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Vindictive virgins: animate images and theories of art in some thirteenth-century miracle stories
ALEXA SAND

It has been persuasively argued that before the fifteenth century the category of art as a theorized entity did not exist; this was a period for which we can write a history of the image, but not a history of art.1 Careful scrutiny of both intellectual and popular discourse on images, east and west, has resulted in the more cautious view that medieval people, while experiencing what we now call 'art' largely through processual rituals and the paradigm of spiritual vision, were also aware, on a variety of levels, of the art object qua art object. At various times and places, they recognized the object as an artificial (i.e. manufactured) representation, capable of being evaluated in aesthetic as well as theological terms.2 In this essay, I am concerned with several texts that give evidence of such recognition of 'objecthood' in a category of objects that certainly functioned in a religious and ritual mode, but which at the same time (between about 1150 and 1250) came increasingly to be viewed in aesthetic terms. The friction between these two ways of seeing these objects — specifically, representations of the Virgin and her son — comes into view not in high-minded theological tracts, but in the literature directed toward the instruction of those whom the theologians suspected of being most dependent on and simultaneously given to mistaken understanding of visual representation. Specifically, the laity, women, and other classes of people presumed ignorant and/or illiterate were associated in medieval thinking with the use of material images in devotion.3

The texts I address here are drawn from a vast body of folklore about the miracles of the Virgin that circulated widely in the later medieval period. They are, however, exceptional among that literature in that they concern themselves specifically with visual images, and even more exceptional in that in these tales, the Virgin acts in a surprisingly violent and vindictive fashion. In each instance, the narrative hinges on a visual image, demonstrating a viewer’s erroneous response or relationship to it, and the punishment that follows. The protagonist’s errors lead to consequences ranging from receiving a stunning blow to the jaw to becoming the victim of cannibalism, leaving no doubt as to the didactic agenda of these narratives. They are cautionary tales, and what they caution against is, in a word, art. This is not to say that they advocate an iconoclastic approach to Christian worship and devotion, but rather that they point at agency and their essence. That such an anxiety should have arisen in the thirteenth century seems fitting; setting these narratives beside the dramatic shift of style and iconography in the representation of the Virgin in the visual media in this period, the cause for concern becomes visible. The distant, reverential gaze constructed by Romanesque depictions of the Virgin gives way to a far more intimate, eroticized visual relationship cultivated by the Gothic sculptors. Stories in which the Virgin exerts punitive force through or on behalf of her image engage with just this problem: how to correctly see the Virgin in her image, both acknowledging and transcending its materiality.

I begin with an exploration of one of these miracle tales in particular, examining how it presents a scenario in which a misunderstanding about artistic style results in severe retribution on behalf of the Virgin’s image. Reading this episode closely for how it describes the image and prescribes the terms by which it should be evaluated, I argue that it speaks to an awareness of a stylistic shift in the representation of the Virgin that took place in the early Gothic period, and that may have puzzled or troubled some observers. A second miracle tale involving the terrible vengeance an image of the Virgin visits upon an offender forms the core of the next part of my discussion. As in the first miracle, aesthetic ways of seeing are contrasted to religious ways of seeing, but instead of revolving around the mistake of judging religious images from an aesthetic standpoint, the second story exposes the erroneous thinking that equates images of the Virgin with pagan idols — a kind of iconographic and materialist fallacy. The third part of the paper deals with several stories that address the materiality and agency of images of the Virgin, and demonstrate the consequences of either respecting or misconstruing the agency of these material bodies. Encoded in all of these accounts, I argue, are valuable clues to the way in which medieval viewers responded to visible alterations in artistic representation taking place over the course of the thirteenth century. As such they inform us about the history of art-historical consciousness before the ‘era of art.’

The matron of Veldenz: an aesthetic fallacy
Before I turn to the first miracle of interest here, it is worth reviewing the context in which it was generated. Whether concerned predominantly with the activities of Mary at a particular shrine, or interested more generally in her interventions in the mortal world, collections of miracles of the Virgin, first in Latin,
and then in vernacular languages, began to flourish in the mid-
twelfth century, and continued to be produced throughout the 
remainder of the Middle Ages.4 However, between about 1200 
and 1300, the repertoire of miracles became more standardized 
and widely diffused. This phenomenon owed something to the 
marked increase of emphasis on preaching associated with rise 
of the Mendicant orders — collections of exemplary stories 
formed the main ammunition of their rhetorical battery, and 
Marian miracles numbered significantly among the exempla.5 
Also, many collections of miracles were composed or compiled 
in this period, and all of the miracle stories I discuss here are 
found in one or several of these compendia. The largest and 
most comprehensive of these collections include (but are by no 
means limited to) the Latin Dialogus Miraculorum of the Cistercian 
Caesarius of Heisterbach (circa 1220), the Old French Miracles de 
Notre Dame of the Benedictine Gauthier de Coinci (before 1233), 
the Spanish Milagros de Nuestra Señora by another Benedictine, 
Gonzalo de Berceo (circa 1250), the Latin Legenda Aurea of the 
Dominican Jacques de Voragine (likewise circa 1250), and the 
Galician-Portuguese Cantigas de Santa Maria by the Castillian 
king, Alfonso X ‘the Wise’ (circa 1280).6 Many of the same 
miracles recur across these collections, sometimes more or less 
unchanged, sometimes adapted to local geography or to the 
particular audience and setting in which the text would have 
been performed.7 

The interest in Mary both reflected in and encouraged by the 
circulation of such miracle narratives was part of a larger trend. 
The rise of Mariolatry in the west in the later Middle Ages has 
been well documented: from about 1000 onward, images of the 
Virgin both visible and imaginative proliferated in the liturgy 
and in extraliturgical devotion and ritual.8 Mary’s intercessory 
compassion was crucial to her increasing popularity — as 
Rachel Fulton has pointed out, the ‘new’ Mary imagined by 
Anselm of Bec in his prayers was, compared to the earlier 
medieval Mary, less Stoic and more expressive, emotive, and 
sympathetic to the piteous cries of the sinner.9 In the words of 
Carolyn Bynum, ‘gradually, in popular religion, she becomes so 
central that her mediation is “automatic” and “ethically irra-
tional” . . . she saves her loyal favorites, even if they fail to meet 
the standards of contrition and penitence.’10 The Marian 
theme, Salve Regina, composed in the eleventh century, 
addresses her as ‘queen of mercy,’11 a role she enthusiastically 
puts on in many later miracle stories — for example, when she 
saves an errant nun from humiliation by taking her place in the 
convent or when she forces the devil to rescind his rights over the 
soul of a misled deacon.12 

While the majority of the Marian miracles demonstrate her 
loving kindness, occasionally, the Virgin of the thirteenth-cen-
tury miracle literature behaves violently or vindictively. The first 
miracle that concerns me here is recounted only by Caesarius of 
Heisterbach but stands as a prime example of this type of 
narrative, in which an offense given to an image of the Virgin 
results in severe consequences for the offender:

In the chapel of the fort of Veldenz there is a certain ancient 
image of the Blessed Virgin, holding her Son in her bosom, not 
indeed fashioned with any skill, but endowed with much vir-
tue. A certain matron of the castle, which is situated in the 
diocese of Trèves, was one day standing in the chapel looking 
at this image and in scorn for the way it was sculptured, said, 
‘Why does this old rubbish stand here?’ But the Blessed Mary 
who is the Mother of mercy, not, as I think making any 
accusation to her son concerning this foolish woman, but 
predicting a future punishment for her fault said to another 
matron: ‘Because that lady,’ mentioning her name, ‘has called 
me old rubbish, she will be an unhappy woman all her life.’ 
A few days afterwards she was despoiled of all her property and 
lands by her own son and even to this day begs her bread 
 miserably, paying the penalty for her folly. You see how the 
Blessed Virgin loves and honours those who love her, and 
punishes and brings low those who despise her.13 

Behind this tale lies an implicit theory of images. The harshness 
of the punishment, superficially so out of proportion with the 
crime, indicates Caesarius’ concern with the correct perception 
of visual representations of the Virgin. Otherwise it is hard to 
understand why a lifetime of begging constitutes an appropriate 
penalty for the woman’s few inconsiderate words that apply, not 
to the Virgin herself, but to a mere representation, which 
Caesarius admits ‘is not indeed fashioned with any skill.’ 

This statement about the crude nature of the image is the crux of 
the tale: Caesarius draws attention to the visual qualities of the 
image in a number of ways. It is ancient, he notes, a characteristic 
that imparts authority of itself, and that can be visually ascertained 
from such cues as wear and tear and archaic appearance. 
The description of the iconography, ‘the Virgin holding her son in her 
bosom,’ is not terribly specific, but in tandem with this assessment 
of great age, it implies the old-fashioned (by Caesarius’ day) type of 
the solo sanctae, or Throne of Wisdom, in which the Christ child 
is seated on the Virgin’s lap and appears, from the front, framed by 
her torso. This also accords with his statement that the work is ‘full 
of virtue’: in the Throne of Wisdom type, the repletion of Mary’s 
body with the incarnate Christ is visually figured in terms of the 
position of the infant on its mother’s lap, directly in front of her 
womb.14 Certainly, Caesarius does not associate its virtue with 
physical attractiveness — like the guilty matron, he is quite frank 
about what he perceives as its inferior quality of artisanship. Given 
the antiquity he attributes to the statue, what looks like poor quality 
to Caesarius might in fact be archaic style. Whether Caesarius is 
writing about an object he has actually seen, or imagining a kind of 
object that might attract such scorn, he clearly has a particular kind 
of image in mind, and I propose that this was a sculpted image of 
the sort that populated parish churches and chapels across western 
Europe in the early thirteenth century. 

Even as the classicism and naturalism of the Gothic style 
achieved their apogee in the architectural sculpture of cathedrals 
constructed in the 1220s and 1230s, the sculptural images of the 
Virgin with which the greatest number of people had familiarity 
remained portable representations of the Throne of Wisdom that
played such an important role in the ritual life of parishes and pilgrimage centers. Their hieratic, abstract form articulates authority and sacredness by opening distance between representation and the visual qualities of the workaday world. As Caesarius’ story suggests, the value of such works lay in their perceived age and the numen imparted by ancient origin — an antiquity reinforced by their formal qualities. For instance, the Virgin of Rocamadour, a work of the twelfth century, was believed to have issued from the hands of Saint Luke, an origin which both explained and was supported by its visual strangeness. Sometimes, Throne of Wisdom type Virgins even appear to have been deliberately made to appear archaic — as is perhaps the case of the Virgin from Évagnée, near Liège (figure 1). The rigid, frontal pose, the severe faces drawn from Byzantine convention, and the often rough quality of the carving are what make these Romanesque Madonnas so engaging to the modern eye, but they hardly correspond to late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century ideas of feminine beauty which emphasized smoothness, blondness, and lightness of complexion.

Furthermore, by the time of Caesarius’ writing, the style associated with such typically Romanesque works as the Throne of Wisdom of about 1150–1200, from the Auvergne, now in the Metropolitan Museum in New York (figure 2), stood in sharp contrast to new artistic approaches to depicting the Virgin. Not only the architectural sculptures associated with cathedrals, but also free-standing works created for both church and private viewing employed a much softer approach to modeling, a more classical sense of proportion, and a broader vocabulary of gesture. All of these changes contributed to an increasingly tender and sensual focus on Mary’s bodily and emotional relationship with her son. This is visible in such Gothic works as the enthroned Virgin and Child in ivory from England, from around 1220, now in the Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, Hamburg (figure 3). Nominally a representation of the same subject as the Romanesque Throne of Wisdom, that is, the enthroned Virgin with her divine son, this work differs on almost every level: style,
scale, material, composition, address to the viewer, and intent. Where the earlier figures sit enfolded in sacred immobility, severe and a little aloof, the English pair break the spatial envelope around them with animated gestures and movements of their limbs accentuated by dramatic swathes of drapery. Each figure spirals slightly away from the center axis, and the Virgin’s posture is no longer symmetrical and static — she lifts one hand in a gesture that seems to greet the viewer, and beneath the child, who sits off-center, she raises her thigh to bear his weight, resting her foot on the back of a symbolic, but also compositionally useful, lion. The slight smile on her lips, the contrast of texture between her wavy hair and her smooth veil, the fullness of her body beneath the thin, silk-like drapery, all draw attention to her youth and femininity. By the same token, the chubby cheeks and limbs of her child make him far more a human baby than the grave, stiff, little men who perch on the knees of the Romanesque Virgins.

Caesarius’ story tells us so, both in his own assessment of the image as being both ‘old’ and ‘without skill’ and in the matron’s evaluation of the work as ‘rubbish.’ The difference between Caesarius and his character, however, is that the matron fails to understand that the work’s displeasing visual qualities do not hinder, and may even express and augment its ‘virtue’ as a numinous entity. What Caesarius proposes in this narrative is that evaluating at a sacred image in aesthetic terms is at best a dangerous business. To dishonor the image of the Virgin is in effect to show disrespect to the Virgin herself, to ‘despise her’ and to be brought low as a result. Caesarius, whose work is addressed as instruction to a novice monk, expresses a theory of the image deeply rooted in Christian practice and theory. The image communicates the honor given it to the subject it depicts, functioning as a kind of sacred conduit.

Then too, Caesarius wrote as a Cistercian novice master, heir to his order’s ambivalent relationship with visible images. While Bernard of Clairvaux’s famous Apologia condemned the uses of art in monastic settings and set out a moral case against excessive art, as Conrad Rudolph has observed, Bernard did not reject out of hand the usefulness of art for lay audiences. In fact, he hardly addressed it, as it was not germane to his topic, and in any case the Gregorian dictum that religious art could serve as an instructional tool for the laity was well entrenched by the twelfth century. Meanwhile, Cistercian mysticism was intensively imagistic and invested in language that conjured visual and even visionary states of mind. Cistercian writers, following Bernard, developed a new idiom for praising the Virgin, one that by its very nature celebrated her in terms of much more clearly physical and often even erotic beauty. While cleaving closely to scriptural sources, Bernard’s second homily in praise of Mary stresses her supernal beauty and casts her in a role familiar to an audience versed in the emerging romance tradition — that of the beautiful but humble girl who has caught the eye of a mighty lord; ‘This queenly maiden… radiant with this perfect beauty of spirit and body, renowned in the city of the Most High for her loveliness and beauty, so ravished the eyes of all the heavenly citizens that the heart of the King himself desired her beauty.’

This attention to Mary’s physical beauty, to her femininity and desirability, was not the purview of the Cistercians alone, though they were particular advocates of it. In the same period, secular and Benedictine lyricists alike began to address Mary in terms very similar to those they might equally apply to secular amies. Gautier de Coinci, for instance, names her ‘Fresh and brilliant rose… neat and pure and clean’ in one of the chansons from his first cycle of songs to Mary, composed about 1218. This appropriation of a literary mode was at least in part calculated to supplant secular with sacred concerns, as many scholars have recognized. G.R. Owst wrote that by the fourteenth century, ‘the preacher might… hope to outvie the minstrel, with his description of a lady more lovely and gentle than the loveliest dame in Camelot.’ But advocates of piety had more ammunition than words alone — unlike the trouvère, whose performance was above all oral and ephemeral, the performance of piety was enmeshed not only in written texts but in visual representations as well, ‘image acts’ as well as ‘speech acts.’

In the story of the matron of Veldenz, Caesarius gives the terms of viewing demanded by visual representations of the

Figure 3. Seated Virgin and Child, photo by permission of the Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, Hamburg.
Virgin as anti-aesthetic, against this mode of fascination with Mary’s beauty. To look for physical beauty is erroneous, and to condemn a work for being poorly made is to miss the visual signs of its power and authenticity. The woman’s negative aesthetic judgment is erroneous not because she lacks taste, but because it quite literally offends God. In this way, Caesarius expresses a profoundly conservative and monastic outlook, in which sensory impressions that give pleasure are suspect. Fundamentally, this is a story about a clash of visualities — a conflict between two ways of seeing, one of which is aesthetic and the other, religious. In effect, Caesarius implicitly contrasts the Virgin of Veldenz to her prettier and more sensually pleasing sisters. The matron’s negative aesthetic assessment of the former points to the existence of the latter as points of comparison. But, Caesarius demonstrates, she sees things all wrong, or rather, like the Pharisees, she sees, but she is blind to the truth. Whether this means that the new style of sculptural representation is itself flawed, in Caesarius’ view, cannot be determined. He is simply making the point that an aesthetic evaluation of the object is not only misguided, but downright sacrilegious. It is the Virgin herself, and not the particular appearance of her image, to which the properly pious mind should direct itself in the presence of her visual representation.

**The iconoclastic gambler: beauty, misconstrued**

The cautionary tale of the matron of Veldenz sends the message that thinking too literally about images of the Virgin as inert objects comparable to other forms of three-dimensional representation is spiritually and materially dangerous. This comes out in a different way in a story that appears in several collections, but is most dramatically related in the *Cantigas de Santa Maria* of Alfonso X of Castile. In this account, a gambler, part of a rabble that has invaded the monastery of Chateauroux, berates an old woman who kneels and prays before an image of the Virgin and child, ‘beautifully carved in stone.’ He tells her that to do so is idolatrous, and to prove his point, throws a stone at the statue, breaking off the arm of the child. The stone then springs to life: the Virgin catches the arm before it falls, blood spurts from the wound, and to heighten the pathos, the Virgin’s golden robe slips down to reveal her breasts. And lest the audience sigh relief at the appearance of these symbols of the Virgin’s life-giving mercy, the tale continues as follows:

> Her eyes narrowed so fiercely that all who saw Her were so frightened of Her that they did not dare gaze at Her face. A crowd of demons took ranks against the one who committed the deed, and like obedient huntsmen, they killed him in short order. Two other demon-possessed gamblers had gone there to carry off that dead comrade. However, in their madness they began to gnaw his flesh in great rage.

This is another appalling outcome for a hermeneutic error: the gambler, like the matron of Veldenz, applies the wrong set of visual referents to the image of the Virgin — in this case, comparing her statue to the statues of pagan gods, and thus to an idol.

Here, it is not a mistaken evaluation of style, but confusion about iconography on which the narrative hangs. The gambler, who with his comrades clearly has no respect for the sacred, cannot tell the difference between a Christian image and a pagan idol. To him, one statue of a beautiful woman is very much the same as any other. The story, which in other versions is specifically set in 1187, dates to a period when the image of the Virgin at its center might have been either in the older, Romanesque manner or in the newer, Gothic style, but this hardly matters. In the illustrated manuscripts of the *Cantigas*, the statue is depicted as a conventionally courtly, elegant figure mounted in a niche on the wall, exactly in keeping with the type of smaller scale sculpture for church use typical of the period. Any viewer of the manuscript would have recognized the subject, and the gambler’s comparison of the sacred figure to a pagan idol seems particularly outrageous in this light. A grotesque figure of the iconoclast, he may, in the *Cantigas*, allude to Jewish aniconism, anti-Semitic imagery and narrative being a stock of both the Marian miracle literature and the courtly culture of Alfonso’s Castille. Whether or not he is meant to be glossed as a negative representation of Jewish attitudes toward the image, he is certainly intended to be read as bestial, sacrilegious, and deserving of his gruesome fate.

The friction between the status of the Christian image and that of the pagan idol is further encoded in the narrative in the baring of the Virgin’s breasts and the way in which the gambler meets his fate. The story of Artemis and Actaeon, familiar to educated medieval readers from Ovid, seems to be invoked: like the gambler, Actaeon suffers from being eaten by his own companions after glimpsing the naked flesh of the goddess. The otherwise incomprehensible detail of the Virgin losing her drapery draws attention to her breasts, ordinarily symbols of mercy, but here associated with its opposite, revenge. The reversal heightens the drama of the narrative and underscores the difference between the ordinarily modestly depicted Virgin and the shameless, erotic nudity of pagan idols. It is almost as if the gambler’s suggestion, that the statue is an idol, is briefly manifested just to show that it is not true. In the context of the illustrated manuscripts of the *Cantigas*, the mildness and modesty of the depicted Virgin contrast sharply with the ferocity of the statue as represented in the text.

Whether mistaking archaic style for low value or polychromatic beauty for false seeming, the unfortunate would-be critics in both the tale of the matron of Veldenz and the gambler of Chateauroux suffer for engaging with material representations of the Virgin as if they were simply objects to be evaluated in aesthetic terms. Their errors are understandable, however. The visible beauty of sacred objects was an important factor in their spiritual value — Hans Belting noted that as late as 1410, a trial over the authenticity of competing relics settled the issue on only two criteria; first and foremost, their age, and secondly, their ‘beauty and piety.’ Furthermore, the thirteenth century saw a great deal of theological effort expended on the contemplation and definition of beauty in its relationship to perception.
Aquinas stressed the sensible nature of beauty when he wrote, ‘those things are called beautiful which please us when they are seen.’\textsuperscript{155} This seems straightforward, until we recall that Aquinas and his contemporaries understood seeing as a discursive mode of perception that spanned the physical and the intellectual senses, leading, ultimately, toward a higher form of vision that was the direct experience of God by the soul at the end of time.\textsuperscript{36} As Umberto Eco observed of Thomistic aesthetics, ‘Beauty is actualized in the relation of an object to the mind which knows it and its beauty.’\textsuperscript{37} In other words, beauty must be recognized by the mind as a relation between a mode of perception and its object. If the mode of perception is faulty, then the true beauty of the object remains invisible.

On a less rarefied intellectual level, the miracle tales demonstrate a similarly dialectic conception of vision and beauty; the human actors are not only seeing, but being seen as well. The matron of Veldenz is observed by the very statue she insults, and in later in the story, Caesarius instructs his listener that she can still be seen on the streets of the town — her visibility a marker of her sinfulness. In the story of the gambler, the mistaken gaze that sees the Virgin as an idol is brought sharply up against the deadly counter-gaze of the Virgin, so fierce that it repels the human regard.\textsuperscript{38} This is a reminder of the statue’s agency and its difference from an inert image, which exists only to be gazed at; it is not only visually perceived, but visually perceiving as well. These constructions of gaze/counter-gaze serve to remind the audience for these miracle narratives that looking at material, physical representations of the Virgin is more like looking at a person, and less like looking at a mute object. To forget this is to cross into dangerous territory, where aesthetic judgments interfere with spiritual perception.

**The object intercedes: respecting agency**

The cautionary and didactic intent of the Marian miracle literature, so evident in the examples of the stories of the matron of Veldenz and the gambler of Chateauroux, means that it constructs an *ad hoc* epistemology of the image. In this folk-theory, material representations of the Virgin both are and are not like other works of art: the positive relationship is in their visible quality of being made (poorly or beautifully), which can be mistaken by a spiritually ignorant viewer for their totality. The negative relation is that unlike other such manufactured objects, these objects perceive: they hear, they see, and they exercise agency. The object oscillates between modes of perception that are physical and material, and modes that are spiritual and imaginative. In this final part of the essay, I look at a few miracle stories that engage with this problem of how representations of the Virgin hover in the gap between the visible and the visionary, and what this reveals about the stories’ intent and their position in regard to the visual culture of their period.

The first two miracles related here demonstrate that a correct visual approach to a representation of the Virgin takes into account its agency and its special status as a perceiving and acting image. But this respect alone does not suffice if the supplicant has already offended the image, and has failed to take into account the possible consequences of the offense. A third story demonstrates that aesthetic and iconographic errors are not the only mistakes that enrage the Virgin and drive her to violence. This tale of a would-be errant nun is found in a number of collections, including the *Dialogus miraculorum*, and it is to Caesarius’ version I will refer here.\textsuperscript{39} A nun, caretaker for her convent’s church, was seduced by a clerk, and agreed to meet him when she had closed up the sanctuary after compline. When she tried to leave, however, she found a vision of the crucified Christ at every door. ‘Then,’ Caesarius tells us, ‘greatly trembling, she threw herself before the image of the Blessed Mother of God and besought pardon for her sin, but the image turned away her face from her, and when, in the eagerness of her supplication she approached nearer, the image smote her on the jaw with her hand . . . . So violent was the blow that she fell to the ground and lay there till the morning . . . in a deep swoon.’\textsuperscript{40}

Why would the Virgin strike the nun, who clearly respects the status of the image as a spiritually numinous presence? And why would the statue turn away from the nun’s supplication? This tale deals with the limits of the Virgin’s vision, or her willingness to bestow her gaze, and draws together for comparison the spiritual action of visionary experience and the physicality of the material image. The unexpected violence of the Virgin’s response fits with the logic of a narrative in which the normative roles of Christ and his mother are inverted. By appearing as a pathetic vision, Christ intercepts the nun’s self-destructive impulse, literally standing between her and sin the way the Virgin ordinarily stands between a sinner and Christ, while it is the Virgin who takes the part of the disciplinary parent, telling the nun to go to her room before she strikes her down. The vision of the Crucifixion recalls to the nun her spiritual duty, and fills her with contrition. But it is not before the vision that she prostrates herself. Rather, she turns to a material image of the Virgin, and perhaps this is where she goes wrong. For just as the nun has turned away in horror from the vision of the Crucified Christ, so the Virgin turns away from the nun and her sin, refusing to see. When the nun does not accept this refusal, and approaches the statue more closely, she is rebuffed even more forcibly: the stunning blow delivered by the furious Virgin underscores both the materiality and the agency of the representation. The blow is the angry gaze of the miracle of the gambler of Chateauroux transformed from visual into tactile menace: the ‘violence of the gaze’ made manifest.\textsuperscript{41}

Where and how and at whom the Virgin looks is an issue charged with significance in later medieval devotional art and literature: Sarah Stansbury has remarked that ‘The existence of her gaze . . . acknowledges female power, for a poetic or pictorial narrative that suppresses or deflects her gaze also acknowledges, if momentarily, its potency.’\textsuperscript{42} Just as in the tale of the gambler of Chateauroux, the Virgin is possessed of a killing look; in this miracle, the violence suppressed by her averted gaze finds its way to the surface with a physical blow. The nun’s mistake is twofold. First, she turns away from the completely immaterial
vision of the Crucifixion, unequal to the visionary experience it offers, and then, she fails to recognize the potentially fatal force of the material Virgin’s wrathful gaze, seeking it even when it is denied to her. Where she falls short is in her understanding of the power of that gaze, and for this mistake she suffers, though not so severely as the sinners featured in the other tales of Marian vengeance, for after all, she has not so much wronged the image as underestimated it.

In contrast to the confused and lust-addled nun, the protagonist of another miracle tale related by Caesarius concerning the image of the Virgin at Veldenz demonstrates how a proper approach to both the materiality and the agency of the object can achieve positive results. Caesarius relates that a woman named Jutta, who witnessed the Virgin’s comment about the fate of her critic in the first story, later returned to engage in her own way with the statue. Her daughter having been taken by a wolf, Jutta prays earnestly to Virgin to restore the girl to her. When this fails to produce results, she takes the sculpted infant from the lap of its sculpted mother, and holds it hostage until the Virgin returns the child.43 While this might seem risky behavior given what she already knows about the divine vengeance that has been wrought against the woman who insulted the image in words alone, Jutta is in fact rewarded. Unlike the first woman, she approaches the sculpted pair in the correct frame of mind; while she takes the child from the mother, she treats it with utmost reverence, wrapping it in fine cloth as if it were a relic, and storing it respectfully out of harm’s way. She sees the sculpted mother as a mother like herself, concerned for the whereabouts and safety of her child, but also as a divine persona, capable of interventions far beyond human power. The appearance and the material nature of the object are her concern insofar as they provide a handle on the sacred, but she is mostly interested engaging with the Virgin’s agency, not her representation. Here, Caesarius demonstrates that when the sacred image is viewed in a properly reverential and essentially credulous mode, its spiritual power can be manipulated to the benefit of the viewer. Kidnapping the infant, far from constituting and insult to the object, testifies to the woman’s faith in its efficacy.

While Jutta’s interaction with the Virgin specifically addresses her maternal role, it does so in a way that posits the Virgin less as a passive, gazed-upon vision of maternity and more as an active, even heroic figure. What is seen in the representation — the seated mother, enthroned, with her son in her lap — is only part of what is imagined by the viewer who approaches the image correctly. She can envision the Virgin in the athletic and martial role required to free the daughter from the wolf. This heroic Virgin is very much present in the larger miracle literature. For example, in one tale she fights in a battle to spare from accusations of cowardice a devout knight who has missed the fray because he is praying, while in another, her image, placed on the ramparts of a castle, tosses invading Moors to their deaths.44 In the extremely popular miracle story of Theophilus, recounted in numerous collections, the Virgin even wrestles with the devil — here she is less the trouvère’s ‘Sweet lady . . . fountain and spring of sweetness’ and more Galahad in skirts.45 At least one Romanesque sculptor embraced this motif: at Souillac, on the interior of the west wall of the church of Sainte-Marie, the Virgin swoops down out of the clouds to return the contract she has wrested from the devil to the sleeping Theophilus. But as Michael Cothren demonstrated, the real iconographical heyday of this story was precisely the period during which the sculptural representation of the Virgin became increasingly mild and non-confrontational: the first half of the thirteenth century.46 Manuscript illuminations, stained-glass windows, and architectural sculptures all attest to an urge to visualize the Virgin’s strong agency; in the tympanum to the north transept portal at Notre Dame, Paris (ca. 1250), for example, she is depicted threatening a demon with a raised sword, a forceful figure notwithstanding her elegant pose accentuated by a sweep of drapery. These are the visual cousins of the miracle stories of the Virgin’s sometimes violent agency.

The disjunction between the sweet, passive maiden-mother who is the subject of so many later medieval representations of the Virgin, and the active and assertive character who appears in many of the miracle stories points to the rift between the courtly, aestheticized mode of depiction and the theological matter it addresses. The miracle tales in which people see representations of the Virgin incorrectly express contemporary anxiety over images of the Virgin and her child, exactly what they are and how one is to attend to them. As such, they constitute evidence for an awareness of shifts in style and iconography, and a concern about how to assimilate them to traditional notions about sacred representation. As physical as well as literary images of the Virgin grew to resemble more nearly the courtly notion of an ideally beautiful female love-object, the situation grew more uncomfortable. In adopting the idiom of courtly love to the visual media, perhaps, the religious artist had also adopted its tendency to deprive the beloved (usually a woman) of independent subjectivity.47 Where the Romanesque Virgin sits foursquare and looks out at the viewer somewhat implacably, the Gothic Virgin has eyes only for her child, allowing the viewer to gaze at leisure, without engaging in an uncomfortable staring match. Sculpted in luxurious, translucent ivory, soft and curvaceous in form, and small in scale she offers herself as a visual delight. The visual pleasure induced by such refinement, however, puts the viewer at risk of making grave errors of visual interpretation. The consequences of such errors, as related in some of the miracle literature, are serious, since the Virgin could not be thought of or treated like an object, given that her primary role, in terms of devotion, was to behave like a subject — a mother who conceives, bears, nurtures, mourns, and above all, intercedes, physically, if necessary.

Stories in which the Virgin behaves violently capture the subjectivity of images of the Virgin and child, in their ability to act, and speak, and above all to see. They remind the listener that looking at sacred images is not equivalent to other kinds of looking; this idea is present, too, in late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century depictions of images of the Virgin — for example in the Psalter and Hours of Yolande de Soissons, where
the book’s owner kneels before a seated statuette of Virgin and child that instead of turning inwards upon itself (as most contemporary examples of actual sculpture do) engages with her, both mother and child making gestures toward her equivalent to those they make, several pages on, toward the Magi. Likewise, in the 1310 copy of the vernacular religious manual, the Somme le Roy, made for the Countess Jeanne d’Eu, a tall, swaying Virgin who closely resembles the standing statues of the Virgin coming into vogue at that moment reaches out and touches Jeanne’s wrist, transformed by her prayer into a tangible and animate presence.

New artistic modes always call for explanation and theorization. Thirteenth-century miracle stories about the Virgin, with their particular emphasis on images and their behavior constitute one venue for such work. Because more highbrow religious writing generally hesitated to engage specifically with artistic representation, these tales offer an important source for understanding how medieval people structured their viewing of images, and what bothered and excited them about the increasing naturalism and humanism of Gothic representation. In a sense, the Virgin acts transgressively as a way of reminding us that it is not the lifelike appearance of her statue (or the lack of lifelike appearance) that makes these representations effective. Instead, as these stories remind us, it is her fundamental humanity—that quality that makes her uniquely qualified to intercede on behalf of the human soul, that makes her compassionate, that enabled her to give flesh to the Word, but that also makes her prone to vindictive rage and even to violent reprisal.
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NOTES
2 – This point is raised (in relation to post-iconoclastic art theory in Byzantium) by Charles Barber, ‘From Image into Art: Art after Byzantine Iconoclasm,’ Gesta, 34/1 (1995), 5–10.
3 – The Gregorian dictum that ‘pictures are the books of the illiterate’ became one of the most widely propagated and intentionally misconstrued apologists for the image in the medieval west, as Célia Chiazelle demonstrated in her article, ‘Pictures, Books, and the Illiterate: Pope Gregory I’s Letters to Serenus of Marseilles,’ Word & Image, 6 (1990), 138–53. Lawrence Duggan (Was Art Really the “Book of the Illiterate”? Word & Image, 5 (1989), 227–51) also explored the disingenuousness with which medieval authors employed this trope. Conrad Rudolph noted that Bernard’s view of the role of art in the instruction of illiterates was absolutely orthodox in this respect, and that he viewed this as the purview of the secular clergy (Things of Greater Importance: Bernard of Clairvaux’s Apologia and the Medieval Attitude Toward Art (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 50–4, 194–5). Jeffrey Hamburger observed that ‘Women have historically been regarded as one of the primary, even formative audiences for devotional art, so it comes as a surprise that devotional imagery has never been adequately analyzed in terms of gender,’ a shortfall his own work has done much to address (‘Introduction: Texts Versus Images: Female Spirituality from an Art Historian’s Perspective,’ in The Visual and the Visionary: Art and Female Spirituality in Late Medieval Germany (New York: Zone Books, 1995), 15).
4 – Miracle collections abounded between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries, and were often tied to a specific shrine, though in the case of Mary, a more geographically decentralized literature of miracles emerged over the last decades of the twelfth century, as discussed by Benedicta Ward in Miracles and the Medieval Mind: Theory, Record, and Event, 1000–1215, revised edition (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), 132–3, in passing; in the course of the thirteenth century, these collections became more generalized with a view to use as exempla in sermons. A cogent discussion of this shift and of its causes is found in Marcus Bull, The Miracles of Our Lady of Rocamadour: Analysis and Translation (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1996), 8–10.
7 – The study of the miracle literature constitutes a discipline of its own, with an extensive critical apparatus. Albert Poncelet, ‘Index miraculorum B.V. Mariae quæ saec. VI–XV latine conscripta sunt,’ Analecta Bollandiana, 21 (1902), 242–360, lists incipits of miracles of the Virgin found in many of the major Latin collections from the twelfth through fifteenth centuries. Tubach’s Index Exemplorum catalogs known narrative types used in medieval collections of exempla (didactic stories) for preachers and is used as an indexing tool to cross-reference miracles found in multiple collections. A recent project sponsored by the British Academy and hosted by Oxford University focuses on the Cantigas de Santa Maria, but, according to its organizers, ‘will eventually contain all Latin and vernacular miracle collections associated with the CSM miracle stories, as well as cycles of miracles associated with particular shrines’ (The Oxford Cantigas de Santa Maria).


9 – Fulton, 204–43.


14 – This visual argument is spelled out most explicitly in the south tympanum of the west façade at Chartres, where the body of Christ in the Nativity scene in the lowest register, in the Presentation in the Temple in the middle register, and on the lap of the Virgin in the upper register underscores the incarnation and the role of Mary’s body as a vessel or seat for the Incarnate Word. See Adolf Katzenellenbogen, *The Sculptural Programs of Chartres Cathedral* (New York and London: W.W. Norton, 1933), 6–12.


16 – Forsyth, 144, 185 (fig. 145).

17 – Forsyth, 137.

18 – For example, when Lancelot, in *Le Chevalier de la Charrette* (ca. 1170), finds an ivory comb with some hairs from the head of Guinevere, they are described as light and filled with light ‘*et cleris et si luians*’ (v. 1415). Chrétien de Troyes, *Romans*, ed. Charles Mela (Paris: Libraire Générale Française, 1994), 510. When Le Comte de la Marche (ca. 1250) praises the beauty of his beloved in a lyric that begins ‘*Tu es like rubies and other precious stones,*’ he speaks of the freshness and high color of her complexion: ‘*Je me merveille/de la color tante fersce et tant vermeille*’ (v. 13–14. *Tout autant comme li rubiz*, *Anthologie de la poésie lyrique française des XIIe et XIIIe siècles*, ed. Jean Dufournet (Paris: Gallimard, 1989), 244.


21 – See note 3, above.


23 – For the relationship between *chaussons courtois* and *chaussons mariales*, see Pierre Béca, *La Lyrique Française au Moyen Age: contribution à une typologie des genres poétiques médiévaux*, I: *études* (Centre d’études supérieures de civilisation médiévale de l’Université de Poitiers, 6) [Paris: A. et J. Picard, 1977], 143.


27 – The anthropologist J.L. Austin first theorized speech as active (rather than simply representational) and, following this model, Liza Bakewell has developed a theory of images as acts (rather than simply representations) which seems a fertile characterization in light of the apparent agency of images in the context of medieval Christianity. See, Liza Bakewell, ‘Image acts,’ *American Anthropologist*, 100.1 (March, 1998), 22.


33 – The Virgin’s breasts — and indeed breasts more generally — were a subject of much devotional rumination. See, for example, Margaret R. Miles, ‘The Virgin’s One Bare Breast: Female Nudity and Religious Meaning in Tuscan Early Renaissance Culture,’ in *The Female Body in Western Culture: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. Susan Rubin Suleiman (Cambridge, MA, and London: 1985 and 1986), 193–208; Carolyn Walker Bynum ‘Jesus as Mother and Abbot as Mother,’ in *Jesus as Mother: Studies in Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: 1982), 110–66.

34 – Belling, 432.

35 – *Summa Thologiae* I. 5, 4 ad 1

36 – Even Roger Bacon’s *Prospectio* concludes with a rationale for the optical theory’s utility to contemplation of the divine, as Dallas Denery II discusses in *Seeing and Being Seen in the Late Medieval World: Optics, Theology and Religious Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 6. Suzannah Biernoff
writes, ‘Sight, as it was defined by Bacon and his contemporaries, offered a means of communion that exceeds Belting’s model of “communication” or “dialogue.” The visual relationship — more than any other sensory interaction — allowed for bodily participation in the divine.’ (Sight and Embodiment in the Middle Ages (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), 134.)


38 – The Virgin’s gaze as a transgressive example of active female viewing is addressed by Sarah Stanbury, ‘The Virgin’s Gaze: Spectacle and Transgression in Middle English Lyrics of the Passion,’ PMLA, 106, no. 5 (1991), 1083–93.


40 – Caesarius, Dialogue on Miracles, 501; for the Latin, Dialogus Miraculorum, 42.


44 – The miracle of the knight spared humiliation has several variations, cataloged by Poncelet at nos. 727, 1087, 1443; the miracle of the Virgin of Chincolla is found only in the CSM, where it is miracle no. 185 (Oxford CSM Database, http://csm.mml.ox.ac.uk/index.php?p=poeindividual&rec=185, accessed 15 July 2008).


49 – Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, ms. 6329, fol. iv. The miniature is reproduced in L’art au temps des rois maudits, cat. no. 208, 304.