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Preface
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Thanks also to the institutions that allowed to publish photographs of their objects: The trustees of the British Museum, Vatican Museums, Musées de Narbonne-Ville de Narbonne, The State Hermitage Museum, German Archaeological Institute Rome, Hildesheim Cathedral Museum, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Kloster Wienhausen and Kloster Loccum.

The troubles of editing were accomplished by student assistants Katharina Knesia, Simone Hacke, Marina Bormann and Julian Hossain (Carly). We would also like to thank Jutta Pabst, editor in chief at Göttingen Universitätsverlag, for her professional support in the final stages of the copy-editing process. Last but not least we are grateful to Timo Kirschberger who translated a good number of the German articles into English, and to Helen Bendix for the English editing. For the maps, which should be helpful for all readers who are not so familiar with today’s Lower Saxony and the Holy Land we are grateful to Robin Volkmar and Bärbel Kröger, Academy of Sciences and Humanities Göttingen.
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Introduction

Hedwig Röckelein, Galit Noga-Banai, and Lotem Pinchover

“She fell down and worshipped before the cross as if she could see the Lord hanging from it.”¹ This is how, in 404, Jerome describes the reaction of the Roman matron Paula when she saw the relics of the true cross in Jerusalem. Almost two decades earlier, her devotion and love of God made her leave behind her children in Rome (except for her daughter Eustochium, to whom Jerome address the hagiographical eulogy), go on a pilgrimage, and settle in Bethlehem, where she built two monasteries and a hospice for pilgrims.

Adoration of the Cross, pilgrimage, and patronage were united by Paula in search for divine love and presence. Years later, when sometime in the eleventh or twelfth century the abbess of the convent in Gandersheim (Lower (today)/ Medieval Saxony) carried a pectoral cross suspended around the neck and ended on her chest, the proximity of Christ’s presence and love was revealed through the cruciform object.

A crucified Christ wearing a loincloth, in gilded repoussé, is on the front of the bronze pectoral from Gandersheim, today in the Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum in Braunschweig [Cover photo and Fig. 1].² Above his head a carved inscription reads IESVS. Although his head bends to the side, implying his suffering, Christ eyes are wide open, proclaiming his triumph over death; the decoration on the back of the cross does not protrude from the surface, but rather engraved. The inscription reading S(ANCTA) MARIA is set above the Virgin, who is flanked by busts of two angels [Fig. 2]. Mary is in full frontal body, wearing a gown and maphorion,

² Pectoral Cross, first half of the eleventh century, made in Gandersheim, bronze, 4.7 × 3.9 cm, Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum Braunschweig (Inv. no. MA 168).
blessing with her right hand while holding a book in her left. The Latin shaped Cross, measuring 4.7 × 3.9 cm, was put together by two silver plates and is hallowed, a fact that may hint at its function as reliquary. A small defect at the upper end suggests that it used to have some kind of a loop so it could be used as a pectoral cross. Based on stylistic grounds, it was suggested that the cross is a product of the first half of the eleventh century.

The body of Christ is framed by the cross and the contour of the cross is framed by a rope pattern that stands out. The height, form, and texture of the edge intensify the engagement of the frame with the representation of the figure and potentially with the wearer. If indeed, as Christian Popp attributed convincingly, the cross belonged to the abbess of the convent in Gandersheim, it is not difficult to imagine her touching and feeling the projecting parts of the front, going time and again over the crucified body and the cruciform shape of the cross with her fingers. This repeated practice was in direct contact with (and activated by) her body. Moreover, the cruciform close to her heart visualized, and at the same time enhanced, her love and devotion to God. The tactile practice as well as the vision of Christ on the cross could allude to the ritual process of body and mind when they link the representation with that which is represented. Enclosing the Crucified in a fitting format recalled on the one hand the historical event of the crucifixion, but on the other hand, it compelled “a devotional access to that transcendent place where he was believed to have gone.”

Pectoral bronze crosses decorated with figurative themes were very popular in the eleventh century, especially in Byzantium. Often Christ appears on one side and Mary on the other. The byzantine-like dress and maphorion of Mary on the cross, as well as her position between two archangels point to a byzantine model. Her full figure on the pectoral from Gandersheim, however, holding a book and blessing, is quite exceptional; on the byzantine pectorals the Virgin sometimes holds Christ, and even more often, she is standing in orant pose, declaring her intercessory position. Typically also on Byzantine pectorals, Christ is wearing a colobium rather than a loincloth.

Whether in the east or west, the figure of Mary with angels situates the scene in celestial settings and Christ’s wide-open eyes provide the concise image and the small medium with soteriological significance. Whether in late antiquity, as described by Jerome, or in the Middle Ages, as suggested by the pectoral cross, when the relics of the cross or the cruciform medium were integrated with the body, the devotional activity and the proximity of God promised salvation.

3 Popp, Der Schatz, p. 103; Marth, ‘Liturgische Geräte’, pp. 143-145.
6 James, ‘Sense and Sensibility’, pp. 522-537, analyzing devotional icons.
8 See for instance an eleventh century pectoral in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, Inv. no. 26.15; Pitarakis, Les croix-reliquaires, no. 212.
As the title of our book, “Devotional Cross-Roads: Practicing Love of God in Medieval Gaul, Jerusalem, and Saxony”, indicates, we are investigating test case witnesses of Christian devotion and patronage, set in and between the Eastern and Western Mediterranean, as well as Gaul and the regions north of the Alps, from Late Antiquity to the late Middle Ages. Devotional practice and love of God refers to people – mostly from the lay and religious elite –, ideas, copies of texts, images, and material objects, such as relics and reliquaries. The cross as a material object, as well as a symbol of holy site and the Christological narrative, is our point of departure. It is the multifunctional quality of the cross as well as its iconography that allows different scholarly methods and approaches.

Via the meanings and media of the Cross the gap between the Christian believers and the Passion of Christ was bridged, and links were drawn between them and Jerusalem, between the devotees and the expected salvation. Thus, the first section in our book is dedicated to the Holy Cross and the Crucifixion of Christ in the first millennium AD. We start with Jutta Dresken-Weiland’s article on the early iconography of the Crucifixion from the second to the sixth century as platform for the following papers. She discusses the crucifixion as an instrument of capital punishment in the logic of Roman State Law, the distribution of the relics of the cross and the genesis of the image of the crucifixion.

The next two articles focus on translation of architectural constructions, modeled after the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, to Gaul. A unique late antique construction representing the Holy Tomb Aedicule in the city of Narbonne is the subject of Shimrit Shriki-Hilber’s article. Shriki-Hilber presents this distinctive structure in the context of its space and timeframe and in conjunction with the special relationship between Gaul, the Holy Land, and Rome. Galit Noga-Banai follows the footsteps of relics of the Holy Cross which were transferred from the East to Gaul in the sixth century and deposited in a special chapel at Queen Radegund’s female monastery of Ste. Croix in Poitiers, and the implementation of a particle of the Holy Cross by Einhard, Charlemagne’s courtier, into an architectural formed reliquary that he dedicated to the monastery of Saint Servatius in Maastricht in the second or third decennia of the ninth century. From iconography of architecture point of view, she traces the additional meaning attributed to the translation of the relic by the accompanied architectural forms.

Between the 790s and the 840s a controversy was raised among Carolingian intellectuals, concerning if and how the Cross and the Crucifixion are to be venerated and artificially depicted. The discussion amongst the Carolingian bishops and abbots was directly pushed by Charlemagne and his court as a reaction to the Byzantine image debate. Einhard was involved in this debate on the adoration and veneration of the cross. Nevertheless, it is the next generation’s positions on the religious practices around the Holy Cross that are the subject of Alexander Winnefeld’s article. He intensively analyses for the first time the positions expressed by bishop Jonas of Orléans, and compares his views to the theological positions of the radical Claudius of Turin. Winnefeld argues that with the Holy Cross we have
the first controversy between symbolists and essentialists in a Western society. For
Jonas, the symbolist, the cross was not only a material object, but a reminder of
Christ’s passion and of human salvation.

In the twelfth century Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem the relic of the Holy Cross
received a new meaning beyond its significance as a religious object. For the West-
ern Crusaders who established a realm in the East, the Holy cross became a sym-
bol of ethnic identity within the process of nation-building. To cite Timo
Kirschberger’s innovative hypothesis: “The Kingdom of Jerusalem was the King-
dom of the Cross.”

The second part of our book is dedicated to the High and Late Middle Ages.
Here, we focus on the reception of relics translated from the East to Medieval
Saxony, as well as issues of male and female patronage, pilgrimages, and the Cult
of Christ’s Passion in Medieval Saxony. In the period concerned the region of
Saxony differed significantly from nowadays State of Saxony in the Federal Repub-
lic of Germany. Reaching from the Rhine Valley in the West to the Elbe River in
the East, and from the Danish boarder in the North to the Thuringian and Hessian
mountains in the South, High and Late medieval Saxony was one of the largest
regions in the Holy Roman Empire. It covered parts of today’s states of North
Rhine-Westfalia, Lower Saxony, Schleswig-Holstein, Saxony-Anhalt and Thuringia.

Evidently translation of relics and the reception of the Christ’s Passion in Me-
dieval Saxony were inspired by the activities of the contemporary Saxon elite,
mainly male. Some of the most central patrons of the monastic communities in
Medieval Saxony were of noble origin, for example members of the Guelf family
and dynasty. These patrons’ relatives, Cistercian abbots and monks as well as Sax-
on bishops took active part in the Crusades to the Holy Land, as well as the cam-
paigns against the Slavs in Northern Germany, aiming to convert the Pagans. These encounters with the east and struggles for the sake of Christianity had a
dramatic impact on the foundations of female and male religious institutions in
Northern Germany. The influence can be traced through endowments of lands
property and other benefits, and through the practice of relics’ translations, as can
be read in the articles by Mai-Britt Wiechmann, Hedwig Röckelein and Katharina
Knesia.

The Cistercian houses, both male and female, played a leading role in the north
German context of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (e.g. Marienfeld,
Wienhausen, Mariengarten, Loccum, Walkenried). Wiechmann examines the rela-
tions between dedication and veneration in Cistercian male and female monas-
teries. Surprisingly she found a stronger veneration for Christ than for Mary even
when these houses were dedicated to the Virgin. Her hypothesis is that this phe-
nomenon was strengthened by the propaganda for the Eucharist, based on a dar-
ing analysis of relic’s legends in relation to questions of gender and incorporation

9 Cf. the map ‘Late Medieval Saxony’ in this volume.
10 Rüdebusch, Der Anteil Niedersachsens; Christiansen, The Northern Crusades.
to monastic orders. Starting in the West as of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, the veneration of the Host was enhanced by the feast of Corpus Christi, officially introduced by the Roman Church in 1311, though celebrated in medieval Saxony already as early as 1301.11 This strong Eucharistic devotion is, as Lotem Pinchover suggests, one of the reasons why the nuns of the area adopted the iconography of Christ’s Resurrection, extremely popular in the artwork of the Lüneburg Heath convents. Pinchover seeks for the visual and textual roots of this scene, in order to explain its noteworthy manifestation.

As shown by Röckelein and Wiechmann, nuns who were not accepted by the Cistercian order, but entitled themselves in the charters as “Cistercians”, had much more freedom in religious practices than their male counterparts. The male monasteries in contrary, which were fully integrated into the order, were under the strict control of the general chapter. While female houses like Wienhausen could open their doors to the inner cloister and even the nuns’ choir for veneration by lay people, the male houses had to reduce access for the laity, particularly women, to the outer precinct.

Besides the important relics of Christ and others from the Holy Land, Röckelein’s article proves that the Medieval Saxon monasteries owned a huge crowd of other saints’ relics of Western and Roman provenance, which they kept concealed in altars, statues, and crosses in their churches and cloisters, where they functioned as mediators. These relics were virtually forgotten in current research.

Relics were one way of interaction with the farther holy places and events, especially for enclosed religious communities. For example, religious women gained access to relics from the East by their male relatives who, in turn, asked the nuns and canonesses for commemorative prayers. The act of founders’ commemoration wore different shapes within male and female communities, as presented by Katharina Knesia. Knesia analysed and gave a new edition to the founding charter of the convent of Saint Aegidii (Saint Giles) in Münster (founded late twelfth century). She shows that gender influenced everyday practice in the monastic space. Women had less direct access to holy places since their participation in pilgrimages and crusades was rather rare. Religious women were much more limited in their mobility than their male counterparts, especially due to monastic reforms, highly active in the area of medieval Saxony in the fifteenth century.12 Although living in strict enclosure during these reform periods, nuns and canonesses did seek access to the world outside the convent through active performance of meditation and devotion. Under these conditions, the female religious replaced real pilgrimages by a spiritual pilgrimage to Jerusalem and Rome, as detailed by Robin Volkmar in his article on the “Aflat to Jerusalem”, transcribed, edited and analysed here for the first time. The performance of such a practice made it possible for the nuns “to visit devotedly the actual locations, where the spiritual suffering occurred.”13

12 Röckelein, Schriftlandschaften, pp. 72-85.
13 Wienhausen, KIA, Ms. 86, lr. Italics and translation by Mecham, ‘Sacred Vision’, p. 305.
Just like Paula in the fifth century, the later medieval religious practitioner
would seek to “see the Lord” and participate His Passion with love. In the words
of fifteenth century nuns of Medingen, embroidered on the Wichmannsburger
Antependium:

“Let us praise, Oh dearest, the cross of our Lord. Hail the cross which was
consecrated by the body of Christ, and by His limbs. I have seen that the water
from His right side came from the temple. I have put my fingers in the nail holes
and my hands (in His side wound). Come see the works of the Lord and what
miracles he has done (on earth)... decorated magnificent tree, adorned with kings’
purpura...”

---

14 Wool and silk embroidery on linen, end of fifteenth century or 1500, made in Medingen, 86 × 342
141-146. Text originally in Latin, translated to German by Lotem Pinchover:

*Gloria(n)du(m) nob(is) e(st) dilectissimi i(n) cru(ce) domini nostri. Salue crux que i(n) corp(or)e ehr(ist)a dedicata es
· (et) ex me(nbris)... Uidi aqua(m) egredi(n)te(m) a latere dextro, de te(m)plo. Misi digitos meos i(n) fixuram
clawor(um) · (et) man(as) me(as). Uenite (et) videte opera d(omi)ni qui posuit p(rudigia)... Arbor deora fulgida,
ornata regis purpura). Wir wollen uns rühmen, Teuerste, in dem Kreuz unseres Herrn. Sei gegrüßt,
Kreuz, das du durch den Leib Christi geweiht bist, und aus seinen Gliedern ... Ich habe gesehen, daß
das Wasser auf der rechten Seite aus dem Tempel hervortrat. Ich habe meine Finger in die Nägelmale
gelegt und meine Hände (in seine Seitenwunde). Kommt und seht die Werke des Herrn und welche
Wunderdinge er (auf der Erde) vollbracht hat... Prächtiger, strahlender Baum, geschmückt mit dem
Purpur des Königs...
Fig. 1-2: Braunschweig, Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, inv. no. MA 168. Pectoral Cross, first half of the eleventh century, provenance Gandersheim, bronze, 4.7 × 3.9 cm. Fontside: The Crucifixion. Reverse Side: Mary with two angels (photo © Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum Braunschweig).
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I.

The Veneration of the Cross from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages in Gaul and Jerusalem
The Cross, the Iconography of the Crucifixion and the Relics of the Holy Cross

Jutta Dresken-Weiland *

Abstract

The cross as a sign is present in everyday life since the middle of the second century, but the crucifixion of Christ as a shameful death remains for a long time a difficult theme for the contemporary Christians. The article follows the iconographic development of the crucifixion, first documented about 200 AD. It appears more frequently since the beginning of the fifth century, and mostly in the context of passion scenes or the cycle of Christ’s life. Single images of the crucifixion are also known. Since the middle of the fourth century, relics of the Holy Cross are diffused in the whole world. It is plausible to suppose that the relics of the cross and their veneration, together with pilgrimage becoming more and more attractive, are the background which stimulates interest to represent Christ’s ignoble death at the cross and also the passion scenes and the resurrection.

Keywords

Crucifixion; cross; punishment; relics; gems; John Chrysostom; sarcophagus; Gaza; Ravenna; pilgrimage art; Narbonne; iconography; Prudentius; third century; fourth century; fifth century.

* Jutta Dresken-Weiland is a German Christian archaeologist. Since 2009 she is extracurricular professor at the Georg-August-University Göttingen.
1 Introduction: Cross and Crucifixion

The cross in everyday life becomes frequent since the second century: The custom to trace the sign of the cross on the forehead in various situations of everyday life and in liturgy is present since at least the middle of the second century. Since the third century, the cross is depicted on gems which continue to be produced until the fourth century. In the late fourth century, John Chrysostom finishes his ‘Demonstration against the pagans that Christ is god’, probably a treatise, written in the years between 380 and 390 AD, with an emotive appeal which refers to the omnipresence of the cross (IX, 9):

‘We see this sign shining forth on the sacred table, at the ordination of priests, and along with the body of Christ at the banquet of the mysteries. Anyone could see a whole chorus of these signs of the cross in houses, in the market place, in the deserts, on the roadsides, on the mountains, in the glades, on the hills, at sea, on ships, on islands, on beds, on garments, on weapons, in bridal chambers, in banquet halls, on vases of gold, on gems, on wall paintings, on the bodies of sick animals, on the bodies of those possessed by demons, in wars, in peace, in the daytime and at night, at worldly festivals, among the groups of those enured to hardships. [...]’.

Of course, the cross also decorates churches. In the letter of Nilus of Ancyra (†c. 430) to the eparch Olympiodorus (ep. 4,61), Nilus recommends a cross in the apse and images of the New and the Old Testament on the walls of the nave. Nilus’ letter was written for a wider circulation to communicate which themes were to be chosen for church decoration and which not. Nilus’ attitude reflects also the contemporary reality, as preserved images show: A mosaic of unknown provenance in the Louvre in Paris, dated to the fifth-sixth century, shows a cross represented in the interior of a church.

---

1 Heid, ‘Kreuz’, col. 1126; see also Tertullian (died after 220), De corona militis, cap. 3; Spier, Late Antique, p. 79.
2 Spier, Late Antique, pp. 46-49.
3 The length of the text militates against considering it as a homily; probably it is a treatise, see Schatkin/Harkins, Saint John Chrysostom apologist, p. 181.
4 For the dating see ibid., pp. 181-184.
6 In the context of the iconoclast controversy, this passage allowing scenes of the Old and the New Testament was substituted by advising to limit the decoration of the church to a cross in the apse and to paint the walls in white, see Cameron, ‘The Authenticity’, p. 190. In this article, I will not enter on the problem of iconoclasm, see recently Brubaker/Haldon, Byzantium, c. 680-850; Brubaker, Inventing Byzantine iconoclasm.
8 Metzger, ‘Deux panneaux’, pp. 154-156.
In contrary to the cross, images of the crucifixion are rare: The crucifixion presents a problem for the men of antiquity. Crucifixion is the extreme and the most severe punishment, as a series of different Greek and Latin authors write,\(^9\) and it is (at least theoretically) still in use throughout the fourth century. In written sources, crucifixion as a sentence is mentioned in a law issued by Constantine in 314,\(^10\) by Firmicus Maternus in his books on astronomy,\(^11\) written between 335-337, and twice still in 391 in a panegyric delivered by Pacatus before Theodosius I. (Paneg. 2 [12] 42.1 and 44.1).\(^12\) It has been proposed that it was Theodosius I. who stopped using crucifixion as a capital punishment,\(^13\) but it seems that it came out of use only in the course of time and was finally substituted by another type of capital punishment by Justianian.\(^14\) So the brutality and humiliation of the crucifixion is still present, as the emphasis on the contrary shows, how John Chrysostom puts it in the text already cited (IX,9):

"No one is ashamed, no one hides his face because he thinks that this is a symbol of an accursed death. [...] The cross is not to be shunned; everyone sees it as something to desire, to love, to seek with all eagerness. It gleams forth on every side, on the walls and roofs of houses, on books, in cities, in villages, in uninhabited places, and in places where men dwell. Now I would gladly ask the pagan how it happens that all men desire and seek with all eagerness this symbol of condemnation and an accursed death. The reason must be the great power of him who was crucified."\(^15\)

Another author who expresses at the same time the shamefulness of the crucifixion is Cyril of Jerusalem (†386). When giving a lecture on the words Crucified and Buried (13,4) he says:

"His Passion then was real: for He was really crucified, and we are not ashamed thereat; he was crucified, and we deny it not, nay, I rather glory to speak of it. For though I should now deny it, here is Golgotha to confute me, near which we are now assembled; the wood of the Cross confutes me, which was afterwards distributed piecemeal from hence to all the world. I confess the Cross, be-

\(^9\) Zestermann, ‘Die Kreuzigung’, pp. 20, 23, 27. Crucifixion is not limited to men, also women can be crucified, cf. ibid., pp. 28-29.
\(^10\) Ibid., p. 17, cites a law which threaten slaves or freedmen who dare to indict their patron with immediate crucifixion. For the Latin text see Girard/Senn, _Les lois des Romains_, pp. 499-501, no 25.
\(^12\) Zestermann, ‘Die Kreuzigung’, p. 19; Nixon/Rodgers, _The Panegyrici Latini_.
cause I know of the Resurrection; for if, after being crucified, He had remained as He was, I had not perchance confessed it, for I might have concealed both it and my Master; but now that the Resurrection has followed the Cross, I am not ashamed to declare it."  

Of course, there are also Christian authors who mitigate Christ’s death at the cross, but both views exist in parallel. Let us now follow the development of the iconography of the crucifixion from its first appearance to the Early Middle Ages.

2 The Iconography of the Crucifixion

An overview of the preserved images of the crucified Christ from the beginning to the sixth century helps to understand the conditions and contexts in which it was used by the men of Late Antiquity. The first visual references to the crucified Jesus can be found in two kinds of monuments in the time about 200 AD: On papyri in the form of the staurogram, and on a gem with the image of the crucified Christ.

2.1 The Earliest Figural Example: The London Gem

The first known figural representation of the crucified Jesus focuses on the atrocity and barbarity of crucifixion. In this gem image in the British Museum in London [Fig. 1], dated about 200 AD, Christ, identified by [KYP]IE ΠΑΤΗΡ ΗΙΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΕ is tied to a T-shape cross. His hands hang down powerlessly. His bearded head is turned to the left. He is nude, and his legs are abducted in a slight angle. This representation corresponds, how I have shown recently, to an ancient method of crucifixion. The image has never been linked to a method of crucifixion which was reconstructed on the basis of a skeleton discovery in an ossuary in Jerusalem, dated to the beginning of the first century AD. The heel of Jehohanan (his name is written on the ossuary) was perforated by a nail long 17 to 18 centimetres, so it was not fixed frontally according to the well known iconographic tradition, but must have been fixed somewhat laterally. The perforation of the heel fixing can be explained by the legs put on each other, or by a splayed position of the legs. The

16 Procatechesis et Catecheses ad illuminandos 12,4. The English translation is taken from Gregory of Nazianus, ed. by Gifford.
18 Since the article of Mrass, ‘Kreuzigung Christi’, twenty years have passed which brought new examples and a different evaluation of others.
latter position explains the seemingly strange position of the legs on the London Gem.

The medical examination of the arms of Jehohanan lets suppose that the convict was bound and not nailed to the cross. Our gem in the British Museum also shows hands hanging down. The binding of the arms to the cross may indicate that the convict had to carry the cross bar to the place of the crucifixion. Although the written sources are not clear in their distinction between the cross bar and the cross as a whole, the T-shape of the cross on the London gem allows the possibility that the cross bar was inserted separately into the vertical element. Medical historians hint to the fact that the way of fixing the arms determined the duration of death struggle. It is clear that there were probably no limits to the arbitrariness and the cruelty of those executing the crucifixion.

There are several texts which indicate that the convict was *de facto* attached nude to the cross, as the London gem shows it. In the gospel according to John (John 19.23-25), it is explicitly reported that Jesus’s clothing was divided by the soldiers in four parts, and that they cast lots about the coat which was without a seam. Casting lots about Jesus’s clothing is also mentioned in Mark 15.24. Another direct testimony provides Artemidor in his ‘Oneirocritica’ (second century). In the context of interpreting the significance when somebody dreams to be crucified, Artemidor explains that it has a positive signification for all seafarers and continues: ‘It is also auspicious for a poor man. For a crucified man is raised high and his substance is sufficient to keep many birds. But it means the betrayal of secrets. For a crucified man can be seen by all. On the other hand, it signifies harm for rich men, since the crucified are stripped naked and lose their flesh.’

Indirectly, the disrobing before the crucifixion is confirmed by two texts from the first and second century, which emphasize that the convicts were crucified with all their precious dressing and jewels. It is clear that the nudity adds to the humiliation and shame of the crucifixion.

The gem thus illustrates vividly the violent and cruel death of Jesus. It shows on its back magical words and belongs to the group of the so-called ‘magic gems’, which are popular and widespread above all in the second and third centuries in the whole Roman Empire. The authenticity of this gem cannot be doubted, because it corresponds in size, material and workmanship to the standards to be found in this group of objects. It is the violent death which makes Jesus interesting for a magical context, because in the magical papyri a special potency is ascribed to men which died by brute force. In order to obtain protection by means of the gem, the crucifixion is clearly recognisable and represented in-depth. Also the material,

---

22 For arguments against see Zestermann, ‘Die Kreuzigung’, p. 40, but see also Dresken-Weiland, ‘Passionsdarstellungen’, pp. 35-36.
23 Also stated by Leclerq, ‘Croix et crucifix’.
25 Zestermann, ‘Die Kreuzigung’, p. 47 hints at Tacitus, hist. 4,3 and Justin 18,7.
the green-brown jasper, is generally used for images which want to protect and help in life after death. The gem corresponds also in this aspect to the rules of the whole group.

We do not know the religious belief of the person who owned this amulet, if he or she was pagan or Christian penchant to magic. The gem was probably worn invisibly below the clothing, so that it could not be seen readily. Obviously, Jesus Christ and his death at the cross were widely known in the ancient world, so that people could get the idea to refer to it in a magical image.

2.2 Other Gems with the Crucified Jesus

Other gems with images of the crucified Christ are of a later date. A gem said to be from Constanza and preserved in the British Museum [Fig. 2], repeats the nudity and the detail of the hanging hands. It shows Christ with the small figures of the twelve apostles, six on either side, and the inscription ΙΧΘΥΣ. A similar iconography shows the so-called Nott gem, known in a plaster impression from the nineteenth century. It is accompanied by the inscription EHC O X-PECT-OC, a variation on the spelling of the name of Jesus Christ, which is not unusual in gems. Below the crucifixion, a sheep is represented, flanked by two letters which probably mean Alpha and Omega.

The iconography of the gems gives indications for their dating. As to the Nott gem, both the sheep and the letters Alpha and Omega occur in fourth-century Christian iconography and give a first chronological indication. ΙΧΘΥΣ is known as a short profession of faith since the second half of the second century and is still used in the sixth century, so it does not help to string the chronological frame. A very rare iconographic detail are the twelve apostles on both gems, which were, as the Gospels note (with the exception of Peter and one other disciple), not present, but had abandoned Christ. The presence of the apostles at the crucifixion occurs in Christian art only on these gems and on a sarcophagus fragment (see below). As Felicity Harley has pointed out, the composition presupposes images of Christ among the apostles. The iconography of the seated Christ among his apostles, also seated, is documented since the time of Constantine, whereas the stand-

---

27 Akrostichon for: Ιησοῦς Χριστός, Ὑστός Υἱός, Σωτήρ.
29 Spier, *Late Antiquite*, p. 74, n. 67.
32 Matthew 26.56; Mark 14.50; Luke 22.54 (for Peter), John 18.15 (Peter and one other disciple).
34 Mara Minasi, ‘Apostoli’, p. 125; see the painting in the catacomb at Via Anapo, which can be dated reliably on the basis of the topographic development of the catacomb: Deckers/Mietke/Weiland, *Die Katakombe*, pp. 55-56, 60.
ing apostles venerating the cross-trophy with the Christogram – which indicates the death of Christ, his resurrection and his victory about death – are a theme in vogue in the later fourth century, particularly on sarcophagi. So a date in the late fourth century, as proposed by Harley, is convincing for these two gems.

Two other gems, a jasper in the British Museum and a haematite one in Berlin, have been identified by Jeffrey Spier as medieval or modern: The body of Christ is given in a slight torsion, which is not documented in antiquity. On a gem in Oxford, Christ is represented frontally at the cross, wearing a long loincloth, accompanied by two figures bearing a spear or a sponge, with the letters Alpha and Omega at either side of his head. It belongs to the sixth or seventh century.

2.3 An Anti-Christian Image: The Graffiti on the Palatine

The crucifixion as an argument to ridicule the Christian faith was the motivation for the person who incised the graffito in the so-called paedagogium on the Palatine hill in Rome, which was, according to the names known from inscriptions, frequented by slaves and freedmen. The exact function of the room has not been determined yet. The other graffiti found in this room belong to the late second and early third century, so that the crucifixion graffiti must have been drawn at the same time.

It shows the crucified with a donkey’s head on a T-shape cross. His feet rest on a cross-piece, and he wears a short robe. To the left, a standing man, also in a short garment, turns towards him and lifts his right hand in a worshipping gesture. The inscription reveals the caricaturing intention of the graffito: ΑΛΕ/ΧΑΜΕΝΟΣ/ΣΕΒΕΤΕ ΘΕΟ (Alexamenos venerates his god). It remains unclear if this mockery refers to the rumour also known in contemporary written sources that Jews and Christians adore a god with a donkey’s head, or if it alludes to the asinity or contrariness attributed generally to donkeys. The crucifixion as the most dreadful and the most ignominious of all punishments is represented in a scoffing image. In its details it should not be taken too seriously, because it is drawn rapidly and with a few lines. It is no surprise that both the crucified and the venerating Alexamenos are dressed in a short tunic, the dress worn by all members of the working population and also by those serving at court.

36 It does, however, not become clear why she prefers a mid fourth-century date for the ‘Nott gem’; Harley, ‘The Constanza Cornelian’, p. 215.
37 Spier, Late Antique, p. 178, no. X 93 (here appear also the Virgin Mary and Saint John, who are typical of a later date); X 94, pl.134.
38 Spier, Late Antique, no. 713.
2.4 A Sarcophagus Fragment in the Museo Pio Cristiano in Rome

An image of the crucifixion can be reconstructed on a fragment from a frieze sarcophagus in the Museo Pio Cristiano in Rome [Fig. 3]. For stylistic reasons, it may be dated in the end of the fourth or in the beginning of the fifth century.

It shows two lines of figures: In the upper line, three apostles clad in tunica and pallium, their traditional dress. They have no beards as it was fashion in the late fourth century and turn to an occurrence to the left. The left apostle has raised his right arm and is pointing a finger at the occurrence; the two figures following him are looking in the same direction. They have put their right hand on their chest. In contrast to other scenes in which the apostles usually grip the pallium with the other hand, here the left hand is invisible. This shows that they have directed their attention to an occurrence which must be extraordinary. For this gesture, no parallel is known in early Christian art. In front of the apostles stand two smaller figures easily identified as soldiers because of their knee-length dress, armour with sword pendant, short cloak held together on one shoulder, and helmets. There was another soldier on the right side as one can deduce from what is left of yet another figure, now broken off, on the left margin one can see some rest of garment which indicates that there was once another figure. In front of the apostles the left soldier uses his left leg as supporting leg and moves his other leg casually to the left. His left hand is holding the scabbard; his right hand is gripping the gladius. Unfortunately his head is missing almost completely. On his upper arm one can see the rest of some relief now broken off; it cannot be part of the gladius. Above his shoulder and in front of the chest of the first apostle on the left there are two remains of supporting parts which sustained the relief as it was worked out. The soldier standing next to him has raised his right arm, arm and hand have broken off, and probably he was holding something whose remains one can see at upper arms height of the first and second apostle. He has turned his head back slightly in order to have a better look at the occurrence; his left arm is lying on the scabbard. The unusual, maybe even minatory of the occurrence can be deduced from the fact that this soldier is taking a wide step to the right and is turning away from it.

Among the iconographical details, the soldier gripping his sword may be compared to a soldier with a similar gesture on a small ivory box in London from the early fifth century [Fig. 4] in the scene of Christ’s Crucifixion. The soldier seems to be checking whether Jesus is dead already as told in the Gospel of John (John 19.33-34). He is depicted on the right margin of the plate. He has bent and raised his right arm; his hand is holding some object, as one can see from the position of

40 Spier, Picturing the Bible, pp. 229-232, no. 57; Kalinowski, Frühchristliche Reliquiare, pp. 173, figs. 154, 229-232.
41 ‘But when they came to Jesus and saw that he was already dead, they did not break his legs. But one of the soldiers pierced his side with a spear, and at once there came out blood and water.’
his fingers. To the left of his hand a little fragment of a dagger or gladius is preserved. Under Christ’s right upper arm there is a round support that has been left as a stabilising element under the blade during the manufacture of the relief. If one draws a line from the soldier’s hand to Christ’s torso, one can see a dark dent beneath Christ’s chest marking the place where blood and water came out. Our sarcophagus fragment in the Museo Pio Cristiano probably depicts the very moment when the soldier pulls out his sword in order to pierce Jesus’s side, because the soldier has just drawn his sword; or it depicts the moment right after he has pierced Jesus’s side, as he is lowering his outstretched arm. The second soldier to the right with his wide step turning to the right side resembles the depiction of the soldier on the little ivory box.

Interestingly, on the little ivory box as well as on the sarcophagus fragment, some kind of sword and not a spear as in the Gospel of John (and on later monuments) was depicted or can be reconstructed. In contrast to the London ivory, on our sarcophagus fragment the emotional involvement of the spectators is emphasized: The first apostle points to the cross, whereas the second soldier is about to run away from the dead Christ. It shows more interest in the psychology of the assisting persons and possible reactions than the London ivory does.

Given the fragmentary character of the scene, it is probable that other Passion images and the resurrection – Christ among the apostles or the women at the tomb – were represented on the sarcophagus. As sarcophagi were very frequently positioned in mausolea or even buried in earth, this crucifixion was probably only seen by a limited audience.

2.5 Other Images or Texts Referring to the Crucifixion in the fifth and sixth Centuries

In the beginning of the fifth century, images of the crucifixion enter the public sphere. The well-known wooden door of Santa Sabina, dated between 431 and 433, shows the crucified Christ between the two felons in the context of a Passion cycle.

The interest in the crucifixion as an image is documented by the titulus no. 42 in the ‘Dittochaeum’, or the later Latin title ‘Tituli historiarum’, written by Prudentius, the most important Christian poet in Late Antiquity. Tituli are a poetic genre which, like the ecphrasis, does not need the existence of real images. The ‘Dittochaeum’ was composed about 400 AD and contains 48 hexametric quatrains in total: 24 refer to scenes and places of the Old Testament and 24 to themes of the New Testament. Although it has been assumed that these quatrains served as cap-

---

42 See for examples a sarcophagus with Passion scenes in Arles: Christern-Briesenick, Reptorium, pp. 29-31, pl. 42,5.
43 Jeremias, Die Holztür, pp. 60-63, pl. 52.
tions in a basilica, Prudentius’s tituli were not meant as a wall decoration. It is impossible to place 48 images with tituli in one early Christian basilica. T. Lehman has demonstrated that the clerestory of an early Christian basilica is not large and high enough to house such a pictorial cycle, which means that there would be two images one upon the other, and two associated quatrains which should be legible. Thus Prudentius does not describe real images, but spiritual images, which aim at veneration and meditation. Because of their brevity and vividness, they are particularly memorable:

‘Pierced through either side, Christ gives forth water and blood. The blood is victory, the water baptism. At this time two robbers on crosses close by on either hand are at variance; the one denies God, the other wins the crown.’

Nonetheless, the crucifixion as a public image remains problematic. In the ecphrasis of the church of Saint Sergius in Gaza, written by Chorikius of Gaza before 536 AD in honour of bishop Markianus, probably in occasion of the dedication of the church, Chorikius describes scenes from the New Testament beginning with the annunciation and ending with the ascension of Christ. The crucifixion is not mentioned explicitly, although it must have been represented: ‘After making much mock of him – or rather, of themselves, since no insult can touch God – they have finally consigned him to the vilest of all deaths, between a pair of thieves.’ The text suggests an iconography like the wooden door of S. Sabina. Chorikius’s discomfort toward the images of the mocking and the crucifixion cannot be overlooked.

Other passion cycles avoid the depiction of the crucifixion. In the passion cycle of S. Apollinare in Ravenna, made about 500 AD, the crucifixion is not represented. The concepts of Christ’s divinity and his victory about death cause the abandonment of the image of crucifixion. In these passion scenes, Christ generally is taller than the other figures; he wears royal garment. He prays without fear of his imminent cruel and painful death at Gethsemane, he stands poised before the high priests and is conducted accompanied by a procession towards the high priests and to the crucifixion. The last passion scene is Christ’s way towards being crucified, and his resurrection is represented with the women at the tomb, Christ

---

44 Gnilka, ‘Zur Frage der Verfasserschaft’, p. 125, n. 20 refers to Bernt, Das lateinische Epigramm, pp. 71-72 who has already pointed out their literary and artificial character.
47 Laudatio Marciani I, 75, see the translation by Hamilton, ‘Two churches’, p. 187.
48 Cf. Jeremias, Die Holztafel, pl. 52.
and two followers walking to Emmaus, and Christ appearing to incredulous Thomas and the apostles.\textsuperscript{50}

When representing the crucifixion, different iconographic formulae appear on ‘public’ visible monuments. On the ciborium columns of Saint Mark in Venice, probably produced in the sixth century in Constantinople, in the scene of the crucifixion it is not the figure of Christ which we find at the cross, but his symbol, the \textit{agnus dei}. It is accompanied by the two felons, clad with a loincloth, the busts of sun and moon which give the cosmic context, and by the two soldiers who cast lots.\textsuperscript{51}

In contrast to the early fifth-century representations of the crucified Christ on the ivory plate in London and on the wooden door of S. Sabina in Rome, where Christ wears a loincloth, on the later images he is vested with a long garment. This is the case on a bronze cross in the collection C.S. in Munich, dated to the sixth-seventh centuries and attributed to the eastern Mediterranean,\textsuperscript{52} where Christ appears between the felons. The small dimensions of the cross and the inscriptions indicate that it had been donated as a votive and let suppose that it was used in a rather private context of devotion and prayer. Other monuments belonging to the sphere of liturgy, the Rabbula gospels from 586 (fol. 13\textsuperscript{a})\textsuperscript{53} and the wooden reliquary from the Sancta Sanctorum in Rome (sixth century)\textsuperscript{54} also show the same long garment. On both, the available space offers further persons present and embeds the scene in a landscape.

2.6 Images of the Cross and the Crucifixion in Pilgrimage Art

Christ’s body at the cross appears more frequently in the context of a cycle of images of scenes from the life of Christ, beginning with the annunciation and ending with the women at the tomb. This cycle occurs often on pilgrimage art,\textsuperscript{55} on objects with images from places visited by pilgrims in Palestine which they brought home as ‘blessings’. An important group among this pilgrimage art are the pilgrimage ampullae, most of them preserved in Monza and Bobbio, some other examples scattered in other places. The pilgrimage flasks bear inscriptions which refer (among the more general term \textit{eulogia}) to the ‘Oil from the wood of the life from the holy places of Christ’, which the pilgrims take with them. They are generally attributed to the sixth century, but there are no iconographic arguments which exclude an older origin already in the fifth century.\textsuperscript{56} Given the flourishing pilgrim-
age in Jerusalem and in the holy sites of Palestine, it is highly probable that an ade-
quately container for the blessings was already created in the fifth century.

As to the crucifixion scenes, more often the bust of Christ on or above the
cross is represented than his body.\(^57\) When Christ is represented in full figure, he is
clad in a long tunic and accompanied by the two felons, as show a few pilgrimage
ampullae.\(^58\) The same iconography can also be found on some amulets [Fig. 5]\(^59\)
and on one pilgrim token.\(^60\) Significantly, also in this fairly numerous group of
pilgrim tokens made of clay, only one token with a crucifixion scene is known.\(^61\)

Images from the life of Christ, inspired by this ‘Palestine’ cycle, but surely pro-
duced in other places, occur on jewellery of different qualities. They can be found
for example on marriage rings, whose destination for this purpose is expressed by
the wish OMONUA on the bezel. As Gary Vikan has pointed out, scenes from the
life of Christ in Palestine were connected with ideas of protection and salvation,
particularly aiming at healthiness, which meant for a couple in particular the wish
for healthy descendants.\(^62\) Also here, the full figure of Christ at the cross, clad in a
long garment, is documented on gold rings in Baltimore, London [Fig. 6], Wash-
ington and Palermo, dated to the sixth–seventh centuries.\(^63\) On other contemporary
jewellery the bust of Christ above the cross can also be found.\(^64\)

Generally speaking, it is the context of pilgrimage which makes the crucifixion
– with a bust of Christ or his body – a more frequent theme in early Christian art.
It is important to bear in mind that these ornaments with scenes of the life of
Christ had an amuletic function, which hints back to the first known representa-
tion of the crucifixion cited above.

2.7 A Painted Crucifixion in Gaul

The clothing of Christ with a long tunic, which seems to be the rule on representa-
tions of the figure of Christ at the cross, explains why in Gaul, the ‘nudity’ of

\(^57\) Engemann, ‘Pilgerampullen’, p. 163.
\(^58\) In Monza and Bobbio: Grabar, *Ampoules de terre sainte*, no. 12, pl. 22; no. 13, pl. 24; in the collection
C.S. in Munich: Engemann, ‘Pilgerampullen’, pp. 134–135, pl. 6a; in Cleveland: ibid., pp. 157–158,
pl. 7e.
\(^59\) Paris, Cabinet des Médailles: ibid., p. 163; fig. ‘Pilgerampullen’, p. 163 pl. 6e; in Thessaloniki,
\(^60\) Vikan, ‘Two Unpublished Pilgrim Tokens’, pp. 341, 345, pl. 197, fig. 2.
\(^61\) Ibid., p. 345.
\(^63\) Baltimore: Vikan, ‘Early Byzantine Pilgrimage Devotionalia’, p. 380, pl. 51a; p. 387; Washington,
Dumbarton Oaks: Vikan, ‘Ring’, p. 496; London: Tait, *Seven Thousand Years*, p. 236, fig. 606. See the
graphic rendering in Vikan, ‘Art, medicine and Magic’, p. 65, figs. 25, 83; Palermo: see the graphic
\(^64\) See for example an amuletic armband in the Museum of Art and Archaeology in Missouri, Vikan,
*Early Byzantine Pilgrimage art*, p. 67, fig. 45; from the collection de Béarn: Vikan, ‘Two Byzantine Amu-
letic Armbands’, p. 41, no. 18; p. 47, fig. 7; two nearly identical armbands in Cairo: ibid., p. 40, no. 7;
p. 40, no. 8; p. 48, fig. 9.
Christ, although girded with a linen, is a strange element. In his ‘Glory of the martyrs’ Gregory of Tours (†594) reports an image which showed the crucified Christ, girded with a sheet:65

‘At Narbonne in the principal cathedral which rejoices to have relics of the martyr St Genesius, there is a picture which shows our Lord on the cross, girded as it were with a linen (loincloth). This picture was constantly observed by the congregation. But a terrifying person appears to the priest Basileus in a vision and said: “All of you are clothed in various garments, but you see me always naked. Come now, as quickly as possible cover me with a curtain!” But the priest did not understand the vision, and when the day came he remembered nothing at all. Again the man appeared to him; but the priest did not think it was important. Three days after the second vision the man [appeared again] struck [the priest] with heavy blows and said; “Did I not tell you to cover me with a curtain, so that I would not be seen naked? But none of this has been done by you. Come now”, he said, “and cover with a line cloth the picture in which I appear on the cross; otherwise a quick death might befall you.” The priest was upset and very afraid, and mentioned the vision to his bishop, who immediately ordered a curtain to be hung over. And the picture is now on display but covered in this way. Even if it is briefly exposed for viewing, soon it is concealed by the lowered curtain, lest it be seen uncovered.’

Unfortunately, due to the impreciseness of the text, the church can neither be localized nor dated.66 Nonetheless the story gives us some information. The painting is not new, but exists since a longer period of time, and it was not located in a central position in the church, otherwise the priest would have known. Of course, the story illustrates that the priest was not interested in art at all, and that the crucifixion was no central image for a sixth century beholder. Against the background of the iconography of the preserved monuments, the painting may have been made in the fifth century, when examples for this ‘nude’ Christ in a loincloth are known. Let us resume the iconography of the crucifixion in a synopsis to see its development.

---

65 I, 22. Gregory of Tours, Glory of the Martyrs, p. 41, no. 22. See also Viellard-Troiekouroff, Les monuments, p. 185 with further reading.
66 Baral y Altet, Topographie, p. 22.
Synopsis: The crucifixion of Christ in images and texts in chronological order from ca. 200 AD until the sixth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of monument</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>context</th>
<th>dating</th>
<th>remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London, gem</td>
<td>Christ crucified, nude</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>About 200 AD</td>
<td>‘magical’ gem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome, graffito</td>
<td>Christ wearing a tunic, with a donkey’s head</td>
<td>A person in a tunic, venerating Christ</td>
<td>Third century</td>
<td>anti-Christian image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, gem</td>
<td>Christ wearing a tunic</td>
<td>12 apostles</td>
<td>Fourth century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Nott’ gem</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>12 apostles, sheep, alpha and omega</td>
<td>Fourth century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome, sarcophagus fragment</td>
<td>Figure of Christ not preserved</td>
<td>Two soldiers, apostles</td>
<td>Late Fourth century</td>
<td>Part of a passion cycle?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, ivory box</td>
<td>Christ wearing a loincloth</td>
<td>On the left, Judas hanging at a tree; a veiled woman and Peter; on the right a soldier with a weapon verifying whether Jesus is dead</td>
<td>420-430 AD</td>
<td>Part of a passion cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome, S. Sabina, wooden door</td>
<td>Christ wearing a loincloth</td>
<td>The two thieves, in the background a city silhouette</td>
<td>431-433 AD</td>
<td>Part of a passion cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual: Prudentius, Dittochaeum, no. 42</td>
<td>Christ, crucified, pierced at either side</td>
<td>The two felons</td>
<td>Ca. 400 AD</td>
<td>Part of a passion cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual: Chorikios of Gaza, Ekphrasis</td>
<td>Christ, crucified</td>
<td>The two felons</td>
<td>Before 536 AD</td>
<td>Part of a passion cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilgrimage ampullae in Monza, Bobbio, Munich, Cleveland</td>
<td>Christ wearing a long garment</td>
<td>The two felons</td>
<td>Fifth-sixth century (?)</td>
<td>Scenes of the life of Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Artifact</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date/Period</td>
<td>Scenes of the Life of Christ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amulets in Paris, Stuttgart, Thessaloniki</td>
<td>Christ wearing a long garment, the two felons, sitting or kneeling persons near the cross</td>
<td>Fifth-seventh century (?)</td>
<td>Scenes of the life of Christ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athen, pilgrim token</td>
<td>Christ wearing a long garment</td>
<td>450-600 AD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Washington, London, Palermo, marriage ring</td>
<td>Christ wearing a long garment, the two felons, sitting or kneeling persons near the cross</td>
<td>Sixth-seventh century</td>
<td>Scenes of the life of Christ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual: Narbonne, cathedral, Gregory of Tours, Glory of the Martyrs I,22 – now lost</td>
<td>Christ wearing a loincloth</td>
<td>Fifth-sixth century, before 594 AD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence, Rabula gospels</td>
<td>Christ wearing a long garment</td>
<td>586 AD</td>
<td>Scenes of the Life of Christ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome, reliquary box</td>
<td>Christ wearing a long garment</td>
<td>Sixth century</td>
<td>Scenes of the life of Christ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
left Mary and John; on the right three Women. At either side above the cross sol and luna.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, gem</td>
<td>Christ, with a cross-nimbus, wearing a long robe, crucified</td>
<td>Sixth-seventh century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich, bronze cross</td>
<td>Christ wearing a long garment</td>
<td>Fifth-sixth century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This overview makes the following aspects clear: Although single images of the crucifixion exist, the crucifixion of Christ is frequently part of passion scenes or of a cycle of the life of Christ. Obviously, the context of the cycle of Christ’s life or of passion scenes eclipses the shamefulness of the crucifixion. Pilgrimage, which led the pious to all places of Christ’s life, will also have played its part to make the crucifixion a ‘normal’ image. The presence of the crucifixion on pilgrimage ampullae, jewellery and amulets (the use of the latter with Christian scenes must have been widespread, how the criticism for example of Severus from Antioch (456-538) indicates)\(^{67}\) shows that it has arrived in everyday life.

3 Relics of the Holy Cross

There is another factor which very probably had influence on the development of iconography which has not yet been mentioned: the relics of the Holy Cross. Remarkably, relics of the cross are intensively documented in the fourth century. Cyril of Jerusalem, who has already been mentioned, repeats also in catechesises directed to the candidates for baptism, probably delivered in 348, that the relics respectively fragments of the wood of the cross are distributed in the whole world.\(^{68}\)

---

\(^{67}\) See the French translation of the Syriac text of hom. 120: Bière, *Les homiliae cathedrales de Sévère d’Antioche*, pp. 78-79.

\(^{68}\) Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus, *Tu En Agios Patros*, Catech. 4.10; 10.19; 13.4.
The presence of relics of the cross in less important places towards the middle of the fourth century is confirmed by inscriptions in Kherbet Oum el Ahdam near Sétil and in Rusguniae\(^69\) (Algeria). Macrina, the sister of Gregory of Nyssa, who died after an ascetic life in 379, wore around her neck ‘the representation of a cross of iron and a ring of the same material’, both marked with an incised cross: ‘The ring is hollow in the hoop, and in it has been hidden a particle of the Cross of Life’\(^70\). Chrysostom gives information on similar objects (X, 4): ‘... many people, both men and women, take a small piece of that cross, encase it in gold, and adorn themselves by hanging around their necks’.\(^71\) Whereas a well-to-do audience in Constantinople uses the relic as a luxury item, the saint ascetic uses iron to contain the relic. With the passage by Chrysostom written between 380 and 390 AD, we arrive at the end of the fourth century. The veneration of relics of the cross described by Egeria in the 380s may also be recorded in this context.\(^72\) A famous testimonial delivers the letter 31 of Paulinus of Nola, written in the spring of 403, when he sends to Sulpicius Severus a fragment of the cross which had been brought to him from Jerusalem.\(^73\)

The presence of relics and their wide circulation (of which here are cited as places with relics only Jerusalem, Constantinople, Cappadocia, North Africa and Italy) predate the diffusion of the iconography of the crucifixion in monumental art and as part of cycles. It is plausible to suppose that the relics of the cross and their veneration, together with pilgrimage becoming more and more attractive, are the background which stimulates interest to represent Christ’s ignoble death at the cross and also the passion scenes and the resurrection.

\(^70\) Vita Macrinae 27; the English translation is taken from Lowther Clarke, *Gregory of Nyssa*. For the sign of the cross on the ring see Dinkler/Dinkler von Schubert, ‘Kreuz I’, pp. 196-197.
\(^72\) Itinerary 37,1-3. For the dating see Aetheria, *Itinerarium*, pp. 21-29.
\(^73\) For the dating see Paulinus von Nola, *Epistulae*, p. 79.
Fig. 1: London, British Museum, inv. no. M&LA 1986,5-1,1. Bloodstone gem, the Crucifixion, c. 200 (photo © The trustees of the British Museum).

Fig. 2: London, British Museum, inv. no. M&LA 95,11-13,1. Cornelian gemstone, the Crucifixion, fourth century (photo © The trustees of the British Museum).
Fig. 1: London, British Museum, inv. no. M&LA 1986,5-1,1. Bloodstone gem, the Crucifixion, c. 200 (photo © The trustees of the British Museum).

Fig. 2: London, British Museum, inv. no. M&LA 95,11-13,1. Cornelian gemstone, the Crucifixion, fourth century (photo © The trustees of the British Museum).

Fig. 3: Vatican, Vatican Museum, Museo Pio Cristiano, inv. no. 31530. Fragment of a frieze sarcophagus, soldiers and apostles from a Crucifixion scene, end of the fourth century (photo © Vatican Museums).

Fig. 4: London, British Museum, inv. no. 1856,0623.5. Ivory casket, the Crucifixion, c. 420-430 (photo © The trustees of the British Museum).
Fig. 5: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France. Amulet, the Crucifixion and the Women at the Tomb, fifth/sixth century (photo © Gary Vikan).

Fig. 6: London, British Museum, inv. no. AF.231. A Byzantine marriage ring, showing Christ and Mary blessing the couple on the bezel, and a cycle of the Life of Christ (the Annunciation, Visitation, Presentation at the Temple, Adoration of the Magi, Crucifixion, and the Angel of the Tomb) on the Hoop, sixth/seventh century (photo © Gary Vikan).
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The Tomb Aedicule of Narbonne and its Significance within the Theological Debates of Fifth Century Gaul

Shimrit Shriki-Hilber *

Abstract

The holy tomb aedicule of Narbonne marks the beginning of the phenomenon that emerged in the fifth century whereby the sacred sites of the Holy Land were represented in various parts of Europe. The article addresses the provenance of the tomb aedicule, clarifying inconsistent assumptions by previous research. It explores the historical circumstances, events, and patterns in theological thought which might have led to the construction of such a representation, including the political struggles between Gaul and Rome, Arianism, the contemporary liturgy in Gaul as well as the theological debate on pilgrimage. A special focus lies on the relations between Gaul and the Holy Land at the time.

* Shimrit Shriki-Hilber is a PhD student at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Her research interests include architectural translations of Jerusalem in Germany and Austria, memory and commemoration and contemporary Christian art. Her Master thesis (2013) dealt with the tomb aedicule of Narbonne and was written within the scope of the research project ‘Spectrum: Visual Translations of Jerusalem in Europe’. This article is published with the support of the European Research Council under the European Union’s Seventh Framework Program (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement no. 249466.
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1 Introduction
In 1639, parts of the fortification surrounding the city of Narbonne in Southern France were disassembled, including a defence tower known as la Tour mauresque, the Moorish tower. The works revealed stone objects which had been in secondary use as spolia in the structure of the tower, among them two parts of an aedicule, originally carved out of a solid piece of rock [Fig. 1-4]. The aedicule was placed in the garden of the archdiocese and, sometime before 1847, was moved to the Musée lapidaire de Narbonne, the former church of Notre Dame de Lamourguier. Today it is exhibited in the Musée archéologique de Narbonne.

The aedicule measures 119 cm in height, 114 cm in depth and 91 cm in width. Although damaged and split horizontally in half, its architectural components are recognisable. It comprises a rectangular ante-chamber, defined by four columns in the Corinthian style, and a polygonal inner chamber with a central plan, covered by a dome. These two parts are connected by a small opening in a concave wall. The opening is crowned by a conch. The space between each two lateral columns was originally occupied by grills, and their remains are still discernible. On top of the one remaining capital rests an architrave, decorated with geometric engravings of a small rectangle within a larger one. A view from the ante-chamber towards the inner chamber is enabled by a small aperture, whose upper part is now broken. To the right of the opening is a bench of solid rock. The (incomplete) octagonal inner chamber is surrounded by columns in the Corinthian style. Their bases and capitals are preserved, and there are some remainders of the shafts as well. The walling between the columns is now partially broken. On the capitals surrounding the inner chamber rests an architrave topped by a conical dome decorated with eight symmetrically engraved stripes, which start at the top and run downward to the rim. The apex of the roof contains an opening.

Since its discovery, the aedicule has attracted the attention of first local and later also international scholars, who sought explanations for the mysterious artefact:

1 Antiquités romaines, ed. by Bousquet, p. 81. At that time, during the Thirty Years’ War, the Spanish Habsburgs threatened to conquer Narbonne, making it necessary to reinforce its fortifications. Cf. Dellong/Moulis/Mireille, Quand la ville, p. 19. It stands to reason that the stone fragments were found during these renovations. The text claims that it was Saracen Arabs then occupying the city who built those fortifications – but this statement is largely disregarded in later research. For this information, I am grateful to Dominique Moulis, from the Service Culture et Patrimoine in Narbonne.
2 Tournal, Description, p. 455.
3 Today the column shafts are mostly lost, but the bases and one remaining capital are well preserved.
As no written sources exist to shed light on the date of its creation or patron, there was much room for speculation regarding its function. The fact that it was displaced from its original location and used as spolia only adds to the enigma. Based on comparisons with the representations of the tomb on sixth century ampullas from the collections of Monza and Bobbio, as well as on the stylistic analysis, modern research dates the aedicule to the fifth century and identifies it as the earliest three-dimensional representation of Christ’s Holy Tomb aedicule in Jerusalem.4 The Narbonne tomb aedicule is a non-figurative sculpture, highly reminiscent of the Holy Tomb in Jerusalem, as described in textual sources5. It was carved from a monolithic rock and the relation to the architectural iconography of the Holy Tomb is further evident in the combination of a central and a rectangular plan.

The first documentation of the aedicule appeared shortly after its discovery in several manuscripts, published by local archaeologists, engineers and religious figures.6 By the second half of the twentieth century, a solid connection had been established between the artefact and the Holy Tomb aedicule in Jerusalem, as a copy and the original, respectively. Since then, scholars have regularly used the copy in an attempt to reconstruct the architectural history of the Tomb aedicule in its earliest Constantinian form.7

Modern research has almost entirely been preoccupied with finding proof that the Narbonne tomb aedicule is a representation of the Jerusalem Holy Tomb aedicule, while important questions as to historical reasons for the building of such an object have been largely set aside. Furthermore, studies that examined the history of the Jerusalem Tomb, and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at large, mention the Narbonne aedicule as a mere illustration for the first stage in the development of these monuments, and fail to apply a wider interdisciplinary approach

5 Mark, 15.46; Heidenheimer Nonne, Hodoeporicon S. Willibaldi, pp. 38-39; Placentinus Antoninus, Cod. Sang. 133, p. 622; cf. Antonini Placentini Itinerarium, ed. by Gildemeister
6 Antiquités romaines, ed. by Bousquet, p. 81; Débris d’anciens monuments, ed. by l’Estagnol, p. 78; Piquet, L’histoire de Narbonne, p. 58. These manuscripts describe the numerous lapidary findings in the city of Narbonne and present initial information and interpretation by the contemporaries. Some of the authors of these manuscripts are briefly mentioned in modern research. An analysis of these manuscripts’ content regarding the aedicule can be found in Shriki, ‘The Tomb’. The aedicule is presented as a product of ancient Rome, used for pagan rituals or for the cult of the Emperor. The manuscripts further suggest that the aedicule functioned as a tabernacle in a temple: of Jupiter, of the god of wind (erected by Augustus), or of Augustus himself. Some antiquarians assumed that the purpose of the opening at the front of the aedicule was to transmit prophecies.
7 Cf. Dieterich, ‘Anastasis-Rotunde’, pp. 7-29; Biddle, The Tomb, pp. 21-52; Ousterhout, ‘The Temple’, pp. 44-53; Egeria’s Travels, trans. by Wilkinson, pp. 249-252; Wilkinson, ‘The Tomb’, pp. 83-97; Lauffray, ‘La Memoria’, pp. 208-217; Bonnery, ‘L’édicule’, pp. 7-42. An intriguing aspect of this tendency in research is to assign the role of the original to the copy and vice versa, through framing the Narbonne aedicule as visual evidence to the original form of the Constantinian Tomb aedicule. Thus, the Narbonne aedicule, a representation of the Holy Tomb, came to be used as the ante-type in an attempt to reconstruct the original.
which is necessary to shed light on and fully appreciate this unique object. Likewise, studies on other representations of Jerusalem in Europe usually gloss over the Narbonne aedicule, mentioning it *en passant* as the earliest known manifestation of phenomenon. To address the above lacuna in modern research, the present paper explores the historical circumstances, events, and patterns in theological thought which might have led to the construction of such a representation of the Jerusalem Holy Tomb aedicule in the fifth century Narbonne, focusing on the relations between Gaul and the Holy Land at the time.

2 Assumptions Regarding the History of the Narbonne Tomb Aedicule

Researchers widely disagree regarding the dating of the Moorish tower, in which the aedicule was found, and consequently the *terminus ante quem* of the aedicule itself. Some contend that the tower was constructed during the 38 year long Arab rule over Narbonne. This claim has been reiterated in more recent studies as well, in spite of a lack of evidence to support it other than the label *la Tour mauresque*. Others argue that the tower was erected only in the thirteenth century, its name notwithstanding. Yet others maintain that the tower was built no later than the eleventh century, a hypothesis supported by five charters which mention the existence of a Moorish tower in the city, four from 1066 and one dated prior to 1050. The attribution of the tower to the Moors is likely a popular myth based on

---

8 Medieval architectural copies in general, and those of the Holy Sepulchre in particular, are usually judged by the modern viewer as inaccurate. This is attributable to the contemporaries’ lack of interest in producing an exact copy: the aim was to represent the idea in more general terms. Cf. Krautheimer, ‘Introduction’, pp. 1-33 (pp. 2 and 6). The ‘detailed’ execution of the Narbonne tomb aedicule have often led scholars to see it as a highly ‘accurate’ representation of the Constantinian aedicule, which it need not be, by any means.

9 Between 713 and 720 Narbonne and the surrounding area came under Muslim control. Arabs occupied Narbonne (*Arbuna*) until its siege by Pepin the Short in 759. Cf. Riess, *Narbonne*, p. 3.

10 An example for this can be found in an article published in 1996 by Liselotte Kötzsche. She writes that the aedicule was found in 1636 during the dismantling of a defence tower, the latter related to the Moorish rule over Narbonne in the first half of the eighth century. Cf. Kötzsche, ‘Das Heilige Grab’, p. 65; Morris, *The Sepulchre*, pp. 63-64; Rey, ‘La Memoria’, p. 22.


12 Cf. *Histoire générale*, ed. by Dulaurier/Mabille/Molinier. These references are included in a collection of charters commissioned in the early eighteenth century and revised in 1875. From these documents, it appears that the Moorish tower was part of the city fortifications. The tower was located between the properties contested by the archbishop and the viscount, in proximity to the Porte Aiguëre/Porta Aquaria and the bridge over the river Aude, called *pons vetus* or *pons civitatis*. A document from c. 1066, pertaining to an agreement between Viscount Raymond of Saint-Gilles and Wilfred, the Archbishop of Narbonne, states: ‘And he agreed the above-mentioned Raymond to the aforesaid Guifredus [Wilfred] that he would give him back the very walls, and those towers, and those fortifications which are in the city of Narbonne from the Quadrata tower, which is near the Porta Regia unto the tower which is called the Mauritca.’ [*Et convenit praedictus Raimundus ad praedictum Guifredum, quad
epic poems recorded in the early thirteenth century, among them Chansons de Gestes of Aymeri de Narbonne, which describe the topography of the area and the construction of the tower by the Saracens.

The close proximity between the Tour mauresque and the Narbonne cathedral suggests that the tomb aedicule might have once belonged to that church. By the time the Arian Visigoths arrived in Narbonne, the city had already had eight places of Christian worship, six outside the Gallo-Roman fortifications and two inside the city, forming an extensive Christian urban topography. The first cathedral was built, in the fourth century, within the city walls, at the south-west corner, over the foundations of a simple third-century oratory. Subsequently, the cathedral was partly destroyed and then replaced, in the fifth century, by a new structure under the patronage of Bishop Rusticus (427-461). Rusticus commemorated his role in the reconstruction of the cathedral with an inscription on the cornice of its lintel – which, together with a column base engraved with the year of Rusticus’s episcopate, was found during the seventh century in the Cour de la Madeleine (palais vieux). The inscription states that the construction of the cathedral was completed on November 29, 445. Its foundations, forming a square, had been laid on Octo-

redat ei ipsos muros, & ipsas turres, & ipsas fortezias quae sunt in Narbona civitate de ipsa turre Quadrata, quae est juxta Portam Regiam, usque ad turrem quae appellatur Maurisca] (author’s translation) Cf. Histoire générale, ed. by Dulaurier/Mabille/Molinier, p. 535.


14 Cf. Demaison, Aymeri de Narbonne, pp. 163-164.

15 Sigal suggests that the tomb aedicule once stood in the crypt of the cathedral erected by Bishop Rusticus, cf. Sigal, ‘Un reliquaire’, p. 106. Following Sigal, Rey unequivocally determines that the tomb aedicule had a function in the Narbonne cathedral, cf. Rey, ‘La Memoria’, p. 23. Wilkinson mistakenly states that the Tour mauresque was built on the site of a basilica which had been founded by Bishop Rusticus in the fifth century, and that therefore it is possible that it had once belonged to the basilica, cf. Egeria’s Travels, trans. by Wilkinson, p. 249.

16 In 732, Rusticus’s cathedral was dedicated to Spanish martyrs St Justus and St Pastor. Between 886 and 890, on the initiative of Archbishop Théodard, the cathedral, which by that time was in poor condition, was restored and transformed. With time, this church again fell into disrepair, so in 1272 began the building of a new cathedral, in the Gothic style. The choir was completed in 1332, but the rest of the church remains unfinished until this day, cf. Caille, Medieval Narbonne, pp. 36-38. Rusticus was also responsible for the construction of two other churches in the city: the church dedicated to St Felix of Gerone, consecrated in 456, and probably also St Marie Major, dedicated to the virgin. Furthermore, attributed to the benefaction of Rusticus is also a marble table altar from 456, today in the church of Minerve, cf. Dellong/Moulis, Narbonne, p. 423. Rusticus himself was buried, in 461, in the church of St Vincent (later St Loup) in Narbonne, cf. Caille, Medieval Narbonne, p. 36.

17 The inscription on the column’s base reads [AN]NO XVII EPISCP[O][P]A[RI]STICI ANNI DIE CCLXVI KL IVL (The seventeenth year of Rusticus’s episcopate, the 266th day of that year on the calends of July [July 1, 444] (translation by the author)). Cf. Dellong/Moulis, Narbonne, p. 417.


19 Dellong/Moulis, Narbonne, p. 423. The text discloses that the new church was built because the old one had been destroyed by a fire. The debris was cleared on October 13, 441 under the supervision of Presbyter Ursus and Deacon Hermes. Engraved in the lower part of the lintel is the genealogy of Rusticus’s family, as well as the ecclesiastical positions he held over time. Rusticus was the son of Bishop Bonosus and nephew of Bishop Arator. In Marseille he was a monastic colleague and presby-
ber 9, 442, the anniversary of Rusticus’s ordination, according to the same inscription. The apse was completed under the supervision of sub-deacon Montanus, and the church was dedicated to Saint Genesius of Arles.20

The church Rusticus built is commonly believed to be of a basilica type, since this was a common style in early Christianity, but no archeological excavations have ever been undertaken to prove this conjecture. However, the phrase *quadrata in fundamentis ponit coepit*21, which is part of the inscription on the lintel, might point to a church with a central plan.22 This is, for example, the case in Bishop Willibald of Eichstätt’s (700-787) description of the Jerusalem Holy Tomb as *quadrans in imo et in sumo subtilis*.23 Similarly, in referring to the structure of the Dome of the Rock, the crusader historian Bernardus Thesaurarius writes that the *Templum Domini* is *octo quadraturis et totidem angulis fabricatum*.24 Furthermore, during the Middle Ages, the term *quadrans* was often used as a synonym for perfect or complete, which could allude to the harmonic form of a central plan.

Research has tended to define the function of the tomb aedicule as an altar or a reliquary. The supposition that it was used as a portable reliquary is highly implausible,25 as the structure is much too heavy to be carried on a sledge.26 Moreover, despite its weight, the object is very fragile, which in all probability precluded it being carried from place to place. This circumstance also militates against the assumption that the Narbonne tomb aedicule was produced in Jerusalem.27

It stands to reason, however, that the Narbonne tomb aedicule emulates the reliquary function of the Jerusalem Holy Tomb aedicule. Some authors believe that the aedicule might have been used as a marble container for the relics of the new Narbonne cathedral. Visitors would have been able to view the relics through the grill28 or even touch them if the rear panel was open. There are also conjectures

ter of Venerius, the future bishop of that city. The lintel also functions as a wall of trustees, where the names of the benefactors are engraved in stone, among them Venerius, other bishops, and Marcellus, the praetorian prefect who motivated Rusticus to build a new cathedral.

21 Dellong/Moulis, *Narbonne*, p. 422.
26 In a rough calculation, the tomb aedicule weighed approximately one ton.
27 Morris’s argument is based in his observation that the Narbonne tomb aedicule is an accurate copy of the original structure in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, he himself discards this claim because the tomb aedicule is carved from the local Pyrenean marble, cf. Morris, *The Sepulchre*, p. 63.
28 Sigal, ‘Un reliquaire’. In the last chapter of his book, Sigal argues that the aedicule served as a container for relics: first as a *loculus*, a recess containing and protecting the relic cases, and later positioned in an open space in front of the *loculus*, forming a kind of cubicle in which the faithful deposited the *sanctuaria*, *linteamina*, and *brandea* – cloths or objects that touched or almost touched the shrine of the relics and which were then displayed for public veneration. The grill made it possible for the faithful to see but not touch the relics.
that the rectangular engraving in the floor of the vestibule served to channel oil, water or other liquids, which were subsequently collected in flasks, as they were believed to have gained holiness upon coming in contact with the relics.

The conception of the Narbonne tomb aedicule must have been the result of a detailed account, maybe even a drawing, which reached the area. Known precedents, as well as the form and the iconography of the aedicule suggest that the motivation behind its building might have involved the arrival of a relic, possibly even a fragment of the True Cross. In all probability, the person who initiated the project sought to emulate not only the external form of the Holy Tomb but also its liturgical function and conceptual significance.

It is plausible that pilgrims and other travellers from the West who had visited the holy places wished to share their spiritual experiences with other members of their congregations at home. To this end, they probably brought back with them material objects representing places and events from the life of Christ, including holy water, holy oil, stones and earth from the loca sancta, as well as relics of the Passion. A desire to possess relics, and in particular those from the True Cross, was common between the fourth and the sixth century, as is evidenced, e.g., by the writings of a pilgrim named Egeria, as well as those of a sixth-century Frankish princess Radegund and of Gregory of Tours. To the believers, a relic was much more than a souvenir, in that it was believed to carry the holiness of the original, which could be transferred from its place of origin throughout the world. Such was the case, for example, when Paulinus of Nola sent an ‘almost indivisible particle’ of the Cross to Sulpicius Severus for the dedication of his church in Primuliacum (Aquitania), where it ‘lies consecrated… in company with the relics of the saints.’

In sum, it was widely believed that, through relics, Jerusalem and its holy sites

---

29 For instance, in her account of the Holy Week liturgy in Jerusalem, the pilgrim Egeria describes that, during the Holy Friday service, the True Cross was placed on a table, and the bishop, surrounded by guarding deacons, laid his hands over it. This ritual, according to Egeria, was a security measure to prevent the masses of people from kissing the cross – the reason being that a catechumen had once performed a despicable act of biting off and stealing a piece of the holy object, cf. *Egeria’s Travels*, trans. by Wilkinson, p. 137.

30 Radegund wished to obtain relics from the True Cross for her monastery at Poitiers dedicated to the Holy Cross – an ambition that was at the centre of her public life. Finally, she received such a relic, thanks to the generosity of the Emperor Justin II and his Empress Sophia. To celebrate the arrival of the relics of the cross, Italian poet and bishop of Poitiers Venantius Fortunatus (530-609) composed the liturgical hymn *Vexilla Regis* to be performed as part of the procession, *Dreves/Blume, Hymnographi Latini*, p. 74; *Mayeski, Women*, p. 107. Radegund’s biographers describe the arrival of the relics to the monastery as the peak of her charitable life, cf. ibid., p. 140. See also the article by Galit Noga-Banai in this volume.

31 Gregory of Tours relays the numerous miracles performed by a relic of the true cross, which was placed together with relics of the martyrs brought from the Holy Land. One miracle he professes to have witnessed himself, when visiting the monastery: An oil lamp placed close to the holy relics overflowed from the power of the true cross, cf. *Gregory of Tours, Glory of the Martyrs*, transl. by van Dam, pp. 22-27.

could be effectively ‘transplanted’ to Gaul.\textsuperscript{33} It is possible that Jerome himself was actively involved in the distribution of relics and that he personally facilitated the passage of several such objects to Gaul, including soil from the Holy Land and fragments of the Cross.\textsuperscript{34} Jerome’s treatise against Vigilantius suggests that this practice was sufficiently widespread in Gaul to draw the latter’s attention and evoke his condemnation.\textsuperscript{35}

In light of the above-discussed textual accounts, which attest to early Christians’ aspirations to obtain and possess relics, the Narbonne tomb aedicule can be seen as visual proof of this tradition of relic trafficking, and of close connections between Gaul and the Holy Land.

Another possibility is that the Narbonne aedicule functioned as a sacrament house, to afford a magnificent setting for the consecrated Eucharistic host. Indeed, the Eucharist played an important role in Gallic liturgy. The use of a representation of Christ’s Tomb for hosting the holy bread, conceived of as the body of Christ, is attested later during the Middle Ages, pointing to the evolvement of a tradition whereby a sacrament house or niche is stylistically associated with, or placed in the vicinity of, a representation of the Jerusalem Holy Tomb. The sacrament house contained the consecrated host following each communion during the liturgical year, or in some cases, once a year between Holy Friday and Easter Sunday.\textsuperscript{36} In light of the possibility that the above-described grooves in the floor of the ante-chamber were designed to channel liquids, it has also been suggested that the aedicule might have been used during the Chrism Mass held on Holy Thursday.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{33} The said cult of relics was criticised in Gaul, as is exemplified by a controversy involving Jerome. In 406 a monk named Sisiniius, who had travelled from Gaul to Bethlehem to pay a visit to Jerome on behalf of Bishop Exuperius of Toulouse, brought with him the hostile writings of Vigilantius, which Jerome had previously requested in a letter, cf. \textit{Jerome}, ed. by Schaff, no. 109, p. 417. In Gaul, Vigilantius promulgated his views against revering relics of holy men and other related liturgical practices, such as night services at the basilicas of the martyrs, which were fraught with scandal over alleged miracles. In Gaul, many people accepted his views, so Jerome deemed it necessary to answer with a polemical pamphlet, one of his most ferocious letters, cf. \textit{Jerome}, ed. by Schaff, p. 417.


\textsuperscript{35} Cf. \textit{Jerome}, ed. by Schaff, no. 61, p. 417.

\textsuperscript{36} Cf. Kroesen, ‘Heiliges Grab’, p. 291. Through the course of the Middle Ages, the sanctity and spiritual content of a place was epitomized in its architecture: the monument built to house \textit{a locus sanctus} came to be regarded both as a reliquary and as a relic in its own right, cf. Ousterhout, ‘Architecture’, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{37} During this service, oil, water or other liquids were poured on the bench in the inner chamber and channelled through the back of the aedicule into vessels. By virtue of its contact with the bench, a liquid was considered sanctified. It was then mixed with ointments containing chrism, which were then used for anointing in the essential sacraments of Christianity – baptism, confirmation and ordination, Mérel-Brandenburg, ‘À propos’, pp. 84-89.
3 Contacts between the Holy Land and Gaul

The phenomenon of pilgrimage played an important role in holding together the West and East of the Christian empire. Pilgrims provided first-hand information and impressions, and their written accounts conveyed valuable knowledge on the holy places. The motives that drove visitors from the West to the Holy Land varied: Some were impelled by adverse circumstances, others sought pious entertainment, but most went for spiritual reasons, on a quest for edification and education. However, the culture of pilgrimage to the Holy Land became firmly entrenched only after Christianity had become the official religion of the Roman empire and, more importantly, after the loca sancta were established through Constantine’s extensive construction projects. Among the earliest pilgrims to the Holy Land in late antiquity and Early Middle Ages were Christians from the Gaul region. The Gallic pilgrims promoted exchange of information between their homeland and the Holy Land and inspired others to follow suit. Western pilgrims also brought back home to Gaul Eastern philosophy and the liturgical practices of the Holy Land. As a harbour city, since its establishment in 118 BC, Narbonne functioned as the cultural and economic centre of the Roman province Gallia Narbonensis. In addition, the city stood at the crossroads of two major Roman routes, via Domitia and via Aquitania, thus becoming naturally an important station for those who journeyed along these roads to the Holy Land.

Two accounts of the Holy Land, which are the first known exemplars of the genre of religious travellers’ itineraries, are attributed to Gallic pilgrims; the so-called pilgrim of Bordeaux (333-334) and Egeria (381-384). As noted in the Itinerarium Burdigalense, the latter pilgrim travelled south, from Bordeaux via Toulouse to Narbonne. Many other travellers must have also traversed Narbonne on their way to the Holy Land. Thus, Sulpicius Severus relays that a certain Postumianus and his colleagues, after setting sail from Narbonne, journeyed to Jerome in Beth-

---

38 When, after a three-year sojourn in the East, Postumianus returned to Narbonne, he relayed to his friend Sulpicius Severus amazing stories of monks whose exemplary obedience enabled them to go unharmed through fire, to tame wolves and lions, and to vanquish demons, Egeria’s Travels, trans. by Wilkinson, p. 25. See Sulpicius Severus Dialogue I, chap. 15, 18, 20, Sulpitius Severus, ed. by Schaff/Wace.


40 The origin of Egeria is disputable: Somewhere between Aquitaine, in south-west Gaul, and Galicia in the Iberian Peninsula. In chronicles from the fourth century, this region between Northern Spain and Southern Gaul is referred to by the name ‘Spanogallia’ or ‘Hispanogallia’, indicating cultural homogeny, as in the provinces of Tuscinia and Attica. Cf. Mommsen, Chronica Minora, pp. 98-99; van Dam, Leadership, p. 57.

41 From there, via Arles, Avignon and Valence, he crossed over the Gaura Mountain and the Cottian Alps and proceeded via Milan to Aquileia. From Italy he travelled to Constantinople via the Balkans (Sophia) and then crossed Syria towards the Holy Land. Itinerary from Bordeaux to Jerusalem, ed. by Stewart/Wilson, pp. 1-18.
Likewise, Jerome mentions a Roman matron named Artemia from the area of Narbonne, while Orosius relates how an aristocrat from Narbonne went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.\(^{43}\)

Contacts between the West and the Holy Land were also enhanced through refugees, for whom the Holy Land was an extension of the Christian brotherhood of southern Gaul and therefore a safe harbour.\(^{44}\) The need for such a refuge was brought about by the barbarian invasions of Gaul and consequent political changes, which drove many residents, among them noble women, to flee the area.\(^{45}\) Indeed, from 406 onward, the city of Narbonne was under a constant threat of assault by the Visigoths. Around 416, the areas surrounding Narbonne were settled by the Alans.\(^{46}\) Ironically, it is due to Jerome that we know in detail about the tumultuous events that took place in the West at that time. Messengers travelling between Gaul and Bethlehem, as well as refugees fleeing Gaul, provided Jerome with information regarding the situation in that region.\(^{47}\)

It can be plausibly argued that the image of the Holy Land in the mind’s eye of the people of Gaul was largely shaped by accounts of pilgrims and other Christian travellers. Thus, in her detailed itinerary, Egeria keeps apostrophizing her homeland community as ‘ladies’, ‘my own souls’, ‘light of my eyes’, or ‘venerable sisters’\(^{48}\) – designations that connote spiritual affinity and suggest that her addressees in the West were eager to hear about the holy places and learn their liturgy. Egeria’s account is not merely a witness report of Eastern customs, but rather a di-

---

\(^{42}\) Sulpicius Severus, Dialogue I, Concerning the Virtues of the Monks of the East, chap. 3-6, in: \textit{Sulpitius Severus}, ed. by Schaff/Wace, pp. 25-26. We can date this fairly precisely to c. 400, because of his account of crowded synods, which ascertained ‘that no one should read or possess the books of Origen’, cf. Hunt, ‘Gaul’, p. 265.


\(^{46}\) Cf. Burns, ‘The Visigothic Settlement’, p. 364. While at the beginning of the fifth century the Alans were still pagans, by the end of that century they had been converted to Orthodox Christianity. In contrast to the Alans, the Visigoths were Arians, cf. Bachrach, \textit{A history}, p. 75.

\(^{47}\) Cf. Rebenich, \textit{Hieronymus}, p. 209. Jerome’s extensive knowledge of the difficulties facing Gaul is evidenced by his letter to a widow from that area named Ageruchia, dated to 409: ‘I shall now say a few words of our present miseries. (…) Savage tribes in countless numbers have overrun all parts of Gaul. The whole country between the Alps and the Pyrenees, between the Rhine and the Ocean, has been laid waste by hordes of Quadi, Vandals, Sarmatians, Alans, Gepids, Herules, Saxons, Burgundi-ans, Allemanni and – alas! for the commonweal – even Pannonians. For ‘Assur also is joined with them.’ (…) [T]he provinces of Aquitaine and of the Nine Nations, of Lyons and of Narbonne are with the exception of a few cities one universal scene of desolation.’ Jerome, ed. by Schaff, p. 408. See also no. 60 to Heliodorus (396), ibid., p. 239; no. 130 to Demetrias (414), ibid., pp. 447, 449; the Preface to Book vii of the commentary on Ezekiel (410-414), ibid., p. 789. In another instance, documents show that a monk named Sisinnius travelled from Gaul to visit Jerome on behalf of Bishop Exuperius of Toulouse and tell him the news of the situation, ibid., no. 61, p. 417; cf. Hunt, ‘Gaul’, p. 268.

dactic text. It is therefore likely that the detailed descriptions of the *loca sancta* in many of the pilgrims’ writings, most of which are now lost, were used by the community in the West to evoke and revive in their local parish ceremonies the events that had once taken place in the Holy Land. Another example illustrating the prevailing conceptions of people in the West is a letter by Eucherius of Lyon (443-449) to Faustus, probably the abbot of Lerins, in which the author admits that most of his knowledge of the Holy Land comes from stories he had heard from pilgrims returning from the East.

Alongside pilgrims, refugees and carriers of alms, a continuous stream of epistolary correspondence flowed between Gaul and the Holy Land, epitomized by the writings of Jerome (347-420). Between 386 and his death in 420, Jerome lived in Bethlehem, where he wrote the Vulgate. Jerome, who had visited Gaul in his youth, invested in and exerted his influence over the people of the Gallic provinces, leaving a lasting mark on Christianity in that area. The corpus of Jerome’s work comprises at least a dozen letters to residents of Gaul, mainly from the south, testifying to active epistolary interactions that began in 394 and intensified during the first and second decades of the fifth century, at the time of the invasion of Gaul by the Vandals. This correspondence affords a good understanding of the heretic ideas that were spreading at that time throughout the region. All this also confirms the importance of the Holy Land in the eyes of Gallic Christians, who sought guidance from Bethlehem rather than Rome.

---

49 A much later, but rather striking example for the connection between descriptions in pilgrims’ accounts and the development of liturgy at home is evident in the itinerary of Hans Tucher, in which he writes instructions to the members of his community in Nuremberg as to how to retrace the path of the Holy Sepulchre church in Jerusalem in the Sänt Sebalb church in Nuremberg: Ich hab mir fürgenommen ein Gleichnuß vom Tempel deß heiligen Grabs zu schreiben / vn setze die Kirchen deß heyligen Hauptherzen S. Sebalts zu Nürnberg/ wiewol die selben Kirch dem nicht ganz gleich ist / dan sie lenger / mag auch ein wenig breyter seyn. Tucher, *Gründtlicher und eigentlicher Bericht*, f 11. For more information, see Dorninger, *St. Sebald Church*.


51 Jerome, ed. by Schaff, no. 7, p. 394.


53 Jerome, ed. by Schaff, no. 55 to Amandus (394); no. 61 to Vigilantius (396); no. 109 to Riparius (404); no. 117 to a Mother and Daughter Living in Gaul (405); no. 119 to Minervius and Alexander (406); no. 120 to Hedibia (406/7); no. 121 to Algis (408); no. 122 to Rusticus (408); no. 123 to Algerachia (409); no. 125 to Rusticus (411); no. 129 to Dardanus (414).


55 See, for example Jerome, letter no. 75 to Theodora, Jerome, ed. by Schaff, p. 154. Jerome also corresponded with a woman from Bordeaux about Manichaicm: ibid., no. 120, p. 224. About the widespread beliefs of Manichaeism in Gaul see also Hilary of Poitiers, *De Trinitate*, Book 6; cf. *Hilary of Poitiers*, ed. by Schaff/Wace, p. 98; van Dam, *Leadership*, pp. 74-75. This situation is described in detail in the missives by Bishop Exuperius of Toulouse delivered to Jerome by Sisinnius, as well as in letters written to Jerome by fellow monks and priests, with queries on biblical exegesis and regarding alms gathered by the people of Toulouse for monks in the Holy Land (cf. Hunt, ‘Gaul’, p. 268).
In 412 Jerome wrote a letter to a young man from the environs of Marseilles by the name of Rusticus. This person is identified as the future bishop of Narbonne, probably an important figure in relation to the Narbonne aedicule. In his reply to Jerome, Rusticus expresses a wish to become a monk and asks for guidance on monastic life. Jerome responds with a lengthy letter of advice in this regard. Surprisingly, in this letter Jerome does not encourage Rusticus to cultivate a connection with the Holy Land, as he had done previously in his other correspondence, for example to Hedybia; nor does he invite Rusticus to consult him further on biblical matters. Quite to the contrary, Jerome advises Rusticus to seek instruction on the monastic life from his local bishop, Proculus of Marseilles, as well as from Bishop Exuperius. This could be indicative of a change in the relations between Gaul and the Holy Land: The Gallic people, suffering from barbarian invasions and faced with challenges they posed for Orthodox Christians, now needed to resolve their problems independently. The theological challenges arising from the Arian heresy had to be countered based on local judgements and resources. Yet, there is a good probability that this state of affairs exacerbated the Gallic Christians’ desire for a spiritual connection with Jerusalem. To the extent that Orthodoxy was under threat and thus felt the need to assert itself, what higher legitimisation could it claim than affinity with Jerusalem — embodied, as it were, in a representation of the Tomb of the Holy Sepulchre?

4 Religious and Political Struggles between Gaul and Rome

In the wake of the barbarian invasion, a large number of the Roman-oriented Gallic aristocracy – of whom many were churchmen – impelled to serve their new barbaric rulers, were at pains to preserve their elitist culture. This led to a renaissance of classical culture, language, and philosophy, which served to differentiate Gallic aristocrats from the rest of the population and at the same time to integrate barbarians into Gallic society. That said, the revival of Roman heritage should not be seen as historically incongruous with Gaul’s growing independence from Rome. Indeed, the fifth century Gaul was torn by the tension between the primacy of Rome and the struggle of three of its southern provinces – Vienensis, Narbonensis Prima, and Narbonensis Secunda – to gain independence.

At the election of Ravennius as the Bishop of Arles by a council of twelve southern bishops, Rusticus of Narbonne figures as one of the most prominent

---

59 Cf. van Dam, Leadership, p. 164.
60 Bishop Hilary of Arles (429-449) had sought to establish an exclusive sphere of influence in the south. After his death, Ravennius, who had been Hilary’s first ambassador to Rome in early 446, and therefore presumably his protégé, was chosen to be his successor. Cf. Mathisen, ‘Ravennius’, p. 173.
Gallic bishops of the time. Upon a closer look, however, a conflict is discernible between Rusticus and the bishop of Rome, Leo. Only years later, when Rusticus continued to extend his influence beyond his own province, his aspirations were endorsed by Leo.

With the advent of Gaul’s secular independence from Imperial Rome, its attitude towards the concept of Rome as the leader of the Christian world changed as well. This development is evidenced by the growing importance of and emphasis on local saints, such as St Martin of Tours and St Julian of Brioude, and a concomitant decrease in the importance of Peter and Paul, the principal Roman saints. Likewise, the building of a cathedral in Narbonne, in 445, by Rusticus testifies to the growing power of local authority, especially that of the bishops. The imperial holidays were supplanted by ecclesiastical ceremonies, Easter festivals and pilgrimage – practices that further promoted the formation of a unified local community.

5 Gallican Liturgy and the Influence of the East

Busy trade relations between the East and southern Gaul from the fifth to the eighth centuries served as a vehicle for the sharing of church traditions. The Gallican liturgy was significantly influenced by the Oriental liturgy, introduced to the West towards the middle of the fourth century. Gaul was quick to adopt Jerome’s

---

61 Cf. Cain, The letters, p. 151. Likewise, in a council scheduled for December 30 (c. 450) at Arles, Rusticus of Narbonne held a special status, as he was able to bring with him at least two of his suffragans, Florus of Lodève and Constantius of Uzès, who had received a personal invitation, cf. Mathisen, ‘Ravennius’, pp. 194-195. Leo’s letters post-452 (cf. ibid., p. 202), and certainly the one from 456 (Leo the Great, letter no. 176 to Rusticus, Bishop of Gallia Narbonensis, with replies to his questions on various points, Leo the Great, ed. by Schaff/Wace, p. 108.), attest to Rusticus’s influence and ambitions, and suggest that the author held him in great favour.

62 Leo the Great, letter no. 10 to the Bishops of the Province of Vienne. Regarding Hilary, Bishop of Arles, Leo the Great, ed. by Schaff/Wace, pp. 8-10; cf. Mathisen, ‘Ravennius’, p. 174. It seems that, although Rusticus did not belong to the province of Viennensis, he still participated in the election, and thereby overstepped his authority. That action was also in violation of Leo’s ruling from 445, to the effect that a new bishop could only be chosen by the metropolitans and the bishops of the province. Although the metropolitans were united in their opposition to Rome, there was a strong rivalry among them – as is evidenced by Leo’s ruling from 445, issued especially for the provinces of Gaul, by the struggle between Arles and Vienne for the metropolitan rights over certain cities in Southern Gaul, and by Ravennius’s unsuccessful attempt to gain power over Rusticus.


64 Leo’s reply in 449 to Ravennius, Rusticus and Venerius granted them an exclusive metropolitan status, cf. Mathisen, ‘Ravennius’, p. 187. Leo the Great, letter no. 60 to the Bishops of the Province of Arles in Gaul, Leo the Great, ed. by Schaff/Wace, p. 51.

65 Cf. van Dam, Leadership, p. 165.

66 Cf. ibid., pp. 166-167.

67 Cf. ibid., pp. 168-169.

68 Cf. Duchesne, Christian Worship, p. 93.
translations of the psalms written at Bethlehem approximately in 388. Besides the popular languages and Latin, citizens of Gallic cities were also familiar with Greek and Syrian, and close connections were maintained between Eastern and Western bishops. The earliest existing source-on the Gallic rite, the *Expositio Brevis Antiquae Liturgiae Gallicanae*, bears witness to more than one stream of Oriental influence. The features of Gallican liturgy that are different from the Roman usage bear all the characteristic of Eastern liturgies. Some of these formularies are found word for word in the Greek texts that were used, in the fourth century or somewhat later, in the Churches of the Syro-Byzantine Rite, a close resemblance which implies that they had been imported. In some cases, not only the prayer itself is identical, but also the way it was performed. For example, Egeria describes the Oriental custom, in the Jerusalem liturgy, to have three boys singing the Kyrie—a practice also adopted in Gaul. In the dismissal of the catechumens, as well, the Gallican rite follows the Eastern pattern. The same is true for the use of gospel light in the rite of the ‘little entrance’, when clergy carrying seven candles accompany the procession of the Gospel Book to the ambo, a custom that Jerome describes as ubiquitous in the East.

The surviving sources regarding the Gallican liturgy put a great emphasis on the rite of the Eucharist. Each Eucharist included the celebration of Passion and Christ’s resurrection. In this connection, not only the arrangement of the different components of the rite, but also its symbolism are translated into the Gallican liturgy. In contrast to the Roman rite, which is minimalistic, the Gallican and Oriental liturgies are colourful, vivid and rich in allegory. For example, the breaking of bread, which in the Gallican liturgy stands for the Passion of Christ, appears in the Oriental liturgies as well, while such symbolism is entirely absent from the Roman liturgy. The principal’s prayer was often directed at Christ and was emotional, poetic and picturesque. The conception of the Eucharist in the Gallican liturgy had moved away from the Roman motifs of praising and thanking the Lord towards the theme of sacrifice and offering.

---

70 Cf. Bernard, *Transitions liturgiques*.
75 Cf. Quasten ‘Oriental Influence’.
6  Arianism in Gaul and the Importance of the Resurrection

Sources indicate that, in Gaul, the rite carried a distinctive anti-Arian emphasis. The anti-Arian connotations are especially clear in mass, which pivots around the feasts of the saints.\(^77\) In the dispute with the Arian Visigoths, the Western church was supported by Orthodox theologians from the East.\(^78\) In what follows, a connection is traced between theological positions relating to the aedicule and the Arian controversy.

For the Arians, the resurrection was effected ‘by the will and command of the Father.’\(^79\) The Arians did not deny the miracles of Christ, but in their arguments with orthodox theologians, they tended to gloss over them and focus on the Biblical texts that either imply Christ’s inferiority to the Father or attribute to Christ the human capacity for weakness or suffering.\(^80\) In a sermon against Arianism addressed, \textit{inter alia}, to the \textit{Provincia Narbonensis}, Hilary of Poitiers attempts to prove that ‘the begotten Son is not a creature, but is a Person undistinguished from the Father’s nature,’ drawing a sharp line between the Christological conception of Christ as ‘begotten of the Father’ and ‘from the beginning’ (meaning not created by the father), on the one hand, and ‘the resurrection’, on the other.\(^81\) In a similar vein, Hilary cites Thomas’ meeting with Christ after the resurrection, on which occasion he cried out ‘My Lord and My God’, as proof for the orthodox belief in the divinity of Christ, i.e., that the latter is one with and of the same nature as God the Father.\(^82\) Likewise, Hilary stresses the centrality of the resurrection as proof for

\(^77\) Cf. ibid.
\(^78\) Cf. ibid.
\(^79\) Sumruld, \textit{Augustine}, p. 74.
\(^81\) Hilary of Poitiers, On the Councils, \textit{Hilary of Poitiers}, ed. by Schaff/Wace, p. 12. ‘And in \textit{one Lord} Jesus Christ, His Only-begotten Son, God through whom are all things, who was \textit{begotten of the Father}, God of God, whole God of whole God, One of One, perfect God of perfect God, King of King, Lord of Lord, the Word, the Wisdom, the Life, true Light, true Way, the Resurrection, the Shepherd, the Gate, unable to change or alter, the unvarying image of the essence and might and glory of the Godhead, the first-born of all creation, who always was in the beginning with God’ (author’s emphasis).

\(^82\) Hilary of Poitiers, De Trinitate, Book 7, \textit{Hilary of Poitiers}, ed. by Schaff/Wace, p. 123. ‘And now let us see whether the confession of Thomas the Apostle, when he cried, My Lord and My God, corresponds with this assertion of the Evangelist. We see that He speaks of Him, Whom He confesses to be God, as My God. Now Thomas was undoubtedly familiar with those words of the Lord, Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is One. How then could the faith of an Apostle become so oblivious of that primary command as to confess Christ as God, when life is conditional upon the confession of the Divine unity? It was because, in the light of the Resurrection, the whole mystery of the faith had become visible to the Apostle. He had often heard such words as, I and the Father are One, and, All things that the Father hath are Mine, and, I in the Father and the Father in Me; and now he can confess that the name of God expresses the nature of Christ, without peril to the faith. Without breach of loyalty to the One God, the Father, his devotion could now regard the Son of God as God, since he believed that everything contained in the nature of the Son was truly of the same nature with the Father’.
the Trinitarian doctrine by saying that Christ ‘declares Himself God, and the Resurrection His own work’.  

In light of the above, it is logical to posit that an emphasis on the resurrection as an act initiated by Jesus Christ (rather than the Father) is incompatible with the Arian view of Christ. On this rationale, an object such as the Narbonne tomb aedicule would seem out of place in an Arian context. And conversely, a substantive representation of this theological concept would be very plausible in an orthodox setting threatened by Arianism.

At the close of the sixth century, Gregory of Tours describes a ceremony held in the Cathedral of Genesius in Narbonne, in which the crucified figure was represented as practically nude, clad only in a loincloth. This icon or crucifix was displayed to the public only on rare occasions; at other times it was hidden from view by a curtain. The implications of this story are important for Christology, since it is salient to the question of Christ’s dual identity as god and man. Christ’s nakedness on the cross creates an image that is aligned with the Chalcedonian orthodoxy. While most of the theological controversies over Christology during the fifth and sixth centuries took place in the Eastern empire, and the only area still in contact with the eastern Mediterranean region was southern Gaul. It is even possible that the naked figure on the cross described by Gregory was of Oriental origin.

To the extent that, at the time, Narbonne was a centre of trade, teeming with Syrian tradesmen, men in Narbonne might have heard about this image by word of mouth and took part in some of the debates over these Eastern theological controversies. Be it as it may, this story attests to the existence, in the sixth century Narbonne, of an elaborate rite in which an image of the crucified Christ was displayed for public view.

---


86 This event is often cited in reference to the attitude to nakedness in early Christianity. It seems Gregory himself was unaware of the Christological implications of this legend.

87 Cf. Gregory of Tours, Glory of the Martyrs, transl. by van Dam, p. 42; Lázár, Die beiden Wurzeln, p. 41. This conjecture is supported by the name of the priest or monk described in the story, which is of Byzantine derivation.
7 Conclusion

The details of how the Narbonne tomb aedicule came into being are unknown, and might never be revealed. Modern research tends to view the aedicule as an *unicum*, a special case, yet it is not impossible that this object is the only remaining exemplar of many of its type, which comprised a set of material representations of the Holy Land.

A strong Oriental influence, coupled with the liturgical emphasis on symbolism and performance, raises the possibility that the Narbonne tomb aedicule served as part of a Gallic ritual centred around the cult of the Holy Tomb. As mentioned above, a sophisticated ritual in Narbonne involving the image of Christ on the cross is attested by Gregory of Tours.

It can be argued that the situation in the fifth-century Narbonne warranted the construction of such an aedicule. As already discussed, Narbonne at that time was a transit point for numerous Gallic pilgrims travelling to the Holy Land both by ship and by land. While theological positions regarding pilgrimage were not clear-cut, the fifth century appears to have been marked by a shift of emphasis towards a more local pilgrimage and the veneration of relics. Evidence exists that relics from the Holy Land had indeed reached Gaul, first and foremost fragments of the Holy Cross. For much of the fifth century, Rusticus, the bishop of Narbonne and an influential religious persona, initiated ambitious building programmes dedicated to martyrs and involving relics, such as St Genesius and St Felix. Furthermore, the adoration of Jerusalem through its representation in the form of a tomb aedicule, such as the one found in Narbonne, could have been instrumental to gaining independence from Rome, as it presented an alternative to the Roman dominance in Gaul. Indeed, the aedicule directly connects to the origins of Christianity in Jerusalem.

A plausible supposition is that the tomb aedicule was used in the (central-plan) cathedral built under Rusticus’s patronage. Thus, not only was the aedicule found close to the church, but the political-theological situation in southern Gaul at the time of Rusticus’s episcopate was highly conducive to such a function. Moreover, the initiation of such an impressive monument must have been effected under institutional patronage. Rusticus was a powerful figure in southern France and an ambitious builder; crucially, it also appears that he was engaged in the ecclesiastical discussions of his time. Moreover, his early correspondence with Jerome might be taken as an indication of a certain affinity to the Holy Land.88 Rusticus’ position in the dispute concerning heresy that was widespread at the time in regions adjoining his episcopate renders him a plausible candidate for the role as a patron of such an endeavor.

Gaul, and in particular Narbonne, was the last remaining area in the empire that maintained a connection with the East and participated in its theological dis-

---

88 Jerome, ed. by Schaff, no. 122.
putes regarding Christology. Gaul required powerful visual propaganda to counter the Arian heresy and promote Christian orthodoxy.

The Narbonne aedicule marks the beginning of the phenomenon that emerged in the fifth century whereby the sacred sites of the Holy Land were represented in various parts of Europe. This phenomenon goes hand in hand with the development of Christian liturgical practice. Textual sources aside, the tomb aedicule of Narbonne is the earliest and the only extant testimony for a Gallican liturgical practice whose central motif revolved around Christ’s Tomb in Jerusalem, thus pointing to the existence of close relations between Southern Gaul and the Holy Land. Moreover, it epitomizes the Christian need – and one that is known to grow ever stronger in times of turmoil – to establish a closer proximity to a place that is central to Christian faith – Jerusalem.
The Tomb Aedicule of Narbonne

Fig. 1: Narbonne, Archaeological Museum. The Tomb Aedicule of Narbonne, front view, mid-fifth century (photo: Shimrit Shriki-Hilber; © Musées de Narbonne – Ville de Narbonne).

Fig. 2: Narbonne, Archaeological Museum. The Tomb Aedicule of Narbonne, side view, mid-fifth century (photo: Shimrit Shriki-Hilber; © Musées de Narbonne – Ville de Narbonne).
Fig. 3: Narbonne, Archaeological Museum. The Tomb Aedicule of Narbonne, rear view with three reconstructed column shafts, mid-fifth century (photo: Shimrit Shriki-Hilber; © Musées de Narbonne – Ville de Narbonne).

Fig. 4: Narbonne, Archaeological Museum. The Tomb Aedicule of Narbonne, rear view towards the tomb chamber, mid-fifth century (photo: Shimrit Shriki-Hilber; © Musées de Narbonne – Ville de Narbonne).
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Architectural Frames for Relics of the True Cross – Two Frankish Test Cases

Galit Noga-Banai *

Abstract

Two early medieval translations of relics to the West, two and a half centuries apart, have ended in significant architectural frames – one monumental, the other portable. The monumental frame was initiated by Queen Radegund (Radegundis, c. 527-587) at her monastery in Poitiers. The portable one was given by Einhard (c. 755-840), Charlemagne’s courtier and biographer, to the monastery of Saint Servatius in Maastricht. The following paper considers both works of art together, both despite and due to the fact that they have so many differences: They were not produced at the same time; they are not of the same medium, material, and technique; one was initiated by a nun and queen, the other by a lay abbot. Apparently, they had one thing in common: They enshrined a relic of the True Cross. Tying the two Frankish cases to one another will help us understand the reasons behind the selected frames of the containers and their significant potential to help trace the relic’s biography. We will see that despite the many differences, the enshrine-

* Galit Noga-Banai is an associate professor of Late Antique and Medieval Art and Architecture at the Department of History of Art, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel. Her main research activity concerns portable art in the Middle Ages, but she is highly interested also in the visual Christianization of Rome and Palestine, as well as modern and contemporary medievalism. The author wishes to thank Yitzhak Hen, Werner Jacobsen, Robert Oustrhout and Tamar Rotman for taking the time to discuss the topic with her. The author is grateful to the Research Cooperation Lower Saxony – Israel for its support of this study, as well as the Mandel-Scholion Interdisciplinary Research Center in the Humanities and Jewish Studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
ment strategies and aims are similar – both are based on architectural references related to Rome and Jerusalem.
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1 **Radegund and the Chapel of the Holy Cross in Poitiers**

Radegund, a Thuringian princess and wife of the Merovingian King Chlothar, hoped to obtain sacred relics for the monastery that she founded in Poitiers in 557. The one she most desired was a relic of the True Cross. As reported in her biography – written between 609 and 614 by Baudonivia, a nun in the convent – Radegund, through her personal and social contacts, ‘got what she had prayed for: That she might glory in having the blessed wood of the Lord’s cross enshrined in gold and gems and many relics of the saints that had been kept in the east living in that one place’.¹ The ‘east’ may refer to Jerusalem, the source of the relic of the True Cross, or to Constantinople, because the gift of relics was sent to Radegund by none other than the Byzantine Emperor Justin II (565-574) and his wife Sophia. Gregory of Tours informs us that ‘Eufronius (Bishop of Tours) came to Poitiers with his clergy…deposited the sacred relics in the nunnery with much chanting of psalms, with candles gleaming and with a great burning of incense’.² For the occasion of the adventus of the relic of the cross to Poitiers, the Latin poet (and later bishop of Poitiers) Venantius Fortunatus composed the two hymns adopted by the Church: The Vexilla Regis and the Pange Lingua.³

Baudonivia does not provide us with precise details about the reliquary received by Radegund apart from mentioning the gold and gems.⁴ Another relic of the True Cross was distributed by Emperor Justin II and Sophia to Rome in a lavish crux gemmate reliquary that can still be seen today in the Treasury of Saint

---


Peter’s Basilica. The reliquary of the True Cross in Rome bears the portraits of the Constantinopolitan pair; they appear in medallions on the reverse of the embossed and gilded Latin cross [Fig. 1]. While they are depicted on the horizontal arms, Christ appears on the vertical axis at the top and again at the bottom. The centre is taken by the Agnus Dei. The space left on the arms is filled with vegetal ornamentation, evoking the tree of life. Pearls and gemstones are embedded on the frame of the cross on the obverse side. At the intersection of the flaring arms, the fragment of the cross is set within a medallion encircled by twelve pearls. Between the gemmed frame and the relic, the arms are filled with a Latin inscription disclosing the imperial patrons: LIGNO QVO CHRISTVS HVMANVM SUBDIDIT HOSTEM DAT ROMAE IVSTINVS OPEM ET SOCLA DECOREM.7

We can assume that if the imperial couple sent the relic of the True Cross in a container similar to the one in Rome, Radegund would have been pleased – unless she preferred not to have the portraits of the imperial benefactors at glance.8 Gregory of Tours, however, recalls a silver chest (arca argentea) before describing the miracles of the cross in Poitiers.9 In another place he mentions a chest (arca) when describing the search for the abbess Leu Bevera following the revolt of the nuns several years after the deaths of Radegund and the first abbess, Agnes. The men sent by the princess and nun Chlothild ‘went into the oratory and found her lying on the ground before the chest (arca) of the Holy Cross’

Perhaps the staurotheke reliquary sent to Radegund was simpler than the one sent to Rome, corresponding more with the definition of an arca, like the kind found in Chersones [Crimea; Fig. 2]. The silver casket from Chersones, produced in Constantinople and kept today in the Hermitage, is decorated on the front with bust medallions of Christ flanked by Peter and Paul; the back has Mary flanked by

7 ‘With the wood with which Christ conquered man’s enemy, Justin gives his help to Rome and his wife offers the ornamentation.’ Engl. trans. see Radiciotti, ‘A Latin Inscription’, p. 34. For the gifts of relics as part of the royal couple’s religious politics in the West, see Cameron, ‘The Early Religious Policies’, pp. 51-67.
9 Gregory of Tours, De Gloria Martyrum, 5; engl. trans. see van Dam, Glory, p. 22.
10 [Introvocnes in oraturium, repperierunt iacentem super humum ante arcam sanctae crucis, HF 10.15. Engl. trans. see Thorpe, The History, p. 567. For a short narration of the rebellion in the convent, see McNarnara/Halborg/Whatley, Sainted Women, pp. 64-65; Daily, Queens, pp. 64-79.
two archangels and the lid contains crosses. Although the casket is not inscribed and bears no imperial portraits that can disclose the patrons, the style of the bust medallions is similar to the medallions that decorate the cross reliquary in Rome. Two sets of four control stamps inside the lid and on the bottom of the casket help date it to the later part of the reign of Justinian I, c. 565, shortly before the accession of his nephew Justin II. But then again, Baudonivia recalls gold and gems.

Although little is known about the portable reliquary of the cross in Poitiers, we may have just enough evidence to analyse the chapel’s structure. Excavations at the site of Sainte-Croix in Poitiers were conducted by François Eygun in 1962. He reconstructed a small chapel dating to the Merovingian period. It is composed of wide walls (0.50 m) enclosing a 5.5 m space. The walls end on the eastern side with an apse [Fig. 9]. Inside the chapel, various fragments of decorative mosaic were found, including an inscription, O CRUX A[V], which, although added later in the Middle Ages, helps to identify the church as the chapel of the Holy Cross. Behind the apse and attached to it there was a small exterior rectangular room (1.90 × 1.80 m) with an opening on its southern side. This was most likely the oratory described by Gregory of Tours on the same occasion when he mentions the chest (area) of the Holy Cross. The plan of Sainte-Croix was exceptional in Gaul. In the Basilica of Saint Martin in Tours, for instance, not far from Poitiers and where Radegund had good contacts, there seems to have been an atrium behind the apse. The pilgrims wishing to venerate Saint Martin could see his tomb by looking towards the altar of the basilica through an opening in the wall. The tomb was located between the hemisphere wall of the apse and the altar, thus sharing the same space. Alternative spatial designs included a tomb chamber below the altar, known especially from

---

11 For more on the casket in the Hermitage, see Noga-Banai, The Trophies, Cat. no. 13, and earlier bibliography on the topic; Noga-Banai/Safran, ‘Late Antique Silver Reliquary’, pp. 3-30 (12), fig. 10.
12 Perhaps the design of the chest was closer to the reliquary depicted in the seventeenth-century painting, now in Saint-Benoît, that shows Saint Radegund receiving the relic of the True Cross. The style and type of the reliquary in the painting is taken to be Carolingian. See Jones, ‘Perceptions’, p. 120; Hahn, ‘Collector’, pp. 268-269.
13 Eygun, ‘Circonscription’, pp. 433-484 (pp. 469-473); fig. 49; Labande-Mailfert, ‘Les Débuts’, pp. 25-116 (70, fig. 2); for a different version of the ground plan, leaving the room behind the apse open towards the eastern side, see Ristow, ‘Gräber’, pp. 59-76 (pp. 71-72).
14 See above n. 10.
15 The church in Tours was rebuilt around 470 by Martin’s successor, Bishop Perpetuus, who dug up Martin’s sarcophagus and transported it to the apse of the new church, where the saint was reburied behind the altar. Gregory of Tours describes a large memorial basilica where the tomb of Martin was located behind the altar upon which a great marble stone was set, probably to enable people to observe the tomb from a distance; Gregory of Tours, HF 2.14,1/2.15. It is possible that a similar arrangement existed in the sixth-century church at Saint-Maurice d’Agaune, where the tomb of Saint Maurice may have been placed inside the apse. See Jacobsen, ‘Saint’s Tombs’, pp. 1107-1143 (pp. 1108-1110), with plans.
cemetery churches in Rome, and a chamber adjacent to the church.\textsuperscript{16} Layouts vary, but to the best of my knowledge, there is no other example in late antique Gaul in which relics of a saint or a tomb are placed within a chamber behind the apse wall.\textsuperscript{17}

The uncommon space behind the apse may be the result of a special plan to enshrine the relic of the cross. One way to corroborate this theory is to see if other churches in possession of a relic of the True Cross were planned along similar lines. In Ravenna, for example, another princess (and later regent and empress), Galla Placidia (388-450), was responsible for the construction of a church dedicated to the True Cross. Built between 424 and 432, the church was shaped first as a Latin cross (12.42 m wide and 38.50 m long) with a single nave and no aisles [Fig. 10].\textsuperscript{18} Among the churches built in Ravenna during the fifth and sixth centuries, this was the only one in that form, suggesting perhaps a connection between the Latin cross frame and the specific relic.\textsuperscript{19} Between 432 and 450 the Latin cross was extended in the north and south with side rooms next to the arms of the cross and porticoes along the nave (this was the phase when the so-called Mausoleum of Galla Placidia was added next to the southern corner of the church narthex).\textsuperscript{20} It was possible to exit directly from the apse to the flanking annexed rooms. The one in the northeast corner was also accessible from the northern crossarm and possibly from the exterior of the church as well.\textsuperscript{21} Janet Charlotte Smith suggests that it served as an annexed courtyard with a shrine at the corner that functioned as a copy of Golgotha. The spatial layout may rely on the Jerusalemitic model: In the Constantinian Holy Sepulchre complex, the basilica of the Martyrium was separated by a wall from the inner atrium. Thus, the inner atrium, with Golgotha in its southeast corner, was located behind the apse [Fig. 11].\textsuperscript{22} Apparently the church in Ravenna was known in the Middle Ages as \textit{sancta Jerusalem}.\textsuperscript{23}

The architectural frame in Ravenna must have been known to Venantius Fortunatus, who grew up near Treviso (Venetia) and later studied in Ravenna before migrating to Gaul. If there was indeed a spatial separation between the main altar

---

\textsuperscript{16} Jacobsen, ‘Saint’s Tombs’.

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., pp. 1126-1129. For a comprehensive catalogue of early medieval church architecture, see Jacobsen/Schaefer/Sennhauser, \textit{Vorromanische Kirchenbauten}.


\textsuperscript{19} The inspiration for the cruciform church might have been the Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople or the church dedicated to the apostles in Milan. See David, \textit{La basilica}, p. 14, with additional examples.

\textsuperscript{20} David, ‘Da Gerusalemme a Ravenna’, pp. 688-689.

\textsuperscript{21} Cortesi, ‘La chiesa’, pp. 47-76. According to a recent plan drawn by Andrea Fiorini, the division of the northern chamber was an outcome of the extension under Valentinian III between 432 and 450; see Fiorini, ‘Analisi stratigrafica’, pp. 93-109.

\textsuperscript{22} For the possibility that a cross was erected on Golgotha as early as the fourth century, see Heid, \textit{Kreuz Jerusalem Kosmos}, p. 230.

\textsuperscript{23} Ravenna, Archivio Capitolare di Ravenna, Pergamena of the Archbishop Anselmo (1155-1158), caps a IV, n. 3; Smith, ‘Side Chambers’, pp. 181-204 (pp. 193-195); Mauskopf Deliyannis, \textit{Ravenna}, pp. 70-74.
in the church and the supposed shrine of the cross in the northern corner, he could have informed his friends in Poitiers. In any event, the church in Poitiers was not shaped as a Latin cross and had only one small room behind the apse. The only church with a chapel behind the apse was, as far as I know, in Rome: Sta. Croce in Gerusalemme. There, too, Galla Placidia played a philanthropic role; according to a monumental inscription, between 425 and 444, the empress and her children decorated the church with mosaics. The foundation of the church, however, goes back to the Constantinian dynasty.  

Constantine himself was quite likely responsible for installing the relic of the True Cross in the church of Sta. Croce in Gerusalemme, within the complex of the Sessorian palace [Fig. 12]. The palace was most probably the place where the Emperor’s mother, Helena, resided prior to her journey to Palestine; in fact, she was buried on the same Sessorian territory. The imperial architects, whether of Constantine or his son Constantius, used an existing third-century hall, 39 m long, 25 m wide, and 22 m high, within the palace complex. They added an apse on the southeast wall and divided the interior into three bays by means of transverse arches. Two original adjoining rooms, on the east, were preserved behind the apse, connected to the church by a corridor along the rounded wall. The remodelled church was open to the public, thus the farther room was probably a baptistery. The nearer room, behind the apse wall, became a shrine for the relic. As in Poitiers and possibly also in Ravenna, there was a spatial separation between the church altar and the relic. The basilica in Rome was named Hierusalem after the imported relic. The name suggests an intention to link the location of the relic with the original sacred spot in Jerusalem by depositing the relic in an adjoining chapel. Apart from the specific layout, however, the basilica in the Sessorian Palace did not evoke the basilica of the Martyrium in Jerusalem, nor the atrium containing Golgotha, although a late-sixth-century source reports that Sta. Croce/Hierusalem was the location of the papal service on Good Friday. Sta. Croce, therefore, may have been not only the earliest shrine of the True Cross in the West, but also the earliest implementation.

---

24 For Galla Placidia consciously associating herself with Helena and her son with Constantine, see Longhi, ‘Epigrafi votive’, pp. 39-70; Brubaker, ‘Memories’, pp. 52-75 (p. 61).
26 De Blaauw, ‘Jerusalem’, p. 60. For Helena’s mausoleum, see Rasch, *Das Mausoleum*.
27 Krautheimer, *Three Christian Capitals*, p. 23, believed that the church was for the imperial family’s private use. This view has been rejected. See de Blaauw, ‘Jerusalem’, p. 64. An alternative plan shows a variation in which the two adjoining rooms were both placed behind the apse – one leading to the next – where the relic was kept. See David, ‘Da Gerusalemme a Ravenna’, fig. 1.
29 *Capitulare lectionum* of Würzburg, following de Blaauw, ‘Jerusalem’, p. 71.
of the long and mostly later tradition of translating a part of the architectural setting of the Holy Sepulchre complex from Palestine to Europe, thus creating a surrogate monument.\textsuperscript{30} Unlike most of the later medieval copies, the church in Rome did not focus on the Rotunda of the Anastasis but rather on the neighbouring layout of the basilica in relation to Golgotha. This makes sense in the context of a shrine for the relic of the True Cross-Poitiers.\textsuperscript{31}

It is impossible to tell to what extent Radegund or the architect of the chapel in Poitiers aimed to visualize the Jerusalemite Golgotha, but if a visual familiarity with the church enshrining the Cross in Rome was the goal, all they needed to do was add a chamber behind the apse. Comparing the plan of the church in Rome with that of the chapel in Poitiers, it seems that the two constructions are closer to each other than to the original in Jerusalem or the basilica in Ravenna: Aside from the room behind the apse, in both churches the apse’s hemisphere wall is almost as wide or as wide as the walls that frame the chapel.

Possible corroboration to the notion that the chapel in Poitiers was meant to recall the one in Rome may be found in contemporary textual sources. Introducing the miracles that were performed in Poitiers due to the presence of the cross, Gregory of Tours made a royal comparison:

‘The Cross of the Lord that was found by the empress Helena at Jerusalem is venerated on Wednesday and Friday. Queen Radegund, who is comparable to Helena in both merit and faith, requested relics of this cross and piously placed them in a convent at Poitiers that she founded out of her own zeal.’\textsuperscript{32}

Whether the relic Radegund received from the imperial couple was a chip of the relic translated by Helena to Constantinople or taken from another origin, the emperor’s mother who found the True Cross was believed to be the ultimate source for the relic which eventually arrived in Poitiers thanks to another noble queen.\textsuperscript{33} Baudonivia made a similar analogy in Radegund’s biography:

‘Thus like Saint Helena, imbued with wisdom, full of the fear of God, glorious with good works, she eagerly sought to salute the wood…. When she had found it, she clapped both hands. When she recognized that it was truly the Lord’s cross that had raised the dead to life with its touch, she knelt on the ground adoring the

\textsuperscript{30} The ‘copies’ of the Holy Sepulchre is a vast field of research. For the possibility that the seventh-century crypt of Mellebaudis in Poitiers was planned to some extent as a replica to the Holy Sepulchre, see Elbern, ‘Das Relief’, pp. 148-189. For other examples, see most recently the articles in Visual Constructs of Jerusalem, ed. by Kühnel, Noga-Banai, and Vorholt.

\textsuperscript{31} An article discussing this group of early churches as addenda to Krautheimer’s Iconography of Medieval Architecture is currently being composed.

\textsuperscript{32} Gregory of Tours, GM 5, engl. trans. van Dam, Glory, p. 22.

\textsuperscript{33} It is unclear where the relic was kept in Constantinople. See Klein, ‘Sacred Relics’, pp. 79-99 (pp. 81-82, 89).
Lord and said: “In truth, you are Christ, the Son of God, Who came into the world and with your precious blood you have redeemed your own people, whom you created, from captivity.” What Helena did in oriental lands, Radegund the blessed did in Gaul!”

Gregory’s comparison and Baudonivia’s description attest to the notion that Radegund’s efforts to obtain a relic of the cross were compared at that time with Saint Helena’s reputation. Perhaps the analogy could benefit the monumental dimension by linking the chapel in Poitiers with the shrine for the cross in Rome, strongly associated with Helena. In other words, it is conceivable that the church’s plan was selected in order to express the typological linkage between Helena and Radegund, between the first chapel of the cross outside Jerusalem and the chapel in Poitiers, consequently validating the power of the imported relic from the east. The outcome would be a reference to the original source, the complex of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, including Golgotha, via the intersession of the imperial patrons and the Roman architectural version. In effect, the chapel’s layout killed two prestige birds with one stone. I will return to this discussion after examining a similar case of recruiting an architectural frame: The portable reliquary created by Einhard.

2 Einhard and the Reliquary of the True Cross in Maastricht

Apart from his tasks in the Carolingian court, Einhard was also a lay abbot of the monastery of Saint Servatius in Maastricht. Between 820 and 830 he gave the abbey a reliquary whose base was shaped like a triumphal arch. The original, most
likely made of wood riveted with silver, is lost; we are left with illustrations made during the seventeenth century, which give the details of the arch and its decorative program [Fig. 13]. The portable arch was the only artefact associated directly with Einhard and therefore inspired many scholars to focus upon the implications of its decorative program as well as the tabula ansata located at the centre of the attic panel: AD TROPÆUM AETER / NAE VICTORIAE SUSTI / NENDUM EINHARDUS / PECCATOR HUNC AR / CUM PONERE AC DEO / DEDICARE CURAVIT (Einhard, a sinner [peccator] strove to set up and dedicate to God this arch to support the cross of eternal victory).

The triumphal arch was actually only part of the reliquary. Einhard set up (ponere) the reliquary with an arch and a cross (tropaeum aeternae victoriae) above it. The arch turned the cross above into a trophy, a kind of military vexillum or tropaeum, as indicated in the dedicatory inscription. The jewelled cross, which the arch must have supported, had a given significance from the early Christian period onward: The cross of the crucifixion, the gemmed cross erected on Golgotha in memory of that event, and the cross foretelling Christ’s return.

Einhard’s dedicatory inscription, supplemented by later inventories of the reliquaries in Maastricht, strongly implies that the cross contained a relic of the True Cross. While this is impossible to prove, the iconography supports the assumption and it will be assumed here. The arch was decorated with an elaborate program arranged in three zones. In the upper register, or attic, two angels flanked Einhard’s tabula ansata on one broad panel; the other three panels in this zone showed Christ sitting on a throne flanked by the seated apostles. The middle register had the Four Evangelists with their symbols on the wider front and back sides and narrative scenes on the two side panels: The Annunciation to Mary and John the Baptist’s first meeting with Jesus, when John proclaimed him the Agnus Dei (John 1.29). Above the keynote of the arch, the extrados, was a medallion with Christ’s monogram, and the same location on the opposite side contained a medal-

37 Liège, Bibliothèque de l'Université, Ms. 840, and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Ms. fr. 10440, fol. 45. See Brassinne, ‘Monuments d'art’, pp. 155-164, 194-195; Montesquiou-Fezensac, ‘L’arc de triomphe’, pp. 73-109. For the dimensions of the arch – 31.9 cm high, 24.6 cm wide, and 11.6 cm deep – see Hauck, ‘Diskussion’, pp. 13-32 (p. 18, n. 8). This section of the article is based on my article on ‘Einhard’s Arch’, pp. 27-41.


39 The combination of a (jeweled) cross and triumphal arch has led to the contextualization of Einhard’s arch with Hrabanus Maurus’s ‘De laudibus sanctae crucis’; In honorem sanctae crucis, ed. by Perrin. The praise of the cross as vexillum, for example, is found in the second figura that accompanies the poem; Ferrari, Il Liber sanctae crucis di Rabano Mauro; Embach, ‘Die Kreuzesschrift’. See also Chazelle, The Crucified God, pp. 125-131.

40 This is best seen in the mosaic decorating the apse of Sta. Pudenziana in Rome, dated 402-17; Christe, ‘La colonne d’ArcADIUS’, pp. 31-42; Elsberin, Die Goldschmiedekunst, pp. 38-43 (p. 39); Belting, ‘Der Einhardsbogen’, pp. 93-121 (pp. 101-102); Engemann, ‘Parusie Christi’, pp. 139-156 (pp. 143-149). For a more recent take on the mosaics in Sta. Pudenziana, see Angelelli, La basilica titolare di S. Pudenziana and Noga-Banai, Sacred Stimulus.

lion with a cross. Finally, the lowest register featured eight standing, haloed saints: four standard-bearers, two on each side panel, and four soldiers with shields and lances flanking the archway on both sides. In the internal passageway, two additional mounted warriors, trampling on serpents and without haloes, have been variously identified as Charlemagne with his son Louis the Pious or Constantine, or as Constantine and Lothar I.42

The reliquary evoked the past and future, combined through the cross. The two narrative scenes selected for the decorative program implied the first epiphany of Christ. The figures in the lower register featured a hierarchical order characteristic of the adventus ceremony; the cross and Christ’s monogram above the keystones serve as forerunners to the heavenly Christ sitting above flanked by his apostles. As we shall see, the architectural frame suggests that the adventus could have been twofold: That of Christ and that of the relic.

With only one passageway, as reconstructed in Fig. 3, Einhard’s triumphal arch has often been compared to the Arch of Titus erected in 81 CE as a tribute to the emperor after his death and deification [Fig. 4].43 Indeed, Einhard’s dedication occupies the same location on his portable arch as the dedication by the senate and people of Rome to the divine Titus on the Roman monument. Both inscriptions are as wide as the opening below and have the same proportions in relation to the framing upper and lower cornices.44 The vault of the Roman arch, apart from the central panel adorned with an eagle carrying the emperor skyward (apotheosis), has a coffered pattern akin to that in the vault of Einhard’s arch.45 In addition, both arches have two narrative panels. While on Einhard’s arch they occupy the side panels and represent biblical scenes, those on the Arch of Titus stand opposite one another in the passageway and contain imperial imagery. On one side, Titus in a chariot is being crowned by a personification of victory; on the other, a triumphal procession carries the war trophies from the Temple in Jerusalem [Fig. 5 and 6]. It is also possible to compare the placement of the Christogram and the cross above the keystone in Einhard’s arch with the figures of deities on the keystone of the

44 Belting, Der Einhardsbogen, p. 93.
45 The similarity between the monumental and portable arches is even closer when both are compared to images of a cross over a city gate or above an architectural facade alluding to Rome or to the rotunda of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, as represented in Charlemagne’s imperial Renovatio bullae and Xpictiana Religio coinage. Hauck, Das Einhardskreuz, pl. 1; see Renovatio Romai[i] Imp[ieri] and Xpictiana Religio in Grierson/Blackburn, Medieval European Coinage, pls. 34, 36; Kluge, ‘Nomen imperatoris’, pp. 82-90; Coupland, ‘Charlemagne’s Coinage’, pp. 211-229, fig. 9. On the identification of the architectural edifice in the Xpictiana Religio coinage as the Rotunda of the Holy Sepulchre, see, most recently, McCormick, Charlemagne’s Survey, pp. 187-193, with earlier bibliography.
Roman arch, emphasizing its crucial function for the stability of the whole structure.\textsuperscript{46}

If Einhard selected the Arch of Titus as an antique Roman model for his Christian reliquary, it is legitimate to ask why he did not choose instead the arch associated with the Roman emperor who legitimized Christianity, especially if one of the mounted figures in the passageway of his arch is possibly Constantine.\textsuperscript{47} Charged with delivering a copy of Charlemagne’s ‘Divisio regnorum’ to Pope Leo III, Einhard visited Rome in 806.\textsuperscript{48} He certainly saw the monumental single arch of Titus at the southeast end of the Forum Romanum, but he could hardly have avoided the triple Arch of Constantine located nearby. In planning a container for his relic of the True Cross, one might have thought the fourth-century arch dedicated to the emperor who founded the complex of the Holy Sepulchre, including Golgotha, would have been a more appropriate model than the arch of the earlier Roman emperor. Herbert Kessler suggests that Einhard chose the Arch of Titus as a model because it represents the Roman triumph over Judaea,\textsuperscript{49} but it does more than that: Titus’s arch, not Constantine’s, bears what is probably the earliest depiction of the translation of sacred objects from Jerusalem to Rome. I suggest that Einhard, in an effort to underscore his relic’s biography and authenticity, directed the beholder’s associative memory to this historical dynamic of translation by using a visual reference to the first of the Jerusalemite imports: The Temple spoils on the triumphal Arch of Titus in Rome.

Einhard used the Arch of Titus as a visual reference to validate his relic as well as to imply the victorious cross. In return, the arch shape contributed an additional layer of meaning to the reliquary’s overall decorative program. The reliquary, then, not only evokes the past and future, combined through the cross, but also visually manifests the stations of the relic that was enshrined inside. The association with the Arch of Titus and its decorative program strongly implies that Einhard’s relic originated in Jerusalem and was translated to Rome under imperial patronage. From Rome it was taken to Francia, and through Einhard, whose name is inscribed on the attic, it was translated to Maastricht. In this reading, the Evangelists and the two annunciation scenes provide the biblical roots of the story leading to the relic of the cross. The standard-bearers, soldier saints, and mounted warriors participate in an imperial triumphal \textit{adventus} for the translated relic. They represent the former possessors of the sacred spolia, whether Constantine or the Frankish

\textsuperscript{46} Engemann, ‘Parusie Christi’, p. 147. The deities decorating the keystones on the east and west sides of the Arch of Titus were interpreted by Pfanner \textit{Der Titusbogen}, pp. 81-82 as \textit{Virtus} and \textit{Honos} rather than their usual interpretation as \textit{Roma} and the \textit{Genius populi romani}.

\textsuperscript{47} See above, n. 11. The Carolingian attitude toward the political ideology that Constantine represented is a matter of scholarly debate. See, most recently, Hen, ‘\textit{Specula principum}’, pp. 515-522.

\textsuperscript{48} \textit{Divisio regnorum} (806), ed. by Boretius, pp. 126-130, no. 45; engl. trans. see D. C. Munro in Dutton, \textit{Carolingian Civilization}, pp. 146-151; McKitterick, \textit{Charlemagne}, pp. 96-103.

monarchs. The imperial associations guarantee that the relic within is part of the True Cross and thereby confirm its potential as protector of the community of monks in Maastricht, both in the ninth century and at the end of days.

3 Architectural Manifestations of the Translation of the Cross

The two cases discussed here, one monumental, the other portable, used a Roman architectural model for the container they planned for the relic of the True Cross. Framing an object that originated in Jerusalem with Roman architecture creates a visual combination of the biblical and the imperial traditions. Together they illustrate the stations in the relic’s biography and validate its authority and power at the same time.

The combination of biblical roots with imperial imagery is not rare in the Carolingian period and can be found in illuminated manuscripts as well as in architecture. Yet Einhard’s arch is the earliest example of a three-dimensional combination entering a church. The next step would be Bernwards’s triumphal column, decorated with biblical scenes, made of bronze, and installed in the Basilica of Saint Michael in Hildesheim [Fig. 7]. In this case, too, the inspiration was Roman. Unlike Einhard’s reliquary, the chapel in Poitiers does not project imperial imagery at first glance – and not even at second. But when we take into account the possible model in Rome and its connection with Helena, the carefully selected architectural plan manifests the aim to compare the two noble queens. Moreover, it realizes the objective of comparing the two translations – that of Helena and that of Radegund.

The choice to use a Roman frame in both cases suggests that it was important for both Radegund and Einhard to emphasize the translations they were responsible for and to recall the earlier forerunners. In making that choice, they expressed the tradition of the migrating movement of the unanimated sacred object from Jerusalem to Rome. Einhard was not referring to the arch of Constantine, but rather to the arch which represented a translatio from Jerusalem to Rome. Radegund, or the architect in Poitiers, could have produced a plan that resembled the Jerusalemite original more closely than it did the Roman habitat of the cross. If, for the sake of the argument, we take a step to the east from Galia Aquitania to Galia Narbonesis, and from the mid-sixth to the mid-fifth century, we find that a visual reference to the church in Jerusalem was made earlier in the West without Roman intervention.

The marble aedicule in Narbonne is said to represent the tomb of Christ [Fig. 8]. The three-dimensional monolithic sculpture, carved from local marble, measuring 119 by 114 by 91 cm, is comprised of a rectangular vestibule (ante-

50 Kessler, ‘Rome’s Place’.
chamber) and an open octagonal inner chamber. The two combined parts were outlined by columns with Corinthian capitals, seven around the inner chamber and two at the front of the vestibule. It was most likely placed in the Cathedral of Narbonne at a time when bishop Rusticus (†461) reconstructed the basilica (444-448). The function of the aedicule is not known. An opening in the wall separating the two parts of the edifice suggests that it could have been used as a reliquary. In any event, it displayed the *locus sanctus* in the east within the church. Although the monument in Narbonne is exceptional in the fifth century, the direct leap to Jerusalem that it represents may indicate that Radegund and Einhard made a conscious selection when they preferred a Roman model for their architectural monument and reliquary. Moreover, it may suggest that reaching the original provenance of the True Cross, i.e., Jerusalem, via the visual intervention of Rome may also have had to do with contemporary liturgy practiced in the monasteries in Poitiers and Maastricht.

Little is known about the liturgy in Poitiers specifically, but we may assume that the feasts associated with the cult of the cross were celebrated with great enthusiasm. While in Jerusalem the finding of the cross was celebrated together with the inauguration of the church on September 13 and 14, the recovery of the cross was celebrated in Rome (probably already in the fifth century and certainly in the sixth) on May 3. The *invention* of the cross is listed under the same day in May in the Merovingian Martyrologium Hieronymianum: *In Hierusalem inventio sanctae crucis Domini nostris Iesu Christi ab Helena regina in monte Golgota post passionem Domini anno ducentesimo trigesimo tertio regnante Constantino imperatore*. It is then reasonable to assume that the Roman feasts of the cross were adopted in Gaul, possibly already during Radegund’s time in Poitiers.

There is indeed too little data for us to reconstruct with certainty the early Merovingian liturgy, but the two Frankish containers discussed here clearly represent early medieval use in monastic context of specific architectural models recruited for the preservation, presentation, and performance of the relic of the True Cross and the memories and associations it carried with it.

---

52 See the article by Shimrit Shriki-Hilber in this volume.
Fig. 1: Vatican, Treasury of Saint Peter’s Basilica. Crux Vaticana (The Cross of Justin II), 565-578 (photo © Sante Guido).

Fig. 2: St. Petersburg, State Heritage Museum, inv. no. X 249. Silver casket from Chersones, c. 565 (photo: Leonard Kheifets and Svetlana Suetova; © The State Heritage Museum).
Fig. 3: Christine Wolfgang, a reconstruction of Einhard’s Arch (photo © Martina Pippal).

Fig. 4: Rome, the Arch of Titus, 81 CE (photo © DAI Rome).
Fig. 5: Rome, the Arch of Titus, detail. Crowning of Titus, 81 CE (photo © Galit Noga-Banai).

Fig. 6: Rome, the Arch of Titus, detail. Triumphal Procession, 81 CE (photo © Galit Noga-Banai).
Fig. 7: Hildesheim, Cathedral Museum. Bernward’s Column, 1015-22 (photo: Florian Monheim; © Hildesheim Cathedral Museum).

Fig. 8: Narbonne, Archaeological Museum. The Tomb Aedicule of Narbonne, front view, mid-fifth century (photo: Shimrit Shriki-Hilber; © Musées de Narbonne – Ville de Narbonne).
Fig. 9: Poitiers, the Chapel of the Holy Cross. Reconstruction of the early medieval floor plan (plan © François Eygun).

Fig. 10: Ravenna, the Church of S. Croce. Reconstruction of the fifth century floor-plan (plan © Massimiliano David).
Architectural Frames for Relics of the True Cross

Fig. 11: Jerusalem, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Reconstruction of the fourth century floor-plan (plan © Virgilio C. Corbo).

Fig. 12: Rome, the Church of S. Croce in Gerusalemme. Reconstruction of the fourth century floor-plan (plan © Richard Krautheimer).
Fig. 13: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, département des manuscrits Français 10440, fols. 45a, 45b. Drawing of the so-called Einhard’s Arch from Recueil de copies d’inscriptions latines, de dessins de monuments antiques et de médailles, recueillis en France aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècle, seventeenth century (photo © Bibliothèque nationale de France).
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Jonas of Orléans and the Veneration of the Holy Cross in the Carolingian Era

Alexander Winnefeld *

Abstract

Between the 790s and 840s, a certain unease about the cult of the Cross can be discerned in the Carolingian sources. In reacting to the council of Hierieia, Carolingian writers began to think about the veneration of images, relics, and the Holy Cross. This essay takes a closer look at the treatise De cultu imaginum by Jonas of Orléans, a text which was begun in the 820s and finished around 840, and its relationship with the so-called Apologeticum by Claudius, Bishop of Turin, to which it served as a rebuttal. It shows how, in the 840s, the Carolingian Cult of the Cross had changed to incorporate not only the relic of the True Cross but also any kind of artistic depiction of the Cross and the Crucifixion.
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1 Introduction

Aliud enim Deus iussit, aliud isti faciunt. Deus iussit crucem portare, non adorare: isti volunt adorare, quam volunt nec spiritualiter nec corporaliter secum portare. Taliter enim Deum colere, ab eo recedere est; ille enim dixit: ‘Qui vult post me venire, abneget semetipsum, et tollat crucem meam et sequitur me.’ (‘God commanded them to carry the cross, not to adore it. They wish to adore it rather than to carry it in either a spiritual or a corporal sense. But to honor God in this manner is to depart from him, for he said, “If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me.”’)\(^1\)

[...] hoc est nobis credamus esse faciendum, ut prosternamur videlicet ante crucem et eum, qui in ea peperdit interioribus oculis intuentes adoremus. Sic et crux, quae sine dubio sancta est et competentem sibi habebit honorem, et Deus, in quo et a quo et per quem, ut beatus Augustinus ait, sancta sunt, quae sancta sunt omnia, in eo quod ipse sanctificavit, venerabiliter adoratur. (‘[...] we believe that we too ought to do this, namely to prostrate ourselves before the cross and, with our inner eye open, to adore him, who is suspended on the cross. And so the cross, which is without a doubt holy, will obtain the honor appropriate to it, and God, in whom, by whom, and through whom, as Saint Augustine says, all things that are holy are holy, because he himself made them holy, [will be] venerably adored.’)\(^2\)

To the scholar of the Carolingian period, the symbol of the Holy Cross appears omnipresent. He encounters it as the vexillum Christi, the symbolic standard of Christ’s triumph. He can find it in the form of richly adorned cruces gemmatae; as a figurative poem in the works of Alcuin or Hraban Maur; as a corporal gesture in liturgy; or as the relic of the True Cross that Louis the Pious had ordered to be brought to him just before he died.\(^3\)

So why was there, at the same time, what seemed like a lively debate about the adoration of the Cross, with some of the major Carolingian authorities taking sides for or against it? It may be important to note that some forms of the cult of the Cross were still relatively new at this time. The cult of the True Cross as a special type of veneration of holy relics was already well-established.\(^4\) The same cannot be said for crucifixes or other artistic depictions of the Cross that had no connections to the True Cross except for their reminiscence of the historical event. At the same

---

1 ‘Claudii Taurinensis’, ed. by Dümmler, p. 612.
3 ‘Vita Hludowici Imperatoris’, ed. by Pertz, c. 64, p. 647.
4 Cf. Galit Noga-Banai’s text in this volume for examples of the use of architectural forms as a means to showcase the relic of the Cross.
time, paganism and pagan rites were not yet as distant in the eighth and ninth centuries as they must have seemed in later centuries. The Saxons had been converted to Christianity only recently and still only quite superficially; and on its northern and eastern borders, the Carolingian Empire still had to deal with Danes and Slavs that were still holding on to paganism. In this context, the possibility of adoration of any man-made object still must have held disruptive potential. The unease concerning this question can be tracked in a number of texts written between the 790s and 840s, which – among other things – prominently feature the problem of the veneration of the Holy Cross.

These writings tend to classify themselves as contributions to a debate about sacred images that was initially spawned by the controversy on Byzantine Iconoclasm: Agobard’s treatise is titled ‘On pictures and images’, Walahfrid Strabo included a chapter ‘On images’ in a larger work about the history of liturgy, and Jonas of Orléans wrote ‘Three books on the cult of images’. Walahfrid as well as Jonas gave a short history of the debate, explicitly linking the matter to Byzantium. At the same time, the texts are also connected with the Christological debate on Adoptianism, which had its roots on the Iberian Peninsula. A few texts, like Einhard’s ‘Inquiry on the adoration of the Cross’, clearly belong into the same context, tackling the same problems, but without placing themselves explicitly in it. For most of the writers, the Holy Cross was without a doubt the standard of Christianity. Some, like Theodulf of Orléans, were at the same time very cautious of its material depictions though, as they might provoke unwanted acts of veneration that could be seen as dangerously close to idolatry. Only one, Bishop Claudius of Turin, went as far as to deny the special role of the Cross in the divine plan of salvation. He reduced it to a mere object, an instrument of torture and execution made of wood, that bore no special significance in any way whatsoever.5

The goal of this paper is to examine the way Carolingian authors thought and wrote about the Holy Cross by taking a closer look at a single work, Jonas of Orléans’s aforementioned De cultu imaginum libri tres. Jonas was one of the last Franks to contribute to the matter. As the author himself categorises his treatise as a work ‘on the cult of images’, it seems appropriate at first to take a broader look at the reception of Byzantine Iconoclasm in the Carolingian West, before moving on to De cultu imaginum in particular.

5 Agobard of Lyon, ‘De picturis’, ed. by van Acker; ‘Claudii Taurinensis’, ed. by Dümmel, pp. 610-613 (the so-called Apologeticum is printed among the letters as ‘excerpts from a more comprehensive volume by Claudius of Turin on the cult of images’); Dungal, Responsum contra Claudium, ed. by Zanna; ‘Einhardi Quaestio’, ed. by Hampe; ‘Jonae Libri’, ed. by Migne; Opus Caroli regis, ed. by Freeman and Mayvaert; ‘Walahfridi Strabonis Libellus’, ed. by Krause, pp. 482-484 (chap. De imaginibus et picturis). Hrabanus Maurus’s Liber de laudibus sanctae crucis is usually placed into the same context, despite not being tied directly to the debates on Iconoclasm and Adoptianism. On these texts, cf. Noble, Images and Chazelle, The Crucified God.
2 Iconoclasm and the Cult of the Cross in the Carolingian Era

The beginning of the Carolingian debate on the cult of Images as well as the cult of the Cross is marked by the Second Council of Nicaea. In 787, Empress Irene had put an end to the first period of Byzantine Iconoclasm by holding a council that suspended the decrees of a synod that had been held at Hierieia about thirty years earlier. In the aftermath, the records of the council, which was held with papal support somehow reached the court of Charlemagne, where they were a major source of irritation. Amongst scholars, there has been a fair amount of speculation on the question of how exactly those documents came into the hands of the Franks, whether the Frankish theologians were able to understand them, and which role the Latin translation played.

What is important in this context is that the Visigoth Theodulf, who later became Bishop of Orléans, was entrusted with the task of writing a refutation of the *Pseudosynodus Grecorum [...] pro adorandis imaginibus* (‘Pseudosynod of the Greeks in favour of the adoration of images’) on behalf of the Franks. In close contact with the Frankish Court, the so-called *Capitulare adversus synodum* was written and sent to Pope Hadrian in 792. It was followed by the *Opus Caroli regis contra synodum*, an exhaustive volume that was meant to develop the official Frankish position on the cult of images in contrast to the views of the Greeks, which were perceived as outrageous and scandalous. In the view of Theodulf (and Frankish orthodoxy), images were mere objects that could depict the deeds of the saints but did not share their holiness. They should not be compared to relics – the actual bodies of the saints – or the Holy Cross. They were even potentially dangerous, as they were wide open to interpretation and could only be identified for certain when they were accompanied by explanatory inscriptions. As objects belonging to the material world, they could not be an instance to which the faithful could apply for help. They could, however, serve as useful reminders of the deeds of the saints, and therefore they were not to be destroyed. To the Franks, the Greeks appeared as extremists, on the one hand destroying images, on the other adoring them.

Theodulf’s opinion on the Holy Cross seems fairly ambivalent: It was praised as *vexillum* and *arma* Christi, as Christ’s standard and arms, but at the same time the *imago crucis* seemed just as unfit an object of veneration as other worldly things.

Subsequently, Theodulf’s treatise fell into oblivion. While it was later copied by a young Hincmar of Reims, it apparently was not used by the writers of the following generation. The fact that Pope Hadrian’s response to the *Capitulare* made it

---


7 It does not seem necessary to revisit those questions; cf. Auzépy, ‘Francfort’ and Thümmel, *Die Konzilien*, pp. 215-230.


10 Ibid., c. II.28, pp. 296-300.
clear that he approved of the Council of Nicaea certainly did not benefit the text’s completion, let alone its distribution. However, the debate itself was revived roughly one generation earlier, under the reign of Louis the Pious. Just as in the 790s, the Byzantine debate on images was the starting point of the debate, when the Frankish court received a letter from Michael II, a moderate iconoclast, in which the Emperor asked for help against iconodules operating from Rome. Louis dealt with the question by summoning an assembly of bishops at Paris in 825 that proceeded to condemn iconoclasm as well as the cult of images.

At the same time, the Carolingians also experienced their very own contentious debate on images, when Bishop Claudius of Turin took measures against what he perceived as an inappropriate cult of material objects by removing images of the deeds of the saints, as well as cruces materiales from churches in his parish. As far as his views can be reconstructed from the surviving excerpts of his writing, he seems also to have had objections to pilgrimage to Rome and maybe the cult of saints in general. He was prompted to justify himself in front of a gathering of bishops (probably convened in Paris in 825) but refused to do so, calling it a ‘gathering of asses’. Furthermore, two churchmen were entrusted with a rebuttal of Claudius’s teachings, namely the Irishman Dungal and Jonas, Bishop of Orléans, whose treatise will be further examined below.

Claudius died around the year 830 – without ever having been officially condemned or stripped of his office. Although this Carolingian image quarrel remained but an episode, a handful of texts continued to be written in the 830s and 840s. Einhard’s De adoranda sancta cruce, the only layman’s work on the problem, answered a question posed by Lupus of Ferrières. Sadly, Lupus’s question itself is lost, and in his response to Einhard’s letter he did not refer to the veneration the Cross. Agobard of Lyon’s De picturis et imaginibus on the other hand seems to have been written considerably earlier and may have been used by Claudius, not the other way round. Walahfrid Strabo writes a chapter on images in his Libellus de exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum but does not touch the question of the Cross. And, last but not least, Jonas of Orléans, who began writing in response to Claudius, finished his work several years after his opponent had passed away.

Certain arguments concerning the cult of images are repeated over and over again throughout the whole corpus of texts. They form the baseline of what Thomas Noble called the Frankish via media concerning religious art. The most important patristic references are the letters of Gregory the Great to Serenus of
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12 The dossier of this assembly is printed in Concilia Aevi Carolini I,2, ed. by Werminghoff, pp. 473-551.
14 Dungal, Responsa contra Claudium, ed. by Zanna, p. 250.
Marseille, in which the Pope chastises the latter for his iconoclastic actions.\footnote{Gregorii Papae Registrum Epistolarum, ed. by Ewald/Hartmann, IX, 208 and XI, 10, pp. 195, 269-272; cf. Noble, Images, pp. 35-45.} The Bible itself is referenced against, as well as in favour of images. Alongside the Old Testament prohibition of images (Exodus 20.4), biblical examples of images that were pleasing to God are quoted regularly, for instance the Cherubim on the Ark of the Covenant (Exodus 25.18-22), or Solomon adorning the temple (2 Chronicles 5). Especially the speciositas of the images that contribute to the splendour of the churches, as well as their usefulness for the commemoration of the deeds of the saints are common arguments in favour of material representations. In the eyes of the Franks, destroying images was just as bad as venerating them with an inappropriate cult. Only God should be adored; however, the question whether an appropriate veneration of material objects was possible was answered by different writers in different ways.

### 3 Jonas of Orléans and His *De cultu imaginum*

Jonas, who was of Aquitanian origin, was elected Bishop of Orléans in 818.\footnote{For his life and works, cf. Brunhölzl, Geschichte, pp. 403-407.} There, he succeeded Theodulf, the writer of the *Opus Caroli regis*. He held his office for more than two decades and became one of the most important and influential Frankish churchmen of his time. Part of Louis the Pious’s inner circle, he played his part in the organisation of several synods, including the assembly at Paris in 825 that dealt with Byzantine iconoclasm and the cult of images.\footnote{Noble, Images, pp. 265-268.} To today’s scholars, he is mainly known as an author of two treatises that can be assigned to the genre of the Mirrors of Princes, *De institutione regia* and *De institutione laicali*.\footnote{Jonas d’Orléans, *Le métier du roi*, ed. by Dubreucq; Jonas d’Orléans, *Instruction des laïcs*, ed. by Dubreucq.} Furthermore, Jonas wrote a *Vita Sancti Huberti* (based on an older *vita* of the saint), to which he added an account of the translation of the saint’s relics from Liège to the newly founded monastery of *Andagium* (today’s Saint-Hubert in Wallonia).\footnote{‘Vita secunda’, ed. by de Smedt, van Hooff and de Backer.}

Among the carolingian texts dealing with the problem of iconoclasm and the veneration of material objects, *De cultu imaginum* stands out as one of the more obscure. While most of the other key authors have been the subject of studies in monographic form, and most of their texts have seen comprehensive critical editions, research on Jonas’ *De cultu imaginum* remains scarce. To date, the most detailed analysis of it has been provided by Thomas F. X. Noble, in his study on ‘Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians’.\footnote{Noble, Images, pp. 295-306.} Apart from that, Celia Chazelle dedicated a few paragraphs of her monograph ‘The Crucified God in the Carolingian
Era’ to Jonas’ treatise. The standard edition of the text is still the one contained in Migne’s *Patrologia Latina*. The only part of the work available in a critical edition is the introduction, with its dedication to Charles the Bald. This is certainly also due to the fact that no manuscript tradition of the text has survived. It is only preserved in two prints from the sixteenth century.

The circumstances of the texts’ creation are described by Jonas himself in the introduction of *De cultu imaginum*. After the dedication of the text to Charles, he traces the course of the debate around Claudius under the rule of Louis the Pious. He reports that Claudius, who, having been sent to Italy by Louis, was appalled by local customs of veneration in his diocese, had images of the deeds of the saints and crosses (probably crucifixes) removed from churches. This spawned a conflict with Theutmir, the abbot of Psalmody Abbey in today’s southern France, who tried to correct Claudius and steer him away from his *superstitiones*. The result of Theutmir’s attack was the so called *Apologeticum*, written by Claudius in direct response as a justification of his deeds. Jonas writes in his *De cultu imaginum* that he was instructed by Louis to compose a treatise in defence of the Holy Mother Church. He had already finished significant parts of his work when he put down the quill after hearing of Claudius’s death.

It is hard to say what exactly prompted Jonas to revisit a work he had started around 825 and that was so deeply rooted in that time, but *De cultu imaginum* was finally finished in the 840s. The disciples of Claudius that are mentioned in the introduction cannot be found anywhere else in the sources. There are a few hints, though, that indicate there was still uncertainty concerning the cult of images after Claudius’s death; Einhard wrote *De adoranda sancta crucis* in 836; Walahfrid Strabo, on the other hand, writing around 840, completely left the matter of the Cross out of his account of the iconoclastic controversy. Towards the end of the century, Anastasius Bibliothecarius wrote that the whole world adhered to the doctrine that images were worthy of veneration, apart from some people in Gaul stating that man-made objects should not be venerated. There might have been further unease apart from this rather scarce evidence; but if there was, it cannot be tracked down in the existing source material.

Did *De cultu imaginum* deal with questions that were still pressing issues in the 840s? Discerning different chronological layers in the text seems difficult. The aforementioned *discipuli* of Claudius are only present in the introduction. There are
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23 ‘Jonae Libri’, ed. by Migne, cols. 304B-88A.
26 ‘Jonae Libri’, ed. by Migne, cols. 305C-06C.
27 Ibid., col. 307A.
no further allusions to them in the main text of the treatise. Instead, the work offers a meticulous and deeply personal rebuttal of Claudius’s *Apologeticum*. Its author, long since deceased, is addressed directly over and over again throughout the whole text, with the exception of the introduction alone. His exact reasons for finishing the book are thus a mystery.

Overall, Jonas’ *De cultu imaginum* is divided into three books. In the first one, Jonas gives his account of the history of the controversy surrounding Claudius, before moving on to the cult of images and the cult of the Cross. He links Claudius to Bishop Elipand of Toledo and to Felix of Urgell; his reference to the adoptianists may have served the purpose of discrediting his opponent. It also shows that, to contemporaries, the discourse on the cult of images was tied to the great Christological disputes of the time.\(^{29}\) The second book is almost completely devoted to the defence of the cult of the Holy Cross. The third and last book deals with pilgrimages to Rome and the relics of saints, which also seem to have been attacked by Claudius.\(^{30}\)

In his *Apologeticum*, Claudius had justified his actions with reference to the biblical prohibition of images according to Exodus 20,4, that *distincte* banned the production, let alone the worship, of any likenesses.\(^{31}\) As far as he understood the passage, the prohibition was not to be limited to the likenesses of heathen deities and therefore was not only to be applied to heathen idolatry.\(^{32}\) He accompanied these considerations with a definition of the terms *adorare* and *colere*, and concluded, that idolatry and the veneration of images were basically the same, distinguishable by name alone.\(^{33}\)

Jonas’ rebuttal builds on the assumption that the Old Testament ban on images was not fully valid anymore. It was still true that man-made *similitudines* should neither be object of *cultus* nor *adoratio*, as both were associated with God alone. But at the same time, even the Old Testament knew of images that were pleasing to God — for example the Cherubim that adorned the Ark of the Covenant.\(^{34}\) All in all, his arguments in defence of images seem quite conventional. Referring to Gregory the Great, Jonas emphasises the benefit of images *ad instruendas nescientium mentes* (‘for the instruction of illiterate minds’).\(^{35}\) This is fully in accordance with the Frankish *via media* in the iconoclastic debate: Images do have a place in churches and should not be destroyed, but at the same time they should not be objects of inappropriate veneration.

Subsequently, Jonas deals with the terminology of acts of cult. He refers to the tenth book of Augustine’s *De civitate Dei*, in which the Church Father explains the
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31 ‘Claudii Taurinensis’, ed. by Dümmler, p. 610.
32 Ibid.
33 Ibid., p. 611.
34 ‘Jonae Libri’, ed. by Migne, col. 318A-C.
35 Ibid., cols. 310D-311B.
meaning of the Greek term *latreia*. The same reference can also be found in the *Libellum* of the assembly of Paris in 825, as well as in Agobard’s *De picturis et imaginibus*. At this point, Jonas leaves the subject of images, going on a tangent on the subject of the cult of the saints, before continuing with another topic: The defence of the Holy Cross. Thomas Noble noticed that it was interesting ‘that a book entitled *On the Cult of Images* devotes so little space to images.’ The Holy Cross, severely attacked by Claudius, seems to have been the key concern of Jonas’ treatise.

4 The Adoration of the Holy Cross

To understand Jonas’ arguments in defence of the Cross, we must again deal with his opponent. Claudius was by far the harshest critic of the cult of the Cross in the Carolingian West. His rejection of it had its roots in two different objections. On the one hand, he took offense at the depiction of the crucified Jesus in the form of crucifixes. Claudius argued that this imagery was cruel and humiliating, as it repeated the death of Christ again and again. In Claudius’s opinion, the promoters of this form of representation were seemingly not able to see Christ in any other way than suffering and dying. Therefore, they were in essence not true Christians; instead, they were indistinguishable from heathens or Jews. In his writing, he himself put more emphasis on the divine nature of Christ over the dying man on the Cross. Claudius’s quotation of II Corinthians 5.16 – *Etsi noveramus secundum carnem Christum, sed nun iam non novimus* (‘Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more’) – is aimed at this distinction. With the Ascension, Christ had transcended the flesh, and for Claudius, Christ on the Cross, just as Christ in his mother’s womb, or Christ riding into Jerusalem on the back of an ass, was the Christ ‘we have known […] after the flesh’. Maybe it was this rather strict distinction, along with his Hispanic descent, that allowed his opponents to associate him not only with Adoptionism but also with Nestorianism.

On the other hand, Claudius was opposed to the veneration of any kind of dead matter. If at all, he states in a passage that deals with images of the saints, living human beings should be adored, as they bear a resemblance to God (*similitudinem Dei habent*). This could not be said about things made of wood or stone, which were only dead matter without life, sense, or reason. Therefore, he passed
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38 Cf. Ibid., p. 299.
39 ‘Claudii Taurinensis’, ed. by Dümmler, p. 611.
41 For Jonas, Adoptionism and Nestorianism were deeply related, as he accused Felix of Urgell of reiterating the error of the Nestorians. Cf. ‘Jonae Libri’, ed. by Migne, col. 309C.
42 ‘Claudii Taurinensis’, ed. by Dümmler, p. 611.
harsh judgement on those who bowed before these false images (‘falsas imaginas’), explicitly including *cruces materiales*:

*Contra quos respondendum est, quia, si omne lignum scemate crucis factum volunt adorare pro eo, quod Christus in cruce peependit, et alia multa illis convent, quae Christus egit per carnem. Vix enim sex horis in cruce peependit, et tamen novem mensibus lunaribus et supra undecim diebus in utero virgini fuit [*…*] Adorentur ergo puellae virgines, quia virgo peperit Christum. (*Against those is to respond, that, if they wanted to adore every cross-shaped piece of wood for the fact that Christ hung from a cross, there would also be many other things Christ did in the flesh. He merely hung from the Cross for six hours, but at the same time, he spent nine months and more than eleven days in the womb of a virgin. Therefore, we would have to adore virgin girls, because a virgin gave birth to Christ’).*

For Claudius, the fact that Christ suffered on the Cross for ‘merely six hours’ does not justify the veneration of ‘every cross-shaped piece of wood’ by his contemporaries. In a *reductio ad absurdum*, he states that by this logic, virgins ought to be venerated, too, because Christ spent considerably more time in the womb of the Virgin Mary than he did on the Cross. Claudius follows this up with a list of objects that should be venerated because Christ had interacted with them in some way or another, or because of some kind of allegorical connection. He mentions cribs, pieces of cloth, ships, asses, lambs, lions, stones, thorns, and lances. His criticism of the cult of the Cross is much harsher than the one delivered by Theodulf of Orleans one generation before. Theodulf was opposed to the veneration of the *imago crucis*, but had at the same time praised the Cross as *arma* and *vexillum Christi*. What was especially new and radical was the fact that Claudius seemingly denied the particular role of the Holy Cross – and thus the Passion – in God’s plan of salvation, by hyperbolically establishing the duration of the interaction of Christ with something as the standard for measuring that particular object’s holiness.

Jonas responds to this full-fledged attack with a passionate defence of the Cross’s role for Christianity. He does so by meticulously citing Claudius’s arguments point by point, to refute them by accusing Claudius of not being aware of the special role of the Holy Cross and the Crucifixion for Christianity and standing alone against patristic authorities by not accepting them. Then, at the beginning of the second book, Jonas opens with a lengthy litany of the Cross, otherwise known as *In venerabilem crucem sermo*, attributed to (Pseudo-)John Chrysostom. The text itself is well known all over the Christian world, but especially in the Eastern
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44 Ibid., p. 612.
45 *Opus Caroli regis*, ed. by Freeman and Mayvaert, c. II,28, pp. 296-300.
46 ‘Jonae Libri’, ed. by Migne, cols. 336B-337C.
47 Ibid., cols. 344B-D.
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Mediterranean.\footnote{The text appears in numerous versions and in a couple of different languages. See for example Alin Suciu’s edition of a ninth century Coptic sermon that borrowed heavily from Pseudo-Chrysostom, cf. Suciu, ‘Ps.-Theophili Alexandrini Sermo de Cruce et Latrone (CPG 2622)’.
\footnote{Here it is referred to as a quotation from Johannes Chrysostom’s homily De cruce et latrone. Amalarii episcopi, Vol. 2: Liber Officialis, ed. by Hanssens, pp. 99-100.
\footnote{‘Jonae Libri’, ed. by Migne, col. 345A.
\footnote{Ibid., cols. 342D-344A.

In western discourse, it had been irrelevant up to this point. The only other Carolingian author even remotely linked to the debate using it was Amalarius of Metz, who took part in the Paris colloquy in 825. He cited it in his \textit{Liber Officialis} written in 823.\footnote{\textit{Liber Officialis}, written in 823.}

In the passage, a myriad of honorific titles are ascribed to the Cross. Among many other things, it is referred to as the hope of Christians, the resurrection of the dead, the way of the desperate, the consolation of the poor, the victory over the devil and the foundation of the Church. In light of all these merits, how could the Holy Cross not seem worthy of veneration by the faithful? The passage from Pseudo-Chrysostom serves as a direct counter against Claudius’s list of objects that Christ had interacted with in his lifetime, by quantifying the merits of the Cross in a very similar manner. Now it is Jonas’ turn to ask sarcastically how a well-educated churchman such as Claudius could not see why the Cross on which Christ had died, and not the ass on which he had ridden, was the centrepiece of Christian symbolism.\footnote{\textit{Jonae Libri}, ed. by Migne, col. 345A.}

Jonas has little to say on the problem of materiality. He merely touches the issue shortly by mentioning the practice of kissing the Gospels, as a form of veneration equally harmless and appropriate to bowing before the Cross. To Jonas, both are symbolic acts, and are not in any way tied to the matter of the concrete object.\footnote{Ibid., cols. 342D-344A.} This relative lack of interest is also due to the fact that Claudius, in his rejection of the veneration of worldly things, did not only attack material crosses or practices of cult associated with them. In his radicalness, he denied the Cross, no matter in which form, any type of veneration by degrading it to a mere piece of wood on which Christ had suffered for an insignificant proportion of his earthly life. This was also an attack on the relic of the True Cross. So it was the Cross itself, not only certain material representations, that Jonas was due to defend in his treatise.

The lack of interest in the problem of materiality is in accord with other late Carolingian texts on the topic. Instead, the focus shifted towards modes and acts of veneration and the vocabulary to describe them, admittedly without ever developing a universally accepted terminology.\footnote{Chazelle, \textit{The crucified God}, pp. 123-124. On the terminology also cf. Cf. Noble, \textit{Images}, passim.}

For example, Einhard defined the terms \textit{adoratio} and \textit{oratio} as acts before a visible object (\textit{res visibilis}) and an inner disposition respectively, before stating that the Holy Cross could and should in fact be adored.\footnote{‘Einharti Quaestio’, ed. by Hampe, p. 148. Cf. Noble, \textit{Images}, p. 323.} At the same time, Walahfrid
Strabo writes that images should not be the objects of immoderate cult (*cultu immoderato*), thus implying that there was also an acceptable, moderate form of veneration. He also states that manmade objects should not be adored with honours only due to God (*divinis honoribus colere/adorare*). Harting-Correa translated this into English as ‘worshipped and adored in the liturgy’ – an interpretation that would leave a possibility for acts of veneration outside the liturgical framework. And finally, Jonas, who is not as concerned with terminology, seems to be thinking of this concept of acceptable, ‘modest honours’ that are directed at an object, but only so far as they serves as a symbol, when he deems kissing the Gospels or bowing before the Cross unproblematic.

For Christianity, the Cross has never been a mere thing but has served as a reminder of the key moment in the History of Salvation, the Passion. The so-called ‘Imperial Carolingian Calendar’ (*Karolingischer Reichskalender*) that found widespread distribution from the beginning of the ninth century already contained two feasts dedicated to the Cross, namely *Inventio Crucis* on May 3 and *Exaltatio Crucis* on September 14. Apart from that, it was indispensable for the liturgy of Good Friday. The debate surrounding Claudius shows the scepticism of a minority of churchmen, as well as the triumph of the Cross in all its forms and matters. In the 840s, it was not important anymore what a certain cross might be made of – instead it was only important what every cross symbolised. Therefore, every crucifix, or even every simple wooden cross was now fit to receive certain physical acts of honour, such as bowing or kissing, in place of Christ, who died on it. Every one of them was now truly the *vexillum Christi*.

55 *Walahfrid Strabo’s Libellus de exordiis*, ed. and transl. by Harting-Correa, p. 79.
56 Cf. *Der karolingische Reichskalender*, ed. by Borst, pp. 852 and 1292. Regarding the rather complex manuscript tradition of the calendar, cf. the introduction ibid., pp. 3-390.
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placuit tunc Deo, quod inventa est particula una crucis dominicae in loco secre-
to, iam ab antico tempore a viris religiosis occultata, nunc autem a quodam
homihe Syro, Deo volente, revelata. \(^1\) (‘It was pleasing to God that a par-
ticle of the Lord’s Cross was found in a hidden place, where it had
been concealed by religious men from ancient times. Now, how-
ever, a certain Syrian had, God willing, revealed it.’)

With these words Fulcher of Chartres, one of the great chroniclers of the early
history of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, describes one of the most important
events in the foundation period of the crusader state. Soon after the conquest of
Jerusalem by the armies of the First Crusade on 15 July 1099, as several sources
attest,\(^2\) Oriental Christians discovered a part of the True Cross. This relic has a
long history. According to legend, the Cross of Christ had been found by Helena,
the mother of Constantine the Great. When the Holy City was threatened by the
advance of Arab Muslim forces in the first third of the seventh century, the relic
was brought to Constantinople for protection. However, the Jerusalem tradition
states that a part of the relic remained in the Holy City. It is that fragment that was
supposedly rediscovered in July 1099 when Jerusalem was once more ruled by
Christians – albeit by Latin newcomers from the West.\(^3\)

This fragment was to become the foremost symbol of the Latin Kingdom of
Jerusalem. Its discovery coincided with the kingdom’s birth. And when the relic
was tragically lost during the Battle of Hattin almost 90 years later, this marked the
death of the old Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, even though it was to live on in exile
with its new capital city of Acre for another century. While the Cross always re-
tained its original religious importance during this period, it also functioned as the
quasi-official relic of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The True Cross was at the centre
of a complex ethno-religious cult that emerged among the kingdom’s Latin popula-
tion.\(^4\)

The dominant research opinion on ethnicity in the Crusader States holds that
only one ethnic group emerged from the First Crusade – this group encompassed
all Latins in the Crusader States. As opposed to this panlatin view I offer a particu-
larist alternative by showing that at least two separate ethnic groups developed –
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\(^1\) Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolimitana*, ed. by Hagenmeyer, I.xxx.4. All translations in this
paper are my own, unless indicated otherwise.

\(^2\) Cf. Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. and transl. by Edgington, VI.xxxviii; Fulcher of
Raymond of Aguilers, ‘Historia Francorum’, XXXII; William of Tyre, *Willelm Tyrensis*, ed. by Huy-
gens, IX.iv.

\(^3\) The history of the division and distribution of the True Cross in the fourth century is not clear and
Wilken, *The Land*, pp. 82-84.

\(^4\) The role of the True Cross for the Kingdom of Jerusalem has previously been dealt with, albeit with
different approaches and emphases, in, for example: Epp, ‘Entstehung’; Gerish, ‘True Cross’; Ligato,
‘Political Meanings’; Murray, ‘Mighty’.
the Antiocheni – or Antiochenes – in the Principality of Antioch, and the Hierosolymitani – or Jerusalemites – in the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The ethnic identity of the Antiochenes was closely connected to the Normans as the most important subgroup among the Latins of Antioch, and particularly to the ruling Norman dynasty of the house of Hauteville-La-Guichard. Jerusalemite identity, on the other hand, depended much less on the kingdom’s rulers and much more on the view that Latin Jerusalem was the realisation of Christ’s kingdom on earth. As opposed to the elite-centered identity of the Antiochenes, Jerusalemite identity was of a more communal nature and stressed the unity of the whole people. For the Latins in Jerusalem – the Hierosolymitani – this function of an ethnic symbol was fulfilled by the True Cross.5

Suggesting an ethnic interpretation of the True Cross may lead to the legitimate question: How can the Cross be the symbol of a specific ethnic group if it was – and indeed is – the symbol of Christianity and all Christians? Did the relic of the True Cross that was found in 1099 have a specifically ethnic meaning for the Latins in the crusader kingdom that went beyond its merely religious importance? In this paper I can only touch upon a few key points. I will deal with the discovery of the relic, with the role of the relic in the wars fought by the Latin kingdom and finally with the rituals celebrated for the Cross whenever it returned to Jerusalem.

There are two important sources for the analysis of the cult of the True Cross in Jerusalem. In the first place, there is the Historia Hierosolymitana by Fulcher of Chartres. Fulcher was born in 1059 near Chartres and received a thorough education at the local cathedral school. He probably took part in the Council of Clermont and was therefore an eyewitness of the First Crusade from its very beginning. As a retainer of Stephen of Blois, Fulcher embarked on the crusade and left for the East. During the campaign in northern Syria in 1097, he became chaplain to Baldwin of Boulogne who was later to rule Jerusalem as Baldwin I. As royal chaplain and as a canon of the Holy Sepulchre, Fulcher was in a prime position to record the early history of the Latin kingdom. He continued to do so until 1127 when his account suddenly stops. Fulcher was to become the most important historian of the Latin kingdom. Excerpts from his texts were even read during public liturgical celebrations that commemorated the conquest of Jerusalem.6

While Fulcher was born in Europe, the second great historian of Latin Jerusalem – William of Tyre – was a native Jerusalemite. Born around 1130, William

5 This paper is based on a longer chapter of my doctoral dissertation on ethnogenesis in the Principality of Antioch and the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem: Kirschberger, Erster Kreuzzug. The Crusader States present a very interesting case for a study of ethnicity and especially ethnogenesis. The history of the Latins of Outremer bears striking resemblance to the archetype of early medieval accounts of the development of peoples, commonly referred to as origines gentium: A group of people leave their ancestral lands on a divine mission, travel across the sea to confront a seemingly superior enemy and finally manage to establish themselves in a new homeland. Such new ethnic groups are always dependent on certain myths and symbols that create and safeguard a common identity.

spent several years studying in Europe but returned in the 1160s to become an important political and ecclesiastical figure as Archbishop of Tyre and chancellor of the realm. His *Chronicon* covers the period from the First Crusade to the year 1184.\(^7\)

From a postmodern perspective, the sudden appearance of the relic certainly provides reason for scepticism with regard to its authenticity. Not only did the relic appear almost like a *deus-ex-machina* out of a mysterious *loco secreto*. The discovery also happened to come at just the right time for the first Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem Arnulf of Chocques in whose cathedral church – the Holy Sepulchre – the relic was to be kept ever since. For various reasons having to do as much with his uncanonical election as with his questionable lifestyle choices, Arnulf was confronted by enduring and heavy criticism and his newly-won position as Patriarch was under serious threat when – just at the right moment – the relic was found. As the protector of the Cross, Arnulf now had an excellent tool with which he could re-establish his credibility and further his influence and prestige. Historians have therefore seen him as not just a beneficiary but also as the instigator of the discovery.\(^8\)

It is therefore all the more surprising that not a single word of doubt is uttered by any of the Jerusalemite sources. Chroniclers such as Fulcher of Chartres and William of Tyre were not naïve or uncritical witnesses when it came to relics. For example, they criticised the alleged discovery of the so-called Holy Lance – the spear with which the Roman soldier pierced the side of Christ on the cross – at Antioch during the crusade in 1098. As opposed to this relic, the True Cross was of such great importance to the Jerusalemites that they did not cast any shadow of a doubt on its, actually quite suspicious, discovery. On the contrary, while non-Jerusalemite authors such as Raymond of Aguilers attest Arnulf’s role in the discovery, the Jerusalemite authors obscure the connection between the relic and the Patriarch. Many chroniclers who wrote in the West and all the texts from Antioch, on the other hand, do not mention the discovery of the relic at all, thus providing a great contrast to the Jerusalemite perspective.\(^9\)

Furthermore, the Jerusalemite accounts of the discovery do not mention any named individuals. No members of the crusader elite take any part in this important event. Even though the Latin Kingdom had mortal human kings, Christ was seen as the true ruler in Jerusalem. Thus, the focus here – as in many other cases – is on the entirety of the people accepting this gift of divine grace and fa-

---


vour. consolationem quasi de celo missam omnes in commune acceperunt¹⁰ (‘They all received this encouragement that was sent as if from Heaven’). Such expressions abound in the Jerusalemite texts that tend to minimize the importance of kings and other leading individuals in favour of the people as a whole and its immediate relationship with their God whose tangible presence was represented by the relic of the True Cross.

For the chroniclers of the Latin Kingdom, the discovery was an event of pivotal importance. Therefore, they also provide further details on the story and mention the creation of a splendid reliquary and the celebrations that occurred when the Cross was brought into the church of the Holy Sepulchre – psallendo et gratias Deo agendo, qui per tot dies hunc thesaurum suum et nostrum sibi et nobis servaverat¹¹ (‘singing psalms and giving thanks to God, who had preserved this treasure, His and ours, for Him and us through all this time’).

This is the earliest instance of the typical Jerusalem processional liturgy. The discovery of the relic is presented as a proof of divine favour for the Jerusalemites. Furthermore, Fulcher attests that the Cross had been preserved for a long time and predestined for the Latins in Jerusalem. In Fulcher’s description, the discovery is raised above the merely historical level and is given the function of a central, mythically supercharged event in the ethnic history of the Jerusalemites.

While Jerusalemite sources usually stress the unity of the whole people, there were certainly tensions within the group. The position of the True Cross within this field of tension allows us to further analyse the role of the relic for the Jerusalemites and their ethnic identity. As the attempts of Patriarch Arnulf show, prestigious relics always bear the potential of being exploited by the secular and ecclesiastical elite for their own purposes. There are indications that the kings of Jerusalem did indeed try to appropriate the Cross for their own cause, to link their rule to the relic. It was, for example, certainly not by chance, that the coronation of Fulk of Anjou and Queen Melisendis in 1131 took place on 14 September – the Feast of the Exaltation of the Cross. Nonetheless, the kings of Jerusalem never managed to successfully establish the Cross as the symbol of their kingship. They could not use it as an instrument to legitimate their rule.¹² The reason for this is, once more, the communal nature of Jerusalemite ethnic identity. The Cross was the symbol of the whole group and could not be appropriated by secular rulers.

During the roughly 90 years of its existence, the First Kingdom of Jerusalem was in a state of almost constant war. Thus, it should not be surprising that the relic of the True Cross was also closely associated with warfare. When the Kingdom went to war, its armies were frequently accompanied by the relic. Its partici-

¹⁰ Fulcher of Chartres, Historia Hierosolymitana, ed. by Hagenmeyer, L.xxx; William of Tyre, Chronicle, ed. by Huygens, IX.iv.
pation in military campaigns is a common topic in Jerusalemite texts. Taking the Cross to war, however, was not always popular with the people. We cannot reconstruct with absolute certainty how the decision about whether the Cross should be taken to war or not was made. Fulcher of Chartres at least provides us with a hint when he describes a campaign of Baldwin II in 1120. He writes: *petivit rex a patriarcha et clero humilime victoriosam Domini crucem sibi contradi* (‘The king asked the patriarch and clergy very humbly to entrust him with the victorious Cross of the Lord’). Apparently, it was principally the Patriarch and not the king who controlled the relic and decided – together with the chapter of his cathedral – whether it should accompany the royal host or not. The king had to ask the Patriarch for the privilege of the relic’s presence in the most humble fashion.

The Jerusalemite people played an important part in this process as well. While they are not attributed with an actual decision-making power, their grave concerns – as in the case of the 1120 campaign – are frequently mentioned. And when the Cross is, indeed, handed over, their consent is needed, at least to legitimise the action. Above all, the people as a whole take part in the ceremonies with which the Cross is sent on its way:

*et cum multis lacrimis pie pro ea profusis et canticis in laude illius decantatis, extra urbem nudis pedibus rex et patriarcha, plebs quoque omnis eam [crucem] conviassent, rex cum ea flendo discessit et populus ad urbem sanctam redit* (‘and with many tears having been piously shed for it [the Cross] and sacred hymns having been sung in its praise, the king, patriarch and people accompanied the Cross outside the City with bare feet. The king departed with it, crying, while the patriarch and people returned to the Holy City’).

This leave-taking ceremony was to become a fixture in the public liturgy of the Latin Kingdom. Whenever the relic went to war, there were elaborate and formalised ceremonies in the public space of the Kingdom’s capital during which the central role of the Cross as the symbol of the group was expressed and reaffirmed. As in the case quoted here, king, church and people act in unison and represent the entirety of the Jerusalemites. This ceremony of leave-taking can also be seen as a transitional ritual, similar to numerous accounts of translations of relics. The separation from the group – in this case from the Jerusalemites – is followed by the transition of the relic into the danger zone of liminality. During translations of relics, this liminality consisted of the dangers of the voyage and in the instability
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14 Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. by Hagenmeyer, III.ix.2.
16 Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. by Hagenmeyer, III.ix.4.
that characterised the time between the beginning and the end of the translation.\textsuperscript{17} This is the dangerous second stage of the transition – mobility. In the aforementioned case of the Jerusalem True Cross, the transition into the state of liminality is even more precarious since the relic takes part in an actual war.

Despite the dangers, however, the Cross was an important part in the kingdom’s military campaigns. Bringing the relic to war always carried the risk that it might be damaged or even lost. And, indeed, this is what happened in 1187 when the Cross was lost during the Battle of Hattin, never to be found again. In times of grave external threat, however, ethnic groups tend to focus on the core of their identity, on their most important myths and symbols. The True Cross, while precious and irreplaceable, was needed by the Jerusalemites in times of war in order to strengthen the group’s internal solidarity and to demarcate the boundaries to other, enemy groups. It was very effective at bringing forth recollections of the group’s foundation during the First Crusade and it assured the Jerusalemites of their religiously founded righteousness and reaffirmed their ties to each other and their homeland. The presence of the cross transformed the fighting of knights and soldiers into an act of spiritual warfare. Under the cross, war against political enemies of the kingdom was transfigured into a struggle of good versus evil.

Research on the relic of the True Cross in the Latin Kingdom has, therefore, interpreted the \textit{lignum Domini} as a ‘morale booster’.\textsuperscript{18} Many examples justifying such an interpretation can be found and there are numerous accounts of the power of the cross that had supposedly brought victory to the Jerusalemites.\textsuperscript{19} Interestingly, however, our sources provide almost no information on the way the cross was actually used during battles. Thus, while there can be no doubt that the relic did, indeed, act as a morale booster during battles, accounts on the events off the actual battlefields and comments on the results of battles reveal fascinating details on the role of the cross that go beyond the morale booster function.

A good example is provided by Fulcher’s assessment of the battle of Jaffa in 1102. One year earlier, the ill-fated crusade of 1101 had failed. In 1102 remnants of the Europeans, however, assisted the troops of the Kingdom of Jerusalem under Baldwin I. After having suffered defeat at Ramla, they triumphed two weeks later at Jaffa, assisted by pilgrims who had freshly arrived from the West.\textsuperscript{20} Fulcher describes this victory as a triumph of the cross and the chosen people: \textit{Vere dignum erat et iustum, ut qui ligno dominicae crucis muniti erant, super inimicos eiusdem crucis victores existerent}\textsuperscript{21} (‘Truly, it was right and just that they who were protected by the wood of the Lord’s Cross were victorious against the enemies of this Cross’).


\textsuperscript{19} Cf. Murray, ‘Mighty’, pp. 228-238.

\textsuperscript{20} Cf. Brett, ‘The Battles, 1099-1105’.

\textsuperscript{21} Fulcher of Chartres, \textit{Historia Hierosolimitana}, ed. by Hagenmeyer, II.xxi.14.
It is not by accident that this sentence begins with words that are based on the preface of the Eucharistic Prayer. The fight of the Jerusalemites under the sign of their immediate relation with God is portrayed as a paraliturgical act that transcends the merely military dimension of the battle. The battle against the enemies of the Jerusalemites was, at the same time, a battle against the inimicos crucis – the enemies of the Cross. The Cross and the Jerusalemite people become an indivisible unit.

Consequently, it must have been hard to imagine the possibility of a victory without the relic. And, indeed, this is precisely the position that informs Fulcher’s assessment of the defeat at Ramla that preceded the victory at Jaffa in 1102. Surely, he attests, the enemies could have been beaten in the first battle if only the Cross had been present. According to this view, it is not the king with his tactical brilliance that wins a battle, but rather the favour of God – and this favour is not merely symbolised but caused by the presence of the relic. King Baldwin I, on the other hand, appears as the mere executor of divine will, an ultimately exchangeable piece on the chessboard of Jerusalemite history. Fulcher cautions the king to accept this role as a tool of divine will and warns him against relying on his own prowess and prudence: qui cum stulte inchoat, rei exitum non considerat, equus paratur ad bellum, Dominus autem salutem tribuiet\(^22\) (‘he who begins foolishly does not consider the outcome. The horse is prepared for battle, but the Lord grants victory’).

At times, the relic of the True Cross even seems to take the position of the king in war. In 1137 the host of Zengi of Mosul was besieging King Fulk of Anjou in the castle of Montferrat between Hama and Tortosa when troops from Jerusalem came to his assistance – salutifere lignum crucis sequentes, unanimiter maturato itinere accelerabant\(^23\) (‘following the wood of the salutary Cross and of one accord, they hurried and undertook the journey’). In the absence of the king, the Jerusalemites remain capable of independent action and join forces to field a host against the enemy. While in reality it was Patriarch William I who led the Jerusalemite troops into battle, no single leader is mentioned by our source – William of Tyre. In this view, the Jerusalemites do not need any earthly leader or king because they are led by the eternal king whose presence is made visible in the relic of the True Cross.

This motif of the Jerusalemite host being led not by a mortal but by the relic is fairly common. When Baldwin II was on campaign north of Edessa in 1123 he was captured by the enemy. His companion Joscelin I of Edessa could escape the Turks and went to Jerusalem to raise an army to free the king: post triduum autem exiit [Joscelinus] de Hierusalem, dominicam sequens crucem, quae usque Tripolim iam delata erat. iturus enim erat cum ea Hierosolymitanus exercitus usque Cartapeta\(^24\) (‘after three days


\(^{23}\) William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, ed. by Huygens, XIV.xxix.4f.

\(^{24}\) Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. by Hagenmeyer, III.xxv.15.
he [Joscelin] left Jerusalem, following the Cross of the Lord, which had already been brought to Tripoli. The Jerusalemite host had travelled with it to Kharput.

While Joscelin plays a role in Fulcher’s account of this event, he is subordinate to the Cross. The Jerusalemite army follows the relic, not Joscelin. A comparison with a European reworking of this passage can show us that this presentation of the Cross was, indeed, a Jerusalemite particularity. Lisiard of Tours, writing in the 1150s or 1160s, gives a different version of the relief force:

*Contrabitur undecunque Christianorum exercitus, et Tripolim undique convenit, ut inde Cartapetam, quo rex cum suis tenebatur clausus, […] Cruce dominica a patriarcha et clero Tripolim jam delata*25 (‘The Jerusalemite army was drawn together and gathered at Tripoli. Thence it continued to Kharput where the king and his men were held. The Cross had already been brought to Tripoli by the patriarch and the clergy’).

While the relic is mentioned, it is relegated to a merely passive function. It needs to be carried by the Patriarch and the clergy and does not act independently, as it seems to do in Fulcher’s version. Here, it acts merely as a morale-booster, not as an independent force.

When the Jerusalemites managed to finally take possession of Ascalon – the last remaining Muslim stronghold on the coastline of the crusader states – in 1153, the Cross once more played a key role. William of Tyre’s account of the celebrations with which the Jerusalemites entered Ascalon reveal some key elements of the group’s ethnic identity – and once more the Cross is at the center:

*Dominus autem rex, dominus quoque patriarcha cum ceteris regni principibus et ecclesiarum prelatis una cum universo clero et populo, previo ligno dominice crucis cum hymnis et canticis spiritualibus urbem ingressi*26 (‘With the wood of the Lord’s cross leading the procession, the lord king and the lord patriarch, together with the other princes of the realm, the prelates and all the clergy and people entered the city, singing hymns and religious chants’).

Once more, the communal nature of Jerusalemite ethnic identity is expressed by the presence of the whole group – from the king down to the *populus*. All participate in the triumphal procession into Ascalon. Leading this procession, however, we find not the king but the Cross – representing all Jerusalemites and their role as the chosen people. Christ – symbolically present in the relic – supplants the king and enters the city as a victorious ruler in triumph, leading His people.

The most striking manifestation of this position of the True Cross is presented by the paraliturgical ceremonies that were performed whenever the relic returned

25 Lisiard of Tours, ‘Secunda Historiae Iherosolimitanae Pars’, XXXVIII.
to the Holy City after a campaign. In the summer of 1119, northern Syria was threatened by the advances of Ighazi of Aleppo and Tugtakin of Damascus and suffered a crushing defeat at the battle of the Field of Blood on 28 June. Baldwin II and his host were in northern Syria in order to counter this threat and assist the kingdom’s neighbour to the north. In this campaign, the relic was present, accompanied by Patriarch Warmund – a decision that had been quite contentious, since it was unusual for the Cross to be carried outside the borders of the kingdom. Baldwin was apparently aware that, after the catastrophe of the Field of Blood, he could not justify the risk of keeping the relic with him. Thus, in late August, the Cross finally returned south – ut decebat [as was fitting], as Fulcher of Chartres attests. Despite its relevance for Christianity as a whole, the relic, for Fulcher and his countrymen, was first and foremost the symbol of the Jerusalemites. Even assisting Latin Christians was not a sufficiently compelling reason to let it stay outside the borders for too long.

Just as the departure of the relic from Jerusalem, its return to the capital city constitutes a very special moment. It marks the third stage of a transitional ritual – the reunion of the group with its symbol. The relic’s virtus is reinforced by the successfully overcome stage of mobility as well as by the prestige won by armies that had fought under its sign. In the summer of 1119, the Cross finally returned to Jerusalem on September 14. It was received with great celebrations, like a returning king. While it cannot be proven that the return was deliberately scheduled to take place on the Feast of the Elevation of the Cross, the date seems too significant and convenient to attribute it to mere chance. Indeed, Fulcher values the relic’s return on its proper feast day so highly that he likens it to the arrival of Emperor Heraclius in Jerusalem in the year 629. Heraclius had returned the Cross to Jerusalem after it had been captured by the Persians fifteen years before. This comparison is remarkable. In 1119, after all, as opposed to the situation in 629, the relic had not been lost. It had been in the company of the king and the patriarch on a campaign assisting fellow Latin Christians. For Fulcher, however, the fact that the Cross was outside the kingdom’s borders was akin to it being lost. Here we find a wish driven by the concerns of Fulcher’s own ethnic group who claimed the exclusive possession of and an exclusively close relation with the relic and, thus, with Christ.

Fulcher then gives a detailed report of the relic’s procession through the capital: cum ea [cruce] urbem sanctam laetantes introierunt, et cum gaudio ineffabili cuncti qui inserant suscepierunt (‘with the Cross, they entered the Holy City gladly. And with great joy all who were there received it’). William of Tyre provides a similar account: a clero et populo cum hymnis et canticis spiritualibus honorifice […] recepta [crux] (‘the Cross

28 Albert of Aachen gives a detailed report of the campaign of Baldwin II in Northern Syria but he does not mention the True Cross in this context. Cf. Albert of Aachen, Historia Ierosolimitana, ed. and transl. by Edgington, XII.xxxii. See also: Epp, Fulcher von Chartres, p. 164.
29 Fulcher of Chartres, Historia Hierosolimitana, ed. by Hagenmeyer, III.vi.1.
30 William of Tyre, Chronicon, ed. by Huygens, XII.xii.69-73.
[was] received by the clergy and the people with hymns and religious chants'). This festive reception of the relic bears striking resemblance to the late-antique and medieval adventus-ritual.\(^{31}\) During the Middle Ages, this ritual, based on the Roman imperial cult, was usually employed to welcome rulers, bishops and popes to a city or a monastery. The words *cum hymnis et canticis*\(^{32}\), taken from the New Testament, that we find in William’s report, are a common fixture in adventus-accounts.\(^ {33}\) In the case of the Jerusalem adventus, though, it is not a secular ruler or even a prince of the Church who is honoured with the ritual – it is the relic of the True Cross. The relic is welcomed by the gathered people like a triumphant ruler returning from battle. Once more, it represents the kingship of Christ in the particular, rather worldly interpretation of the Jerusalemites.

That this was indeed a particularity of the Jerusalemites can be demonstrated with a comparison between texts from the Latin Kingdom on the one hand and from the Principality of Antioch on the other. William of Tyre bases his account of the relic’s return in 1119 on two sources: On Fulcher of Chartres and his *Historia Hierosolymitana* and on the *Bella Antiochena*, written between 1115 and 1122 by the Antiochene chancellor Walter. When William of Tyre composed his account on the reception of the True Cross in Jerusalem based on these two sources he made a remarkable decision. He uses, almost verbatim, words from the text of Walter the Chancellor. While William writes that the relic *a clero et populo cum hymnis et canticis spiritualibus honorifice sit recepta*, Walter uses the words: *ab omni populo et clero cum hymnis et canticis spiritualibus [...] suscipitur*\(^ {34}\) (‘was received by all the clergy and the people with hymns and religious chants’). Walter, however, did not use these words to describe the return of the relic but rather the welcome celebrated for Baldwin II by the Antiochenes who were grateful for the Jerusalemite king’s intervention on their behalf after the defeat of the Field of Blood. The Jerusalemite Fulcher uses vocabulary that was commonly employed to describe a king’s adventus to fashion his account of the relic’s adventus. Once more, we can see the relic being given the position usually reserved to kings.

The relic of the True Cross that was found in the summer of 1099 was the most powerful sign of ethnic identity for the Jerusalemites. This identity was characterised by its communal nature. High-ranking individuals such as the king play a decidedly reduced role in the Jerusalemite texts and are always relegated to a secondary position behind the relic of the True Cross – sometimes literally, as in the case of the adventus processions. The relic was the symbol of Christ the eternal king, whose reign was interpreted in a very immanent and direct way to be the earthly kingdom of Jerusalem. As such, for the Jerusalemites, the relic was – despite its general Christian significance – an exclusively Jerusalemite symbol that was jealously guarded – even against the fellow Latin Christians in the other Crusader

---

\(^{31}\) Cf. the contributions in: *Adventus*, ed. by Johanek and Lampen. See also: Shagrir, ‘Adventus’.

\(^{32}\) Based on Ephesians 5.19 and Colossians 3.16.


\(^{34}\) Walter the Chancellor, *Bella Antiochena*, ed. by Hagenmeyer, II.xii.11.
States. This powerful ethnic symbol was activated during times of threat and times of triumph to reactivate and reinforce the ethnic solidarity of the group. The Kingdom of Jerusalem was, in fact, the Kingdom of the Cross.
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Passion, Relics, Pilgrimage: Religious Practice and Patronage in Medieval Saxony
Witnesses of Passion in Cistercian Houses – The Veneration of Christ’s Relics in Walkenried, Mariengarten and Wienhausen
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Abstract

The monastic houses of Walkenried, Mariengarten and Wienhausen had three things in common: They were all located in medieval Saxony, they were all Cistercian Houses and they all owned relics of Christ. But aside from this, they appeared to be fundamentally different. Taking these three examples as case studies, the author gives an insight into the veneration of Christ and Christ’s relics in Cistercian houses and examines which share this practice had in their spiritual everyday life. To achieve this, she investigates historical traditions of the relics’ translations to the monastic houses, their veneration within the houses, as well as the worship by laypeople. It can be shown that the relics of Christ all played a central role among the communities’ sacred objects, but the devotional practices differed considerably. As the author can prove, these differences were less caused by the communities’
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affiliation with the Cistercian Order but rather by miscellaneous parameters in their environment.
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1 Introduction
The monastery of Walkenried and the two female convents of Mariengarten and Wienhausen had three things in common: They were all Cistercian houses, they were all situated in the area of medieval Saxony and they all possessed relics of Christ. For Cistercian houses, this was scarcely a rare thing: Apart from the great abbey of Clairvaux, which boasted an abundant collection of relics associated with Jesus, such artefacts could also be found in more recent and smaller foundations, for instance Kamp, Altenberg, Rostock, Bergen, Marienstern, Amelungsborn and Fröndenberg, to name but a few from northern Germany.¹

Nevertheless, according to research on Cistercian spirituality, it does not appear to be Christ himself, but Mary, whose veneration takes centre stage. The Cistercians dedicated their convents to the Virgin, bore her on their seal, and made her both a fundamental part of their liturgy and the patron of their order.² Even now, Marian devotion is treated as a cardinal characteristic of Cistercian spirituality, although legitimate doubts about the exclusivity of her role had already been raised some years ago.³

When one consults the sources, however, it becomes obvious that the veneration of Christ played a no less significant role in Cistercian spirituality: the works of Cistercian authors express their heartfelt devotion, focusing on his incarnation and on discipleship as a means to achieving union with God. Christ became tangible in the Eucharist, which according to the order’s prescriptions became an inherent part of Cistercian everyday life in the late Middle Ages.⁴ This is evident in the or-

¹ Wipfler, Corpus Christi, pp. 83-89; Fey, ‘Reliquien’, p. 572.
³ Signori appraises Mary’s role in Cistercian worship critically, and is able to rebut some of the older biases in the relevant scholarship, cf. Signori, ‘Totius ordinis’, pp. 253-277. Also Esther Wipfler’s study on ‘Corpus Christi’ in Cistercian liturgy and art emphasises Christ’s importance for the Cistercian cult, Wipfler, Corpus Christi.
⁴ See (for example) the works of Bernard of Clairvaux, William of Saint-Thierry, Isaac of Stella, Baldwin of Forde; similarly Caesarius’ of Heisterbach Dialogus miraculorum. Müller, ‘Vorschriften’, p. 25; Wipfler, Corpus Christi, p. 29.
der’s provisions about the Communion: The regulations became more and more concrete and the reception of communion more and more frequent.\(^5\) Eucharistic piety became manifested in the feast of Corpus Christi, which was prescribed in 1318 for all Cistercian houses and, in 1332, was elevated to a *festum sermonis*.\(^6\)

Such surveys of Cistercian veneration of Mary and of Christ can give an initial impression of Cistercian piety, yet they show a significant problem: that of one-sidedness. Since they are based on the rulings of the order and on the writings of a few authorities, they scarcely touch upon the actual spirituality. Although the Cistercian order was organised in a strictly centralised structure, not all religious houses were affected in equal measure by the order’s prescriptions. It must be differentiated between those houses, which belonged to the order, and those which were not incorporated – as in the case of the many female convents whose acceptance was regulated in 1220 and 1228. Non-incorporated houses could not be supervised by Cistercian abbeys, and therefore did not lie under the order’s direct influence.\(^7\) Instead, there was more scope here for the interplay of influences from the neighbouring environs, which naturally differed in each case.\(^8\)

If one only elucidates Cistercian spirituality from the order’s own perspective, this varied character of the particular convents and monasteries is given unpardonably short shrift. This is the point with which I wish to engage more closely, concerning the veneration of relics of Christ. The order itself never made any pronouncements upon these relics or their worship; however, their wide distribution in Cistercian houses and their high value suggest a broad source-base concerning their veneration. That makes them suitable for getting a glimpse into piety as it was actually lived out in these houses, aside from the order’s prescriptions, or the adumbrations of intellectual or theological literature.

Now the questions arise: Which meaning did these relics of Christ have to the possessing houses, how were they venerated and which role did they play relative to other forms of veneration of Christ? As case studies to investigate this issue, I chose the three Cistercian houses from medieval Saxony mentioned at the beginning: Walkenried, Mariengarten and Wienhausen, all based in medieval Saxony. Since 1351, Walkenried had owned two thorns of the *Spinae Christi*; the two female convents are supposed to have held relics of the Holy Blood by the thirteenth century. Thus, they all possessed witnesses of Christ’s Passion, witnesses of the History of Salvation, and of the Holy Land. But apart from theses points of congruence, the communities appear to have been very different: The monastery of Walkenried was one of the first Cistercian foundations in today’s Germany and is characterised by a considerable economic strength. The convent of Mariengarten was established during a wave of female foundations, but remained a very small community, which never became highly important. The nunnery of Wienhausen,

---

\(^5\) Müller, ‘Vorschriften’, p. 25; Wipfler, *Corpus Christi*, p. 29.
\(^8\) See also Katharina Knesia’s contribution to this volume.
finally, is referred to as the Guelf dynasty’s ‘family convent’ and presented itself rather to be a noble canonesses’ house. The major distinction, however, has to be seen in their different relationship to the Cistercian Order.

This selection may be justified by two considerations. Firstly, it is dictated by the sources available, since the religious houses in question are among the few where the cult of the relics can largely be reconstructed. Regarding the area of inquiry, it seems that nunneries were more likely to possess relics of the Holy Blood, whereas male monasteries usually owned other types of relics of Christ. Therefore, this investigation shall also serve as a comprehensive overview of three highly interesting, but until now scarcely examined cults. Secondly, these examples represent a large variety of the various shapes the relation between order and religious house could take on, and thus broadens our perspective beyond the pure influence of the order itself.

Three aspects have been selected to investigate the importance of these Christly relics and their veneration: 1) the acquisition of the relics by the particular house, and the sources documenting this; 2) the veneration of the relic within the religious house; 3) the veneration of the relic by outsiders, particularly laypeople. Through these examples, I will examine the significance of relics of Christ and the corresponding patterns of veneration. What role did the order play in the cult’s development; which further factors influenced the veneration, and to what extent did the three houses define their cult on their own?

2 Walkenried, Mariengarten and Wienhausen: A historical Overview

The male monastery of Walkenried at the foot of the Harz mountains was founded between 1127 and 1129 and was the third Cistercian house in today’s Germany characterised by an enormous economic strength and political significance.

Walkenried belonged to the important filiation of Morimond and was integrated into the structure of the order. The abbots of Walkenried routinely participated in the general chapter of the Cistercians, and the chapter itself intervened in the

---

10 Apart from the Walkenried relic, also the Holy Robe from Loccum is to be mentioned. Other examples for Holy Blood relics owned by Cistercian houses are Wasserleben and Wöltingerode, both female convents. The only male monastery in the area which possessed a relic of the Holy Blood is Doberan, but this was a bleeding host, not a blood relic in the common sense, see also Bynum, *Wonderful Blood*, p. 51.
monastery’s affairs on several occasions. The architecture of the monastic complex shows special Cistercian features.

In 1546 the community became Lutheran and subsequently was dissolved in the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. The cloister buildings still exist today, but the church and large parts of the furnishing were destroyed during the Peasants’ Revolt.

The convent of Mariengarten was founded in 1245, about thirteen kilometres south of Göttingen as an offspring of the Cistercian nunnery Beuren, which was situated in the Eichsfeld area. The nuns came from the surrounding families of the lower nobility. Throughout the following centuries it remained a small convent.

Founded in the mid-thirteenth century, Mariengarten is part of the wave of nunery foundations, particularly of the Cistercian order, but was also founded after the order placed restrictions on the affiliation of female convents. Therefore, like all the other Cistercian nunneries in today’s Lower Saxony, it was never incorporated into the order. Indeed, we have no evidence of Cistercian influence on Mariengarten. Soon after its establishment, the contact with its mother house broke off and it remained without any relationship with the order or other Cistercian houses. The only other monastery with which Mariengarten held contact was the nearby Benedictine monastery of Reinhausen. The bishop and the sovereign did not show much interest in the small convent either. However, Mariengarten’s environment apparently perceived the community as Cistercian, while the convent’s self-identification changed between Cistercian and Benedictine.

In 1508, the convent was reformed through the influence of the reforming abbey of Bursfelde, and in 1588, after an earlier attempt at reformation, finally became Lutheran. After the ‘Thirty Years’ War the convent of Mariengarten was dissolved. Today the complex is leased out for agricultural purposes by the Klosterkammer Hannover. The church and the nuns’ dormitory from the sixteenth century still exist, all other parts of the monastic complex have been lost.

Wienhausen near Celle is first named in a charter dating from 1229. It was founded on the initiative of Agnes of Landsberg (†1266), the second wife of Duke Henry the Elder of Braunschweig, Count Palatine of the Rhine (*c. 1174, †1227),

---

12 Heutger, Kloster Walkenried, pp. 57-60.
13 The abbey church of Walkenried shows similarities with other Cistercian churches, e.g. Lilienthal in Austria, which also belonged to the filiation of Morimond, Nicolai, ‘Libido Aedificandi’, pp. 87, 111; the same applies to the cloister, Heutger, Kloster Walkenried, pp. 45, 52-54.
16 Warnatsch-Gleich, Herrschaft, p. 40.
18 Between 1320 and 1372, the convent referred to itself as Cistercian three times, another three times as Benedictine, between 1477 and 1480, and, since 1490, continuously as Cistercian, Urkundenbuch des Klosters Mariengarten, ed. by Boetticher, nos. 148, 193, 240, 309, 312, 315, 323, 339, 341, 395 and 407.
20 For Wienhausen see also the papers of Hedwig Röckelein and Lotem Pinchover in this book.
but the first endowment was given by the diocese of Hildesheim.\textsuperscript{21} Wienhausen was a foundation of the high nobility and is known as the ‘House of Guelf’s family convent’.\textsuperscript{22} Its rich endowment, the considerable possessions held by the nuns, and their close relationship with their secular neighbourhood are features more typical of a noble canonesses’ house than of a Cistercian convent.\textsuperscript{23}

Although larger and much wealthier than Mariengarten, Wienhausen was not incorporated into the order either, but this did not keep it from maintaining contact with Cistercian houses from the area and seeking privileges from the order.\textsuperscript{24} Some visualisations of Christological topics in Wienhausen attest a Cistercian influence, but no specifically Cistercian texts have been preserved.\textsuperscript{25} Wienhausen appears to have had a closer relationship with the order than Mariengarten, yet it was also influenced by factors in the region, by the diocese, and by the ruling family.\textsuperscript{26}

In 1469, the nunnery was reformed and in 1528, upon instructions of Duke Ernest of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, named the Confessor, it became Protestant – the first protestant Domina only took office in 1587 though.\textsuperscript{27} The nunnery has survived as a Protestant women’s convent until today. Consequently, a substantial part of its décor is still extant.

Whereas Walkenried was an ordinary member of the Cistercian Order, the Cistercian identity of the nunneries, both not incorporated into the order, mainly de-

\textsuperscript{21} Ahlers, \textit{Weibliches Zisterziensertum}, p. 197; Leerhoff, ‘Wienhausen’, p. 757. Agnes and the House of Guelf were not involved in the first endowments, though Agnes is seen as the foundress in the convent’s tradition.

\textsuperscript{22} Research named it ‘the House of Welf’s family convent’ due to the long list of Guelf family members in the Wienhausen necrology, the high number of Guelf daughters and widows who came there, and its role as the Guelf’s burial place, Mattern, \textit{Literatur}, pp. 215-216; Hengevoss-Dürkop, \textit{Skulptur}, p. 128.

\textsuperscript{23} Wienhausen is the only one among the convents of the Lüneburg Heath whose nuns often came from the high nobility. The large complex and its amenities, which contradicted the Order’s ideal of simplicity, testify to their wealth, cf. Wipfler, \textit{Corpus Christi}, p. 152; more general: Warnatsch-Gleich, \textit{Herrschaft}, p. 119; Ahlers, \textit{Weibliches Zisterziensertum}, p. 202; Riggert, \textit{Die Lüneburger Frauenklöster}, pp. 245-258, particularly pp. 249-250.

\textsuperscript{24} Apart from the general chapter’s instruction to incorporate Wienhausen in 1244, which provided Riddagshausen, Loccum and Michaelstein as its supervisors but was never enforced (Mattern, \textit{Literatur}, p. 226), Wienhausen’s necrology tells us about a visitation by the abbot of Marienrode in the second half of the fifteenth century. They maintained contact with Riddagshausen as well (Ahlers, \textit{Weibliches Zisterziensertum}, p. 200-201). Together with the nearby convent of Isenhagen, they were exempt from taxation, with reference to the Order’s privileges, Ahlers, \textit{Weibliches Zisterziensertum}, p. 204; Schlotheuber, ‘Die Zisterzienserrinnengemeinschaften’, p. 278.

\textsuperscript{25} E.g. the glass window showing the ‘crucifixion of Christ by the virtues’, Wipfler, \textit{Corpus Christi}, p. 173; Furthermore, there are depictions of Bernard of Clairvaux. On the texts cf. Mattern, \textit{Literatur}, p. 335.


\textsuperscript{27} Brandis, ‘Wienhausen’, p. 1520.
pended on their self-perception and on the importance they attributed to Cistercian rules in their convents’ daily life and their spirituality.

3 The Relics of Christ and their Acquisition by the Monastic Houses

There are reports on the translation of relics of Christ from all three convents, albeit in different forms and to varying extents. From Walkenried, we have a charter documenting a donation dated to January 5, 1351, sealed with the Guelf’s lion. It states, that Duke Henry of Braunschweig-Grubenhagen (*c. 1289, †1351) endowed the monastery with two spines of the Crown of Thorns, cum quibusdam aliis reliquis, namely a splinter of the Cross and oil from the tomb of Saint Catharine.28 He had brought it de partibus [...] transmarinis.

The charter offers a very detailed description of the translation process: Henry travelled to the Holy Land via the court of his brother-in-law, the Byzantine Emperor Andronikos III (*1297, †1341), who issued him a letter of recommendation. When Henry visited Saint Catharine’s Monastery on Mount Sinai, the local archbishop, encouraged by the letter, presented him with the spines as a gift – ob reverenciam imperatoris –, which the archbishop himself had received from the French King during a mission to France, as is written in the charter. Since Henry’s journey is documented for the years 1327 to 1331, and the Emperor’s recommendation is attested as well, the report from the charter is substantiated.29 The two spines certainly belonged to the relic of the Crown of Thorns, which is held in the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris.30 Louis IX of France (*c. 1214, †1270) had bought it from the last Emperor of the Latin Empire of Constantinople, Baldwin II (*c. 1217, †1273), whose family might have held it since the conquest of Constantinople in 1204, during which the crusaders acquired many oriental relics.31

Twenty years after this journey, Henry decided to give the relics to Walkenried, for his and his family’s salvation.32 Due to financial problems, he had to sell large

28 NLA Wolfenbüttel 25 Urk. no. 686, printed in Urkundenbuch des Klosters Walkenried, ed. by Dolle, no. 1123.
29 Schnath, ‘Sinaipilger’, p. 463. The letter of safe conduct was kept in the archive of the monastery of Saint Blaise in Braunschweig, but was lost in the seventeenth century. It was reconstructed by Werner Ohnsorge based on a print by Heinrich Meibom the Elder from 1613, Ohnsorge, ‘Eine verschollene Urkunde’, pp. 437-447.
30 The charter states that the relic originated from the French king, though it does not directly refer to the Crown of Thorns in the Sainte-Chapelle. Already Johann Georg Leuckfeld saw a connection between these two relics, Leuckfeld, Antiquitates Walckenredenses, pp. 297-298; Kovác, ‘Die Dornenkrone’, pp. 462, 471.
31 In Constantinople, there were many relics, among them relics of Christ, such as the Holy Blood, the Holy Robe and the Crown of Thorns. Having conquered the city, the crusaders were able to bring a large number of relics into their possession, cf. Toussaint, Kreuz, pp. 44, 164-167.
32 On endowments for salvation see also Katharina Knesia’s paper in this book.
parts of his property, though he still kept the spines until shortly before his death in summer 1351.\textsuperscript{33} Tracing the path of the relics, they travelled from the Holy Land to the West twice: First from Jerusalem via Constantinople to France, and later, after the archbishop had received them, from Mount Sinai to Walkenried.

The charter focuses on the thorns, which seem to bear much more importance than the other relics: The archbishop chose the spines deliberately, because \textit{non haberet maiores reliquias}. They are even more important than the splinter of the Cross – actually at least an equal witness to the Passion – which is only named once, at the beginning of the charter. The reason for the report’s detailed information on the subject is explained in the charter itself: It serves to ensure Henry’s donation is remembered, and to authenticate the relic itself. This charter is the first source on Walkenried’s relic of Christ, and is even the first concrete evidence of a veneration of Christ in Walkenried.

In the case of Mariengarten, there is a legendary account of the origin and translation of the relic of the Holy Blood. It was written on a single sheet of parchment, which fell victim to the air raid on Hannover’s central archive in 1943, but thanks to a transcription by the archivist Carl Ludwig Grotefend in 1858, we know of its content.\textsuperscript{34} In contrast to the report from Walkenried, we will see that the one from Mariengarten contains some inconsistencies.

The legend reads of a nobleman of Ziegenberg, who travelled to the Holy Land to pray at the Holy Sepulchre. On his way back, he stopped in Naples for several days, where he befriended the King of Naples. When the \textit{nobilis de castro Segenbergk} prepared to leave, the king wanted to grant him a wish. Ziegenberg asked for a portion of the king’s relic of the Holy Blood and his wish was, indeed, fulfilled. At first, he wanted to keep the relic at his castle, but after his wife had had a vision, he gave it to the nearby nunnery of Mariengarten. Two miracles are said to have taken place when the relic arrived, proving the Blood’s power: The church bells began to toll, although no one was pulling the rope; and a nun, who had been bled some days before, began to bleed again as if her blood was gushing forth for joy in the presence of Christ’s blood.\textsuperscript{35}

Some questions arise from this legend: Who was this one nobleman of Ziegenberg? Who was the king of Naples and when did the translation take place? The event could have happened no earlier than 1285, because the Kingdom of Naples was only founded after the Sicilian Vespers and the death of the last King of Sicily.\textsuperscript{36} The \textit{terminus ante quem} has to be set to the year 1316, when the dynasty of Ziegenberg died out.\textsuperscript{37} The period can be narrowed down further by the sale of the

\textsuperscript{33} Schnath, ‘Sinaipilger’, p. 464.
\textsuperscript{34} Mariengartener Translationsbericht, ed. by Grotefend, pp. 143-145.
\textsuperscript{35} Similar miracles are reported from other Cistercian houses as for example Stams where it also served as an authentication tool for a Holy Blood relic, cf. Fey, ‘Reliquien’, p. 568.
\textsuperscript{36} Cuozzo, ‘Neapel, Kgr.’, cols. 1076-1077.
family’s castle between 1302 and 1311, since the castle is still referred to in the account in several instances.\(^{38}\)

Therefore the translation of the Holy Blood from Naples to Mariengarten took place between 1285 and 1316 (1302/1311?). During that time, Charles II of Anjou (r. 1285-1309) and his son Robert (r. 1309-1343) were kings of Naples, but there is no evidence that would suggest either of them owning a relic of the Holy Blood. In this period, there were six noblemen of Ziegenberg, of whom Burghard I (documented 1241-1294) had the closest relationship with the convent.\(^{39}\) However, there is no evidence that either he or any other member of the Ziegenberg family ever undertook a journey to the Holy Land, or possessed a relic of the Holy Blood.\(^{40}\) Thus, none of the mentioned persons can be identified with certainty.

It seems that the account was only written down some time after the translation itself. Based on palaeographical considerations, Grotefend dated the text to the second half of the fourteenth century.\(^{41}\) According to the content, it must have been written after 1316, but presumably not long after the middle of the fourteenth century, because the report names eyewitnesses.\(^{42}\) The first documented evidence of the relic in Mariengarten dates from 1335.\(^{43}\)

The translation of Wienhausen’s Holy Blood relic is known from the convent’s chronicle written in Early New High German. Although it dates from the seventeenth century, it is based on medieval traditions and precursors.\(^{44}\) Agnes of Landsberg, the foundress of Wienhausen, plays a key role in the relic legend. She is said to have brought the relic from Rome to Wienhausen – ‘enclosed within a feather’ (in eine Feder verschloßen) –, where it worked ‘many miracles’ (viele Wunderwerke).\(^{45}\) This very short note serves as an introduction to various miracle stories in the chronicle. The medieval original may have been a longer and more detailed

\(^{38}\) Ibid., pp. 308-310; Küther, ‘Ziegenberg’, p. 163.

\(^{39}\) Urkundenbuch des Klosters Mariengarten, ed. by Boetticher, nos. 14, 28, 34, 35, 59, 64.

\(^{40}\) Cf. ibid., nos. 3, 4, 13-15, 22, 28, 34, 35, 59, 61, 64, 87.

\(^{41}\) Grotefend, ‘Beiträge’, p. 142.

\(^{42}\) According to the report the dynasty of Ziegenberg had already died out when it was written, but lived on in the dynasty of Plesse: [...] quod quidam nobiles de castro Segenberge, de quorum stirpe habentur adhuc aliqui in propugine ramorum, erant enim nobiles ille de Segenberg genere, ut nunc isti de Plesse – [...] This was interpreted by Grotefend as a feudal relation between the noblemen of Ziegenberg and the noblemen of Plesse, but a family relation seems to be more convincing, especially due to the words stirps, propago and ramus, Mariengartener Translationsbericht, ed. by Grotefend, p. 143; Grotefend, ‘Beiträge’, p. 143, n. 3. That relational link was Gisla of Ziegenberg who had married Gottschalk III of the Plesse, and whose children inherited parts of the Ziegenberg possessions later on, Landau, Die bessischen Ritterburgen, pp. 304, 309-310.

\(^{43}\) Urkundenbuch des Klosters Mariengarten, ed. by Boetticher, no. 185. Although Grotefend dated the report to the second half of the fourteenth century, Heuser, who knew Grotefend’s work, asserted that the charter and the report date back to the same time – without explaining his reasoning, cf. Heuser, ‘Heilig-Blut’, p. 23.

\(^{44}\) Chronik und Totenbuch des Klosters Wienhausen, ed. by Appuhn, p. VII.

\(^{45}\) Ibid., p. 140. This and all the following quotations from German sources were translated by the author. The original quote is added in brackets.
report, which supposedly originates in the Latin *vita* of Agnes from the beginning of the fourteenth century. This *vita* was used for the chronicle, but is no longer extant.\textsuperscript{46}

But what is meant by the ‘feather’/\textit{Feder}, which was allegedly used during the relic translation? It is mentioned as a type of container for the relic on its journey from Rome, but what type of vessel exactly remains unclear. Supposedly, the nun who wrote the chronicle made a mistake in translating the Latin original into German. The word used originally may have been *calamus* – ‘pen’ or ‘quill’ –, which can be translated into German as ‘(Schreib-)Feder’.\textsuperscript{47} This probably referred to a small box for writing equipment as does a comparable container listed in a Roman register of relics from 1489, designated as \textit{calamare}.\textsuperscript{48}

Considering Agnes’ date of death, this relic translation must have been carried out before 1266. The few other sources on Agnes do not tell anything about a journey to Rome, let alone a relic of the Holy Blood.\textsuperscript{49} We do know about another Holy Blood relic in her environment, given to the Bishop of Lübeck by her father-in-law, Duke Henry the Lion, but it does not show any connection to the Wienhausen blood.\textsuperscript{50} The first documented reference to the Wienhausen relic dates back to 1299, roughly the time when Agnes’ *vita* was written.\textsuperscript{51}

Comparing these three reports about the translations – regardless of their different genres, different level of detail, and the varying degree to which their historicity can be verified – we can observe some similarities. In all three convents, this kind of report only refers to the relics of Christ. Other types of relics were not given a similar degree of attention. Important persons brought all three relics to the monasteries from distant, sometimes even holy places. The relics of Walkenried and Mariengarten were previously owned by kings. In the cases of the two nunneries, the Holy Blood was donated by the founders or their families concatenating it closely in the convents’ history and identity. These aspects or rather literary motifs, served one overriding purpose – to underline the importance, uniqueness, and authenticity of the convents’ relics of Christ. The report from Walkenried seems to describe historical facts, while in the nunnery’s descriptions some extent of literary creativity cannot be excluded.

The accounts of the relic translations from these three convents are part of a larger phenomenon. There are similar texts from other monastic houses that employ comparable motifs, which date from the same time, the thirteenth and four-

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., p. VII, 140.
\textsuperscript{47} Cf. the listing in the Medieval Latin-German-Dictionary: \textit{Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch}, ed. by Prinz et al., cols. 52-54.
\textsuperscript{48} Braun, \textit{Die Reliquiare des christlichen Kultes}, p. 74.
\textsuperscript{49} Fuchs, ‘Heinrich (V.)’, p. 382. Cf. the Braunschweiger Reimchronik (\textit{Sächsische Weltchronik}, ed. by Weiland, pp. 551-552, vv. 7407-7452) and the Chronica Ducum (ibid., pp. 583-584, no. 16).
\textsuperscript{50} Heuser, ‘Heilig-Blut’, pp. 25-26.
\textsuperscript{51} Wienhausen, KlA, Urk. 162/Or. 132.
teenth centuries, and also deal with relics of Christ, particularly of the Holy Blood.\textsuperscript{52}

In this period, relics of Christ grew more and more common. There are various reasons for this large distribution: On the one hand, the crusades established relations with the East that facilitated the transferral of such relics to Europe (such as the one from Walkenried).\textsuperscript{53} On the other hand, people, including laymen, became more interested in the Eucharist due to the dogmatisation of transubstantiation by the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 and the introduction of the feast of Corpus Christi in 1311.\textsuperscript{54} Consequently, a cult of Eucharistic symbols emerged, such as miraculous hosts, which were to prove the presence of Christ in the sacrament.\textsuperscript{55} This popularity had a direct impact on relics of the Holy Blood, as possessed by the two nunneries.\textsuperscript{56} New cults developed in various locations, and places, where relics of Christ had been present already, ‘rediscovered’ them and established new cults around them. To this end, these places used accounts of reliquary translations. As in Mariengarten and Wienhausen, the translation accounts were written several years after the reported translations took place and thus did not necessarily reflect actual events.\textsuperscript{57}

The considerable increase in the number of these relics led to a competition between sacred sites and led to doubts regarding the relics’ authenticity.\textsuperscript{58} The accounts of relic translations were meant to counteract these doubts; therefore, they were not only written for the convents themselves, but were primarily intended to promote the relics to the public and defend them against accusations. This is obvious in the report from Mariengarten, in which the convent dissociates itself from all the ‘dissemblers’, \textit{qui se fingunt habere quod non habet}, using the miracles as authentication. It is uncertain whether the descriptions from Walkenried and Wienhausen were written in this context as well: In case of Walkenried, it was Duke Henry in the first place, who wanted to prove the authenticity of the relic to the monks, and the Wienhausen report is too short to provide definite information. Nevertheless, these reports could function as instruments for the promotion of the cults as well.

\textsuperscript{52} Cf. n. 56.
\textsuperscript{53} Toussaint, \textit{Kreuz}, pp. 44-45.
\textsuperscript{54} Rudolf, ‘Heilig-Blut-Verehrung’, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{56} For the connection between relics of the Holy Blood and miraculous hosts cf. Heuser, ‘Heilig-Blut’, p. 179; relics of the Holy Blood were very popular due to the fact that laypeople were not allowed to receive the Eucharist in both forms, and therefore took the Holy Blood as a compensation for receiving the blood during mass, cf. Venard, ‘Le sang’, p. 4; Bynum, \textit{Wonderful Blood}, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{57} For example the relic of the Holy Blood of Marienfließ, which is said to have been given to the convent by Otto IV. The charter documenting this donation was later exposed as a counterfeit, Bergstedt, ‘Das heilige Blut’. In Weingarten early medieval accounts of reliquary translations were used and in the thirteenth century, supplemented with new details in order to prove the authenticity of their Holy Blood, cf. Kruse, ‘Die historischen Heilig-Blut-Schriften’, pp. 77-123. Bynum observed similar strategies in monasteries in Mecklenburg and Brandenburg, cf. Bynum, \textit{Wonderful Blood}, p. 85.
\textsuperscript{58} Dinzelmacher, ‘Das Blut Christi’, p. 417.
The Communities’ Veneration of the Relics

Apart from a few charters, no medieval sources on the spines are extant in Walkenried. The most detailed reports about the cult in Walkenried date back to the Early Modern Era. Those are three chronicles written by the Protestants Johannes Letzner (1598), Heinrich Eckstorm (1617) and Johann Georg Leuckfeld (1706). Whereas Letzner and Eckstorm were closer to the medieval events, yet known for their historical inaccuracies and discrepancies, Leuckfeld, in contrast was much more critical, but he also wrote longer after the events he covered. Therefore, the chroniclers provide very different impressions of the cult. Based on these sources, we have to reconstruct the actual handling of the relic.

Letzner and Eckstorm both write that the relic was kept in the abbey church. From there it was brought to a chapel in the monastery’s gatehouse ‘several times a year’ (zu etzlichen Zeiten im Jahr). It was carried on a pillow ‘ex serico rubro fact[um]’. In contrast, Leuckfeld wrote that the relic had usually been kept in this ‘famous chapel of Saint Nicholas at the entrance of the monastery’ (so berühmte […] Nicolaus-Capelle beym Eingang in das Closter). On selected days, it was carried around in a silver ‘statue of Mary with the child’ (Marien-Bild mit dem Kindchen). We know this Madonna statue, which is not preserved, from a charter issued for its consecration, dated to 1456.

Following Wipfler’s studies, reliquaries in the shape of the Madonna were not commonly used for hosting relics of Christ. However, its iconography fits other objects known from Walkenried, which were mostly representations of the Virgin made of stone. This correlates with the special significance that Mary had for the Cistercian Order, who was the patron of their monasteries, and of the order itself. The most important part of the Cistercian cult of Mary, indeed, was her role as Mother of God. In this capacity, she made God’s incarnation and thereby the act of salvation possible. Thus, the core of Cistercian Mariology focused on Christ, and this becomes visible in the reliquary from Walkenried. Mary as Dei genitrix is depicted with Christ the child, who is situated at the centre of the sculpture. The spines of the Crown of Thorns were not enclosed within the sculpture, but were presented by the child in its extremis digitis and ‘offered for veneration’ (zur venera-

---

59 Letzner, Die Walkenrieder Chronik, ed. by Reinboth; Eckstorm, Chronicon Walkenredense; Leuckfeld, Antiquitates Walkenredenses.
60 Letzner, Die Walkenrieder Chronik, ed. by Reinboth, fol. 24r (p. 76).
61 Eckstorm, Chronicon Walkenredense, p. 150.
62 Leuckfeld, Antiquitates Walkenredenses, p. 292.
63 Ibid., p. 93.
64 Urkundenbuch des Klosters Walkenried, ed. by Dolle, no. 1372.
65 Wipfler, Corpus Christi, p. 87.
67 Cf. n. 2 and 3 in this paper. For the Christocentric veneration of Mary, cf. Leclercq, Bernard von Clairvaux; p. 153; this is also evident in the writings of other authors, e.g. in Caesarius’ Dialogus miraculorum.
68 Eckstorm, Chronicon Walkenredense, p. 149.
tion dargebothen): Christ the child indicates His own Passion. Thus, Christ's incarnation as well as redemption of mankind are represented in the reliquary.

Therefore, we are left with two contradictory statements regarding the relic's location: While according to two chroniclers, the relic was allegedly kept in the abbey church, the other said it was embedded in a sculpture of Mary, which was kept in the gatehouse chapel. Since the charter confirms that the reliquary was consecrated in 1456, Leuckfeld's report can only apply to a later time. The descriptions of Letzner and Eckstorm may refer to the years before, when the relic was kept in the church, where it was reserved for the monks' veneration. Due to a lack of sources, the questions of its storage and actual veneration during that time have to remain unanswered. I will come back to its translocation to the gatehouse chapel later on.

The first source on the cult of Mariengarten's relic of the Holy Blood is a charter, which dates back to 1335: The chaplain and a nun made a donation for a liturgical lamp in front of the Holy Blood. With the money they gave once a year on Palm Sunday, wax should be bought for the candle and a procuratrix was intended to care for the light. The charter dates just a few years before the single sheet of parchment on which the account of the reliquary translation and the miracle reports were written. Together, these two documents are the earliest sources for Mariengarten's cult of the relic of the Holy Blood, and the first evidence of the local cult of Christ in general. In Addition to the translation report, on the back of the same sheet of parchment, there were two chants about the Holy Blood, complemented by musical notation: The first one about the seven seals, which are broken by the blood of the Lamb (Apoc. 5.5-9), the other about the redemption brought about by Christ shedding his blood six times:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Agnus Christus occisus sigilla} \\
sanguine suo resolvit illa.
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Morte Christus redemit hominem.} \\
\text{Sacrum sexis fudit sanguinem,} \\
\text{sex etatum emendans scelera:} \\
\text{Circumcisus etate tenera,} \\
\text{in agone gutte sanguine} \\
\text{decurrunt, flagra, sentes spine} \\
\text{cruorem fundunt, clavi, lancea.} \\
\text{Tua, Christe, nos salvant vulnera etc.}
\end{align*}
\]

The chants appear to be unique. They attest a special musical veneration of the relic in Mariengarten and could have been part of a particular office for the Holy Blood.

---

70 *Urkundenbuch des Klosters Mariengarten*, ed. by Boetticher, no. 185.
71 Cf. p. 133 in this paper and ibid. n. 41.
Blood. We do not know the context in which the sheet of parchment was written and used, but we can suppose that Mariengarten owned a special document, perhaps even a manuscript for the veneration of the Holy Blood. This sheet demonstrates that the cult had already been firmly established in the middle of the fourteenth century, even though it only emerged in the 1330s.

There are a few additional references to the Holy Blood in Mariengarten. One of the nunnery farms had to give two pounds of wax to the relic every year, and therefore was called ‘grange of the Holy Blood’ (Hilgen blodes vorwerk). Apparently, the relic was kept in a house-shaped reliquary known due to its cover, which is mentioned in an inventory dating from 1585. This also names a liturgical vestment covered with gilded silver that was intended for the relic, referred to as rock des heiligen blodes mitt silbern verguldten spangen.

The vestment was kept in a chest, together with a charter of indulgence for Mariengarten’s chapel of Saint Anne, which was said to have been connected to the relic as well. According to the chronicler Johannes Letzner, Causaria, the first abbess of Mariengarten, had built it for the relic and Saint Anne, so that both could be adored there, day and night (zu tage und zu nachf). However, an abbess called Causaria does not appear within the sources, and supposedly, such a chapel only existed from the mid-fifteenth century onwards when the cult of Anne became popular. Until then, the relic had probably been kept at the convent, but even for the following period it appears unlikely that the relic should have been permanently situated within the chapel. Two kilometres distant from the cloister, it would have been difficult for the nuns to venerate the relic or care for its liturgical lamp.

Wienhausen’s relic of the Holy Blood is first documented in a charter from 1299, only a few years before the account of the translation supposedly was written. Again, the occasion is a donation of a liturgical lamp, followed by another three light donations until 1344. In Wienhausen, the charter and the account of the reliquary translation are among the first pieces of evidence of a cult of Christ as well. They date from approximately the same time as the oldest sources for veneration of Christ not directly connected to the relic of the Holy Blood, namely the sculpture of the Rising Christ from about the 1290s.

---

73 The relevant works of reference and databases do not mention these pieces of music. Heuser, von Boetticher, and Wipfler interpreted them as parts of a liturgical office. However, due to the brevity of the fragments and without the original this cannot be proved, cf. Heuser, ‘Heilig-Blut’, p. 23; Boetticher, Kloster, pp. 9-10; Wipfler, Corpus Christi, p. 43.
74 Urkundenbuch des Klosters Mariengarten, ed. by Boetticher, no. 321.
75 Mariengartener Inventar, ed. by Boetticher, p. 172.
76 Letzner, Drittes Buch (Cod. Histor. 248), pp. 830, 835.
77 Boetticher, Kloster, p. 11.
78 Ibid., p. 10 and n. 107: Even though the exact location of the chapel remains unknown, its position in the so-called Stockwiesen allows estimating the distance from the convent.
79 Wienhausen, KIA, Urk. 162/Or. 132.
80 Ibid.; Urk. 186/Or. 155; Urk. 259/Or. 227; Urk. 293/Or. 260. This form of private veneration is also observed by Mecham, cf. Mecham, Sacred Communities, p. 111.
The first charter documenting the 1299 donation locates the relic of the Holy Blood in choro dominarum. This cannot refer to today’s nuns’ choir, since this was only built in the 1330s, about three decades later.\textsuperscript{81} Beforehand, the choir was presumably situated in the upper storey of the former western tower.\textsuperscript{82} However, the nuns’ choir was the central room of the convent – not only for prayer and service, but for the nuns’ daily life as well – and having attained such a prominent place, it is most likely that the relic of the Holy Blood kept this position, when the new choir was built.

It was Horst Appuhn, who in his seminal publications on Wienhausen from the 1960s first drew a connection between the Holy Blood and the late thirteenth century wooden sculpture of the Rising Christ – the so-called \textit{Auferstehungschristus} [Fig. 1] – supposing it to have served as a reliquary for the Blood. This sculpture was placed in the nuns’ choir as well. Appuhn’s hypothesis has been quite influential, but should be questioned in my opinion.\textsuperscript{83} The \textit{Auferstehungschristus} is characterised by its stigmata, and by its deep side wound.\textsuperscript{84} An oblong hollow in its corpus, which could be formerly closed with a lid from the back, was suggested to have kept the relic, indicated by the distinctive wounds. However, the eye-catching shape of the stigmata also has to be seen in the context of the numerous other visual motifs in Wienhausen. These are, in general, strongly influenced by themes of the Eucharist and the Passion, and do not automatically refer to the relic of the Holy Blood.

In one of his earlier publications, Appuhn himself supposed that the body of the \textit{Auferstehungschristus} was intended to contain the consecrated host, whereas the relic was kept in the base of the sculpture, shaped as Christ’s sarcophagus. When this was legitimately contradicted, he then located the relic of the Holy Blood in the body of Christ.\textsuperscript{85} Thus, the connection between the relic and the \textit{Auferstehungschristus} is not as certain as it seems. The written sources, in particular, do not indicate any such relationship: There were endowments of liturgical lamps for the relic of the Holy Blood, as well as for the \textit{Auferstehungschristus}. There are also reports

\textsuperscript{81} Mohn, \textit{Mittelalterliche Klosteranlagen}, pp. 235, 238.
\textsuperscript{82} Siart, \textit{Kreuzgänge}, p. 21.
\textsuperscript{83} On the location of the \textit{Auferstehungschristus}, cf. \textit{Chronik und Totenbuch des Klosters Wienhausen}, ed. by Appuhn, p. 140; Appuhn first supposed a connection between the sculpture and the Holy Blood in 1961 (Appuhn, ‘Der Auferstandene’) which has only been challenged by Hengevoss-Dürkop, \textit{Skulptur}, pp. 147-150. Klack-Eitzen concludes that the connection between relic and \textit{Auferstehungschristus} cannot be certain, cf. Klack-Eitzen/Haase/Weißgraf, \textit{Heilige Röcke}, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{85} In his original proposition, Appuhn supposed the \textit{Auferstehungschristus} to have functioned as a dual repository: The relic was kept in the sarcophagus, the base of the sculpture, whereas the Eucharist was stored in Christ’s body, Appuhn, ‘Der Auferstandene’, p. 98. After Hartwig’s technological examination had shown that the sarcophagus could not have been opened, Appuhn revised his theory and suggested that the relic was kept in the corpus of the \textit{Auferstehungschristus}, cf. Hartwig, ‘Holzkopituren’; Appuhn, \textit{Kloster Wienhausen}, p. 25.
about miracles performed by both of these sacred objects – but all charters of
donation and even the miracle reports name only one or the other. In other
sources, the sculpture and the relic are always named separately and no connection
between them is acknowledged. Therefore, a relationship of the sculpture and the
relic is definitely not as certain as is often supposed.

Appuhn tried to identify the altar of Mary as another place where the relic was
 Possibly kept, at a later point [Fig. 2]. This altarpiece had been placed in the nuns’
choir since 1519. At the centre of the predella, there is the Trinity with God the
Father sitting on a throne, holding the dead Christ in his arms, who is marked by
his tortures and covered with blood. The Holy Spirit, pictured as a dove, soars
above them. Beneath them, Christ’s streams of blood flow together and into a
chalice. This depiction points to a tabernacle, which is placed behind it within the
predella, where the consecrated host as Christ’s eucharistic body was kept. Due
to the blood-filled chalice beneath Christ’s body, Appuhn suggested that the relic
of the Holy Blood was also kept in this place – beneath the host, under a wooden
pedestal. Thus, as in the picture, Christ’s blood would have been the counterpart
to Christ’s body. Appuhn based his interpretation on an inscription within the
predella’s niche, only legible from the backside, which he transcribed as Ave iheu
panis vine / presta nobis gaudia vite. Instead of vine, however, it reads vive [Fig. 3].[88]
Therefore, the inscription does not necessarily refer to the wine of the Eucharist,
and hence to the relic. Zimmer supposed that the pedestal in the niche was not
used to house the relic of the Holy Blood, but rather for the presentation of the
monstrance during Eucharistic adoration. Since there are no written sources on
the relic dating from this time, the altarpiece’s function as a repository for the Holy
Blood has to be doubted.

After the middle of the fourteenth century, donations for the relic of the Holy
Blood in Wienhausen stopped. The reason is unclear. Later sources from
Wienhausen attest that the suffering Christ and his Eucharistic body, which were
also the base of the cult of the Holy Blood, were venerated intensely until the six-
teenth century.[90] The relic itself, however, did not seem to have any share in this.

---

[86] For the miracle reports cf. Chronik und Totenbuch des Klusters Wienhausen, ed. by Appuhn, pp. 140-142;
on the donations of liturgical lamps for the relic of the Holy Blood: Wienhausen KIA, Urk. 162/Or.
132, Urk. 186/Or. 155, Urk. 259/Or. 227, Urk. 293/Or. 260; the donations of liturgical lamps for the
[88] See the right reading in the M.A. thesis of Johanna Fuchs and Silvia Behle (née Hellwig), submitted
in the subjects Conservation and Restauration at HAWK Hildesheim/Holzminden/Göttingen in July
2009: Fuchs/Hellwig, Der spätmittelalterliche Marienaltar, p. 29 and p. 72, fig. 56. Many thanks to the
authors for providing this material. See as well Die Inschriften, ed. by Wehking, No 96.
[90] This is proved by the artworks inspired by Christ’s Passion and the Eucharist, which were pro-
duced in the convent. We also have several written sources on these topics from Wienhausen: A
fragment of an Easter drama (cf. Boeckmann, ‘Bemerkungen’), three manuscripts, including a medita-
tion on the Crown of Thorns, owned by the nuns (cf. Mecham, Sacred Communities, p. 218-228), sever-
al meditations on the Cross in the Wienhausen hymnal (nos. 19, 28, 44), one hymn about the Eucha-
The chronicle only mentions one last occasion when the relic participated in a precatory procession during the Hildesheim Diocesan Feud (1519-1523).91

The relics of Christ took a central position among the relics of the three discussed monasteries.92 They were situated in the spiritual centres of the monastic houses, be it in the abbey church or in the nuns’ choir. In this position, they were at first reserved for veneration by the monks and nuns. It can be supposed that the relic from Mariengarten was also stored within the convent’s walls at first. Whereas in Walkenried and Mariengarten, the relics were kept in precious reliquaries, whose shape and material emphasised their glorious content, for Wienhausen, there is no clear evidence. The central position of the relics speaks for their special significance for the communities.

The practice of worship and veneration, however, varied. Some seeming disparities might be attributed to a lack of sources. With regard to Mariengarten, the scarce sources provide little information on the nuns’ spiritual life, but nevertheless Mariengarten is characterised by the most varied manifestations of cultic practices among our three examples: The relic of the Holy Blood was worshipped in a private, individual manner, as well as by the whole convent. As is demonstrated by the endowment of the liturgical lamp, the account of the reliquary translation, and the chants. The vestments bear witness to liturgical veneration as well. Whether the chants were part of a liturgical office cannot be determined, but it would constitute a unique and outstanding case of Cistercian veneration of the Holy Blood.

With regard to Wienhausen, we may also observe an intense private cult of the Holy Blood, but it appears to have been quite short-lived. Presumably, the relic lost its special significance as a witness of Christ’s Passion at an early stage. Other cult objects replaced it. As imagery played an exceptionally important role for the nuns of Wienhausen, the numerous devotional images may have been more suitable to fulfil their needs. Expressively and emotionally illustrating Christ’s suffering, these objects had an inspirational function and offered the emotional element the nuns required for their immersion in the mysteries of faith.93

There is only little evidence of cult practices in Walkenried. We do not know anything beyond the placement of the spines and their fifteenth century reliquary. One important reason may be that nearly all of the monastery’s images and sculptures as well as the manuscripts have been destroyed, which, presumably, might

ristic Mill – an allegoric treatment of the Eucharist – (no. 38), and another two about desecrations of the Host by Jews (nos. 21, 22) (cf. Wienhäuser Liederbuch, ed. by Kaufhold) and finally a written Way of Sorrows (cf. the paper of Robin Volkmar in this book).

91 Chronik und Totenbuch des Klosters Wienhausen, ed. by Appuhn, p. 134.
92 In most cases, we do not know about the other relics possessed by the houses. Regarding Mariengarten, no other relics are known. In Walkenried, apart from the ones named in the donation charter, there were about seventy relics from unknown saints. In Wienhausen, we also know of relics of Saint Alexander, the convent’s patron, and Saint Maurice, patron of the nearby convents of Medingen and Ebstorf. Hedwig Röckelein was able to identify the relics that were kept in the Holy Sepulchre.
93 Cf. Lentes, ‘Inneres Auge’.
have been the strongest indicators of an active veneration of the relic. Perhaps, however, an actual cult never emerged in Walkenried.

The first signs of a cult at the Cistercian nunneries of Mariengarten and Wienhausen date back to the first half of the fourteenth century. At that time they had already possessed the relics for several years. The background for this development is the increasing religious interest in the Passion and the Eucharist. In Mariengarten, the full establishment of the cult only took a short time: There were only a few years between the first documentary record and the various attestations of a cult that can be found on the sheet of parchment. Walkenried only received its relic in the fourteenth century. During the following years it was kept in the abbey church, but an intense cult at this early time cannot be certainly determined.

5 Veneration by Outsiders and Laypeople

Finally, there is the question whether and, if so, to what extent laypeople had access to the relics of Christ. What opportunities of veneration did they have, and how did the monastic communities organise the contact between outsiders and the relics? This question is of special interest regarding the female convents, as they were particularly affected by the monastic rule of enclosure.

Although the early modern chroniclers do not tell much about the cult of the spines practised by the community of Walkenried, they provide quite a detailed view on the veneration by outsiders. Since it was situated in the abbey church in the beginning, laypeople did not have access to the relic, since it was inaccessible to ‘women and the monastery’s servants’ (Frauenvolck und des Closters gemeine Hoff- und Hausgesinde).

At best, they would have been able to see the relic during the frequent processions mentioned by the early chronicles, but there was no opportunity of direct worship.

However, this changed no later than 1456, when the reliquary in the shape of the Virgin was made for the spines. This sculpture was placed in the gatehouse chapel of Saint Nicholas, to which women had access as well – auch die Weibes-Persohnen. Presumably, this chapel was built in the first half of the fourteenth century, after Louis the Bavarian (r. 1314-1347) had allowed Walkenried to secure the monastery with surrounding walls. Cistercian houses often added chapels to their gates, in order to provide an area where the monastic community could minister to laypeople. Sometimes located into the cloister walls, two entrances from both sides provided separate access to the chapel for the priest and for laymen. In monasteries, where outsiders only had little, and women often no access, these

94 Letzner, Die Walkenrieder Chronik, ed. by Reinboth, fol. 24v (p. 76).
95 Leuckfeld, Antiquitates Walckenredenses, p. 291.
96 Privilege of Louis the Bavarian from August 18, 1323, cf. Urkundenbuch des Klosters Walkenried, ed. by Dolle, no. 987. Cf. also Heutger, Kloster Walkenried, pp. 53.
chapels served as a connection between the inside and the outside worlds. The chapel of Saint Nicholas in Walkenried allowed laymen to visit the relic and worship it directly. We observe a similar practice in the Cistercian house of Loccum, situated in today’s Lower Saxony as well, where relics were kept in a gatehouse chapel, too.

After the relic had been transferred to the gatehouse chapel, ‘pilgrimages to Walkenried’ developed (grosse Wahlfarthen zum Closter). People kissed the relic, and ‘venerated it by donating gold and silver’ (aureo & argento von den Ankommenden aufs höbste verehret). The worshippers came from the immediate vicinity, but also from more remote locations. Thus, by transferring the relic to the gatehouse, it became accessible to a wider public. According to Leuckfeld, this relic was quite a profitable business: He blamed the monks for betraying people with the spines (gewaltigen Betrug getrieben), in order to gain their money (die Layen üm das Geld) – concerning his Lutheran background, his harsh criticism of the medieval Catholic cult is not surprising.

In addition, processions with the relic continued to be held on the scheduled feast-days (angesetzten Fest-Tagen), now with the sculpture of the Virgin. This was a great attraction because people could receive indulgences. Such an indulgence was engraved on the reliquary’s bottom, granting a remission of twelve times forty days to anyone who worshipped the sculpture on its feast days:

\[ \text{IN FESTIS MEIS ACCEDENTIBUS ALTARE MEUM, ET ME DEVOTE HONORATIBUS [sic] XII CARENÆ LAXANTUR} \]

The precise dates of these feast days, however, are not provided, neither here nor in the charter of the reliquary’s consecration, which promises another remission of forty days. The indulgences supposedly functioned as an incentive that led even more people to visit the relic on feast days.

The cult of the spines ended when Walkenried was pillaged during the Peasants’ War in 1525. Since all the monastery’s relics, the spines among them, were stolen, Abbot Georg Kreite (in off. 1568-1579) decided to melt the reliquary down and sell it.

---

100 Eckstorm, *Chronicon Walkenredense*, p. 149.
102 Eckstorm, *Chronicon Walkenredense*, p. 150. It mentions the village Ellrich, about 5 kilometres from the monastery, and the town of Eisleben, about 70 kilometres far.
103 Leuckfeld, *Antiquitates 1*, p. 94.
104 Ibid., p. 292.
106 Urkundendebuch des Klosters Walkenried, ed. by Dolle, no. 1372.
In the case of Mariengarten, the account of the reliquary translation broached the issue of a competition between the nunnery and other monastic houses. This suggests that Mariengarten had been interested in facilitating contact between the relic of the Holy Blood and laypeople.

In his chronicle, Letzner mentions a pilgrimage to the Holy Blood of Mariengarten: According to him, every year, on Judica Sunday, two weeks before Easter, many people came to the above-mentioned chapel of Saint Anne, where the relic was shown. They made donations and received indulgences. In addition, an annual fair was held on the occasion (Heiligthum gezeigt, Ablaß verkündigt, geopfert und Jahrmarck gehalten\textsuperscript{108}). But Letzner’s accounts have to be interpreted with caution as we have already seen before, regarding his unlikely assertion, that the relic was permanently placed in Saint Anne’s chapel. A charter from 1554, however, confirms his statements insofar as it states that a fair that had previously been held at the chapel on Judica Sunday and on the following Monday was to be granted to the nearby town of Dransfeld, instead.\textsuperscript{109} With regard to this point, Letzner was right.

In 1524, the Archbishop of Mainz granted an indulgence for the maintenance of the chapel of Saint Anne, which was bound to the saint’s feast days.\textsuperscript{110} The relic itself is not mentioned in the charter, but according to an inventory from 1585, this charter was kept in a chest, together with the vestment of the Holy Blood mentioned earlier. Thus, the chapel was very likely related to the cult.\textsuperscript{111}

Considering this, it appears that once a year, on Judica Sunday, the relic was brought from the convent to the chapel of Saint Anne, situated about two kilometres away. We can assume that attendance was very high on these occasions, because a fair is an event that attracted people from the whole region. Thus, the presentation of the relic benefitted from the annual fair and vice versa. This would have been the case from the fifteenth century onwards, when the chapel had already been built and could serve as the venue for the event.

The legend of the reliquary translation, the report of the miracles, and the chants of the Holy Blood from the fourteenth century may have also played a role in this spectacle. The first two were intended to prove the relic’s authenticity, as well as its miraculous ability, and therefore could have likely been used to legitimise the pilgrimage. Concerning the date of these sources, we can assume, that, at that time, laypeople may already have had the chance to visit the Holy Blood. How this early veneration was organised, however, has to remain unclear.

The cult of the Holy Blood must have ended when the annual fair was transferred to Dransfeld, possibly earlier. Perhaps, the popularity of the relic had decreased at that time, because people from the area had become Protestants, or Mariengarten had even lost the relic of the Holy Blood when its first Lutheran

\textsuperscript{108} Letzner, \emph{Drittes Buch} (Cod. Histor. 248), p. 835.
\textsuperscript{109} Städtesachen Dransfeld, no. 1, pp. 17-18.
\textsuperscript{110} \emph{Urkundenbuch des Klosters Mariengarten}, ed. by Boetticher, no. 366.
\textsuperscript{111} \emph{Mariengartener Inventar}, ed. by Boetticher, p. 172.
visitation took place in 1542. Whichever reason – the relic lost its effect, and an annual fair in Dransfeld appeared more attractive.\(^{112}\)

The Holy Blood relic of Wienhausen was venerated by laypeople as well. The convent’s chronicle provides some relevant evidence: Apart from the precatory procession during the Hildesheim Diocesan Feud, in which outsiders may have participated, there are three accounts of miracles that are said to have been worked on laypeople.\(^{113}\)

Thanks to their narrative nature, these reports give us an insight into the circumstances of this contact: A prisoner was miraculously freed when he promised to visit the relic, a blind man regained his sight, and a pregnant woman successfully delivered her child when her priest requested the whole community to visit the relic of the Holy Blood and pray for her. Consequently, gifts and presents were donated to the relic by the grateful laypeople.\(^{114}\)

All miracles occurred in response to concrete situations of need and the affected persons could personally visit the relic. This suggests that the Holy Blood must have been accessible at nearly all times, although it was placed in the nuns’ choir within the cloister. Indeed, there are sources, which explicitly prove that laypeople could enter the choir for prayer; for instance a 1483 charter related to the convent’s reform.\(^{115}\) Apparently, the nuns did not see any problem with this, even though it contradicted the principle of enclosure.

Using the staircase on the outer south-western edge of the church laypeople could enter the nuns’ choir without passing through the cloisters, but occasional encounters between nuns and secular visitors on the nuns’ choir are likely, particularly since the nuns used the choir even outside the liturgical prayer times.\(^{116}\) This procedure is not unique. Wöltingerode, Wienhausen’s mother house, kept its relic of the Holy Blood in the choir, too, where laypeople were allowed to visit it, and could gain indulgence.\(^{117}\)

Wienhausen’s relic of the Holy Blood, however, was not endowed with an indulgence. We do not know anything about the numbers of the believers from beyond the convent’s walls who came to venerate the relic, but in all probability, they did not travel from anywhere more than a few days’ distance. The miracle reports name Altencelle, about five kilometres from Wienhausen, and Groß Oesingen, about thirty kilometres away, as points of origin.

\(^{112}\) In 1529, the first Protestant service was celebrated in Göttingen. In Rosdorf, closer to Mariengarten, a Lutheran preacher is named even earlier, cf. Moeller, ‘Die Reformation’, pp. 495, 499; on the Reformation in Mariengarten cf. Boetticher, ‘Mariengarten’ B, pp. 998-999.

\(^{113}\) Chronik und Totenbuch des Klosters Wienhausen, ed. by Appuhn, pp. 140-142.

\(^{114}\) Ibid., p. 140.

\(^{115}\) Ibid., p. 141; Urk. 554, integrated into a copy book, Wienhausen, KLA, Ms. 24/1.

\(^{116}\) Mohn, Mittelalterliche Klosteranlagen, p. 240. This is evident from the numerous objects found under the nuns’ choir in the 1950s, among them various utensils which the nuns used for sewing and embroidering, cf. Bynum, “Crowned with many Crowns”, pp. 22-23.

\(^{117}\) Kreutz, ‘Wöltingerode’, p. 1557.
In 1953, when various objects were discovered under the floorboards of the Wienhausen nuns’ choir, a huge amount of small painted devotional objects and pilgrim badges came to light. Apart from badges from other holy sites, there were also several miniatures from Wienhausen. Noteworthy is the strikingly large number of depictions of the Holy Face of Jesus: Besides miniatures in kind of the Veronica with Christ’s face painted on a veil – a highly popular motif in late medieval piety –, there are also illustrations only showing the Face in various types. Eight nearly identical pictures of the Face drawn one next to another on a single sheet of parchment assume that these images in Wienhausen were produced in series [Fig. 4].

Since their discovery, these pictures were suggested to have served as badges of a Holy-Blood-pilgrimage in Wienhausen and this hypothesis remains persistent until today. It was again Appuhn, who drew this connection by relating the miniatures to quite similar depictions of Veronicas known as badges of Rome pilgrims. The relic’s presumed provenance from Rome was sufficient reason to Appuhn to identify the drawings as badges for a Holy-Blood-pilgrimage. This slight connection becomes even more unlikely as we know that this origin is utterly improbable.

However, the use as pilgrim badges cannot be excluded, but might be more suitable for another devotional object from Wienhausen, the Holy Sepulchre. The larger-than-life sculpture of dead Christ, the Grabchristus, from the late thirteenth century experienced a second heyday in the fifteenth century, when it got a new sarcophagus donated by abbess Katharina of Hoya (*1412, †1474), which was endowed with a vast number of relics and an indulgence. The veneration of the Holy Sepulchre increased, not only by the convent’s members but also by outsiders. Indeed, the long and gaunt face of dead Christ framed by a shawl and bedded on a cushion shows clear similarities to Christ’s face in the small series of Faces, the ones without Veronica and her veil in the background [Fig. 5]. Consequently, in that case these pictures should not be addressed as Veronicas but rather as depictions of dead Christ.

Another possibility, which appears very likely, is the function as little presents, which could be exchanged among the nuns and even with people from outside the cloister’s walls. In the letter books from the nearby convent of Lüne from the

120 Kloster Wienhausen, Wie Ke 5.
121 Appuhn, Der Fund, pp. 18-19.
122 Ibid., p. 20.
124 Cf. Mecham, Sacred Communities, pp. 172-173.
fifteenth and sixteenth century there are numerous letters which refer to small devotional pictures added to the writings and sent to relatives and nuns from other convents. It appears likely that these tiny pictures were produced in series so that one had the appropriate gift for any occasion.\textsuperscript{125}

The Wienhausen cult of the Holy Blood must have ended no later than with the advent of the Reformation, when a priest from Celle, the nearest town, took all the relics held in the nuns’ choir.\textsuperscript{126} It is unclear, if the relic was still visited by outsiders at that time, since the convent itself appears to have lost all interest in it.

In all three convents, laypeople had access to the relics of Christ, but the convents developed different ways of facilitating this access. Walkenried and Mariengarten transferred their relics from the enclosure to more accessible locations. At the male house of Walkenried, this happened in the mid-fifteenth century, but laypeople might have had opportunities to see and venerate the relic during processions even earlier. However, in the gatehouse chapel the spines were more easily accessible. The community of Mariengarten had plans to enable contact between the Holy Blood and laymen as early as the fourteenth century, which was implemented in the fifteenth century, when the relic was transferred to Saint Anne’s chapel once a year. Both monastic houses tried to popularise their relics, be it with indulgences or with an annual fair, scheduled on specific dates in order to control the streams of pilgrims. Thus, we can observe actual sites of pilgrimage in these cases. They may only have attracted people from a limited area, but in this manner were part of a network of pilgrimages in the Harz region and beyond, which developed in the late Middle Ages and was characterised by its regional nature.\textsuperscript{127}

While Walkenried and Mariengarten reacted to the needs of laity by transferring the relics from enclosure to more accessible places, in Wienhausen outsiders were allowed to enter the nuns’ choir. In this respect, Wienhausen is akin to a canonesses’ house with habitually maintained contact to the outside world. Due to its wealth, the convent obviously did not rely on the financial benefits an organised pilgrimage might have offered. Instead, they concentrated on other sacred imagery, e.g. the Holy Sepulchre. The observations gained on the basis of veneration by the convent’s members is thus borne out: Nuns as well as laypeople did not focus on

\textsuperscript{125} One of these letters referring to devotional images as gifts is published by Schlotheuber, ‘Intellectual Horizons’, p. 371. This appears as a common practice in other letters, too. The letter books from Lüne are object of the soon to be completed dissertation project of Lena Vosding, Universität Düsseldorf, and of the current research project ‘Netzwerke der Nonnen’ run by Henrike Lähnemann and Eva Schlotheuber. Other examples for this serial productions are four small reliefs made from papier mâché also found under the Wienhausen nuns’ choir. Two of those show the Man of Sorrows and the other two the Coronation of the Virgin, in each case identical to one another as they were produced with the same model. It has to be assumed that there existed many more, of which only these few were preserved by accidentally, Kloster Wienhausen, Wie Kc\textsuperscript{8} and Wie Kc\textsuperscript{24}; Wie Kc\textsuperscript{9} and Wie Kc\textsuperscript{21}.

\textsuperscript{126} Chronik und Totenbuch des Klosters Wienhausen, ed. by Appuhn, p. 75.

\textsuperscript{127} Kühne, ‘Der Harz’.
the relic for a long period, before the Holy Blood, in the late Middle Ages, was replaced by other sacred objects, particularly by images and sculptures.

6 Conclusion

The various forms of veneration we can observe in the three chosen examples give a first impression of a presumably diverse Cistercian veneration of Christ. In Walkenried, Mariengarten, and Wienhausen the broad lines of cultic development ran along the same lines: The cult of the relics of Christ emerged nearly at the same time, the first half of the fourteenth century, when the relics, some of which had been in the possession of the convents before, began to take centre stage. For all three Cistercian houses, these holy objects were extremely valuable, for not only were they closely bound up with their own institutional identity, but, as witnesses to Christ’s death on the Cross, they also established a direct connection between the monastery, the convents and the history of salvation. In each case, this significance was reflected in the exposed location of the relics, and their sumptuous reliquaries. Laymen, too, were increasingly interested in the relics, taking advantage of opportunities to venerate them. In all three convents, the cult then came to an end in the early sixteenth century.

However, these parallels in the cult’s structure cannot be based on the convents’ affiliation to the same order only. This becomes clear through the cult’s emergence and subsequent decline. The cult began due to the growing veneration of Christ and his Passion, which, although significantly moulded by Cistercian theology, soon spread far beyond the order’s confines, and influenced religious practices more generally. The end of the cult was not caused by the order, either, but by other general factors, which did not only have an impact on our three houses, but throughout Europe. The political and religious upheavals which at the beginning of the sixteenth century in the form of the Reformation and the Peasant Wars changed the landscape of the Reich, and of Saxony in particular, caused the cult to come to an end in all religious houses at almost the same time.

Apart from that, the cult’s manifestations in the three houses were fairly diverse. Mariengarten, despite being a small convent, which has been barely noticed by research, is an outstanding example for conventual Holy Blood veneration, even across different religious orders. The individual reasons for its development are hard to ascertain. It was certainly significant, however, that the convent had been given the liberty to form its cult in whatever way it wished. Since neither the territorial authorities nor the order showed much interest in this small community, Mariengarten was able to develop its cult freely cultivating a variety of devotional strategies pertaining to the relic. Probably this lack of outside influence in itself determined the uniqueness of Mariengarten’s cult of the Holy Blood.

Wienhausen showed an intense veneration when the cult emerged as well, but this broke off only a few years later. Here, the cult was closely dependant on the
nuns’ background: They were noble, educated and wealthy. Mystic devotion was a central part of their conventual life as is illustrated by the numerous visual and written treatments of topics such as the Passion and the Eucharist. Throughout the Middle Ages, further artworks were created which offered an omnipresent backdrop for their devotional practices. They could imagine and re-enact Salvation History and Christ’s Passion in various ways. This intensive veneration of Christ provided fertile soil for a flourishing cult of the Holy Blood, yet also probably contributed to its ending only a few decades later. The artworks appealed more readily to the noble nuns’ desire for splendour, and constituted a better inspiration for mystic contemplation, than the relic, which was consequently forced into the background. On the laity’s interest in the relic, they reacted only partially: like canonesses, the nuns felt themselves only conditionally bound to the rule of enclosure, and thus admitted outsiders to the choir. The financial advantages of Holy Blood pilgrimages were of little interest to them, and so they did not advertise their relic either.

Given the meagre source base, the cult of the Walkenried spines is the hardest to reconstruct. Devotional practices within the monastery, apart from the location and the reliquary, are unknown. Most likely, this is due both to the lack of sources and to the monastery’s character. Walkenried was the only one among the three chosen examples that was completely subordinate to the order and its controlling influence. Therefore, developing specific patterns of veneration was scarcely possible. Even individual devotion cannot be proved, since the vow of poverty was far stricter pursued than in the female convents. Perhaps for this reason, the early modern chroniclers focused more on the veneration by outsiders.

Thus, comparing the cult of the relics of Christ in the different communities, we can observe similar patterns of veneration, as well as major differences. However, the congruences cannot primarily be explained by the shared affiliation with the Cistercian Order but rather by general historical developments. The differences between the cults resulted primarily from the differing relationships between the particular house and the order. It can be seen that non-incorporated houses were more strongly influenced by other factors, which could have been the ruler, the bishop, the founder, the nuns’ origin or the convent’s history, as well as the geographic and social environment, their proportion varying from case to case. These factors could facilitate different paths of cultic development, but could also give the house greater room to constitute its own cult. The incorporated monasteries did not have such liberties.

What can this tell us about Christly devotion in these religious houses in general, and therefore about Cistercian spirituality? Here, two properties of the cult are decisive: in all of the cases considered here, relics of Christ constituted the central holy objects. They had a unique position, and surpassed all other relics and cults of saints in their significance, at least temporarily – including the veneration of Mary, which previous scholarship always considered a particular characteristic of Cistercian spirituality. Furthermore, the cult of these relics represented a large, if not the
most significant part, of the veneration of Christ in general within the houses. The sources for the relic-cult are among the earliest witnesses to the veneration of Christ in each house, and the concrete development of the cult of Christ can often first be deduced through the sources on the veneration of the relics. In Walkenried and Mariengarten, there are only a few hints for a cult of Christ not referring to the relic at the same time. Even in Wienhausen, where an intense worship of Christ is evident in all the images, the early charters on the Holy Blood are also among the earliest testimonies for a cult of Christ.

In conclusion we can determine that Cistercian veneration of Christ could take far more varied forms than the sparse prescriptions of the order suggest. Nowhere in the statutes of the order can we find any mention of Christly relics, but in many cases these formed the principal constituent of the monastic veneration of Christ. It was significantly shaped by the background and surroundings of the religious houses, and their own self-image. Thus, the actual conditions of religious practice did not necessarily match the order’s prescriptions – about the true character of Cistercian piety they only tell us little.
Fig. 1: Wienhausen, Convent, inv. no. Wie Ac 1. A sculptural group of the Christ's resurrection (so-called *Auferstehung Christus*), frontal view, c. 1260-1300 (photo © Kloster Wienhausen).

Fig. 2: Wienhausen, Monastery, Nuns’ choir. St Mary’s altar, detail from the predella niche depicting the Throne of Mercy, 1519 (photo: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Wienhausen).
Fig. 3: Wienhausen, Monastery, Nuns’ choir. St Mary’s altar, detail of the inscription on the backside of the pedestal, placed in the predella niche, 1519 (photo: Hedwig Röcklein; © Kloster Wienhausen).

Fig. 4: Wienhausen, Monastery Museum, inv. no. Wie Kc 5. Painted parchment with the Holy Face, fifteenth century (photo © Kloster Wienhausen).
Fig. 3: Wienhausen, Monastery, Nuns' Choir. St Mary's altar, detail of the inscription on the backside of the pedestal, placed in the predella niche, 1519 (photo: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Wienhausen).

Fig. 4: Wienhausen, Monastery Museum, inv. no. Wie Kc 5. Painted parchment with the Holy Face, fifteenth century (photo © Kloster Wienhausen).

Fig. 5: Wienhausen, Monastery. Christ's effigy (so-called Grabchristus) in the Holy Sepulchre, Christ c. 1290. Sarcophagus 1448 (photo © Kloster Wienhausen).
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The Cult of the Invisible – Relics in the Cistercian Houses Loccum and Wienhausen

Hedwig Röckelein *

Abstract

The bodily remains of venerated saints and secondary relics of the Lord preserved in the male Cistercian monastery of Loccum and the female Cistercian house of Wienhausen in Lower Saxony are presented and analyzed here for the first time ever. These collections of relics will be discussed with the receptacles in which they were preserved. These are on the one hand the shrine and the monumental cross in Loccum and on the other the Holy Sepulchre, the figure of the Grabchristus, and a relic bundle from the nuns’ choir in Wienhausen. Although invisible to the convent’s inhabitants, to lay brothers and sisters and to laypeople, these relics worked as powerful and effective religious objects. By analysing the collections of relics, the hypothesis has emerged that Mary was not the only saint venerated in these Cistercian houses, but rather primarily Christ and, to a lesser degree, a wide range of other saints and martyrs. By and within the receptacles and the sculptures, the cult of Mary and the cult of the martyrs seemed to be incorporated literally and metaphorically into the veneration of Christ. In addition, in Wienhausen relics seem to have been received from the East (Byzantium? Palestine?) in an early phase of the monastery’s existence. Finally, the author compares the accessibility of

* Hedwig Röckelein is full professor at the history department of the Georg-August-University Göttingen. This article is based on her investigations in Loccum and Wienhausen during the Lower Saxon-Israeli programm ‘Practising Love of God’, 2013-2018.
the respective relics with regard to the monks / nuns and the laity in respect to gender.
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1 The Cistercians and the Veneration of the Saints

The medieval cult of saints and their remains provides an important insight into conceptions of piety, into the identity of religious institutions and their social and political relations. At first glance, the Cistercians appear to have practised a uniform and monotonous cult in this respect, since all of their communities were entrusted to the patronage of the Mother of Christ. In all Cistercian houses, Saint Mary was present in many places and in many ways – in the form of statues, images, wall-paintings, and prayer books. This ubiquitous devotion to the virgin cannot be traced back to the very beginnings of the Cistercian Order, however. As Gabriela Signori has shown, this feature of Cistercian piety only emerged during Bernard of Clairvaux’s process of canonization. Furthermore, the cult of Saint Mary is only a secondary phenomenon, derived from the cult of Christ, as Esther Wipfler has again brought to attention recently. With Bernard of Clairvaux’s writings, or possibly even earlier, Christology has been placed at the centre of Cistercian theology. Within the order, there was an intense examination of the dogma of transubstantiation, promulgated at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. The Cistercians were also involved in the Eucharistic cult that was brought about by the visions of Juliana of Liège, and the feast of Corpus Christi that was adopted by the order in 1318. Resulting from the fervent cult surrounding Christ and his mother Mary, the Theotokos, many Cistercian communities wanted to acquire their relics. Combined with indulgences that the Cistercians used to fund their building activities, these relics attracted laypeople and pilgrims.

In addition to their main patron Saint Mary, almost all Cistercian communities also had one or more special patrons. They had numerous other saints whose relics they kept and venerated in altars, statues, and other receptacles in diverse places of

---

1 This is the opinion of Mussbacher, ‘Die Marienverehrung’; Cassidy-Welch, *Monastic Spaces*, p. 88.

2 Signori, ‘Totius ordinis’.

3 Wipfler, *Corpus Christi*, cap. II.2, pp. 80-89.

4 The relics of Christ are covered by Mai-Britt Wiechmann’s contribution to this volume.
their monasteries.\textsuperscript{5} Due to the dominant position of Saint Mary and Christ, it has rarely been noticed that male and female Cistercians possessed a wide range of holy remains and venerated a great number of different saints.\textsuperscript{6} These non-marian relics and saints will be the focus of this article.

I will demonstrate the diversity of the veneration of saints with the examples of the male monastery of Loccum and the female convent of Wienhausen, two important Cistercian communities in Northern Germany, in today’s federal state of Lower Saxony. I will not focus on the relics of Christ and, consequently, the main relics of both communities – the Holy Tunic of Loccum\textsuperscript{7} and the Holy Blood of Wienhausen\textsuperscript{8} – will not be considered here. Instead, we will concentrate on different receptacles for relics: The reliquary of the main altar and the triumphal cross from Loccum, two monuments that were created shortly after the middle of the thirteenth century, when the community received its first endowments. From Wienhausen, the relics deposited in the so-called Grabchristus (c. 1290), an effigy of the dead Christ at the tomb, and the sarcophagus that was made for it in the mid fifteenth century will be in concern; in addition, a relic, wrapped in pieces of cloth, whose precise medieval location within the Wienhausen convent is unknown. All these relics share a common feature: During the Middle Ages, they were hidden from the eyes of the faithful. In some cases, the receptacles and relics are still connected today, in other cases, the connection can be reconstructed, based on inventories of relics, historiographical texts, or archival sources.\textsuperscript{9}

These invisible relics and their receptacles pose a number of questions: When did the monastic communities receive these relics, and who provided them? Did the monks in Loccum and the nuns in Wienhausen deliberately collect specific saints? Did they identify with them, as they identified with the main relics and patrons of their communities? Do the collections of the male and female monastic houses differ, and, if they do, are the differences gender-based? The male monastery was incorporated into the order, the female convent was not – did this affect the profile of the two collections of relics? Who had knowledge of the presence of these relics and the saints they represented during the Middle Ages? Where and how were the relics kept? Who had access to them? Did only the monks and nuns venerate these saints, and did only they pray for their assistance, or did laypeople from within and without the communities do likewise?

\begin{footnotes}
\item[8] On the Holy Blood and other relics of Christ at Wienhausen cf. the contributions by Mai-Britt Wiechmann and Lotem Pinchover in this volume.
\item[9] The analysis is based on an examination of the relics in Loccum’s monastic archive and in the Convent of Wienhausen in the years 2012 and 2013. The comprehensive documentation and analysis of the collections of relics will be published separately. For some first impressions, cf. Röckelein, ‘Heilige’, pp. 77-104, and Röckelein, ‘Reliquienauthentiken’.
\end{footnotes}
2 Loccum and Wienhausen – A Male and a Female Cistercian Monastery

In order to better understand the historic and functional contexts of the receptacles and relics some points of background data on the communities need to be addressed first: The foundation, the founders, donors, and later benefactors, the position within the order, diocesan affiliation, fifteenth century reform movements, post-Reformation history and the corpus of relevant sources.\(^\text{10}\)

According to legend, a certain count of Hallermund founded the Cistercian monastery of Loccum\(^\text{11}\) in 1163.\(^\text{12}\) In 1187 Pope Gregory VIII declared that Loccum’s abbot was to be subordinate to the authority of the Bishop of Minden, while the community should enjoy a high degree of autonomy.\(^\text{13}\) Loccum’s abbots and monks sought to safeguard their independence by not only maintaining close relationships with their diocesan bishop but also with the bishops of Bremen, Verden on the Aller, and Hildesheim. Furthermore, they granted burial rights in their church to a number of local and regional dynasties of low and high nobility, or at least assumed memorial duties for these families.\(^\text{14}\) Thus, they managed to avoid submission to the control of their local bishop and the dominion of a local territorial lord. During the course of the Middle Ages, they established one of the most extensive territories in Northern Germany.\(^\text{15}\)

The monastery’s fortune was based on land, on tithes, on endowments of local benefactors, on donations of pilgrims and on indulgences.\(^\text{16}\) Already in the thirteenth century, the monks built a large church and a representative cloister as well as outbuildings, stables and barns. A wall with a gatehouse – containing a chapel – offered protection and security. The choir and the transepts were consecrated no later than 1255,\(^\text{17}\) while the consecration of the whole church took place in 1277.\(^\text{18}\) Although the monastery experienced both a financial and a spiritual crisis in the fourteenth century, the monks resisted the attempts at reform Benedict XII had imposed on the order in 1335. In 1519, during the Hildesheim Diocesan Feud, the monastery was pillaged and partially destroyed. For a long time, the monks resisted

\(^{10}\) Additional data is provided by the contributions of Mai-Britt Wiechmann and Lotem Pinchover in this volume.  
\(^{13}\) Calenberger Urkundenbuch, ed. by Hodenberg, no. 15.  
\(^{15}\) Cf. Rösener, ‘Grangien’.  
\(^{16}\) Reitemeier, ‘Entwicklung’, pp. 125-140.  
\(^{17}\) This can be deduced from the donations of liturgical lamps for the altars of Saint Mary, Saint Martin, and Saint John the Baptist in the choir and the transept in 1255 (Loccum, Monastery archive, Urk. 182).  
\(^{18}\) In 1277, Bishop Simon [I] of Paderborn gave an indulgence for the occasion of the dedication of the abbey church at Loccum (Loccum, Monastery archive, Urk. 362).
the introduction of the Reformation by the dukes of Calenberg, until duke Julius of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel was successful in 1592/93. Even as a Protestant monastery, however, Loccum maintained contact with the Cistercian Order, well into the seventeenth century.

No significant religiously relevant written sources with religious content from Loccum’s medieval phase are extant. Evidence on the monks’ spiritual life, however, is provided by many other sources: The surviving buildings, the furnishings of the abbey church, the relics, the charters, the miracle accounts by Caesarius of Heisterbach, a Cistercian from the Rhine, as well as early modern chronicles by Johannes Letzner (from 1531 to 1613), and by the Loccum abbots Theodor Stracke (in office 1600-1629) and Gerhard Wolter Molanus (*1633, †1722, abbot since 1677).

According to a legend from the seventeenth century, the convent of Wienhausen was founded next to the pre-existing parish church Saint Alexander in Huginhusen on the Aller before 1229. The charter confirming the foundation, dating from 24 April 1233 and issued by Conrad II, bishop of Hildesheim (in office 1221-1247), names Duchess Agnes of Landsberg (1192/93-1266) as the founder. It further mentions the commemorative purpose of the foundation for her deceased husband Henry, Duke of Saxony and Count Palatine of the Rhine.

In 1244 Duke Otto the Child made a fruitless appeal to the general chapter on behalf of the convent’s incorporation into the Cistercian Order. Due to their wealth, the nuns were in a position to commission some costly works in the late thirteenth and in the fourteenth century: The All Saints Chapel (late thirteenth century), the Grabchristus, the Auferstehungchristus, and the Madonna (c. 1290), the second, two-storeyed cloister, the enclosure’s western wing with its heatable winter refectory, as well the Armarium on the upper level (c. 1310). The construction of the nuns’ choir began around 1325, work on the wall paintings there started in

---

20 The charters are kept in the monastic archive of Loccum. An edition is currently being prepared by Ursula-Barbara Dittrich on behalf of the Protestant Church of Hanover.
21 Caesarius of Heisterbach, Dialogus miraculorum, ed. by Nösges/Schneider; the Loccum miracles according to the accounts of the monk, priest and custodian Adam are to be found in chap. VII,17-19, VII,24, VII,52, VIII,18, VIII,74, X,40, XI,19.
22 Leuckfeld, Leutzners Hinterlassene geschriebene Nachricht, p. 126.
23 Two German chronicles by Abbot Theodor Stracke, Loccum, Monastery archive, II 2 no. 7. The chronicles have not been edited so far; Simon Sosnitza, Helmstedt, is preparing an edition.
25 Agnes was the daughter of Conrad (II) of Landsberg of the House Wettin, Margrave of the Ostmark (on him cf. the Saxon Biography, <http://saebi.isgv.de/biografie/Konrad_(II.)_von_Landsberg_(1159-1210)>, 27.11.2016). In 1209, she was wed to Henry the Tall (*1173, †1227), the oldest son of Henry the Lion and Matilda of England. Henry was Count Palatine of the Rhine. He held this office thanks to his first wife Agnes of the Staufen family, Countess Palatine of the Rhine, who died in 1204 and was buried in Stade. Since his wedding with the second Agnes in 1209, he styled himself Dux Saxoniae. On him, cf. Briechle: Heinrich, and Neue Deutsche Biographie, vol. 8, pp. 381-383.
26 Wienhausen, KLA, Urk. 9/Or. 5.
1335. Between 1300 and 1469, the nuns produced a large number of tapestries in their own workshop, eighteen of which have survived to this day. Wienhausen suffered financial losses during the Lüneburg War of Succession in the 1370s. For her own private devotions, Abbess Katharina of Hoya (*1412, †1474) erected the chapel of Saint Anne, next to the convent building. For the convent’s nuns, she commissioned numerous manuscripts, the Heilsspiegel-Tapestry, devotional images, and the sarcophagus of the Grabchristus. Katharina was deposed in 1437 and again in 1469, because she resisted strict observance of the monastic rules. In 1469 the monastery was incorporated into the Windesheim reform group, a development that was to have a great impact on the community’s spiritual life. In 1528, the provost was removed from office and the pertaining benefices were sequestrated. The first Protestant abbess (domina) was introduced to Wienhausen in 1587.

The convent’s medieval charters are preserved in Wienhausen’s monastic archive but remain unedited. The buildings and the numerous sculptural and textile furnishings still exist and are in excellent condition. They have been researched extensively by art historians, historians, and musicologists since the 1960s.

3 The Reliquary Receptacles from Loccum and Wienhausen

3.1 Loccum

Around the middle of the thirteenth century, the Loccum monks commissioned a painted wooden shrine for the main altar. They used this to store their collection of relics [Fig. 1]. The shrine, shaped like a house, was probably made in the same workshop as the predella from the main altar in the Cathedral of Minden. It stretched across the whole width of the altar table. The side of the shrine that faces the church’s interior imitates the facade of a Gothic nave, complete with arcades, pinnacles, turrets, a portal, and two transepts. The shrine’s reverse side however,

---

29 Cf. ibid., chap. 6, pp. 159-203: ‘The Art of Reform’.
30 Transcripts, regesta, and microforms of the Wienhausen charters are kept by the Archive of Lower Saxony in Hannover: Niedersächsisches Landesarchiv, FA Cop. IX 02 (2 volumes).
31 An overview of the current state of research is provided by Mersch, Soziale Dimensionen, ch. IV.1.3: on images dating from the founding period of the thirteenth century; ch. V.1.3 on documents from the reform period of the fifteenth century; on this, cf. Mecham, Sacred Communities, and Lotem Pinchover’s contribution in this volume.
33 This is what is assumed by Grube, Der Reliquienschrein, pp. 62-64, based on structural similarities of both monuments. The predella of Minden’s high altar is now preserved in the Bode Museum in Berlin.
facing the wall, is flat and without any sculptural decoration [Fig. 2]. This indicates that the shrine has always stood at the main altar and was not carried in processions. Its today’s brilliant colourfulness is a result of nineteenth century restoration work. Today, the arcades on the front side are open, while in the Middle Ages they were covered by boards that could be slid aside with the help of a mechanism. The Loccum shrine represents an abstract church building, the symbol of the ecclesia and the Heavenly Jerusalem. It refers both to the saints as living building stones in the edifice of the church and to the afterlife where the saints have gone already. Due to the arcades and the sliding doors, the usually hidden relics could be revealed temporarily.

We do not know on which occasions the arcades were opened and the relics shown, since no relevant written instructions are extant. Probably the shrine was opened and the relics shown on the high feast days of the ecclesiastical year, as well as on the feast days of the main patron saints, Mary and George, and possibly also when high ranking visitors came to the monastery.

Since the shrine has been empty for a long time and there are no written sources old enough to list its contents, we do not know what exactly was shown to the faithful on these occasions. The shrine’s interior was subdivided into three compartments with boards. These compartments were large enough to contain small wooden or metal receptacles filled with relics. These receptacles, however, certainly did not contain the relics that are kept in the Loccum monastic archive today. Grube’s and Wipfler’s suggestion that the shrine may have contained the Holy Tunic, has to be dismissed, since, according to the chronicler abbot Stracke, it was deposited in the wall of the abbey church.

In his collection of miracle stories, Caesarius of Heisterbach gives an account of a vision, which Loccum’s custodian Adam had supposedly had in the monastic church. At dusk, Adam is said to have seen a very bright circle, akin to a rainbow, in front of the presbytery, hovering above the altar. On the circle of light, he allegedly saw Christ the Saviour together with the Mother of God, and surrounded by numerous saints, especially those whose relics were kept in the church. He knew their names because he was the church’s custodian. Unfortunately, neither Adam,
nor Caesarius give any actual names, otherwise we might know which relics were kept and venerated by the Loccum monks in the shrine on the high altar.

Not all the inhabitants of the monastery had access to the shrine, only the monks themselves. They saw it on a daily basis, when they gathered in the church’s eastern part in front of the main altar during the Liturgy of the Hours and for mass. The lay brothers, on the other hand, prayed in the church’s western part, which was separated from the eastern part by the rood screen, and from where they did not have an unobstructed view of the main altar. A further miracle account by Caesarius reports that the abbot allowed guests to enter the abbey church and advance to the sanctuary’s barrier.\textsuperscript{41} The sick were permitted to be carried up to the actual altar in order to pray and ask for healing.

The second reliquary from the monastic church of Loccum that used to contain a large number of relics is the monumental triumphal cross [Fig. 3].\textsuperscript{42} On both sides, it showed images of the suffering Christ in a Byzantine style.\textsuperscript{43} These painted images, instead of sculptural crucifixes, fulfilled the ideals of simplicity and poverty that the Cistercian general chapter of 1134 (ch. 26) had mandated for the furnishing of churches.\textsuperscript{44} In the case of Loccum, however, the simplistic execution is countered by the imitation of precious stones and other decorative elements.

Based on stylistic, architectural and liturgical criteria, the cross had previously been dated to the time between 1240 and 1277.\textsuperscript{45} In contrast, recent technical and dendrochronological examinations suggest that building work on the monastery church started in the first third of the thirteenth century and was completed after only about fifty years, around the year 1250, including the roof of the nave.\textsuperscript{46} The cross, consequently, was probably installed at that time as well. The story of the translation of two relics that rested in the cross suggests, that the repositories were filled in the years 1259-1261.\textsuperscript{47}

The monumental cross hung over the rood screen, where an altar of the Holy Cross was erected in 1280. There, it was visible to the monks in the church’s eastern part, as well as to the lay brothers in the western part of the nave.\textsuperscript{48} Conse-

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., VII,17, p. 1342: venisset... ad cancellos, ubi hospitibus stare moris est. ... super feretrum ... iacere vidit. ‘Feretrum’ refers to the stretcher.

\textsuperscript{42} Ahrends, \textit{Das Loccumer Tafelkreuz}, cap. 6.7, pp. 63-64. An art-historical classification is provided by Beer, \textit{Triumphkreuze}, no. 64, pp. 680-684, and Wipfler, ‘\textit{Corpus Christi}’, pp. 63-65. In a short sentence on p. 65, Wipfler refers to the depositories, without, however, connecting them to Molanus’ inventory. Instead, he identifies the entries on pp. 89-99 of his register as the contents of the shrine on the main altar.

\textsuperscript{43} On this type cf. Wipfler, ‘\textit{Corpus Christi}’, p. 66.

\textsuperscript{44} Cf. Beer, \textit{Triumphkreuze}, p. 683.

\textsuperscript{45} Ahrends, \textit{Das Loccumer Tafelkreuz}, p. 63.

\textsuperscript{46} Boeck/Gomolka, ‘Kloster Loccums Kirche’, pp. 55-60.

\textsuperscript{47} Cf. below pp. 170-171.

\textsuperscript{48} The painting on the side facing the choir was destroyed during restoration work carried out in 1848-1850. Most of the painting on the side facing the nave survived, was restored in 1953-1958, and is now visible again from the nave. On the restoration work and its results, cf. Beer, \textit{Triumphkreuze}, p. 683, and Ahrends, \textit{Das Loccumer Tafelkreuz}. 
sequently, monks as well as lay brothers had the image of the crucified Christ in front of their eyes at several times during the day, when they gathered in the abbey church for prayer and mass.

There is evidence for the presence of such monumental crucifixes in the churches of other male Cistercian monasteries in northern Germany, for example at Riddagshausen and Amelungsborn. Since these, however, are not extant, we usually do not know anything about their appearance, or whether they contained any relics. It is only in the case of the Westphalian male Cistercian house of Marienfeld that we have written evidence of a triumphal cross that had repositories, placed in its reverse side, filled with 100 relics. During the Early and High Middle Ages, approximately a third of all crucifixes and sculptures of Saint Mary were embedded with relics, as a recent study by Anna Pawlik shows. Manuela Beer presumes that relics were an important component of triumphal crosses and crucifixion scenes, imparting these images with sacral identity.

The four ends of Loccum’s triumphal cross show symbols of the four evangelists. In each of the triangular appendages of the cross arms, two small square recesses were cut into the wood and closed with wooden lids [Fig. 4a-b]. These recesses have been empty for a long time. Thanks to Loccum’s abbot Gerhard Wolter Molanus (in office 1677-1722), however, we know that they used to contain relics. This can be read in the notes he took in 1715, when the cross was relocated within the church and broke into seven pieces during the process. Molanus lists 44 little packs of relics [Fig. 6a-b]. He was able to associate a large number of these with individual saints; others, he combined in anonymous fascicles. He identified relics of the bones, blood, and gown of Philip the Apostle, of James (the apostle, 

---

49 Cf. Wipfler, ‘Corpus Christi’, p. 79. A painted triumphal cross from the Cistercian monastery of Schulpforta in Thuringia (created after 1268), similar to the one from Loccum, has no cavities for relics. Cf. Beer, Triumphkreuze, no. 101, with fig. 413, p. 778.

50 The relics were described when the cross was opened in 1485. Cf. Karrenbrock, ‘Heilige Häupter’, p. 269. The relics were last mentioned by Wigger, Antiquitates, p. 14. Cf. Böhmer/Leidinger, Die Zisterzienserabtei, pp. 145-146. Neither the cross nor the relics are extant. They are not covered by Beer, Triumphkreuze. Katharina Knesia’s contribution to this volume deals with the early history of the Cistercian convent of Marienfeld.

51 Pawlik states that there are depositories of relics in a third of all the extant crucifixes and statues of Mary dating from the time before the eleventh century (p. 96); on relics of Christ in these depositories, cf. Pawlik, Das Bildwerk, pp. 107-114. Beer, Triumphkreuze, pp. 57-59, lists all crucifixes with reliquary depositories dating from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Beer regrets that the relics have often been treated improperly and were not documented during restoration work.

52 Beer, Triumphkreuze, p. 59.

53 Loccum, Monastery archive III no. 3, pp. 1-2. P. 1: ‘In der großen Kirche Zu Lockum sein nachfolgende reliquien, bey Umsetzung des großen Crucifexes, auch Wegrueumung des Baufeligen Lectorij am eingange des Chors [x: auch andernorit] gefunden [F: oder dem Closter geschenkt] und hier wieder an verschieneen orten heimlich bejgezet- zett worden.’ (‘The following relics were found [F: or given to the monastery] in the large church of Loccum, when the large crucifix was relocated and the damaged lectern next to the entrance to the choir [x: also elsewhere] was removed. And they were secretly entombed here and in other places’). At the end of the register, p. 2, we find the crucial reference: Hactenus reliquia ex Crucifico. Cf. Röckelein, ‘Heilige’, p. 99.
bishop or martyr?), of the head of Eustace the Martyr, and of an anonymous saint’s tooth. In addition, he names unspecified relics of Stephen the Protomartyr, Sebastian the Martyr, Fabian, Lawrence, Christopher, Boniface, Denis, Felix, Cosmas and Damian, Valentine, Vitalis, Vincentius, Hippolytus, Alexander, Gereon and his companions, Gall the Confessor, Giles the abbot, Godehard the bishop, the holy virgins Petronilla, Mary Magdalene, Fides, Spes, Caritas and Sapientia, Margaret, Felicitas, Christina, Agnes, Quirina, Emerentiana, and of the 11,000 Virgins, among them Saint Ursula.

At the beginning of his inventory, Molanus states that he had secretly entombed the relics in several places. Probably, this is only a precautionary statement by Molanus, who allegedly harboured Catholic sympathies. As my research has shown, the relics he mentions are now kept in chipboard boxes in the monastic archive in Loccum and were definitely not buried in an unknown place, as Molanus has stated.

The relics in the archive are accompanied by authenticating labels and small notes. The following saints correspond to the names in Molanus’ inventory: James, Fabian, Petronilla, Fides, Spes, Caritas and Sapientia, Margaret, Felicitas, Agnes, Quirina, Emerentiana and the 11,000 Virgins with Saint Ursula. Further relics of Saint Dorothy, Saint Urban, and several patriarchs are extant in the archive but are not listed by Molanus. Up to now I could not identify the places where these were kept in the Middle Ages.

Some relics have been especially useful for this study by providing deeper insights into the history of Loccum and the creation of the triumphal cross. These are the relics of Petronilla, of Boniface and Emerentiana, and of the group around Fides, Spes, Caritas, and Sapientia.

The Petronilla relic [Fig. 7] is remarkable for having been packaged and labelled in the eleventh century, long before the monastery’s foundation. Accord-
The Cult of the Invisible

...ing to legend, Petronilla, a Roman martyr whose feast is celebrated on 31 May, was the daughter of Saint Peter. In the eighth century her relics were taken from the Catacombs of Domitilla to St Peter’s Basilica in Rome. From there, they were distributed to high-ranking visitors from the Frankish Empire. In Carolingian and Ottonian times Petronilla was venerated in several places in Westphalia and Saxony. It is likely that the Loccum monks received this relic as part of their foundational endowment from a bishop or a nobleman. Early charters from Loccum name Petronilla as the community’s third patron, after Mary and George. She lost this prominent role during the Middle Ages and has now fallen into complete oblivion in Loccum.

Two crumpled fragments of cloth have been preserved together with the relics. In the early seventeenth century Abbot Stracke authenticated these as relics of Saint Boniface and Saint Emerentiana [Fig. 8]. The cult of these two saints was already important during the early period of Saxony’s Christianization. Relics of Boniface, an Anglo-Saxon missionary who was buried in Fulda, and of Emerentiana, a Roman martyr, have been present in Saxony, especially in Hameln on the Weser, as of the middle of the ninth century. My inquiries have demonstrated that the relics of these two saints probably came to Loccum from Hameln via Minden between 1259 and 1261. At that time, Prior Isfrid settled a dispute between the Abbot of Fulda and the Bishop of Minden, on the one hand, and the dukes Albert and John of Braunschweig, on the other hand.

The group of holy virgins consisting of Fides, Spes, Caritas, and Sapientia represents Christian virtues of Late Antiquity that were associated with concrete biographies during the Middle Ages. Complete bodies of these virgins were in the possession of Minden Cathedral, where Sapientia was known as a widow under the small envelope of parchment, labelled by Stracke as De Corpore / S. Petronella. For a comprehensive description of this bundle cf. Röckelein, ‘Heilige’, p. 88.

---

60 Loccum, Monastery archive, Urk. 7 (1181-1185); Urk. 35 (1209).
61 Loccum, Monastery archive, chipbox 1, no. 3: small folded piece of thick, lightly coloured parchment: S. Bonifaci / martyris; within, a light, yellow-white, crumpled piece of silk. Loccum, Monastery archive, chipbox 4, no. 1: folded piece of paper from the seventeenth century: Emerentiana / virginiis, containing a crumpled piece of red silk. Cf. Röckelein, ‘Heilige’, pp. 95-96. One must assume that Stracke’s specifications are based on older, medieval labels that have been lost subsequently. The great age of the cult indicates that, in these cases, pieces of cloth were seen as relics. Until the ninth century, pieces of cloth were much more common as relics than bones.
63 More information on this is provided by Röckelein, ‘Heilige’, pp. 98-99.
64 Loccum, Monastery archive, chipbox 3, no. 1: Parchment, folded, inscribed (by Stracker?) in the seventeenth century: Fidei, Spei Charitatis et Sapientiae. The small paper envelope does not contain cloth or bone fragments. Inventory of relics by Abbot Gerhard Wolter Molanus, c. 1715 Loccum, Monastery archive III no. 3, p. 1: Fidei, spei, charitatis et sapientiae.
Greek name ‘Sophia’. The other women were seen as her daughters.\textsuperscript{65} Probably, Bishop Anno had translated Sophia’s complete body from Rome to Minden in the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{66}

At first glance, the saints from Loccum’s reliquary cross are consistent with the usual composition of early and late medieval reliquary collections: The high proportion of relics associated with Cologne, the 11,000 Virgins around Saint Ursula, and the Theban Legion, represented by Saint Gereon, is typical of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Most of the martyrs are familiar from the Roman Rite; their feasts were celebrated by the whole Latin Church annually. Although the Loccum monoks owned corporal as well as secondary relics of Philip the Apostle, he was not among those disciples of Christ that were objects of special veneration. Their emphasis was rather on Andrew the Apostle and John the Evangelist.\textsuperscript{67} Despite Loccum’s foundation in the twelfth century, the community collected relics of early medieval saints: The missionaries and founders of the monasteries Gall (Saint Gall) and Boniface (Fulda), and the Roman women Emerentiana and Petronilla, who were venerated in Saxony as early as the ninth century. Connections with the local diocesan are reflected by the relics of Fides, Spes, Caritas, and Sapientia. The relics of Bishop Godehard of Hildesheim and Abbot Giles, patron of the Benedictine monastery of Braunschweig, document associations with the neighbouring diocese.

It is remarkable that the triumphal cross contained neither relics of Christ or Mary, nor of George, the abbey church’s patron, nor of Cistercian saints. Together with her mother and Jesus, Mary was represented in the sculpture of the Virgin and Child with Saint Anne (Anna Selbdritt), placed immediately below the triumphal cross in the altarpiece at the main altar [Fig. 5]. Also present in this place were polychromatic wooden statues depicting Saint George and the Cistercian saint Bernard, as well as Andrew the Apostle, and John the Evangelist.\textsuperscript{68} We do not know if the monks of Loccum also possessed relics of these saints.

Which conclusions can be drawn from the Loccum Cistercians’ partially reconstructed and partially extant reliquary treasure? Despite indications of an active cult of Mary,\textsuperscript{69} the veneration of Christ enjoyed the most prominent position in Loccum. Its focal points were two monuments, the triumphal cross and the Holy Tunic. The saints whose relics were contained in the triumphal cross surrounded Christ like gleaming gems. Together with the image of the Lord, they hovered high

\textsuperscript{65} Seventeenth century inscription on the Sophia’s calvaria, Minden Cathedral: \textit{Caput S. Sofia [...] Vidua / inclusa sunt etiam sacra / reliquiae de Filibus eius / Fidei, Spei & Charitatis.}

\textsuperscript{66} As stated in the early modern bishops’ chronicle by Heinrich Tibbe. At Minden, the two Sophias were confused: Saint Sophia, whose body had been brought to Minden from Rome, and Saint Sophia from Milan, the widow and, supposedly, mother to the three daughters. Cf. Bölling, ‘Regnum’, pp. 222-225.

\textsuperscript{67} Röckelein, ‘Heilige’, p. 87.

\textsuperscript{68} The statues from the altarpiece were made c. 1500. Among them were also Saint Ursula, Saint Lucia, Saint Michael the Archangel, and Saint Erasmus the Church Father. Cf. ibid, p. 87.

\textsuperscript{69} The evidence is collected in ibid., pp. 80-82.
above, between this world and the afterlife. In the cross, they were united with Christ. They had already attained the goal towards which the monks and lay brothers were still striving.

The relics were set into the two sides of the cross and were thus within view of both monks and lay brothers, who did not, however, know exactly which saints were hidden within. And even if they had not been aware that the cross did contain relics, each and every prayer and request for help they enunciated in front of the crucifix was not only directed at Christ but also at the saints as intercessors. The cross contained those relics of saints that the monastery had received during its foundation. They were awarded the highest dignity, they represented venerable age and a connection with the first witnesses of Christian faith in Saxony.

Monks and lay brothers had unrestricted access to the saints in the triumphal cross, under which they gathered for prayer several times a day. The saints in the shrine on the high altar, on the other hand, were reserved for the priests and monks as well as for selected guests. The abbey church’s custodian apparently knew the names of the saints in the shrine, most of the monks probably did not. Even the monks only saw the relics when the shrine’s arcades were opened for special occasions.

### 3.2 Wienhausen

With regard to Wienhausen, an overwhelming number of visual monuments dating from the Middle Ages are preserved. For the nuns of Wienhausen, the saints were always in front of their very eyes, in stained-glass windows, tapestries, altars, and sculptures. Saints’ relics also rested hidden in statues, altars and in the Grabchristus, maybe also in the Auferstehungschristus. The omnipresence of saints in images and relics transformed the convent into a paradisiacal place, where the religious anticipated an existence in heaven.

I will introduce two hidden complexes of relics that have, so far, attracted little scholarly attention, that had even been temporarily forgotten in the monastery itself: The relics in the Grabchristus (Wie Aa 6) and a trove of relics (s.n.), wrapped in cloth, that is kept in the monastic archive within a wooden box dating from the nineteenth century. As of the middle of the 1950s onwards Horst Appuhn has worked on these two assemblages. In his time, the objects were distributed over

---

70 The abbey church’s division into a western part, reserved to the lay brothers, and an eastern part, reserved to the monks and the celebration of mass, can also be observed in the English Cistercian monasteries of Byland, Jervaulx and Rievaulx. The lay brothers did not attend mass on a daily basis. Cf. Cassidy-Welch, *Monastic Spaces*, pp. 76-87, 170-171.
71 Cf. Mecham, *Sacred Communities*; Mersch, *Soziale Dimensionen*; and Lotem Pinchover’s contribution to this volume.
72 On the *Auferstehungschristus* cf. Appuhn, passim; Hartwig, ‘Holzskulpturen’; the contributions by Mai-Britt Wiechmann and Lotem Pinchover in this volume.
different places in the convent and were kept in the art depot, the archive, and as parts of the permanent exhibition. A small portion was again replaced within the sacred objects. Consequently, their original functional context was unravelled. In the course of two campaigns in 2012 and 2013, I have attempted to reconstruct and analyse the medieval complexes.74 In this study, only those complexes that can be associated with specific saints, based on inscriptions or authenticating notes, will be covered.75

The reliquary deposits in the Wienhausen Grabchristus (c. 1290) and its sarcophagus (1448) [Fig. 9] have been the subjects of studies by – as mentioned before – Horst Appuhn and more recently Babette Hartwieg in 1988.76 The reclined figure of the Grabchristus has a deep recess, drilled into the crown of the head [Fig. 10]. The recess’ edges are marked by scuffs which Hartwieg attributes to the frequent removal and replacement of the plug.77 Relics were probably deposited within this cavity during the Middle Ages, a practice that has been common for sacred sculptures since the High Middle Ages.78 Konrad Maier alleges that relics were also placed within the feet of the Grabchristus,79 but I deem this unlikely due to the absence of suitable recesses.

Wienhausen’s abbess Katharina of Hoya (in office 1422-1437, 1440-1469) commissioned a sarcophagus for the Grabchristus. It was consecrated by Bishop Johannes Christiani of Hildesheim, on 28 August 1448.80 Cavities for the deposition of relics were created within the sarcophagus, placed under the head and feet of the Grabchristus. These recesses are still in use. Upon the occasion of the conse-

74 On June 4/5, 2013 I examined the reliquary depositories within the Grabchristus in the presence of Abbess Renate von Randow, archivist Wolfgang Brandis and the Klosterkammer’s conservator Corinna Lohse. I first presented the results during a workshop of the cooperative Lower-Saxon/Israeli research project ‘Practising Love of God’ on September 30, 2013 in Wienhausen under the title: ‘in diesen unscheinbaren Dingen eine dem Kloster seit Jahrhunderten zugehörige Kraft verborgen: Saints’ cults and relics at Wienhausen Cistercian monastery’. I would like to express my gratitude to my student research assistant Katharina Knesia, who helped with the examination of the relics.

75 A complete documentation of the depositories in the Grabchristus’ sarcophagus and from the box from the archives will be published independently.

76 For Appuhn’s publications cf. n. 72; Hartwieg, ‘Holzskulpturen’.


78 Cf. Pawlik’s systematic analysis in Das Bildwerk. The Bilshausen Madonna kept at the Göttingen City Museum dates from the twelfth century and has a bore hole in the head’s crest. This hole used to contain relics. Cf. Michels/Röckelein, ‘Die Reliquien’.

79 Die Kunstdenkmale des Landkreises Celle, ed. by Maier, p. 119; the repository under the figure’s feet may have been confused with the figure’s feet proper.

80 Wienhausen, KLA, Urk. 471 (August 28, 1448 = indulgence issued by Hildesheim’s auxiliary bishop Johann (Christiani von Schleppegrell), titular bishop of Missinum, issued upon the occasion of the Holy Sepulchre’s consecration: quod venerabilis et illustris domina nostras Domina Katharina de hoya, Abbatisa In Wynhusen ... Ob amoren et Reverenciam divine passionii Eiusque Sanctissime sepulture quamdam sollemne facit fieri ymaginem in honore dominice Sepulture .... Johannes Missinensis (†October 8, 1468), who is often mistakenly identified as Bishop of Meißen, belonged to the Order of Hermits of Saint Augustine. He was made titular bishop of Missinum (olim Drusipara) in Thrace and suffragan in Minden and Hildesheim, cf. Hierarchia catholica, ed. by Eubel, p. 345.
cation in 1448, the thirteenth century packs of relics, together with the pertaining inventory no. 1 [Fig. 11a], were presumably removed from the cavity in the head of the *Grabchristus* and placed in the repository beneath its feet. Additional relics that had been packaged between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries were also deposited in recesses within the sarcophagus. To a certain extent, the content and the distribution of the relics and other items can be reconstructed from the slips of paper that Appuhn left in place during the last opening in May 1960.81 There was an inventory of relics under the head of the *Grabchristus* (henceforth referred to as ‘head repository’) [Fig. 12].

Inventory no. 2 [Fig. 11b] is written on paper and can be dated to the late fourteenth century, based on a palaeographical examination. Sixteen names of (groups of) saints are still legible: Brigid, Maternus, Giles, George, Nicholas, Benedicta (?), the 11,000 Virgins, Valentine, Pancras, Lawrence, Vincentius, Cyriacus, Peter, James the Less, Ursula, and Cordula, as well as two secondary relics from the Holy Land: Oil of Saint Nicholas and cement from the Mensa Christi.82 The sequence in the inventory does not follow a meaningful order; in addition some names are attributed with false epithets. The scribe seems to have made a faulty copy of an original. The same repository held a polychrome bag of cloth. Its contents are authenticated by a fifteenth century hand as *S. Eustachij*.83 In the late medieval period, this saint was venerated as one of the Fourteen Holy Helpers.84

Among other items, there was an inventory of relics (no. 3) [Fig. 11c] in the repository in the sarcophagus’ foot (henceforth referred to as ‘foot repository’). It is written on paper and dates from the late fifteenth century. The text has been

81 Accordingly, the repository was opened on May 4, 1960, and its contents were partially replaced three days later. In 2013, the slips of paper were no longer completely readable due to damage caused by vermin. There is a typed transcription of the piece of paper from the head repository, now kept by the KIA Wienhausen (M 341). From this transcription, the lost text can be reconstructed. Fragments of a letter to Abbess Katharina of Hoya, used as packaging (‘Bruchstücke eines Briefes an Äbtissin Katharina Hoya, die als Packmaterial verwendet sind’), are no longer extant. According to Appuhn, the letter was addressed to Abbess Katharina of Hoya and signed by *Radolphus Radecke praepositus* (?), the confessor of the Wienhausen convent (cf. Appuhn, ‘Der Auferstandene’, p. 135, n. 270: *Venerable in Christo domini dominae katrihne nobili de hoya Abbatisse monasterii winhufen dignissime domine gratiosissime*). From this, Appuhn concluded that Katharina of Hoya had provided further relics for the Holy Sepulchre before it was consecrated. My observations confirm this hypothesis, cf. below pp. 166, 176, 180.

82 Appuhn, ‘Der Auferstandene’, p. 134, n. 269, reproduces the list of 26 saints. Due to damages caused by water and vermin, the first five lines of the upper third have been destroyed, and only 16 names are legible. I have checked Appuhn’s transcription against the original and have corrected it accordingly.

83 Apparently, the bag is still in its original medieval condition. I did not open it during my examinations in June 2013. Its upper end is reinforced with parchment, similar to the dresses for saints’ figures from Wienhausen, cf. Klack-Eitzen/ Haase/Weißgraf, *Heilige Röcke*. Eustace is also named in the inventory from the foot repository (inventory of relics no. 3, fifteenth century, line 2: ‘*...themo et Eusta*’), but not in inventory no. 2 from the head repository.

84 Eustace is also among the relics from Loccum’s triumphal cross, in a preserved bundle. See above p. 169.
damaged by water and vermin, but references to relics of the following saints are still legible: Eustace, Bartholomew, the tooth of Saint Maurice, 10,000 Knights, Brigid, Maternus, Giles, George, oil of Saint Nicholas, James, Catharine, Barbara, 11,000 Holy Virgins, Valentine, Pancras, Peter, Lawrence, Vincentius, Cyriacus, and Cordula. The inventory ends with the notice: He reliquie suprascripte continentur in hoc gle. Consequently, the relics must have rested within an altar, before they were transferred to the sarcophagus of the Grabchristus. Possibly, this altar stood in the chapel Katharina of Hoya had donated. Inventory no. 3 corresponds with register no. 2 from the head repository to a very high degree, dating from the fourteenth century. Apparently, Katharina of Hoya arranged relics that had already been present at Wienhausen to be set into the altar of the chapel of Saint Anne. The relics mentioned in the inventories no. 2 and 3 are no longer extant or cannot be found.

Furthermore, the foot repository contained twenty-three relics and a thirteenth century inventory of relics (no. 1) [Fig. 11a], all wrapped in modern cloth of light colour [Fig. 13 a-b]. The inventory is written on parchment and names thirteen saints, ordered in a hierarchical sequence, beginning with the apostles Bartholomew, Matthew, Thomas, and James. It continues with the bishops and martyrs Blaise, Boniface, Pancras, Martin (of Tours), and Nicholas (of Myra). The inventory concludes with the virgins and martyrs Margaret, Benedicta, Corona, and Felicitas. The scribe or scribes of this inventory has or have also inscribed a number of the labels attached to packs of relics, sometimes with identical epithets. Others were only authenticated during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. These later labels identify relics of Bishop Bernward of Hildesheim, of Mary Magdalene, of the 11,000 Holy Virgins and Cordula, and of the 10,000 Knights. The inventory mostly corresponds with the labels of the relics. Only the relics of Matthew the Apostle and Bishop Nicholas, named in the inventory, are missing today.

I presume that inventory no. 1 and the authenticating labels, written by the same hand, came to the Cistercian convent of Wienhausen and were placed within the head of the Grabchristus as early as the second half or the end of the thirteenth century. After the sarcophagus’ creation in the middle of the fifteenth century, they

---

85 The inventory was transcribed by Appuhn, ‘Der Auferstandene’, p. 134, n. 268. It names 29 saints. I have checked Appuhn’s transcription against the original and have corrected it accordingly.
86 Ibid.; Appuhn transcribes the abbreviation ‘gle’ as ‘loco’. The correct transcription would be ‘altare’.
87 Ibid.; Appuhn assumed that the relics had previously been kept in another place.
88 To a certain degree, the names in inventory no. 3 correspond to the patrons of the altar in the chapel of Saint Anne. The latter are mentioned in the charter of indulgence issued by Bishop Albert of Minden (Wienhausen, KlA, Urk. 470, March 13, 1448), Abbess Katharina of Hoya’s nephew: Anne, John the Baptist, James the Major, Valentinus, Cyriacus, Mary Magdalene, Barbara. The indulgences were granted for high feast days and for the feasts of various saints: John the Baptist, John the Evangelist, Michael the Archangel, Peter and Paul, all holy apostles and evangelists, Lawrence, Stephen, Vincentius, Christopher, Blaise, Martin, Nicholas, Augustine, Gregory, Jerome, Ambrose, the holy virgins Catharine, Margaret, Agnes, Agata, Lucia, and Caecilia.
89 Appuhn, ‘Der Auferstandene’, p. 134 contains a transcription and reproduction of the inventory. I have checked Appuhn’s transcription against the original and have corrected it accordingly.
were removed to the repository beneath the sculpture’s feet, together with relics that had been packaged at a later date. There is only a low degree of congruence between the saints in this mostly untouched earliest medieval collection and the two later inventories of relics.

Two of the saints from the oldest repository, Corona and Benedicta, necessitate some further explanation. Otto III, who had been tutored in Hildesheim by Bishop Bernward, had brought relics of Corona from Rome in 994, before he officially began his reign. So far, relics of this saint have been documented in the treasuries of Aachen, Magdeburg, and Quedlinburg. Several relics of Corona, however, were also kept by the community of canons of Saint Blaise in Braunschweig, the court church of the Guelf dynasty. The relics were distributed across different shrines; one particle rested in the statue of Saint Philip. According to contemporary sources from Braunschweig, the saint’s body was kept in Quedlinburg. It was probably from the Braunschweig Guelfs that Corona’s bones came to Wienhausen.

It is likely that the relic of Benedicta of Origny, a Gallic missionary saint, predominantly venerated in Northern France and in Flanders, also came to Wienhausen via the Braunschweig Guelfs. Bishop Godehard of Hildesheim had her established as the co-patron of the main altar and of the northern side altar in Braunschweig’s Saint Blaise collegiate church. In addition, the capital reliquary of Saint Blaise contained several of Benedicta’s bones, folded into a cloth. Other particles were distributed across other shrines, the cross of the holy Bishop Erhard of Regensburg and the figure of Mary on the altar in the crypt that was seen as the chapel of the Guelf lords. Further relics of Benedicta were kept in the chapel of Mary Magdalene, the Guelfs’ house chapel at Braunschweig castle.

90 According to older martyrologies, the nobilis matrona Corona was martyred in Coma in Egypt, together with Saint Victor of the Theban Legion. The feast of both saints is celebrated on July 21. For the Corona relics in Aachen and Magdeburg cf. Huschner, Transalpine Kommunikation, pp. 691-692.

91 In Quedlinburg, Abbess Adelheid IV (1406-1425) and Provost Mechthild of Hakeborn commissioned a large, gilded, wooden shrine dedicated to Saint Corona. Cf. the lecture by Herbst, ‘Sehreine’.

92 According to the 1482 inventory from the church of Saint Blaise in Braunschweig, there were relics of Corona in shrines nos. 11, 14 (santae Coronae virginis et martiris ... magna particula) and no. 26, as well as in the lost statue of Saint Philip (no. 107). Cf. the edition by Boockmann, Die verlorenen Teile.

93 The 1482 inventory contains a note on the lost ivory shrine (no. 14), which was decorated with painted birds and a peacock and contained predominantly relics of the 11,000 Holy Virgins: sanctae Coronae virginis et martiris caus corpus quiescit in Quedelinghorcb (Boockmann, Die verlorenen Teile, p. 133).

94 On Saint Benedicta’s biography and on her cult cf. Gardill, Sancta Benedicta, on the relics and further evidence of the cult in Braunschweig, cf. ibid., pp. 65-66.

95 Head reliquary of Saint Blaise, Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, inv. no. W 30. Inventory of relics of the community of canons of Saint Blaise, dating from 1482, no. 2: In Capite sancti Blasii continentur infrascripte reliquiae ... item de sancta Benedicta multa visita in uno panno colligato. (Boockmann, Die verlorenen Teile, p. 128). Further particles of the virgo Benedicta were in shrines nos. 5 and 7, as well as in the reliquary cross of Saint Erhard (no. 135), and the Madonna on the crypt’s altar (no. 136), cf. Boockmann, Die verlorenen Teile, passim.


97 Cf. Gardill, Sancta Benedicta, p. 66.
The Wienhausen religious probably received the relic of Bishop Bernward directly from Hildesheim, the bishopric to which the convent was subordinated. Both the female convent of Wienhausen and the male Cistercian monastery of Loccum held relics of Saint Boniface, as well as relics of the martyr Felicitas, the mother of Saint Alexander, who was the patron of Wienhausen’s older parish church. Mary Magdalene was of particular importance to Wienhausen’s nuns: Katharina of Hoya established her as co-patron of the chapel of Saint Anne. She is the only saint of whom there are three representations on the exterior of the Grabchristus’ sarcophagus. She is also depicted in manuscript 36 in the Hortulanus scene. In the role play of the Visitatio sepulcri, the nuns could identify themselves with the three Maries, among them Mary Magdalene.

In the foot repository, Appuhn also mentions a small silver cross of Saint Maurice that was no longer present in 2013. The cross, which bore the inscription S. Mauricio / wda – cristofero, was apparently not replaced within the sarcophagus in 1960 but was transferred to the museum, together with other small vessels containing relics that had been taken from the two depositories [Fig. 14]. The cross is fashioned from two metal sheets and possibly contains relics. Appuhn hypothesises that it might have been used as a pectoral cross by Katharina of Hoya. There are two depictions of Saint Maurice in the nuns’ choir: On the northern wall (c. 1335), and as a sculpture in the main altar of 1519. He was also shown, together with the convent’s patron Alexander, in a stained-glass window, in the upper southern cloisters. The second saint whose name is inscribed on the pectoral cross, Christopher, is also represented on the northern wall of the nuns’

97 Cf. above pp. 170-172.
99 Die Kunstdenkmale des Landkreises Celle, ed. by Maier, p. 118, scene 27: Christ as gardner, on the door flap (Die Kunstdenkmale des Landkreises Celle, ed. by Maier, p. 118, scene 33: Mary Magdalene, kneeling, with a vessel containing balm), and on the door’s lower part (Die Kunstdenkmale des Landkreises Celle, ed. by Maier, p. 118, scene 34: Noli me tangere, Christ as gardner).
101 Wienhausen, Museum, Wie Eb 37. On the inscription, cf. Die Inschriften der Lüneburger Klöster, ed. by Wehking, no. 84. The abbreviation ‘wda’ is hard to interpret. Capelli identifies ‘vda’ as ‘Vale dulcis amica’ or ‘anima’. Was Saint Christopher seen as a guide for the souls of the deceased on their journey into the afterlife?
102 Appuhn, ‘Der Auferstandene’, p. 135, fig. 105, interprets the relics from the miniature box (Wie Ae 1), the small glazed yellow earthen jar (Wie Kc 119), and the miniature Krautstrunk-jar (Wie Fb 1) as Katharina of Hoya’s children’s toys. They are not dealt with here, since they are not identified by labels. In the Middle Ages, larger versions of these miniatures were commonly used as receptacles for relics. Cf. Röckelein, ‘Schätze’. On the removal of objects, cf. Appuhn’s record of May 7, 1960, Wienhausen, KIA, Akte M 341.
103 Die Inschriften der Lüneburger Klöster, ed. by Wehking, no. 8 (58).
choir, above the entrance, in a more than life-size depiction. According to Appuhn's hypothesis, Christopher was Katharina of Hoya's special patron.

What overall image can be gained from the host of saints that were collected in the sarcophagus of the Grabchristus between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries? The ensemble is not extraordinary and is little different from other late medieval collections of relics. Benedicta and Corona are the only exceptions and the only rare cases in the corpus. Saint Alexander, as Wienhausen's main patron, is depicted in many places of the convent but there is no (longer any) evidence that the community possessed his relics; thus, we can rule out that he was venerated at the site of the Grabchristus and its sarcophagus. As early as the thirteenth century, however, the convent owned relics of Alexander’s mother Felicitas. Saint Maurice is mentioned on the pectoral cross (of Abbess Katharina of Hoya?), and the Wienhausen religious possessed one of the saint’s teeth and a fragment of his skull. Apart from these examples, the Grabchristus in the sarcophagus was predominantly surrounded by apostles and Roman martyrs as well as by a few particular saints that had probably come to Wienhausen via the bishops of Hildesheim (Bernward) and the Guelf dynasty (Benedicta, Corona, Blaise). The penitent Mary Magdalene was the object of special veneration. She is the only saint who is portrayed in three scenes on the sarcophagus.

The Grabchristus did not contain relics of Christ, a feature shared with the triumphal cross from Loccum. The inventory no. 2 refers to an uncertain object de [...] dni, and to a piece of the cement of the Mensa Domini (cement(tum) de mensa dni); the corresponding relics, though, are no longer extant. Appuhn mentions relics of the Holy Sepulchre among the packs from the foot repository that had been labelled c. 1440-1450; these, however, are no longer extant, either. It is also uncertain where the spina de corona domini, mentioned in the inventory from the box of relics, was kept and what has become of it. The low number of relics of Christ within the Holy Sepulchre is in stark contrast with the ubiquity of christological subjects throughout the Wienhausen convent. It is also inconsistent with the cult of the relic of the Holy Blood, which even gave rise to a pilgrimage.

Where were the Grabchristus and its sarcophagus placed, and who had access to this double monument? No notice was made of the placement of the Grabchristus during the first one and a half centuries after it had been created c. 1290. The ensemble was only mentioned after 1448, when the figure was enclosed in the

---

108 See below p. 186.
109 Cf. the contributions of Mai-Britt Wiechmann and Lotem Pinchover in this volume.
110 There is no evidence for the assumption by Appuhn, ‘Der Auferstandene’, p. 132 u. 134, that the Grabchristus was first placed in the chapel of the Holy Cross, next to the chapter hall, where laypeople would have been able to observe its elevation during the Easter liturgy from the parish church. Cf. Die Kunstdenkmale des Landkreises Celle, ed. by Maier, p. 115.
sarcophagus and relocated to the chapel of Saint Anne, built by Abbess Katharina of Hoya. A charter of Bishop Albert of Minden, dating from March 13, 1448, states that the corresponding indulgences were to be granted to the religious as well as to laypeople who visited the Corpus dominicum and the relics of the saints for pious prayer, or on a pilgrimage on the named feast days, or on the feast days of the patron saints. A similar wording can be found in a charter of indulgence issued by Hildesheim’s auxiliary bishop Johannes Missinensis for the convent on August 28, 1448. This charter demands that the saints in the abbey church and the chapel of Saint Anne, as well as the Holy Sepulchre and the Holy Cross, ought to be venerated in a proper manner on the appropriate feast days. In his charter, Johannes expresses his hope that all the faithful of Christ (a Christi fidelibus venerentur) would be motivated to participate in prayer and pilgrimage (causa devotionis, orationis et peregri- nacionis ... accesserint) on these days. Katharina of Hoya had caused the chapel of Saint Anne to be built on a piece of land she had bought from Wienhausen’s provost Herman Eyken, for the sum of five marks. It was located outside of the enclosure, close to the church and its courtyard. June Mecham believes that, just as the chapel of Saint Fabian and Saint Sebastian, the chapel of Saint Anne had two entrances, one for the nuns and another one for the people of the parish. This would mean that laypeople had access to the Grabchristus, at least until the reform of 1469. Afterwards, the chapel of Saint Anne was relocated into the enclosure, and consequently laypeople were no longer able to visit the sepulchre. The chapel was demolished together with the eastern wing of the cloisters upon the command of Duke Ernest the Confessor (in office 1521-1546) in 1531.

The question whether the visitors of the sepulchre, be they religious or laypeople, could touch the Grabchristus, is the object of controversial discussion. Mecham believes they could, and she cites graffiti on the figure’s arm as evidence. Horst Appuhn and Peter Jezler assume that visitors could touch the Grabchristus through

---

111 Wienhausen, KIA, Urk. 470, August 13, 1448: accesserint ante corpus dominicum et ante reliquias sanctorum in prefatis ecclesia et capella et in ymagine in honorem dominico sepulture consecrata contenti ... de qualibet ipsarum reliquiarium particula ...

112 Wienhausen, KIA, Urk. 471, August 28, 1448: Charter of indulgence by Bishop Johannes Missinensis, issued on the occasion of the Holy Sepulchre’s consecration: omnibus igitur vere penitentibus et confessis Qui coram Nominata ymagine amore dominice Sepulture dominicam oracionem reitauerint Cum angelica salutacione vel candelam ardentem Coram sepe dicta Ymagine offerre devotionis causa studuerint ...

113 Wienhausen, KIA, Urk. 452, December 13, 1433.


115 This is also what Mersch states in Soziale Dimensionen, p. 223: ‘Das heilige Grab in Wienhausen erfüllte also genauso wie die Anlage in Gernrode mehrere Funktionen und war auch anderen Personengruppen als den Wienhäuser Nonnen zugänglich.’ [The Holy Sepulchre in Wienhausen, like the complex at Gernrode, fulfilled several functions and was accessible to people other than the nuns of Wienhausen.]

116 Mecham, ‘Sacred Vision’, p. 120.
the two hatches in the sarcophagus’ head and foot. Babette Hartwig rejects this assumption, because there are no marks that would indicate the hatches had ever been used in this way. Kerstin Hengevoss-Dürkop even posits that laypeople did not have access to the Grabchristus at all, and that the figure was primarily intended for the devotions of the religious. The Grabchristus, she states, was meant to inspire the nuns to undertake a spiritual substitute for an actual pilgrimage to Jerusalem – just as the spiritual pilgrimage and the Via crucis in Wienhausen’s manuscripts nos. 85 and 86. Her argument appears sound. The inscriptions accompanying the scenes depicted on the sarcophagus are written in Latin and would not have been understood by illiterates. Furthermore, the scenes and the corresponding banners on the sarcophagus’ roof and doors constitute a kind of sermon, culminating in the final scene on the roof: There, the Lamb of God and the Trinity are shown, surrounded by hosts of the faithful and saints. The text identifies this scene as the heavenly Jerusalem (Hec est Jerusalem ciuitas ista). Praying and meditating in front of the Grabchristus, the nuns of Wienhausen were able to imagine themselves being present in this scene of the afterlife.

While there is no consensus on the question of access to the Grabchristus, it is certain that neither nuns nor laypeople would have been able to see the relics deposited within. The particles were securely enclosed within their receptacles, locked as in a strongbox. The Easter hymn O sepulcrum nobile, preserved on a small devotional image that was found under the floor of the nuns’ choir in 1953, refers to the Wienhausen sepulchre as thezaurum nobilem, a noble treasure and strongbox.

---


118 Appuhn, ‘Holzkulturen’, p. 191: ‘Appuhn’s Rekonstruktion des liturgischen Ablaufs ist in ihren Einzelheiten aufgrund der neueren Forschungen nicht mehr haltbar, da er eine Form des Grabgehäuses voraussetzt, für die es keine weiteren Beispiele und Belege gibt.’ [‘Due to recent research, Appuhn’s reconstruction of the liturgy can no longer be accepted. It is based on a supposed form of the Sepulchre for which there are neither parallels nor evidence.’] Ibid., p. 194: ‘Eine längere Präsentation des Grabgehäuses im Zustand D, mit den geöffneten kleinen Türen an Fuß- und Kopfende und geschlossenen Dachschrägen, ist kaum vorstellbar, ihr Zweck noch unklar.’ [‘A longer presentation of the sepulchre’s exterior in state D, with opened doors at both ends and closed roof covers, does not seem likely, their purpose remains unclear.’]

119 Hengevoss-Dürkop, Skulptur, p. 143, n. 98, pp. 159-161. According to Lotem Pinchover (written notice dating from January 1, 2016) descriptions of the Holy Sepulchre in manuscripts 85 and 86 do indeed suggest that it was placed in a separate chapel, which was perhaps accessible to outsiders. For further information on the manuscripts, cf. Mecham, Sacred Communities, pp. 228-239, and Robin Volkmar in this volume. Mersch, Soziale Dimensionen, p. 223, rejects the interpretation by Hengevoss-Dürkop: ‘Es gibt ... keinerlei Hinweise darauf, dass das originale Ensemble und seine Umgestaltung im 15. Jahrhundert durch die Kreuzzugsidologie motiviert waren.’ [‘There is no evidence that would suggest that the original ensemble and its fifteenth century refashioning were motivated by crusading ideology.’]


121 Wie Ke 3. Transcription of the hymn (two four-lined stanzas) (correction of the version by Appuhn/Heusinger, ‘Der Fund’, cat. no.14, p. 188) in Hartwig, ‘Holzkulturen’, p. 251, n. 55: O sepulcrum nobile / rutians deore / Gem(m)am tenens celicum / vernans i(n) amore – Redde thezaurum(n) nobilem / ... / cernamus i(n) Gloria / .... Mersch, Soziale Dimensionen, p. 218, n. 313, found out that this hymn is
As in an altar, the martyrs, confessors, and virgins were united with Christ in the sepulchre. Together with the Grabchristus, they awaited the time of resurrection that was anticipated in the images on the sarcophagus’ exterior and in many other places throughout the convent. When the faithful prayed in front of the sarcophagus, their prayers also reached the saints who were embedded in the recumbent figure, and then in the sarcophagus. As in the case of the Loccum crucifix, the saints were closer to Christ than the faithful. Visitors would not have known the identities of the saints, since the inventories of relics were as inaccessible to them as the actual relics. Only those who participated in the consecration in 1448, or those who later consulted the charters of indulgence from March and August 1448, could have known which saints rested within the sarcophagus.

The monastic archive of Wienhausen has in its possession a wooden box, containing the remnants of a medieval collection of relics: Two large pieces of cloth [Fig. 15-16], two labels of relics, a fragmented inventory, a few larger ‘bare’ bones, textile scraps from opened relic bundles, and the dust of dissolved particles of bone and cloth. These are the remains of a pack of cloth that had once been filled with relics. In 1953, it was found under the steps of the southern row of the stalls in the nuns’ choir. As far as Horst Appuhn’s descriptions are concerned, the bundle of cloth contained other objects when the discovery was made, but these are now either lost or are kept in other places.

also contained in the Latin-Low German Orationale from Neukloster, near Buxtehude (Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Cod. brev. 22, fol. 229v, cf. Irtenkauf, ‘Osterorationale’), where it follows the Easter liturgy.

122 For the various monuments that visualize the theme of the Resurrection, cf. the contribution by Lotem Pinchover in this volume.

123 Wienhausen, KIA, sine numero. I examined the contents of this box on February 20, 2013. I would like to express my gratitude to Renate von Randow, Abbess of Wienhausen, and to Wolfgang Brandis, the archivist for the Lüneburg convents, for the permission to analyse the objects from the box. I would like to thank the textile conservators of the Klosterkammer Hannover, Wiebke Haase and Tanja Weißgraf from the workshop at the convent of Lüne, for their helpful suggestions. Finally, I am grateful to Dr Sabine Welking of the Inschriftenkommission at the Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities for her additional research on the relics and inventories. First results of my analysis will be published in: Röckelein, ‘Reliquiennauthentiken’. A complete documentation of the contents of the box is being prepared.

124 Appuhn, ‘Der Auferstandene’, p. 78. ‘A small pack of bone fragments, some dust, and four very small shards of Chinese porcelain’ [‘ein kleineres Päckchen Knochenreste, etwas Staub und vier winzige Scherben chinesischen Porzellans’], mentioned in Appuhn, Der Fund, p. 50, are no longer extant; Grubenbecher/Appuhn, Kloster Wienhausen, p. 28; Appuhn, Das Kloster Wienhausen, p. 50. The yellow-red silk cloth with a Kufic inscription and adorned with depictions of birds (Wie Kc 101) is now exhibited in the museum. The pannisellus (cover for the abbess’ crosier) is kept in storage (Wie Hb 10).
Appuhn assumed that the linen bundle was hidden under the floorboards upon the completion of the nuns’ choir, as a kind of magical offering. This would have been shortly after 1330. In contrast, based on the ensemble’s composition of relics and cloth, I would posit that it was either the content of a shrine, formerly kept within an altar, or a pack that used to be enclosed in a larger sculpture. In all probability, the pack was only hidden under the steps of the nuns’ choir in the early summer of 1543, when Duke Ernest ordered the nuns to renounce the Catholic faith and to destroy relics and cult objects as signs of the ‘old faith’.

For the topic of relics in Wienhausen, only a few objects from this pack, respectively from the wooden box, are of interest: Two labels of parchment, an inventory, and a human bone with metal fittings. The labels were written by a hand of the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, thus dating from the time of the convent’s foundation, or immediately before. Palaeographic evidence allows the double-sided fragment of an inventory of relics to be dated to the fourteenth century. These written documents have been separated from the corresponding objects for a long time, and consequently it is not clear which relics they identify and authenticate.

The parchment label with the inscription S(an)e(t)i Gregorij spoletani ep(i)sopi) et m(a)r(tyris) authenticated the bones of Gregory of Spoleto [Fig. 17], whose feast was asked on December 23 in the Roman calendar, and on December 22 in Cologne. According to a legend common in Carolingian martyrologies, Gregory was persecuted and beheaded under Diocletian; he was subsequently buried in front of the walls of Spoleto. Ruotger, the hagiographer of Cologne’s Archbishop Brun (in office 953-965; brother of Emperor Otto I), states that the corpus integrum of Saint Gregory of Spoleto was brought to Cologne and buried in the cathedral. In his testament, Brun supposedly determined that an oratory be built for Gregory in the cathedral. Accordingly, the translation of the saint’s body must have occurred before 965. Other bones of Gregory are said to have been given to Cologne Cathedral on the command of Emperor Frederick Barbarossa in 1155 (king from 1152, emperor from 1155, died 1190).

---

125 Appuhn, ‘Der Auferstandene’, p. 80, gives ‘1306’ as the date. The construction of the nuns’ choir, however, only commenced c. 1330.
126 Cf. the account in the seventeenth century chronicle of the convent of Wienhausen, which is based on medieval sources: Chronik des Klosters Wienhausen, ed. by Appuhn, p. 76.
127 The labels had already been separated when the last documented examination of the box’s contents, by Bishop Joseph Godehard Machens of Hildesheim (in office 1934-1956), took place on 8 May 1954. Cf. Wienhausen, KIA, Akte M 370. I am grateful to Wolfgang Brandis for mentioning this document to me and for providing me with a copy.
130 Ruotgeri Vita Brunonis archiepiscopi Colonensis, ed. by Ott, pp. 31-32.
131 Bruno’s 965 testament. Ruotgeri Vita Brunonis archiepiscopi Colonensis, ed. by Ott, p. 53.
132 Guerrini, ‘Santi di Spoleto’, pp. 76-82 on the legendary dissemination of further relics of Gregory in Italy and France (partially attested by archival sources): In 969, Bishop Dietrich I of Metz supposedly brought the bigger part of the corpse to his church. He is further said to have given fragments to
Today, the bones of the martyr Gregory of Spoleto are the oldest corporal relics kept at Cologne Cathedral. Together with other main relics, they have been kept within the Shrine of the Magi, probably since the thirteenth century. In 1510, Magister Petrus fashioned a head reliquary, in which Gregory’s *calvaria* was deposited, together with the Banner of Saint Gerberga, the sister of Otto the Great.

Gregory of Spoleto is a saint who is documented only rarely. Consequently, one is almost forced to conclude that the particles in the Wienhausen box were taken from the *corpus integrum* kept at Cologne Cathedral. Assuming the Wienhausen label was inscribed at the time when the particles were taken from the saint’s body in Cologne, this dismemberment could have occurred when Saint Gregory’s body was transferred to the Shrine of the Magi (c. 1220/30). Thus, it is possible that Gregory’s relics were presented to the Wienhausen convent upon its foundation by Duchess Agnes.

The second parchment label from the wooden box, written by the same hand, also dates back to the convent’s founding period. It authenticates a *Brachium cum manu nominati sancti alicuius degreâia*, an ‘arm with the hand of a certain saint from Greece’, in other words: from Byzantium [Fig. 18a]. This label was probably attached to a long bone that was darkened while it was resting in the ground for a long time. An anthropological analysis has shown this long bone to be the upper end of a radial bone from the forearm [Fig. 18b]. One end of this bone is enclosed in a sleeve of gilded sheet metal, bearing this engraved inscription in Greek capitals: *TOY AΓIOY CΪΛOYA / NOY* (‘tou agiou Silouanou’: belonging to/of Saint Silvanus). The inscription was engraved in the middle Byzantine period, between the middle of the seventh and the beginning or middle of the thirteenth century. Four saints named Silvanus are known from the Byzantine world, and it is impossible to determine the exact identity of the bone from Wienhausen. Saint

Saint-Paul in Verdun (arm and leg bones that were missing from Cologne, p. 78). Other fragments allegedly came to Cremona in 993. I would like to thank Dr Dorothee Kemper for her information on this subject.

133 Kemper, ‘Gregor von Spoleto’, p. 64.
134 Cf. ibid., pp. 85-86. The protocol of the 1864 opening of the Shrine of the Magi, AEK MK 839, was published by Schulten, ‘Kölner Reliquien’, pp. 68-69.
135 Kemper, ‘Gregor von Spoleto’, fig. 2, p. 67, and fig. 9, p. 76, and fig. 3, p. 69, and the coat of arms of the founder, the Cologne jurist and holder of a benefice at the cathedral chapter Dr Johann Menchen (died April 9, 1504), Kemper, ‘Gregor von Spoleto’, p. 69, fig. 4.
136 I am grateful to Dr Birgit Großkopf of the University of Göttingen’s Institute for Anthropology for the anthropological analysis.
137 In July 2013, the inscription was subsequently included as no. 1a in the database *Die Inschriften der Lüneburger Klöster*, ed. by Wehking, cf. <http://www.inschriften.net/lueneburg-kloester-ebstorf-isenhausen-luene-medingen-walsrode-wienhausen/inschrift/nr/di076-0001a.html#content> (entry by Sabine Wehking [accessed: November 27, 2016]. I would like to express my gratitude to Prof Emeritus Dr Rainer Stichel, Münster, and to Dr Andreas Rhoby, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna, for transcribing the inscription and identifying the saints.
Silouanos, who was martyred in the early fourth century (?), probably in Lycaonian Isauropolis (feast day: July 10); the martyr Silvanus of Emesa (feast days: January 5, November 5, February 6); or the bishop, apostle and martyr Silvanus of Thessaloniki (feast days: June 30, July 30, November 26/28/29), who is often confused with Silas of Corinth, a disciple of Saint Paul.

It can be stated with certainty, however, that the piece of sheet metal was applied directly to the bone in Byzantium, since this technique was only commonly practised there, not in the West. Bones of saints labelled in this way only reached the West in significant numbers after the 1204 sack of Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade. There are two comparable sleeves with Greek inscriptions in the treasury of San Marco, Venice. These metal casings have eyelets and authenticate a rib of Saint Stephen and a bone of Saint Christopher. It is possible that the casing attached to the Wienhausen arm bone used to have such an eyelet as well, because there, a drill hole and traces of a fixture can still be seen on its underside. Were these relics worn as amulets around the neck?

It is very likely that crusaders or pilgrims to Jerusalem brought the Wienhausen bone of Silvanos to the West. Maybe the one who carried it was a male relative or brother-in-law of the foundress Agnes? Her father-in-law, Henry the Lion (*c. 1129/30, †1195), went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1172; his oldest son Henry, Agnes’ husband, went to Jerusalem as a pilgrim in 1195, shortly after the Third Crusade (1189-1192). Her father, Margrave Conrad of Landsberg (*1159, †1210), participated in the so-called German Crusade in 1197-98. Any one of these three could have been the one who brought the relic to the West.

The fragmentary inventory from the Wienhausen bundle dates from the fourteenth century. There is writing on both sides, but the writing itself is only partially legible, even under UV lighting.

---

139 Meriani, ‘Silva’.
140 Toussaint, ‘Identität’.
141 On the relics from San Marco, cf. ibid., pp. 81-85 and pls. 8-9, figs. 11-12.
142 Cf. Rüdebusch, Der Anteil, p. 18. Henry refused to participate in the Third Crusade, on which he was supposed to accompany Frederick Barbarossa.
143 Ibid., pp. 31, 34-35.
145 Appuhn, ‘Der Auferstandene’, p. 133, dates the script to the thirteenth century, which is definitely too early.
146 I am grateful to Dr Sabine Wehking of the Inschriftenkommission at the Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities for the infrared image taken on April 8, 2013, and for the transcription she suggested.
The words (s)(an)(c)(t)i ioseph[ci] q(u)i petit refer to Joseph of Arimathea who is mentioned in Matthew 27.27-60. He was involved in Christ’s Descent from the Cross and in his entombment. This scene is depicted on the roof of the Grabchristus’ sarcophagus. Like the spina de corona domini, mentioned on the reverse side of the inventory, Joseph belongs to the events of the Passion and the Resurrection of Christ.

Saints named Cassianus and Pelagius are also documented in many instances. A Greek patriarch Cassianus was venerated in Cologne, both at the church of Saint Gereon and at the Dominican friary of the Holy Cross. There are two potential candidates for the Pelagius mentioned in the inventory: A third century martyr from Aemona (Istria) (feast day: August 28), whose bones were translated to Constance Cathedral by Bishop Solomon III in 904; and a fourth century bishop of Laodicea in Syria (feast day: March 25). Like the bone of Silvanos, the relics of all three saints – Joseph of Arimathea, Cassianus, and Pelagius – could have been brought to the West from the orient. It is just a hypothesis that these ‘oriental’ relics had been gifted by duchess Agnes to the monastery during the monastery’s founding act as was the case with the relic of the Holy Blood, which later attracted pilgrims to Wienhausen.

The inventory’s entry of caput s. Mauritii may refer to a skull fragment in the box. In addition to this, as mentioned before, the nuns owned one of Maurice’s teeth. Maurice, commander of the Thebian Legion, was the object of special veneration in Cologne. His relics may have come to Wienhausen from Cologne, together with the relics of Saint Gregory, and those of Saint Cordula and Saint Ursula, the female leaders of the 11,000 Holy Virgins. The only cult of all these ‘Cologne’ saints that can be proved to have been practised in Wienhausen, how-

147 I would like to thank Dr Beate Braun-Niehr, Berlin, for her suggestion on the quotation.
148 Cf. the description in Die Kunstdenkmale des Landkreises Celle, ed. by Maier, p. 117, scene 22.
149 For this contribution, I dispense with a detailed presentation of all the supporting evidence. This will be presented and discussed in the comprehensive documentation.
150 Kracht/Torsy, Reliquiarium Coloniense, p. 190, no. 194: ‘caput Cassiani, patriarchae ex Graecia’.
ever, is that of Saint Maurice. The ‘Greek’ saints were never venerated there. The collection of relics contained in the wooden box apparently constitutes the convent’s oldest treasury of relics. Parts of this collection, especially the Silvanos-bone and the relic of Gregory of Spoleto, are older than the collections from the Grabchristus’ head and the sarcophagus. The later parts of the collection, documented in the fragmentated inventory, include further relics from the Holy Land: Joseph of Arimathea and the Spina Domini. The relics of Gregory of Spoleto, who was, without a doubt, from Milan in Northern Italy, and Maurice’s skull may have come to Wienhausen from Cologne, possibly from the collection gathered by Duke Henry the Tall, oldest son of Henry the Lion and husband of Duchess Agnes. The underlying hypothesis is this: Agnes, the foundress, chose the Wienhausen nuns to act as guardians of her husband’s memory and of the relics he had collected during the various stages of his life. We do not know where exactly in the convent this collection of relics was kept during the Middle Ages. It was probably placed within a shrine or an altar, but surely not as a consecration offering under the floor of the nuns’ gallery, as Appuhn believed. Apparently, however, the nuns held the collection in such high regard that they preserved it through the centuries and safeguarded it when it was threatened by the Reformation’s proscriptions.

4 Summary and Results

The monks of the Cistercian monastery of Loccum and the nuns of the Cistercian convent of Wienhausen amassed considerable collections of relics during the first centuries after their communities had been founded. The numerous saints were kept out of sight, in various receptacles, since the thirteenth century. In Loccum the relics were kept within the shrine of the abbey church’s main altar and within the triumphal cross suspended above the rood screen, between the nave and the choir; in Wienhausen there was a collection within the Grabchristus and, later, in the sarcophagus that had been built for the sculpture, and another collection that was wrapped in two pieces of cloth.

The contents of the four receptacles analysed in this paper show that these two important Cistercian communities in northern Germany harboured a great variety of saints, and that they were not limited to the veneration of their relics of Christ – the Holy Tunic in Loccum and the relic of the Holy Blood in Wienhausen. The

154 For supporting evidence see above pp. 178-179.
155 Since no calendars and liturgical manuscripts from the time before the fifteenth century reform are preserved in Wienhausen, there is little knowledge on the cultic practices after the founding period.
156 Henry the Tall, as Count Palatine of the Rhine, stayed in Cologne for a longer period during the year 1205 for the selection of a new archbishop, cf. Briechle: Heinrich, p. 113.
157 The inventory of reliquaries of Braunschweig’s community of canons of Saint Blaise, compiled in 1482, often refers to relics ‘in panno colligati’. Thus, it is possible that, in the case of Wienhausen, we are dealing with the contents of a former reliquary.
wide spectrum of saints shows that the religious cult in Loccum and Wienhausen was not limited to Christ and his mother exclusively. The often alleged limitation of the Cistercians and their purportedly exclusive cult of Mary and Christ are disproved by the evidence of the collections of relics of Loccum and Wienhausen. In Loccum and in Wienhausen, Christ (and his mother) were surrounded by the saints – in Loccum, on the main altar and in the triumphal cross, in Wienhausen in the Grabchristus and the sarcophagus. The saints mediated between this world and the next and, according to contemporary religious belief, would be among the first to ascend to heaven when the world ends.

As far as we can judge, no secondary relics of Mary, the main patron of both Cistercian communities, were among the relics kept in these receptacles. Relics of Christ are also rare, even though the Loccum triumphal cross and the Grabchristus of Wienhausen represent Christ.

Within these receptacles, apostles, Roman martyrs, and virgins are strongly represented – saints the Roman Church accepted and whose cult it propagated. With the stories of their lives and the translations of their relics, the Anglo-Saxon missionary Boniface, the two Roman martyrs Emerentiana and Felicitas, as well as Saint Peter’s daughter Petronilla conjure up memories of Saxony’s Christianisation during the ninth century. This is fairly astonishing, since both Cistercian communities were only founded in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, not during the missionary era. Benedict and Bernard of Clairvaux, two characteristic Cistercian saints, are missing entirely from the collections and were only present in the form of painted or sculpted images.

The special patrons of both communities are only represented sporadically in the receptacles. One relic of Petronilla, only documented as Loccum’s patron during the founding period, was deposited within the triumphal cross. George, as the patron who became dominant, is missing completely. No relics of Alexander, Wienhausen’s main patron, can be documented. There is, on the other hand, evidence of his mother Felicitas, both in Wienhausen and Loccum, in the form of relics and written documents.

The treasures of relics in both houses reflect connections with the ecclesiastical and temporal lordships in their region. The diocese of Hildesheim is represented by its prominent high medieval bishops Godehard (Loccum) and Bernward (Wienhausen). The monks of Loccum received the bones of Boniface, Emerentiana, and the virgins Fides, Spes, Caritas and Sapientia from their local diocesan, the Bishop of Minden. The relics of Saint Giles in Loccum and Wienhausen may have come from the Benedictines of Braunschweig. The Guelf dynasty of Braunschweig probably presented the Wienhausen nuns with the relics of Blaise, Benedicta, and Corona as well as all the other relics from the foot repository of the Grabchristus that had likely been contained in the figure’s head earlier.158

---

158 Relics of all the saints who are mentioned in the Wienhausen inventory authentic of relics no. 1 and in the pack of relics from the Grabchristus’ foot repository, inscribed by the same hand, were also
Both the triumphal cross of Loccum and the Grabchristus of Wienhausen reflect supraregional relations with the metropolitan see of Cologne: The group of the 11,000 Holy Virgins is represented in both receptacles by anonymised packs of relics, as well as by the named leaders Cordula and Ursula, in the same way as the soldiers of the Theban Legion and their most prominent officers, Maurice and Gereon. The special saint Gregory of Spoleto and Maurice’s skull probably came to the Cistercian convent of Wienhausen via Cologne. Both relics may have originated from the heritage of Henry the Tall, son of Henry the Lion and Count Palatine of the Rhine, husband to the convent’s foundress Agnes.

There is little difference between the reliquary collections of the monastery of Loccum and the convent of Wienhausen. Even Mary Magdalene the Penitent, who served as an example to the Wienhausen nuns, was also present in the Cistercian monastery of Loccum in the form of a relic.\(^{159}\) Both Cistercian communities possessed relics of two special saints – Benedicta and Corona – which they had probably received from the Guelfs of Braunschweig. It is hardly by chance that both communities assumed memorial responsibilities for the dead of the Guelf dynasty, especially of Count Palatine Henry the Tall.\(^ {160}\)

Predominantly, the relics in the Loccum triumphal cross and in the Grabchristus of Wienhausen and the sarcophagus represent saints of the Roman Church. In addition, they recall the founding period and reflect connections with regional institutions of ecclesiastical administration. With these saints, the two monastic communities expressed their integration into the universal Church and into the history of Christianization in their region. The reasoning behind this was not to prove their affiliation with the Cistercian Order, nor to express commitment to the Cistercian idea, nor to display the attachment to their, or the order’s special patrons. The Cistercians’ cult of Mary and Christ was not, or only negligibly, echoed by these collections of relics, even though they were kept within the cross and the Grabchristus.

Despite the homogeneity of the collections of both communities, there is one significant difference. Only Wienhausen possessed relics from Byzantium and the

kept at Braunschweig’s collegiate church of Saint Blaise (cf. Boockmann, *Die verlorenen Teile*). Based on methodological reasoning, Braunschweig is only a likely direct origin for the special saints Blaise, Corona, and Benedicta.

\(^{159}\) Gilchrist, *Gender*, pp. 186-187, sees a special affinity of the Cistercians with Mary Magdalene. The example of Loccum, however, shows that gender-specific restrictions of the cult to female communities should be approached with caution.

\(^{160}\) The reason behind Wienhausen’s foundation was the commemoration of Henry the Tall (see above). The Loccum ‘Todten register’ (Monastery archive, II 2,7) lists prayer obligatons for the sons of Henry the Lion, for Emperor Otto IV (May 15,1198-1218), and for Count Palatine Henry (July 4, 1173/74-1279: *Henricus palatinus dux in Bromwic defensor et benefactor noster*). Cf. Kruppa, ‘Loccum’, p. 81; Haas, ‘Das Totengedenken’, pp. 118-119.
Holy Land: Relics of Silvanos, Pelagius, Cassianus, Joseph of Arimathea, and the thorn as well as the cement of the altar of Christ, and the relics from the Sepulchre of Christ. In the case of the bone of Silvanos, the relic was authenticated with Byzantine technique. Doubtlessly, these relics had been brought to Wienhausen by crusaders and by pilgrims returning from Jerusalem, probably male relatives of the foundress Agnes of Landsberg – from her own family, or her husband’s. At Wienhausen, relics from the Holy Land were not as numerous as at the collegiate church of Saint Blaise in Braunschweig, the burial place of Duke Henry the Lion and his oldest son Henry the Tall. This observation, however, supports the assumption that Agnes had inherited those relics from her spouse and gave them to the nuns of Wienhausen, whom she obligated to commemorate her late husband.

The relics from the Loccum triumphal cross narrate the founding story of the monastery and reflect its original endowment. The set of relics from Wienhausen’s wooden box fulfils a similar function. Both collections reflect the history and identity of the two communities. The Wienhausen Grabchristus’ sarcophagus, on the other hand, is the work of one specific abbess.

With regard to the time after the founding period, it is unlikely that the monks and nuns knew the identities of the saints within the receptacles, unless they were themselves actively involved when the objects were opened, newly grouped, and labelled. Although the relics from Loccum’s main altar were shown from time to time, they could not be identified by the spectators, who only saw their covers. The custodian Adam was the only one who could claim to know the saints’ names. Whether Loccum’s religious even knew that the triumphal cross contained relics of saints, remains an open question. The names of the saints from Wienhausen’s Grabchristus are at least documented in the Bishop of Minden’s charter of indulgence. Consequently, anyone who read this charter – the archivist or the abbess? – was able to learn about the saints; maybe the charter was also read aloud in the convent from time to time. There was definitely no concrete practice of venerating individual and identifiable saints in front of these receptacles. The daily or periodic commemoration of individual saints was only guaranteed, and active veneration was only facilitated by their visualization in other media, such as statues, altar-pieces, mural paintings, stained-glass windows, tapestries, prayer books, and devotional images.

---

161 At the community of canons of Saint Blaise, the relics from the Holy Land were mostly concentrated in the so-called ‘borch’, the famous dome-shaped reliquary, which is now in Berlin (Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Kunstgewerbemuseum, inv. no. W 15). On the contents, see the inventory of 1482, no. 1 (Boockmann, Die verlorenen Teile, pp. 127-128). This register also mentions an altar of the Lord in Nazareth. Maybe the cement from Wienhausen is to be located in the same place.

As opposed to the relics, the receptacles in which they rested were visible to the religious every day. The monks of Loccum prayed the liturgy of the hours and celebrated mass in front of the shrine on the main altar. A select few sick laypeople might gain special permission to visit the shrine. Several times every day, the monks and lay brothers prayed and meditated in front of the triumphal cross with its depictions of the suffering Christ. Whenever they wished, the Wienhausen nuns could visit the Grabchristus for their private devotion, while laypeople were only able to do so periodically, in the chapel of Saint Anne. At times, these objects seem to have been more accessible to external laypeople at the convent of Wienhausen than at the monastery of Loccum, where women from the outside were only permitted to enter the gatehouse chapel, where a selection of relics was available for them. Similar arrangements were in place at the male Cistercian monastery of Walkenried during the Late Middle Ages. Judging by the accessibility of relics, the common perception that female Cistercians observed stricter enclosure and separation from outsiders than male Cistercians cannot be upheld. The opposite seems to have been the case.

Monks, nuns, lay brothers, indentured peasants, parishioners, and select sick people gathered in front of the reliquaries on a daily basis. There, they confronted themselves with the Passion, death, and Resurrection of Christ. Without their conscious knowledge, they included the saints, whose relics were hidden in the receptacles, in their prayers. In these receptacles martyrs, confessors, and virgins were positively incorporated into the suffering or dead Christ. Towards the end of the Middle Ages, however, the concept of intercession by Mary and the saints as the only way of appealing to the Son of God probably gave way to the idea of a more direct approach to God. G.J.C. Snoek proposed that, towards the thirteenth century, and especially after the Fourth Lateran Council, the forms and rites with which the early Church venerated the relics of saints (burial, altar, visitatio, prayer, incensation, procession, exposition, greeting and kiss, miraculous activities) were increase-

---

163 In 1277, an indulgence of forty days was granted for the women who had to remain outside the gate (Calenberger Urkundenbuch, ed. by Hodenberg, no. 350). Heutger, Loccum, p. 20: ‘Der Verkehr mit der Außenwelt vollzog sich durch das Torhaus. Frauen konnten nur bis hierher gelangen. Für sie war die erhaltene, von zwei Kreuzgewölben überdeckte, gotische Frauenkapelle bestimmt, die nach der Inschrift über dem Türsturz von Johannes Longus aus Bremen gestiftet ist.’ [‘Contact with the outside was maintained via the gatehouse. This was as far as women were allowed to go. The Gothic Women’s Chapel with two cross vaults was intended for them. An inscription above the lintel identifies Johannes Longus from Bremen as the donor.’]  
164 Gilchrist, Gender, pp. 160-169 supports this view, referring to the evidence of English monastic houses. She observes a number of differences between male and female Cistercian houses, with the female communities being characterised by a higher degree of permeability and a larger number of access points, by greater segregation of the private areas within the communities, and by more physical and symbolic barriers.
ingly transferred to Christ and the Eucharist.\textsuperscript{166} The cross from Loccum and the \textit{Grabechristus} from Wienhausen seem to provide convincing evidence for the validity of this hypothesis.

\textsuperscript{166} Snoek, \textit{Medieval Piety}. 
Fig. 1: Loccum, Monastery Church. Polychrome wooden shrine from the main altar, mid-thirteenth century, long side view (photo: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Loccum).

Fig. 2: Loccum, Monastery Church. Polychrome wooden shrine from the main altar, short side view (photo: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Loccum).
Fig. 3: Loccum Monastery Church. Triumphal Cross, second half of the thirteenth century (photos: Hedwig Röckelein; © Gerold Ahrends). Fig. 3a: front side. Fig. 3b: reverse side.

Fig. 4: Loccum Monastery Church. Triumphal Cross, details of the reverse side (photos: Hedwig Röckelein; © Gerold Ahrends). Fig. 4a: Lion as symbol of Saint Mark the Evangelist. Fig. 4b: Recesses for relics next to the representation of the lion.
Fig. 5: Loccum, Altarpiece from the main altar, with statues of venerated saints, 1500 (photo: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Loccum).

Fig. 6: Loccum, Monastery archive III no. 3. Abbot Gerhard Wolter Molanus of Loccum, inventory of the relics from the Triumphal Cross, c. 1715 (photo: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Loccum).

Fig. 6a: cover. Fig. 6b: p. 1.
Fig. 7: Loccum, Monastery archive, Chipbox 6, no. 3. Relic of Saint Petronilla, identified by an authentic from the eleventh century, wrapped in parchment from the seventeenth century, labelled by Abbot Theodor Stracke (1600-1629) (Photo: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Loccum).

Fig. 8: Loccum, Convent archive, Chipbox 1, no. 3. Relic Letter: S. Bonifacii | martyrj, labelled by Abbot Stracke (1600-1629), containing a piece of light silk fabric from the Middle Ages (photo: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Loccum).
Fig. 9: Wienhausen, Convent. Christ’s effigy (so-called Grabchristus) in the Holy Sepulchre. Christ c. 1290. Sarcophagus 1448 (photo: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Wienhausen).

Fig. 10: Wienhausen, Convent. Relic repository in the head of Christ’s effigy (photo: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Wienhausen).
Fig. 11: Wienhausen. Three relic inventories from the sarcophagus of the Holy Sepulchre (photo: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Wienhausen).

Fig 11a: Relic inventory no. 1 from the repository under Christ’s feet, thirteenth century.
Fig 11b: Relic inventory no. 2 from the repository under Christ’s head, fourteenth century.
Fig 11c: Relic inventory no. 3 from the repository under Christ’s feet, fifteenth century.

Fig. 12: Wienhausen. Complete content of the relic repository under Christ’s head, including relic inventory no. 2 and Appuhn’s record from May 1960 (photo: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Wienhausen).
Fig. 13: Wienhausen. Content of the relic package under Christ’s feet, thirteenth century (photos: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Wienhausen).

Fig. 13a: Wrap’s content: Relics and inventory no. 1.

Fig. 13b: Modern light fabric wrap as cover.

Fig. 14: Wienhausen, KIA, inv. no. Wie Eb 37. Pectoral Cross from the repository under Christ’s feet, front side with inscription: *S. Mauricio | vda — cristofera* (photo: Inschriftenkommision der Akademie der Wissenschaften Göttingen, digital = DI 76 no. 84, fig. 118; © Kloster Wienhausen).
Fig. 15: Wienhausen, KlA, s. n. Relic box, containing large pieces of cloth for remains of medieval relics (photo: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Wienhausen).

Fig. 16: Wienhausen, Convent Museum, s. n. Wooden box, containing bones, fragments of textile and inventory, opened relic bundles, and dust of dissolved particles (photo: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Wienhausen).
Fig. 17: Wienhausen. Contents of the wooden box: relic label with inscription *S(an)ci Gregoriij spoletani epi(scopi) er m(a)r(tyris)*, late twelfth/early thirteenth century (photo: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Wienhausen).

Fig. 18: Contents of the wooden box: ‘Greek’ bone with authentic (photo: Hedwig Röckelein; © Kloster Wienhausen).

Fig. 18a: Relic label with inscription *Brachium cum manu nominati sci alicuius degreca*, late twelfth/early thirteenth century.

Fig. 18b: Radial bone with attached metal and inscription *TOY ΑΓΙΟΥ ΣΙΛΟΥΑ / NOY*, High Middle Ages (mid-Byzantine).
Works Cited

Manuscripts, Archival Sources and Objects


Chipboxes 1-9: Relics from the triumphal cross.

Hannover, Niedersächsisches Landesarchiv, FA Cop. IX 02.

II 2 no. 7: Zwei deutsche Chroniken von Abt Theodor Stracke.

III no. 3: Akte Molanus.

Loccum, Monastery archive, Urk. 7 (1181-1185), 35 (1209), 182 (1255), 362 (1277).

Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Cod. brev. 22.

Wienhausen, KIA, Urk. 9/Or. 5 (April 24, 1233), Urk. 452 (December 13, 1433), Urk. 470 (March 13, 1448), Urk. 471 (August 28, 1448), Akte M 341, Akte M 370.

Printed Primary Sources


Calenberger Urkundenbuch, ed. by Wilhelm von Hodenberg (Hannover: Jäneke, 1938), vol. 3.

Chronik des Klosters Wienhausen, ed. by Horst Appuhn (Celle: Bormann-Archiv, 1956).


Il Menologio di Basilio II (Cod. Vaticano greco 1613), Codices e Vaticanis selecti, 8 (Turin: Fratelli Bocca, 1907).

Ruotgeri Vita Brunonis archiepiscopi Coloniensis, ed. by Irene Ott, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicum. N.S. 10 (Hannover: Hahn, 1951).

Secondary Works


—, Kloster Wienhausen (Wienhausen: Kloster Wienhausen, 1986).


—, *Sacred Communities, Shared Devotions. Gender, Material Culture, and Monasticism in Late Medieval Germany*, ed. by Alison J. Beach et al., Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts, 29 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014).


Rüdebusch, Dieter, Der Anteil Niedersachsens an den Kreuzzügen und Heidenfahrten, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte Niedersachsens, 80 (Hildesheim: Lax, 1972).


Re-living Resurrection in Medieval Saxony – The Development of New Imagery of the Resurrected Christ

Lotem Pinchover *

Abstract

Christ’s passion and resurrection are the cornerstones of the Christian faith, which have been a subject of artistic expression in Christian iconography since the Early Middle Ages. However, as the physical resurrection of Christ is not described in the biblical sources, it is perhaps not surprising that, until the twelfth century, the resurrection scene was represented by the depictions of the moments following the event itself: The empty tomb and the visiting women and/or the angel. A new type of iconography emerged around 1160 in the diocese of Hildesheim, showing Christ’s triumph over death as he rises from the sarcophagus. The newly emerged type of the resurrection image was promulgated in the centuries that followed, especially in Germany, and became uniform in the art produced in the convents of
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the Lüneburg Heath. The paper explores the visual and textual sources of the image and probes the reasons for its special popularity in medieval Saxon convents.

Keywords
Christ’s resurrection; Hildesheim; Wienhausen; Ebstorf; convents; nuns; glory; Lüneburg Heath; twelfth century; thirteenth century.

1 Introduction
In the High and Later Middle Ages, the convents of Northern Germany, and especially those located in what is known as the Lüneburg Heath (Lüneburger Heide), were home to a rich variety of artwork as well as devotional trends and spiritual preoccupations.\(^1\) One of the most important art- and devotional objects from the area is the now-lost Ebstorf world map, which was created around 1300 and is the largest documented medieval world map.\(^2\) It features the continents of Europe, Asia and Africa surrounding the umbilicus mundi – where Jerusalem is placed. Jerusalem is depicted as a rectangular golden-walled city, within which Christ is portrayed rising from a sarcophagus [Fig. 1, 2]. Thus, the centre of the world, i.e. the holy city, is represented by Christ’s resurrection.

The Jerusalem of the Ebstorf world map is the Golgotha, the site of Christ’s crucifixion; it is the place of his burial and his sepulchre;\(^3\) and it is the heavenly city described in Revelations 21, where it is symbolized by the Lamb of God enclosed in the golden city walls with their twelve gates.\(^4\) But first and foremost, it is the

---

\(^1\) Cf. the map ‘Late Medieval Saxony’ in this volume. General bibl.: Mecham, ‘Sacred Vision’; Riggert, Die Lüneburger Frauenkloster. In this regard, it is also important to mention the study by Mersch, Soziale Dimensionen.

\(^2\) Wolf dates the map to 1234, see Wolf, Jerusalem, pp. 19-36. A later date (1300) is proposed by several other scholars, see for example Die Ebstorf Weltkarte, ed. by Kugler/Glauch/Willing (with further bibliography). The original was burned in 1943. Copies are kept in the convent of Ebstorf, in the Lüneburg Museum, and in the Landschaftsmuseum of Kulmbach. The original painted vellum were probably made in the area of Lüneburg. The size of the map was 3.56 × 3.58 m. See more details in App. I.6.

\(^3\) An example for such a mappa mundi, which presents Jerusalem as a concentrically walled city with the Hill of Calvary positioned at the top and an image of the crucified Christ is the Hereford Map painted by Clergyman Richard of Haldingham, c. 1290, 1.59 × 1.34 m., Hereford cathedral (see The Hereford Map ed. by Westerm). Other eleventh and twelfth century maps show Jerusalem (a little off-centre) as a church building, probably the Holy Sepulchre Church: Isidore World Map copy, BSB, Clm 10058, fol. 154\(^v\) (Harvey, Medieval Maps, pp. 22-23, fig. 16).

\(^4\) Such a depiction containing the Lamb of God is not commonly found at the centre of medieval maps, but was very common in various other media of medieval art. For example, it appears at the wall paintings of the crossing vault of Saint Blaise Cathedral in Braunschweig from the thirteenth century (Soffner, Der Braunschweiger Dom, p. 18). However, the concentric walls of the city in the Hereford Map are likewise suggestive of the heavenly city (see above, n. 3).
place where the miracle of Christ’s resurrection took place – a point of time in sacred history, on par with the end of time and the time yet to come. Why does the Ebstorf world map accord this event centrality in representing Jerusalem?

The importance and meaning of Christ’s resurrection to the Christian faith cannot be overemphasised: it is a moment of crucial significance, prefiguring Christ’s second coming, and thus symbolizing his divinity and triumph over death. However, the physical act of resurrection is not described in the texts of the four gospels. Perhaps the mystery associated with this gap is what prompted the creators of the Ebstorf world map to connect the resurrection moment to Jerusalem as both the historical city and the heavenly Jerusalem.

On the map, the depiction of Jerusalem is rotated ninety degrees clockwise, so that the image of the risen Christ within it is turned towards the upper part of the map. Accordingly, the risen Christ is facing the crucified Christ, whose hands appear at the sides of the orbis terrarum and the feet at the bottom [Fig. 1]. In the picture at the centre of the map, Christ is shown with one foot outside a rectangular sarcophagus, his left hand holding a cross-staff and banner, while his right hand making a gesture of blessing [Fig. 2]. He is clothed in a robe and a mantle, and bears a halo. Below him are two sleeping guards, considerably smaller in scale, wearing pointed hats and holding armour.5 While rising out of the tomb, Christ is almost stepping on the guards. An inscription next to the image reads: Sepulchrum D[omi]ni glo[rio]sum teste Ysaias (the glorious sepulchre of the Lord, according to Isaiah’s testimony), echoing Isaiah 11.10.6

This reference to the glorious Holy Sepulchre assumed a special meaning during and after the first crusade.7 When the Ebstorf world map was created, Jerusalem had already been re-captured by the Muslims, but the glorification of Christ’s sepulchre through the conquest of Jerusalem in the first crusade was still alive in popular memory. It stands to reason that re-conquering the Holy Sepulchre could have been perceived as a restoration of the Christian authority in the Holy City. This conjecture, however, does not help to solve the question of how the un-

5 The accuracy of the details and colours of the image is uncertain. Reconstructions (and the 1953 reproductions by Rudolf Wieneke) are based on photos and drawings made by Sommerbrodt, Kropp and Miller (Die Ebstorfer Weltkarte, ed. by Sommerbrodt. Colour reproductions do not appear in the atlas; they were made in the 1930s by Augustus Kropp; Miller, Mappaemundi; Miller, Monialium Ebstorfensium; Miller, Die Ebstorferkarte). The photos are black and white and of poor quality; the drawings are inaccurate and have been claimed to represent, at times, a point of view that is not entirely objective. Regarding this point, see Die Ebstorfer Weltkarte, ed. by Kugler/Glauch/Willing, vol. 2, pp. 3-12. It is, however, accepted that the walls of Jerusalem were golden, also according to a commentary by Ritter Blumenbach (Blumenbach, Beschreibung, p. 5).

6 The inscription, in red, is located on the right side of the Jerusalem walls, and is rotated to the same angle as the figure of the rising Christ, translation to English by the author [Fig. 2].

7 Hengevoss-Dürkop, Jerusalem, pp. 217-218. See also Gabriele, ‘From Prophecy to Apocalypse’.
witnessed, non-documented moment of Christ’s resurrection could have been given a distinctive graphic expression.\(^8\)

In the textual sources, the earliest report of the resurrection comes from the women’s testimonies at the empty tomb and the annunciation of the angel, or angels, to them. Until the twelfth century, the artistic references to the resurrection involved the depiction of the moments after Christ rose out of the tomb.\(^9\) However, in the mid-twelfth century a new iconography emerged showing Christ rising out of the sarcophagus – an element which I will henceforth call ‘the new type of the resurrection image’. That iconography was developed and gradually promulgated, especially in the area of Old Saxony, becoming canonical by the later thirteenth century – and around 1300, when the Ebstorf world map was created [App. I.6]. In what follows, I examine the sources of the new type of the resurrection image, beginning with its characteristics and visual sources. Next follows a discussion of its earliest exemplars and the evolvement of its distinctive features. Finally, reasons are suggested for the remarkable popularity of the new resurrection image in the Lüneburg Heath convents (henceforth, the Heath convents). In the attached appendices, one can find a list of the earliest representations of the new type of the resurrection image from the Heath convents, together with a list of comparative sculptures in visual and textual sources (large and small scale).

Before the Reformation, the area of medieval Saxony contained at least 100 active female convents.\(^10\) The Heath convents, Wienhausen, Lüne, Medingen, Ebstorf, Isenhan and Walsrode, belonged to the duchy of Braunschweig-Lüneburg and to the dioceses of Hildesheim and Verden. In the Middle Ages and thereafter, these convents were relatively wealthy, as they maintained close ties with local noble families, especially the Guelf dynasty, and in particular Henry the Lion. The Heath convents were not only united geographically, but were also similar in terms of their occupants, and hence shared liturgy, devotional practices, culture and art. The convents discussed below were founded in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. All underwent monastic reform under the house of Windesheim sometime around 1470 and all came under the influence of the Lutheran Reformation in the 1520s and 1530s. In the eighteenth century, they became what is known in Germany as ‘Protestant women’s chapters’ (Evangelische Damenstifte), and have remained so to this day.\(^11\) It is worth noting that the transition of the Heath con-

---

8 This question was the subject of several studies, most recently by Baert ‘Imagining’, pp. 483-506 (with further bibliography).
9 These would be a depiction of the visit of the holy women to the tomb, shown with the angel and the empty tomb, or depiction of Christ appearing to his disciples / to Thomas. See, for example the miniature in fol. 111r of the *Stammheim Missal* (made in Hildesheim in the 1170s, J. Paul Getty Museum, Ms. 64), where the depiction of the women and angel at the empty tomb appears together with the *Ascension*.
10 Röckelein, ‘Schriftlandschaften’, pp. 19-140. See the map ‘Late Medieval Saxony’ and the introduction to this volume.
11 An exception is the Benedictine convent of Walsrode, which was founded in 986. This convent will not be discussed here since it was burned down in the fifteenth century and later destroyed entirely.
vents from Catholicism to Evangelism was not as clear-cut as is customarily portrayed by scholars, and a large number of medieval objects were left in their original settings. The resulting inventory is impressive, making it possible to trace the development of the new iconography at issue here.¹²

Several representations of the new type of the resurrection image from the Heath convents date to the last two decades of the thirteenth century.¹³ Probably the most important among them is the monumental wooden sculptural group¹⁴ of the Risen Lord (the so called *Auferstehungschristus*) from Wienhausen, 106.5 cm high [Fig. 3].¹⁵ The exact date of its execution is unknown; it is generally dated to the end of the thirteenth century, and like other works from Heath convents, is believed to have been made in a workshop in the Braunschweig-Lüneburg area.

2 The Sculptural Group of the Risen Lord (*Auferstehungschristus*) from Wienhausen

The figure of Christ in the sculptural group bears a crossed, decorated halo and is rising from a sealed sarcophagus.¹⁶ The relief on the front wall of the sarcophagus displays three guards reclining inside three blind arches. As on the Ebstorf world map, Christ steps out of the sarcophagus by placing his right foot over its front wall, for all intents and purposes treading on the middle guard at the sarcophagus’ base. The other two guards are positioned symmetrically on either side, one of them holding a shield with a rampant lion – a coat of arms of the Duke of Lüneburg, possibly indicating the work’s provenance.¹⁷ As on the Ebstorf Map, Christ’s right hand is extended in a gesture of blessing, while in his left hand is a triumphal cross-staff and banner, of which only fragments have remained. Originally, the sculptural group also included the figures of two angels, positioned on the sarcophagus on either side of Christ. Two wing fragments preserved in the convent probably belonged to these figures.¹⁸

---

¹³ See App. I. See also Pinchover, ‘Representations’.
¹⁴ The sculpture is referred to as ‘a sculptural group’ by virtually all scholars who have dealt with it, probably because it contains several figures, including Christ, the three guards, and formerly also two angels. Therefore, I have adopted this title.
¹⁵ For further details and bibliography see App. I.2.
¹⁶ The fact that the sarcophagus is sealed has been interpreted as an allusion to Mary’s virginity, for example, in Jacobus da Varagine, *The Golden Legend*, p. 217. In some cases, however, the sarcophagus is presented open (for example, see wall painting from Wienhausen in App. I.1).
¹⁸ See some of the fragments (kept today at Wienhausen, KIA, inv. no. Wie Ac 1) in: Hartwig, ‘Holzskulpturen’, pp. 226-227, fig. 29-30. Evidence that the original composition included two angels comes from several sources. First, the sarcophagus lid on both sides of Christ contains holes, where
The sculpture is hollow, with a small chamber within the figure of Christ, which has a rectangular opening at the back.\textsuperscript{19} Christ is dressed in a golden long-sleeved robe, open at the chest so as to reveal the side wound, and a long, voluminous red mantle. Christ’s halo and the sarcophagus’ frontal wall were once richly decorated with precious stones, of which only a few have been preserved. The figure also bore a removable crown, which no longer exists, which was put by the nuns on feast days, with suitable robes.\textsuperscript{20} Other decorations, geometrically patterned, are painted on Christ’s garments and on the base of the sarcophagus. The rich decoration of the sarcophagus, together with the strong frontality of the figure of Christ and the putative crown, transform the sarcophagus into a throne of majesty.\textsuperscript{21} Moreover, the impression is that Christ is sitting down in an upright position, as his robe hangs vertically all the way to the floor, suggesting a lack of movement. Christ’s face is noticeably young – round and with rosy cheeks; the very short beard is painted onto the lower chin, in contrast to the hair, which is depicted in relief; and his facial expression is naïve, with a hint of a smile. All of Christ’s five wounds are visible and emphasised by being painted as large dark dots surrounded by wavy red or white lines, forming the shape of a sun or a flower. The centre of the side wound includes a hole, through which the spectator could peek at the inner space within the figure.

The sculptural group was probably used as an altar image, although its iconography and composition are rather unique in the history of sculpture, inasmuch as it has no predecessors and only few successors [see App. II].\textsuperscript{22} The convent’s chronicle speaks of ‘an image of the resurrected Jesus, which stood above the [choir’s] altar.’\textsuperscript{23} Hence the assumption is that the group had served as the altar image of the

\textsuperscript{19} See photos of the back in Hartwieg, ‘Holzskulpturen’, pp. 215-216, fig. 21, p. 220, fig. 25.
\textsuperscript{20} An inventory from 1685 records robes for the figure of Christ and the angels, a silver crown, and three different banners. Moreover, there are holes in Christ’s halo and back of the head, which probably served to hold the crown in place (ibid., pp. 217, 227). See also Klack-Eitzen/Haase/Weißgraf, Heilige Röcke, pp. 38-39, 49-52.
\textsuperscript{22} Hartwieg, ‘Holzskulpturen’, p. 214; Leerhoff, ‘Wienhausen’, p. 779.
\textsuperscript{23} Chronik und Totenbuch des Klosters Wienhausen, ed. by Appuhn, pp. v-xxvii, 141, translated by the author. The manuscript of the convent’s chronicle is dated to 1692 and the entries continue until 1793. However, certain misspellings and errors, as well as the writing style, have led the scholars to conclude that the chronicle may have been copied from an earlier version dating to around 1470. The extant manuscript is preserved in Wienhausen, KlA under Ms. 20.
nuns’ choir until a new altar was installed in 1519. As such, it must have held within its hollow chamber the Eucharist, and possibly also relics.

The sculptural group has several visible signs of heat damage, possibly because it was surrounded by burning candles. This suggests that, in addition to its role in liturgy, it was also used for devotional practices as the convent’s dominant An-dachtsbild. If so, the sculptural group must have been accorded a central place at the convent and in all likelihood was also well known to the outside community. Indeed, this work was depicted again and again in artistic media other than sculpture, in Wienhausen and elsewhere.

The preserved exemplars in painting testify to the sculpture’s original form as well as to its importance.

3 The New Type of the Resurrection Image

Christ’s resurrection is a recurrent theme in the art of all Heath convents: it is one of the central motifs in the famous tapestry collection from the convent of Lüne, and is frequently the subject of illustrations in manuscripts from the convent of Medingen. All in all, over fifty pre-Reformation art objects in different media belonging to the Heath convents include the new type of the resurrection image, a degree of prevalence comparable only to the crucifixion. The theme was repeated

---

24 Hamburger, ‘Art’, pp. 83-84, 97. Hartwieg doubts that the image was displayed on the altar, and instead argues that it was the convent’s central devotional image and that it was carried in processions especially relating to the Elevatio. Hartwieg, ‘Holzskulpturen’, pp. 194-195.

25 The most precious relic possessed by the convent was a drop of the Holy Blood, which the convent’s founder Agnes of Landsberg (†c. 1250 / 1266) had brought from Rome. The translation legend appears in Chronik und Totenbuch, ed. by Appuhn, pp. v-xxvii, 140. See the papers of Mai-Britt Wiechmann and Hedwig Röckelein in this volume regarding the relic of the Holy Blood in Wienhausen.

26 Hamburger succinctly describes the manifold functions and meanings of the sculpture as follows: ‘...the image combined the functions of reliquary, cult image, devotional image, and monstrance, proof that medieval images defy the strictures of art-historical terminology’ (Hamburger, ‘Art’, p. 97). Other scholars suggest that the image may have been used in Easter liturgy. Regarding this use and the relation of the sculpture to the Eucharist see Zimmer, ‘Die Funktion’, pp. 124-138; Mersch, Soziale Dimensionen, pp. 210-226.

27 The two most prominent examples from Wienhausen are: a devotional image of Christ’s resurrection from Wienhausen, see App. I.10; wall painting in the nuns’ choir (third Bay from the west, top medallion of the western vault cell), 1335 (Wittekind, ‘Passion’, pp. 168-169).

28 Among objects that include the image are seventeen embroideries and applied decorations; eight devotional objects; six lamps and candlesticks; four stained glass windows; four manuscripts, of which some include several miniatures featuring the theme; four sculptures and statuettes; two wall paintings; one altar painting; and several unique items. The statistics are based on an exhaustive investigation carried out by the author while working of her dissertation (Pinchover, ‘Representations’, pp. 26-27 and Appendices). In the 1953 discovery underneath the stalls of the Wienhausen nuns’ choir, and in the 1959 discovery in the roofing of the convent’s northern wing, the most popular themes were crucifixion and resurrection (Appuhn/Heusinger, ‘Der Fund’, p. 166). In the art of the Heath convents the theme of the resurrection is more prominent than the Entombment (Mecham, ‘Sacred Vision’, p. 149).
in the post-Reformation art of these convents as well, pointing to a special importance assigned to the image by the nuns of the Lüneburg Heath. In spite of some variations, the characteristics of the new type of the resurrection image are rather uniform: Christ appears as the central figure of a symmetrical composition, stepping out of a sarcophagus with one foot, sometimes treading on the figure of a sleeping guard at the bottom. In his left hand he holds a cross-staff and banner, while his right hand is raised in a gesture of blessing. He is clothed in a robe and a mantle, which reveal his side wound; in most cases the wounds on the hands and feet are depicted as well. He is shown frontally and, while the thrust of the stepping-out motion is forward, the impression of stasis prevails, so that Christ appears to be sitting on a throne. In many representations, Christ is crowned. He is often depicted as a youth – lively, healthy and strong, his face bearing a calm, at times even jovial expression. The composition usually includes other figures: three reclining guards and two angels.

4 Textual and Visual Sources

A search for textual sources for this iconography has not yielded palpable results. The scene is not described in the biblical texts, and is absent from theological discussions of early Christianity or later periods. The description of Christ’s rising from the tomb first appears in texts long after the iconography of this event had been established and popularized in visual art. This most probably means that the visual representations influenced the writings rather than vice versa. It is also

29 See variations in the position of the angels, the depiction of Christ etc. in App. I, for example nos. 1, 5.
30 Two early Christian Syrian texts that did elaborate on the act of resurrection are the Gospel of Peter and the Sermons of Saint Ephraem, but both were unknown to the medieval Latin West, as they were written in Syrian and poorly disseminated (Touber, ‘Die Auferstehung’, p. 33, n. 2, p. 43 with further bibliography).
31 None of the widely known religious works (such as the writings of Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, Jacobus da Varagine’s Golden Legend, Ludolph of Saxony’s Vita Christi or the text of Die Erlösend) give a description parallel to the contemporary artistic depictions, although some do elaborate on the resurrection in general (Jacobus da Varagine, The Golden Legend, trans. and ed. by Granger Ryan, p. 217; Ludolphus de Saxonia, Vita Jesu Christi, ed. by Rigollot, Cap. LXIX, pp. 171-176).
32 For example, this influence can be discerned in texts of Easter plays: several plays, from the fourteenth century on, include specific stage directions which instruct the actor impersonating Christ to stand up, in most cases on an elevated area, and chant or sing resurreci (fol. 37v in the Innsbruck (Thuringian) Easter Play (Innsbruck, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Cod. 960, play is in fols 35v-37v, 38v-50r) 1391 (Hartl, Das Drama., p. 144). However, the depictions of the actual stepping out of the sarcophagus, along with the cross-staff and banner, appear only rarely, and had emerged much later than the first depictions of the new type of the resurrection image, from the fifteenth century on (fol. 82r in the Donaueschingen Passion Play (Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Donaueschingen 137 (Ms. Fürstenberg Ms. 137)), 1470-1500 (Schauspiele, ed. by Mone, pp. 150-350). For a discussion of the resurrection scene in regard to the Elevatio performance, see Taubert/Taubert, ‘Mittelalterliche
important to note that the later textual descriptions matching the new type of the resurrection image were written almost exclusively in the vernacular or semi-vernacular, suggesting that the interest in the issue was of local and popular nature.\textsuperscript{33}

As already discussed, the new type of the resurrection image is not rendered in texts prior to the late fifteenth century, but is prevalent in visual sources much earlier. The lack of textual sources for this new iconography suggests that it is an intrinsically artistic phenomenon, i.e., a development that is exclusive to the sphere of art. As shown by several scholars, the above described features of the new type of the resurrection image can be discerned in the depiction of other scenes in visual sources prior to the twelfth century, but the image as a whole does not seem to have a single antecedent. It may therefore be concluded that the roots of the new iconography derive from several models.\textsuperscript{34} If, however, one were to argue that there must be a depiction close in meaning and composition to the new type of the resurrection image, one would probably point to a portrayal of a triumphant Christ, that is, to \textit{Christus Victor}.

The image of the triumphant Lord features Christ holding a cross-staff and stepping on animals; it dates back to Early Christian art and to the portrayal of emperors in Roman and Hellenistic art. From its first appearances as early as the fourth century in Christian art, this depiction became part of the resurrection cycle. In the art produced in the German lands, the subject was popular long before the Carolingian era. The significance of stepping on wild animals (dragon, snake, lion, basilisk, etc.) comes from the Roman \textit{calcatio} (step) ceremony, in which the emperor demonstrated his victory by stepping onto the head or neck of the vanquished leader after a battle. This iconography appears on fourth and fifth century coinage.\textsuperscript{35} The symbolism of stepping on wild animals, on Satan or on enemies can be found in several Old Testament verses, such as Psalms 72(71).9; 91(90).13; 110(109).1; and Isaiah 11.8. In the New Testament, Paul mentions it in I Corinthians 15.25 in connection to Christ’s resurrection: ‘For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet.’\textsuperscript{36} Similarly, in depictions of the ‘Harrowing of Hell’, a scene from the resurrection cycle, represented iconographically since around the eighth century, Christ is shown holding a cross-staff and banner and stepping on

\textsuperscript{33} Muir, \textit{The Biblical Drama}, p. 139. Vernacular plays appeared from the fourteenth century onward.

\textsuperscript{34} In other resurrection scenes, e.g., the \textit{Resurrection of the Dead} or the \textit{Raising of Lazarus}, only the position of the sarcophagi is parallel to the new type of the resurrection image. The positioning and attitude of the figures in these scenes are very different (Brenk, ‘\textit{Auferstehung}’, col. 219; Schiller, ‘\textit{The Raising}’, pp. 181-186, esp. figs 559-566).

\textsuperscript{35} Schiller, ‘\textit{Christus victor}’, pp. 32-34.

\textsuperscript{36} All biblical citations are taken from the King James Bible.
the figure of either Hades or Satan. Likewise, the theme of *Christus victor* was frequently linked in the Middle Ages, visually and theologically, to that of the resurrection, and the image sometimes appears next to other resurrection symbols such as the Sacrifice of Isaac. As in the ‘Harrowing of Hell’ scene, in most of the early representations of *Christus victor*, Christ is holding a cross-staff, and some images also include two admiring angels on either side of Christ, parallel to the new type of the resurrection image. The depictions of Christ flanked by two angels, holding a cross-staff and banner, and stepping on two or four animals were prevalent throughout the Middle Ages until the thirteenth century, when they were gradually supplanted by the new type of the resurrection image.

In many exemplars of the new type of the resurrection image, including the Wienhausen sculptural group [Fig. 3], Christ is shown stepping on the guards sleeping in front of the sarcophagus. As mentioned above in connection to *Christus victor* and the ‘Harrowing of Hell’, this gesture symbolizes victory over the enemy or death, respectively. However, in the new type of the resurrection image, the composition is strictly symmetrical; Christ is depicted *en face*, and the sense of stasis is conveyed in spite of the movement directed forward. These representative characteristics, which are not part of the ‘Harrowing of Hell’ or the *Christus victor* compositions, stylistically transform the new type of the resurrection image into an icon and render it closer to the eastern portrayals of the *Anastasis*, as well as to the ‘Last Judgement’ and *Majestas Domini*. The images of Christ in Majesty and Christ as Judge both glorify Christ, and are thus thematically related to the resurrection image as well, their traits investing the latter with majesty and grandeur.

37 The *Harrowing of Hell*, or *Christ’s Descent to Hell*, took place between his death on the cross and his resurrection. According to the tradition, Christ descended into hell or limbo and freed progenitors and patriarchs from the underworld, Adam and Eve, Abraham, David and Solomon. This event is only alluded to in the verses of the Old and the New Testaments, but was discussed in detail by early Christian theologians. Thus, Melito of Sardis (†180) describes in his *Peri Pascha* (Homily on Pass-over) how Christ defeated Hades after his resurrection (III: 102). Later on, other theologians dwelt on this event as well, especially the second part of the apocryphal Evangelium of Nicodemus, the so called *Descensus ad Inferos*, probably fourth century (chap. XVIII-XXVI). See Schiller, ‘Die Höllenfahrt’, pp. 45-47; Scheidweiler, ‘The Gospel’, pp. 444-484.

38 See, for example, a sarcophagus from Gerona with a relief of the Sacrifice of Isaac, and the mosaic in the Orthodox Baptistry in Ravenna, which shows the theme of resurrection in the context of baptism (Schiller, ‘Christus victor’, pp. 33-34, figs 61-62).

39 The triumphal cross-staff and banner became, from the twelfth century on, a symbol of the resurrection (Schiller, ‘Die Höllenfahrt’, p. 61). See such examples for a combination of scenes in Schiller, ‘Der Aufstieg Christi’, p. 75, figs 78, 80.

40 In what can be seen as a transitional stage between the iconography of *Christus victor* and the new type of the resurrection image, several thirteenth century German manuscripts combine both scenes: Christ is depicted rising from the tomb while also stepping on a snake (both manuscripts are copies of *Sermons of Bernard of Clairvaux*, made c. 1250. The first (fol. 117v) was made in Cologne, and is kept today in Cologne, historical archive, Ms. W 255; the second (fol. 122v) was made in Heisterbach (?) today in Düsseldorf, Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. B 31. See Stork, ‘Die Kreuzigung’, pp. 205-222, figs 87, 92.

41 Appuhn, ‘Der Auferstandene’, pp. 107, 112-113 (also mentions a similarity to cross reliquaries).
5 The New Type of the Resurrection Image: Earliest Representation and Place of Origin

What made the new composition so central in the life and art of the Heath convents? The answer to this question must take into account the place in which the new type of the resurrection image emerged. First representations of the resurrection showing Christ stepping out of a sarcophagus with one foot appeared in the twelfth century. It is commonly agreed that the first exemplar of the new type of the resurrection image is found in fol. 75r of the so-called Ratmann Sacramentary, produced in 1159 by the eponymous monk from the monastery of Saint Michael in Hildesheim [Fig. 4].\(^42\) The miniature inside the historiated initial of a minuscule \(d\) of one of the paschal prayers shows Christ standing in an open sarcophagus, whose lid is positioned in the foreground diagonally to the right. He is stepping out with his right foot, holding a cross-staff and banner in his left hand, and extending his right hand to the side. Christ’s upper body is bare; his robe reaches up to his chest, and a mantle is thrown over his left arm. His wounds are invisible. He is frontal, looking straight ahead. The image is emblematic and does not include any other figures, of either guards or angels. The composition of the Ratmann Sacramentary miniature became the model for subsequent representations of Christ’s resurrection. It is the earliest securely dated example of its type.

An almost equally early example (crafted around 1160-1170), more elaborate in detail but less well known in research, is a fragment of a wall hanging, kept today in the Kunstgewerbemuseum in Berlin [Fig. 5].\(^43\) This embroidery is part of a figurative hanging created by the nuns of a convent in the area of Halberstadt, a product of nuns’ idle work, as it were (woven \textit{Nonnenarbeiten}).\(^44\) The resurrection is represented in two adjacent scenes, both of which include the figure of a monk or a bishop at the bottom right corner. The right side portrays the visit of the holy

\(^42\) The \textit{Ratmann Sacramentary} (also called the Ratmann Missal), Hildesheim Cathedral Treasury, Ms. 37 (or inv. no. DS 37). A colophon (fol. 1v) dates the manuscript to 1159 and indicates the scribe, a monk named Ratmann, from the Benedictine monastery of Saint Michael in Hildesheim. Though the text of the manuscript was altered in 1400 to include a Missal, most of the original miniatures were kept (\textit{Abglanz}, ed. by Brandt, pp. 133-134, cat. no. 3.9; Menke, ‘The Ratmann Sacramentary’. Schiller (‘Der Aufstieg Christi’, p. 73, fig. 197) and Rademacher (Rademacher, ‘Darstellungen’, p. 208, fig. 10) describe an ostensibly earlier example of Christ stepping out of the tomb in a French miniature from a manuscript of the first half of the twelfth century (Initial N from fol. 183v of a Easter sermon from a manuscript of \textit{Saint Jerome’s Epistles}, written for Abbot Stephen Harding of Cîteaux, made in 1120 Cîteaux, today in Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 135. However, the image shows Christ stepping upwards from a diagonally positioned sarcophagus, a configuration that is different from the one at issue here. Moreover, Schrade claims that the miniatures of this manuscript date only to the end of the twelfth century (Schrade, \textit{Ikonographie}, p. 51, n. 1).

\(^43\) Fragment of a wall hanging from a nunnery in Halberstadt, 1160-1170, silk embroidery on linen, 185 × 120 cm (of originally 240 × 200 cm), Kunstgewerbemuseum Berlin, inv. no. 1888,470. See Lambacher, \textit{Schatze}, pp. 84-85, no. 36 with further bibliography.

\(^44\) Regarding the theme of \textit{Nonnenarbeiten} see Hamburger, \textit{Nuns as Artists}, esp. Part V, ‘Nuns Work’, pp. 177-212.
women to the tomb and the announcing angel, while on the left Christ is represented stepping out of the sarcophagus with his left foot, holding a cross-staff and banner in his right hand and extending his left hand towards one of the two flanking angels. The position of the two angels enhances the symmetry of the composition, a feature that is repeated in later works. Two reclining guards are displayed at the bottom. As in the miniature from the Ratmann Sacramentary, Christ’s wounds are invisible even though part of his torso is bare, an aspect that changes over the course of the thirteenth century. Thus, this early embroidery includes almost all elements that appear in the later exemplars from the Heath convents, and can therefore be described as a mature work containing the new type of the resurrection image.

The dioceses of Hildesheim and the diocese of Halberstadt, where the above described miniature and embroidery fragment originate, respectively, were both located in the area of Old Saxony under the archdiocese of Mainz.45 The new type of the resurrection image seems to be indigenous to this area, and especially so to Hildesheim. Situated in the heart of Old Saxony, the city of Hildesheim was a powerful bishopric in the region. Between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries, a number of new architectural monuments were built in the city, and the small diocese exercised significant influence as far as the Lüneburg Heath, that is, throughout the northern Germany of today. It was a rich spiritual centre with several scriptoria and workshops, whose numerous artworks have been preserved to this day.46

Some sources show that Hildesheim was home to new spiritual trends and liturgical practices. Thus, a 1232 document from the Saint Maurice monastery mentions the use of an ‘image of the Ascension’ on Ascension Day.47 This is very early evidence for a dramatic element in liturgy in general, and that related to the feast of the Ascension in particular.48 Another early documentation attests to the celebration of Corpus Christi in the Church of Saint Godehard in Hildesheim as early as 1301.49 The fact that the image from the Ratmann Sacramentary [Fig. 4] predates this celebration suggests that the preoccupation with the physical union with Christ was prominent in Hildesheim’s religious practices as early as the twelfth century and in later periods as well. It is therefore not surprising that the Hildesheim diocese was the one to produce a new iconographic scheme in the twelfth century.

As Hildesheim was the diocese of the Wienhausen convent, there was a strong connection, as well as affinity, between the city and the monastery. In particular,

45 Cf. the map ‘Late Medieval Saxony’ in this volume.
47 The sculpture of the *Salvator mundi* or the resurrecting Christ from Lüne [see App. I.5] might have been used for this purpose. See Tripps, *Bildwerk*, pp. 152-153.
48 Advocate Lippold of Hildesheim requested that every year a figure of the ascending Christ be used in the Church of the Holy Cross in order to dramatize the Ascension story, and thus strengthen people’s faith. The figures were pulled up by ropes between the stairs (Doebner, *Urkundenbuch*, vol. I, p. 67, no. 128 Krause, “Imago ascensionis?”, pp. 300-302). It is possible that images of the resurrection were used in a similar way during Easter, perhaps even earlier than the preserved texts indicate.
the convent had close ties with Hildesheim bishops, who were actively involved in both the temporal and spiritual affairs of the Wienhausen convent. The approval for the establishment of the convent was given by Bishop Conrad of Hildesheim, who acted as its patron. Later bishops, too, became deeply involved with the workings of the convent, including the consecration of new altars and chapels, and supplied the nuns with indulgences. Needless to say, these connections entailed correspondence, as well as artistic influence.\(^{50}\) The influence of Hildesheim extended to convents other than Wienhausen as well, for although the convents of Lüne, Medingen and Ebstorf belonged to the diocese of Verden, all the Heath convents were strongly connected: their occupants and patrons often came from the same families and their liturgical practices and artwork were stylistically and iconographically similar.\(^{51}\) The new type of the resurrection image reached the Heath convents only at the end of the thirteenth century [see App. I], but its uniform representations had existed throughout Old Saxony from its creation in the middle of the twelfth century onward.\(^{52}\)

### 6 The Meaning of the Image for the Heath Convents’ Nuns

As already discussed, the sculptural group of Christ’s resurrection was probably used as an altar image, and its iconography was reproduced in various places and settings throughout the Heath convents. Additionally, this subject recurs in the devotional writings of the nuns, which shed light on its meaning and importance in their eyes. For example, the resurrection is among the most popular themes in the Songbook of the Wienhausen convent, one of the richest medieval song collections written in Middle Low German.\(^{53}\) The manuscript is kept today in the convent’s archive. The songs were written mostly in the fourteenth century and copied into the existing compilation in the beginning of the sixteenth. The resurrection is the subject of seven songs,\(^ {54}\) surpassing the crucifixion theme – which, in itself, is surprising. The theme of nativity, which is consonant to resurrection, appears in

---


\(^{53}\) The Songbook of Wienhausen (Wienhausen, Monastery archive, Ms. 9). The book includes 59 songs on different themes, religious as well as secular, in Latin, German and mixed Latin-German. Thirty songs from this collection are unique, in that they appear only in this book. Others are collected from different areas (Kaufhold, *Liederbuch*, pp. 5, 9). Roolf (‘Liederbuch’, pp. 245-264) proposes a new dating based on the watermarks found in the manuscript, and suggests that the book originated in Derneburg, and/or possibly in Wienhausen, and that, it was probably written in a male cloister but intended for a female audience. The fullest edition of the text is that of Kaufhold.

fourteen songs. The explanation for this unusual thematic distribution may be anchored in the Songbook’s most prominent motif: rebirth. For example, the fifth paragraph of song number 50, *Eyn maget wys unde schone*, includes an illustrative depiction of the resurrected Christ:

[...]*Jhesus stunt up vam dem grave. | de eddel forste gud. | myt eynem crucestare. | eyne fanen van wunden rot. | be vor up myt groter ere. | to hymmel wolde be keren, | vorwunnen was de dot. ('Jesus rose from the grave | the noble and good prince | with a cross-staff (and) | a banner, red from the wounds | he arose with great honour | he wanted to return to heaven | death was overcome')

This fifteenth century song, found in other songbooks as well, emphasises the act of arising from the grave and also mentions a cross-staff and banner. Another song, from a prayer book of the *Elevatio* written in the Heath convent of Medingen and dated to the second half of the fourteenth century, is dedicated to the enthroned, resurrected Christ:

[...]*also wert nv de koningh der ere kronet mit der konichliken kronen [...]*

Vnde sprank vt deme grauve alse en bloyende rose an den wunnen der suten gotheyt [...]. ('[...] and so is the king of glory crowned with kings’ crown [...] And springs out of the grave as a blossoming rose on the wounds of the sweet deity [...])

A similar emphasis on the glory of the resurrected Christ is found in a 1530 Middle Low German text of a prayer book from the convent of Medingen:

*Wan de leve got horet dat loff der hilgen clarenheit so secht he to der innigen sele also: ‘Resurrexi et adnec tecum sum’ – Ick bin upgestan van dem dode und hebbe wedder to mi genamen alle de clarcheit unde ere, de ik gehad hebbe van ambeginne der werlt. ‘Et adnec tecum sum’ – unde bin noch mi di... unde wil di kronen, darumme dat du underwilen mine bant drichst vei wesen in der ewi- gen froude. Denne scholtu wunderlick openbaren den enghelshen gheisten, wan ik di nen sterflicklen liecham wedder schippen wille, lick gebildet der clarcheit*

55 For example, Jacobus da Varagine speaks of the *Nativity* in the context of his discussion on Christ’s Resurrection (*The Golden Legend*, trans. and ed. by Granger Ryan, n. 215). The two themes, nativity and resurrection, appear side by side in several artworks, for example, in the early wall painting from Wienhausen, App. I.1.

56 Translation and emphasis by the author, based on the German as appears in Kaufhold, *Liederbuch*, pp. 168-171, no. 50, fols 37r-38r. I thank Robin Volkmar for the help in translation.

57 The song is transcribed in a collection of songs from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries by Wackernagel, *Das deutsche Kirchenlied*, vol. II, p. 924, no. 1152, and appeared in other sixteenth century songbooks (Kaufhold, *Liederbuch*, pp. 207-208, no. 50).

58 Translation and emphasis by the author. I thank Robin Volkmar for the help in translation. The text is taken from the Elevatior from Medingen, Trier, Diocesan archive, Ms. I, 528, fol. 45r, transcribed by Axel Mante. See *Ein niederdeutsches Gebetbuch*, ed. by Mante, pp. 56-57.

59 Berlin, Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Ms. germ. oct. 265 (Medingen BE 3), fols 90r-92r.
Re-living Resurrection in Medieval Saxony

These three texts focus on Christ enthroned rather than on Christ’s suffering, analogous to the visual art discussed above. The nuns either produced the texts themselves or, more frequently, copied them to the existing manuscripts, and the same can be said with regard to Easter plays as well. Although the vast collection of the Heath convents’ texts of Passion and Easter plays do not incorporate the scene of the resurrection as such, they do include other extra-biblical narratives which pivot around the act of Christ’s resurrection. For example, Ms. 36 from Wienhausen describes the dialogue between Christ as the gardener and Mary Magdalene (Hortulanus), which occurred, according to the tradition, immediately after Christ’s resurrection. Mary’s lines read: Sepulchrum Christi viventis et gloriam vidi resurgentis (‘I saw the sepulchre of the living Christ and the glory of the resurrection’).

The devotional texts cited above date between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries, the period during which the Wienhausen sculptural group served as an altar image. At that time, one of the most common and favoured compositions

---


62 Texts of Passion and Easter plays were extremely popular in German speaking areas (Linke, ‘A Survey’, p. 22), including the Lüneburg Heath and in the larger area of Old Saxony; this was especially true in regard of female monasteries (Lipphardt, ‘Die Visitatio sepulchri’, pp. 119-128). It is important to note that these lists of plays also include liturgical writings with dramatic elements which are not pure ‘plays’ (for example, the Elevatio from Medingen, mentioned in n. 57).

63 Emphasis by the author from fol. 5v in Wienhausen, KIA, Ms. 36 (previously Ms. D), from around 1400. Transcribed and cited in Mecham, ‘Sacred Vision’, pp. 140, 401-404, App. 1, tables A1 and A2. See also Bockmann, ‘Bemerkungen’, pp. 81-104. The scene is based on the biblical meeting between christ and Mary Magdalene just before the noli me tangere dialogue (John 20.15) and was extended and developed in dramatic texts, therefore is regarded as an extra biblical scene. Another extra-biblical scene is that of the Mercator (or unguentarius, describing the women who came to buy ointments for Christ’s body), which was highly prevalent in the writings of the Heath convents and also appeared in the visual art (Linke, ‘A Survey’, p. 23).
reproduced throughout the Heath convents was the new type of the resurrection image. The devotional images of the resurrection, on par with the dramatic or poetic liturgical texts, allowed the nuns to experience intimacy with Christ. The texts show that what started as a new iconographic scheme in the area of Hildesheim soon affected every aspect of devotional practices in the Old Saxon convents, both private and communal.

7  ‘I Saw the Sepulchre of the Living Christ and the Glory of the Resurrection’

The new type of the resurrection image is the theme of several single sheet vella from the Heath convents.64 A painted parchment, which along with dozens of other objects was found, in 1953, underneath the stalls of the Wienhausen nuns’ choir, had in all likelihood been created by a nun around 1300 or 1320, and retouched in the fifteenth century [Fig. 6].65 The nail holes which perforate it suggest that the parchment may have hung in a nun’s cell and been used for private devotion. The fact that it had to be retouched probably means that it had been continuously used as a devotional image. It was hidden underneath the stalls, possibly to prevent its destruction, which shows that it was treasured by the convent’s occupants.66 The parchment has been identified as a direct copy of the sculpture, providing further evidence to the original’s composition: Christ is shown crowned and flanked by admiring angels.67 The background of the resurrection scene contains numerous inscriptions. The text surrounding the figures is from the Easter hymn *Salve paschalis regnator*:68 Other inscriptions in the background are related to

---

64 Apart from the example discussed below, see also the following fourteenth and fifteenth century images found underneath the choir stalls today in Wienhausen, KLA: Appuhn/Heusinger, ‘Der Fund’, p. 189, no. 15; p. 187, no. 13; pp. 222-223, no. 76; pp. 194-195, no. 23. See also a miniature on a prayer folio from Ebstorf in Uhde-Stahl, ‘Drei Miniaturen’.

65 For further details and bibliography, see App. I.10.

66 Mecham, ‘Sacred Vision’, p. 198. Appuhn/Heusinger (‘Der Fund’, pp. 160-162) offer that the hidden objects had an apotropaic power so that the nuns’ choir’s stall can be seen as a sort of reliquary.


68 ‘*Salve paschalis regnator cuius miserations sunt super omnia opera tua praerpa nobis post solutionem temporis cernere te ut sit nobis gaudium angelorum uni regnas et gaude et imperas per potentiam resurrectiones et ubi convivium colitur dulcisimum festum eternitatis... Laus et gloria sit summe trinitati in dominice resurrectionis memoria... Amen*’. (‘All hail paschal sovereign, whose mercies stand above all your works, prepare for us that you will recognize us after the end of time, so that we will have the joy of angels, where you reign and you rejoice and you rule due to your power of resurrection and where a banquet is venerated as sweetest feast of eternity... Praise and glory to the highest trinity in memory of the lord’s resurrection... Amen’). Cited in: Zimmer, ‘Die Funktion’, p. 132, n. 321, kindly translated by Annika Hilleke and Mai-Britt Wiechmann. This is a rare text, which appears again in a manuscript from the convent of Medingen (Hannover, Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek., Ms. I 75, pp. 412-413). The manuscript also includes several miniatures of the resurrection (Appuhn/Heusinger, ‘Der Fund’, p. 186).
Eucharistic devotion and express a personal appeal to Christ.\(^{69}\) As in the texts cited above, these also contain a reference to Christ as a king, and to the glory of the resurrection. An inscription on a speech-roll in the resurrection depiction in the 1335 murals of Wienhausen nuns’ choir invokes Christ’s glory as well.\(^{70}\) The same attribute is designated at the centre of the Ebstorf world map, in a paraphrase of Isaiah 11.10: ‘and his rest shall be glorious’.

As shown by Caroline Walker Bynum, ‘glory’ was related to the resurrection both ‘theologically’ and ‘practically’.\(^{71}\) It was not only the glorified risen Lord that was wearing a crown; the nuns, who had crowned him, likewise were habited in nuns’ crowns and played the role of the heavenly brides.\(^{72}\) This type of female mysticism and devotional trends, and in particular the holy women’s role-playing at Easter, helped to promulgate the new type of the resurrection image in its Hildesheim form.

As an altar image, the resurrection sculptural group was located in the easternmost vault of the Wienhausen nuns’ choir, underneath the depiction of the heavenly Jerusalem [Fig. 7]. According to Horst Appuhn’s reconstruction, the altar image was surmounted by a canopy hung under that depiction, at the apex of the decoration programme showing the sacred events of Salvation History.\(^{73}\) As in the Ebstorf world map, the icon of Christ’s resurrection is placed at the centre of a hierarchic, cosmic order. In both examples, Christ’s resurrection is linked to his second coming as a king especially while, in the case of the sculpture, the nuns crowned him. The nuns were not passive spectators contemplating these images, but actually re-lived the resurrection together with their Lord – while their monastery transformed itself into the eternal Jerusalem.

\(^{69}\) Mecham, ‘Sacred Vision’, pp. 195-196. The connection to the Eucharist may derive from the sculptural group, which functioned as a container.

\(^{70}\) The depiction is found at the third bay from the west, top medallion of the western vault cell. At the top of the resurrection composition is the hand of God with a crossed nimbus emanating from clouds; the hand holds a speech roll with the inscription: EXVRGE•GL[ori]A•MEA (Awake up, my glory, from Psalm 57(56).8(9)). See Wittekind, ‘Passion’, pp. 168-169 with further bibliography.

\(^{71}\) Theologically, Clarheit or Claritas is one of the four gifts with which the immortal soul endows the resurrected body (Bynum, The Resurrection, p. 132). Practically, see Bynum, ‘Crowned’.

\(^{72}\) Kerstin Hengevoss-Dürkop, Skulptur, p. 161. Illustrations that the nuns made, those related to bridal mysticism and those depicting the resurrection, appear side by side, for instance in fol. 21r of the miniatures of the Wienhausen Responsorial, Wienhausen, Ms. 29, made in the last quarter of the fifteenth century (see Mecham, ‘Sacred Vision’, pp. 324-329).

\(^{73}\) Appuhn suggests that this wooden canopy was topped by a pelican feeding its young, as a nest has survived (Appuhn, ‘Der Auferstandene’, pp. 101, 104-105, fig. 84).
Appendices

Appendix I: Representations of the new type of the Resurrection image from the Heath Convents, dating to 1280-1300, in a chronological order

1) Wienhausen, Convent of Wienhausen, eastern wall of the upper-southern corridor, wall painting of Christ’s resurrection, c. 1280-90, h.: 220 cm.

This is one of the earliest wall paintings still preserved at the convent. It is located on the outer wall of the former choir (perhaps part of a lost chapel), next to a wall painting of the Nativity. Christ is shown en-face, stepping out of the opened sarcophagus with his right leg already out. The sarcophagus lid stands diagonally inside the sarcophagus next to Christ. There are two flanking bushes on each side. The hand of God is visible at the top right descending from a cloud, while two angels fly down from the top corners. Three sleeping guards, of which two wear ‘Jewish hats’, lie in front of the sarcophagus; Christ is nearly treading on them. Christ’s right hand is extended in a gesture of blessing, while his left holds a triumphal cross-staff and banner. He bears an indifferent expression.

Unusual in the depiction are the woundless, beardless, juvenile Christ; the two green bushes together with the hand of God descending from a cloud; and the location of the angels, flying down from the top corners.

Selected bibliography: Maier, Die Kunstdenkmale, pp. 83-84, no. 3, with further bibl.

2) Wienhausen, Convent of Wienhausen, inv. no. Wie Ac 1, a sculptural group of Christ’s resurrection (so-called Auferstehungschristus), frontal view, c. 1280-1300, oak tree, gilding and painting on gesso, inlaid with gems (some lost), total height: 106.5 cm; Christ: 95.5 × 36 × 34.5 cm; sarcophagus: 37 × 70.5 × 25.5 cm [Fig. 3].

Christ, represented en-face, steps out of the sealed sarcophagus by placing his right foot over its front wall, practically treading on the middle reclining guard, depicted in relief at the sarcophagus’ base. The other two guards are portrayed symmetrically on either side inside blind arches. One of them is holding a shield with a rampant lion – a coat of arms of the Duke of Lüneburg. Christ’s right hand is extended in a gesture of blessing, while his left holds a cross-staff and banner, of which only fragments have remained. Originally, the sculptural group also included the figures of two angels, positioned on the sarcophagus on either side of Christ.

Christ is dressed in a golden long-sleeved robe, open at the chest so as to reveal the side wound, and a long, voluminous red mantle. His face is noticeably young – round and with rosy cheeks, his facial expression is naïve, with a hint of a smile. All of Christ’s five wounds are visible and emphasised by being painted as large dark dots surrounded by wavy red or white lines, forming the shape of a sun or a flower. The centre of the side wound includes a hole, through which the spectator could peek at the inner space within the figure. According to the convent’s
chronicle it stood in place of the current altar in the nuns’ choir until the sixteenth century.

The original figure would have worn a crown, perhaps adorned with especially woven robes, and had several different banners, all mentioned in an inventory from the seventeenth century. Some heat damage indicates candles were burned near the image.


3) Wienhausen, Convent of Wienhausen, window of the eastern wall of the All-Saints’ Chapel (top part, right window), stained glass window of Christ’s resurrection, 1290-1300, 72 × 37 cm.

The stained glass window shows Christ stepping out from an opened sarcophagus with the left foot. He is shown en-face, treading on a shield of one of the sleeping guards (preserved are two of the original three). His right hand is extended in a gesture of blessing, the other holds a cross-staff and banner. He appears mature and cheerful. His belly and chest are bare and his wounds are visible. The scene takes place against a blue background and a green grass is shown at the foreground.

Some parts belong to a nineteenth century rearrangement: large parts of the background, the lower part of the flag staff, most parts of the sarcophagus and of the left guard, the entire right guard, and parts of the ground.

Recently, Siart offered that the window decoration dates to around 1340. While his offer regarding the murals of the chapel is convincing, his dating of the windows is unjustified.

Selected bibliography: Siart, Kreuzgänge, pp. 31-37; Maier, Die Kunstdenkmale, p. 103, no. II.1.4, with further bibl.

4) Ebstorf, Convent’s Museum, inv. No. EBS Ea 9, small corporal box with a depiction of Christ’s resurrection, mid thirteenth century or first quarter of fourteenth century, gilded silver relief, 8.5 × 21.5 × 21.5 cm.

The corporal box includes reliefs and inlaid jewellery. The central depiction shows the Crucified. In each corner is a medallion with a scene (from the top left): annunciation to Mary, nativity, flagellation, and resurrection.

In the resurrection scene Christ is depicted stepping out of the sarcophagus with his right foot, holding a cross-staff and banner with his right hand while the other holds the lid which stands diagonally in the opened sarcophagus. He treads on a decorating frame in which three small sleeping guards lay.

Selected bibliography: Die Inschriften, ed. by Wehking, no. 4, with further bibl.
5) Lüneburg, Museum des Fürstentums Lüneburg, inv. no. R.60, a sculpture of the World Judge (*Salvator mundi*) or the resurrecting Christ from Lüne, 1290-1300, coloured oak wood, 88.5 × 28 × 12.5 cm.

This sculpture shows a different type of the Risen Lord, perhaps closer to the depiction of the ascending Christ or of *le beau Dieu*. Christ is shown standing in a long robe hanging straight down to the floor. Both arms had been broken. The right was replaced by the museum and is now raised in blessing. The left perhaps held a cross-staff and banner. Christ stands upon a base on which a later inscription (probably from the seventeenth century) reads: ‘SALVATOR MU[N]DI’.

Christ’s side wound is cut deep on the chest through an opening in the robe. The limb wounds were probably also indicated by painting, but most of the colour had worn off.


6) The Ebstorf world map (now lost), 1300?, painting on parchment, 3.56 × 3.58 m, original burned in 1943, copies are kept in the Convent of Ebstorf, in Lüneburg Museum, and in the Landschaftsmuseum of Kulmbach.

The now-lost Ebstorf world map was drawn on a rectangular surface created by 30 attached vella. Around the *orbis terrarum* and between the continents of Europe, Asia and Africa are more than 1200 inscriptions in Latin. The map’s date of origin is disputed. It was probably made around 1300 in the area of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, which was dominated by the Guelfs.

Jerusalem features the centre of the world – *umbilicus mundi*, and is shown as a rectangular golden-walled city, within which Christ is portrayed rising from a sarcophagus. It is rotated ninety degrees clockwise, so that the image of the risen Christ within it is turned towards the upper part of the map. The risen Christ is shown with one foot outside a rectangular sarcophagus, his left hand holding a cross-staff and a banner, while his right hand making a gesture of blessing. He is clothed in a robe and a mantle, and bears a halo. Below him are two sleeping guards, considerably smaller in scale, wearing pointed hats and holding armour. While rising out of the tomb, Christ is almost stepping on the guards. An inscription next to the image reads: *Sepulchrum D[omi]ni glo[rio]sum teste Ysaia*.

Selected bibliography: *Die Ebstorfer Weltkarte*, ed. by Kugler/Glauch/Willing, with further bibliography.

7) Lüne, Convent’s Museum, Lenten veil with scenes from Christ’s passion and resurrection, c. 1300, linen threads on linen, 113 × 383 cm.

The Lenten veil consists of two embroidered decorative bands. The upper scenes from Christ’s passion and resurrection. The resurrection appears between the Harrowing of Hell and the Entombment. It shows Christ sitting on the sealed sarcophagus, his left foot extended on the tomb while the right is rested on the ground. Christ holds a cross-staff and banner in his right hand and makes a gesture
to the side with his left. His gaze and two arms are tilted to the right. His wounds
are invisible. The sarcophagus is decorated with small arches. No other figures are
included. An inscription Resurrexio Domini appears on the left.

Selected bibliography: Kroos, *Niedersächsische Bildstickereien*, pp. 61, 144-145, cat.
no. 91.

8) An antependium (now lost) of the former high altar of the Convent of Lüne,
c. 1300, 100 × 250 cm, lost in 1946 in Berlin.

The antependium was lost during the Cold War. It included a central depiction
of the trinity between the evangelists’ symbols, and eight scenes from Christ’s life,
Passion and resurrection inside architectural frames. The scene of the resurrection
appeared on the right side. It showed Christ stepping out of an open sarcophagus
with his left foot. He was holding a cross-staff and banner in his left hand and was
blessing with the other. Guards sat on both sides of the sarcophagus holding lanc-
es. Due to its loss, further details are unknown.

Selected bibliography: Kroos, *Niedersächsische Bildstickereien*, p. 75.

9) Hannover, Kestner Museum, inv. no. W M XXII 19, Lenten veil with scenes
from Christ’s passion and resurrection from the Convent of Lüne, 1300-10, white
embroidery on linen, 115 × 660 cm.

The Lenten veil consists of a series of seven scenes, of which the resurrection
is the third from the left. It shows Christ sitting on the sealed sarcophagus, his
right foot extended on top of the tomb while the left is down on the ground. He
holds a cross-staff and banner in his left hand and blesses with the other. Both
arms and gaze are tilted to the left. He smiles a gentle smile and his wounds are
invisible. The sarcophagus is decorated with small arches and geometrical patterns.
No other figures are included.

no. 42.

10) Wienhausen, Convent’s Museum, inv. no. KIA, Wie Ke 7, a devotional image
of Christ’s resurrection, 1300-1320, 27.5 × 19.5 cm.

The painted parchment, which along with dozens of other objects was found,
in 1953, underneath the stalls of the Wienhausen nuns’ choir, had in all likelihood
been created by a nun around 1300 or 1320, and retouched in the fifteenth century.

The parchment has been identified as a direct copy of the sculptural group de-
scribed above (no. 2), providing further evidence to the original’s composition:
Christ is shown crowned, holding a triumphal cross-staff and banner and flanked
by admiring angels. The background of the resurrection scene contains numerous
inscriptions relating to Easter and to Eucharistic devotion.

Christ is stepping out of the open sarcophagus with his right foot. He is de-
picted *en-face*, flanked by angels playing instruments and admiring Christ. His right
hand is extended in a gesture of blessing, while his left holds a triumphal cross-
staff and banner. His face is young and cheerful. His wounds are visible and em-
phasised, with the side wound in a diamond shape. Three guards are painted inside
the arches of the sarcophagus (repainted at the sixteenth century).


11) Lüne, Convent’s Museum, altar cover with scenes from Christ’s life, Passion
and resurrection, 1300-1325, linen threads on linen, 112 × 323 cm.

The altar cover is divided into three vertical sections. In the central section are
six scenes with inscriptions, each framed by the architectural frame. The two outer
sections contain each four quatrefoil frames with a triumphing Lamb of God. The
tapestry frame includes geometrical decoration and the coats of arms of Lower
Saxon families, some of which have been cut off. An inscription of an Easter song
is embroidered in between the three sections.

The resurrection scene is the last of six scenes, located at the bottom right.
Christ, wearing a long mantle, is shown stepping out of an open sarcophagus with
his left foot. His right hand is extended in a gesture of blessing, while his left holds
a triumphal cross-staff and banner. He is treading on the shield of a sleeping guard.
Two other guards lay awake on either side of the sarcophagus. Two angels, holding
liturgical vessels, stand asymmetrically on either side of Christ. His wounds are
invisible.

Selected bibliography: Kroos, Niedersächsische Bildstickereien, pp. 60, 14, cat. no.
90, 4.
Appendix II: Visual and textual evidence for sculptural representations of the new type of the Resurrection image, fourteenth till sixteenth century, in a chronological order

2.1 Visual Evidence

2.1.a Monumental Representations

1) Liège, Museum of Liège, Tympanum of St. Croix, 1330-1350, carved stone, 128 × 165 cm.

Christ, between two censing angels, is stepping out of a sarcophagus with his right foot on a sleeping guard. Two other guards are located on either side. Christ is blessing with his right hand, and used to hold a cross staff, now missing, with the other. The composition is strictly symmetrical. The figures, especially Christ, are depicted in a gentle realistic style, the drapery is rich and the bare upper body is depicted with a high anatomical precision. Slight dents are carved in the stone for the wounds.

Selected bibliography: Schiller, ‘Der Aufstieg Christi’, p. 77, fig. 216.

2) Gotland, southern portal of a Church in Stånga, fourteenth century, stone relief.

This is a highly compact representation of the resurrection. Christ is depicted en-face, stepping out of the sarcophagus with his right foot, blessing with his right hand and holding a cross-staff and banner with his left. His upper body is exposed, but no wounds are visible. Three small sleeping guards can be seen below, leaning on the sarcophagus wall.


2.1.b Small-Scale Representations

3) Ebstorf, Convent’s Museum, a sculptural group of Christ’s resurrection, c. 1330, painted oak wood, h.: 34 cm.

Christ is stepping out of a sealed sarcophagus with his right foot, depicted with a strong sense of movement: His head is tilted sideways, his arms are positioned asymmetrically and his red mantle is windblown. Christ’s right forearm is missing, and so is the banner which was probably held by the left hand. The side wound is

---

74 Here I refer to works representing the new type of iconography only. Therefore representations of the type of the Lüne sculpture [App. I.5] were omitted, except for the special case of Rostock [App. II.4], which is close to the Wihenhausen group in many details. Other examples can be found in the studies of Krause, “Imago ascensionis”, pp. 280-353, Taubert/Taubert, ‘Mittelelterliche Kruzifikre’, pp. 38-50 and Tripps, *Bildwerk*. This is also the reason why reliefs from Easter sepulchers such as the ones presented by Sekules were omitted. See Sekules, ‘The Tomb of Christ’, pp. 118-131.

In order for the study to not be exhausting I won’t be referring to representations of the new type of the resurrection image when these are part of a cycle, as in altar images (for examples see *Corpus der mittelalterlichen Holzskulptur*, ed. by Albrecht, vol I, p. 114, no. 26; p. 190-195, no. 62).
shown through an opening in Christ’s robe. His face is mature and he has rosy cheeks. Two somewhat contorted sleeping guards are leaning on the frontal sarcophagus wall.


4) Schwerin, Staatliches Museum, inv. no. Pl. 30, a sculptural group of Christ’s resurrection from the Cistercian Convent of the Holy Cross in Rostock, beginning of the fifteenth century, painted oak wood, 31.2 × 25.4 × 7 cm.

Christ is shown standing with both feet on the top of an open sarcophagus. He was flanked by two angels, of whom only one has remained. Four guards, of whom only one still exists, used to lean on the sarcophagus wall, clothed with tunics. Broken are the right foot of Christ, the wing and left hand of the angel. Christ’s wounds, especially the side wound, are highlighted. Christ is blessing with his right hand and used to hold a cross staff in his left; the hole for it can still be found in the sarcophagus, as well as the pins for the rest of the figures. All figures could be removed. The sculpture is attributed to the workshop of Henning Leptzow in Wismar.


5) Reims, Palais du Tau, a reliquary from the Church of Notre-Dame de Reims, second half of the fifteenth century, gilded and painted silver, h.: 25 cm.

Christ is stepping out of the sarcophagus with his right leg. He is wearing a golden robe and a red mantle which uncovers his upper body. No wounds are visible. He used to hold a staff in his left hand, probably topped by a cross and banner. He is blessing with the right hand. The sarcophagus is highly decorated and includes small gothic arches peopled by small figures. On it lean two guards on either side, while a third is lying on the floor in front of it. The base of the sarcophagus was used as a reliquary.


6) Bruges, Jerusalem Church Treasury, a reliquary, 1491-1510, embossed and chased silver, 23.5 × 22 cm.

Christ is stepping out of the open sarcophagus with his right foot. He holds a staff and banner in his left hand and blesses with his right. The wounds are marked in the silver relief. The two flanking angels are holding the edge of the sarcophagus lid. The base of the sarcophagus was used as the reliquary for Holy Land relics. No guards are present.


7) Wienhausen, KIA, a small figurine of an angel, probably part of a small sculptural resurrection group, fifteenth or sixteenth century, painted linden wood, h.: 5.1 cm.
The angel, carved somewhat schematically, makes a gesture of admiration with both hands. He wears a long white robe and a red mantle. The assumption it was a part of a resurrection group relies on comparisons, especially to the case of Rostock.


2.2 Textual Evidence

8) An image of the resurrection from the Benedictine Monastery of Prüfening, near Regensburg, fifteenth century

The monastery’s Ordo from 1489 (fols 73v-74v) tells of imaginem dominici resurrectionis. The text directs the clergymen to place the image in the ‘Sepulchre of the Lord’. There’s no further description of the image.

Selected bibliography: Rubrica seu Breviarius de divinis officiis secundum ritum chori monasterii S. Georgii in Prüfening ordinis S. Benedicti Ratisbonensis dioecesis, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 12018, fols 64v, 65v, 66v-67v, 73v-74v; Taubert/Taubert, ‘Mittelalterliche Kruzifixe’, p. 96.

9) An image (and a reliquary) of the resurrection from the Cathedral of Halle, sixteenth century.

Two documents mention a silver image of the resurrection, belonging to the church in Halle in the sixteenth century. The chart of the 1526 relics’ collection of Cardinal Albert of Brandenburg (fol. 122r of the Hallesches Heiltum) includes a description of Eyn silbern aufferstehung mit einem vbergluten grabe, which held several Holy Land relics, including 28 particles of the Holy Cross and a Thorn from the Crown of Thorns. The later Ordo of Halle from 1532 (fol. 97v) tells of argentea maior imago resurrectionis… Interim argentea maior imago resurrectionis cum vexillo suo. Thus the image of the resurrection from Halle was made of silver and held a cross-staff. The relics were probably kept in the gilded sarcophagus or at the base, as the case in Bruges or Reims. The dimensions would have been similar or larger, judging by the amount of relics mentioned.

Selected bibliography: Hallesches Heiltum, Aschaffenburg, Hofbibliothek, MS 14; Breviarius glorioso et prestantissime ecclesie collegiate sanctorum Mauritij at Marie Magdalene Hallis ad sudarum domini 1532, Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Ms. lit. 119 (Ed. VI, 3); Bösch, ‘Kleinodien’, Appendix, pp. 101-102.

10) An image of the resurrection from the Durham Cathedral, sixteenth century.

The Ordo of Durham from 1593, preserved in later manuscripts, tells of a marvelous beautifull Image of our saniour representinge the resurrection. The image of the resurrection from Durham had a hole in the breast for the Holy Sacrament, enclosed with transparent crystal and it held a cross.

Fig. 1: Ebstorf, Convent. A reproduction of the (now-lost) Ebstorf world map, c. 1300 (photo: Wolfgang Brandis © Kloster Ebstorf).

Fig. 2: Ebstorf, Convent. A reproduction of the (now-lost) Ebstorf world map. Detail, rotated view, Christ’s resurrection, c. 1300 (photo: Wolfgang Brandis © Kloster Ebstorf).
Fig. 1: Ebstorf, Convent. A reproduction of the (now-lost) Ebstorf World Map, c. 1300 (photo: Wolfgang Brandis © Kloster Ebstorf).

Fig. 2: Ebstorf, Convent. A reproduction of the (now-lost) Ebstorf World Map. Detail, rotated view, Christ's Resurrection, c. 1300 (photo: Wolfgang Brandis; © Kloster Ebstorf).

Fig. 3: Wienhausen, Convent, inv. no. Wie Ac 1. A sculptural group of the Christ's resurrection (so-called Auferstehungschristus), frontal view, c. 1260-1300 (photo © Kloster Wienhausen).

Fig. 4: Hildesheim, Cathedral Treasury, Ms. 37, fol. 75v. Detail of Christ's resurrection inside minuscule d, 1159 (photo: Lutz Engelhardt; © Hildesheim Cathedral Museum).
Fig. 5: Berlin, Kunstgewerbemuseum, inv. no. 88.470. Fragment of a wall hanging from Halberstadt, 1160-1170 (photo: Hans-Joachim Bartsch; © bpk/Kunstgewerbemuseum, SMB).

Fig. 6: Wienhausen, Convent, inv. no. KIA, Wie KC 7. Miniature of Christ’s resurrection, 1300-1320 (photo © Kloster Wienhausen).
Fig. 7: Wienhausen, Convent, Nuns' choir. Detail of the easternmost vault showing the heavenly Jerusalem, 1335 (photo © Kloster Wienhausen).
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The Endowment and Patronage of the Cistercian Houses of Marienfeld and Saint Aegidii in Münster
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Abstract

Numerous Cistercian monasteries were founded in Germany during the thirteenth century. Research has usually focused on the male communities, because only these were integrated into the Order of Cîteaux. How and why did male and female Cistercian houses develop under these institutional conditions? What impact did the third crusade and the Baltic missionary have on their foundation and later development? This article is dedicated to this pivotal question of Cistercian monasticism, based on one male and one female community from Northern Germany both of which were established contemporarily by the same group of founders in the Diocese of Münster. As in a lab experiment, this allows different developments and their causes to be highlighted and examined. A complete edition of the female convent’s founding charter is presented together with the article.

* Katharina Knesia is a M.A. student of history at Georg-August-University Göttingen. She graduated with a B.A. in History and Religious Studies. This paper was developed from her B.A. thesis, submitted in October 2016.
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1 Introduction
The Westphalian monasteries of Marienfeld\(^1\) and Saint Aegidii (Saint Giles)\(^2\) were both founded in the Diocese of Münster in the late twelfth century, in a monastic landscape dominated by female convents and communities of canonesses.\(^3\) The monastery of Marienfeld, founded in 1184, was to remain the diocese’s only male Cistercian house until 1256; subsequently, the female Cistercian convents in Münster (Saint Aegidii), Marienborn, and Vinnenberg were established.\(^4\) The male monastery of Marienfeld was fully integrated into the Cistercian Order. Initially at least, the nuns of Saint Aegidii ordered their lives based on the Cistercian *Carta caritatis*. In both foundations, members of the family of Wöltingerode-Wohldenberg were involved as founders.\(^5\) Starting from the similar basic situations in both cases, this article will present a comparative analysis of the further development of one male and one female Cistercian community from the order’s early period. In addition, the causes for the different development of both monastic houses will be investigated. For the Cistercian house of Marienfeld it will also be necessary to examine the role the founders played in the third crusade as well as the impact the Baltic missionary had on Marienfeld.

In both cases, extant charters facilitate a fairly clear reconstruction of the founding processes and reveal underlying intentions, the endowments, as well as the connections between the founders and the two communities. Research has commonly interpreted rural Marienfeld as a so-called *Sühnestiftung* – a monastery founded as a means of compensation for transgressions on the part of the founder or founders. Due to its topographical situation and its attachment to the parish church, Saint Aegidii’s history, then again, is closely intertwined with the urban development of Münster.

---


\(^5\) Cf. Petke, *Die Grafen*. 
2 The Male Monastery of Marienfeld

2.1 Marienfeld’s Founding Charter

A charter by Bishop Hermann II of Münster (in office 1174-1203), dating from 1185, constitutes the earliest evidence of the community in Marienfeld. In this charter, the bishop describes and sanctions the monastery’s foundation and endowment. The charter further shows that Widukind of Rheda and his mother provided donations of property for the foundation of a monastery. The narratio reveals that the donated property had been exchanged for land owned by the community of canonesses at Freckenhorst. Thus, they had gained possession of Huttingen, on the small Lutterbach River, which they intended to give to the new monastery. They first kept this intended exchange of property secret: in mentis secre-tario retinentes quid inde proponerent. Rumours of their intentions, however, reached Count Bernhard II zur Lippe and Count Ludiger II of Wöltingerode, who are said to have been so impressed that they acquired two thirds of the property in question, and thus became co-heirs. Subsequently, the three owners approached the bishop and begged permission to found a monastery in a suitable location. Hermann II acquiesced and consecrated the location, upon which the construction of the monastery began. The charter’s dispositio further states that the founders provided additional property and rights of patronage for proprietary churches, which they had acquired by purchases and exchanges. The Diocese of Münster also contributed to the monastery’s endowment. Thus, Hermann II appropriated the church in Harsewinkel to the monastery. The dispositio names further benefactors: Widukind of Schwalenberg and his three brothers gave the church and estate at Stapelage, witnessed by six noblemen. The dispositio closes with a reference to additional endowments. Bishop Hermann II took the monastery under his protection, while granting the monks the privilege of freely electing their provost, and exempting them from all levies. Thus, he acknowledged the exemption from tithes that Pope Innocent II had granted to the Cistercian Order in 1132. The 1185 charter also stipulates that the monks were expected to live in accordance with the rules of the Cistercian Order. Twenty-three witnesses are named, among them

---

6 Regesta Historiae Westfaliae, no. 451. The original charter is extant but incomplete; a longer passage was cut from the central part. The edition in the Westfälisches Urkundenbuch adds the missing parts, based on the transcript in Marienfeld’s cartulary which was begun c. 1215 and continued to 1383. Landesarchiv Nordrhein-Westfalen, Nichtstaatliches Schriftgut, Archivische Sammlungen, Manu-skripte Msc. VII no. 1236: Kopiar des Klosters Marienfeld.
7 Regesta Historiae Westfaliae, no. 451.
8 Ibid.
9 Among the witnesses were Widukind of Rheda and Bernhard II zur Lippe but not Ludiger II of Wöltingerode. Thus, one might question, whether Ludiger was personally present in Marienfeld or Münster.
10 The privilege relating to tithes was granted to the Cistercian Order by Pope Innocent II on 10 February 1132, in his bull Habitantes in domo (J-L. 7537). Cf. Brem/Altermatt, Einmütig, pp. 239-242.
clergy of the Diocese of Münster and high-ranking laymen. Also present were the entire cathedral chapter and 'many others more'.

2.2 Persons and Networks

The charter’s narratio and dispositio show that several people were involved in the foundation of the male monastery in Marienfeld. Together, they formed a social and political network. Widukind of Rheda and his mother Luttrudis appear to have initialized Marienfeld’s foundation, assisted by Count Bernhard II zur Lippe, Count Ludiger II of Wöltingerode and Bishop Hermann II of Münster.11 As the confirmation issued by Innocent II in 1198 shows, Widukind and his mother were moved to give their property to the monastery in order to safeguard their immortal souls.12 Later, Widukind of Rheda was indeed laid to rest in Marienfeld.13

The charter does not provide any insights into the motives that caused Bernhard II zur Lippe and Ludiger of Wöltingerode to participate in the foundation, while Bishop Hermann II is said to have had the good care of his diocese in mind.

Upon closer examination of the involved people, one notices that they all belong to a wider group of relatives [see App. II] who acted together in contemporary politics. All people involved in the foundation and endowment of Marienfeld belonged to the supporters of Duke Henry the Lion in the time before his fall in 1180.14

On his mother’s side, Widukind of Rheda (in office 1169-1189/1191) descended from the family of the counts of Schwalenberg, his father Everin was provost of Freckenhorst. Everin himself is first mentioned as provost of Freckenhorst in 1169.15 From 1170 on, he was associated with the sobriquet of Rheda.16

Succeeding the death of his older brother, Bernhard II zur Lippe (in office 1167-1196) received a secular education at the court of Henry the Lion. The family zur Lippe based their power on provostships.17 Bernhard II zur Lippe was related to Widukind of Rheda, via the latter’s mother Luttrudis and his own father Hermann I: Hermann I zur Lippe was Luttrudis’ brother-in-law.18 In a charter dating from 1221, Bernhard II zur Lippe identifies Widukind of Rheda as his cognatus.19

11 Different in Wolf, ‘Kontroversen’, p. 13. Wolf only identifies Widukind of Rheda as the founder of Marienfeld.
12 Regesta pontificum Romanorum, ed. by Potthast, no. 132 (Mai 4, 1198). There is a transcript from Marienfeld’s cartulary in Westfälisches Urkundenbuch, no. 569.
15 Regesta Historiae Westfaliae, no. 342.
16 Ibid., no. 345.
19 Westfälisches Urkundenbuch, no. 167.
Ludiger II of Wöltingerode, called of Wohldenberg as of 1195, first appears in charters in 1178. Bernhard II zur Lippe was the brother of Guta, probably Ludiger’s mother. He acted as provost for minor rural parish churches.\(^{20}\)

Widukind of Rheda and Bernhard II zur Lippe were followers of Henry the Lion, the only ones remaining west of the river Weser after 1178. In October 1179, Widukind of Rheda joined the campaign against Soest that was led by Bernhard II. zur Lippe. The town of Soest was a stronghold of Philipp of Heinsberg in Westphalia, Archbishop of Cologne and enemy of Henry the Lion. While Widukind of Rheda and Bernhard II zur Lippe failed to conquer the town, they laid waste to the surrounding area and captured the smaller town of Medebach. Having been driven away by the Archbishop, Widukind and Bernhard found refuge with Henry the Lion.\(^{21}\)

After the downfall of Henry the Lion in 1180, Widukind of Rheda found himself in political isolation. It is unclear whether he provided compensation for the damages his actions had caused, or whether he was punished.\(^{22}\) It has been proposed repeatedly that his involvement with the Marienfeld project may have been a Sühnestiftung.\(^{23}\) Foundations of this type did indeed occur in the network of Marienfeld’s founders. In 1128, the grandparents of Widukind of Rheda, Widukind I of Schwalenberg and his wife Luttrudis, founded the monastery Marienmünster, in the Diocese of Paderborn, as a means of expiation. As in the case of Marienfeld, it was the bishop’s initiative that led to the foundation.\(^{24}\)

Widukind, however, is likely to also have had religious interests in mind when he founded Marienfeld. His religious conviction is evidenced by the fact that he accompanied Emperor Frederick II on the crusade, during which both died in 1190. Widukind’s body, as opposed to Frederick’s, was probably brought back to his home where it was entombed at the monastery of Marienfeld.\(^{25}\) This joining of the crusade to the Holy Land is an indication for the special relationship he had with Bishop Hermann II, since Hermann played a big part in the diplomatic preparation for the crusade and none of the other founders participated.\(^{26}\) Before he

---


\(^{21}\) Cf. Weinfurter, ‘Die Entmachtung’.


\(^{23}\) This kind of atonement was seen as a legally respected means for the resolution of conflicts. It facilitated reconciliation between the parties of a conflict and was recognised by superior authorities. It also provided the offending party with a return to society. Cf. Sellert, ‘Sühne, Sühneverträge’. Differently interprets Wolf the foundation of Marienfeld. Cf. Wolf, ‘Kontroversen’, pp. 13-14.

\(^{24}\) In addition to Paderborn’s bishop Bernhard I of Oesede, Hermann I zur Lippe, father of Bernhard II. zur Lippe, was also involved in this Sühnestiftung. Cf. Kindl, ‘Die Gründung’, pp. 9-11.

\(^{25}\) Two tombs attest to this. Cf. *Die Bau- und Kunstdenkmäler von Westfalen*, ill. 382 and 383. In addition, Marienfeld’s chronicle also mentions a tomb in a nook, located at the entrance of the chapter-house, that was reserved for Widukind of Rheda and his parents. Cf. *Chronicon Campi S. Marie*, ed. by Zurbonsen, p. 21.

\(^{26}\) Hermann II, together with four other noblemen, was assigned by Frederick Barbarossa to travel to Byzantium as a validation for the treaty Barbarossa and Byzantium concluded during the assembly held in Nuremberg in 1189. But Widukind is not found in the entourage Hermann II took to Byzant-
embarked on the crusade, Widukind and his mother had given all of their property to the monastery of Marienfeld. Widukind intended to enter the monastery himself, after his return from the crusade.  

Widukind’s marriage with Matilda of Rickingen had remained without children, and thus Bernhard II zur Lippe assumed the lordship of Rheda. This lordship consisted of certain judicial responsibilities (the Freigericht), Rheda Castle, and the provostships of the religious communities of Freckenhorst, Liesborn and Marienfeld.

After the fall of Henry the Lion, Bernhard II zur Lippe appears to have followed his lord into exile in England. Only in 1183, he appears once more on the sources, when he attends Frederick Barbarossa’s assembly in Mainz, where he receives permission to found a town at the site of his castle on the river Lippe. He transferred the town to the Hochstift of Cologne as a fiefdom, maybe as a means of compensation for grievances of the Archbishop. In 1195 or 1196, Bernhard II also left secular life and entered the monastery of Marienfeld as a monk. There, he would later be venerated as a saint. His cult, however, never spread beyond Marienfeld.

Such conversions from secular to monastic life, as those of Widukind of Rheda and Bernhard II zur Lippe, were common among the nobility of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. To men with military training and experience who were in the later stages of their lives, the formal separation from their wives, the entry into a monastery, and the establishment of a Sühnestiftung provided an opportunity to leave the secular world and make preparations for the afterlife.

tium. All noblemen of Munster, that joined the crusade, did not travel with the bishop. Cf. Stehkämper, ‘Die reichspolitische Tätigkeit’, pp. 32-33.

27 Regesta Historiae Westfaliae, no. 496: ‘Ecce enim quidam vir nobilis advocatus de Rethe Widekindus et mater eius deuota Luttrudis gratia spiritus sancti diuinitus inspirati partier obtulerunt monasterio campi sancta Marie uniussea quecumque proprietatis iure possederant […]’.  


30 The charter for the town’s foundation is not extant, another one, dating from c. 1220, is. It deals with the town’s rights and contains the following statement by Bernhard II zur Lippe: ‘quod cum ego Bernardus de Lippia, imperatore majestate favente, in bonis proprietate michi cedentibus civitatem novellam plantarem [...]’, Westfälisches Urkundenbuch, no. 546. Records of Magister Justinus from Lippstadt, dating from c. 1247, associate the town’s foundation with the Hoftag in Mainz, cf. Justinus (Lippiensis), Das Lippiflorium, ed. by Althoff, verses 423-428.  


32 Bernhard II zur Lippe saw himself as a sinner, after he had become lame as a result of an illness. He promised to become a monk if he should be healed. Cf. Justinus (Lippiensis), Das Lippiflorium, ed. by Althoff, verses 629-640.  

33 See the so-called Lippiflorium, an epic poem, composed before 1250, which provides a stylised hagiographical biography of Bernhard. Cf. Pätzold, ‘Alteruta fides’. The necrology calls him beatus Bernardus de Lippia episcopus Selonensis, cf. Ledebur, ‘Necrologium Marienfeldense’.  


Extant sources do not provide any certain indication on what motives had caused Ludiger of Wöltingerode-Wohldenberg to undertake the foundation. After 1181, his area of influence was limited to the area of the Harz Mountains, west of the river Oker. After the fall of Henry the Lion, he did not manage to re-establish his political standing. Expiation as well as piety may have been reasons for his commitment to the Cistercians. The Benedictine monastery that had been founded at the castle of Wöltingerode in 1174 was converted into a female Cistercian convent. It was to become one of Northern Germany’s most important Cistercian houses. Ludiger seems to have contributed his allodium to the community’s endowment.

Hermann II of Katzenelnbogen’s involvement in Marienfeld's foundation was apparently greater than the charter shows. According to Leidinger, Marienfeld was not founded in one single action but rather as the result of a longer phase of planning, agreements and negotiations that involved several persons and institutions. At least, this is the impression given by a charter issued by Hermann II in 1185. He seems to have been the foundation’s actual initiator. It is possible that he attempted to find a way for the followers of banished Duke Henry to reconcile with the Empire and the Emperor. Wilhelm Kohl was not convinced by Paul Leidinger’s interpretation of Hermann II’s motivation for founding Marienfeld as resting on political considerations.

Preparations for the foundation of Marienfeld began around 1182, simultaneously with the attempts at reconciliation between Henry the Lion and his enemies in Westphalia.

Together with Widukind of Rheda, Hermann II took part in the assembly in Mainz on May twentieth, 1183, where they met Bernhard zur Lippe. Presumably, the Bishop of Münster intervened on their behalf with the emperor. On his journey back from Mainz, the bishop visited the Cistercian monastery in Hardehausen, where concrete negotiations on a possible foundation of a Cistercian community in the Diocese of Münster may have taken place already. Marienfeld was later established as a daughter house of Hardehausen.

It is not clear whether Hermann II, who had initiated the foundation of Marienfeld, also chose the site for the monastery. Widukind of Rheda did not hold possessions there, and only acquired those plots of land he later donated to the community in property exchanges.

---

41 Kohl, *Marienfeld*, p. 88 disproves Leidinger’s hypothesis convincingly.
In my opinion, an act of recompense can only be identified as the primary reason behind the donations to Marienfeld in the cases of Widukind of Rheda, Bernhard II zur Lippe, and Ludiger of Wöltingerode-Wohldenberg. Hermann II of Katzenelnbogen most likely had other aims. Presumably, he was more interested in facilitating the first foundation of a monastery belonging to the reform order of the Cistercians in his diocese, be it for religious or political reasons. Even if the two founders Widukind of Rheda and Bernhard II zur Lippe had been obliged to undertake an act of expiation, their commitment also was also connected with religious considerations, since both planned to enter the monastery of Marienfeld as monks. Only Bernhard, however, would fulfil this ambition, while Widukind of Rheda lost his life on the crusade. From a medieval perspective, of course, this meant that he improved his prospects for the afterlife, even compared to life in a monastery.

2.3 Endowment, Privileges and Relation with the Cistercian Order

The 1185 charter shows that the settlement of Hundingen on the Lutterbach River, a tributary of the Ems, had been chosen as the site for the monastery of Marienfeld. Widukind of Rheda and his mother exchanged some of their holdings in order to acquire suitable land for the project. The existence of the so-called Wadenhart Chapel at the site may have been one reason it was picked as the monastery’s location. Thus, the site fulfilled the order’s requirement that monasteries be erected in direct proximity to an existing church or chapel, so that divine service could commence immediately. Bishop Werner of Münster transferred the chapel to the Benedictine monastery of Liesborn in 1134. Due to its remoteness and low financial yields, Liesborn had not incorporated it before 1185. Bishop Hermann II of Münster dissolved the parish in 1185 and incorporated the chapel into the cenobio de campo sancte Marie. In addition, further farms surrounding Wadenhart were transferred to the monastery. Consequently, Marienfeld was founded in an area that was already inhabited and cultivated. It was situated on the road from Warendorf to Paderborn and Gütersloh. Accordingly, the reclamation of uncultivated land for agricultural purposes, although seen as one of the main activities of Cistercian houses, did not play any role for the monks and lay brothers of Marienfeld.

Bernhard II zur Lippe’s contribution to the endowment was not limited to the acquisition of a share of the land: Even before the monastic buildings had been completed, he also provided holdings from his personal property and exchanged

---

45 Cf. Kohl, Marienfeld, p. 87.
46 Les plus anciens textes de Cîteaux, ed. by Bouton/Van Damme, p. 121. This requirement is taken from the so-called Summa Carta Caritatis, dating from 1124.
47 Regesta Historiae Westfaliae, no. 462, l. 6-7.
48 Ibid., no. 462; the monks of Marienfeld used this chapel as an oratory until the abbey church’s completion in 1222 (Cf. Kohl, Marienfeld, p. 90).
49 Cf. Kohl, Marienfeld, p. 90.
more land for other plots south of Marienfeld. Furthermore, he gave the tithes from two houses in Honlo, which Sweather of Oelde had transferred to the Diocese of Münster. Hermann II, in turn, gave these tithes to Marienfeld. While it is not clear whether he also contributed anything from his personal property, Hermann II also provided holdings from his episcopal possessions.

In addition to the actual circle of donors, the charter also names Widukind III of Schwalenberg and his brothers Hermann, Volkwin and Henry. They did not have any heirs, and thus contributed the church and farm of Stapelage, as the 1185 charter tells. Another charter, issued by Archbishop Adolf I of Cologne in 1194, provides a different view, however. Supposedly, Widukind of Rheda had held this property as collateral, estimated at sixty silver marks and one gold mark. It is unclear how he gained the Schwalenberg family’s agreement for the transfer to Marienfeld. For most of the following forty years, they attempted to regain the possessions and are thus unlikely to have contributed their property voluntarily. They should rather be identified as unwilling donors. In any case, the Cistercian monastery of Marienfeld profited from this donation that provided significant income during the community’s early life.

From the beginning, apparently, the founders had been intent on establishing a contiguous area of properties by exchanging land. The monastery’s income appears to have rested on annuities, interest and tithes, rather than on the development and cultivation of land. Accordingly, the Benedictine precept of manual labour does not seem to have had primary importance for Marienfeld. Instead, the monastery was economically modern and forward-looking from the very start in the founding period.

As should have become apparent by now, Hermann II of Münster’s relation with Marienfeld was particularly close. He granted the privilege to freely elect the provost, as well as immunity, and also confirmed the monastery’s possessions. He only required the abbot’s obedience in questions of importance to the whole diocese. The bishop was allowed to visit the monastery and exert a certain degree of oversight, but interventions with regard to internal affairs were prohibited. Marienfeld was incorporated into the Cistercian Order, and therefore benefitted from privileges the order as a whole had been granted. These included: Free election of the abbot and exemption from any fees levied by the diocesan bishop when he consecrated churches, altars, and liturgical vessels. Marienfeld first appears in the

---

50 Regesta Historiae Westfaliae, no. 451.
51 Ibid., no. 536.
53 Nonetheless, on a monument in Marienfeld’s cloisters, which was rediscovered in 1988, they are listed as founders, together with Bernhard (II zur Lippe), Ludolf (of Wöltingerode-Wohldenberg), Widukind (of Rheda) and his mother Liuttrud as well as Bishop Hermann (II of Münster). Cf. Strohmann, ‘Wandnische’.
55 Regesta Historiae Westfaliae, no. 451. Apparently the general chapter had approved of the incorporation into the order as early as 1185.
protocols of the order’s general chapter in 1200, when the abbots of Marienfeld and Bredelar were tasked to assess the suitability of the proposed site for the foundation of the monastery of Hude. Before 1250, Marienfeld appears an additional five times in the protocols. In 1215, the good relationship between the monastery and its diocesan bishop is commended specifically.

From the beginning, Marienfeld had been endowed exceptionally well and thus had an excellent base for further development. Consequently, monastic life at the site began on 1 November 1186, when Abbot Eggehard and eleven other monks arrived from Hardehausen Abbey, 60 kilometres away. One day later, Bishop Hermann II of Münster consecrated the monastic buildings. He remained a lifelong benefactor of the abbey, where he was laid to rest after his death in 1203, in accordance with his arrangements. The monks honoured him as their founder, just as Widukind of Rheda and Ludiger II of Wöltingerode-Wohldenberg. All three were commemorated at the abbey where they were also buried.

Marienfeld’s connection with the families of the founders transcended their deaths. In 1221, after a brief hiatus, the family zur Lippe began to support Marienfeld once more, and also used the abbey as a place of burial for its members.

Additional noble benefactors from the region began to support the monastery: The counts of Rietberg, of Tecklenburg, and of Arnsberg. They all transferred property, usually as a means of securing salvation for their souls. Later bishops of Münster also followed the example of Hermann II by supporting Marienfeld.

From the end of the twelfth century, Marienfeld Abbey was actively involved in missionary activities in Livonia. Although the Cistercian Order prohibited the participation in missionary activities and crusades again in 1200, it seems that the Cistercian Order had to bow to the pressure pope Innocent III. put on the Cistercians to join the missionary activities in Livland.

56 Statuta capitulorum generalium, I, ed. by Canivez, 1200, no. 54.
57 Ibid., 1215, no. 60 and 1219, no. 23; Statuta capitulorum generalium, II, ed. by Canivez, 1239, no. 33, 1244, no. 48 and 1248, no. 21.
58 Statuta capitulorum generalium, I, ed. by Canivez, 1215, no. 60.
59 Wolf, ‘Kontroversen’, p. 10. Kohl (Marienfeld, p. 92) suggested the first of November 1186 as the beginning for the monastic life, but Wolf showed convincingly that this date didn’t celebrate the arrival of the monks, but the annual celebration for the consecration of the church, cf. Wolf, ‘Kontroversen’, p. 11.
60 Cf. Kohl, Das Bistum, p. 112.
61 Sassen/Sassen, Die Grabplatten, pp. 10-11, 16-17, 23-27.
63 The counts of Rietberg were a secondary branch of the counts of Arnsberg. Cf. Vahrenhold, Kloster Marienfeld, pp. 73-87; Vahrenhold, ‘Wirtschaftsformen’.
64 Cf. Ledebur, ‘Necrologium Marienfeldense’.
66 Statuta capitulorum generalium, II, ed. by Canivez, 1242: n. 12.
have gone as far that the third abbot of Marienfeld, Florentius, at the general chapter asked for permission to found a monastery of the Cistercian order in Dünamünde, which later was populated by monks of Marienfeld.\textsuperscript{68} This filiation of Marienfeld later became the centre for the missionary activities in the Baltic area.\textsuperscript{69} Bernhard II zur Lippe became the second abbot of the Livonian monastery Dünamünde in 1211, and Bishop of Samogitia in 1218.\textsuperscript{70} Despite his conversion to a monk at the end of the twelfth century, Bernhard II zur Lippe still used the skills he learned through all the feuds to fulfil his goals.\textsuperscript{71} After his death he was buried in the monastery of Dünamünde.\textsuperscript{72} Marienfeld’s abbey church, which had already served as a model for the cathedral of Münster and churches in Lippstadt, Rheda, and Herford,\textsuperscript{73} now became the example for ecclesiastical buildings throughout the Baltic area.\textsuperscript{74}

In its second and third generation, Marienfeld became a place of commemoration for regional noble families, and a missionary centre for the establishment of diocesan and monastic structures in the Baltic.

3 The Female Monastery Saint Aegidii in Münster

3.1 Foundation and Endowment

The foundation of the female Cistercian monastery of Saint Aegidii had three distinct phases: The donation of land, the establishment of the parish, and finally the foundation of the monastery.

The donation of land is evidenced by the charter issued by Hermann II of Münster in 1184,\textsuperscript{75} the same bishop who had also been instrumental in the foundation of Marienfeld [see App. I]. In his charter, Hermann confirms the donation of a plot of land ranging from the cemetery of Saint Giles (Aegidius) to the Aa river within the city walls. He also exempts it from the municipal ‘lap’ (a biblical term that was used to refer to taxes in central and northern Germany until early modern times). The episcopal ministerial Wulfhardus and his wife Hildegund, assisted by the priest Ludgerus, are said to have donated their inherited property, with the

\textsuperscript{68} The idea to erect a cloister in Dünamünde came from Theoderich of Treyden, a cistercian monk of Loccum, who already missioned in Estonia since 1191, cf. Bender, ‘Bernhard II.’, p. 160.
\textsuperscript{70} Cf. Wiersing, ‘Ein Mensch’, p. 19.
\textsuperscript{72} Cf. Wiersing, ‘Ein Mensch’, p. 19.
\textsuperscript{73} Cf. Kempkens, ‘Bernhard II.’.
\textsuperscript{75} Landesarchiv Nordrhein-Westfalen, Abteilung Westfalen, A 145 I Kloster Saint Aegidii, Münster, no. 1.
condition of retaining the lifehold for the gifted property. They gave their property to the Bishop of Münster, despite having offspring and heirs. This can be attributed to the influence of Hermann II, and can further be explained with reference to the establishment of the parish. The population of Münster had grown considerably, and Bishop Hermann II was obliged to establish three additional parishes. Before he created the parish of Saint Aegidii, he had already established and incorporated parishes at the newly built collegiate churches of Saint Ludgeri and Saint Martini. The parish church Saint Aegidii only appears to have been incorporated into the female monastery of the same name after 1235. Two charters seem to support this. In the first charter, probably dating from between 1200 and 1203, Bishop Hermann II attests that his ministerial Friedrich of Erlo mortgages the tithes for six houses in Aldenthorpe to Saint Aegidii. In the second charter, likely issued in 1201, Hermann II institutes an eleemosynary prebend at Saint Aegidii.

The foundation of Saint Aegidii at the site of an existing parish church probably only occurred after the donors’ deaths and the end of their lifehold, presumably in 1205 or 1206. Bishop Hermann II, who had died in 1203, had no part in this. The act of foundation was carried out by his successor Otto I. The initiator behind the foundation was probably the same priest Ludgerus who had been present when the plot of land had been donated. A charter dating from 1217 identifies him as the monastery’s founder. He probably also ensured that the Cistercian community was not established in connection with a community of canons, but

---

76 Cf. Kohl, *Das Bistum*, p. 108. The parishes of Saint Martini and Saint Ludgeri were also established on plots of land that had earlier been held in fief by episcopal ministeriales, cf. *Westfälischer Städteatlas*.
78 Hock asserts that terms such as *ecclesia* and *monasterium* were used synonymously in Westphalia during the thirteenth century. Consequently, it cannot be determined whether the church or the monastery of Saint Aegidii is meant. Cf. ibid., p. 45, n. 3.
79 Previously, the charter has been dated between 1193 and 1203, cf. *Regesta Historiae Westfaliae*, no. 553. This is supported by the term *nepos noster*, which is used to refer to the cathedral’s provost Hermann who can only be documented in his office from 1193, while Bishop Hermann II’s death in 1203 provides the terminus ante quem. However, an analysis of the list of witnesses (Herewico St. Ludgeri decano, Geruasio sancti Mauricii canonico, Volmar canonico) further allows to limit the likely period for the charter’s issue to between 1200 and 1203. Until 1200, a certain Theodoricus had been the dean responsible for Saint Ludgeri, cf. *Regesta Historiae Westfaliae*, no. 451; the other two canons only started to appear as witnesses in Münster from 1201. Cf. *Westfälisches Urkundenbuch*, nos. 3 and 9.
80 Landesarchiv Nordrhein-Westfalen, Abteilung Westfalen, A 145 I Kloster Saint Aegidii, Münster, no. 2. Aldenthorpe is identical with Handorf, today part of the city of Münster.
81 Ibid., no. 4. This charter has often been seen as the earliest record of the Cistercian female monastery, even though it does not refer to an existing or planned female community, nor does it provide any information on such a convent’s affiliation with a religious order. Cf. Höing, *Kloster*, p. 29; Elm, ‘Zisterziensertum’, p. 52; Mühlen, ‘800 Jahre’, p. 35; Leidinger, ‘Die Gründung’, p. 235.
85 The charter uses the term *ecclesia*, but the abbess is also present at the foundation, even though the church had not been incorporated at that time. Thus we may assume that the foundation in question is, indeed, the monastery. Cf. *Westfälisches Urkundenbuch*, no. 114.
rather at the site of a parish church. Wilhelm Kohl assumed that Ludgerus was a descendant of the counts of Wöltingerode, based on the observation that the name Ludgerus occurred in the family, and on the fact that Alheidis, the first abbess, had come from Wöltingerode. It is worth considering, however, that no facts are known about the Münster priest called Ludgerus, and that the name of the missionary Bishop Liudger (and its variants, such as Ludgerus) was very common in the city and Diocese of Münster. All that can be stated with certainty is that Ludgerus had been a priest of the parish Saint Aegidii before 1220 and later became a cathedral canon and provost of the cathedral chapter.

Alheidis of Schwerin, the first abbess of Saint Aegidii, was a daughter of Count Ludolf II of Wöltingerode-Wohldenberg and Guta, a sister of Ludiger II of Wöltingerode-Wohldenberg and niece to Bernhard II zur Lippe [see App. II]. She was given in marriage to Count Helmold of Schwerin, one of Henry the Lion’s allies, but she was widowed while still young. When her brother Ludiger II of Wöltingerode-Wohldenberg died around 1205, she received his inheritance, which she gave to the Diocese of Münster. This donation explains her institution as abbess of Saint Aegidii.

The counts of Wöltingerode-Wohldenberg’s land holdings and power centred in the northern Harz region. In addition, they had acquired property remote from this area, in western Westphalia, as the result of a feud. In 1164, the lords of Steinfeld went to Cologne to witness the festive reception of the bones of the Magi in the presence of Cologne’s archbishop Rainald of Dassel, their relative, and Emperor Frederick Barbarossa. During their absence the lord of Ascheberg destroyed their castle, which led to a drawn-out feud. Rainald of Dassel had the lands of the lords of Ascheberg confiscated in the name of the king and gave them to the counts of Wöltingerode-Wohldenberg as a fiefdom. While a charter dating from 1206 indicates that the Crown remained in superordinate possession of these lands, this proviso of a later return of the holdings probably expired when the last member of the Ascheberg family died. In this way, Alheidis may have attained

87 Petke does not give any reference to a Ludgerus who was active in Münster. Cf. Petke, Die Grafen.
88 At that time, there was a canon with this name at Cappenberg in Münster, but he cannot be the priest in question. Cf. Kohl, Das Bistum, p. 110.
89 Cf. Kohl, Benediktinerinnenkloster, p. 40. As a relative of the counts of Wöltingerode, Ludgerus would probably have become a canon of the cathedral immediately, instead of being employed as parish priest for several years.
90 Cf. Petke, Die Grafen, pp. 75-76.
92 Cf. Westfälisches Urkundenbuch, no. 37. This charter moderates the conflicts resulting from the donation.
94 Westfälisches Urkundenbuch, no. 37.
95 There are records of Burghard of Ascheberg up until 1185. He appears as a witness in Marienfeld’s founding charter, cf. Regesta Historiae Westfaliae, no. 451.
the office of abbess in Münster. We do not know whether she brought nuns from Wöltingerode to Saint Aegidii.96

The monastery of Saint Aegidii first appears in a charter issued in 1209, and thus after Alheidis' death (1208/09).97 At that time, Ermgardis of Arnsberg, whose family had also contributed donations for Marienfeld, was abbess of Saint Aegidii. Thus, the counts of Wöltingerode do not appear to have been involved with Saint Aegidii after the founding period.

Saint Aegidii's initial endowment remains mostly unknown, but it is certain that the Bishop of Münster and his provisors98 attempted to alleviate the convent's poverty, which is still mentioned in a charter issued by Bishop Dietrich (in office 1218-1225) in 1222.99

3.2 Relationship with the Cistercian Order100

What was Saint Aegidii’s relationship with the Cistercian Order? In 1213, the Cistercians began to define the conditions for the admission of women to the order. In 1221, 1228 and 1251 the general chapter even prohibited the admission of female communities altogether.101 In 1258, the order acknowledged its willingness to admit women under special conditions. The return to a more open policy towards women had several reasons. In 1140, the Premonstratensians abolished double monasteries. In 1176, they determined that women could no longer be admitted to the order.102 In addition, the pope decreed that the Cistercians had to incorporate a number of female monasteries into the order.103 There were three ways in which this could happen: Foundation as a Cistercian house from the very start, transformation of an existing community of pious women, or the conversion of an established house in the course of monastic reform.104

Women were intent on incorporation into the order, because it brought a number of benefits. An incorporated convent was removed from the usual ties and obligations of the diocese and enjoyed freedom from diocesan influence. Its economic circumstances were improved, as it did not have to pay taxes or other dues to the bishop. Having been incorporated, the community was made subordinate to a father abbot, who supervised and represented the nuns with regard to spiritual

---

97 Landesarchiv Nordrhein-Westfalen, Abteilung Westfalen, A 145 I Kloster Saint Aegidii, Münster, no. 11.
98 Cf. Darpe, Verzeichnisse, pp. 1-44.
99 Westfälisches Urkundenbuch, no. 175.
100 For an examination of the relationship of other female monasteries and the Cistercian Order, cf. Wiechmann’s article in this volume.
and secular matters, and who also fixed the number of nuns at a certain limit. He had to ascertain that the women maintained monastic discipline, especially enclosure, and that they celebrated divine service properly. Furthermore, he was responsible for the nuns’ pastoral care.

From 1235, those unincorporated monasteries and female communities that were approved by religious authorities could claim the order’s privileges, just as incorporated monasteries, provided they lived in accordance with Cistercian rules and were seen as Cistercian by others. Saint Aegidii’s foundation early in the thirteenth century fell into a time when the Cistercian Order only concerned itself sporadically with female monasteries. In 1206, the general chapter dealt with the question of whether boys should be permitted to be educated in female monasteries. Most of the female communities that had been founded before 1206/1213 were identified as Cistercian by popes or metropolitan bishops, because they had assumed a Cistercian way of life. Rare are the cases in which it can be proved that Cistercian abbots ministered to female communities, just as actual incorporations can rarely be documented; some communities also remained within the diocesan framework.

In 1242, Saint Aegidii first appears in the acts of the general chapter. The assembly discussed the convent’s paternitas and determined that the abbot of Hardehausen, Westphalia’s oldest male Cistercian house, was to assume responsibility for the pastoral care of the female community in Münster. While it cannot be stated with certainty whether this was actually put into practice, the fact that the general chapter pronounced on the question is evidence of formal incorporation. Indeed, Florentius, the third abbot of Marienfeld (in office 1194-1211), served as confessor to Alheidis, the first abbess of Saint Aegidii. Of course, Florentius was a close relative of Alheidis’, which might also be an explanation for his role as her confessor. Nonetheless, Florentius’ successor Liborius of Hardehausen exercised this function in service of the nuns of Saint Aegidii until his death in 1214. Subsequently, however, Marienfeld does not appear to have sent confessors to Saint Aegidii.

From 1265, a chaplain assumed this responsibility, since the order did not wish to delegate its priests for the pastoral care of women anymore.

In a charter issued in 1217, Bishop Otto I of Münster identifies Saint Aegidi as a monastery of the Cistercian Order. There is no clear evidence that Saint Ae-
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gidii officially left the diocesan framework, which would have been indicative of formal incorporation into the order. Nonetheless, subsequent bishops of Münster did not encroach on the community’s monastic life. They did, however, support the monastery with endowments, particularly during its early existence. On the other hand, no visitation of Saint Aegidii was ever carried out by the order. Considering all criteria of formal incorporation, Saint Aegidii’s status and relation with the Cistercians cannot be judged with certainty. Indubitably, though, the nuns of Saint Aegidii lived according to Cistercian rules during the founding period.

The monastery’s urban, rather than isolated, location is not extraordinary for a female community, in fact, it is rather typical. However, this chosen site did influence its economy. Two thirds of the incorporated parish church were allocated to the monastery. Bishops from the region donated property and bought additional lands for the monastery, although it is not clear whether their donations came from their personal possession or from their dioceses. This support notwithstanding, the income available to the male monastery of Marienfeld was four times as high as that of the female community of Saint Aegidii. Just as Marienfeld, Saint Aegidii also attempted to organise the community’s property, and to acquire contiguous land holdings by purchase or exchange. Thus, in 1228, Bishop Conrad of Minden and his brother Hermann gave lands to Saint Aegidii in exchange for other holdings. This exchange of property was probably intended to consolidate the community’s holdings and should not, as Kaspar Elm suggests, be seen as an indication that the nuns attempted to found a daughter house in Levern (Diocese of Minden).

During its subsequent history, Saint Aegidii, just as Marienfeld, seems to have attained the function of commemorating the deceased members of its benefactors’ families. They established memorial foundations and arranged to be buried at Saint Aegidii. With regard to the community’s spiritual development, the sources provide little information.

113 Landesarchiv Nordrhein-Westfalen, Abteilung Westfalen, A 145 I Kloster Saint Aegidii, Münster, no. 15.
115 The only extant charters document bishops endowing the monastery, cf. Westfälisches Urkundenbuch.
116 Vgl. Darpe, Verzeichnisse, pp. 1-44.
118 Cf. Darpe, Verzeichnisse, pp. 1-44.
119 Cf. Kohl, Benediktinerinnenklöster, p. 47.
120 Extant charters document transfers of fiefdoms and other exchanges of property, cf. Westfälisches Urkundenbuch, nos. 222, 223, 748, 1504, 1542 and 1543.
121 Ibid., no. 149.
123 Westfälisches Urkundenbuch, nos. 79, 114 and 241.
3.3 A Male and a Female Cistercian House Compared

Two Cistercian monasteries are the object of this analysis, one male and one female community. Both were founded in the Diocese of Münster in the 1180s, supported by the local ordinary Hermann II of Katzenelnbogen. They were co-founded and endowed by several and sometimes identical benefactors, among them comital families who acted supra-regionally. The question is, whether these monasteries developed in a similar way or differently, and whether founders and benefactors acted differently in the case of the male community in comparison to their involvement with the female convent.

The sources provide considerably less information on the female community’s early history and the further development of Saint Aegidii than in the case of the male house of Marienfeld. We cannot determine if this is due to a comparative lack of interest on the part of the founders and benefactors, or if the nuns merely did not have the same degree of output of written records as their male brothers. This discrepancy between male and female communities with regard to documentary evidence is not limited to our cases. Even the important medieval communities of canonesses in Saxony are usually less well documented than comparable contemporary male Benedictine monasteries.

The diocesan bishop had great interest in both foundations, which is remarkable, considering that he granted them the privileges and liberties associated with Cistercian houses, namely exemption from diocesan control and the relatively loose integration of Saint Aegidii into the order. The exact legal relation between Saint Aegidii and the order cannot be determined with the help of available sources, which is typical of so-called Cistercian female communities in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Saint Aegidii’s endowment was considerably less generous than that of the male house of Marienfeld. The founding families, who were involved in both houses, clearly favoured the male monastery. Nonetheless, both communities were intent on adding to and consolidating their land-holdings, by way of purchases and exchanges of property. Isolated, remote, and consequently less accessible holdings were sold.

Initially, both communities were personally and religiously very attractive to the founding families. The female convent’s first abbess came from the founding family, two male founders intended to join the male monastery. However, the families tended to maintain contact with the male monastery for a longer time, while they seem to have lost interest in the female convent after one generation. They were replaced by local and less important regional noble families, which would also happen at Marienfeld, later in the monastery’s history. Although neither of the two communities had been intended as memorial locations for the founders, this is the function they came to fulfil during the following generations. Founders and benefactors were buried or commemorated in the houses. In this respect, there was no clear difference between the male and female community.
The male house of Marienfeld was considerably more important and influential than the convent of Saint Aegidii: Due to the monks’ missionary activities in the Baltic, Marienfeld’s monks and abbots were able to establish an impressive network and a position of political and religious influence.124 This would not have been conceivable for a community of nuns living in enclosure. The men’s wide-ranging network also contributed to Marienfeld becoming an important model for cathedrals in Westphalia and the Baltic. In contrast, the poor convent situated at the parish church of Saint Aegidii, established in the course of an expansion of the urban area and population, was never able to compete. As an urban community within the city limits of Münster, it enjoyed the protection of the city and its citizens, even though it was exempt from municipal taxes earmarked for the maintenance of the city’s defences. However, Saint Aegidii’s importance was limited to the city of Münster. Rural female Cistercian houses such as Wöltingerode had a much higher potential for development.

Neither Saint Aegidii nor Marienfeld fit the Cistercian ideal of a monastery of (manual) labour, the intent of which was to use a location in the wilderness as a basis for the reclamation and cultivation of agricultural land. The female convent was established in a prosperous episcopal city, the male monastery in a civilised area, where agriculture and transport had been developed for centuries. The female community was mainly oriented towards urban society and was the first institution to provide women from Münster’s lower nobility and from the families of the city’s burghers with the opportunity to live a religious life. Überwasser, the only existing house of canonesses in Münster, was limited to the high nobility. The monks of Marienfeld, on the other hand, looked far beyond their own area for an object of colonisation.

124 For the possibilities nuns had to crusade or make a pilgrimage cf. Volkmar’s article in this volume.
Appendices

Appendix I: Charter for the donation of land for Saint Aegidii, 1184

Bishop Hermann II of Münster recognises that Wulfhard, ministerial of Saint Paul, and his wife Hildegund, with the permission of their sons Wulfhard, Leo, and Johannes, and assisted by Ludgerus the priest, have given a plot of land to the Diocese of Münster. This plot ranges from the cemetery of Saint Giles (Aegidius) to the Aa river. The donors reserve themselves a lifehold for the property. The property includes, in addition to other buildings, the newly erected church of Saint Aegidii. The bishop grants the property exemption from municipal taxes. Given in Münster in 1184.


Reverse: De erste fundacie unses cloters\textsuperscript{125}

The red seal, in the form of a pointed oval, is attached to the charter with red and green threads of silk. It depicts a bishop in episcopal regalia, seated on a low chair (sella), holding a crosier in his right hand and an open book in his left.

Circumscription: Herimann(us) D(e)I GR(atii).A MONASTERIENSIS EP(is)C(opus) S(e)C(un)D(u)S

Edition (complete) by Katharina Knesia:

\begin{verbatim}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{125} The reverse of this charter (approximately fourteenth century) indicates a historical reinsurance of the foundation of the monastery. Cf. Röckelein, \textit{Schriftlandschaften}, p. 12.
Appendix II: Genealogical table of the families Schwalenberg/Rheda, Lippe and Wöltingerode
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The *Aflat to Iherusalem* – Spiritual Pilgrimage to Palestine’s Holy Sites in the Augustinian Canonesses’ House of Heiningen

Robin Volkmar *

Abstract

To virtually travel to Christianity’s holy sites was a common endeavour in medieval Saxony’s female convents in the Late Middle Ages. A ‘guideline’ for spiritual pilgrimages was offered by the *Aflat to Iherusalem*, which originated in the Augustinian canonesses’ house of Heiningen. This article provides a description of the first edition of this text, as well as an analysis of its unique features in order to contribute to research on devotional practices in female monasteries. The author’s hypothesis is that the *Aflat’s* original source was a pilgrim’s report that was copied and adapted to guide the canonesses of Heiningen during their spiritual journeys. Spiritual pilgrimages allowed these women to escape their enclosure, to venerate the holy sites mentally, and earn indulgences, just as the primarily male pilgrims who took on the dangerous physical journey to the Holy Land.

* Robin Volkmar received a master’s degree in History, Ancient Cultures and Classical Archaeology at the Georg-August-University Göttingen in 2017. This article is based on his bachelor thesis, submitted 2014.
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1 Introduction

*Dyt iß dat aflat unnd bilge stede to Iherusalem* (‘this is the indulgence and the holy site in Jerusalem’) – this is the brief preface to the *Aflat to Iherusalem*, a Middle Low German quire from the second half of the fifteenth century, which lists over fifty of Palestine’s holy sites, and the indulgences pilgrims can gain there while visiting. The *Aflat* is preserved in the Codex Guelferbytanus 1130 Helmstadiensis, which is kept at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel. It once belonged to the canonesses of the Augustinian Canonesses’ house of Heiningen, near Braunschweig, in today’s Lower Saxony.

The *Aflat to Iherusalem* has not been the subject of any major investigations so far. It was shown to the public for the first time in 2013, during the exhibition ‘Rosenkranze und Seelengärten – Bildung und Frömmigkeit in niedersächsischen Frauenklöstern’ at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel. In the exhibition’s catalogue and in her latest publication,1 Britta-Juliane Kruse discusses it briefly, along with the *Aflat to Rome*.2 These two texts make up the last part of the compilation. In this article I will provide an edition3 of the *Aflat to Iherusalem*, with an extensive commentary, in order to make it accessible for further research. In addition, I will discuss the text’s structure and its unique features, its origin and how it could have been used for devotional practices in Heiningen.

The question of the *Aflat’s* usage in Heiningen is not easy to answer: The text itself does not provide any information on who used it, how it was used, and in what context. Kruse suggests that both texts are *Anleitungen zum Pilgern im Geiste* (‘manuals for spiritual pilgrimages’).4 While this is very likely, this information can barely be obtained from the text itself but only by considering its origin, and the circumstances under which it was composed: The spiritual environment the canonesses of Heiningen created under the impression of the Windesheim Reform.

According to a legend, the canonesses’5 house of Heiningen6 was founded around the turn of the millennium by the Saxon noblewoman Hildesvit and her daughter Walburgis, who were presumably members of the House of Billung.6 With the support of Bishop Bernward of Hildesheim (*c. 960, in office 993-1022), the foundresses were able to win Otto III’s (*980, in office 996-1002) protection,
which was confirmed by Henry II (*973/78, in office 1002-1024) in 1013. After the degeneration of the canonesses’ morality had been ascertained, Bishop Berthold I of Hildesheim (in office 1119-1130) had the canonesses’ house reformed by the provost Gerhard of Riechenberg (†1150), so that in 1126 it was turned into an Augustinian canonesses’ house. The reform, which presented itself mainly in the observance of enclosure and in regular choral prayers, had a positive effect on monastic life in Heiningen, as well as on the economic situation of the canonesses’ house. Heiningen accumulated considerable property in the following years, and the canonesses became renowned for their skilful needlework.

By the fourteenth century, this development had reversed: The economic state declined, and the canonesses frequently lacked the bare necessities, such as bread and candles in winter. According to Taddey, economic decline went hand in hand with the deterioration of the convent’s moral (and spiritual) situation. The conditions and the canonesses’ behaviour towards each other apparently worsened to such an extent that one of them felt forced to flee the convent and had to be tracked down and returned. Taddey states that the canonesses understood that they were living in a wrong and hypocritical way which did not conform to the rules of monastic life. Fear of punishment in the afterlife and true remorse led them to seek the help of a reformer. According to Taddey, the promise of an indulgence at the Jubilee of 1450 seems to have been the last incitement that made them turn to the provost of the Sültekloster in Hildesheim, Berthold Ziegenmeier, in 1451. However, when he initiated the reform, it was then partly boycotted by the canonesses. This indicates that, contrary to what Taddey assumes, the reform might rather have been forced on them by the provost. Taddey relies largely on the Windesheim reformer Johannes Busch’s (*1399, †1479/80) testimonial, which can be evaluated more critically than he did.

After Ziegenmeier retired in 1457, Johannes Busch took over as provost. He seems to have been very involved with the canonesses’ house, participating in almost every aspect of the women’s religious life. Even though his work has to be studied carefully, it allows us to comprehend the impact of the Windesheim Reform on the convent in Heiningen (nevertheless the convent has most likely never been officially incorporated). In the years after the reform, the vita communis was reintroduced, personal property was confiscated, and several changes were made to the canonesses’ life, including stricter enclosure. Subsequently, the canonesses’ house recovered on the economic, as well as the spiritual and moral levels.

---

8 Cf. Taddey, Kloster Heiningen, pp. 28, 51-55.
9 Cf. ibid., pp. 86-96 and 101.
10 Busch, Liber de reformatione monasteriorum, ed. by Lesser.
11 Bertram Lesser takes a more critical approach on Busch’s works than Taddey did. Cf. Bertram Lesser, Johannes Busch.
12 Cf. Taddey, Kloster Heiningen, pp. 95-103.
Influenced by the Windesheim Reform, embroidery and the production of textiles flourished in Heiningen.\textsuperscript{13} The reform also stimulated the spreading and development of devotional practices in the convents, while enclosure was more strictly observed. It is not far-fetched to assume that spiritual pilgrimages, which were practiced in the Netherlands and the reformed convents in Saxony, became part of the devotional repertoire of Heiningen’s canonesses’ as well, especially because, due to the reinstated enclosure, they were bound more closely to their convent than ever before. The \textit{Aflat to Iherusalem} was a product of this process, as were similar texts in the convents of the Windesheim Reform.

2 \textbf{The Codex Guelferbytanus 1130 Helmstadiensis}

The Codex Guelferbytanus 1130 Helmstadiensis was first listed in Otto von Heinemann’s catalogue of the manuscripts of the Herzog August library (HAB) in Wolfenbüttel in 1888.\textsuperscript{14} Von Heinemann only provides a brief description, without giving further details about the \textit{Aflat}. In the online archive of the HAB, the codex is named \textit{Gebetbuch} (prayer book).\textsuperscript{15} However, not all of the texts in this compilation, written in Middle Low German and Latin, are prayers: Apart from the \textit{Aflat to Rome} and \textit{the Aflat to Iherusalem}, it also contains a \textit{Betrachtung über die Worte Psalm 30, 12} […] (‘a contemplation on the words of Psalm 30.12’),\textsuperscript{16} and the last page of the \textit{Aflat to Iherusalem} includes a medical recipe.

The Codex was written by several hands. However, the recipe, the \textit{Aflat to Rome}, and the \textit{Aflat to Iherusalem}, which can be found at the end of the compilation, were most likely written by a single hand. There are several small differences in the style of writing but these could indicate that a certain amount of time passed between the productions of the texts, or that the circumstances of writing had changed. This part of the manuscript must have once stood for itself. Its dimensions differ from the rest of the compilation. In addition, the stained first (fol. 36\textsuperscript{r}) and last (fol. 45\textsuperscript{v}) pages indicate that this quire had been kept separately and unbound for a certain period of time. It was probably used frequently and was not connected to the other texts of the codex from the beginning.\textsuperscript{17} Apparently, the \textit{Aflat to Rome} and the \textit{Aflat to Iherusalem} were composed as a single unit and constituted a booklet (libellus), which belonged to one of the canonesses, or was kept in the nuns’ choir.\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{13} Cf. Mersch, ‘Zusammenspiel’ and Taddey, \textit{Kloster Heiningen}, pp. 108-110.
\item\textsuperscript{14} Heinemann, \textit{Handschriften}, III, p. 70, no. 1237.
\item\textsuperscript{15} HAB, Handschriftendatenbank, ‘Gebetbuch’.
\item\textsuperscript{16} Cf. Heinemann and Cod. Guelf. 1130 Helms., fols 30\textsuperscript{r}-35\textsuperscript{r}.
\item\textsuperscript{17} The codex’s cover was dated to the nineteenth century by Bertram Lesser (not published). It is unclear if the texts had been bound together before. Cf. also Kruse, \textit{Stiftsbibliotheken}, p. 329.
\item\textsuperscript{18} At this point, I would like to express my gratitude to Britta-Juliane Kruse, who examined and discussed the \textit{Aflat} and the whole Cod. Guelf. 1130 Helms. with me and contributed to my research with her expertise on the codices from Heiningen.
\end{itemize}
The compilation’s owner (or at least the owner of the first part) was the canoness Anne Santfos, as we know from fol. 25r: *Det bock hort Annen Santfos tho Heny* (‘this book belongs to Anne Santfos of Heiningen’). Her handwriting was dated to the sixteenth century by Kruse and differs from the hand that wrote the *Aflat*. Nonetheless, it is likely that all writers were canonesses, since copying and collecting texts (as well as modifying them to meet personal preferences) was common practice in female monasteries. Furthermore, several clues indicate that the codex was compiled in Heiningen.

Anne Santfos’ ownership is not the only proof of the compilation’s origin in Heiningen. The provenance can be further determined by a charter used for the front binding of the codex. According to Kruse, it dates back to the year 1463 and mentions Adelheid of Bortfeld, who was Heiningen’s prioress from 1451 until her death in 1477. However, it is likely that the charter had not been used as a book cover during Adelheid of Bortfeld’s time as prioress. Some of the texts date back to the years 1440/50. The *terminus post quem* for one of the other texts in the compilation must be the year 1479, as it mentions a contemporary bull by Pope Sixtus IV (*1414, in office 1471-1484*). Therefore, the codex must have been bound in the time between the end of the fifteenth up to the middle or the third quarter of the sixteenth century, at the latest in 1572, when the manuscripts were taken from Heiningen by Duke Julius of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (*1528, in office 1568-1589*). Likewise, it cannot be determined when exactly the *Aflat to Iherusalem* was written, because it lacks any indicators beyond the style of handwriting. Furthermore its quire is not bound in the charter but is an addition that was attached to the first part at a later point.

## 3 The *Aflat to Iherusalem*

The *Aflat to Iherusalem* is the last part of the Cod. Guelf. 1130 Helmst. It lists the holy sites and their indulgences in Palestine. The manuscript’s somewhat misleading title *Dyt iß dat aflat to Iherusalem*, fol. 41v (‘this is the indulgence in Jerusalem’) is followed by a short prayer – *In nomine domini amen* (‘in the name of the Lord, amen’) – and the brief introduction *Dyt iß dat aflat unnd hilge stede to Iherusalem*, fol. 41r, ll. 1-2 (‘this is the indulgence and the holy site in Jerusalem’). This is followed by the list of the fifty-seven locations, of which seven are not linked to any indulgences. The list is not subdivided into chapters, or interrupted in any other way; it ends with a

---

23 Cf. for the manuscripts’ journey Kruse/Lesser, *Büchersammlungen* pp. 98, 101 and 105.
24 For my full transcription with a comprehensive comment see the appendix.
25 All translations of the *Aflat’s* text by the author.
simple *Amen* on the last page of the indulgence (fol. 45v, l. 15), which is then followed by the recipe (fol. 45v, ll. 16-25).

The author introduces the reader to the individual sites, using mainly the first person plural in the present tense, in combination with the indefinite pronoun *me* (one, cf. e.g. fol. 43r, ll. 6-7). The stations are generally distinguished from each other by a majuscule that is sometimes rubricated. The stations’ listing follows a set scheme: First, the site is described briefly, in no more than one or two lines, initiated in many cases by an *Item* (cf. e.g. fol. 42r, ll. 6, 13, 17), or a similar conjunction. This is immediately followed by the specification of the indulgence that can be gained at the site.

Following this simple, text-specific scheme, the author does not only take the reader to stations in Jerusalem (including Mount of Olives) but also to other pilgrimage destinations in Palestine. Roughly one third of the stations are outside the Holy City, such as the Sea of Galilee (fol. 41v, ll. 17-22), Bethlehem (fol. 45r, ll. 7-18), the Jordan River (fol. 45v, ll. 9-13), or Hebron (fol. 45v, ll. 13-15). The third station is curiously attributed to Rome, *dar sune Jurgen martert wart*, fol. 41v, ll. 11-13 (‘where Saint George was martyred’).

While the list clearly favours stations that are connected to the birth, life, passion, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ (more than half of the sites), there are also sites connected with the apostles, Mary, other saints as well as figures from the Old Testament. Saint Stephen is referred to three times (cf. fol. 42r, ll. 22-24; 43r, ll. 5-7; 43v, ll. 18-21) and the old testament prophets Samuel (fol. 41v, ll. 14-16) and Isaiah (fol. 41v, 17-22), Adam, and *alle propheten* (‘all the prophets’, fol. 45v, ll. 13-15) are mentioned.

None of the places are described in detail. The author identifies the sites by a brief description of the events that took place there. The only longer account describes how the Holy Cross was identified by Helena, who ordered it to be put *up eynen doden licham* (‘onto a dead body’, fol. 43v, l. 23-43v, ll. 1-6), in order to determine if it was the real cross. This account can be found for example in the *Legenda aurea* by Jacobus da Varagine, which tells of how the True Cross miraculously revived a corpse.26 This station exemplifies how medieval hagiographic lore found its way into the text. The actual appearance of the station, as it would have been perceived by a pilgrim in the Holy Land, is not described at all. In those cases in which the text does not provide any information about the sites’ physical appearance, their identification and localization are rather problematic. In addition, there are references that point to sacred objects directly – for example the column of the Flagellation (fol. 44r, ll. 1-4) – or sacred structures or churches, such as the tomb of the Virgin Mary (fol. 44v, ll. 17-20).

Apart from the one station of the betrayal of Jesus by Judas Iscariot, where the author states that *myn zele iß dedrovet* (‘my soul is aggrieved’, fol. 44r, l. 20-44v, l. 3), the *Aflat* does not contain any indications of the author’s emotions or personal

---

memories.  

It is only at one station that the pilgrim is requested to pray – one Pater Noster and one Ave Maria (fol. 42v, ll. 17-21). No further prayers can be found; nor does the author inform the reader about Jerusalem’s situation or the condition of the sites. We do not find any mention of the stations’ possible deterioration, nor are we told if they are accessible, or in the possession of Muslims and thus off limits for Christians. No particular incidents connected to the sites are mentioned either. Moreover the Aflat to Iherusalem does not refer to processions (which pilgrims commonly joined), or to religious orders, especially the Franciscans, who re-established themselves in Jerusalem around the year 1333 and assisted pilgrims. It does not mention accommodation for pilgrims, nor does it contain similar insertions. The reader would also look in vain for any information on the distances the pilgrims had to travel between the stations. The only addition to the brief descriptions of the sites are the listed indulgences.

The indulgences differ from station to station. In the majority of the cases, one can gain vorghevige aller sunde (‘forgiveness of all sins’, cf. e.g. fol. 41v, ll. 5-6). Additionally, at some stations one can redeem one or more zele ut pinen (‘souls from anguish’ – Purgatory, cf. e.g. fol. 41v, l. 11.). At the station of the tomb of the Virgin, the pilgrim is rewarded with the highest indulgence: ‘Dar iß seven werve vorghev- ingbe aller sunde unnd iii zi zele ut pinen’ (‘there is sevenfold forgiveness from all sins, and four souls to be redeemed from anguish’). Three souls can be relieved at the Holy Sepulchre (fol. 43r, ll. 9-13) by looking at the tomb of Christ, at the acker godes, dar unse leve here dre jungeren to sik nam (‘God’s Acre, where our Lord took with him three disciples’, fol. 44r, ll. 10-15), located at the slope of the Mount of Olives, and at the next station, where Jesus prayed in Gethsemane while sweating water unnd blot (‘water and blood’, fol. 44r, ll. 15-20). Two souls can be saved at the site where the Cross stood (fol. 43r, ll. 12-15), at the Church of the Ascension of Christ (fol. 44r, ll. 12-16), and in Bethlehem, whence the Holy Family had to flee to Egypt (fol. 45r, ll. 14-18). Apart from the tombs of Mary and Christ, it is hard to distinguish why there are higher indulgences granted at these stations in comparison to others, which are of similar importance. In some cases, the pilgrims can gain years of indulgence for each step they take (cf. fol. 41v, ll. 17-22 and fol. 42r, ll. 6-12; here, 100 Carena can also be gained, which is unique for the text).

The brief descriptions of the stations and the lack of additional information or instructions create a rather confusing picture of the sites that are listed in the Aflat to Iherusalem. Today’s reader may wonder to which places the author refers, and about the general composition and the order of the stations. Answering these questions is critical for identifying the origin of the Aflat’s site-list and allows us to propose an idea of how it was composed and then used in Heiningen.
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27 This insertion could also refer to a responsory that had to be sung at the station. Cf. commentary to the thirty-seventh station in the appendix.
29 Carena can be described, in a wider sense, as a forty-day public penance that could be imposed by bishops. Cf. Paulus, Geschichte, II, p. 80.
By taking a closer look at the composition of the text, it is possible to identify accumulations of stations that refer to specific events, which are mentioned in the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. These events all pertain to the life of Christ, as it is told in the New Testament’s accounts, arranged in a chronological order. In contrast, the ‘blocks’ of events in the text are not listed chronologically. The stations concerning the events around the Last Supper (fol. 43v, ll. 15-21) and Christ’s arrest (fol. 44v, l. 10-fol. 44v, l. 8) can, for example, be found earlier in the text than the ones that refer to his birth in Bethlehem, which can be found almost at the end of the Aflat (fol. 45r, ll. 7-14). The stations in these complexes are partly listed in chronological order, i.e. in the ‘blocks’ connected to Christ’s conviction and his way to Mount Calvary (fol. 42r, l. 23-fol. 42v, l. 17), but I attribute this rather to the proximity of the stations than to a coincidental resemblance to the order in which they are told in the Gospels. Stations that appear between sites which are presented in a chronology-based order, like the stoning of Saint Stephen (fol. 42v, ll. 22-24), which is a clear break from the places that are related to Christ carrying the Cross and those connected with the Crucifixion, underline the assumption that the author did not compose the Aflat with chronological order in mind, copying them from the Bible.

After a detailed examination of the Aflat’s descriptions of the stations and the topography of the Holy Land and its reflection in pilgrims’ reports, I was able to identify the majority of the sites the author lists in the Aflat.\(^{30}\) It became clear that the majority of the stations could be assigned to actual sites that are listed in a topographical order. Even though it seems like the author of the text may not have been familiar with the topography of the Holy Land – which is indicated by some confusions in the text –, after close inspection and in comparison with other pilgrim’s accounts, many of the stations can now be assigned to sites that lay on the most popular pilgrimage routes. Below, the most likely itinerary for the Aflat to Jerusalem is presented, which was created based on where the sites where located in the days of the crusaders and the Late Middle Ages.\(^{31}\)

The first two stations (fol. 41v, ll. 2-11) are to be found on the coast of the Mediterranean Sea (Jaffa) and near the Sea of Galilee. The next station, Rome, where Saint George was tortured, seems to be totally out of place. This is an obvious mistake on the part of the author. Ignoring his localization of the station in

\(^{30}\) The individual stations’ possible localizations are specified in the footnotes of the edition, which follows this article. Of immeasurable value to my research was the comprehensive guidebook Küchler, *Jerusalem.* For stations that are not to be found in Jerusalem, I consulted Kopp, *Die Heiligen Stätten.* In addition, I was only able to identify some of the stations by comparing them to the more detailed accounts of (spiritual) pilgrimages from the Netherlands, published by Kathryn M. Rudy in 2011, as well as with reference to Felix Fabri’s (*1441, †1502*) *Sionpilger*, ed. by Carls, who offers very detailed descriptions.

\(^{31}\) This list is incomplete, since the locations of the stations changed over the centuries, and in many cases, there were different traditions as to where the sites were located. This makes it hard to identify them clearly. Cf. i.e. for the Last Supper, which was commemorated at three different sites, Küchler, *Jerusalem,* p. 818.
Rome, the site is most likely to be identified with the crusader’s Saint George in today’s Lod (Lydda). It is followed by the station dar sunte Iohanneß vor weckede sinen wert Samuwele van dem tode (‘where Saint John raised his host Samuel from death’, fol. 41r, ll. 14-16), which might be located in Rama, which is the place of the birth and death of the prophet Samuel. Then, the text takes us to Bethsaida near the Sea of Galilee, the birthplace of Philip the Apostle (fol. 41r, ll. 15-22), and via Emmaus, where the disciples recognized Christ as he broke the bread (fol. 41r, l. 22-42r, l. 2), to the Mount of Olives, where Christ cried over the coming destruction of Jerusalem (fol. 42r, ll. 2-4).

Jaffa, Lod, Rama and Emmaus are on the route from the Mediterranean Sea to Jerusalem. Felix Fabri travelled the same way and mentions similar stations. The Sea of Galilee appears out of place. This might be attributed to the Aflat’s composer’s lack of knowledge of the topography of the Holy Land. He might simply not have known that the Sea of Galilee is located much further north, and therefore thought it to be close to the other sites on the way to Jerusalem.

Through the Golden Gate, the gate of Christ’s entry to Jerusalem (fol. 42r, ll. 4-6), the reader enters the Holy City and visits the House of Herod the Great (*c. 74/73 BC, in office 37-34 BC), which was, beginning in the times of the crusaders, assumed to have been located at the old Antonia fortress, north to Herod’s temple in Jerusalem (fol. 42r, ll. 6-12).

The next two stations (fol. 42r, l. 12-19) can be found either north to the Temple Mount or at Mount Zion which is at the south – Christ as a prisoner at Caiaphas’ house and Saint Peter’s betrayal – depending on the traditions the Aflat refers to. After the station where Saint Peter is vorweckede […] van der drofnisse, do unse here waß upgestan (‘awoken from his grief, after our Lord had risen’, fol. 42r, ll. 19-23) by an angel, which I was not able to locate, the pilgrim is sent to the inner city of Jerusalem.

The pilgrim is taken along the traditional Way of the Cross (fol. 42r, l. 23-42v, l. 21) – with a stop at Saint Stephen’s gate (fol. 42v, ll. 22-24) – that ends at Mount Calvary and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (fol. 43r, l. 1-43r, l. 15), which is called temple, a common term for the church that can be found in several pilgrimage reports. The Sorrowful Way of Christ carrying the Cross, which was established no earlier than the thirteenth century, when the focus of devotion shifted more and more to the suffering of Christ during the Passion, was constantly evolving, and the locations of its stations changed over the centuries. In the Aflat, the reader visits the Column of the Flagellation, one of the places where Christ fell with the Cross, the place where Simon of Cyrene was forced to carry the Cross, the site where Christ told the women to cry over themselves and their children, and another station where Christ fell with the Cross while climbing Mount Calvary. In comparison with the stations that had become part of the canon in the West in the
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32 Cf. Fabri, Sionpilger, fols 38v-40r (Carls, pp. 108-107).
sixteenth century, one notices that two of the stations that are still extant today are missing: The Fainting of the Virgin Mary, and the incident of a woman wiping the face of Christ (Veronica’s veil). It is worth mentioning that the latter only became a part of the Way of the Cross in the fifteenth century. The several chapels and altars the pilgrim visits before entering the Tomb of Christ are most likely to represent those that can (or could) be found in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, such as the chapel of the Invention of the Holy Cross.

After the return to Mount Zion, to the place of the Last Supper, the place where Saint John celebrated the mass for Mary, and the station where a part of the column of the Flagellation was shown (fol. 43r, l. 15-44r, l. 4), which, from crusader times on, could all be encountered in the Church of Saint Mary on Mount Zion, the reader finds the well where Christ sin teken de de nach der mynscheyt (‘performed his sign for humanity’, fol. 44v, ll. 4-7), and the zoy sathatika pra yn (?) where the Holy Cross was buried (fol. 44r, ll. 7-10). Since the account of the Invention of the Cross is given earlier at the chapel in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, I assume that this station is most likely not located at the church. Maybe the text refers to the Pool of Bethesda where, according to a legend which developed in the second half of the twelfth century, the horizontal bar of the Cross was found. However, both sites must have been located in Jerusalem, since these traditions have always been associated with the Holy City.

The next four sites can be found on the Mount of Olives (Gethsemane) and tell of Christ praying in agony, sweating water and blood, and being arrested after Judas’ betrayal (fol. 44r, l. 10-44v, l. 8). Then, the pilgrim is taken out of Jerusalem to the village dat het Joacham. Dar sint de ersten prester bestedighet (‘that is called Joacham, where the first priests are buried’, fol. 44r, ll. 8-10). It is possible that the author refers to this village, which is hard to locate, by mistake. The station could also have been located in the Kidron Valley, with its well-known monumental tombs, since many of these were referred to as the tombs of priests, and several Christian traditions were attached to them. In addition, the preceding and following stations are all connected to the Mount of Olives and Mount Zion, which could indicate that this station too is to be found in this area, indicating a comprehensible itinerary.

After the place where Matthew was elected to become the twelfth apostle (fol. 44v, ll. 10-12) on Mount Zion, the pilgrim climbs the berghe to Oliveti (‘Mount of Olives’), where one can find the Church of the Ascension (fol. 44v, ll. 12-16). Then the pilgrim continues down again to the Tomb of the Virgin Mary in deme dale Iosaphat (‘in the valley of Josaphat’), where there is sevenfold forgiveness of sins, and four souls can be redeemed (fol. 44v, ll. 17-20). Even though the next station is located in the text at the borch to Galylea (‘the mountain in Galilea’, fol. 44v, l. 20-45v,

34 Cf. Storme, Way, pp. 95-106.
l. 1), and thus far away from the city, it is more likely that this refers to a site on the Mount of Olives. From the thirteenth century, when it became more and more dangerous to travel to the sites in the northern parts of the Holy Land, a tradition was apparently established in connection with the Mount of Olives that transferred these sites to Jerusalem and thus within reach for the pilgrims – among them also the place ‘Galilea’ where the resurrected Christ showed himself to his disciples.\(^{37}\) The next station, where the places of Mary Magdalene’s encounter with the risen Christ, Christ teaching the acht stücke der salichet (‘the eight beatitudes’) and Christ teaching the Pater Noster are combined (fol. 45\(v\), ll. 1-7). This is also very likely to have been found on the Mount of Olives, since the crusaders moved the tradition there to their newly erected Church of the Pater Noster.\(^{38}\) This church is only a stone’s throw away from the previous stations, except for the tomb of Mary, and the traditions concerning encounters with the risen Christ had accumulated on the Mount of Olives.

The next stations in Bethlehem (fol. 45\(r\), ll. 9-18) are a lot easier to localize, because the events concerning the Birth of Christ were commemorated there exclusively, mainly in the Church of the Nativity. They are most likely to be identified with the birthplace in the Grotto of the Nativity, the altars of the Circumcision and of the Magi, and the different sites where the Holy Innocents were venerated, which changed over the centuries. With the arrival of the crusaders, the veneration of the Holy Innocents began to have its focus in the Church of the Nativity.\(^{39}\)

The account of Christ turning water to wyne (‘water into wine’, fol. 45\(r\), ll. 18-20) in the Gospel of Saint John takes place at the Wedding at Cana. Therefore, this station, even though the name ‘Cana’ is not mentioned, might be located at Chirbet Qana, a village fourteen kilometres north of Nazareth, that has been identified with the biblical place since the twelfth century.\(^{40}\) Similar to ‘Galilea’ at the Mount of Olives, this station might also have been located at the Mount of Olives from the thirteenth century on.\(^{41}\) This would correlate with the next stations, which take the pilgrim to the biblical village of Bethany.

Bethany is located on the south-eastern slope of the Mount of Olives. Here, the pilgrim visits the place where Christ resurrected Lazarus, and the station where he cried for him (fol. 45\(r\), l. 21-45\(v\), l. 3). The place where Christ sent the disciples to find the donkey on which he rode into the city is located up dem berghe to Betanien (‘on the hill in Bethany’, fol. 45\(v\), ll. 3-6). The next station, where he let the donkey
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\(^{37}\) Cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, pp. 904-910, esp. 906; Fabri, Sionpilger, fol. 84v-91v.

\(^{38}\) Cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, pp. 853 and 864.

\(^{39}\) Cf. Kopp, Die Heiligen Stätten, pp. 40-42, 74, 84, esp. n. 298. The altar of the Magi was erected by the Franciscans, who had had an active friary in Bethlehem since the fourteenth century. The Milk Grotto had become the place of veneration of the Holy Innocents before the crusader period, pp. 77-80. They were mainly venerated in the Church of the Nativity, but also at other sites in Bethlehem, pp. 81-85.


\(^{41}\) Cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, p. 906.
graze and *bewende Iberusalem* (‘cried over Jerusalem’, fol. 45v, ll. 3-9), is on the Mount of Olives, closer to the city.

The last two stations can be found at the Jordan River in the desert and in Hebron at the burial place of Adam and the prophets (fol. 45v, ll. 9-15). This might refer to the Cave of the Patriarchs, where Adam and Eve are said to be buried next to Abraham and the other patriarchs’ graves.⁴²

As mentioned above, the *Aflat*’s author locates the site of Saint George’s martyrdom in Rome. This is an obvious mistake, since Saint George’s martyrdom is usually associated with the Holy Land, namely the city of Lod. It was suggested that the puzzling occurrence of Rome might be a contamination from or a link to the *Aflat to Rome*, or that Saint George was particularly venerated in the place where the *Aflat* was composed.⁴³

The *Aflat to Rome* can be found right before the *Aflat to Iberusalem* in Cod. Guelf. 1130 Helmst. As mentioned above, the two texts form a single unit and were bound together in a small booklet that was only later attached to the codex. Even though they are closely related, the texts differ in several aspects. In contrast to the *Aflat to Iberusalem*, the author states his primary source in the introduction of the text: *Sunte Silvester formet in siner kroneken, dat to Rome sint gewesen dusent unnd vyf unnd veflich kerken, denn dat meyste del vorvallen sint* (‘Saint Silvester⁴⁴ states in his chronicles that in Rome there were 1045 churches, of which the majority lie in ruins’, fol. 36r, ll. 1-4). The following text is structured by the description of the sites and indulgences at the *seven hovet kerken, de dar sint mit groten aflate unnd gnade vorladen* (‘seven main churches, which are endowed with great indulgences and grace’, fol. 36r, ll. 5-7): Saint John Lateran (fol. 36r, l. 8-37r, l. 17), Saint Peter’s Basilica (fol. 37r, l. 18-38r, l. 20), Saint Paul Outside the Walls (fol. 38v, l. 21-38v, l. 12), Saint Lawrence Outside the Walls (fol. 38v, l. 13-39v, l. 5), the Basilica of Saint Mary Major (fol. 39v, l. 6-21), the Basilica of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem (fol. 39v, l. 22-39v, l. 17), and Saint Sebastian (and Fabian) Outside the Walls (fol. 39v, l. 18-40r, l. 15). For each church the author lists the altars, chapels, tombs, and relics that are venerated there. The indulgences range from seven years for climbing the stairs at Saint Peter’s Basilica (fol. 37r, ll. 18-22), as well as much more significant indulgences – *twelf dusent iar aflateß unnd so vele kaynen unnd quitinge den dridden deyl aller sunde* (‘twelve thousand years of indulgence and as many carena and redemption of the third part of all sins’, fol. 37v, ll. 16-18) – to forgiveness of all sins (fol. 39v, ll. 15-18). The pilgrim can also redeem the souls of his loved ones from Purgatory (i.e. fol. 38v, ll. 16-25).

The *Aflat to Rome* and the one to *Iberusalem* must have been composed with the same intention and both provide an itinerary of the holy sites, including the indulgences. However, Saint George is not mentioned in the *Aflat to Rome*. There is no

---


⁴³ At this point, I would like to thank Hedwig Röckelein for these suggestions and her steady support of my research.

⁴⁴ Most likely Pope Silvester I (pap. 314-335).
explanation to be found on how and why the city on the Tiber made its way into the Aflat to Iherusalem, apart from the fact that both texts belonged together in the booklet and are closely related to each other. Neither could I identify any specific veneration of Saint George in Heiningen. To conclude: The composer of the Aflat simply confused the name of the city where the site is located and did not intend to add Rome to his itinerary.

4 The Aflat’s Source and Possible Usage

Since the Aflat to Iherusalem was termed a guide for spiritual pilgrimages by Kruse, her idea should be examined more closely. The practice of participating in a spiritual pilgrimage offered those who were not able or allowed to journey to the Holy Land the opportunity to see the holy sites with their mind’s eye, while staying safe within the walls of their homes or convents. In the Late Middle Ages, this form became especially popular with religious women who were bound to their convents by enclosure. Inside the walls of their monasteries they developed practices that allowed them to walk in the footsteps of Christ or Mary, to relive the Passion, and to participate in the recorded pilgrimages of others, gaining indulgences at the sites they would never have the chance to see with their own eyes.

A prominent example of spiritual pilgrimages are two manuscripts from the Cistercian monastery of Wienhausen that can be clearly identified as guides for the nuns to lead them on their virtual pilgrimage. These texts, however, differ strongly from the Aflat to Iherusalem. It was definitely created by Wienhausen nuns, who wanted to turn their monastery into ‘a northern Jerusalem’ and to recreate and re-enact the Passion of Christ, while identifying with Virgin Mary, mentally and by their own actions. This intention shaped the way their manuals for spiritual pilgrimage were composed: The texts focus on the Passion and contain eleven stations, which are described in detail; they come with precise instructions and prayers. These instructions integrate the topographical and architectural features of the Wienhausen monastery into the nuns’ imaginary journey. They also included props and artworks in their contemplations.

The Aflat to Iherusalem does not contain these features. Nor does it refer to the conventual buildings or the canonesses in Heiningen. There are no detailed instructions or prayers. The numerous stations of the Aflat do not focus on the pas-
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45 Cf. n. 2.
46 The text is preserved in two slightly different versions in Wienhausen, KIA, MSS 85 and 86. Edition and translation of MS 86 by Mecham, ‘Sacred Vision’, pp. 440-455.
47 ‘Internal references to the chapel of Saints Fabian and Sebastian, to “our cemetery,” and “our sepulcher,” combined with the lack of a professional hand, indicate that the nuns produced these works specifically for use within their convent.’ Mecham, ‘Sacred Vision’, p. 307.
48 Ibid., p. 305.
49 Cf. ibid., pp. 305-306.
50 Cf. Pinchover, ‘The Via Crucis’.
sion exclusively but rather guide the pilgrim from station to station, where different saints and (sometimes unrelated) events are commemorated. In comparison with the text from Wienhausen and others, such as the ones composed by Felix Fabri, that guide the reader on a spiritual pilgrimage, it becomes clear that the Aflat differs greatly from such works, which were indubitably composed for this purpose exclusively.

The reason the text from Wienhausen is still of interest for us is that it proves spiritual pilgrimages were a common devotional practice in the female convents of medieval Saxony, reaching their peak in the Late Middle Ages, the period of the Devotio Moderna and the monastic reform movements.51 Wienhausen as well as Heiningen were reformed under the supervision of the Windesheim reformer Johannes Busch in the second half of the fifteenth century,52 which ‘brought a renewed emphasis on the written word, both in terms of the private devotional reading the reformers advocated as well as in terms of improving the administration […]’,53 as stated by June Mecham. It would not be wrong to express that the two houses shared the same ‘cultural context’54 – at least in the reform period – and therefore similar devotional practices. The reform and becoming part of the Congregation of Windesheim entailed significant changes in the social and religious life of a convent. It is likely that the canonesses made spiritual pilgrimages as part of their devotional repertoire in the time after the Windesheim Reform in Heiningen, when enclosure was reinforced and religious life, with its rich devotional practices, flourished again.

In this time of seclusion from the outside world, when pilgrimages became even less acceptable for women and when ‘devotion increasingly had to do with affective piety mostly centred on the Passion of Christ’55, texts were copied and (re-)composed to aid the religious in their devotional practices. This was especially the case in convents that became – officially or unofficially – part of the Congregation of Windesheim.56 I therefore assume that the innovative milieu, which could be found in the reformed convents, was also present at Heiningen, where the collection of books was adapted to the standards of the congregation.57 The New Testament and hagiography offer little detail on the topography of the Holy Land and especially Jerusalem. In their desire for intensive contemplation and visualisation, the religious needed to fill these empty spaces. One of their sources – arguably the most essential – were the various forms of pilgrims’ diaries and reports,

51 For the veneration of relics and the accompanying devotional practices in Wienhausen cf. the articles by Mai-BrittWiechmann and Hedwig Röckelein in this volume.
52 Cf. for Wienhausen Mecham, ‘Sacred Vision’, chap. 2 and for Heiningen Taddey, Kloster Heiningen, pp. 95-88.
54 Ibid., p. 101.
55 Rudy, Virtual Pilgrimages, p. 19.
56 Cf. ibid., p. 24.
written by men who had visited the Holy Land themselves and had brought knowledge about the sites back with them.

These accounts can be found all over northern Europe and reached the peak of their popularity in the century before the Reformation. They tend to have rather conservative features, providing the reader with relatively similar information.58 This can be attributed to the fact that the pilgrims’ focal points were indeed quite similar, focusing on the main events of the Bible. Also, the majority of authors relied on existing sources for their reports – ‘one person’s diary became the next person’s guide.’59 Therefore, in the process of copying, the texts were reshaped and in some cases given a new function, according to the intention of the copyist and the needs of its new user.60 Among these new users were, in many cases, religious women, whose conventual libraries frequently contained travelogues that had been ‘copied, fragmented and recopied for decades or even centuries’61 and became the fundamental source for their self-composed spiritual pilgrimages.

A good example of such a text is the so-called ‘Windesheim Virtual Pilgrimage Compilation’,62 which is certainly more extensive than the Aflat but does show similar features and structures. It originates from the same time as the Aflat and was created for a nun who was ‘probably connected to the Windesheim Congregation.’63 Like Cod. Guelf. 1130 Helmst., the codex in which this text can be found also includes a virtual pilgrimage to the seven principal churches of Rome. Both texts are based on a pilgrimage diary.64

The ‘Windesheim Virtual Pilgrimage Compilation’ is comparatively similar to the Aflat to Iherusalem, even though it is much more detailed. In the introduction – ‘These are the Holy Places which one sees and visits in the Holy Land’ (fol. 57r)65 – the stations are introduced. Their descriptions, as well as the listed indulgences may differ in details but generally follow the same scheme as the Aflat to Iherusalem. In the end, the extent to which the authors transformed and reshaped their sources and formulated their own texts depended on their own preferences and decisions. Due to the similarities with the ‘Windesheim Virtual Pilgrimage Compilation’ and other texts that are associated with the Congregation of Windesheim, and the fact that the idea of spiritual pilgrimages (and related books) spread with the reform movement, I assume that the Aflat was composed in the course of the Windesheim Reform in Heiningen.
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59 Ibid., p. 40.
60 Cf. ibid., pp. 39-40.
61 Ibid., p. 41.
62 Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 133 F 1, ‘The Windesheim Virtual Pilgrimage Compilation,’ ed. by Rudy, pp. 425-446.
63 Rudy, *Virtual Pilgrimages*, p. 146.
64 Cf. ibid., pp. 146-147 and also Rudy’s edition in App. X.
65 Translation by Rudy.
Kruse identified the *Aflat to Rome*’s main source as the *Indulgentiae ecclesiarum urbis Romae*, of which a Latin copy is preserved in Cod. Guelf. 990 Helmst. (fol. 1r-59v), which originates from the sexton’s office in Heiningen. It is therefore probable that the *Aflat to Iherusalem* is based on a similar source, written in Latin, or already in Middle Low German. However, this text has not been preserved, nor have any other texts from Heiningen related to the *Aflat* survived (or have been identified as originating in the Canonesses’ house), as stated by Kruse. Therefore, we can only guess to which extent the original source was transformed, shortened and adapted to meet the new users’ requirements.

The *Aflat*’s author does not tell us directly, but there are many indicators that show that the text was composed based on a pilgrimage report. The *Aflat to Iherusalem*, unlike the spiritual pilgrimage from Wienhausen, does not focus on either Christ or the Virgin Mary. In addition, various saints from the Old Testament as well as the early Church are venerated at the sites. It appears that the text, while certainly referring to it, is not based on or structured (chronologically) by the Gospels or hagiographical texts. Furthermore, certain waypoints can be found that are unlikely mentioned just for their own sake, such as wells, chapels, and tombs, as well as the precise number of steps on staircases. I believe that these reflect the original source, which might have contained more detailed descriptions of the places and directions. Through a closer examination of the order of the stations, it has become clear that they are grouped according to certain areas such as the Mount of Olives, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre or Bethlehem. Even though these accumulations are mostly not visited in a topographical order but rather randomly, in many cases the single stations were on a traceable route. This might be due to the fact that pilgrims visited the sites in one area by easy stages that allowed them to take time to contemplate, pray and also take part in the liturgy. Afterwards, they returned to the place where they spent the night, such as a pilgrims’ hospice (e.g. on Mount Zion). I therefore suggest seeing the accumulations of stations as stages that make up the itinerary of the *Aflat*’s original source. As was common practice, the composer may have transformed the text(s) that were the source for the *Aflat*’s stations greatly. In the process, other elements that may have been part of the source might have been omitted, since they are found in many pilgrimage reports or more detailed spiritual pilgrimages, e.g. rules for the pilgrims. In addition, the *Aflat to Rome* and the *Aflat to Iherusalem* seem to have been composed as a single unit, therefore the source of the Jerusalem-*Aflat* may have been transformed to adapt it to the style of the *Aflat to Rome*.

The *Aflat*’s composer certainly did not omit the indulgences. According to Rudy, indulgences were – together with developing an empathetic relationship with Christ – one of the main motivations for virtual travels, especially in the time of the *Aflat*’s likely composition, the century before the Reformation. In comparison
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to other pilgrims’ accounts and spiritual pilgrimages, such as the ones from the Netherlands published by Rudy, or a text of unknown origin from the fifteenth to sixteenth century in the Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, the indulgences in the *Aflat to Iherusalem* appear to be much more significant than usual (forgiveness of all sins and redemption for souls from Purgatory at almost every station!). Indulgences of similar extent can only be encountered in a few other instances; one example is the Bickenkloster in Villingen in southern Baden-Württemberg. In Villingen, the abbess Ursula Haider (*1413, in office 1480-98), who started to reform the convent in 1480, ordered the nuns to erect several stations all over the convent, with the descriptions and indulgences written on small tables (*Ablaßtafeln*). At these stations, the indulgences, which Haider had been awarded by the pope, were granted. They were unusually potent. It is unlikely that Heiningen also gained similar indulgences and that the *Aflat* is a reflection of them. I attribute the quality and quantity of the indulgences in the text to the pilgrim’s report it is based on, since such powerful indulgences were, according to Nikolaus Paulus, reported widely in pilgrim’s accounts, beginning in the middle of the fourteenth century and later.

The *Aflat*’s source was most likely not written before the fourteenth century. This is indicated by the large number of indulgences, which became incredibly important in the fifteenth century, and the stations that are listed in the text. They reflect the sites Fabri and the other pilgrims encounter in the Holy Land, and the language of the *Aflat* has many parallels in the terminology of contemporary pilgrims’ accounts. The stations resemble the sacred topography of the Holy Land from crusader times on and later, such as the *grave unser leven irowen in deme dale Iosaphat* (the tomb of Our Lady in the Valley of Josaphat, fol. 44v, ll. 17-18). According to Küchler, the name *Josaphat* had been used in the first centuries but was then neglected and only became popular again in the twelfth century, when the whole complex was called *Sancta Maria in valle Josephat*. Another good example is the *borch to Galylea* (Mountain of Galilee), which was, as stated earlier, thought to have been located on the Mount of Olives, beginning in the middle of the thirteenth century.

---

68 Cf. ibid., appendix.
70 Cf. Stegmaier-Breinlinger, “‘Die heltigen Stett’”.
71 Paulus, III, pp. 343-344. Paulus also states that these indulgences were *freilich unecht* (‘certainly made up’), p. 343.
5 Conclusion

After examining the context in which the *Aflat to Iherusalem* was used and most likely composed, and based on a thorough analysis of the text and its unique features, I come to the conclusion that the text is a transformed (and to a large extent shortened?) pilgrims’ report from the Late Middle Ages. Together with the stylistically related *Aflat to Rome*, the text constitutes a short booklet for spiritual pilgrimages, written by a single hand. The *Aflat* was used as a mental itinerary – a blueprint – for the virtual travels of the canonesses of Heiningen. Such spiritual journeys to the holy sites were undertaken in medieval Saxony’s monasteries, such as Wienhausen and other convents that were influenced by the Congregation of Windesheim. Guides for the nuns’ spiritual pilgrimages and pilgrims’ accounts were popular and widely known at that time. It is hard to imagine that the canonesses in Heiningen did not join their fellow religious in this devotional practice, especially after the Windesheim Reform in 1450, when the convent’s spiritual life flourished again, new books came to the Canonesses’ house and the enclosure was, once again, enforced. Their wide knowledge of the New Testament and saints’ lives, as well as their expertise in similar practices allowed them to complement the brief descriptions of the *Aflat*, which provided a structure to visiting the Holy Land’s sacred sites in their mind’s eye. It can be assumed that they had no need for a more detailed guide and liked to rely more on their imagination, which offered them an opportunity to relive the journey in a different way all over again and to create a new devotional experience, every time they travelled in their minds.

For this edition, punctuation has been added to the original text, and the abbreviations have been expanded to ensure better readability. The numbers of the folios are given in square brackets. The letters u and v are normalized according to modern usage. Names of persons and places are capitalized, and quotation marks have been added to mark direct speech. Rubricated letters are indicated by round brackets, while missing letters and words were added in square brackets. The Chi Rho (XPS and XPI) has also been expanded in square brackets. Biblical references are in accordance with the English Standard Version. The number of the stations equal the number of the respective footnote, in which possible identifications and locations of the sites are proposed. For those stations that are no longer extant or that I could not identify myself, I rely on Fabri and the Windesheim Virtual Pilgrimage Compilation for my identification.

[41v] >D<yt iß dat aflat to Iherusalem


---

74 Portegaß might refer to the ancient port of Jaffa (Joppe) on the coast of the Mediterranean, while the scene might be identified with the resurrection of Tabitha, cf. Acts 9.36-41. Lübben, *Mittelniederdeutsches Wörterbuch*, p. 573 translates the term *werdynne* as ‘wife’, ‘housewife’, or female ‘innkeeper’, which can be attributed to Tabitha. The resurrection of Tabitha is the best known resurrection accredited to Peter. Fabri encounters this station at the house of Tabitha, at the beginning of his pilgrimage in Jaffa, fol. 38v (Carls, p. 108).

75 This station must be situated in the village Bethsaida (Betsaida) at the Sea of Galilee, Andrew the Apostle’s and Peter’s birthplace, cf. Mark 1.16-18 and John 1.44. The exact location of Bethsaida is under discussion, cf. Kopp, *Die Heiligen Stätten*, pp. 230-243, esp. pp. 240-241 and Bowker, pp. 55-56. This station very likely refers to Lod (Lydda), on the way from the port of Jaffa to Jerusalem, where the martyrdom of George is commemorated (see above). Fabri also visits Saint George in Lydda on his way to the Holy City, fol. 39v (Carls, p. 108). The martyrdom of George is told in Jacobus da Varagine, *Legenda aurea*, ed. and transl. by Benz, pp. 300-306.

76 There is no account of John the Apostle resurrecting a man called Samuel in the Bible, while there are several accounts of him resurrecting people in Jacobus da Varagine, *Legenda aurea*, ed. and transl. by Benz, pp. 65-72. The name Samuel is not mentioned. A city connected to the Old Testament’s Prophet Samuel – his place of birth and death – can be found in Rama, on the way to Jerusalem, and this station is most likely to be found there, cf. I Sam 7.17 and Kopp, *Die Heiligen Stätten*, pp. 18-20. This place was also visited by Fabri, who travels to ‘sant Samuels statt’ (the city of Saint Samuel) directly after Saint Jorge de Lidde, fol. 39v-39v (Carls, p. 108).
dar iß vorghevinge aller sunde. >V<ort, dar Philippa geboren wart, dar Ysayaß gewonet hadde.78 dar iß vorghevinge aller sunde unnd eyn zele ut pinen unnd so mannighe votstappen alze he trit, so mannich vertich dage wareß aflateß. >T<o Emmaß, dar u[n]se leve here dat brot brack vor den jungeren,79 [42'] dar iß vorghevinge aller sunde. Vort, dar unse leve here bewende Iherusalem,80 dar iß vorghevinge aller sunde unnd eyn zele ut pinen. >J<tem vor der porten, dar unse leve here inreyt, 81 dar iß de sulve gnade. Jtem so kummet we to dem tempel Herodeß, dar unse leve here wart gebracht van Pylato to Herodeß,82 alzo mannighe vottrede alze he tryt, so mannighe dusent iar aflateß unnd hundert karynen unnd vertich dage warhaftich aflateß. >J<tem de sulve gnade iß do he one weddersende to Pylato83 unnd in Cayphaß huß, dar se unsem leven heren de ogen vorbunden,84 dar iß vorgevinge aller sunde. >J<tem in M[ar]jaß huß, dar sunte Peter vorsak unnes

---

78 The birthplace of Philip the Apostle is also Bethsaida, on the shores of Lake Galilee, cf. station two and John 1.44 and 12.21. It is unclear why the author connects the Old Testament’s Prophet Isaiah with this place.

79 Emmaus, twenty-three kilometres west of Jerusalem, is the place where the Disciples of Emmaus recognized the resurrected Christ when he broke the bread, cf. Luke 24.30-35. According to Kopp, *Die Heiligen Stätten*, p. 447, the crusaders built a church at the site of the house of Cleopas, where the breaking of the bread was assumed to have taken place. Fabri visits this place but does not mention a church, fols 40r-40v (Carls, p. 109).

80 Christ crying over the destruction of Jerusalem is only mentioned in Luke 19.41-44, but associated with the Mount of Olives, east of the Holy City. This station can be identified with today’s Dominus Flevit. The crusaders commemorated the event at the stone on which the crying Christ was said to have sat, cf. Küchler, *Jerusalem*, pp. 839-840. This event (mistakenly?) reappears at station fifty-five.

81 This usually refers to the so called ‘Golden Gate’, on the east side of the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. While this gate most likely did not exist during the times of Christ, it is later venerated as the gate through which he entered the city on the donkey on Palm Sunday, cf. Küchler, *Jerusalem*, pp. 195-199, Matthew 21.1-11 and Mark 11.1-12. The name of the gate is not mentioned in the Bible. Fabri travels through this gate and tells the story of the Byzantine emperor Heraclius I (*575, in office 610-641), who was denied access through the gate by the wall itself until he stripped off his clothes and assumed a humble posture, fols 78r-79v (Carls, pp. 135-136).


83 Christ being sent back to Pilate is only reported in Luke 23.11-15. The Praetorium of Pontius Pilate was assumed to have been located at the same place as the House of Herod Antipas during the times of the crusaders, cf. ninth station. In the fifteenth century, the stations moved (back) to Mount Zion, cf. Küchler, *Jerusalem*, p. 361. It cannot be clarified without a doubt to which place this and the following stations refer.

84 Until the fifteenth century, the house of the Jewish high priest Caiaphas was also assumed to have stood north of the Temple Mount, cf. stations nine and ten. Since the next station is likely to be situated at Mount Zion, it cannot be ruled out that this station refers to a tradition that is associated with that place as well. The Bible gives one account of Christ being blindfolded in Caiaphas’ house, cf. Luke 22.64-65. For the trial in the house of Caiaphas cf. Matthew 26.57-68, Mark 14.53-65 and Luke 22.63-71.
The Aflat to Iherusalem

haren,85 dar iß vorgevinge aller sund e. >]<tem dar de engel kam to Peter undn vorweckede one van der drofnisse, do u[n]se here waß upgestan,86 dar iß vorgevinge aller sund e unnd eyn zele ut pinen. >]<tem in Pylatuß huß dar steyt de sule dar u[n]se [42] lev e here umme gegeyselt wart, dar iß eyn wyt mormeln steyn.87 Dar iß vorghevinge aller sund e. >]<tem dar u[n]se leve here vel mit dem cruce,88 dar iß dat sulve aflat. Jtem dar de ioden over one repen: ‘crucifige!’,89 dar iß vorgevinge aller sund e. >]<tem in der porten, dar Simon wart getwungen, dat he [Christus] scholde helpen dat cruce dragen, dar iß vorgevinge aller sund e. Da repen de iodeschen vrowen over de unschult de se [Christus] deden. Do sprak [Christus]: ‘gy, dochter van Iherusalem! Wenet nicht over mek, sunnder over juwe kinder, wente de tyd kumpt, dat gy de moten eten.’90 >]<tem dar u[n]se leve here vel, do

85. Peter’s denial of Christ and the house of Mary can – at first sight – not be attributed to the same place. Acts 12.12-17 relates how Peter tells the crowd at the house of Mary, the mother of (John) Mark the Evangelist, how he was freed from imprisonment by the angel. Peter’s denial is described in detail and takes place at the courtyard of the house of Caiaphas, cf. Matthew 26.69-75, Mark 14.66-72, Luke 22.54-62 and John 18.15-18. From the beginning, his denial and regret had been commemorated at Mount Zion. The crusaders erected their Church of Saint Peter in Gallicantu there in 1102, which existed until the fourteenth century. There are no archaeological traces of that site, but the tradition continued to be associated with Mount Zion, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, pp. 661-662. The author was apparently not familiar with the topography, and it is not to be ruled out that there was also a tradition of Peter’s denial connected with other places – especially the sites of Christ’s trial. Consequently, this station may also be located north of the Temple Mount, like the previous stations.

86. In the New Testament, it is not Peter who is informed about the resurrection by the angel, but the women, cf. Matthew 28.1-8, Mark 16.1-8 and Luke 24.1-7. I was not able to locate this station, but it is likely that, just as the previous stations, it can be found in the northern part of the Old City of Jerusalem.

87. As stated above, the crusaders (re-)located every station connected to the trial, flagellation etc. with their Praetorium, north of the Temple Mount. This is the second station of the traditional Way of the Cross, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, pp. 361-362 and stations nine to eleven.

88. This station very likely refers to the third station of the traditional Via Dolorosa and can be found in a former Polish chapel, opposite today’s Austrian Hospice, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, p. 405. A fall of Christ is not mentioned in the New Testament but represents a common tradition.

89. This refers to the Ecce Homo-account during the trial and the Jews screaming for Jesus to be condemned in Matthew 26.22-24, Mark 15.12-14; Luke 23.20-23 and John 19.13-16. The so-called Ecce Homo Arch has been venerated from the times of the crusaders, but the name dates back to the sixteenth century, which might indicate that the Aflat and its source had been written earlier, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, pp. 380 and 387. It is the traditional third station of the Via Dolorosa.

90. Cf. Matthew 27.32, Mark 15.21 and Luke 23.26. The traditional fifth station of the Way of the Cross, where Simon of Cyrene was forced to carry the Cross for Jesus, was established at the small oratory of the Franciscans in 1895. In the period between the twelfth and the sixteenth centuries, several traditions of Christ carrying the Cross have been associated with this area, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, p. 407 and the ‘Windesheim Virtual Pilgrimage Compilation’, fol. 58v-59r (Rudy, Virtual Pilgrimages, pp. 426-427). The quote refers directly to Luke 23.27-31.

The second site at this station, the traditional Via Dolorosa’s eighth station, was venerated at different places along the way over the centuries, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, p. 408. In the Aflat, these two stations seem to be combined, because there is only one indulgence given, and they are not separated stylistically. I therefore count them as one station, even though they were venerated at different sites, albeit ones close to each other.
he scholde den berch angan, dar iß vorghevinge aller sunde. Dar springet eyn borne, dar iß vorghevinge aller sunde. Dar schal sik eyn knyen unnd spreken eyn pater noster unnd awe Maria so vorlozet he eyne zele ut pynen. Since the previous station is located at Mount Calvary, this station is very likely also to be found there. The author does not tell the reader, to which event this station refers, but locates it at a well, where the pilgrim has to say the only prayers to be encountered in the Aflat. This is a very strong indication that the text is based on an actual pilgrim’s report.

Saint Stephen’s Gate – today known commonly as the Lion’s Gate – is located on the eastern wall of Jerusalem’s Old City, north of the Temple Mount. Fabri passes through this gate, fols 63v-64r (Carls, p. 125). The rock where Stephen was stoned to death has been venerated in the east, outside of the city walls, from the earliest times, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, p. 667. As of the fifth century, however, his bones were venerated in Saint Stephen, north of Jerusalem. This tradition dominated in the times of the crusaders, but from 1290 on, the tradition returned to the east, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, pp. 679-681. The previous and following stations are not located outside the city walls, which could indicate that the Aflat’s station refers to the tradition in the north. Then again, when considering that the author was not familiar with the topography of the city, and that the later reports locate the gate and the place of the stoning in the East, I assume that the author refers to the later tradition.

This station might refer to a chapel in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, since a chapel of Saint John has existed there from the times of the crusades, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, p. 449, fig. 240 A1. The reader is taken via the Way of the Cross to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which makes it likely that these two chapels should be located in that area, but most likely inside of the church itself.

This station, which is described as the place where Christ and John the Baptist met while they were still in their mothers’ wombs, probably refers to a chapel in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. It might be identified with the chapel of Mary, cf. station twenty-one and Küchler, Jerusalem, p. 449, fig. 240 A1.

Temple in this case does not refer to Herod’s temple. The term was also used for the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the aedicule, with the Tomb of Christ, where this altar might be located, cf. the ‘Windesheim Virtual Pilgrimage Compilation’, fol. 57r (Rudy, Virtual Pilgrimages, p. 426).

The altar Jerusalem might be identified with the compass, an omphalos on the east side, opposite the aedicula, which was thought to be the exact centre of the world – so is Jerusalem, as represented, for example, on the Ebstorf Map, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, pp. 480-481. For the Tomb of Christ cf. pp. 475-478. For the burial of Christ cf. Matthew 27.57-66, Mark 15.42-47, Luke 23.50-56, John 19.38-42 and Acts 13.27-29.

91 There is no account of Christ falling to the ground in the New Testament, cf. station fifteen. The berch must be identified with Mount Calvary (Golgotha), the site of the Crucifixion. This site refers to the traditional seventh or ninth station of the Way of the Cross, which both resemble places where Christ fell with the Cross, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, p. 408.

92 Since the previous station is located at Mount Calvary, this station is very likely also to be found there. The author does not tell the reader, to which event this station refers, but locates it at a well, where the pilgrim has to say the only prayers to be encountered in the Aflat. This is a very strong indication that the text is based on an actual pilgrim’s report.

93 Saint Stephen’s Gate – today known commonly as the Lion’s Gate – is located on the eastern wall of Jerusalem’s Old City, north of the Temple Mount. Fabri passes through this gate, fols 63v-64r (Carls, p. 125). The rock where Stephen was stoned to death has been venerated in the east, outside of the city walls, from the earliest times, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, p. 667. As of the fifth century, however, his bones were venerated in Saint Stephen, north of Jerusalem. This tradition dominated in the times of the crusaders, but from 1290 on, the tradition returned to the east, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, pp. 679-681. The previous and following stations are not located outside the city walls, which could indicate that the Aflat’s station refers to the tradition in the north. Then again, when considering that the author was not familiar with the topography of the city, and that the later reports locate the gate and the place of the stoning in the East, I assume that the author refers to the later tradition.

94 This station might refer to a chapel in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, since a chapel of Saint John has existed there from the times of the crusades, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, p. 449, fig. 240 A1. The reader is taken via the Way of the Cross to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which makes it likely that these two chapels should be located in that area, but most likely inside of the church itself.

95 This station, which is described as the place where Christ and John the Baptist met while they were still in their mothers’ wombs, probably refers to a chapel in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. It might be identified with the chapel of Mary, cf. station twenty-one and Küchler, Jerusalem, p. 449, fig. 240 A1.

96 Tempel in this case does not refer to Herod’s temple. The term was also used for the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the aedicule, with the Tomb of Christ, where this altar might be located, cf. the ‘Windesheim Virtual Pilgrimage Compilation’, fol. 57r (Rudy, Virtual Pilgrimages, p. 426).

97 The altar Jerusalem might be identified with the compass, an omphalos on the east side, opposite the aedicula, which was thought to be the exact centre of the world – so is Jerusalem, as represented, for example, on the Ebstorf Map, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, pp. 480-481. For the Tomb of Christ cf. pp. 475-478. For the burial of Christ cf. Matthew 27.57-66, Mark 15.42-47, Luke 23.50-56, John 19.38-42 and Acts 13.27-29.
unse leve here recket an dat cruce, dar iß vorghevinge aller sunde. >J<tem dar se
dobbelden ume de elder [Christi], dar geyt nedder en treppe, de heft achte unnd
vertich trad, dar vant sunte Helena dat cruce unseß heren, dar iß vorgevinge aller
sunde unnd en zele ut pynen. Da konden se [43\textsuperscript{a}] nicht bekennen dat cruce [Chris-
ti], do leyden se id up eynen doden licham. Do richtede sik de dode licham up
unnd vormeldede dat cruce. Do sette me od an de stede unnd vordelde id an de
kristen. >J<tem so kumpt me an de stede, dar [Christus] wart van dem cruce
nomen unnd wart Marien up den schot geden.\textsuperscript{99} Dar iß vorghevinge aller sunde
unnd en zele ut pynen alle den, de medelidinge hebben mit unser leven vrown
Marien. >J<tem dar unse leve here steyt an dem cruce,\textsuperscript{101} dar iß vorgevinge aller
sunde unnd twey zele ut pynen. >J<tem dar unse leve here at dat aventeten mit
sinen jungeren,\textsuperscript{102} dar iß vorgevinge aller sunde. >J<tem up dem grave sunte
Stephen, dar unse leve here sinen jungeren de vote wosch,\textsuperscript{103} dar iß dat sulve aflat.

\textsuperscript{98} This resembles the eleventh station of the traditional Via Dolorosa, in the Church of the Holy
Sepulchre. The crusaders erected their Chapel of the Nailing of the Cross in accordance with Mat-
thew 27.57-59, Mark 15.42-46 and John 19.38 on the Rock of Calvary, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, pp. 466-
467.

\textsuperscript{99} The place where the soldiers gambled over Christ’s garments – the tenth station of the traditional
Way of the Cross – is located in the choir of the Armenian Chapel of the Division of the Robes; cf.
Küchler, Jerusalem, p. 468. In the New Testament, the soldiers are gambling directly under the Cross,
the True Cross, which is relatively long for the Aflat, refers to the Roman Catholic Chapel of the
Invention of the Holy Cross, also in the Armenian part of the church. This chapel can indeed only be
entered via a longer staircase and was built in the eleventh century, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, pp. 469 and
473-474. An account of the finding of the Cross is given in Jacobus da Varagine, Legenda aurea, ed.
and transl. by Benz, pp. 349-358, esp. 355-356.

\textsuperscript{100} The thirteenth station of the traditional Way of the Cross, where the body of Christ was taken
down from the Cross, is usually connected with the Stone of the Anointing in the Church of the
count Matthew 27.57-59, Mark 15.42-46 and John 19.38. The Bible does not mention any anointing
under the Cross.

\textsuperscript{101} This station refers to the twelfth station of the traditional Way of the Cross, the erection of the
Cross and the death of Jesus in the eastern part of the nave of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, cf.
27.57-59, Mark 15.42-46 and John 19.38.

\textsuperscript{102} There are several places in Jerusalem where the Last Supper is said to have taken place, cf. Küch-
lzer, Jerusalem, pp. 818-819. Since the following stations can also be located here, I assume that this site
refers to the Cenacle in Sancta Maria in Monte Sion, which was erected by the crusaders but is associ-
ated with a much older tradition of the Last Supper, cf. pp. 624-626. Today’s Cenacle was built during
Frederick II’s bloodless recovery of Jerusalem in 1229, cf. pp. 632-633. In addition, Mount Zion
plays an important role for the pilgrims in Fabri’s Sionpilger. For the Last Supper cf. Matthew 26.20-

\textsuperscript{103} These two sites are usually not commemorated at the same place. The washing of his disciples’
feet took place during the Last Supper, cf. John 13.5-11. There is a room in Sancta Maria in Monte
Sion, in which this event was commemorated in the crusader period, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, pp. 637,
fig. 350 and 639. The tomb of Stephen had indeed been venerated on Mount Zion in earlier times
and had a brief revival during the crusader period, but the tradition did not remain connected with
that place, cf. pp. 618-619. Maybe the account in the Aflat refers to one of the rooms in Sancta Maria in Monte Sion, with which the memory of this tradition may have continued to be associated.

104 This station does not refer to the Tomb of Mary in the Valley of Josaphat since the tomb is listed, without any doubt, at station forty-three. However, there are accounts of a site where John celebrated mass for Mary before her death (dormitio Mariae). This tradition continued to be connected with Sancta Maria in Monte Sion from the seventh century on, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, pp. 619-620. The place is mentioned in the ‘Windesheim Virtual Pilgrimage Compilation’, fols 91v-91v (Rudy, Virtual Pilgrimages, p. 441) but there is no corresponding account in the Bible.

105 Parts of the Column of the Flagellation can be found in several places in Jerusalem. In the middle of the first millennium, pilgrims could encounter it with several other relics in Sancta Maria in Monte Sion, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, pp. 614 and 618. This tradition faded during the days of the crusaders, cf. pp. 626. The account in the Aflat might reflect it, but the idea cannot be excluded that the Column, a very mobile relic, was at least temporarily to be found in the church again.

106 The well might refer to the Pool of Bethesda, where the healing of the lame man took place, cf. John 5.1-18 and Küchler, Jerusalem, pp. 321-322 and 332-335. This would connect the station with the following one. Another site worth considering is the Pool of Siloam, where Jesus heals a man who had been blind from birth, one of the most popular miracles, cf. John 19.1-12. The pool is located outside the walls of the Old City, to the Southeast, and the healing of the blind man was commemorated there in the days of the crusaders, cf. pp. 68-71.

107 I was not able to identify the term zoy satbatika prasyn. However, Fabri, Sionpilger, fols 89v-89v (Carls, pp. 142-143), and the ‘Windesheim Virtual Pilgrimage Compilation’, fols 61v-62v (Rudy, Virtual Pilgrimages, p. 428) mention the Probatica Piscina, which refers to the Pool of Bethesda. Along with the tradition of the healing of the lame man – station thirty-three – the wood, from which the Holy Cross was made, is said to have emerged miraculously from this pool, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, p. 335. In this case, the term begraven can be translated as ‘burrowed’, meaning both ‘buried’ and ‘hidden’, to express that the wood was hidden under water.

108 In the New Testament, Jesus takes Peter, Jacob and John (the same disciples that joined him during the Transfiguration, cf. Matthew 17.1-9, Mark 9.2-8 and Luke 9.28-36), with him to the Garden of Gethsemane, where he orders them to wait while he prays. He leaves behind the other eight disciples – in the Aflat they are said to have left him – and Judas Iscariot is on his way to betray Jesus, cf. Matthew 26.36-38 and Mark 14.32-34. Küchler, Jerusalem, pp. 822-823 states that the crusaders assembled all the traditions concerning the arrest of Jesus and the events before on the Mount of Olives, except for the Last Supper that was still commemorated at Mount Zion, cf. station twenty-nine.

This station can also be found in Gethsemane. The phrase *myn zele iß dedrovet* could reflect the emotions of the author but might actually reflect a responsory that was to be sung at this site. Fabri orders the pilgrims to sing the ‘Responsorium *Tristis est anima mea*’ at this site, fol. 82r (Carls, p. 138).


To identify this village, *Joacham*, I received help from Lotem Pinchover. She stated that there is a Bedouin village called Judhum some eight kilometres from Bethlehem and the Hebrew name is very similar to *Joacham יואכים*. It is common that Arab villages retain their biblical names. It remains unclear, however, how the first priests are connected to this place. There is no biblical account of it. As stated above, the author might have confused this village with the Kidron Valley east of the Old City of Jerusalem, where the tombs of priests are venerated, cf. Küchler, *Jerusalem*, pp. 698-730.

Matthew was chosen to become the twelfth apostle after Judas’ betrayal. This took place in Jerusalem, in ‘the upper room, where they were staying’, cf. Acts 1.12-26. This vague description most likely refers to Mount Zion, close to (or at?) Sancta Maria in Monte Sion, cf. the ‘Windesheim Virtual Pilgrimage Compilation’, fol. 91r (Rudy, *Virtual Pilgrimages*, p. 441), and Fabri, *Sionpilger*, fol. 59r-60r (Carls, pp. 122-123).


This is the station where the pilgrim can gain the highest indulgence. In addition, the fact that the name *Iosaphat* is used, is an indicator for the time during which the *Aflat’s* source was written, since the term was only used in the earliest times, and then again by the crusaders, who also restored and enlarged the church with the tomb of Mary, cf. Küchler, *Jerusalem*, pp. 672 and 689-691.

As stated above, this station does not take the pilgrim out of the Holy City but refers to the Viri Galilaei on the Mount of Olives. Küchler, *Jerusalem*, p. 906 states: ‘Als Pilgerwohnheit ist der Besuch von Galiläa auf dem Ölberg erst ab Mitte des 13. Jh.p. – aber von da an konstant – belegt.‘ (The pilgrims’ custom to visit Galilee on the Mount of Olives is documented only from the middle of the thirteenth century on – but since then, it has been documented constantly). He adds: ‘Bis in die 2. Hälfte des 15. Jh.s wird diese Tradition von den Pilgern durchgehend benutzt. Es scheint, dass das richtige Galiläa im N fast durch diese Prothese verdrängt wurde.’ (Until the second half of the fifteenth century, this tradition has been used continuously by the pilgrims. It appears as if the real Galilee in the north was almost replaced by this ‘prosthesis’), cf. p. 907. This is confirmed by Fabri, fol. 83r-84r (Carls, pp. 138-139), who also explains, that all the indulgences for sites that are inaccessible for the pilgrims, can be gained here, because they can be seen from the site, as well as the ‘Windesheim Virtual Pilgrimage Compilation’, fol. 66r-67r (Rudy, *Virtual Pilgrimages*, p. 430). For Christ showing himself to Mary Magdalene and the disciples after his resurrection, cf. John 20.11-29.

110 This station can also be found in Gethsemane. The phrase *myn zele iß dedrovet* could reflect the emotions of the author but might actually reflect a responsory that was to be sung at this site. Fabri orders the pilgrims to sing the ‘Responsorium *Tristis est anima mea*’ at this site, fol. 82r (Carls, p. 138).


113 To identify this village, *Joacham*, I received help from Lotem Pinchover. She stated that there is a Bedouin village called Judhum some eight kilometres from Bethlehem and the Hebrew name is very similar to *Joacham יואכים*. It is common that Arab villages retain their biblical names. It remains unclear, however, how the first priests are connected to this place. There is no biblical account of it. As stated above, the author might have confused this village with the Kidron Valley east of the Old City of Jerusalem, where the tombs of priests are venerated, cf. Küchler, *Jerusalem*, pp. 698-730.

114 Matthew was chosen to become the twelfth apostle after Judas’ betrayal. This took place in Jerusalem, in ‘the upper room, where they were staying’, cf. Acts 1.12-26. This vague description most likely refers to Mount Zion, close to (or at?) Sancta Maria in Monte Sion, cf. the ‘Windesheim Virtual Pilgrimage Compilation’, fol. 91r (Rudy, *Virtual Pilgrimages*, p. 441), and Fabri, *Sionpilger*, fol. 59r-60r (Carls, pp. 122-123).


116 This is the station where the pilgrim can gain the highest indulgence. In addition, the fact that the name *Iosaphat* is used, is an indicator for the time during which the *Aflat’s* source was written, since the term was only used in the earliest times, and then again by the crusaders, who also restored and enlarged the church with the tomb of Mary, cf. Küchler, *Jerusalem*, pp. 672 and 689-691.

117 As stated above, this station does not take the pilgrim out of the Holy City but refers to the Viri Galilæi on the Mount of Olives. Küchler, *Jerusalem*, p. 906 states: ‘Als Pilgerwohnheit ist der Besuch von Galiläa auf dem Ölberg erst ab Mitte des 13. Jh.p. – aber von da an konstant – belegt.‘ (The pilgrims’ custom to visit Galilee on the Mount of Olives is documented only from the middle of the thirteenth century on – but since then, it has been documented constantly). He adds: ‘Bis in die 2. Hälfte des 15. Jh.s wird diese Tradition von den Pilgern durchgehend benutzt. Es scheint, dass das richtige Galiläa im N fast durch diese Prothese verdrängt wurde.’ (Until the second half of the fifteenth century, this tradition has been used continuously by the pilgrims. It appears as if the real Galilee in the north was almost replaced by this ‘prosthesis’), cf. p. 907. This is confirmed by Fabri, fol. 83r-84r (Carls, pp. 138-139), who also explains, that all the indulgences for sites that are inaccessible for the pilgrims, can be gained here, because they can be seen from the site, as well as the ‘Windesheim Virtual Pilgrimage Compilation’, fol. 66r-67r (Rudy, *Virtual Pilgrimages*, p. 430). For Christ showing himself to Mary Magdalene and the disciples after his resurrection, cf. John 20.11-29.
zele ut pynen. >J<tem dar sik unse leve here openbarde sunte Marien Magdalenen in der staltnisse eyneß gherdenerß, dar lerde he de ache stueck der salicheyt unnd dat hilge pater noster.>118 Dar iß vorhevinge aller sunde >J<tem to Bethlehem, dar unse leve here boren wart,119 dar lozet me eyn zele ut pinnen. >J<tem dar he besneden wart, dar iß de sulve gnade.120 >J<tem dar ome de hilgen dre konnigh dat opper brochten,121 dar iß de gnade twevolt. >J<tem dar Herodeß de kinder dode umme [Christi] willen,122 dar iß vorhevinge aller sunde. >J<tem do Maria vlo in Egipten, do se waren bedrovet, do de engeln quam,123 dar lozet me ii zele ut pinnen, alle de medelident hebben mit unser leven vrowen. >J<tem dar unse leve here water to wyne makede,124 dar iß vorhevinge aller sunde. >J<tem so kummet

118 This account refers to the Sermon on the Mount (in Galilee), where Jesus set out the Eight Beatitudes. He also taught The Lord’s Prayer there. Cf. Matthew 5.1-12, Matthew 6.5-15 and Luke 11.1-13, where the site is only described as ‘in a certain place’. Fabri encounters both places on the Mount of Olives, cf. Fabri, Sionpilger, fol. 87° (Carls, p. 141). The other event that is commemorated at this station, Christ showing himself disguised as a gardener to Mary Magdalene, took place in front of the empty tomb, according to the New Testament, cf. John 20.11-18. To locate the site where Christ taught The Lord’s Prayer on the Mount of Olives, close to the Church of the Ascension, is a new tradition from the crusader period, cf. Küchler, Jerusalem, p. 864. According to Kopp, Die Heiligen Stätten, pp. 262-263 the same tradition was commemorated simultaneously at the Sea of Galilee. Fabri visits both places.

119 The original Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem was commissioned by the Roman Emperor Constantine the Great (*c. 272, in office 306-337) and his mother Helena. The crusaders restored the Church. The Birth of Christ is venerated in a cave below the choir, called the Grotto, cf. Kopp, Die Heiligen Stätten, pp. 35-55, for the account in the Bible Matthew 1.18-25 and Luke 2.1-20, and for Fabri’s account fols 116°-117° (Carls, pp. 160-161).

120 At least from the fourteenth century on, the Circumcision of Christ has been commemorated at an altar in the southern part of the Church of the Nativity, cf. the ‘Windesheim Virtual Pilgrimage Compilation’, fols 85°-86° (Rudy, Virtual Pilgrimages, p. 439), Kopp, Die Heiligen Stätten, p. 84, and the account in Luke 2.21.

121 Also in the Church of the Nativity. The altar of the Magi was erected in the Grotto of the Manger in the Middle Ages, cf. Kopp, Die Heiligen Stätten, pp. 42-43. Fabri encounters the altar in the Grotto, fols 117°-17° (Carls, p. 161). Cf. also Matthew 2.1-12 and the account in Jacobus da Varagine, Legenda aurea, ed. and transl. by Benz, pp. 103-111.

122 The Holy Innocents were venerated at different places in Bethlehem. However, from the crusader period on, the veneration has focused on the Chapel of the Innocents in the Church of the Nativity, cf. Matthew 2.16-18, Kopp, Die Heiligen Stätten, pp. 83-85, and Fabri, Sionpilger, fol. 119° (Carls, p. 162).

123 The biblical account can be found in Matthew 2.13-15. The exact location of this station is unclear. The Chapel of Saint Joseph, where the angel’s appearance to Joseph is commemorated, existed only from 1621 on. Before, the site could be encountered in two different places in the area, cf. Kopp, Die Heiligen Stätten, p. 43.

124 In the New Testament, this event took place during the Wedding at Cana and is the first account of Jesus working a miracle, cf. John 2.1-12. There are different traditions concerning the location of the site. Kopp, Die Heiligen Stätten, pp. 194-195 states that the crusaders attributed this tradition mainly to the village of Chirbet Qana, and that the tradition only shifted to Kafr Kanna in the seventeenth century. Both villages are located in the vicinity of Nazareth. According to Küchler, Jerusalem, p. 906, in the thirteenth century this site was also to be found on the Mount of Olives. Since Cana is not explicitly mentioned, and the following stations are definitely to be found in Bethany, on the south-
me to Betanien, dar unse leve here Lazarum vorweckede van dode,\textsuperscript{125} dar lozet me eyne zele ut pinen. \textgreater J<\textless tem dar unse leve here [45'] stunt unnd wenede umme Lazaruß willen, do he van dannen toch an deme palmdaghe.\textsuperscript{126} \textgreater J<\textless tem up dem berghe to Betanien, dar sende he tvey jungeren na dem ezele,\textsuperscript{127} dar iß vorghevinge aller sunde. \textgreater J<\textless tem by deme stene, dar he veydede deß eselß, do he sprak unnd bewende Iherusalem,\textsuperscript{128} dar iß de sulve gnade. \textgreater J<\textless tem by dem hilgen Jordane, dar unse here makede de hilghen vertich daghe, dar one sunte Iohanneß dofte,\textsuperscript{129} dar iß dat sulve aflat. \textgreater J<\textless tem dar Adam begraven iß to Ebron, dar sint alle propheten begraven.\textsuperscript{130} >A<\textless me>n<.

eastern slope of the Mount of Olives, this station may refer to the site there, in accordance with stations forty-four and forty-five.
\textsuperscript{125} John 11.17-44 tells the account of the Raising of Lazarus in Bethany, today’s city of al-Eizariya, east of Jerusalem. The crusaders renovated the Church of Saint Lazarus with his tomb and also built another church devoted to Mary and Martha, cf. Küchler, \textit{Jerusalem}, pp. 927-928.
\textsuperscript{126} Jesus is said to have cried ‘in the place where Martha had met him’ and continued from there to the Tomb of Lazarus, cf. John 11.28-38, and station fifty-two above. In the ‘Windesheim Virtual Pilgrimage Compilation’, fol. 93v (Rudy, \textit{Virtual Pilgrimages}, p. 442), this site is described as ‘the place where Our Lord came walking and Martha came to meet him and spoke to him’ (transl. by Rudy).
\textsuperscript{127} Cf. Matthew 21.1-7, Mark 11.1-7, and Luke 19.29-35. This place is traditionally commemorated in the village of Bethphage, on the way from Bethany to Jerusalem, on the eastern Mount of Olives. The station may refer to the Church of Bethphage, which became the start of the procession on Palm Sunday, cf. Küchler, \textit{Jerusalem}, pp. 923-940.
\textsuperscript{128} This station may also refer to the crusader’s Church of Bethphage, which housed the stone on which Christ rested before he mounted the donkey on his way into Jerusalem, cf. station fifty-four above, and Luke 19.28-40. Küchler, \textit{Jerusalem}, pp. 933-934 states that this stone has sometimes been confused with the stone on which Jesus sat crying over the destruction of Jerusalem. This seems to be the case in the \textit{Aflat}, since this stone also appears earlier at station seven.
\textsuperscript{129} The sites of the Baptism of Jesus are traditionally located on the eastern bank of the Jordan, near Jericho. The village Bethany is said to be the centre of John the Baptist’s activity. This Bethany should not be confused with the Bethany on the Mount of Olives (maybe the composer of the \textit{Aflat} did?), cf. Kopp, \textit{Die Heiligen Stätten}, pp. 153-166. The tradition of Jesus’ forty days in the desert, where he was tempted by the devil, also has to be located in this area, cf. for both events Matthew 3.13-17 and 4.1-11, Mark 1.9-13, Luke 3.21-22, and 4.1-13, as well as John 1.29-34.
\textsuperscript{130} Hebron, c. 30 kilometres south of Jerusalem, is traditionally believed to house the Tomb of Abraham. In the \textit{Aflat}, Abraham may be confused with Adam. However, there are also several other important figures of the Bible said to be buried in Hebron, which makes it likely that there was also a tradition connected to Adam to be found in the city, cf. Bowker, pp. 187-191. Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 73 F 23, fol 236v-237r (Rudy, \textit{Virtual Pilgrimages}, p. 335) – a report of pilgrimages from the second half of the fifteenth century – refers to a Greek church, with the graves of the twelve prophets in the Valley of Hebron.
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**JUTTA DRESDEN-WEILAND**
The cross, the relics of the Holy Cross and the iconography of the crucifixion

Fig. 5: Gustave Schlumberger, ‘Quelques monuments byzantins inédit’, in Byzantinische Zeitschrift 2 (1893), 187-191, fig. 1.


**GALIT NOGA-BANAI**
Architectural Frames for Relics of the True Cross – Two Frankish Test Cases

Fig. 9: François Eygun, ‘Circonscription de Poitiers’, Gallia 21, no. 2 (1963), 469-473, fig. 49.

Fig. 11: Virgilio C. Corbo, Il Santo Sepolcro di Gerusalemme: Aspetti archeologici dalle origini al periodo crociato, 3 vols. (Jerusalem: Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, 1981–1982), vol. 2, pl. 3.

Fig. 12: Richard Krautheimer, Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae I (Vatican City: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 1937), pl. 28.

**HEDWIG RÖCKELEIN**
The Cult of the Invisible – Relics in the Cistercian Houses Loccum and Wienhausen

Fig. 3-4: Gerold Ahrends, Das Loccumer Tafelkreuz – ein Werk des 13. und 19. Jahrhunderts. Technologisch vergleichende Untersuchung der Vorder- und Rückseite, Erstellung eines Behandlungskonzeptes (unpublished diploma thesis), HAWK Hildesheim, 2005, fig. 9, 48.
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The index contains the names of people, places, saints and relics. Medieval persons are referred to by their first name; persons who died after 1600 are listed by their surname. Where they are known, lifespan or office terms of the respective person are indicated. Contemporary authors and modern institutions are not included.

Abbreviations

* date of birth
† date of death
admin. dist. administrative district
arrond. arrondissement
c. circa (around)
bef. before
cent. century
fed. st. federal state
fl. floruit (= he/she flourished)
i.o. in office
prob. probably

A
Aachen 177
Abraham, Biblical Figure 220 n. 37, 286, 301 n. 130
Acre 108
Adam, Biblical Figure 220 n. 37, 280, 286, 301 n. 130
Adam (fl. 12th cent.), Custodian in the Cistercian Monastery of Loccum 165 n. 21, 167, 190
Adelheid IV, Abbess of Quedlinburg Convent (i.o. 1406–1425) 177 n. 90
Adelheid of Bortfeld (*bef. 1451, †1477), Prioress of the Heiningen Convent 279
Adolf I of Altena (*c. 1157, †1220), Archbishop of Cologne (i.o. 1193–1205) 257
Aegidius → Giles
Aelia Sophia (*c. 530, †c. 601), Wife of Emperor Justin II 43 n. 30, 64, 65 n. 8
Agata of Sicily (*c. 231, †c. 251), Saint and Virgin Martyr 176 n. 88
Agnes (*c. 291, †c. 304), Roman Saint and Virgin Martyr 170, 176 n. 88
Agnes (fl. 6th cent.), Abbess of Sainte-Croix Convent in Poitiers 65
Agnes of Landsberg (*1192/1193, †1248–1253), Duchess of Saxony, Foundress of the Wienhausen Convent 129, 130 n. 21, 133–134, 165, 184–187, 189–190, 217 n. 25
Agobard (*c. 779, †840), Archbishop of Lyon (i.o. 814–834, 837–840) 93, 95, 99
Albert I (*1236, †1279), Duke of Braunschweig–Lüneburg 171
Albert of Aachen (fl. 1100) 116 n. 28
Albert of Brandenburg (*1490, †1545), Cardinal, Archbishop of Mainz (i.o. 1514–1545) and Magdeburg (i.o. 1513–1545) 235
Albert of Hoya (†1473), Bishop of Minden (i.o. 1436–1473) 176 n. 88, 180
Alcuin of York (*c. 735, †804) 92
Aldenthorpe (admin. dist. Münster, fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia) 260
Alexamenos (fl. 2nd cent.) 17
Alexander (†165), Saint 141 n. 92, 165, 170, 178–179, 188
Alheidis of Schwerin (†1208/1209), Abbess of Saint Aegidii Convent in Münster 261–263
Altenberg (fed. st. Hesse), Premonstratensian Nunnery 126
Altenelle (admin. dist. Münster, fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia) 145
Arator, Bishop of Verdun (i.o. c. 440) 41 n. 19
Artemia (fl. bef. 400), Roman Matron 4
Artemidor of Daldis (fl. 2nd cent.) 15
Augustine (*c. 354, †430), Bishop of Hippo (i.o. 395–430) 92, 98, 174 n. 80, 176 n. 88
Augustus (*63 BC, †AD 14), Emperor (i.o. 31 BC–14) 39 n. 6, 68 n. 25
Aurelius Prudentius Clemens (*348, †aft. 405) 19–20
Avignon 45 n. 41

B
Balduin of Forde (*c. 1125, †1190), Archbishop of Canterbury (i.o. 1185–1190) 126 n. 4
Baldwin I of Boulogne (*c. 1060/1069, †1118), Count of Edessa, King of Jerusalem 109, 113–114
Baldwin II of Constantinople (*c. 1217, †1273), Emperor (i.o. 1228–1261) 131
Baldwin II of Jerusalem (†1131), Count of Edessa, King of Jerusalem 112, 114, 116–117
Barbara (†late 3rd or early 4th cent.), Saint and Virgin Martyr 176
Bartholomew (†1st cent.), Apostle and Saint 176
Basileus, Priest at Narbonne Cathedral 23
Baudonivia of Poitiers (fl. c. 600), Nun and Hagiographer 64, 66, 69–70
Benedict of Nursia (*c. 480, †c. 547) 163 n. 5, 188
Benedict XII (*1285, †1342), Pope (i.o. 1334–1342) 164
Benedicta of Origny (†362), Saint and Virgin Martyr 175–177, 179, 188–189
Bergen (Island of Rügen, fed. st. Mecklenburg–West Pomerania), Cistercian Convent 126
Bernard of Clairvaux (*1090, †1153), Abbot 126 n. 4, 130 n. 25, 162, 163 n. 5, 172, 188, 218 n. 31, 220 n.40, 258 n. 67
Bernardus Thesaurarius (†1232) 42
Bernhard I of Oesede (†1160), Bishop of Paderborn (i.o. 1127–1160) 253 n. 24
Bernhard II (*c. 1140, †1224), Count of Lippe 251–256, 257 n. 53, 259, 261
Bernhard IV (*c. 1230, †1275), Count of Lippe 258 n. 62
Bernward (*960, †1022), Bishop of Hildesheim (i.o. 993–1022) 74, 176–179, 188, 276
Berthold I of Alvensleben (†1130), Bishop of Hildesheim (i.o. 1119–1130) 277
Berthold Ziegenmeier (fl. 1450), Provost of the Hildesheim Sültekloster 277
Bethany (Palestine) 285, 300 n. 124, 301 n. 125; 127 and 129
Bethlehem 1, 44 n. 33, 46–47, 50, 280–282, 285, 290, 299 n. 113, 300 n. 119 and 122
– Chapel of the Innocents 300 n. 122
– Church of the Nativity 285, 300 n. 119
Bethphage 301 n. 127 and 128
Bethsaida 283, 293 n. 75, 294 n. 78
Beuren (admin. dist. Eichsfeld, fed. st. Thuringia), Cistercian Convent 129
Blaise (†316), Saint 176, 179, 188, 189 n. 158
Bobbio (Italy), Monastery 21, 22 n. 58, 24, 39
Boniface (*c. 675, †754), Saint and Martyr 170–172, 176, 178, 188
Bonosus (fl. 5th cent.), Bishop of Narbonne 41n. 19
Braunschweig 177, 189, 276
– Castle 177
– Saint Blaise, Cathedral of 131 n. 29, 177, 187 n. 157, 189 n. 158, 190, 212 n. 4
Bremen 164
Brigid of Kildare (*c. 453, †c. 525), Saint 175–176
Brun (*925, †965), Archbishop of Cologne (i.o. 953–965) 183
Brunswick → Braunschweig
Burghard (fl. 1185), Count of Ascheberg 261 n. 95
Burghard I (*c. 1241, †1294), Count of Ziegenberg 133
Bursfelde (admin. dist. Göttingen, fed. st. Lower Saxony), Benedictine Monastery 129
Buxtehude (admin. dist. Stade, fed. st. Lower Saxony) 182 n. 121
Byland (England, North Yorkshire), Monastery 173 n. 70

C
Caecilia (†176/180 or 222/235), Saint and Virgin Martyr 176 n. 88
Caesarius of Heisterbach (*c. 1180, †c. 1240) 165, 167–168
Caiaphas, Biblical Figure 283, 294 n. 84, 295 n. 85
Cappenberg (admin. dist. Unna, fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia) 261 n. 88
Caritas (†2nd cent.), Saint and Martyr 170–172, 188
Cassianus of Imola (†363), Saint and Martyr 186, 189
Catharine of Alexandria (*c. 287, †c. 305), Saint and Virgin Martyr 131, 176
Causaria (fl. 13th cent.), Abbess of Mariengarten Convent 138
Cecilia → Caecilia
Celle (fed. st. Lower Saxony) 129, 147
Charlemagne (*742, †814), Emperor (i.o. 800–814), King of the Franks (i.o. 768–814) 3, 72–73, 94
Charles II of Anjou (*1254, †1309), King of Naples, Count of Anjou, Provence, Maine and Forcalquier 133
Charles the Bald (*823, †877), Emperor (i.o. 875–877) 73 n. 49, 97
Chersones (Ukraine, Crimean Peninsula) 65
Chirbet Qana (Israel, Lower Galilee) 285, 300 n. 124
Chlothar I (*c. 497, †561), King of the Franks (i.o. 558–561) 64
Chorikius of Gaza (†518) 20
Christina of Bolsena (†3rd cent.), Saint and Martyr 170
Christopher (†c. 251), Saint 170, 176 n. 88, 178–179, 185
Cîteaux, Monastery 221 n. 42
Clairvaux, Monastery 126
Claudius (*780, †827), Bishop of Turin (i.o. 817–827) 3, 93, 95, 97–102
Cleopas, Biblical Figure (†1st cent.) 294 n. 79
Cologne 97 n. 25, 172, 183–184, 186–187, 189, 220 n. 40, 254, 261
  – Cathedral 184
  – Dominican friary of the Holy Cross 186
  – Saint Gereon Church 186
Coma (Egypt) 177 n. 90
Conrad I of Rüdenberg, Bishop of Minden (i.o. 1209–1236) 264
Conrad II of Landsberg (*bef. 1159, †1210), Margrave of Lusatia 165 n. 25, 185
Conrad II of Reisenberg (*late 12th cent., †1249), Bishop of Hildesheim (i.o. 1221–1246) 165, 223
Constance (fed. st. Baden–Württemberg), Cathedral 186
Constantine the Great (*272, †337), Emperor (i.o. 306–337) 13, 16, 45, 65 n. 8, 68, 70 n. 35, 72–74, 108, 300 n. 119
Constantinople 21, 27, 45 n. 41, 64–65, 67 n. 19, 69, 108, 131–132, 185
  – Church of the Holy Apostles 67 n. 19
Constantius (fl. 5th cent.), Bishop of Uzès 49 n. 61
Constantius II (*317, †361), Emperor (i.o. 337–361) 68
Cordula (*fc. 304 or 451), Saint 175–176, 186, 189
Corona (*fc. 170), Saint 176–177, 179, 188–189
Cosmas and Damian (*287), Saints and Martyrs 170
Cremona 184 n. 132
Crown of Thorns → Holy Thorn
Cyriacus (*fc. 303), Saint and Martyr 175–176
Cyriakus → Cyriacus
Cyril (*c. 313, †386), Patriarch of Jerusalem 13, 26

D
Damián → Cosmas and Damian
Daugavgrīva → Dünamünde
David, King of Israel (i.o. c. 1000 BC) 220 n. 37
Denis (*fc. 250/258 or 270), Bishop of Paris, Saint and Martyr 170
Derneburg (admin. dist. Hildesheim, fed. st. Lower Saxony) 223 n. 52
Dietrich → also Theoderich, Theodericus
Dietrich I (*†984), Bishop of Metz (i.o. 964–984) 183 n. 132
Dietrich III of Isenberg (*†1226), Bishop of Münster (i.o. 1218–1226) 262
Doberan (admin. dist. Rostock, fed. st. Mecklenburg–West Pomerania), Cistercian Monastery 128 n. 10
Dorothea (*c. 290, †287/304), Saint 170
Dransfeld (admin. dist. Göttingen, fed. st. Lower Saxony) 144–145
Dünamünde (Latvia, City of Riga) 259
Dungal of Bobbio (fl. 811–828), Monk 95
Durham, Cathedral 235
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birth/Deceased</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ebstorf</td>
<td></td>
<td>Benedictine Convent 141 n. 92, 212 n. 2, 214, 223, 226 n. 64, 229–230, 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckstorm, Heinrich</td>
<td>*1557, †1622</td>
<td>136–137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edessa</td>
<td></td>
<td>92, 212 n. 2, 214, 223, 226 n. 64, 229–230, 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egeria</td>
<td>(fl. 4th cent.), Pilgrim to Jerusalem</td>
<td>27, 43, 45–46, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggehard</td>
<td>(fl. 12th cent.), Abbot of Hardehausen Monastery</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einhard</td>
<td>(*c. 775, †840)</td>
<td>3, 70–75, 93, 95, 97, 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elipand</td>
<td>(*717, †c. 808), Archbishop of Toledo (i.o. 754–c. 800)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerentiana</td>
<td>(†c. 304), Saint and Martyr</td>
<td>170–172, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmaus</td>
<td></td>
<td>21, 283, 294 n. 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucharius</td>
<td>(*c. 306, †373)</td>
<td>218 n. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus of Formia</td>
<td>(†c. 303), Saint</td>
<td>172 n. 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erhard</td>
<td>(*7th cent.), Bishop of Regensburg, Saint</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ermgardis of Arnsberg, Abbess of Saint Aegidii Convent in Münster</td>
<td>(i.o. 1209–1217)</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest I the Confessor</td>
<td>(*1497, †1546), Duke of Braunschweig–Lüneburg</td>
<td>130, 180, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucherius</td>
<td>(*c. 380, †c. 450), Bishop of Lyon (i.o. 434–450)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eufronius</td>
<td>(*c. 503, †573), Bishop of Tours (i.o. 556–573)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugen III</td>
<td>(*c. 1080, †1153), Pope (i.o. 1145–1153)</td>
<td>258 n. 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustace</td>
<td>(†1118), Saint and Martyr</td>
<td>170, 175 n. 83 and 84, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve, Biblical Figure</td>
<td></td>
<td>220 n. 37, 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everin</td>
<td>(fl. 12th cent.), Provost of Freckenhorst Monastery</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exuperius</td>
<td>(†c. 410), Bishop of Toulouse (i.o. 405–411)</td>
<td>44 n. 33, 46 n. 47, 47 n. 55, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabian</td>
<td>(†250), Saint and Martyr</td>
<td>163 n. 5, 170, 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faustus</td>
<td>(fl. 5th cent.), prob. Bishop of Lérins</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicitas</td>
<td>(*c. 101, †c. 165), Roman Saint and Martyr</td>
<td>170, 176, 178–179, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>(†287/303), Saint</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>(†818), Bishop of Urgell (i.o. 798–799)</td>
<td>98, 99 n. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix Fabri</td>
<td>(*1441, †1502), Dominican Friar at Ulm</td>
<td>282 n. 30, 283, 288, 291, 293–294, 296 n. 93, 298–300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix of Gerone</td>
<td>(†304), Saint</td>
<td>41 n. 16, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fides</td>
<td>(†2nd cent.), Saint and Martyr</td>
<td>170–172, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firmicus Maternus</td>
<td>→ Julius Firmicus Maternus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florentius</td>
<td>(†1211), Abbot of Marienfeld Monastery</td>
<td>259, 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florus of Lodève</td>
<td>(†c. 389), Saint</td>
<td>49 n. 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foy</td>
<td>→ Fides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Freckenhorst (admin. dist. Warendorf, fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia),
   Canonesses’ House 251–252, 254
Frederick I Barbarossa (*1122, †1190), Emperor (i.o. 1155–1190) 184, 185 n. 142, 253 n. 26, 254, 261
Frederick II (*1194, †1250), Emperor (i.o. 1220–1250) 253, 297 n. 102
Friedrich of Erlo (fl. 12th cent.), Ministerial of Bishop Hermann II of Münster
Fröndenberg (admin. dist. Unna, fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia), Cistercian
   Convent 126
Fulcher of Chartres (*1059, †c. 1127) 108–117
Fulda 171–172
Fulk V (*c. 1089/1092, †1143), Count of Anjou, King of Jerusalem 111, 114

G
Gall (*550, †646), Saint 170, 172
Galla Placidia (*c. 390, †450), Empress 67–68
Gandersheim (admin. dist. Northeim, fed. st. Lower Saxony), Canonesses’ House 1–2
Gaza, Saint Sergius Church 20
Genesius of Arles (†303/308), Saint and Martyr 23, 42, 53
George (†303), Saint and Martyr 167, 171–172, 175–176, 188, 280, 282–283, 286–287, 293 n. 76
Gerberga (*c. 913, †968/969), Sister of Emperor Otto I 184
Gereon (†c. 304), Saint and Martyr 170, 172, 189
Gerhard (†1150), Provost of Riechenberg Monastery 277
Gerona 20
Gera 20
Gisla of Ziegenberg (*c. 1235, †1299), Wife of Gottschalk III of Plesse 133 n. 42
Godehard (*960, †1038), Bishop of Hildesheim (i.o. 1022–1038), Saint 170, 172, 177, 188
Göttingen 129, 145 n. 112
Gottschalk III of Plesse (*c. 1234, †c. 1301), Count of Plesse 133 n. 42
Gregory (*c. 335, †c. 394), Bishop of Nyssa (i.o. 372–376 and 378–c. 394) 27
Gregory (*c. 538, †593/594), Bishop of Tours (i.o. 573–594) 23, 43, 52–53, 64–66, 69–70
Gregory I (*c. 540, †604), Pope (i.o. 590–604) 95, 98, 176 n. 88
Gregory of Spoleto (†304), Saint 183–184, 186–187, 189
Gregory VIII (*c. 1100/1105, †1187), Pope (i.o. 1187) 164
Groß Oesingen (admin. dist. Gifhorn, fed. st. Lower Saxony) 145
Guelf, Dynasty 4, 128, 130–131, 177, 179, 188–189, 214, 230
Guta zur Lippe (fl. 12th cent.), Sister of Ludiger II of Wöltingerode–Wohldenberg 253, 261
Gütersloh (fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia) 256

H
Hadrian I, Pope (i.o. 772–795) 94
Halberstadt 221–222
Halle 235
Hama (Syria) 114
Hameln 171
Handorf → Aldenthorpe
Hans Tucher (VI) (*1428, †1491), Citizen of Nuremberg 47 n. 49
Hardehausen (admin. dist. Höxter, fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia), Cistercian
Monastery 255, 258, 263
Harnewinkel (admin. dist. Gütersloh, fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia) 251
Hattin (Palestine) 108, 113
Hauteville–La–Guichard, Norman Dynasty 109
Hebron 280, 286, 301 n. 130
Hedybia (fl. 5th cent.) 48
Heiningen (admin. dist. Wolfenbüttel, fed. st. Lower Saxony), Canonesses’ House
276–279, 281, 287–292
Heisterbach (admin. dist. Rhein–Sieg, fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia), Cistercian
Monastery 220 n. 40
Helena (*246/250, †327/330), Empress, Saint 65 n. 8, 68–70, 74–75, 108, 280, 297
n. 99, 300 n. 119
Helmold I (*bef. 1174, †bef. 1206), Count of Schwerin 261
Henry I (*bef. 1178, †1214), Count of Schwalenberg and Waldeck 257
Henry II (*973, †1024), Emperor (i.o. 1014–1024) 277
Henry II (*c. 1289, †aft. 1351), Duke of Braunschweig–Lüneburg and Grubenhagen 131–132
Henry IV the Elder (*1463, †1514), Duke of Braunschweig–Lüneburg, Prince of
Wolfenbüttel 129
Henry the Lion (*c. 1129, †1195), Duke of Saxony and Bavaria 134–135, 165 n. 25,
185, 187, 189–190, 214, 252–255, 261
Henry V the Tall (*c. 1173, †1227), Count Palatine of the Rhine, Duke of Saxony
165, 185, 187, 189–190
Heraclius I (*c. 575, †641), Emperor (i.o. 610–641) 116, 294 n. 81
Hereford Cathedral (England, Herefordshire) 212 n. 3
Herford (fed. st. Lower Saxony) 259
Herman Eyken (fl. 15th cent.), Provost of Wienhausen Convent 180
Hermann (fl. 1193), Provost of Münster Cathedral Chapter 260 n. 79
Hermann (fl. 13th cent.), Brother of Conrad of Rüdenberg 264
Hermann I (†1167), Count of Lippe 252, 253 n. 24
Hermann I (*c. 1163, †c. 1224), Count of Schwalenberg and Waldeck 257
Hermann II of Katzenelnbogen (*1130/1140, †1203), Bishop of Münster 251–
253, 255–260, 265, 267
Hermes (fl. 5th cent.), Deacon of Narbonne Cathedral 41 n. 19
Herod Antipas (*bef. 20 BC, †39) 294 n. 82 and 83
Herod the Great (*c. 74/73 BC, †c. 4 BC), King of Judea 283, 296 n. 96
Hieria (Turkey) 94
Hildegund (fl. 12th cent.), Wife of Wulfhardus 259, 267
Hildesheim 130, 164, 174 n. 80, 177–180, 188, 214, 222–223, 226–227
– Church of the Holy Cross 222 n. 48
– Saint Godehard, Benedictine Monastery 222
– Saint Maurice, Canons’ House 222
– Saint Michael, Benedictine Monastery 74, 221
– Sültelkloster, Canons’ House 277
Hildesvit (fl. 1000), Foundress of the Heiningen Convent 276
Hildegard of Bingen (*1098, †1179), Abbess of Baiersbronn 48 n. 111
Hippolytus of Rome (*170, †235), Saint and Martyr 170
Holy Blood, Relic 127–128, 131 n. 31, 132–135, 137–141, 144–150, 163, 179, 186–
187, 217 n. 25
Holy Cross, Relic 1, 3–4, 26, 43 n. 30, 53, 64–65, 66 n. 12, 67–71, 73–75, 92–94,
284, 297 n. 99, 298 n. 107
Holy Lance, Relic 110
Holy Robe, Relic → Holy Tunic, Relic
Holy Thorn, Relic 127, 131–132, 136, 141–143, 147, 149, 186–187, 190, 235
Holy Tunic, Relic 128 n. 10, 131 n. 31, 163, 167, 172, 187
Holy Virgins, 11,000, Relics 170, 172, 175–176, 177 n. 92, 186, 189
257
Hrabanus Maurus (*c. 780, †856), Abbot of Fulda, Archbishop of Mainz (i.o. 848–
856) 71 n. 39, 92, 93 n. 5
Huginhusen → Wienhausen
Hundingen (admin. dist. Bielefeld, fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia) 256

I
Ilghazi of Aleppo (†1122), Emir of Mardin and Aleppo 116
Imad ad–Din Zengi → Zengi of Mosul
Innocent II (*bef. 1088, †1143), Pope (i.o. 1130–1143) 251–252
Innocent III (*1160/1161, †1216), Pope (i.o. 1198–1216) 258, 263 n. 105
Innsbruck 218 n. 32
Irene of Athens (*c. 752, †803), Empress 94
Isaac, Biblical Figure 220
Isaac of Stella (c. 1100, †c. 1170) 126 n. 4
Isaiah (†7th cent. BC), Prophet 213, 280, 294 n. 78
Isenhagen (admin. dist. Gifhorn, fed. st. Lower Saxony), Cistercian Convent 130 n. 24, 214
Isfrid (fl. 13th cent.), Prior 171

J
Jacobus da Varagine (c. 1230, †1298/1299) 218 n. 31, 224 n. 55, 280
Jaffa 113–114, 282–283, 293 n. 74 and 76
James the Less 170 n. 57, 175
James, Apostle and Martyr 169–170, 176
Jehohanan (fl. 1st cent.) 14–15
Jericho 301 n. 129
Jerome (c. 347, †420), Saint 1–2, 44–50, 53, 176 n. 88
– Antonia Fortress 283, 294 n. 82
– Holy Cross Basilica 286
– Holy Sepulchre Church 39, 47 n. 49, 110–111, 212 n. 3, 283–284, 290, 296 n. 94–96, 297 n. 98, 100 and 101
– Armenian Chapel 297 n. 99
– Chapel of Mary 296 n. 95
– Chapel of Saint John 296 n. 94
– Chapel of the Invention of the Holy Cross 284, 297 n. 99
– Chapel of the Nailing of the Cross 297 n. 98
– Golgotha 13, 67–71, 73, 75, 212, 282–283, 296 n. 91–
– Holy Sepulchre 3, 40 n. 8, 48, 67, 69–70, 72 n. 45, 73, 109, 132, 213, 281
– Holy Tomb aedicule 39–42, 44, 48, 53–54, 296 n. 96
– Martyrium Basilica 67–68
– Mount Calvary → Golgotha
– Church of the Ascension 281, 284, 299 n. 115, 300 n. 118
– Dominus Flevit Church 294 n. 80
– Gethsemane 20, 281, 284, 298 n. 108 and 109, 299 n. 110 and 111
– Mount Zion 283–284, 290, 294 n. 83–84, 295 n. 85, 297 n. 102–103, 298 n. 108, 299 n. 114
– Sancta Maria in Monte Sion 297 n. 102–103, 298 n. 103–105, 299 n. 114
– Pool of Bethesda 284, 298 n. 106–107
– Pool of Siloam 298 n. 106
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index of Names and Places</th>
<th>317</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>– Saint Peter in Gallicantu Church 295 n. 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Temple Mount 283, 294 n. 82 and 84, 295 n. 85 and 87, 296 n. 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Dome of the Rock 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Temple of Herod 72, 283, 296 n. 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Tomb of Mary 285, 298 n. 104, 299 n. 116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Via Dolorosa 295 n. 88–90, 297 n. 98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jervaulx (England, North Yorkshire), Cistercian Monastery 173 n. 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joacham 284, 299 n. 113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Christiani of Schleppgrell (*1389, †1468), Bishop of Hildesheim (i.o. 1428–1468) 174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes (fl. 12th cent.), Son of Wulphardus 267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes Busch (*1399, †c. 1480), Augustinian Canon, Provost of the Sültekloster in Hildesheim 277, 288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes Longus (fl. 13th cent.), Citizen of Bremen 191 n. 163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes Missinensis (†1468), Auxiliary Bishop of Hildesheim 174 n. 80, 180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John (*c. 1242, †1277), Duke of Braunschweig–Lüneburg 171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John (*c. 6, †c. 100), Apostle and Saint 17 n. 37, 283–284, 293 n. 77, 298 n. 104 and 108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chrysostom (*c. 349, †407), Patriarch of Constantinople 12–13, 27, 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John the Baptist (†28–36), Biblical Figure 25–26, 71, 164 n. 17, 176 n. 88, 296 n. 95, 301 n. 129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John the Evangelist (*c. 15, †100), 15, 18–19, 172, 176 n. 88, 285, 294 n. 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonas (*c. 760, †843), Bishop of Orléans (i.o. 821–843) 3–4, 93, 95–102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joscelin I of Courtenay (*c. 1070/1075, †1131), Count of Edessa, Prince of Galilee 114–115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph, Biblical Figure, Saint 300 n. 123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph of Arimatha, Biblical Figure 186–187, 189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judas Iscariot (†30/33), Apostle 24, 280, 284, 298 n. 108, 299 n. 114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juhdum → Joacham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian of Brioude (†304), Martyr 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana of Liège (*c. 1192/1193, †1258) 162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius (*1528, †1589), Duke of Braunschweig–Wolfenbüttel 165, 279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Firmicus Maternus (fl. 4th cent.) 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin II (*520, †578), Emperor (i.o. 565–574) 43 n. 30, 64, 65 n. 7–8, 66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian the Great (*482, †565), Emperor (i.o. 527–565) 13, 66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinus (fl. 13th cent.), Magister at Lippstadt 254 n. 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justus of Madrid (*c. 295, †c. 305), Saint and Martyr 41 n. 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**K**

Kafr Kanna (Israel, Northern District) 300 n. 124
Kamp (admin. dist. Wesel, fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia), Cistercian Monastery 126
Katharina of Hoya (*1412, †1474), Abbess of the Cistercian Convent of Wienhausen 146, 166, 174, 175 n. 81, 176, 178–180
Kharput (ancient region in Armenia) 115
Kherbet Oum el Ahdam (Algeria, admin. dist. Sétif) 27
Knights, 10,000, Relics 176
Konrad → Conrad

L
Laodicea 186
Larnaca, Saint Lazarus Church 301 n. 125
Lawrence (*225, †258), Saint and Martyr 170, 175–176
Lazarus of Bethany, Biblical Figure 285, 301 n. 125–126
Leo (fl. 12th cent.), Son of Wulfhardus 267
Leo I (*c. 400, †461), Pope (i.o. 440–461) 49
Leo III (*c. 750, †816), Pope (i.o. 795–816) 73
Leubevera (fl. 6th/7th cent.), Abbess of Sainte–Croix Convent in Poitiers 65
Leuckfeld, Johann Georg (*1668, †1726), Historiographer 131 n. 30, 136–137, 143
Levern (admin. dist. Minden–Lübbecke, fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia) 264
Liborius of Hardehausen (†1214), Abbot of Marienfeld Monastery 263
Liège 96, 233
Liesborn (admin. dist. Warendorf, fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia), Benedictine Monastery 254, 256
Lilienthal (Austria), Cistercian Monastery 129 n. 13
Lippold (fl. 13th cent.), Advocate of Saint Maurice in Hildesheim 222 n. 48
Lippstadt (admin. dist. Soest, fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia) 259
Liudger (*c. 742, †809), Bishop of Münster (i.o. 805–809), Saint 261
Liudger → also Ludgerus, Ludger
Liuttrudis → Luttrudis
Lod (Palestine) 283, 286, 293 n. 76
Lothar I (*795, †855), Emperor (i.o. 817/823–855) 72
Louis IV (*1282, †1347), Duke of Bavaria (i.o. 1301–1347), Emperor (i.o. 1328–1347) 142
Louis IX (*1214, †1270), King of France (i.o. 1226–1270) 131
Louis the Pious (*778, †840), Emperor (i.o. 813–840) 72, 92, 95–97
Lucia (*c. 283, †304), Saint and Virgin Martyr 172 n. 68, 176 n. 88
Ludgerus (fl. 13th cent.), Priest at Münster 259–261, 267
Ludiger II (†c. 1205/1206), Count of Wöltingerode–Wohldenberg 251–253, 255–256, 258, 261
Ludolf I (*1108, †1153), Count of Wöltingerode–Wohldenberg 257 n. 53
Ludolf II (*1129, †1191), Count of Wöltingerode–Wohldenberg 261
Ludolph of Saxony (*c. 1295, †1378) 218 n. 31
Lüne (admin. dist. Lüneburg, fed. st. Lower Saxony), Cistercian Convent 146, 147 n. 125, 182 n. 123, 214, 217, 222 n. 47, 223, 230–232, 233 n. 74
Lüneburg (fed. st. Lower Saxony) 212 n. 2
Lupus (*c. 805, †aft. 862), Abbot of Ferrières Monastery 95
Lupus Servatus → Lupus of Ferrières
Lutrudis of Schwalenberg (fl. 12th cent.), Mother of Widukind of Rheda 252–253, 254 n. 27, 257 n. 53
Lydda → Lod
Lyon 46 n. 47

M
Maastricht 71, 73–75
– Saint Servatius 3, 70
Macrina the Younger (*c. 330, †379), Saint 27
Magdeburg 177
Mainz 222, 254–255
Marcellus (fl. 5th cent.), Praetorian Prefect 42 n. 19
Margaret (*289, †304), Saint and Martyr 170, 176
Marienborn (admin. dist. Börde, fed. st. Saxony–Anhalt), Cistercian Convent 250
– Wadenhart Chapel 256
Marienfließ (admin. dist. Prignitz, fed. st. Brandenburg), Cistercian Convent 135 n. 57
– Chapel of Saint Anne 138, 144, 147
Marienmünster (admin. dist. Höxter, fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia), Benedictine Monastery 253
Marienrode (admin. dist. Hildesheim, fed. st. Lower Saxony), Benedictine Convent 130 n. 24
Marienstern (admin. dist. Bautzen, fed. st. Saxony), Cistercian Convent 126
Mark (*c. 5, †68), Evangelist 21, 295 n. 85
Markianus (fl. 4th/5th cent.), Bishop of Frigento 20
Maroveus, Bishop of Poitiers (i.o. 573–594) 64 n. 2
Marseille 41 n. 19, 48
Martha of Bethany, Biblical Figure 301 n. 125 and 126
Martin (*316, †397), Bishop of Tours (i.o. 371–397) 49, 66, 164 n. 17, 176
Mary Magdalene (fl. 1st cent.), Saint 170, 176–179, 189, 225, 285, 299 n. 117, 300 n. 118
Mary of Bethany, Biblical Figure 294 n. 85
Maternus (*c. 285, †315), Bishop of Cologne, Saint 175–176
Matilda of England (*1156, †1189), Duchess of Saxony 165 n. 25
Matilda of Ricklingen (fl. 12th cent.), Wife of Widukind of Rheda 254
Matthew (†1st cent.), Apostle and Evangelist 176, 284, 299 n. 114
Maurice (†287), Saint 66 n. 15, 141 n. 92, 176, 178–179, 186–187, 189
Mechthild of Hakeborn (*1240/1241, †1298), Provost of Helfta 177 n. 90
Medingen (admin. dist. Uelzen, fed. st. Lower Saxony), Cistercian Convent 6, 141 n. 92, 214, 217, 223–224, 225 n. 60 and 62, 226 n. 68
Melisendis (*1105, †1161), Queen of Jerusalem 111
Melito (†180), Bishop of Sardis 220 n. 37
Mensa Christi, Relic 175, 179, 190
Michael II (*770, †829), Emperor (i.o. 820–829) 95
Michael, Archangel and Saint 172 n. 68, 176 n. 88
Michaelstein (admin. dist. Harz, fed. st. Lower Saxony), Cistercian Monastery 130 n. 24
Milan 45 n. 41, 67 n. 19, 172 n. 66, 187
Minden 164, 171–172, 174 n. 80, 188, 190, 264
– Cathedral 166, 171, 172 n. 65
Minerve (France, arrond. Béziers) 41 n. 16
Molanus, Gerhard Wolter (*1633, †1722), Abbot of Loccum Monastery 165, 168 n. 42, 169–170, 171 n. 64
Montanus (fl. 5th cent.), Sub–Deacon of Narbonne Cathedral 42
Montferrand, Castle 114
Monza 21, 22 n. 58, 24, 39
Morimond, Cistercian Monastery 128, 129 n. 13
Mount Sinai 131–132
– Saint Catharine’s Monastery 131
Münster 250–252, 255, 257, 260–267
– Cathedral 259
– Saint Aegidii Convent 5, 250, 259–267
– Saint Ludgeri Church 260
– Saint Martini Church 260
– Überwasser Church 266
### N

Najm ad–Din Ilghazi ibn Artuq → Ilghazi of Aleppo  
Naples 132–133  
Narbonne 23, 38–41, 45–46, 48, 52–53, 75  
  – Genesius Cathedral → Saint–Just–et–Saint–Pasteur Cathedral  
  – Holy Tomb Aedicule 3, 38–44, 48, 51–54, 75  
  – Moorish Tower (Tour mauresque) 38, 40  
  – Notre Dame de Lamourguier Church 38  
  – Pont des Marchands (*pons vetus/pons civitatis*) 40 n. 12  
  – Porte Aiguère/Porta Aquaria 40 n. 12  
  – Saint Marie Major Church 41 n. 16  
  – Saint Vincent Church 41 n. 16  
  – Saint–Félix Church 41 n. 16  
  – Saint–Just–et–Saint–Pasteur Cathedral 25, 41 n. 15, 42, 49, 52, 75  
Nazareth 190 n. 161, 285, 300 n. 124  
Neukloster (admin. dist. Stade, fed. st. Lower Saxony) 182 n. 121  
Nicaea 94–95  
Nicholas (*270, †343), Bishop of Myra, Saint 175–176  
Nicodemus, Biblical Figure 220 n. 37  
Nilus of Ancyra (†430) 12  
Nuremberg 47 n. 49, 253 n. 26  
  – Saint Sebald Church 47 n. 49

### O

Olympiodorus (fl. 5th cent.), Eparch 12  
Orosius → Paulus Orosius  
Otto I (†1218), Bishop of Münster (i.o. 1203–1218) 260, 263  
Otto I (*912, †973), Emperor (i.o. 962–973) 183–184  
Otto I the Child (†1204, †1252), Duke of Braunschweig–Lüneburg 165  
Otto III (*980, †1002), Emperor (i.o. 996–1002) 177, 276  
Otto IV (*1175, †1218), Emperor (i.o. 1209–1215) 135 n. 57, 189 n. 160

### P

Pacatus Drepanius 13  
Paderborn 253, 256  
Pancras (*c. 289, †303/304), Roman Martyr 175–176  
Paris 95–96, 99, 101  
  – Sainte–Chapelle 131  
Pastor of Madrid (*c. 295, †c. 305), Saint and Martyr 41 n. 16  
Paul (*c. 5, †c. 64/67), Apostle and Saint 49, 65, 163 n. 5, 176 n. 88, 185, 219, 267  
Paula (fl. 4th/5th cent.), Roman Matron 1, 6  
Paulinus (*c. 354, †431), Bishop of Nola (i.o. 409–431) 27, 43
Paulus Orosius (*c. 385, †c. 418), Historiographer 46
Pelagius (†prob. 283), Saint and Martyr 186, 189
Perpetuus (†c. 490), Bishop of Tours (i.o. 460–490) 66 n. 15
Peter (†between 64 and 68), Apostle and Saint 16, 24, 49, 65, 163 n. 5, 171, 175–176, 188, 283, 293 n. 74–75, 295 n. 85–86, 298 n. 108
Petronilla (†end of 1st or 3rd cent.), Saint and Virgin Martyr 170–172, 188
Petrus (fl. 1510), Magister 184
Philip (†80), Apostle and Saint 169, 172, 177, 283, 294 n. 78
Philipp of Heinsberg (*1130, †1191), Archbishop of Cologne (i.o. 1167–1191) 253
Poitiers 43 n. 30, 64–66, 68–70, 74–75
– Crypt of Mellebaudis 69 n. 30
– Sainte-Croix/Holy Cross Convent 3, 64, 66–67
Pontius Pilate (†36–39), Prefect of Roman Judaea 294 n. 82–83
Postumianus (fl. 4th cent.), Pilgrim to Bethlehem 45
Primiuliacum (Aquitania) 43
Proculus (†430), Bishop of Marseille (i.o. 380–430) 48
Prudentius → Aurelius Prudentius Clemens
Prüfening (admin. dist. Regensburg, fed. st. Bavaria), Benedictine Monastery 235

Q
Quedlinburg 177
Quirina, Saint 170

R
Radegund (*c. 520, †587), Merovingian Queen 3, 43, 64–66, 69–70, 74–75
Radolphus Radecke (fl. 15th cent.), Confessor of the Wienhausen Convent 175 n. 81
Rainald of Dassel (*c. 1120, †1167), Archbishop of Cologne (i.o. 1159–1167) 261
Rama (Palestine) 283, 293 n. 77
Rama (Palestine) 113–114
Ratmann (fl. 1159), Monk at the Benedictine Monastery Saint Michael in Hildesheim 221 n. 42
Ravenna 67–69, 220 n. 38
– Galla Placidia, Mausoleum 67–68
– Sant’Apollinare Nuovo Church 20
Ravennius (†455/461), Bishop of Arles (i.o. 449–455/461) 48, 49 n. 62
Raymond IV of Saint–Gilles (*c. 1041, †1105), Count of Toulouse, Duke of Narbonne, Margrave of Provence 40 n. 12
Raymond of Aguilers (fl. 11th cent.), Viscount 110
Regensburg 235
Reims, Notre–Dame, Cathedral 234
Reinhausen (admin. dist. Göttingen, fed. st. Lower Saxony), Benedictine Monastery 129
Rheda 259
– Castle 254
Richard of Haldingham (fl. 1280–1290), Cleric and Author of the Hereford Map 212 n. 3
Riddagshausen (admin. dist. Braunschweig, fed. st. Lower Saxony), Cistercian Monastery 130 n. 24, 169, 175 n. 81
Rievaulx (England, North Yorkshire), Cistercian Monastery 173 n. 70
Riga, Cathedral 259 n. 74
Robert of Anjou (*1275, †1343), King of Naples, Count of Provence and Forcalquier 133
Rome 1, 3, 5, 39 n. 6, 47–48, 53, 64–70, 72–75, 95, 98, 133–134, 146, 172, 177, 217 n. 25, 276 n. 2, 280, 282–283, 286–287, 289
– Catacombs of Domitilla 171
– Forum Romanum 73
– Palatine Hill 17
– Saint John in Lateran, Basilica 286
– Saint Lawrence Outside the Walls, Basilica 286
– Saint Mary Major Basilica 286
– Saint Paul Outside the Walls, Basilica 286
– Saint Peter, Basilica 171, 286
– Saint Sebastian (and Fabian) Outside the Walls, Basilica 286
– Sancta Sanctorum, Chapel of 21
– Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, Basilica 68, 70 n. 35
– Santa Pudenziana, Basilica 71 n. 40
– Santa Sabina, Basilica 19–21
– Sessorian Palace 68, 70 n. 35
Rosdorf (admin. dist. Göttingen, fed. st. Lower Saxony) 145 n. 112
Rostock 126, 233 n. 74, 234–235
– Cistercian Convent of the Holy Cross 234
Ruotger (fl. 966), Hagiographer 183
Rusguniae (Algeria, Roman Province Mauretania Caesariensis) 27
Rusticus (†461), Bishop of Narbonne (i.o. 427, c. 441–445) 41–42, 48–49, 53, 75

S
Saint Gall 172
Saint Giles → Giles
Saint–Benoît sur Loire (France, arrond. Orléans), Benedictine Monastery 66 n. 12
Saint–Hubert (Belgium, Wallonia) 96
Saint–Laurent–d’Aigouze, Psalmody Monastery 97
Samuel, Biblical Figure 280, 283, 293 n. 77
Sapientia (†2nd cent.), Saint and Martyr 170–172, 188
Schulpforta (admin. dist. Burgenlandkreis, fed. st. Saxony–Anhalt), Cistercian
   Monastery 169 n. 49
Sebastian (†c. 288), Saint and Martyr 163 n. 5, 170
Serenus of Marseille (†c. 601), Saint 95
Servatus Lupus → Lupus of Ferrières
Sétif (Algeria, admin. dist. Sétif) 27
Severus the Great (*c. 459/465, †538), Patriarch of Antioch (i.o. 512–538) 26
Sicily 132
Sigibert I (*535, †575), King of Austrasia (i.o. 561–575) 64 n. 2
Silas of Corinth (fl. 1st cent.), Disciple of Saint Paul 185
Sisinnius (fl. 5th cent.), Pilgrim and Monk 44 n. 33, 46 n. 47, 47 n. 55
Sixtus IV (*1414, †1484), Pope (i.o. 1471–1484) 279
Soest (fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia) 253
Solomon (*c. 990 BC, †c. 931 BC), King of Israel (i.o. 970–931 BC) 96, 220 n. 37
Solomon III (†919), Bishop of Constance (i.o. 890–919) 186
Sophia → Aelia Sophia
Sophia → Sapientia
Sparta (Town in Bulgaria) 45 n. 41
Spes (†2nd cent.), Saint and Martyr 170–172, 188
Spina Domini → Holy Thorn
Stade (fed. st. Lower Saxony) 165 n. 25
Stams (Austria), Cistercian Monastery 132 n. 35
Stånga (Sweden, Gotland) 233
Stapelage (admin. dist. Lippe, fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia) 251, 257
Stefano Borgia (*1731, †1804), Cardinal (i.o. 1789–1804) 65 n. 6
Stephen (*5, †34), Saint and Protomartyr 170, 176 n. 88, 185, 280, 282, 296 n. 93,
   97 n. 103
Stephen Harding (*c. 1050, †1134), Abbot of Citeaux Monastery 221 n. 42
Stephan of Blois (*c. 1092/1096, †1154), King of England (i.o. 1135–1154) 109
Stracke, Theodor, Abbot of Loccum Monastery (i.o. 1600–1629) 165, 167, 170 n.
   56–57, 171
Sulpicius Severus (*c. 363, †c. 425) 27, 43, 45
Svether of Oelde (fl. 12th cent.) 257
T
Tabitha, Biblical Figure 293 n. 74
Théodard (*c. 814, †c. 893), Archbishop of Narbonne (i.o. 885–893) 41 n. 16
Theoderich → also Dietrich, Theodericus
Theoderich of Treyden (†1219), Bishop of Livonia and Estonia 259 n. 68
Theodericus → also Dietrich, Theoderich
Theodoricus (fl. 1200), Dean at Saint Ludgeri in Münster 260 n. 79
Theodosius the Great (*347, †395), Emperor (i.o. 379–395) 13
Theodulf (*c. 750/760, †821), Bishop of Orléans (i.o. c. 798–818) 93–94, 96, 100
Theutmir (fl. 9th cent.), Abbot of Psalmody Monastery (France) 97
Thomas (†72), Apostle and Saint 21, 51, 176, 214 n. 9
Titus (*39, †81), Emperor (i.o. 79–81) 72
Tortosa (Spain) 114
Tours, Saint Martin Basilica 66
Treviso (Italy) 67
Tripoli 115
True Cross → Holy Cross
Tugtakin (†1128), Atabeg of Damascus 116

U
Urban I (†230), Pope (i.o. 222–230) 170
Ursula (†383), Saint and Martyr 170, 172, 175, 186, 189
Ursula Haider (*1413, †1498), Abbess of Bickenkloster in Villingen 291
Ursus (fl. 5th cent.), Priest at Narbonne Cathedral 41 n. 19

V
Valence 45 n. 41
Valentine (*226, †269), Saint 170, 175–176
Valentinian III (*419, †455), Emperor (i.o. 425–455) 67 n. 21
Venantius Fortunatus (*c. 530, †600/610) 43 n. 30, 64, 65 n. 8, 67
Venerius, Bishop of Marseille (i.o. 431–452) 42 n. 19, 49 n. 64
Venice, Saint Mark’s Basilica 21, 185
Verden (fed. st. Lower Saxony) 164, 214, 223
Verdun, Monastery of Saint–Paul 184 n. 132
Veronica (fl. 1st cent.), Saint 146, 284
Victor of Solothurn (†c. 286), Saint and Martyr 177 n. 90
Vigilantius (fl. c. 400), Presbyter 44
Villingen (admin. dist. Schwarzwald–Baar, fed. st. Baden–Württemberg), Poor Clares’ Convent Bickenkloster 291
Vincentius of Valencia (fc. 304), Saint 170, 175–176
Vinnenberg (admin. dist. Warendorf, fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia), Cistercian Convent 250
Virgin Mary → Mary
Vitalis, Saint 170
Volkwin of Schwalenberg (*1170, †1243) 257

W
Walhfrid Strabo (*c. 808, †849) 93, 95, 97, 101
Walburgis (fl. 1000), Founder of the Heiningen Convent 276
– Saint Nicholas Chapel 136, 142–143
Walsrode (admin. dist. Heidekreis, fed. st. Lower Saxony), Benedictine Convent 214
Walter the Chancellor (†aft. 1122) 117
Warendorf (fed. st. North Rhine–Westphalia) 256
Warmund (*bef. 1069, †1128), Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem 116
Wasserleben (admin. dist. Harz, fed. st. Saxony–Anhalt) 128 n. 10
Weingarten, Benedictine Monastery 135 n. 57
Welf → Guelf
Werner of Steußlingen (†1151), Bishop of Münster (i.o. 1132–1151) 256
Widukind I (*c. 1090, †c. 1136), Count of Schwalenberg 251, 253
Widukind III (*c. 1155, †c. 1190), Count of Schwalenberg 257
Widukind of Rheda (*1154, †1189/1191), Advocat of Freckenhorst and Liesborn 251–258
– Chapel of All Saints 165, 229
– Chapel of Saint Anne 166, 176, 178, 180, 191
– Chapel of Saint Fabian and Sebastian 180, 287 n. 47
– Chapel of the Holy Cross 180
– Holy Sepulchre 141 n. 92, 146–147, 174 n. 80, 175 n. 81, 178 n. 100, 179–180, 181 n. 119
– Saint Alexander Parish Church 165
Wilfred (†1079), Archbishop of Narbonne 40 n. 12
William (*c. 1075/1085, †1148), Abbot of Saint–Thierry Monastery 126 n. 4
William (*c. 1130, †1186), Archbishop of Tyre (i.o. 1175–1186) 109–110, 114–115, 117
William I of Bures (*c. 1090, †1143/1144 or 1158), Prince of Galilee 114
Willibald (*c. 700, †787/788), Bishop of Eichstätt (i.o. 741–787/788) 42
Windesheim (Netherlands, Overijssel) 214, 288–289
Wismar 234
Wöltingerode (admin. dist. Goslar, fed. st. Lower Saxony), Cistercian Convent 128 n. 10, 145, 255, 261–262, 266
Wulfhard (fl. 12th cent.), Son of Wulfhardus 267
Wulfhardus (fl. 12th cent.), Ministerial of Saint Paul in Münster 259, 267

Z
Zahir ad–Din Tughtigin → Tugtakin of Damascus
Zengi of Mosul (*c. 1085, †1146) 114
The collection of essays presented in "Devotional Cross-Roads: Practicing Love of God in Medieval Gaul, Jerusalem, and Saxony" investigates test case witnesses of Christian devotion and patronage from Late Antiquity to the Late Middle Ages, set in and between the Eastern and Western Mediterranean, as well as Gaul and the regions north of the Alps. Devotional practice and love of God refer to people – mostly from the lay and religious elite –, ideas, copies of texts, images, and material objects, such as relics and reliquaries. The wide geographic borders and time span are used here to illustrate a broad picture composed around questions of worship, identity, religious affiliation and gender. Among the diversity of cases, the studies presented in this volume exemplify recurring themes, which occupied the Christian believer, such as the veneration of the Cross, translation of architecture, pilgrimage and patronage, emergence of iconography and devotional patterns.

These essays are representing the research results of the project "Practicing Love of God: Comparing Women’s and Men’s Practice in Medieval Saxony" guided by the art historian Galit Noga-Banai, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and the historian Hedwig Röckelein, Georg-August-University Göttingen. This project was running from 2013 to 2018 within the Niedersachsen-Israeli Program and financed by the State of Lower Saxony.