentar des Bischofs Sigebert von Minden," *Festschrift für K.H. Usener* (1967), pp. 181-200.

[243] This is notably a sung text, and it is frequently accompanied by elaborate tropes in the early medieval period. There is some debate surrounding when the *agnus dei* is sung; Charles Atkinson has argued that it was sung during the eighth through tenth centuries at the fraction of the Eucharist, Communion, and the Kiss of Peace. Ninth-century authors who write of the *agnus dei* accompanying the Kiss of Peace are Hrabanus Maurus, Remigius of Auxerre, and Florus of Lyon. See C. Atkinson, "The Earliest Agnus Dei Melody and its Tropes," *Journal of the*

of Sigebert are the vigils of the Feast of the Nativity. Thus the paintings on ff. 8v-9r must be understood in relation to the Eucharistic rite that immediately precedes it as well as the image of the Crucifixion, which includes the beginning of the *Te Igitur* prayer, on f. 3v.

Each of these three images has clear Eucharistic resonance, and they present Christ's body in different forms. In the opening with the Apocalyptic lamb and Sigebert at the altar, the incarnate, anthropomorphic Christ is notably absent. Instead, a strange and completely fictitious liturgical moment is depicted: Sigebert at once consecrates and drinks Christ's blood offered to him by Ecclesia (or "Mother Grace"). The scene thus underscores his exceptional access to Christ's sacramental body. The clerical figure immediately behind Sigebert is tonsured and, given that he holds a book, can perhaps be identified as a deacon.

The presence of this second clerical figure implies that while it is Sigebert who takes Ecclesia's chalice, he is charged with consecrating that Eucharist and then distributing it to *other* members of the clergy and those members of his church. In this way, Sigebert is the guarantor of access to Christ's body—past, present, and future—as evoked in the 'agnus dei' spoken at the close of the Eucharistic rite (on the recto of folio 8). The Eucharist that Sigebert consecrates is Christ's historical body delivered by Ecclesia but also his future body: upon closing the manuscript, the blood emitted from the lamb's side wound and the Eucharistic chalice from which Sigebert will drink physically touch. The Eucharist that Sigebert consecrates and

---

American Musicological Society Vol. 30, N. 1 (Spring, 1977), pp. 1-19. For more on *agnus dei* tropes, see G. Iversen, (ed.), *Tropes de l'agnus Dei, Corpus troporum* 4 (1980).

distributes, then, is at once that wine and wafer, bleeding lamb, and Christ on the cross from which Ecclesia gathered his blood.[244]

Sigebert is emphatically inscribed into this complex web of Christological representatives in the opening. His formal prominence in the image (within a sacramentary he commissioned and used) makes it clear that he, too, is a representative of Christ on Earth, precisely because of his role in guaranteeing access to Christ's sacramental body. Curiously, it is not his vestments (or any other attribute) that identify him as a bishop, but rather his *actions*. Without the accompanying inscription, he could easily be identified as a priest instead. He does not wear the pallium (which he would have perhaps removed during the celebration of the Eucharist), which could otherwise clearly identify him as a bishop. Consider this image in contrast to an ivory carving made in the first half of the eleventh century on the cover of Bishop Sigebert's book of private prayers (Berlin Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin MS Germ. qu. 42), which likely represents Sigebert himself (fig. 3.15).[245] In this carving, Sigebert wears a pallium or perhaps—as Cynthia

[244] Evan Gatti reads this particular image in relation to a rite known as the *commixtio* as well. See Gatti, *Developing an Iconography of the Episcopacy*, pp. 144-146. Notably, the host is conspicuously absent in the opening. If it is present, it is in an extremely understated way (i.e., on the paten on f. 9r). The opening is instead very focused on Christ's blood, which I believe may be important to the opening's meaning and a point that I hope to develop in future research.

[245] J. Pierce has written at length on Sigebert's *Liber precum*. See, for instance, J. Pierce, "Sigebert 'the Beloved': A Liturgical Perspective on Episcopal Image from Eleventh-Century Minden," *Envisioning the Bishop: Images and the Episcopacy in the Middle Ages* (ed. S. Danielson and E. Gatti), 2014), pp. 249-274l; J. Pierce, *Sacerdotal Spirituality at Mass.* For more on ivories and the Ottonian episcopacy, see also W. North and A. Cutler, "Ivories, Inscriptions and Episcopal Self-Consciousness in the Ottonian Empire: Berthould of Toul and the Berlin Hodegetria," *Gesta* 42 (2003), pp. 1-17.

Hahn and other scholars have more recently argued—a rationale, a liturgical ornament worn increasingly by bishops in the tenth and eleventh centuries.[246]

Sigebert is here explicitly presented as a bishop; his episcopal status is marked through both his clothing as well as his relation to other figures in the scene: he stands between two clerics, and below him are two figures (perhaps also clerics) that hold up a garment upon which Sigebert seems to float. The figure in the lower right holds the hem of Sigebert's garment, and his counterpart on the left holds the bishop's crosier. On either side of Sigebert's head, above, is an image of the lamb of God and the dove of the Holy Spirit.

The positioning of these figures has invited a comparison of this scene with contemporary images of Christ's transfiguration, in which he is typically flanked by Moses and Elijah, while various apostles (including James, Peter, and/or John) crouch below, dazzled by Christ's brilliance at this moment.[247] In her brief study of the plaque, Beate Fricke has noted that the image figures at once a *visio* and an *apparitio*: a vision for the viewer, who sees the Christ-like Sigebert, and an apparition for those other figures in the plaque.[248] Sigebert's physical proximity to the lamb and dove as well as the fact that he seems to float at the plaque's center, well above the other clerics, indelibly mark him as a Christ-like figure.

---

[246] C. Hahn, "Portable Altars (and the Rationale): Liturgical Objects and Personal Devotion," *Image and Altar 800-1300* (ed. P. Grinder-Hansen, 2014) pp. 45-64. Maureen Miller and Beate Fricke have also discussed the rationale in this image, as I detail in the footnotes that follow.

[247] See B. Fricke, *Fallen Idols, Risen Saints: Sainte Foy of Conques and the Revival of Monumental Sculpture in Medieval Art* (2015), pp. 189-191, especially footnote 232 on the transfiguration.

[248] Fricke, pp. 190-191.

But it is the vestment that Sigebert wears in this plaque that has primarily attracted the attention of scholars, to date. Although once thought to be a pallium, Hahn, Fricke, and Miller all agree that he is wearing on his breast a rationale, which Hahn describes as a "mysterious liturgical ornament…known to have been worn in certain areas of Germany and in Liège."[249] In her study of this vestment, which can sometimes be made of precious metals, stones, and even serve as a reliquary, Maureen Miller has argued that the rationale became an increasingly sought-after garment by bishops in the tenth and eleventh centuries, who would procure the rationale without papal consent.[250] Contemporary bishops understood the meaning and importance of the rationale in relation to Exodus 28, or accounts of the vestments of the Jewish high priesthood, which they would correlate to those of the Christian liturgy.[251] Pseudo-Alcuin (an important tenth-century liturgical commentator whose work I examined in chapter one) also commented on the meaning of the rationale, noting that:

> The Rationale, which was worn by the pontiff on his front, shows that the pastor must be endowed with wisdom and doctrine. Therefore it is called the rationale of judgment, because a ruler of the Church ought with subtlety and deliberation to distinguish good

---

[249] Hahn, 52.

[250] Miller, *Clothing the Clergy*, pp. 64-76. See also Braun, *Die Liturgische Gewandung* (1907), pp. 676-700 and K. Honselmann, *Das Rationale der Bischöfe* (1975). Braun has argued that the rationale served as the episcopal counterpart to the archiespiecopal pallium. On this also see Miller, p. 66, footnote 51 and Braun, *Die Liturgische Gewandung*, pp. 694-7. Through a study of letters between tenth-century bishops, Miller notes that bishops did not necessarily feel the need to seek papal permission to wear this new liturgical ornament, including Bihsop Hildeward of Halberstadt and Bishop Adalbero II of Metz. See Miller, p. 66. On the question of papal consent, see H. Beumann, "Das Rationale der Bischöfe von Halberstadt und seine Folgen," *Kirche und Reich: Beiträge zur früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Kloster-, Bistums- und Missionsgeschichte* (ed. I. Fees, 2004), pp. 43-59.

[251] See specifically Exodus 28:17-23. The high priest wears a breastplate, or a "rationale of judgment." The various stones with which it should be adorned are outlined in Exodus.

> and bad…Hence is the saying, "put on the rationale of judgement, doctrine, and truth" (doctrinam et veritatem).[252]

Miller proposes that changes to the conception of the bishop's status may have "nurtured desires to heighten visually the distinction between ordinary priests and priests serving as bishops."[253]

The only extant rationale from this period dates from the mid-eleventh century and is now in the Bamberg cathedral treasury (fig. 3.16).[254] Although fragmentary and now sewn onto a sixteenth-century chasuble, the rationale remains legible , in part thanks to a fifteenth-century drawing of its reverse (fig. 3.17). The golden embroidery presents a complex visual exegesis of the Song of Songs (3:9-11), Revelation (5:6 and 19:11), and Exodus 28, among other texts.[255] Miller writes that texts from the Song of Songs below and above the figure of Christ on the rationale's front collectively evoke medieval exegetes' understanding of the bride in the Song of Songs as Ecclesia, the church, who had a mystical marriage with Christ.[256] She makes the

---

[252] Pseudo-Alcuin, *De divinis officis*, PL 101, col. 1241 B-C. Quoted in (and translated by) Mayr-Harting, *Ottonian Book Illumination*, vol. II, p. 96.

[253] Miller, p. 67.

[254] Miller, pp. 68-74. See also W. Messerer, *Der Bamberger Domschatz in seinem Bestande bis zum Ende der Hohenstaufen-Zei*t (1952), pp. 69-70; Honsemann, *Das Rationale*, plates 1-2; A. Cohen, *The Uta Codex*, p. 85.

[255] Old Testament prophets like Aaron, Melchisedek, or Jeremiah were frequently understood (in biblical exegesis and images) in the early Middle Ages to figure the Christian bishop. See, for instance, how Jeremiah is framed as a Christ-like figure on f. 15r of Arras BM MS 559 (435), vol. II, which I cite in the introduction of this chapter (fig 3.2). He is juxtaposed with the *agnus dei,* wears the pallium, and stands within a mandorla. Eric Palazzo also discusses this connection at length in his book, *L'espace rituel et le sacré dans le christianisme. La liturgie de l'autel portatif dans l'Antiquité et au Moyen Age* (2008) in the context of images of Old Testament prophets on portable altars.

[256] Especially since Origen's 3rd-c commentary on the Song of Songs. See especially E. Ann Matter, *The Voice of My Beloved: The Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity* (1990), pp. 876-111. Quoted on Miller, p. 70.

compelling case that the words and images on this rationale would have identified its episcopal wearer with both the apostles *and* Christ.[257]

Indeed, the bishop's Christ-like status was also made plain during his consecration, when he became the *sponsus* of his Church, like Christ, upon putting on a ring that symbolized his own spiritual marriage to the church.[258] In her study of the bishop-as-bridegroom trope, Megan McLaughlin considers several ordination texts, including the consecration ordo in the pontifical of Aurillac, which dates from ca. 900.[259] Upon giving the bishop his ring, the following text was spoken:

> With this ring of faith (*sub hoc annulo fidei*) we commend to you the bride of Christ, [this] church, so that you may keep her holy and immaculate.[260]

As McLaughlin points out, the bishop is treated more as the "guardian of Christ's bride rather than…her spouse" in this and several other earlier texts.[261] It was in the eleventh century, in fact, when the allegory of the bishop's marriage to the church was further developed, particularly at the onset of major clerical reform. In a text known as *De ordinando pontifice*, written ca. 1044 by the Auctor Gallicus (an unidentified author from northern Europe), the bishop is presented as a proxy for the bridegroom, Christ:

---

[257] Miller, p. 70.

[258] Miller, p. 70.

[259] M. McLaughlin, "The Bishop as Bridegroom: Marital Imagery and Clerical Celibacy in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *Medieval Purity and Piety: Essays on Medieval Clerical Celibacy and Religious Reform* (ed. M. Frassetto, 1998), pp. 209-238. See also McLaughlin, *Sex, Gender, and Episcopal Authority in an Age of Reform, 1000-1122* (2010).

[260] M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines romani du haut moyen âge*, 5 vol (1931-61), 4:108, quoted in McLaughlin, "Bishop as Bridegroom," p. 211, footnote 14.

[261] McLaughlin, "Bishop as Bridegroom," p. 211.

> If it is permitted to compare human to heavenly things…the Church is the bride of Christ and bishops fill Christ's place…"[262]

This analogy also served bishops well whose own churches wanted to 'divorce' them at any given moment, as it maintained that like a (sacramental) marriage, the relationship between a church and its bishop was indissoluble. A letter by Pope Leo I (d. 461) was cited in another part of the Auctor Gallicus' *On Pontifical Ordination* arguing this point:

> For the venerable Pope Leo, writing to Nicetas, bishop of Aquileia, said "If a wife, when her husband has been captured, marries another, if he returns from captivity, let her be united to her former [husband], and let each man receive what is his."[263]

The canon law of marriage is later evoked by the same author, suggesting that marriage was indeed on the forefront of the church's mind during this moment of ecclesiastical reform, when questions about clerical celibacy and marriage were the subject of intense debate.[264] It is not surprising that at this moment, then, the motif of the bishop as mystical *sponsus* of the Church was further developed.

Returning to the Bamberg rationale, its verso figures a more eschatological program than its front. At the center of the fifteenth-century drawing of this liturgical garment is an image of the lamb of God and an open book, surrounded by the evangelist symbols (fig. 3.17). Miller

---

[262] Auctor Gallicus, *De ordinando pontifice*, *MGH, Libelli de lite*, 1:9. Quoted in McLaughlin, ibid., p. 214, footnote 21. There is a specific political context for this text, namely the legitimacy of the pope who was recently driven out of Rome in 1044, Benedict IX. He had the support of most of the bishops in Western Europe, notes McLaughlin, and it is at this point in the text that "the image of the bishop as bridegroom first comes into play," according to McLaughlin, p. 214.

[263] Auctor Gallicus, *De ordinando pontifice*, *MGH, Libelli de lite*, 1:9-20. McLaughlin, ibid., p. 65, footnote 62.

[264] See McLaughlin, especially p. 220. On celibacy and the Gregorian Reform Movement, see McLaughlin, *Sex, Gender, and Episcopal Authority* and D. Elliot, *Spiritual Marriage: Sexual Abstinence in Medieval Wedlock* (1993), pp. 94-131.

notes that the book and the evangelists together recall the bishop's own ordination ceremony, when the archdeacon would put an open Gospel book over the bishop's neck (or upper back).[265] Together, the front and back of the Bamberg rationale suggest that the bishop is at once like the apostles, who share Christ's word with the world; the *sponsus* or Christ himself in the Song of Songs who marries the church; and the apocalyptic Christ "who battles those arrayed with the Antichrist."[266]

Similarly, the collective of figures in the powerful opening that concludes the Eucharistic rite in the Sacramentary of Sigebert of Minden makes Christ present in various ways. The bishop is at once Christ as the *sponsus* of Ecclesia, and he is also the guarantor of Christ's sacramental body to the members of his church—here restricted to clerical Christians—through his consecration and subsequent (implicit) distribution of the Eucharistic elements.[267] Notably absent are any lay figures Ecclesia and (perhaps) the Virgin Mary stand on the other side of the altar; are they individually or collectively that 'Mother Grace' evoked in the inscription? Ecclesia is a personification of the Church, or a single female figure with no concrete existence in reality. The opening is a representation of a liturgical fantasy, or an exegesis of that Eucharistic liturgy performed by the bishop, in which the artist is teasing out the various relationships between different figures, personifications, and signs of Christ, both real and imagined. The bishop is presented as the bridge between the past, present, and future Christ who

[265] Miller, p. 73.

[266] Miller, p. 73.

[267] It must be noted, however, that Ecclesia is depicted as highly energetic in this image: she almost seems to usurp the strongly gendered role of the sacerdos, Sigebert, who is ultimately a recipient of her ministry. In some ways, then, their interaction upsets the normative understanding (grounded in scriptural exegesis and canon law) of gendered hierarchy in marriage.

can make his body present through the Eucharistic elements and, as the *sponsus,* cares for and is forever bound to his Ecclesia. It is notably Christ's absence on Earth as well as his visual absence as an incarnate, anthropomorphic being in this opening that is the occasion for the artist to consider various representational schemae so that the absent Christ can be made present.

There are a number of images made in the first decades of the eleventh century in which a bishop, the lamb of God (with or without the tetramorph), and Ecclesia are variously positioned in relation to one another. But there is something very emphatic about the way that Ecclesia and Sigebert commune together at the altar in the Sacramentary of Sigebert of Minden: it makes explicit their identification with the *sponsus* of *sponsa* from the Song of Songs. I will continue to explore the relationship between Ecclesia, the bishop, and the *agnus dei* further in a study of a contemporary sacramentary made at the monastery of Fulda on the occasion of the dedication of its church. By closely attending to the language used to describe the bishop and his actions as he consecrates the church in the dedication rite, I hope to consider how the bishop, in particular, was understood to represent Christ on Earth following his Ascension.

Gestare Personam Christi **in the Fulda Sacramentaries**

Widely known (and contested) by art historians of Ottonian manuscripts is the enigmatic full-page illumination on f. 66v of a sacramentary made in Fulda in the late tenth century (fig. 3.18, Udine Arcidiocesi di Udine Biblioteca Capitolare MS 1).[268] The manuscript is one of

[268] On this and other sacramentaries made in the same period at Fulda, see E. Palazzo, *Les Sacramentaires de Fulda. Etude sur l'iconographie et la liturgie à l'époque ottonienne* (1994); C Sauer, "Allerheiligenbilder in der Buchmalerei Fuldas," *Kloster Fulda in der Welt der Karolinger und Ottonen* (ed. G. Schrimpf, 1996), pp. 365-402; J. Raaijmakers, *The Making of*

several sacramentaries made at the monastery of Fulda in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries in which images of the Church were treated with particular artistic interest.[269] Iconographically, these images share a few key elements in common, namely, Ecclesia, the *agnus dei*, a chalice, and often the bishop.

Unlike the sacramentaries of Warmund of Ivrea and Sigebert of Minden, the Fulda sacramentaries was made in a monastic setting but frequently exported for use at non-monastic churches.[270] Founded by St Boniface in the 740s, the monastery at Fulda was exempt from episcopal jurisdiction since its very beginnings. Mayr-Harting writes that the monastery resisted the Gorze monastic reform, which strengthened bishops' influence over other neighboring monasteries.[271] Instead, the Fulda monks were under the authority of the pope; Boniface secured a papal privilege from Pope Zachary in 751.[272] This historical contextualization is important to the reading of the Fulda sacramentaries' images of the Church that follows; in the case of the Udine sacramentary, it was made at Fulda but for use at the Church of Bremen. Thus it is understandable why, despite its monastic origins, the bishop continues to play a central role mediating Christ on Earth in the manuscript's paintings. He, along with other members of the clergy, holds a significant place in making and unifying the Church in these images.

---

the Monastic Community of Fulda, c. 744-900 (2012)*;* Mayr-Harting, *Ottonian Book Illumination*, Vol. II (1991), pp. 148-53; B. Kühnel, *The End of Time in the Order of Things* (2003); Gatti, *Developing an Iconography*, p. 151; C. Winterer, *Das Fuldaer Sakramentar in Göttingen: Benediktinische Observanz und römische Liturgie* (2009).

[269] Mayr-Harting, vol. II, 144. Mayr-Harting notes that the manuscript was made for the Church of Bremen and kept by the patriarchate of Aquilaeia until c. 1031.

[270] Mayr-Harting, vol. II, p. 138.

[271] Mayr-Harting, vol. II, p. 126.

[272] Ibid.

In the full-page illumination on f. 66v in the Udine Sacramentary, which has been widely understood as an image of the Adoration of the Elders from the Book of Revelation, Ecclesia is depicted at the center of the heavenly church (fig. 3.18). The painting immediately follows the feast of the vigil for All Saints (ff. 65r-66r) and faces the beginning of the festal Mass of All Saints (f. 67r). Standing in profile atop a green mound, Ecclesia holds up in her left hand the Eucharistic chalice and in her right the cross-bearing standard.[273] Immediately above her chalice is the clypeus surrounding the lamb of God, who does not bleed into the holy receptacle (as it does in other Fulda sacramentary illuminations, as we will see). A heavenly choir of saints surrounds the pair, while below a group of figures without haloes, perhaps representing the Earthly church, direct their bodies and gestures towards Ecclesia. At the center of this lower group is a completely adorsed figure, who raises his or her arms. Mayr-Harting has identified this figure as another representation of Ecclesia; in his view, the image presents at once an image of the heavenly Ecclesia (above) and the earthly Ecclesia (below). I would like to argue for a more capacious reading of this single figure, first by turning to the liturgical rite with which this image coincides and that it also commemorates.

The opening prayers for the celebration of the festal Mass of All Saints face the full-page miniature. The feast and its historical importance at Fulda are plainly evoked in the painting's iconography; it was on All Saints Day (November 1) that the monastic church at Fulda was

[273] The singularity of the chalice, like in several of the images we have studied thus far, is likely significant. In her study of the Drogo Sacramnetary, Chazelle writes that the depiction of the chalice alone, and not the paten, in the miniature on Palm Sunday may be read in relation to early medieval literature on the redemptive nature of explicitly Christ's blood. It may also relate to Augustine's understanding of John 19, as the blood and water that come from Christ's side wound evoke the liquids of the Eucharist and baptism and suggest the birth of the Church. See Chazelle, *The Crucified God*, p. 265.

consecrated in 819 and again, following a fire, in 948.[274] Turning to the elaborate choreography and meaning of the church dedication rite as it has been reconstructed by modern liturgists in the Roman-German Pontifical can help further elucidate the complex iconography of the full-page painting in the Udine manuscript.[275]

The Roman-German Pontifical describes in Ordo XXXIII (volume I) the rite of church consecration as follows: the bishop (or pontifex) stands outside of the physical church while a deacon remains inside and lights twelve candles in a circle. The bishop then arrives at the door of the church and says, "Tollite portas, principes vestras et elevamini, portae aeternales, et introibit rex gloriae."[276] The deacon in turn responds from inside the church, "Quis est iste rex gloriae?"[277] A number of subsequent rites are then detailed in this section of the RGP, including the singing of the *agnus dei*, writing out the Latin and Greek alphabets on the floor, blessings and exorcisms of salt and ashes, and the consecration of the altar.[278]

---

[274] Abbot Ratger completed a major building campaign at Fulda by creating a church modeled on Saint Peter's in Rome, which he had consecrated on November 1, 819. Following a fire in 937, however, the church was rebuilt, and so re-consecrated, again on the feast of All Saints in 948. Otto I was allegedly present for this second consecration rite. See Mayr-Harting, p. 152.

[275] For important studies on the dedication of the church in the Middle Ages, see R. Horie, *Perceptions of Ecclesia: Church and Soul in Medieval Dedication Sermons* (2006); D. Méhu (ed.), *Mises en Scène et Mémoires de la Consécration de l'église dans l'occident médiéval* (2007); L. Hamilton, *A Sacred City: Consecrating Churches and Reforming Society in Eleventh-Century Italy* (2010); R. Gyug, *The Rite of Church Dedication in the Early Medieval Era* (1998); D. Polanichka, "Transforming Space, (Per)forming Community: Church Consecration in Carolingian Empire," *Viator* 43:1 (2012), pp. 79-98.

[276] *Pontifical Romano-germanique du Xe siècle*, vol I, XXXIII ("Ordo romanus ad dedicandam ecclesiam), p. 83. Notably a priest soon thereafter bows before the altar and says "Agnus dei qui tollis…" RGP, vol. I, XXXIII, p. 83.

[277] RGP, vol. I, p. 83.

[278] *Pontifical romano-germanique du Xe siècle*, vol. I, XXXIII, pp. 83-89.

An exegetical account of these rites then follows in section XXXV of the RGP.[279] In this text, we learn that the pontifex who sings "Tollite portas…" outside the church essentially acts in the *persona* of Christ, or: "Scimus autem sacros pontifices domini nostri **Iesu Christi gestare personam**, sicut ipse eis dicit 'Sicut misit me pater et ego mitto vos'" (my emphasis).[280] In other words, "We know that it is the sacred pontiffs who **manage/bring to completion [gestare] the person of Jesus Christ**, just as he says to them 'Just as my father sent me I send you'" (my emphasis).[281] The quotation is from John 20:21, when Christ is speaking to the apostles after his Resurrection (but before his ascension). A pen-drawing now in the Pontifical of Lanaleth (Rouen BM MS 368, f. 2v) made between 1031 and 1046 offers a visual account of the important role of the bishop in this rite: he knocks with his crozier on the door as he impersonates the figure of Christ (fig. 3.19).[282]

The manner in which the bishop or pontiff is described as actively wearing or containing the *persona* of Christ in the RGP can help us understand the mechanisms by which the Fulda artist figures the bishop wearing, containing, or even composing Christ. In the images and texts we have considered thus far, the bishop arguably manages or brings to completion Christ's *persona* by putting on meaningful vestments, marrying the Church during his ordination, or

---

[279] RGP, vol. I, pp. 90-121

[280] RGP, vol. I, p. 92.

[281] The Blaise Medieval Latin Dictionary defines gesto, -are as "porter, contenir…composer," as in, "gestare canticum." http://clt.brepolis.net.proxy.uchicago.edu/dld/pages/QuickSearch.aspx. Last visited March 14, 2019.

[282] Made in SW England (Wessex), this pontifical was used by the abbey of Saint-Germans in Cornwall. For more on this manuscript and its pen-drawings, see E. Palazzo, *L'évêque et son image, L'illustration du pontifical au Moyen Age* (1999), pp. 136, 318-320, fig. 14; and ibid., "L'illustration des livres liturgiques autour de l'an mil," *L'Europe de l'an mil* (2001), p. 301.

performing an array of other liturgical actions, not least the consecration and consumption of the Eucharistic elements. But this language might also elucidate how Ecclesia as a personification operates in these images as a figure of the heavenly Church and an actual physical church. The phrase "Ecclesiae gestare personam" is also found in several early Patristic texts to describe the actions of Peter, and Ecclesia herself is described as a "persona" who was "in una femina."[283] More often than not, however, the *persona* whom others "gestare" is Christ. But how might the *persona* relate to a personification, in this case Ecclesia—a female figure—who can represent at once an actual physical church and the immaterial Church?

Returning to the Fulda illumination, then, I would like to consider this image in relation to the celebration of All Saints Day as well as the local celebration of the church's consecration and re-consecration on this precise day. Other scholars before me, like Mayr-Harting, Palazzo, and Toubert, have all suggested that the image should be read in relation to this dedication rite, but I will be more explicit in my juxtaposition of the two.[284] Ecclesia, who stands atop the mound at the center of the Udine Sacramentary painting represents at once the church as an architectural structure and sacred space that he bishop consecrates and thus activates in the consecration rite as well the Church to whom the bishop is spiritually married. Moreover, the dorsal figure below, who stands with his or her arms raised as if directing attention towards Ecclesia and the heavenly gathering suggests, in part, the figure of the pontiff or bishop who

[283] See, for instance, Augustine, *De Diversis Quaestionibus* LXXXIII liber unus (on John the Baptist), PL 42; idem, *Post Collationem ad Donatistas: Episcopi ad Donatsitas post Collationem Liber Unus*, PL 675; idem, *Sermones de Sanctis: Natali Apostolorum Petri et Pauli,* I, Caput II, PL 1349.

[284] See Mayr-Harting, p. 152 (although he mentions this connection only in passing), and Toubert, *Un art dirigé*, p. 59.

would "gestare" the *persona* of Christ during the consecration rite. This figure stands among eleven others, and they collectively suggest the apostles, which in turn recalls the apostolic mission of the clergy. The *Rückenfigur*—whose face we cannot see—could be the bishop who consecrates the church of Fulda, one of the apostles who continues to carry out Christ's mission on Earth, and a figure of Christ himself, placed at the bottom of this trio of powerful Christological signs.

Turning to other images of Ecclesia and the lamb made in Fulda within the same ten-year period may help us further secure the identity of this enigmatic and adorsed figure. In the full-page illumination for All Saints in another Fulda Sacramentary now in Bamberg (Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek MS Lit. 1, f. 165) made between 997 and 1024, the lamb of God, Ecclesia, and a series of saints are again the subject of the image, but they appear in a slightly different configuration (fig. 3.20).[285] In this instance, a stream of blood exits the lamb's wound and falls into the chalice of Ecclesia, who stands below. She turns her body to the left and faces a nimbed bishop who wears a pallium and holds a book. The two appear to look directly at one another, and their gestures also suggest a physical intimacy: the lower terminal of Ecclesia's cross touches the bishop's vestments, and he points with his left hand upward at the chalice.[286] This trio of Christological figures—Ecclesia, bishop(s), and lamb of God—as well as the particularly

[285] See Mayr-Harting, vol. II, pp. 148-153 and Palazzo, *Les sacramentaires de Fulda.* See, for instance, D. Ganz, *Medien der Offenbarung. Visionsdarstellungen im Mittelalter* (2008) and G. Suckale-Redlefsen, *Die Handschriften des 8. bis 11. Jahrhunderts der Staatsbibliothek Bamberg* (2005); C. Winterer, "Monastische Meditatio versus fürstliche Repräsentation. Überlegungen zu zwei Gebrauchsprofilen ottonischer Buchmalerei," *Die Ottonen. Kunst – Architektur – Geschichte* (eds. K. Gereon Beuckers, J. Cramer, M. Imhof, 2002), pp. 103–128, especially p. 125.

[286] It is possible, however, that it is the bishop immediately behind this figure who raises his hand and points to the chalice, nearly touching Ecclesia's arm.

close proximity between the bishop and Ecclesia, who holds the blood-filled chalice, calls to mind the opening in the Sacramentary of Sigebert of Minden. The Bamberg painting's presentation of these three figures might strengthen a reading of the adorsed figure in the Udine manuscript as an episcopal or otherwise unspecified clerical figure.[287]

Yet another full-page painting made in tenth-century Fulda depicts Ecclesia and the lamb, but in this instance, no clerical figure is depicted (fig. 3.21, Aschaffenburg Hofbibliothek MS 2, f. 1v).[288] Made ca. 970, this image presents the bleeding lamb of God with an open book at center, surrounding images of the evangelists, two angels, and Ecclesia, below. She leans back and lifts her chalice to collect faint drops of blood and is surrounded by the inscription "Aecclesia ecce cernua quippe suscipit agni digna cruorem." In other words, "Behold inclined Ecclesia, she, worthy, naturally takes up the blood of the lamb."[289]

Mayr-Harting has commented on how Ecclesia appears particularly masculine in the Sigebert image, and one could make the same argument here: she has an unusually strong jaw line and muscular body.[290] Recall, too, that in the Warmund Sacramentary, the bishop and Ecclesia are interchangeable: the viewer would have expected to see Ecclesia at the Crucifixion but instead sees bishop Warmund. Perhaps, then, we are to understand Ecclesia as both the *sponsa* of the bishop but also—at rare moments—one and the same. In fact, the bishop himself

---

[287] I would also add that juxtaposition of the lamb and the priest in a pen-drawing of the Adoration of the Lamb by the elders coupled with the façade of old St Peter's in Rome would further my reading of the adorsed figure as an episcopal one. See Eton College Library MS. 124, fol. 122r.

[288] Mayr-Harting, vol. II, pp. 148-153, plate IX, and Palazzo, *Les sacramentaires de Fulda.*

[289] My translation.

[290] Mayr-Harting, *Ottonian Book Illumination,* vol. II, p. 92.

acts a personification in the way that he is encouraged to "gestare" the *persona* of Christ at the consecration of his church. I would suggest, then, that the adorsed figure in the Udine sacramentary is meant to be read at once as the earthly Church, as Mayr-Harting proposed, but also as those multiple figures who "gestare" Christ and his church in various ways, whether the bishop, pope, or even Christ himself.

In chapter two, I argued that a single adorsed figure could at once be Christ and a member of the clergy in images of the Ascension. But as a manuscript illumination, it is of course a material impossibility to have a'hidden' image of this figure's face to which the viewer could be privy. Instead, the Fulda illuminations adamantly refuses a singular reading of this multivalent figure, who can be at once Christ and his representative on Earth. The artistic decision to adorse this figure was, moreover, a powerful means to depict the episcopal *persona mixta*, or the bishop who, through his impersonation of Christ, is at once a particular man on Earth and Christ himself.[291]

Conclusion: Clerical Authority, A Work in Progress ca. 1000

In the manuscripts I have studied in this chapter, the bishop is repeatedly presented, through a variety of formal means, as a figure of the absent Christ. But he is never presented entirely alone: the important semiotic and liturgical work he does in mediating the absent Christ is visually expressed in relation to others. He holds a significant, if not central place within a complex network of Christological signs that include the clergy, Ecclesia, Eucharist, and *agnus*

[291] See P.-A. Mariaux, *Warmund d'Ivrée et ses images. Politique et création iconographique autour de l'an Mil* (2002) for more on the bishop as a 'persona mixta.'

dei. Early medieval artists were interested in negotiating the place of the bishop amidst this ecclesiological web, as they constantly re-configured his relationship to other members of the Church. This visual exploration occurs at precisely the moment when church councils were actively redefining clerical orders and offices, largely in relation to who could confect the Eucharist.[292] Questions of celibacy and simony were of growing importance, too, as the Church actively debated who could mediate Christ's body for others.[293] The artists who made the images I have examined in this chapter were clearly interested in theorizing changes to the Church's hierarchy in eleventh-century reform movements; these images offer an exploration, and perhaps at times an authorization, of these new ecclesiological schemas.

As I (and countless historians of the Church) have suggested, clerical authority was a frequent site of contention and negotiation in the early medieval period. Roles were shifting both within the clerical hierarchy and between the clergy and faithful more broadly; the notion that the church resides principally in its clergy rather than the collective body of the faithful is commonplace by the tenth and eleventh centuries.[294] Although the term "sacerdos" could

---

[292] See previous discussions in this chapter of R. Reynolds, *The Ordinals of Christ,* M. Miller, *Clothing the Clergy*, and Y. Congar*, L'ecclésiologie du haut Moyen Age*. On the re-invigoration of Carolingian debates about the sign-status of the Eucharist by Heriger of Lobbes, among others, see B. Fricke, "Jesus Wept! On the History of Anthropophagy in Christianity: A New Reading of a Miniature from the Gospel Book of Otto III as Kippfigur," *Res* 59/60 (2011), pp. 192-205; W. Otten, "Between Augustinian Sign and Carolingian Reality: The Presence of Ambrose and Augustine in the Eucharistic Debate Between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie," *Dutch Review of Church History* 80.2 (2000), pp. 137-156, especially p. 139.

[293] See M. McLaughlin, *Sex, Gender, and Episcopal Authority.*

[294] As early as the Carolingian period, several theologians identify a growing distance between the priest and the faithful in the celebration of Mass as well as an increasing understanding of the church in more individualist (the priest) rather than collective (the faithful) terms. See Congar,

frequently refer to both the bishop and priest in the early medieval period, by the tenth and eleventh centuries, there are several marked attempts to signal the distinct nature of these two figures, as Reynolds and Miller have made clear (and as I have discussed above). Some bishops even goes so far as to call themselves "supersacerdos" and underscore their superior status to priests by reminding readers of the bishop's special relationship to Peter and Christ.[295]

In one rather ostentatious display of episcopal flattery and affirmation of power, Rather of Verona (d. 974)—a bishop himself—writes in his *Praeloquia* that every soul on earth is subject to the authority of the bishop, which comes from the Holy Spirit, passed down through the apostles and their successors.[296] Bishops, he writes,

> Dii sunt, Domini sunt, Christi sunt, celi sunt, angeli sunt, patriarchae sunt, prophetae sunt, apostoli sunt, evangelistae sunt, martyres sunt, uncti sunt, reges sunt, principes sunt, iudices sunt, non tantum hominum, sed et angelorum, arietes gregis Domini sunt, pastores ovium—non quarumcunque, sed Christi sanguine lotarum—sunt, pupilla oculi sunt,

---

L'Ecclésiologie du haut Moyen Ag (1968), p. 96. There are many ways these changes manifest themselves. For instance, the priest begins to recite the Canon quietly; he turns his back towards congregants at different moments during the Mass; and, the faithful can no longer bring their offerings to the altar. It also permeates the very notion of how the Eucharist is offered by the priest. See Congar, pp. 96-97 as well as O. Nussbaum, *Kloster, Priestermönch u. Privatmesse* (1961) on the development of private masses from the eighth century onward. This shifting focus manifests itself through particular textual changes, too: prayers are increasingly written in the first-person singular ("pro seipso sacerdote") rather than on behalf of all the faithful in the ninth century. For more on this see Congar, p. 97 and Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. I, p. 279. This shift away from a more collective account of the church body to a focus on the individual priest who can effect salvation for his flock is echoed in multiple church councils, notes Congar, including in Paris (829). See Congar, p. 97, footnote 165 and J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (1774), C. I, XIV, 537.

[295] Mariaux, p. 153.

[296] Rather de Verona, *Praeloquia*, ed. P. Reid, Corpus Christianorum: Continuiatio mediaevalis 46 A (1984), caput III, 10. Quoted in Mariaux, p. 151.

> claves celi portant, reserare et claudere celum valent, nubes quas Dominum ascensum suum posuit, bases, super quas tota iacet structura templi Dei.[297]

In other words, bishops are like gods, lords, Christs, heavens, angels, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and so forth. This highly self-flattering text—of which there are many written by bishops between the late tenth and early eleventh centuries—can lead to a potentially over determined reading of bishops during this period as singularly important figures in mediating Christ. While one cannot deny the crucial role bishops played in ecclesiastical and secular politics, I would argue that contemporary images did much more than affirm the bishop's singular power to mediate Christ on Earth. Instead, they negotiated his place amidst the larger clerical collective and other Christological signs. The bishop undeniably took on an increasingly important role in images of the Church during this period, which were often figured as 'imagined' liturgical events.

My study of episcopal images in this chapter is in some ways, then, a continuation of that of other scholars who have studied iconographies of the episcopacy in the tenth and eleventh centuries. But by broadening my focus beyond the figure of the bishop, I hope to return to and reinvigorate the important work done by scholars like Roger Reynolds on clerical hierarchy and its constant re-negotiation in those years leading up to the Gregorian Reform. For it was the

[297] Rather de Verona, *Praeloquia*, III, 12. Quoted in Mariaux, p. 151. Rather even qualifies the bishop as a saint (III, 15), as the Holy Spirit gave him the power to baptize and anoint the faithful with chrism, just as the Spirit crowns martyrs (quoted in Mariaux, p. 151). The bishop is also the shepherd, and the people his flock: "Nam quandiu populi grex, tandiu episcopus pastor" (III, 15), making the bishop and Christ very similar in this regard. Rather extends this analogy further: "quandiu verbum Dei adnuntiabitur, tandiu adnuntiator angelus dicetur et erit; quandiu chrisma conficietur, tandiu confector Christus vocabitur; quandiu prophetia recitabitur, tandiu recitator propheta dicetur" (III, 15).

occasion of Christ's absence following the Ascension that offered artists a powerful opportunity to reflect on who and what can make him present anew.

CONCLUSION

Figuring and mediating the absent Christ were central artistic and ecclesiological projects at the turn of the millennium. The Resurrection, Ascension, and medieval liturgical present posed significant representational opportunities, but also challenges, for artists. Deploying innovative means to figure and, frequently, to qualify Christ's absence, early medieval artists explored how to re-frame these moments in terms of ecclesiological presence. But why was there a heightened interest in Christ's absence, as both a narrative event and ontological state, around the year 1000 specifically?

The year 1000 has, quite paradoxically, been at once a liminal no-man's land in medieval studies but also the subject of intense debate in scholarship of the last century.[298] Often situated between the fall of the Carolingian empire and the beginning of the so-called Gregorian Reform movement, the year 1000 (and the surrounding decades) has received scholarly attention first and foremost in relation to contemporary fears that the world would end.[299] It is also frequently characterized in relation to the rise of the episcopacy and Benedictine monasticism, particularly at Cluny.[300] Unfortunately, because it falls between two periods that have historically been of

[298] A few classic studies on this period, some of which I have already cited, are H. Focillon, *The Year 1000* (1969); G. Duby, *L'an mil* (1980); P. Riché (ed.), *L'Europe de l'an mil* (2001).

[299] See, for instance, J. Reston, *The Last Apocalypse: Europe at the Year 1000 A.D.* (1998); M. Frassetto (ed.), *The Year 1000: Religious and Social Response to the Turning of the First Millennium* (2002); R. Landes, A. Gorw, D. C. Van Meter (eds), *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950-1050* (2003); J.T. Palmer, *The Apocalypse in the Early Middle Ages* (2014); M. Gabriele and J.T. Palmer (eds), *Apocalypse and Reform from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages* (2019).

[300]Scholars who have studied this area notably include J. Howe, *Before the Gregorian Reform: The Latin Church at the Turn of the First Millenium* (2016); K. Cushing, *Reform and the Papacy*

greater interest to historians of art and theology, its objects and texts have not been the subject of sufficient scrutiny. The exception to this, however, is in liturgical studies: this is the era of the birth of liturgical "drama," if we can call it such, and new ways of celebrating the liturgy—often in increasingly mimetic ways—have been identified across Europe by scholars.[301]

Towards the close of my study, it has become increasingly clear that artistic interest in the narrative event and ontological state of Christ's absence ca. 1000 can be partly understood in relation to to the beginnings of eleventh-century reform movements. It was in the decades leading up to the so-called Gregorian Reform Movement that members of the clergy, in particular, were actively debating questions of ecclesiastical hierarchy, including who could mediate Christ's body, particularly through the celebration of the Eucharist, as well as who could become a representative of Christ on Earth. Was it important that the subdeacon handling the Eucharistic vessels be celibate, for instance? Or what were the dangers in selling a clerical office to someone who had not first passed through the lower clerical grades? And finally, how might the figure of the bishop, an officer of the Church, stand in for other clerics, Ecclesia, and even Christ himself?

The images on which I have focused explore answers to such questions through narrative representations of the absent or partially obscured Christ as well as through images of an

---

in the Eleventh Century: Spirituality and Social Change (2005) and N. Hiscock (ed.), *The White Mantle of Churches: Architecture, Liturgy, and Art around the Millennium* (2003). For important work on monastic reform during this period, see B. Rosenwein, *Rhinoceros Bound: Cluny in the Tenth Century* (1982); K. Halliger, Gorze-Kluny. *Studien zu den monastischen Lebensformen und Gegensätzen im Hochmittelalter (Studia anselmiana*, 22-25, 1950-51); A. Cohen, "The Art of Reform in a Bavarian Nunnery Around the Year 1000," *Speculum* 74:4 (Oct., 1999), pp. 992-1020.

[301] See scholars cited on this topic in chapter one, notably D. Bevington, K. Young, M. Kobialka, TJ McGee, O.B Hardison, and C. Flanigan.

imagined liturgical present. But whether the artist's point of departure was Christ's absence (*Visitatio sepulchri* and Ascension) or ecclesiological presence (images of the liturgy), both temporalities (the historical past and liturgical present) are deeply enmeshed throughout the images I have studied. While these new, millennial iconographies are highly varied in form, they all repeatedly and resoundingly asserted that Christ's absence was the precondition for the birth of the Church and its system of signs.

The images I have studied are in some ways, then, forward-looking: their artists are working out questions of clerical representation before they were textually codified. But they also were returning to some central ideas, visual formulas, and questions posed in earlier Carolingian images, including how to figure the hypostasis or dual character of Christ. In the case of the Visitatio sepulchri and Ascension images examined in chapters one and two, artists figured the divine and human character of Christ while also figuring the Eucharistic cloths and eastward-facing body of the celebrant. These objects prompt modes of spiritual seeing, but they do not immediately divert the eye from the image: the fold-lines of the cloths demand close inspection to understand their relationship to both the grave and Eucharistic cloths, and the 'hidden' carvings on the Ascension ivory in fact allow the privileged viewer to see Christ's face, associated with his divinity, but not at the same time as looking at his back parts, evoking his humanity. These images obfuscate Christ to various degrees, but they insist that there are other bodies and representatives of Christ that are present and to which Christian viewers should attend.

By making a case for the power of material signs to effectively mediate and make present the absent Christ, these art objects were inherently offering a defense of their very own being and

place in the macrocosmic Christian scheme of salvation. In some ways, absence was the very condition for the presence of images for medieval Christians. But in the medieval liturgical present, these ivories and manuscript illuminations inside and on the covers of manuscripts play an integral role in figuring that which cannot be seen and offering visual and theological solace in making present the absent Christ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agobardus Lugdunensis, *Liber contra Amalarium* (Patrologia Latina, vol. 104. J. P. Migne, 1851).

Amalarius, *De Divinis Officiis*. Trans. and ed. E. Knibbs for Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library (2014).

Andrieu, Michel. *Immixtio et consecratio: la consecration par contact dans les documents liturgiques du Moyen Age* (1924).

------. "L'Ordo romanus antiquus et le Liber de divinis officiis Pseudo-Alcuin," *Revue des Sciences religieuses* 5-4 (1925).

Auctor Gallicus, *De ordinando pontifice*, *MGH, Libelli de lite*, 1:9 (1982).

Auctor incertus (Alcuinus?), *De divinis officiis* (Patrologia Latina, vol. 101. J. P. Migne, 1851).

Auerbach, Erich. "Figura," *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature,* trans. R. Manheim (1954). Essay originally published in 1938.

Augustine. *De Doctrina Christiana* 3.9.13. Ed. and trans. by R.P.H. Green (1995).

------. Tractate on John, 50.4 on John 11:55-12 in *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation: St Augustine Tractates on the Gospel of John 28-54* (1993).

Backhouse, Janet. "The Making of the Harley Psalter," *British Library Journal*, 10 (1984), pp. 97-113.

Bale, Anthony. *Feeling Persecuted: Christians, Jews and Images of Violence in the Middle Ages*, (2010).

Barasch, Moshe. "'Elevatio': The Depiction of a Ritual Gesture," *Artibus et Historiae* 24:48 (2003), pp. 43-56.

Barber, Charles. *Figure and Likeness: On the Limits of Representation in Byzantine Iconoclasm* (2002).

B. Baroffio and F. Dell'Oro, "'L'ordo Missae' di Warmondo d'Ivrea," *Studi medievali* 16 (1975), pp. 795-823.

Beauduin, Dom Lamberg. "Quelle est l'origine de l'huméral?" in *Questions liturgiques*, Vol. 3 (1912-13), pp. 179-182.

Belting, Hans. *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image Before the Era of Art*. Chicago, 1993. Originally published as *Bild und Kult: Eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst* (1990).

Bessette, Lisa. *The visualization of the contents of the psalms in the early Middle Ages*, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor (2005, PhD dissertation).

Bettazzi, Luigi, Ferdinando Dell'Oro, and Luigi Magnani, *Sacramentario del vescovo Warmondo di Ivrea: fine secolo X: Ivrea, Biblioteca capitolare, MS 31 LXXXVI* (1990).

Beumann, Helmut. "Das Rationale der Bischöfe von Halberstadt und seine Folgen," *Kirche und Reich: Beiträge zur früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Kloster-, Bistums- und Missionsgeschichte* (ed. I. Fees, 2004), pp. 43-59.

Bevington, David. *Medieval Drama* (1975).

Bjork, David A.. "On the Dissemination of 'Quem quaeritis' and the 'Visitatio sepulchri' and the Chronology of their Early Sources," *Comparative Drama* 14:1 (1980), pp. 46-49.

Björkvall, Gunilla, Gunilla Iversen, and Ritva Jonsson. *Corpus Troporum III: Tropes du proper de la Messe, Cycle de Pâques, Volume 2* (1982).

Blick, Sarah. "Exceptions to Krautheimer's theory of copying," *Visual Resources. An International Journal of Documentation*, 20 (2004), pp. 123-142.

Bloch, Peter and Hermann Schnitzler. *Die ottonische Kölner Malerschule*, 2 vols. (1967).

Bock, Nicolas, Ivan Foletti, and Michele Tomasi (eds.). *L'évêque, l'image et la mort: Identité et mémoire au Moyen Age* (2014).

Boeckler, Albert. "Elfenbeinreliefs der ottonischen Renaissance," *Phoebus: Zeitschrift für Kunst aller Zeiten. Revue des Arts anciens et modernes. A Journal of Art in All Ages* (1948-49), volume 2 (1946), pp. 145-155.

Boor, Helmut de. *Die Textgeschichte der lateinischen Osterfeiern* (1967).

Borchgrave d'Altena, Joseph de. "A Propos d'un ivoire liégois du XIe siècle," *Bulletin des Musées Royaux d'art et d'histoire* 21 (1949), pp. 17-24.

Braun, Joseph. *Das christliche Altargerät* (1932).

-----. "*Handbuch der Paramentik* (1911).

-----. “Humeral Veil,” *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (1910).

-----. *Praktische Paramentenkunde* (1924).

Brockett, Clyde W. “Ambiguities in the Designation of Antiphons for the Tenth-Century ‘Quem Quaeritis’: In Memory of Clifford Flanigan,” *Musica Disciplina*, Vol. 51 (1997), pp. 103-26.

Brooks, Neil. *The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy: With Special Reference to the Liturgical Drama* (1921).

Bruggisser-Lanker, Therese. “Der Mythos Gregor und die Grundlegung der musica sacra im heiligen Buch,” *Das Mittelalter* 18:1 (2013), pp. 87-105.

Burrus, Virginia. *Begotten not Made: Conceiving Manhood in Late Antiquity* (2000).

Caillet, Jean-Pierre. “Metz et le travail de l’ivoire vers l’an Mil,” *Religion et culture autour de l’an mil* (1990), pp. 316-318.

Chazelle, Celia. “Archbishops Ebo and Hincmar of Reims and the Utrecht Psalter,” *Speculum*, Vol. 72, No. 4 (Oct., 1997), pp. 1055-1077

-----. *The Crucified God in the Carolingian era. Theology and art of Christ’s passion* (2001).

Clark, James. *The Abbey of St Gall as a Center of Literature and Art* (1926, 2013).

Cohen, Adam. “The Art of Reform in a Bavarian Nunnery Around the Year 1000,” *Speculum* 74:4 (Oct., 1999), pp. 992-1020.

-----. *The Uta Codex: Art, Philosophy, and Reform in 11th-century Germany* (2000).

Coldeway, John. *Medieval Drama* (2007).

Collins, Kristen. *Visualizing Mary: Innovation and Exegesis in Ottonian Manuscripts* (PhD dissertation, University of Texas Austin, 2007),

Congar, Yves. *L’Ecclesiologie du Haut Moyen Age* (1968).

Cramer, Peter. *Baptism and Change in the Early Middle Ages, c. 200-c.1150.* Cambridge, 1993.

Cushing, Kathleen. *Reform and the Papacy in the Eleventh Century: Spirituality and Social Change* (2005).

Cross, F.L. and E. A. Livingstone (eds), "Corporal," *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (ed. F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone, 2005), see especially p. 423.

Cutler, Anthony. "Ivories, Inscriptions and Episcopal Self-Consciousness in the Ottonian Empire: Berthould of Toul and the Berlin Hodegetria," *Gesta* 42 (2003), pp. 1-17.

Danielson, Sigrid and E. Gatti (eds). *Envisioning the Bishop: Images of the Episcopacy in the Middle Ages* (2014).

Das Mittelalter in 111 Meisterwerken, Cologne, Schnütgen Museum (2003).

De Bruyne, Donatien. "Psautier de Stuttgart (Landesbibliothek No. 23)," *Speculum* VII (1932), pp. 361-366.

Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae (Leipzig, 1863; repr. Aalen, Ger., 1963).

Décréaux, Joseph. *Le sacramentaire de Marmoutier (Autun 19bis) dans l'histoire des sacramentaires carolingiens du IXe siècle* (1985).

Dell'Acqua, Francesca, Anthony Cutler, Herbert Kessler, Avinoam Shalem, and Gerhard Wolf. *The Salerno Ivories: Objects, Histories, Contexts* (2016).

Deshman, Robert. "Another Look at the Disappearing Christ: Corporeal and Spiritual Vision in Early Medieval Images," *Art Bulletin*, vol. 79, no. 3, Sep. 1997, pp. 518-546.

----. *The Benedictional of Aethelwold* (1995).

-----. *Eye and Mind: Collected Essays in Anglo-Saxon and Early Medieval Art* (ed. A Cohen) (2010).

-----. "Otto III and the Warmund Sacramentary: A Study in Political Theology," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 34, Bd. H. 1 (1971), pp. 1-20.

Dewald, Ernest. "The Iconography of the Ascension," *American Journal of Archaeology* 19:3 (Jul.-Sep., 1915), 277-319.

-----. *Stuttgart Psalter* (1930).

Diebold, William. "Except I shall see…I will not believe" (John 20:25): Typology, Theology, and Historiography in an Ottonian Ivory Diptych," *Objects, Images and the Word; Art in the Service of the Liturgy* (2003), pp. 257-273.

-----. *Word and image. An Introduction to Early Medieval Art* (2000).

Dieterich, Barbara. "Das Konstanzer Heilige Grab: Inszenierte Absenz," *Medialität des Heils im Späten Mittelalter* (ed. C. Dauven-van Knippenberg, C. Herberichs, and C. Kiening, 2009), pp. 165-188.

Dolan, Diane. *Le Drame Liturgique de Pâques en Normandie et en Angleterre au Moyen-Age* (1975).

Dölger, F.J. *Sol salutis: Gebet und Gesang im christlichen Altertum: Mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Ostung in Gebet und Liturgie*, 2nd ed., LF 4/5 (1925).

Drout, Michael. *How Tradition Works: A Meme-Based Cultural Poetics of the Anglo-Saxon Tenth Century* (2006).

Duby, Georges. *L'an mil* (1980).

Dümpelmann, Britta. "Non est hic, surrexit. Das Grablinnen als Medium inszenierter Abwesenheit in Osterfeier und-bild," *Medialität des Heils im späten Mittelalter,* ed. C. Dauven-van Knipperberg, C. Herberichs, C. Kiening (2009), pp. 131-164.

-----. "Visual-Textile-Tactile: Touching the Untouchable in Easter Liturgy and Art," *Noli me tangere in Interdisciplinary Perspective. Textual, Iconographic, and Contemporary Interpretations* (ed. R. Bieringer, B. Baert, K. Demasure, 2016), pp. 233-252.

Dunning, Robert (ed.), *Jocelin of Wells: Bishop Builder and Courtier* (2010).

Dupont, Anthony. "Augustine's Homiletic Appreciation of the Feast of Easter," in R. Bishop, J. Leemans, and H. Tamas (eds.), *Preaching after Easter: Mid-Pentecost, Ascension, and Pentecost in Late Antiquity* (2016), pp. 158-184.

Durand, Janic. *Byzance* (exhibition catalog, Louvre, 1992).

Dynes, Wayne. "The Dorsal Figure in the Stavelot Bible," *Gesta*. Vol. 10, No. 2 (1971), pp. 41-48.

Ehl, Heinrich. *Die ottonische Kölner Buchmalerei* (1922).

Ekkehard IV, *Die Geschichten des Klosters St. Gallen*. Die Geschichtsschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit. 3. Gesamtausg., volume 102 (1958).

Euw, Anton von, *Die St. Galler Buchkunst vom 8. bis zum Ende 11. Jahrhunderts* (2008), vol I and II.

Elbern, Victor. "Die bildende Kunst der Ottonenzeit zwischen Maas und Elbe," *Das erste Jahrtausend an Rhein und Ruhr*, II (1964).

Elliot, Diane. *Spiritual Marriage: Sexual Abstinence in Medieval Wedlock* (1939).

Elsner, Jas. "Art History as Ekphrasis," *Art History* 33.1 (2010), pp. 10-27.

Fillitz, Hermann. "Die Wiener Gregor-Platte," *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien*, N.F., XXII (1962).

Fingernagel, Andreas. *Die illuminierten lateinischen Handschriften süd-, west- und nord-europäischer Provenienz der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin PK: 4.-12. Jahrhundert, 2 vol*. (1999).

Flanigan, Clifford. *Liturgical Drama and Dramatic Liturgy: A Study of the Quem Queritis Easter Dialogue and its Cultic Context*, PhD Dissertation, Washington University (1973).

-----. "Karl Young and the Drama of the Medieval Church: An Anniversary Appraisal," *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 27 (1984), pp. 156-66.

----- (but completed by N. Petersen). "Medieval Liturgy and the Arts: Visitatio Sepulchri as Paradigm," *Liturgy and the Arts in the Middle Ages: Studies in Honor of C. Clifford Flanigan*, ed. E. L. Lillie and N.H. Petersen (1996), pp. 9-35.

Fleury, Charles Rohault de. *La Messe, études archéologiques sur ses monuments* (1898).

Focillon, Henri. *The Year 1000* (1969).

Frassetto, Michael (ed.). *The Year 1000: Religious and Social Response to the Turning of the First Millennium* (2002).

Freeman, Ann (ed.) with P. Meyvaert, *Opus Caroli regis contra synodum (Libri Carolini),* Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Concilia, 2, suppl. 1 (1998).

Fricke, Beate. *Fallen Idols, Risen Saints: Sainte Foy of Conques and the Revival of Monumental Sculpture in Medieval Art* (2015).

-----. "Jesus Wept! On the History of Anthropophagy in Christianity: A New Reading of a Miniature from the Gospel Book of Otto III as Kippfigur," *Res* 59/60 (2011), pp. 192-205.

J. Froger (ed.), *Paléographie musicale* II^{e} série, (1900/1970).

Gaborit-Chopin, Danielle (ed.), *Avori Medievali*, Museo Nazionale del Bargello (1988).

-----. *Ivoires Médiévaux, Ve-XVe siècle*. Paris: Musée du Louvre (2003).

-----. “La plaque de la Passion du Louvre: ivoire ottonien ou carolingien?” *Revue du Louvre: La Revue des Musées de France* (2003), pp. 42-51.

Gabriele, Matthew and James T. Palmer (eds), *Apocalypse and Reform from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages* (2019).

Gameson, Richard. “The Romanesque Artist of the Harley 603 Psalter,” *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700*, 4 (1993), pp. 24-61.

Ganz, David. *Medien der Offenbarung. Visionsdarstellungen im Mittelalter* (2008).

-----. “Von Innen nach Außen: Die Verborgenheit des rituellen Texts und die Sichtbarkeit des Prachteinbands,” *Verborgen, Unsichtbar, Unlesbar. Zur Problematik restringierter Schriftpräsenz* (2014), pp. 85-116.

Gatti, Evan. *Developing an Iconography of the Episcopacy: Liturgical Portraiture and Episcopal Politics in Late Tenth- and Early Eleventh-Century Manuscripts* (Dissertation, UNC Chapel Hill, 2005).

-----. “In a Space Between: Warmund of Ivrea and the Problem of (Italian) Ottonian Art,” *Peregrinations: Journal of Medieval Art and Architecture* 3, 1 (2010), pp. 8-48

Gertsman, Elina. “Phantoms of Emptiness: The Space of the Imaginary in Late Medieval Art,” *Art History* 41:5 (Nov. 2018), pp. 800-837.

Gibson, Margaret. *Liverpool Ivories* (1994).

Goldschmidt, Adolph. *Die Elfenbeinskulpturen*, vol. 1-6 (1914-34).

Goldschmidt, “Die Elfenbeinschnitzerei,” *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst* (1909), pp. 157-160.

Griffiths, Fiona. “Like the Sister of Aaron: Medieval Religious Women as Makers and Donors of Liturgical Textiles,” *Female ‘vita religiosa’ between Late Antiquity and the High Middle Ages: Structures, Developments, and Spatial Contexts* (2011), pp. 343-374.

Guenot, Magali. “Les images de l’Ascension du Christ dans la chrétienté latine du 9e au 13eme siècle” PhD Dissertation (Université Lille III) supervised by Nicolas Reveyron. Defended in 2016. The thesis has been published entirely online as of January 2019 and is available here: theses.univ-lyon2.fr/documents/lyon2/2016/guenot_m/.../guenot_m_these_udl.pdf

Gutberlet, Helena, S.. *Die Himmelfahrt Christi in der Bildenden Kunst von den Anfängen bis ins hohe Mittelalter. Versuch zur Geistesgeschichtlichen Erfassung einer ikonographischen Frage* (1934), vol. I and II.

Gyug, Richard. *The Rite of Church Dedication in the Early Medieval Era* (1998).

Hahn, Cynthia. "Portable Altars (and the Rationale): Liturgical Objects and Personal Devotion," *Image and Altar 800-1300* (ed. P. Grinder-Hansen, 2014) pp. 45-64.

-----. *Portrayed on the Heart: Narrative Effect in Pictorial Lives of Saints from the Tenth through the Thirteenth Century* (2001).

Halliger, Kassius. *Gorze-Kluny. Studien zu den monastischen Lebensformen und Gegensätzen im Hochmittelatler.* Part of the *Studia anselmiana philisophica theologica* series, fascicules n. 22-25, 1950-51).

Hamburger, Jeffrey and Anne-Marie Bouché (eds). *The Mind's Eye: Art and Theological Argument in the Middle Ages* (2005).

Hamburger, Jeffrey. "Body vs Book: The Trope of Visibility in Images of Christian-Jewish Polemic," *Ästhetik des Unsichtbaren: Bildtheorie und Bildgebrauch in der Vormoderne*, ed. D. Ganz & T. Lentes, vol. 1 of *KultBild: Visualität und Religion in der Vormoderne* (2004-2011), pp. 112-145

Hamill, Sarah and Megan Luke (eds), *Photography and Sculpture: The Art Object in Reproduction* (2017).

Hamilton, Louis. *A Sacred City: Consecrating Churches and Reforming Society in Eleventh-Century Italy* (2010).

Hamilton, Sarah and Helen Gittons (eds). *Understanding Medieval Liturgy: Essays in Interpretation* (2015).

Hanson, John. "The Stuttgart Casket and the Permeability of the Byzantine Artistic Tradition," *Gesta* 37:1 (1998), pp. 13-25.

Hardison, O.B. *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages: Essays in the Origin and Early History of Modern Drama* (1965).

Heitz, Carol. *L'architecture religieuse carolingienne: Les formes et leurs fonctions* (1980).

-----. "Eucharistie, Synaxe et Espace liturgique," *Segni e Riti nella Chiesa Alto Medievale Occidentale, Settimani de Studi* (33, 1987), pp. 609-38.

-----. *Recherches sur les rapports entre architecture et liturgie à l'époque carolingienne* (1963).

Heslop, T.A. "The Implication of the Utrecht Psalter in English Romanesque Art," in *Romanesque: Art and Thought in the Twelfth Century: Essays in Honor of Walter Cahn*, ed. by Colum Hourihane, Index of Christian Art Occasional Papers, 10 (2008), pp. 267-90.

Hiscock, Nigel. *The White Mantle of Churches: Architecture, Liturgy, and Art Around the Millennium* (2003).

Holcomb, Melanie. *Pen and parchment. Drawing in the Middle Ages* (2009)

-----. *The Function and Status of Carved Ivory in Carolingian Culture* (PhD dissertation, University of Michigan, 1999). Supervised by Elizabeth Sears.

Holopainen, Toivo. *Dialectic and Theology in the Eleventh Century* (1996).

Honorius of Autun. *Gemma Animae*, PL 558B-C.

Honselmann, Klemens. *Das Rationale der Bischöfe* (1975).

Horie, Ruth. *Perceptions of Ecclesia: Church and Soul in Medieval Dedication Sermons* (2006).

Horst K. van der, William Noel, and Wilhelmina Wüstefeld (eds), T*he Utrecht Psalter in Medieval Art: Picturing the Psalms of David* (1996).

Howe, John. *Before the Gregorian Reform: The Latin Church at the Turn of the First Millenium* (2016).

Hughes, Christopher. "Visual Typology: An Ottonian Example," *Word and Image*, XVII (2001), pp. 185-198.

Innocent III. *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, Libri Sex. PL 217.832A-B.

Iogna-Prat, Dominique. *La Maison Dieu. Une histoire monumentale de l'Eglise au Moyen Age (800-1200)* (2006).

Iversen, Gunilla. "Aspects of the Transmission of the Quem Quaeritis," *Text*, Vol. 3 (1987), pp, 155-182.

Izbiki, Thomas. "Linteamenta altaria: The Care of Altar Linens in the Medieval Church," *Medieval Clothing and Textiles* 12 (2016), pp. 41-60.

Izydorczyk, Zbigniew. ed., *The Medieval Gospel of Nicodemus: Texts, Intertexts, and Contexts in Western Europe* (1997).

Jászai, Géza. “Christus als neuer Mose?: Zur Ikonologie des Einbandes vom Evangeliar der Äbtissin Theophanu im Essener Domschatz,” *Das Münster*, vo. 66 (2013), pp. 40-49.

-----. “Was heißt ‘Christliche Ikonologie’?—Ein Beispiel,” *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst und Kunstwissenschaft* n. 2, (2016) pp. 118-120.

Johnson, Geraldine. (ed.) *Sculpture and Photography: Envisioning the Third Dimensi*on (1998).

Jordan, William Chester. “Stephaton: The Origin of the Name,” *Classical Folia*, XXXIII (1979), pp. 83-86.

Jung, Jacqueline, “The Kinetics of Gothic Sculpture: Movement and Apprehension in the South Transept of Strasbourg Cathedral and the Chartreuse de Champmol in Dijon,” *Mobile Eyes*, ed. D. Ganz and S. Neuner (2013), pp. 133-173.

Jungmann, Joseph. *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origin and Development* (1951).

Kaiser, Reinhold. *Bischofsherrschaft zwischen Königtum und Fürstenmacht: Studien zur bischöflichn Stadtherrschaft im westfränkisch-französischen Reich im frühen und hohen Mittelalter* (1981).

Kantorowicz, Ernst. *The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (1957).

Kelly, Thomas. *The Exultet in Southern Italy* (1996).

Kessler, Herbert. “The Book as Icon,” *In the Beginning: Bibles Before the Year 1000* (ed. M.P. Brown, 2006), pp. 95-103.

-----. “Christ’s Fluid Face,” (in press), *Festschrift für Martin Büchsel*, pp. 221-234.

-----. “Face and Firmament: Dürer’s An Angel with the Sudarium and the Limits of Vision,” *L’Immagine di Cristo dall’archeropita alla mano d’artista dal tardo medioevo all’età baroca* (eds. C. Frommel and G. Wolf), *Studi e Testi* 432 (2006), pp. 143-165.

-----. “‘Hoc Visibile Imaginatum Figurat Illud Invisibile Verum’: Imagining God in Pictures of Christ*,” Seeing the Invisible in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages.* Ed. G. de Nie, K. Morrison, and M. Mostert, 2005, pp. 291-325.

-----. “Image and Object: Christ’s Dual Nature and the Crisis of Early Medieval Art,” *The Long Morning of Medieval Europe: New Directions in Early Medieval Studies* (2008).

-----. “Images of Christ and Communication with God,” *Settimane di studio della Fondazione Centro italiano di studi sull’alto Medioevo* (v. 52, pt. 2, 2004), pp. 1099-1136.

-----. *Neither God nor Man: Words, Images, and the Medieval Anxiety about Art* (2007).

-----. *Seeing Medieval Art* (2004).

-----. *Spiritual Seeing: Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art* (2000).

Kingsley, Jennifer. *The Bernward Gospels: Art, Memory, and the Episcopate* (2014).

Kitzinger, Beatrice. *Cross and Book: Late-Carolingian Breton Gospel Illumination and the Instrumental Cross,* Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University (2012).

Kleinschmidt, Beda. "Eine Elfenbeinschnitzerei mit der Himmelfahrt Mariä aus der sog. Metzer Schule," *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst* (1909), pp. 1-10.

Kobialka, Michal. *This is My Body: Representational Practices in the Early Middle Ages* (1999).

Koch, Margarete. *Die Rückenfigur im Bild von der Antike bis Giotto* (1965).

Koerner, Joseph Leo. *Caspar David Friedrich and the Subject of Landscape* (2009).

Köhler, Wilhelm and Florentine Mütherich, *Drogo-Sakramentar: Manuscrit Latin 9428, Bibliothèque nationale, Paris*, 2 vol. (1974).

Konis, Polyvios. *From the Resurrection to the Ascension: Christ's Post-Resurrection Appearances in Byzantine Art (3rd-12th c.),* PhD dissertation, University of Birmingham (2008).

Körntgen, Ludger and Dominik Waßenhoven (eds.), *Patterns of Episcopal Power: Bishops in Tenth and Eleventh Century Western Europe* (2011).

Krautheimer, Richard. "Introduction to an 'Iconography of Architecture," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* (1942), pp. 1-33.

Kretzenbacher, Leopold. 'Zum kaum noch bekannten Namen des Kreuzigungszeugen Stephaton," *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*, LV (2001), pp. 1-22.

Kühnel, Bianca. *The End of Time in the Order of Things* (2003).

Kumler, Aden. *Translating Truth: Ambitious Images and Religious Knowledge in Late Medieval France and England* (2011).

Laffitte, Marie-Pierre and Charlotte Denoël, *Trésors carolingiens: Livres manuscrits de Charlemagne à Charles le Chauve*, Bibliothèque nationale de France (2007).

Lakey, Christopher. *Sculptural Seeing: Relief, Optics, and the Rise of Perspective in Medieval Italy* (2018).

-----. "'To See Clearly': The Place of Relief in Medieval Visual Culture," *Optics, Ethics, and Art in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries: Looking into Peter of Limoges's Moral Treatise on the Eye,* ed. H. Kessler and R. Newhauser (2018), pp. 119-139.

Landes, Richard, Andrew Gow, David Van Meter (eds), *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950-1050* (2003).

Leclercq, Jean. "Eucharistic Celebrations without Priests," *Worship* 55 (1981), pp. 160-168.

Leesti, Elizabeth. "Pentecost Illustration in the Drogo Sacramentary," *Gesta* XXVIII no. 2 (1989).

Legner, Anton. *Rhein und Maas: Kunst und Kultur, 800-1400* (1972-3).

Leidinger, Georg. *Das Perikopenbuch Kaiser Heinrichs II* (1912),

Levy, Ian Christopher. "The Eucharist and Canon Law," *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Middle Ages*, ed. G. Macy, K. van Ausdall, I.C. Levy (2011), pp. 399-445.

Lipphardt, Walther. *Lateinische Osterfeiern und Osterspiele*, 9 vol (1975-90).

U. M. Loang, *Turning towards the Lord: Orientation in Liturgical Prayer* (2009).

Loisel, Armand. "Missel et un bénédictionnaire anglo-saxons de la Bibliothèque de Rouen," *Bulletin des amis des monument rouennais* (1911).

Macy, Gary. *The Hidden History of Women's Ordination* (2008).

Marchesin, Isabelle. *L'arbre et la colonne. La porte de bronze d'Hildesheim* (2017).

Mariaux, Pierre-Alain. *Warmond d'ivrée et ses images: Politique et Création iconographique autour de l'an mil* (2002).

Marin, Louis. "Les femmes au tombeau," *Langages* 6:22, pp. 39-50 (1971).

Marcoci, Roxana. *The Original Copy: Photography of Sculpture, 1839 to Today* (Exhibition catalog, MoMA) (2010).

Marrow, James. *Passion Iconography in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages and Early Renaissance: A Study of the Transformation of Sacred Metaphor into Descriptive Narrative* (1979).

Matter, E. Ann. *The Voice of My Beloved: The Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity* (1990).

Mayr-Harting, Henry. *Ottonian Book Illumination*, vol. I and II (1991).

Mazzoli Casagrande, Maria Antoinetta. *I codici warmondiani e la cultura a Ivrea fra IX e XI secolo, Ricerche medievali* 6-9 (1971-1974), pp. 89-139.

McGee, Timothy. "The Liturgical Placements of the 'Quem Quaeritis' Dialogue," *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 29:1 (1976), pp. 1-29

-----. "The Role of the 'Quem Quaeritis' Dialogue in the History of Western Drama," *Renaissance Drama, New Series, Vol. 7, Drama and the Other Arts* (1976), pp. 177-19.

McKitterick, Rosamond (ed.). *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (1993).

M. McLaughlin, Megan. "The Bishop as Bridegroom: Marital Imagery and Clerical Celibacy in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *Medieval Purity and Piety: Essays on Medieval Clerical Celibacy and Religious Reform* (ed. M. Frassetto, 1998), pp. 209-238.

-----. *Sex, Gender, and Episcopal Authority in an Age of Reform 1000-1122* (2010).

Méhu, Didier. "L'évidement de l'image ou la figuration de l'invisible corps du Christ (IX^{e}–XI^{e} siècle)," *Images Re-vues* 11 (2013) online publication. Last visited January 2019. http://journals.openedition.org/imagesrevues/3384.

----- (ed.). *Mises en Scène et Mémoires de la Consécration de l'église dans l'occident médiéval* (2007).

Mellinkoff, Ruth. *The Horned Moses in Medieval Art and Thought* (1997).

Meyer, Ruth. *Die Miniaturen im Sakramentar des Bischofs Sigebert von Minden* (1967).

Melzak, Robert. "The Carolingian Ivory Carvings of the Later Metz Group." PhD diss., Columbia University (1983).

Messerer, Wilhelm. *Der Bamberger Domschatz in seinem Bestande bis zum Ende der Hohenstaufen-Zei*t (1952).

Migura, Diana. *Kunst der Karolinger. Die Schule von Reims: Ebo Evangeliar und Utrecht-Psalter* (2014).

Maureen, Miller. *The Bishop's Palace: Architecture and Authority in Medieval Italy* (2000).

-----. *Clothing the Clergy: Virtue and Power in Medieval Europe c. 800-1200* (2014).

Molinier, Emile. *Catalogue des Ivoires* (1896).

Montesquiou-Fezenac, Blaise de. *Le Trésor de Saint-Denis, Inventaire de 1634* (avec la collaboration de Danielle Gaborit-Chopin, 1978).

Morgan, Nigel. "The Utrecht Psalter and its copies," M. Miró Blanchard (ed.), *Anglo-Catalan Psalter* (2006), pp. 17-28.

Morris, Colin. *The Sepulchre of Christ and the Medieval West: From the Beginning to 1600* (2005).

Morrison, Karl. (co-ed. With G. de Nie and M. Mostert), *Seeing the Invisible in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (2005).

Myslivec, Josef and Géza Jászai, "Frauen am Grab," *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie*, Bd. 2 (1979), pp. 54-62.

Noel, William. *The Harley Psalter*, Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology (1996).

Noble, Thomas. *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians* (2009).

Nordenfalk, Carl. "Karolingisch oder Ottonisch? Zur Datierung und Lokalisierung der Elfenbeine Goldschmidt I, 120-131," *Kolloquium über spätantike und frühmittelalterliche Skulptur*, III (1974), pl. 26 (1).

Obrist, Barbara. "Wind Diagrams and Medieval Cosmology," *Speculum* 72:1 (1997), pp. 33-84.

O'Driscoll, Joshua. *Image and Inscription in the Painterly Manuscripts from Ottonian Cologne.* Harvard University Dissertation, supervised by Jeffrey Hamburger. Submitted in 2015.

-----. "Visual Vortex: An Epigraphic Image from an Ottonian Gospel Book," *Word & Image: A Journal of Verbal/Visual Enquiry* 27:3 (2011), pp. 309-321.

Oettinger, Karl. "Der Elfenbeinschnitzer des Echternacher Codex Aureus und die Skulptur unter Heinrich III. (1039-56)," *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen*, 2. Bd. (1960), pp. 34-54.

Omlin, Ephrem. "Hartker von St. Gallen," *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte* (1931), pp. 226-233.

Les Ordines romani du Haut Moyen Age (ed. M. Andrieu), Spicilegium sacrum lovaniense, études et documents, fasc. 11 (1931).

Ornamenta Ecclesiae. Kunst und Künstler der Romanik: Katalog zur Ausstellung des Schnütgen Museums in der Joseph-Haubrich-Kunsthalle. 3 vols (1985).

Ott, John and Anna Trumbore Jones (eds.) *The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages* (2007).

Otten, Willemien. "Between Augustinian Sign and Carolingian Reality: The Presence of Ambrose and Augustine in the Eucharistic Debate Between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie," *Dutch Review of Church History* 80.2 (2000), pp. 137-156.

Pächt, Otto. *The Rise of Pictorial Narrative in Twelfth-Century England* (1962).

Palazzo, Eric. *L'espace rituel et le sacré dans le christianisme. La liturgie de l'autel portatif dans l'Antiquité et au Moyen Age* (2008).

-----. *L'évêque et son Image: L'illustration du Pontifical au Moyen Age* (1999), especially pp. 138-141.

-----. *Les Sacramentaires de Fulda: Etude sur l'iconographie et la liturgie à l'époque* (1994).

-----. "Le Visible, l'invisible, et les cinq sens dans le haut Moyen Age. A propos de l'iconographie de l'ivoire de Francfort," *Actes du colloque* (Oct. 2010, published in 2012), pp. 11-38.

Palmer, John T. *The Apocalypse in the Early Middle Ages* (2014).

Parker, Elizabeth. *The Cloisters Cross: Its Art and Meaning* (1994).

Parkes, Henry. *The Making of Liturgy in the Ottonian Church: Books, Music and Ritual in Mainz, 950-1050* (2015).

Patzold, Steffen. *Episcopus. Wissen über Bischöfe im Frankenreich des späten 8. bis frühen 10. Jahrhunderts* (2008).

Paulinus of Aquileia, *Libellus sacrosyllabus episcoporum Italiae, Concililum Francofurtense* a. 794, MGH Conc 2/1:131.

Pentcheva, Bissera. "The Performative Icon," *The Art Bulletin* 88/4 (2006), 631-55.

-----. *The Sensual Icon: Space, Ritual, and the Senses in Byzantium* (2010).

Petersen, Nils Holger. "The Role of the Altar in Medieval Liturgical Representation: Holy Week and Easter in the Regularis Concordia," *Image and Altar 800-1300* (2014), pp. 15-25.

-----. "Les textes polyvalents du Quem quaeritis à Winchester au Xe siècle," *Revue de musciologie* 86.1 (2000), pp. 105-118.

Pierce, Joanne Michelle. *Sacerdotal spirituality at mass: Text and Study of the Prayerbook of Sigebert of Minden (1022-1036*), Dissertation, Notre Dame, 1988.

Pfaff, Richard. *The Liturgy of Medieval England: A History* (2009).

Poilpré, Anne-Orange. *Maiestas Domini: Une Image de l'église en Occident* (Ve-IXe siècles) (2005).

Polanichka, Dana M. "Transforming Space, (Per)forming Community: Church Consecration in Carolingian Empire," *Viator* 43:1 (2012), pp. 79-98.

Le *pontifical Romano-Germanique du dixième siècle* (ed. C. Vogel and R. Elze), *Studi e testi* 226, 227, 269, 3 volumes (1963-72).

Pouderoijen, Kees and Ike de Loos, "Wer ist Hartker? Die Entstehung des Hartkerischen Antiphonars," *Beiträge zur Gregorianik* 47 (2009), pp. 67-96.

Powell, Amy, "Bread/head: Morphology of an encounter," *postmedieval: a journal of medieval cultural studies* (2016) 7, pp. 10-28.

-----. *Depositions: Scenes from the Late Medieval Church and the Modern Museum* (2012).

Prange, Regine. "Sinnoffenheit und Sinnverneinung als metapicturale Prinzipien zur Historizität bildlicher Selbstreferenz am Beispiel der Rückenfigur," *Ambiguität in der Kunst: Typen und Funktionen eines ästhetischen Paradigmas* (2010), pp. 125-67.

Prassl, Franz Karl. "Muss Hartker Vergleiche fürchten?: zur Notation einer Sammelhandschrift des 10. Jahrhunderts aus St. Alban, Mainz, heute Wien, ÖNB codex latinus 1888," Beiträge zur Gregorianik, Band 59/60 (2015), pp. 203-219.

-----. "Rhetorische Notation als Vermittlung liturgischer Theologie in den Codices St. Gallen 390/391 und Einsiedeln 121," *Studia musicologica* 45 (2004), pp. 201-212.

Professione, Alfonso. *Inventario dei Manoscritti della Biblioteca Capitolare di Ivrea* (1967).

Raaijmakers, Janneke. *The Making of the Monastic Community of Fulda, c. 744-900* (2012).

Rademacher, Franz. "Die frühesten Darstellungen der Auferstehung Christi," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 28 (1965), pp. 195-224.

Rankin, Susan. *The Music of Medieval Liturgical Drama in France and England*, 2 vol (1989).

Rather of Verona. *The Complete Works of Rather of Verona*, ed. and trans. Peter L.D. Reid, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 76 (1991).

Réau, Louis *Iconographie de l'art chrétien, Vol. 2-II: Nouveau Testament* (1957)

-----. "La Visite des Saintes Femmes au Tombeau dans le plus ancien Art Chrétien," *Mémoires de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France,* neuvième série, tome III (1954), pp. 109-122.

Regularis Concordia text, see. T. Symons (ed.), *The Monastic Agreement of the Monks and Nuns of the English Nation* (1953).

Reilly, Diane. *The Art of Reform in Eleventh-Century Flanders: Gerard of Cambrai, Richard of Saint-Vanne, and the Saint-Vaast Bible* (2006).

Reston, James. *The Last Apocalypse: Europe at the Year 1000 A.D.* (1998).

Reudenbach, Bruno (ed.), *Geschichte der bildenden Kunst in Deutschland, Bd 1: Karolingische und ottonische Kunst* (2009).

Reuter, Timothy. "Ein Europa der Bischöfe. Das Zeitalter Burchards von Worms," *Bischof Burchard von Worms 1000-1025* (ed. W. Hartmann, 2000), pp. 1-28.

Reynolds, Roger. "Eucharistic Adoration in the Carolingian Era? Exposition of Christ in the Host," *Peregrinations: Journal of Medieval Art & Architecture* 4:2 (Autumn 2013), pp. 70-153.

-----. "Image and Text: The Liturgy of Clerical Ordination in Early Medieval Art, *Gesta* 22:1 (1983), pp. 27-38.

-----. "The Imago Christi in the Bishop, Priest, and Clergy," *A Companion to Priesthood and the Holy Orders* (ed. G. Peters, C. Anderson, 2015).

-----. *The Ordinals of Christ from their Origins to the Twelfth Century* (1978).

-----. "Ordinatio and the Priesthood in the Early Middle Ages and its Visual Depiction," *A Companion to Priesthood and Holy Orders in the Middle Ages* (2015), pp. 51-52.

-----. "The Portrait of Ecclesiastical Officers in the Raganaldus Sacramentary and its Liturgico-canonical Significance," *Speculum* 46:3 (1971), pp. 432-442.

-----. “The Subdiaconate as a Sacred and Superior Order,” *Clerics in the Early Middle Ages* (1999), pp. 1-39.

-----. “A Visual Epitome of the Eucharistic Ordo from the Era of Charles the Bald: The Ivory Mass Cover of the Drogo Sacramentary,” *Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom* (ed. M. T. Gibson and J. L. Nelson, 1990), pp. 241-60.

Riché, Pierre (ed.), *L’Europe de l’an mil* (2001).

Robinson, N.F.. “Concerning Three Eucharistic Veils of Western Use,” *Transactions of the St Paul’s Ecclesiological Society*, 6 (1906-10) pp. 129-60.

Rose, Els. *Ritual Memory: The Apocryphal Acts and Liturgical Commemoration in the Early Medieval West* (500-1215) (2009).

Rosenwein, Barbara *Rhinoceros Bound: Cluny in the Tenth Century* (1982).

Ruchaud, Elisabeth. *Les représentations du Saint-Sépulcre* (2017).

-----. *Les représentations du Saint-Sépulcre: Dans les images, les architectures, les rites et les textes (fin du IXe - début du XIIe siècle)*. Dissertation completed at the *Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales* under the supervision of J.-C. Schmitt (2011).

Russo, Daniel. “Présence de l’absence: Les conceptions monastiques de l’art, IXe-XIe siècles,” *Cluny: les moines et la société au premier âge féodal* (eds. D. Iogna-Prat, M. Lauwers, F. Mazel, I. Rosee, D. Russo, C. Sapin, 2013), pp. 169-184.

Ryan, J. Joseph. “Pseudo-Alcuin’s Liber de divinis officiis and the Liber ‘Dominus vobiscum’ of St Peter Damiani,” *Mediaeval Studies*, 14 (1952), pp. 159-164.

Rzucidlo, Ewelina. *Caspar David Friedrich und Wahrnehmung. Von der Rückenfigur zum Landschaftsbild* (PhD Dissertation, Freie Universität Berlin, 1997).

Sauer, Christine. “Allerheiligenbilder in der Buchmalerei Fuldas,” *Kloster Fulda in der Welt der Karolinger und Ottonen* (ed. G. Schrimpf, 1996), pp. 365-402.

Sauerland, Heinrich V. & Arthur Haseloff, *Der Psalter Erzbischof Egberts von Trier: Codex Gertrudianus, in Cividale* (1901).

Schapiro, Meyer. “Frontal and Profile as Symbolic Form,” *Words, Script and Pictures: Semiotics in Visual Language* (1996), pp. 69-114.

-----. "The Image of the Disappearing Christ: The Ascension in English Art Around the Year 1000," *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, ser. 6, 23, 1943, 133-52, repr. in Schapiro, *Selected Papers, III. Late Antique, Early Christian, and Medieval Art* (1979), pp. 267-87.

Scherrer, Gustav. *Verzeichnis der Handschriften der Stiftsbibliothek von St. Gallen* (1875).

Schiller, Gertrud. *Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst*, 5 vol. (1971).

Schilling, R. "Carolingian and Ottonian Manuscripts in the Exhibition at Berne," *Burlington Magazine*, XCII (1950).

Schmitt, Jean-Claude. *Le Corps des images: Essais sur la culture visuelle au Moyen Age* (2002).

Schnitzler, Hermann. "Fulda oder Reichenau?" *Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch*, IXI (1957).

Schrade, Hubert. "Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst. Die Sinngehalte und Darstellungsformen," Vol. I: *Die Auferstehung Christi* (1932).

-----. *Zur Ikonographie der Himmelfahrt Christi* (1930).

Schubiger, Anselm. *Histoire de l'école de chant de Saint-Gall du VIII^e^ au XII^e^ siècle, documents fournis à l'histoire du plain-chant pendant le moyen-âge* (1866).

Schram, Percy Ernst. *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige in Bildern ihrer Zeit*, 751-1190 (1928).

-----. *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio* (1930).

Sharpe, Richard. "A Hand list of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland Before 1540," *Publications of the Journal of Medieval Latin I* (1997).

Sheingorn, Pamela. *The Easter Sepulchre in England* (1987).

Sheppard, Jennifer. "A Devotional Diptych of the Resurrection: Oxford, CC MS 2," in *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700*, (ed. P. Beal and J. Griffiths,1990), pp. 231-256.

Sicard of Cremona, *Mitrale sive Summa de officiis ecclesiasticis* (Patrologia latina, vol. 213. J. P. Migne, 1855), section 146D.

Skubiszewski, Piotr. "Ecclesia, Regnum, et Sacerdotium dans l'art des Xe-XIe siècles [Idées et structures des images]," *Cahiers de civilisation médiéval*, 28th year, n. 110-111 (April-September 1985), pp. 133-180.

Smoldon, William. "The Origins of the Quem Quaeritis Trope and the Easter Sepulchre Music-Dramas, as Demonstrated by their Musical Settings," *The Medieval Drama*, ed. S. Sticca (1972) pp. 121-54.

Snoek, G. J.C. *Medieval Piety from Relics to the Eucharist: A Process of Mutual Interaction* (1995).

Steenbock, Frauke. *Der kirchliche Prachteinband im frühen Mittelalter: Von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Gotik* (1965).

Steiner, Ruth. "Hartker's Antiphoner and the Oral Tradition of Chant at St. Gall," *Sangallensia in Washington. The Arts and Letters in Medieval and Baroque St. Gall, Viewed from the Late Twentieth Century*, ed. J.C. King (1993).

Sticca, Sandro. *The Latin Passion Play: Its Origins and Development* (1970).

Stolzenburg, Xenia. "Non est hic. Heilige Gäber als Erinnerungsorte an die Auferstehung," *Das Münster* 60:3 (2007), pp. 171-175.

-----. "Präsenz und Absenz des Heiligen Grabes und die Osterliturgie in Italien," *Architektur und Liturgie* (ed. W. Jacobsen, forthcoming).

Suckale-Redlefsen, Gude. *Die Handschriften des 8. bis 11. Jahrhunderts der Staatsbibliothek Bamberg* (2005).

Sun-ah Choi, *Sacred Images in Medieval Chinese Buddhism* (University of Chicago dissertation, 2012).

Surmann, Ulrike "Der Meister der Wiener Gregor-Tafel," in: Franz J. Ronig (ed.): *Egbert, Erzbischof von Trier 977-993. Gedenkschrift zum 1000 Todestag* (1993), pp. 207-229.

-----. *Studien zur ottonischen Elfenbeinplastik in Metz und Trier: Nordenfalks Sakramentar- und Evangeliargruppe*. (1990).

Swarzenski, Hans. *Monuments of Romanesque Art* (1954).

-----. "The Role of Copies in the Formation of the Styles of the Eleventh Century," *Studies in Western Art: Acts of the Twentieth International Congress of the History of Art*, 4 vols (1963), I: *Romanesque and Gothic Art*, pp. 7-18.

Unterkircher, Franz. *Zur Ikonographie und Liturgie des Drogo-Sakramentars (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale Ms. Lat. 9248)* (1977).

Thurston, Hebert. "Corporal," *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908).

Tilghman, Benjamin. "Ornament and Incarnation in Insular Art," *Gesta*, v. 55 n. 2 (Fall 2016), pp. 157-177.

Toubert, Hélène. *Un art dirigé: Réforme grégorienne et iconographie* (1990).

Traub, Andreas. "Notker III und Hartker in St. Gallen," *Beiträge zur Gregorianik* 18 (1994), pp. 5-13.

Travis, William. "Representing 'Christ as giant' in early medieval art," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 62 (1999), pp. 167-189.

Trenk, H. "Das Oeuvre des Meisters der Wiener Gregorplatte," *Zu Gast in der Kunstkammer* (1991).

Trotz Natur und Augenschein: Eucharistie—Wandlung und Weltsicht. Exhibition catalog, Kolumba Museum (2013).

Vogler, Werner (ed.), *L'Abbaye de Saint-Gall: Rayonnement spiritual et culturel* (1991) (or, in English: The *Culture of the Abbey of Saint Gall: An Overview*, also 1991).

Vogel, Cyril. "L'Orientation vers l'Est du celebrant et des fidèles pendant la celebration eucharistique," *OrSyr* 9 (1964), pp. 3-37.

-----. "Sol Aequinoctialis: Problèmes et technique de l'orientation dans le cultue chrétien," *Revue des Sciences Réligieuses*, tome 36, fascicule 3-4, 1962.

----. "Versus ad orientem: l'orentation dans les Ordines romani du haut moyen age," *Studi medievali*, (196) Vol. 1 n. 2 pp. 448-469.

Voraginus, Jacobus de. *The Golden Legend* (trans. W. G. Ryan, 2012).

Voyer, Cécile. "Un livre d'évangile à l'epreuve des sens (Paris, Arsenal ms. 592)," Cahiers de civilisation medieval, 55:12 (2012), pp. 417-431.

-----. "Le Sacramentaire de Marmoutiers (Autun BM. 19bis) et l'abbé Rainaud," *La culture des comamnditaires. L'oeuvre et l'empreinte* (ed. S. Brodbeck and A-O. Poilpré), Actes de la journée d'études organisée à Paris le 15 novembre 2013, Paris, site de l'HiCSA, pp. 158-173

Vulgate Bible (Latin and English). Douay-Rheims translation (ed. S. Edgar, 2010).

Wallraff, Martin. *Christus verus sol: Sonnenverehrung und Christentum in der Spätantike*, JAC.E 32 (2001), pp. 60-88.

Weber, Louis. *Einbanddecken, Elfenbeintafeln, Miniaturen, Schriftproben aus Metzer liturgischen Handschriften* (1912).

Weitzmann, Kurt. *Die byzantinischen Elfenbeinskulpturen*, II (1934).

Wilks, Guntram. *Das Motiv der Rückenfigur und dessen Bedeutungswandlungen in der deutschen und skandinavischen Malerei zwischen 1800 und der Mitte der 1940er Jahre* (2005).

Williamson, Paul. *Medieval Ivory Carvings. Early Christian to Romanesque*. Victoria and Albert Museum (2010).

Wilson, H.A.. *The Missal of Robert of Jumièges*, London, Henry Bradshaw Society (1896).

Winterer, Christoph. *Das Fuldaer Sakramentar in Göttingen: Benediktinische Observanz und römische Liturgie* (2009).

-----. "Monastische Meditatio versus fürstliche Repräsentation. Überlegungen zu zwei Gebrauchsprofilen ottonischer Buchmalerei," *Die Ottonen. Kunst – Architektur – Geschichte* (eds. K. Gereon Beuckers, J. Cramer, M. Imhof, 2002), pp. 103–128.

Witte, Fritz. *Die Skulpturen der Sammlung Schnütgen* (1912).

Woudhuysen, P. *Treasures of the Fitzwilliam Museum*. Cambridge (1982).

Wu Hung's, "Reading Absence in Chinese Art and Material Culture," University of Cambridge (three lectures, May 2012. "Pillow and Mirror: Absence as Subjectivity," "Representing Vacancy: Absence as Memory," and "Demolition Projects: Absence as Contemporaneity.") https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z4kzAsyuLtQ. Last visited January 2019.

Wu Hung, *A Story of Ruins: Presence and Absence in Chinese Art and Visual Culture* (2012).

Yalçin, Fatma. *Anwesende Abwesenheit. Zur Entwicklingsgeschichte von Bildern mit menschenleeren Räumen, Rückenfiguren und Lauschern im holländischen 17. Jahrhundert* (2004).

Young, Karl. *The Drama of the Medieval Church* (1933).

-----. *The Origin of the Easter Play* (1914).

-----. "The Origin of the Easter Play," *PMLA* 29:1 (1914), pp. 1-58.

Zacagni, L.A. *Collectanea monumentorum veterum* (1698).

Zchomelidse, Nino. *Art, Ritual, and Civic Identity in Medieval Southern Italy* (2014).

-----. "Descending Word and Resurrecting Christ: Moving Images in Illuminated Liturgical Scrolls in Southern Italy," *Meaning in Motion: The Semantics of Movement in Medieval Art* (ed. N. Zchomelidse and G. Freni, 2011), pp. 3-34.