Fig. 21. Seal of Bishop Notker of Liège, 980. Brussels, Algemeen Rijksarchief. Photo © Algemeen Rijksarchief.

Chapter Eight

The Bishop as Artist?

The Eucharist and Image Theory Around the Millennium†

Pierre-Alain Mariaux

Once, relates Paul the Deacon, Gregory the Great refused to give the body of Christ to a Roman woman.[1] When the moment came to receive Holy Communion, she began to laugh and could not stop. After mass was over, Gregory summoned the woman and asked her why she had behaved in this way while he was offering the host. She replied that when she had recognized the piece of bread she made as that which Gregory claimed to be the body of Christ, she could not help but laugh. Paul's story, which reveals the blurry distinction between "sacred" and "profane" in the early Middle Ages, also expresses in quite blunt terms the contentious nature of the doctrine of the Real Presence—a doctrine that, as we have just seen, was the focus of debates in the eleventh century which provoked new notions of identity and representation among the contemporary episcopacy. In this chapter, however, I argue that these debates contributed to another set of reflections in which the act of confection, and the notions of image-making and image-maker which it entailed, led not only to new modes of episcopal representation and projection, but to a new identity for the *sacerdos*: that of the artist. In turn, episcopal attempts to claim unique sacerdotal status as "vessels of the elect" and receptacles of the Holy Spirit—a status they would eventually have to share with the priesthood in general—would pave the way for a new set of spiritual claims by visual artists at the beginning of the twelfth century—in particular, the claim that the artist was himself a *sacerdos*.

This aspiration is clearly recognizable in the numerous signatures left by twelfth-century artists. At Saint-Pierre in Chauvigny, for instance, the sculptor Gofridus signed one of the capitals in the choir with the usual *me fecit* (fig. 22).

† I am grateful to Arnold Angenendt, Sean Gilsdorf, Jean Wirth, and the late Michael Camille for their valuable comments.

[1] Paul the Deacon, *S. Gregorii magni vita*, I.23 (*PL* 75: 52-53); John the Deacon, *S. Gregorii magni vita*, II.41 (*PL* 75: 103). According to Joseph Jungmann, this episode is a ninth-century legend; the text later would be reformulated to fit the theory of the transsubstantiation. Joseph A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development*, 2 vols., trans. Francis A. Brunner (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1951-55), 2: 390 n. 118, and Marta Cristiani, "La controversia eucaristica nella cultura del secolo IX," *Studi Medievali* 9 (1968): 167-233.

The scene to which he chose to apply his name depicted the Adoration of the Magi. In it, Christ raises his hand for the benediction, a gesture which also denoted an act of speech. The sculptor's own gesture is rendered equally ambiguous: did his "fecit" refer to the capital itself, or did he mean that, in one way or another, he participates in the Incarnation of Christ? In fact, the signature "Gofridus made me" can indeed refer to both the *imago* and the model it represents, linking incarnation, that is the creation of Christ's body, with what we will call artistic creation (echoes of which can still be heard today in the use of expressions like "giving birth" to describe the process of art-making).[2] This association, in fact, was grounded in the increasingly hieratic nature of the eucharistic rite in the early Middle Ages. Indeed, Paul the Deacon's story would probably have made little sense in the ninth century, since the faithful no longer brought to the altar the offerings which the priest would then consecrate. From the Carolingian period on, attention came to be focused on the performance at the altar, and the progressive dramatization of the mass displaced the idea of communion as a common sacrifice in favor of consecration by the priest alone. The central part of the mass, the canon, was whispered by the priest, who now became the sole agent of sanctification. The recitation of prayers in a low voice, away from the congregation, indicated the progressive separation of the priest from the rest of the flock.[3] This separation often led to abuses, which were regularly condemned from the tenth century on.[4] Furthermore, since the sacrifice of the mass was now concentrated in the hands of the priest, a literal creator of sacred matter, accidents committed during the eucharistic celebration (summarized in a few passages of the *libri penitentiales*) tended to highlight the problematic relationship between the sacred and the profane.[5] At any time, the priest might stumble; he might bite the chalice or spill its contents; the *sacrificium* might fall on the ground; or, worst of all, the priest might trip over the words he was speaking and thus mispronounce the consecratory prayer.[6]

These theological and practical problems surrounding the Eucharist were addressed by a number of tenth century writers, most of whom worked within the boundaries established by the earlier Carolingian controversy over the mass, and tried to reconcile Paschasius and Ratramnus' views on the nature of the Eucharist. In doing so, however, they were forced to consider the validity of priestly consecration and the conditions for creating Christ's body. All of their texts thus share a common concern—namely, the position of the *sacerdos*, whose role is presented as crucial, even fundamental, for the conversion of the species. In turn, these discussions about the performance of the sacrament led their authors to reflect upon the prerogatives of the bishop as well, because bishops considered themselves to be *supersacerdotes*.[7] This is illustrated well by Berno of Reichenau's *De officio missae*, composed slightly after 1024. In his second chapter, he distinguishes what properly derives from the power of the bishop and what is a gift of the Holy Spirit. Particular to the bishop, he claims, is the capacity to ordain clerics, to dedicate churches, and to prepare the holy chrism, while the sacred imposition of hands, a gift of the Holy Spirit, is common to both bishops and priests. Likewise, Christ's body is no more or less holy according to who actually consecrates it, since it is neither the priest nor the bishop who acts, but the Holy Spirit through them. For Berno, quoting Jerome, priests and bishops are *consortes*, associates, in the benediction. And, contrary to what some

[2] Among other examples, see for instance the porch of Santa Maria la Real in Sangüesa, where the Virgin holds a book containing Leodegarius' signature (MARIA MATER XPI LEODEGARIUS ME FECIT), or a capital at Notre-Dame-du-Port in Clermont-Ferrand depicting an angel holding a scroll with the artist's signature (ROTBERTUS ME FECIT). Jean Wirth has demonstrated the highly self-referential character of donation scenes and the staging of good works and works of art during that same period, leading to the wider diffusion of both portraits and signatures of artists; see his *L'image à l'époque romane* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1999), 303 ff..

[3] On the history of the Mass see, in addition to the work of Jungmann, Marius Lepin, *L'idée du sacrifice de la messe d'après les théologiens depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1926).

[4] See in particular Rather of Verona, *De contemptu canonum*, II.2 and II.4, and *Synodica*, c. 5, in *Complete Works*, 375, 378, 447-48.

[5] Hubertus Lutterbach, "The Mass and Holy Communion in the Medieval Penitentials (600-1200): Liturgical and Religio-Historical Perspectives," in *Bread of Heaven. Customs and Practices Surrounding Holy Communion*, ed. Charles Caspers, Gerard Lukken, and G.A.M. Rouwhorst (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995), 61-81.

[6] Raymund Kottje, "Oratio periculosa—Eine frühmittelalterliche Bezeichnung des Kanons?" *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 10/1 (1967): 165-68.

[7] Canon 7 of the Second Council of Seville in 619 forbade the priests "eo [episcopo] praesente sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi conficere" (quoted in Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, 1: 195 n. 4), a prohibition that also can be found in Theodulph of Orléans, *Capitulare*, I.45 (*PL* 105: 208). Around the millennium, bishops were trying to defend their old prerogatives, and it seems that Berno's discourse should be read against the background of the progressive elaboration of the *missa sollemnis*, at a time when more and more priests celebrated mass like bishops.

bishops believe, there do not exist *two* bodies of Christ, a major one consecrated by the bishop, and a minor one consecrated by the priest.[8]

Berno of Reichenau's argument leads us in two directions. First, we have to understand that around the beginning of the eleventh century, some bishops intended to arrogate to themselves something common to all priests, the grace of the Holy Spirit, and thus tried to put themselves above the priesthood. Berno's claim that episcopal and priestly consecration are equivalent provides a useful indication of the opinion bishops had of themselves, and can be compared with more or less contemporary texts written by Rather of Verona, Atto of Vercelli, or the author (now thought to be Ademar of Chabannes) of the anonymous *Sermo de informatione episcoporum*. It is not necessary to analyze these particular texts in detail; their authors concur that, on the one hand, the sacerdotal body occupies the highest position in the scale of beings, and that, on the other hand, within the sacerdotal *ordo* itself a further hierarchy applies in which the bishop occupies the first place. The author of the *Sermo de informatione episcoporum* thus says that while there is nothing more excellent than priests, there also is nothing more sublime than bishops, because bishops are the favored receptacle of Divine Grace.[9] For Atto of Vercelli, bishops are the guarantors of the world order established by God and the main instrument of His love, which regulates interaction within Christian society. The bishop is thus seen as a *superinspector*.[10] Finally, Rather of Verona elevates the bishop to the highest level, and makes him literally touch the sky: "Bishops are gods, lords, christs, heavens, angels, patriarchs . . . [they] are the foundations on which the whole

[8] Berno of Reichenau, *De officio missae*, c. 2 (*PL* 142: 1061): "Et mirum valde videtur cum certa sit ratione discretum, quid soli liceat episcopo, non autem presbytero: videlicet, ut ad episcopum pertineant ordinationes clericorum, dedicationes aecclesiarum, sacris chrismatis confectio, ad dandum Spiritum paracletum, sacra impositio manuum, quid aliud esse possit in sacramentis divinis quod non sit presbyteris commune cum episcopis, praecipue cum id quod excellentissimum est in omnibus sacramentis, sanctum videlicet corpus et sanguinem Domini, quotidie sicut episcopi, ita et consecrent presbyteri, nec sanctius sit illorum quam istorum . . . Hi [sc. presbyteri] namque in benedictione cum episcopis consortes sunt mysteriorum ac nulla in conficiendo corpore Christi ac sanguine inter vos et episcopos credenda distantia est . . . credens Deum duo corpora habuisse, unum majus, aliud minus; quod episcopus conficit majus, quod presbyteri minus; qui Christum ita divisit, Deo injuriam fecit."

[9] *Sermo de informatione episcoporum*, 17. I have used the edition of Flavio Nuvolone in "Il *Sermo pastoralis* Pseudoambrosiano," 524.

[10] Atto of Vercelli, *Sermo* 13 (*PL* 134: 853).

building of God's Temple stands."[11] Likewise, these authors agree that the figure of Christ can be seen implicitly in the figure of the *sacerdos* (and for Rather, more specifically in the figure of the bishop). This position, of course, was not a novel one at the turn of the millennium; Carolingian authors like Amalarius of Metz and Florus of Lyons already had made such a comparison, pointing out that while we need a human priest who represents us, it is Christ who accomplishes what has to be done at the altar. This "double vision" constitutes the first point of contact between Eucharist and image theory, a point to which I will return.

Second, Berno assumes a semantic equivalence between *consecrare* and *conficere corpus Christi*. As Bernard Botte has shown, this latter expression appears in three different forms during the Middle Ages. [12] The first and oldest of these is *conficere sacramentum*; used by Ambrose and Augustine, it simply means that the bread and wine effectively become Christ's flesh and blood. The second, *conficere corpus*, appeared with Isidore of Seville. Although this phrase is similar to its predecessor, it is more direct and hence provocative, insofar as it gives the impression that the priest conceives or produces Christ Himself. Finally, in the thirteenth century *conficere* appears alone and simply means *consecrare*; any implications about the explicit creation of Christ have thus been put aside.

There is something in this expression, however, that Botte did not analyze: the verb "conficere" itself, which means "to succeed", "to realize entirely", "to achieve", or "to perfect". The word was used for different things, from the successful conclusion of a transaction to the performance of sacrifices, and applied to all kinds of activities involving the preparation and transformation of one thing into another—most notably in the kitchen, with the meaning of reducing, elaborating or shaping, a meaning that we find in the modern French words *confit* and *confiture*. When the verb is applied to the sacrament of the Eucharist, it is used in this sense of transformation and achievement. Eleventh-century authors

[11] Rather of Verona, *Praeloquia*, III.6.12, in *Complete Works*, 102-3. It is worth quoting the entire passage (*PL* 136: 227): "Dii sunt, Domini sunt, Christi sunt, celi sunt, angeli sunt, patriarchae sunt, prophetae sunt, apostoli sunt, evangelistae sunt, martyres sunt, uncti sunt, reges sunt, principes sunt, iudices sunt, non tantum hominum, sed et angelorum, arietes gregis Domini sunt, pastores ovium —non quarumcunque, sed Christi sanguine lotarum —sunt, pupilla oculi Dei sunt, amici Dei viventis sunt, filii Dei sunt, patres sunt, luminaria mundi sunt, stellae celi sunt, columnae Ecclesiae sunt, medici animarum sunt, ianitores paradysi sunt, claves celi portant, reserare et claudere celum valent, nubes quas Dominus ascensum suum posuit, bases super quas tota iacet structura templi Dei."

[12] Bernard Botte, "Conficere Corpus Christi," *Année théologique* 8 (1947): 309-15.

were not embarrassed to use the same verb for activities particular to cooking and for the sacramental conversion of the species. Gregory VII, for instance, uses *conficere* to describe the production of a compound with butter as well as the confection of Christ's body.[13]

What happens during the Eucharistic sacrifice, then, is the mixing or confection of Christ's body by the *sacerdos*. When he describes the conversion of the species as a *confectio*, Berno implies that the priest is working with matter, that he is transforming the bread and the wine in order to achieve or create Christ's flesh and blood.[14] We are now confronted with a very important problem: *who creates what?* Is it the priest, the priest as Christ *in aenigmate* or *in persona Christi*, or the Holy Spirit animating or working through him? In turn, what is the nature of the created body: is it the sacramental body, the historical body of Christ, or both at the same time? This latter question was central to the Eucharistic controversies, in which we confront once more the problem of vision and the image. According to Gregory the Great, as the liturgical ceremony progresses, the eucharistic conversion opens the heavens and signals the unity of the visible realm with the invisible one.[15] The author of the *Confessio fidei* (probably John of Fécamp) clarified this notion, distinguishing two modes of vision at the altar: while the believer sees with his carnal eyes (*oculis corporeis*) a priest offering bread and wine, with the eyes of his heart—that is, with the gaze of faith (*intuitu fidei*)—he sees Christ offering himself. [16] Moreover, according to

[13] Gregory VII, *Das Register Gregors VII*, ed. Erich Caspar [MGH *ES* 2] (Berlin: Weidmann, 1920), VIII.1: "Audivimus etiam quod contra morem sanctae Ecclesiae vestrae non ex balsamo sanctum chrisma sed ex butyro conficiat," and VIII.21: "quod maximum est in christiana religione, quis eorum valet proprio ore corpus et sanguinem Domini conficere?"

[14] I would suggest that the prohibition against confecting the body of Christ in wooden chalices may have been meant precisely to avoid the confusing collusion between mortar and chalice, between the art of cooking and liturgical performance.

[15] Gregory I, *Dialogues*, IV.58 (*PL* 77: 425): "Quis enim fidelium habere dubium possit, in ipsa immolationis hora ad sacerdotis vocem coelos aperiri, in illo Jesu Christi mysterio angelorum choros adesse, sumaris ima sociari, terrena coelestibus jungi, unumque ex visibilibus atque invisibilibus fieri?"

[16] *Confessio fidei*, IV, 1 (*PL* 101: 1087): "Ideo quamvis corporeis oculis ibi ad altare Domini videam sacerdotem, panem et vinum offerentem, tamen intuitu fidei, et puro lumine cordis inspicio illum summum sacerdotem, verumque pontificem Dominum Jesum Christum, offerentem seipsum . . .."

Faustus of Riez (cited by Paschasius), Christ as an invisible priest (*invisibilis sacerdos*) converts the visible creatures into His own substance.[17]

Two modes of vision, each with a different object, thus must be distinguished in the context of the sacrament. We need a human priest who represents us, but it is Christ who accomplishes what has to be made at the altar. In order to better understand the implications of this double vision for the priest's function at the altar, it is useful to review the Carolingian eucharistic debates between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus regarding the nature and role of *figura* and *res*.[18] Following Ambrose, Paschasius had contended that the sacramental body was identical with Christ's historical body. Since it is difficult to deny the Eucharist's figurative quality, he had to explain how it could nevertheless contain the truth. His solution was to argue that since every figure is a figure of another thing, and always refers to it, there must be a true thing of which it is the figure. More precisely, the Eucharist is the figure of what it contains, though what is contained is concealed from sight. Since Christ is the figure—Paschasius here adds "or the imprint (*character*)"—of the Father's substance (cf. Heb. 1:3), the Eucharist may properly be called both figure and truth: truth, because it contains the true, real body of Christ, and figure, since it is the "imprint" of the truth. In summary, then, "[the Eucharist] is the figure or imprint of the truth insofar as it is outwardly perceived, but whatever is correctly understood or believed inwardly from this mystery is the truth."[19]

Although Paschasius does not explicitly cite Ambrose, it is clear that the latter's concept of the progression from *umbra* to *veritas* through *imago* influenced his views. According to Ambrose, we must seek realities, in which perfection and truth will be found. To do so, however, we must first learn *how to look*, because "here is shadow and image, there the truth; the shadow is in the Law, the image in the Gospels, the truth in the heavenly realities." "Here," he adds, "we

[17] Faustus of Riez, *Sermones*, IV.3 (*PL* 83: 1225): "Nam invisibilis sacerdos, visibiles creaturas in substantiam corporis et sanguinis sui, verbo suo secreta potestate convertit."

[18] See the brilliant study by Celia Chazelle, "Figure, Character, and the Glorified Body in the Carolingian Eucharistic Controversy," *Traditio* 47 (1992): 1-36.

[19] Paschasius Radbertus, *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, ed. Beda Paulus [*CCCM* 16] (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969), c. IV (28-29): "Omnis enim figura alicuius rei figura est . . . Hoc mysterium aut veritas est aut figura ac per hoc umbra est . . . Sed si veraciter inspicimus, iure simul veritas et figura dicitur, ut sit figura vel caracter veritatis quod exterius sensitur, veritas vero quicquid de hoc mysterio interius recte intellegitur aut creditur. Non enim omnis figura umbra vel falsitas."

walk in image, we see in image; there, we will see face to face." [20] *Umbra* thus is equated to the historical and carnal aspect of things, prefiguring an expected spiritual reality; *imago* is the point at which that spiritual reality "co-adheres" to the flesh; and *veritas* points to the zone of preexistence and eschatology. The image seems to be at the same time accomplishment and anticipation, just as Christ both fulfills the prophecies and announces the kingdom of God. As well, the image is a vision *in aenigmate*: what is perceived is reality as it appears physically, not reality in itself. The truth, in contrast, is the complete spiritual reality, a manifest vision *facie ad faciem* of that which was presented in visible and historical form with Christ's Incarnation. According to Ambrose, this means that after Christ's Incarnation the truth is made visible or present in the eucharist, because Christ is *imago Dei* and not *vacua imago*.[21]

The minister of the eucharist, according to Paschasius, thus does not create anything at the altar. He is a mediator between divine grace and the consecrated species, which will be brought up to the celestial altar by the angels. It is no surprise, therefore, that Paschasius does not use the verb *conficere* to describe the priest's role; indeed, in his *Epistola de corpore et sanguine domini ad Frudegardum* he explicitly states that the only artist is the Holy Spirit. It would be absurd, he concludes, to suppose that the priest creates Christ's body at the altar, since this would mean that the creature is creating its creator. God, and only God, is the *opifex*.[22]

[20] Ambrose, *De officiis*, 2 vols., ed. Maurice Testard (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1984-1992), I.48.239 (1: 210-11): "Hic umbra, hic imago, illic veritas. Umbra in lege, imago in Evangelio, veritas in coelestibus . . . Hic ergo in imagine ambulamus, in imagine videmus: illic facie ad faciem."

[21] Ambrose, *De excessu fratris*, II.109, in *Sancti Ambrosii opera*, vol. 7, ed. Otto Faller [*CSEL* 73] (Vienna: Tempsky, 1896), 311-12: "Christus non umbra, sed imago Dei, non vacua imago, sed veritas."

[22] See Paschasius, *Epistola ad Fredugardum*, in *idem*, *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, 160: "Ac per hoc apostolo teste sicut nemo dicit Dominum Iesum nisi in Spiritu Sancto [1 Cor 12:3], ita nemo credit hoc ita esse nisi per Spiritum Sanctum, per quem haec fides data est et per quem hoc efficitur sacramentum, ut vera caro atque ipsa et non alia quam ipsa caro. Alias autem sine Spiritu Sancto sicut nec caro Christi prodest quicquam [John 6:63], ita nec hoc sacramentum carnis et sanguinis prodesse potest. Quia in his omnibus unus est opifex Spiritus Sanctus, unus et Christus qui conceptus de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine, unus et creator atque sanctificator corporis ac sanguinis ipse Spiritus." Cf. *idem*, *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, XII.53-55 (78): "Unde sacerdos non ex se dicit, quod ipse creator corporis et sanguinis esse possit, quia si hoc posset quod absurdum est, creator creatoris fieret . . .."

A quite contrary position on this issue was taken by Ratramnus of Corbie. At the beginning of his *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, he offers his own analysis of the relationship between truth and figure.[23] A figure, he argues, is a kind of overshadowing: it says one thing but signifies another, and cannot make its referent clear or obvious to the senses. Truth, on the other hand, is the demonstration of something manifest, something that is not veiled.[24] The Eucharist presents a spiritual or intangible content. Since it has nothing to do with something visible or tangible, therefore, the sacramental body is not identical with the real body of Christ. Although Ratramnus claims that Christ is not really, materially, or sensibly present in the species, however, this does not mean that he questions the truth of Christ's spiritual presence. The sacramental body offers a pledge, the image, the likeness and appearance of Christ's body, which itself will be revealed to the faithful on the last day. For Ratramnus, as Celia Chazelle has shown, "a proper historical presence requires a belief either that the body and blood in the Eucharist are separate *material* entities lying beneath an outer, material covering of bread and wine, perhaps hidden by that covering but still potentially visible; or the bread and wine must be totally replaced by perceptible flesh and blood, as though consecration has produced a sensible, material presence."[25]

These arguments were repeated in the tenth century, when Gezo of Tortona and Heriger of Lobbes propounded a realist, even sensual, conception of the eucharist. Everyone agreed that the eucharist involves some kind of creation of Christ, with the help of the Spirit. Two principles are involved in this creation: the first is material and visible, specific to the priest (*conficere*), while the second is spiritual or intellectual and invisible, specific to the Spirit (*creare*). It was this very same Spirit at work when the Virgin came to be with child; thus, the ineffable *operatio* of the Spirit produces the same result in the Incarnation and in the eucharist, i.e., the body of Christ. There still is a danger, however, that the faithful may confuse what pertains to the Spirit's action with what pertains to the priest's. Berengar of Tours clearly understood the risks of such a sensual ap-

[23] Chazelle, "Figure, Character, and the Glorified Body," 20.

[24] Ratramnus of Corbie, *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, 7-8 (*PL* 121: 130): "Figura est obumbratio quaedam quibusdam velaminibus quod intendit ostendens . . . Veritas vero est rei manifesta demonstratio, nullis umbrarum imaginibus obvelatae, sed puris et apertis, utque plenius eloquamur, naturalibus significationibus insinuatae . . .."

[25] Chazelle, "Figure, Character, and the Glorified Body," 25.

proach to the Eucharist, and denounced the notion that the priest could materially create Christ's body. One even wonders whether Berengar accused his opponents of worshipping (if not making) images, since he protested against the idea that the *sacerdos* could create Christ's body *de novo*. Peter the Deacon's exclamation at the Council of Vercelli in 1050, which condemned Berengar's theses for the first time, is a telling one: "If we still are in the image, when will we be able to grasp the reality?"[26]

Peter's *cri du cœur* reflects the degree to which Berengar had gone beyond even Ratramnus, his major intellectual and doctrinal influence. While Ratramnus had argued that the sacramental body is an "image" of Christ's historical body, Berengar radically separated the figure from the truth. For Berengar, Christ's presence in the eucharist is one *in figura*, not *in veritate*. The sacrament is its sign, its pledge, its image, its similitude. Employing the familiar Augustinian formula, he concludes that since the sacrament is a sacred and visible sign of invisible Grace, similar to but not identical with that which it signifies, then the bread and wine are visible signs, offered to the senses and perceived with corporeal eyes, of Christ's body, which is truly perceived only with the intellect or spiritually. For Berengar, Christ is now sitting at the right hand of the Father, and is no longer visible in this world of images. He cannot be created *de novo* each day at the altar, much less be divided into parts. The consecration thus does not imply a sensible change: the conversion happens *intellectualiter*, with the bread and wine remaining in their essential nature. As a result, the priest does not in fact create anything.

At the Council of Rome in 1059, Berengar was forced to renounce this eucharistic theory, and to profess his belief in the sensible conversion of the species. Twenty years later, however, he was made to accede to a second confession, one in which the eucharistic body was identified so completely with the body born from the Virgin that the priest now replaces Mary, giving birth to Christ anew in the sacrament. It seems that the warnings of Ratramnus, and even Paschasius, had been forgotten. As René Laurentin has shown, Peter Damian was familiar with the parallel between the priest's role and that of the Virgin; [27] indeed, the

[26] Berengar of Tours, *Rescriptum contra Lanfrancum* , ed. R.B.C. Huygens [*CCCM* 84] (Turnhout: Brepols, 1988), I.439-40 (48): "Si adhuc in figura sumus, quando rem tenebimus?" On the dispute surrounding Berengarius' views, see Jean de Montclos, *Lanfranc et Bérenger: La controverse eucharistique du XIe siècle* (Louvain: Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense, 1971).

[27] René Laurentin, *Marie, l'Eglise et le Sacerdoce*, 2 vols. (Paris: Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1952-1953), 1: 114.

priest's daily creation of Christ's body was a main reason why the priesthood became such a central element of religious life in the eleventh century.[28]

This model of the priest as creator of Christ, I would argue, was deeply influential for later medieval artists. The reasons for this appeal can be found in a fantastic story told by Thietmar of Merseburg in his *Chronicon*.[29] Archbishop Gero of Cologne had commissioned a wooden crucifix for his church, one which still stood above his tomb in Thietmar's day. When Gero noticed a crack in the crucifix's head, he decided to "heal it" (*curare*). Taking a bit of the consecrated host (*Dominici corporis portio*) and a piece of the True Cross (*pars salutifere crucis*), he tied them together and set them in the crack. Then, crying and prostrate, he invoked God's name and thus completely repaired the damage.

When Gero repairs his wooden crucifix, he is presenting himself as an artist of a particular kind, working with an extraordinary material. Gero succeeds in fixing the crucifix when he fills the crack with a mixture of Christ's body and the True Cross, and then recites a blessing. There is no doubt about the story's miraculous and eucharist-related nature. But there is more than that: the episode binds in the simplest and even bluntest way the body of Christ, which is produced at the altar by the priest, and the crucifix made by the artist. The text thus leads the reader to the heart of the Eucharistic controversy, and more particularly to the central distinction between figure and truth. It is noteworthy that Thietmar makes no claim about, and thus does not allow us to distinguish between, what is said *in figura* and what is said *in veritate* about Christ's body. First, he stresses the identity of the body created at the altar with the crucified one, i.e., he proclaims the identity of the sacramental with the historical body. Second, he states that Christ's image *is* Christ. Once the blessing has been performed, the mixture used for repair disappears into the wood and conceals the fissure; the fragment of the True Cross apparently serves here as a binding agent. Third, by directly associating priestly creation with artistic creation, the text affirms the superiority of the former over the latter: the priest not only uses a sacred and miraculous material, but he also creates through the power of blessing, that is, with his speech. Gero of Cologne thus makes the body of Christ with his hands and

[28] See in particular Laudage, *Priesterbild und Reformpapsttum*.

[29] Thietmar, *Chronicon*, III.2-4 (86-88). Cf. Reiner Haussherr, *Der tote Christus am Kreuz. Zur Ikonographie des Gerokreuzes*, Ph.D. dissertation, Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Bonn, 1963, 35-41, and Annika Fisher's paper "Making the Body of Christ: The Crucifix of Archbishop Gero of Cologne," read at the conference "*Genus Regale et Sacerdotale*: The Image of the Bishop Around the Millennium," Chicago, October 1999.

through the invocation of the divine name—a striking reflection of the formula found in the *Libri Carolini*, "per manum sacerdotis et invocationem divini nominis conficiatur."[30] Yet while in the ninth century those words were used to separate the eucharist *from* the image, around the first millennium they served to define the creation of the true body of Christ *as* an image, if not the image of Christ *as* Christ.

Was the *sacerdos*, then, an artist? The answer is yes—when he was performing the sacrament at the altar. With the help of the Holy Spirit, he creates Christ's body; more precisely, it is the Holy Spirit that creates what the priest confects. As Peter Lombard would later say in his *Sentences*, it is only God who creates something; man can just make, that is compose, things.[31] It is possible, however, to speak of creation as long as the Spirit intervenes during the process. Thanks to bishops and priests, therefore, medieval artists little by little became aware that they too worked in conjunction with that same Spirit, and some of them even came to consider themselves as a kind of priesthood (or better, as theodidacts). [32] This belief was an understandable one, since priests before them had considered themselves to be not only ministers, but artists as well.

30 *Opus Caroli regis contra synodum (Libri Carolini)*, ed. Ann Freeman (MGH *Conc* II, Suppl. 1) (Hannover: Hahn, 1998), II.27.

31 Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, II, Dist. I.1 (*PL* 192: 651): "Creator enim est qui de nihilo aliquid facit. Et creare proprie est de nihilo aliquid facere; facere vero non modo de nihilo aliquid operari, sed etiam de materia. Unde et homo et angelus dicitur aliqua facere, sed non creare; vocatur factor sive artifex, sed non creator. Hoc enim nomen soli Deo proprie congruit, qui de nihilo quaedam, et de aliquo aliquo facit. Ipse est ergo creator et opifex et factor, sed creationis nomen sibi proprie retinuit, alia vero etiam creaturis communicavit."

32 Cf. 1 Thess. 4:9. On this issue, see Pierre-Alain Mariaux, "La Vierge dans l'atelier de Tuotilo. De l'artiste médiéval considéré comme un 'théodidacte'," *Revue de l'Histoire des religions* 218/2 (2001): 171-93.

Fig. 22. Choir capital with Adoration of the Magi. Church of St.-Pierre, Chauvigny. Photo courtesy of the Institute d'Histoire de l'Art, Université de Neuchâtel.

Neue Aspekte der europäischen Mittelalterforschung

herausgegeben von

Prof. Dr. Natalie Fryde (TU Darmstadt)
Prof. Dr. Michael Gelting (Universität Kopenhagen)
und Prof. Dr. Hanna Vollrath (Universität Bochum)

Band 4

LIT

Sean Gilsdorf (ed.)

The Bishop: Power and Piety at the First Millennium

LIT

Contents

Illustrations

Tables

Figures